

Spring 2018

The relationship between adult attachment theory, jealousy, and attitudes towards monogamy

Zachary Michael Szabrowicz
Eastern Washington University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://dc.ewu.edu/theses>



Part of the [Personality and Social Contexts Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Szabrowicz, Zachary Michael, "The relationship between adult attachment theory, jealousy, and attitudes towards monogamy" (2018). *EWU Masters Thesis Collection*. 525.
<https://dc.ewu.edu/theses/525>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Student Research and Creative Works at EWU Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in EWU Masters Thesis Collection by an authorized administrator of EWU Digital Commons. For more information, please contact jotto@ewu.edu.

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN ADULT ATTACHMENT THEORY, JEALOUSY, AND
ATTITUDES TOWARDS MONOGAMY

A Thesis

Presented To

Eastern Washington University

Cheney, Washington

In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements

for the Degree

Master of Science in Psychology

By

Zachary Michael Szabrowicz

Spring 2018

THESIS OF ZACHARY MICHAEL SZABROWICZ APPROVED BY

NAME OF CHAIR, GRADUATE STUDY COMMITTEE

DATE

NAME OF MEMBER, GRADUATE STUDY COMMITTEE

DATE

NAME OF MEMBER, GRADUATE STUDY COMMITTEE

DATE

Abstract

The purpose of this study was to look at how jealousy manifests through different attachment styles, and whether an individual's attachment style was related to their attitude toward monogamy. The participants consisted of undergraduate psychology students at Eastern Washington University. Participants were assessed and put in to categories based on how they placed in the four attachment styles: secure, preoccupied, dismissive, or fearful. Participants were evaluated on three dimensions of jealousy (cognitive jealousy, emotional jealousy, and behavioral jealousy). Finally, participants were evaluated on their attitude towards monogamy, and whether they viewed monogamy as enhancing to the relationship or a sacrifice for the sake of the relationship. Results showed that all four attachment styles experienced higher emotional jealousy than they did cognitive and behavioral jealousy. Results also showed that all four attachment styles viewed monogamy as enhancing to the relationship. This study provides us with the opportunity to further understand how individuals of each adult attachment style react and relate to their significant others in their relationships. It also allows us to further understand the nature of those relationships in which each attachment style is drawn to in their personal lives.

Keywords: attachment, jealousy, monogamy

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Introduction.....	1
Methods.....	15
Results.....	17
Table 1.....	19
Table 2.....	21
Table 3.....	22
Table 4.....	23
Discussion.....	24
References.....	28
Vita.....	31

The Relationship between Attachment Theory, Jealousy, and Attitudes Towards Monogamy

Jealousy is an innate emotion that is a part of our lives and relationships. Buss states, "...jealousy has deep evolutionary roots that were critical to the success and proliferation of our ancestors" (Buss, 2000, p. 27). Recently, jealousy has taken on different perspectives in our lives, given the increase of opportunities to experience jealousy due to technology. Technology has given us opportunities to inconspicuously keep up on others' lives twenty-four hours a day via social media. With this ability, it is possible for us to watch our significant others more easily and inconspicuously; we can watch them interact with others via Facebook, texting, email, etc. This growing ability to watch others interact and to connect with individuals at any given point in the can lead to feeling threatened. Guerrero (1998) describes jealousy as "...a multifaceted reaction that is triggered by perceptions of threat" (Guerrero, 1998, p. 274). In the presence of a threat to the relationship, individuals may behave in ways that are based in how they view others and how they view themselves (Guerrero, 1998).

The purpose of this research in part, was to link adult attachment theory to jealousy. We specifically looked at whether individuals with different attachment styles in the adult attachment model would express and/or experience different levels of jealousy in their relationships and more specifically, what type of jealousy was displayed. Because jealousy can affect our relationships in many ways, it is important to study for a number of reasons: it can give us insight as to what type of attachment styles experience more jealousy so we can work to address the problem in a clinical setting with individuals and couples, and it can give us further insight as to what type of jealousy is heightened for different attachment styles. In addition, we also looked at the link between adult attachment, jealousy, and how adult attachment theory influence an

individual's view of monogamy. Specifically, we looked to see how each attachment style viewed monogamy and the role monogamy played in their relationships. To better understand this issue, we will need to look into past research on attachment theory, the adult attachment model, jealousy, and monogamy.

Overview of Attachment Theory

According to Fraley (2010), the attachment behavior system links the ethological models of human development with the modern theories on emotional regulation. The basics of attachment theory suggest children form a special relationship with a caregiver. This caregiver is known as an attachment figure. When a child is young, they use this caregiver as a secure base in which they can explore their environment and always have this attachment figure they can return to for security. Bradbury and Karney (2014) explain, "The caregiver's presence and protection, in turn, promote the experience of felt security, which makes the child feel safe and sheltered from impending threat or harm" (Bradbury & Karney, 2014, p. 95). As children grow, they develop these types of relationships with caregivers that ultimately set them up for future relationships.

Previous research by Ainsworth, Blehar, Waters, and Wall (1978) noted that there were three patterns of attachment: secure, anxious/ambivalent, and avoidant. Ainsworth, a seasoned researcher in the topic of attachment theory explains that when children learn language it is possible for them to better communicate with caregivers about their needs and plans, thus coordinating mutual plans with their caregivers (Ainsworth, 1989). This makes it possible for children to explore further and to still experience this safe haven and secure base. Rholes and Simpson (2004) explain the concept of secure base and safe haven. They state that "...infants are driven to maintain proximity to an attachment figure who, ideally, offers an available and

responsive target for proximity seeking; serves as a safe haven, providing support, comfort, reassurance, and relief; and constitutes a secure base, facilitating engagement in exploration and play” (Rholes & Simpson, 2004, p. 161).

Attachment styles are not only present during childhood. They carry over into adulthood and play a big part in how we interact with people. Bradbury and Karney (2014) state, “... [attachment theory] proposes that the intimate relationships we form in our adult lives are shaped largely by the nature of the bonds we form with our primary caregivers in infancy and early childhood” (Bradbury & Karney, 2014, p. 94). Hazan and Shaver (1987) also believe that the bonds an individual form as a child carry over to their bonds with adult lovers and are inherently similar to those bonds formed between parent and child during infancy. They studied how people categorized themselves regarding their attachment styles as adults. The researchers administered a survey via newspaper for the first study they conducted and the results showed that 56% of individuals categorized themselves as securely attached, while 25% categorized themselves as avoidant and 19% anxious. Their study determined that these numbers were consistent with attachment rates among infants (Hazan & Shaver, 1987), suggesting a stability in attachment models from childhood to adulthood.

Hazan and Shaver (1987) then conducted a second study with the notion that their first study was limited in numerous ways. Their second survey was administered to undergraduates and was refined by including self-descriptive items and items concerning relationships with others. The results of the second study were similar to the first in that 56% of individuals were considered to have secure attachments, 23% were considered to have avoidant attachments and 20% were considered to have anxious attachments. Hazan and Shaver state that “...the results provide encouraging support for an attachment-theoretical perspective on romantic love...”

(Hazan & Shaver, 1987, p. 511). Given this research, it supports that humans would hold an attachment style they have learned in childhood through to adulthood.

Attachment research has come a long way from its original three category model. Over the years, attachment has been measured numerous ways. It has been measured through interview and a number of different questionnaires. Through the different forms of measurement, there have been very miniscule changes since Hazan and Shaver's research in 1987. Brennan, Clark & Shaver (1998) who have studied attachment over the years, have received numerous calls, letters and emails asking which measure is best for assessing a person's attachment style. These questions sparked them to create an all-purpose reply to future attachment researchers who wish to use self-report measures for measuring attachment styles in individuals. The researchers conducted an extensive search for preexisting attachment measures, which they compiled into one massive pool. Then, they performed factor analysis on the items. This factor analysis provided data suggesting that the majority of the items were correlated strongly and organized into either relationship avoidance or relationship anxiety factors. Once the factor analysis was done, the researchers computed two brief scales that could represent each dimension. These two scales were found to have good reliability with avoidance ($\alpha = .94$) and anxiety ($\alpha = .91$). The name of this scale is the Experiences of Close Relationships (ECR) (Brennen, Clark & Shaver, 1998). With research pointing towards attachment being on a spectrum, we will be able to better understand what leads individuals to adopt these certain attachment styles depending on where they place on the spectrum that explains relationship anxiety and relationship avoidance.

Rholes & Simpson (2004) have taken Brennan, Clark, & Shavers (1998) research and described it rather simply. They state that anxiety, the first dimension of the adult attachment model "...reflects the degree to which individuals worry about being rejected, abandoned, or

unloved by significant others” (p. 199), and avoidance, the second dimension of the adult attachment model “...reflects the degree to which individuals limit intimacy and interdependence with others” (p. 199). If we place anxiety and avoidance on spectrums and have them intersect like a mathematical graph, we can place individuals in quadrants based on where they place on the two dimensions.

Additionally, they interpreted the four attachment styles relative to where the individuals place on the quadrant. Securely attached individuals rate low on both anxiety and avoidance. These individuals are open to forming close relationships and are generally caring and responsive. Secure individuals are comfortable with becoming dependent on others as needed. Preoccupied individuals, previously known as anxious/ambivalent, are high on the anxiety spectrum and low on the avoidance spectrum. These individuals want to become close with others but have reservations in that these individuals think others are not responsive or available to them. These individuals seek others’ approval, and have high anxiety about being rejected and abandoned. Fearful individuals are high in both anxiety and avoidance spectrums. These individuals have a lot of distrust in others along with heightened expectations of rejection, causing these individuals to be uncomfortable with intimacy and close relationships. Lastly, dismissive individuals are low in anxiety and high in avoidance. These individuals view themselves as confident and think that others are unreliable and unresponsive. They also try to stay away from intimacy with the fear that rejection would hurt their self-image.

Bradbury & Karney (2014) agreed with Rholes & Simpson (2004) on how the four attachment styles view others and how they view their relationship. However, Bradbury and Karney made an extra point on how each attachment style views themselves and how they view others. The researchers describe secure individuals to have a positive view of others and a

positive view of themselves. This allows these individuals to be open to forming intimate relationships and to be dependent on others, because they view themselves as worthy and others as reliable. Preoccupied individuals are described to have a positive view of others and a negative view of the self. This negative view of the self leads these individuals to be preoccupied with their own insecurities and inadequacies causing high anxiety in their relationships. These individuals can come across as needy and need reassurance in their relationships. Dismissing individuals have a positive view of the self and a negative view of others. Having a negative view of others leads these individuals to value independence and self-sufficiency. They also tend to avoid intimacy in the attempt to maintain their positive view of the self and negative view of others. Fearful individuals have a negative view of the self and a negative view of others. This creates high anxiety in that these individuals feel unworthy, and high avoidance in that others are not likely to be reliable and responsive. These individuals avoid intimacy in fear of what might happen in their future.

Collins and Read (1990) wanted to expand on Hazan and Shaver's 1987 research on attachment theory. They were curious about the relationship between individuals who were either comfortable or anxious with relational closeness and the general mental representations of the individuals, others, and their romantic relationships. The researchers also looked at individual's current views of self, others, and relationships compared to their history of relationships and views. In their study, they found results consistent with attachment theory research. They found that individuals that were comfortable with closeness tended to be close with others, dependable, had a positive view of the world, and were less likely to have relationships that were obsessive or characterized as game playing. They also noted that these individuals were selfless in their relationships. Individuals that were characterized as anxious

about closeness had negative views of themselves and others and were much more likely to be in relationships that were obsessive and dependent. The researchers noted that they had moderate support for the link between the individual's current views of self, others, and relationships compared to their history. Overall, the researchers stated that if an individual perceived their parents to be warm and responsive, they were likely to be more confident and less anxious in their relationships. If an individual perceived their parents to be cold and unresponsive, the individual tended to have a negative self-image and were likely to be more anxious.

The connections that Collins and Read (1990) have made are crucial for the understanding of how individuals see not only themselves or others, but their relationships in general. Given the previous research, it is easy to make the connection from childhood to adulthood regarding attachment styles. Attachment is known to affect many parts of our lives because of how we view others and how we view ourselves, including our relationships.

Link Between Attachment Theory and Jealousy

One of the major aspects of romantic relationships is jealousy. Attachment styles, overall, are thought to affect jealousy in romantic relationships. Prior research looks at how jealousy and attachment styles are related. Sharpsteen and Kirkpatrick (1997) stated that jealousy is a product of threats to a relationship. With this being said, they investigated the relationship between attachment styles and the experiences of jealousy based on the qualitative differences using a two-part study. Part one looked at the differences between attachment styles and chronic jealousy, and concurrent emotions of jealousy. The second part of the study looked at the relationship between attachment style and participant's thoughts, feeling, and behaviors associated with jealousy-provoking stimuli. What they found was that securely attached individuals felt anger more than any other emotion and felt it more intensely than the other

emotions. They were also more likely to turn that anger towards their partner. Anxious participants felt anger intensely but were likely to turn it into irritability and not confront their partners on it. Avoidant individuals felt sadness more than anything and were likely to work to maintain their self-esteem.

These findings are consistent with the previously discussed literature on how people with different attachment styles view themselves. The securely attached individuals were likely to turn the anger towards their partners because of their high view of their partners and their high self-worth. Anxious individuals were likely to turn their anger elsewhere because of their negative view of self and feeling of unworthiness. And the avoidant individuals were likely to experience sadness, as a result from the blow to their ego, and then engage in self-esteem maintaining behaviors such as finding faults in others. Sharpsteen and Kirkpatrick (1997) provides us with the opportunities to link the theoretical frameworks of different attachment styles and how individuals interact within the different attachment styles to concrete experiences of emotion given a threatening stimulus.

Guerrero (1998) extended previous work on attachment and jealousy. She looked at how attachment styles differed from each other in the way the individuals within them experienced and expressed romantic jealousy. To measure this, participants in romantic relationships were given questionnaires to assess attachment style, jealousy experiences, and jealousy expression. What she found was that individuals with negative views of themselves showed higher cognitive jealousy, meaning they experienced more jealous worry and suspicion than individuals with positive views of themselves. Secondly, Guerrero found that individuals with negative views of others engaged in more avoidance behaviors more often and use relationship maintaining behaviors less frequently. Third, preoccupied individuals reported engaging in more surveillance

behaviors than those in other attachment styles. Lastly, dismissive individuals' experience less fear when experiencing jealousy than other attachment styles.

Knobloch, Solomon, and Cruz (2001) were curious on how the development of a relationship would affect how individuals experienced jealousy. The researchers predicted that cognitive jealousy and relational uncertainty would have a positive association and that cognitive jealousy would have a stronger association with relational uncertainty than emotional jealousy would. The researchers found this to be true. In fact, they found that cognitive jealousy was associated to relational uncertainty rather strongly. They also found that cognitive jealousy had a stronger association to relational uncertainty than emotional jealousy did. Knobloch et al. also found, as predicted, that cognitive jealousy and intimacy were positively associated. They also found that cognitive jealousy and intimacy were mediated by relational uncertainty. The researchers explained that doubts about either partner or the relationship would make the individual vulnerable to suspicions about the partner's fidelity regardless of the level of intimacy the partners had.

Knobloch, Solomon, and Cruz (2001) also predicted that cognitive jealousy and emotional jealousy would both have a positive association with relationship anxiety. Results showed that individuals' perceptions of anxiety indirectly affected their experience of cognitive jealousy, but directly affected their experience of emotional jealousy. The researchers explain that this effect happens through relational uncertainty. The researchers highlight the importance of the attachment orientation when understanding an individual's jealousy experience in a relationship, explaining that "relationship characteristics such as security and dependency, which, in turn, predicted jealousy evoked in response to a specific threat" (Knobloch, Solomon & Cruz, 2001, p. 220). Knobloch et al. research provides us with evidence that different forms of

jealousy can be present and can manifest in different ways.

Individuals within different attachment styles can differ on how they experience jealousy. Marazziti, Consoli, Albanese, Laquidara, Baroni, and Dell'Osso (2010) assessed how attachment styles relate to different aspects of jealousy. Their study looked at the relationship between qualitative characteristics of jealousy and attachment style. Marazziti et al. used the “Experiences in Close Relationships” (ECR) scale to measure attachment and the “Questionario della Gelosia” (QUEGE) scale to measure jealousy.

The QUEGE scale breaks down jealousy into five psychopathological dimensions: obsessive jealousy (the involuntary feelings of jealousy which are excessive, unrealistic, and difficult to suppress), depressive jealousy (an individual's sense of inadequacy when compared with the partner, leaving the individual to not feel trust, which causes the individual to feel potential betrayal with some distant rival), separation-anxiety-related jealousy (the inability to accept thoughts of loss. This leads the individual to be dependent, requesting their partners presence all the time. It also refers to signs of distress when separated from their partner), paranoid jealousy (extreme suspicion, interpretative and controlling behaviors towards partner or rival, poor perceived morality of partner), and sensitivity-related jealousy (hypersensitivity towards partner, overreaction to external situations, and unfamiliar individuals are considered aggressive so everybody is subjected to constant monitoring).

The researchers found that preoccupied individuals were linked with high obsessional jealousy, interpersonal sensitivity, and fear of loss compared to securely attached individuals. They also found that fearful individuals scored higher on fear of loss than securely attached individuals. Finally, the researchers found that dismissive individuals had lower scores on the self-esteem dimension than securely attached individuals. The results of the preoccupied

individuals make sense given that they have high anxiety but also have a negative view of self, driving obsessions of fear of loss of a partner. Fearfully attached individuals also reacted as predicted assuming the fear of loss comes from their negative view of self and negative view of others.

Overview of Jealousy scale

Pfeiffer and Wong (1989) put together a questionnaire that assessed the three dimensions of jealousy: cognitive jealousy, emotional jealousy, and behavioral jealousy. This scale is called the Multidimensional Jealousy Scale (MJS). They described cognitive jealousy as "...how often he or she has various suspicions concerning his or her partner and a rival" (p. 186), emotional jealousy as "...how 'upset' they would feel in response to various hypothetical jealousy-evoking situations" (p. 186), and behavioral jealousy as "...how often they engage in various detective behaviors (e.g., going through a partner's belongings" (p. 186). Their scale consists of 24 (8 per dimension) questions to assess jealousy. Cronbach's alphas were computed for each scale. The cognitive scale had an alpha of 0.92, the emotional scale had an alpha of 0.85, and the behavioral scale had an alpha of 0.89.

Overview of Monogamy

Jealousy is but one characteristic that is related to relationships. Monogamy is another aspect of a relationship that might be more controversial than thought. It's worth noting that monogamy itself does not shape our relationship, but how we view and interpret monogamy can influence how we interact within our relationships. Hosking (2014) mentions that there has been an increasing interest in understanding and exploring motivations around establishing sexual agreements, rules associated with those agreements, and the association of breaking those agreements. Moreover, the topic of monogamy and monogamous relationships has had a spike in

interest.

Previous research has shown that men in same-sex monogamous relationships did not differ in relationship satisfaction from men in same-sex nonmonogamous relationships (Whitton, Weitbrechet, & Kuryluk, 2015). The researchers did note that men in nonmonogamous relationships reported higher quality alternatives than men in monogamous relationships. Quality alternatives is referred to as “the degree to which the participant’s needs could be fulfilled in relationships other than that with the current partner...” (Whitton, Weitbrechet, & Kuryluk, 2015, p. 48). This suggests that there is an internal component that may be driving certain people to monogamous relationship and others to nonmonogamous relationships. The researchers also suggested that men in nonmonogamous relationships are associated with lower commitment and higher break-up rates (Whitton, Weitbrechet, & Kuryluk, 2015). Even though men in nonmonogamous relationships do not differ in relationship satisfaction from men in monogamous relationships, they are likely to not be as attached to their partners as men who are in monogamous relationships.

Hosking (2014) explored the relationship of attitudes towards monogamy, relationship quality, and dispositional jealousy in gay men. What he found was that men in closed relationships (monogamous) reported significantly higher dispositional jealousy than those in monogamish (monogamous with the chance of exceptions) relationships, and those in monogamish relationship reported significantly higher dispositional jealousy than those in open relationships. Hosking suggests that men in open relationships, are more likely to be at ease with their partners seeing other men; however, this does not make them immune to experiencing jealous feelings. Those men who did experience jealous feelings showed a decreased level of relationship satisfaction. These findings are consistent with Whitton, Weitbrechet, and Kuryluk’s

research in that relationship satisfaction in these (non)monogamous relationships can be driven by internal thoughts and emotions. Given this information, we can make the assumption that an individual's attitudes towards monogamy might be driven by their experiences of jealousy, which could be related to a person's attachment style.

Summary

The previous research supports that attachment theory and jealousy are linked together. It is clear that securely attached individuals confront their partners because of their positive view of self and low avoidance. This leads them to experience low levels of jealousy. Preoccupied individuals' experience higher anxiety (e.g., fear of loss, obsessional jealousy), but also have low avoidance leading them to come off needy and engaging in behaviors such as surveillance of their partners. Dismissive individuals' experience lower levels of jealousy characteristics based on their motivation for a high-self-esteem and the negative view of others. These individuals tend to minimize the important and the need of an intimate relationship. Fearful individuals' experience higher anxiety (e.g., fear of loss) than secure individuals. Because fearful individuals have a negative view of other, they are more likely to engage in avoidance, which is consistent with where they place on the two dimensions of adult attachment.

Current Study

The current study addressed jealousy as it manifests in different attachment styles based on the adult attachment scale, and the relationship between attitudes towards monogamy and attachment styles. This study provides us the opportunity to understand how attachment styles prevail in adult relationships by how individuals' experience jealousy and whether they are drawn towards monogamous relationships or nonmonogamous relationships. Participants were given a questionnaire that assessed their attachment style. They were also given a questionnaire

that assessed how they express/experience jealousy (cognitive, emotional, behavioral) and a questionnaire that assessed their attitude toward monogamy. We predicted that secure individuals would experience higher levels of emotional jealousy based on previous research that secure individuals experienced anger rather intensely in the presence of a jealousy provoking situation (Sharpsteen & Kirkpatrick, 1997). These individuals were predicted to view monogamy as enhancing to the relationship based on previous research that securely attached individuals' value closeness and intimacy with a partner (Rholes & Simpson, 2004). Secondly, we predicted that preoccupied individuals would experience higher levels of behavioral jealousy based on previous research that they are more likely to engage in surveillance behaviors (Guerrero, 1998). These individuals were predicted to view monogamy as enhancing to the relationship based on research that they fear abandonment and rejection (Rholes & Simpson, 2004). Third, we predicted that dismissive individuals would experience relatively low levels of jealousy, with the exception of a small spike in cognitive jealousy based on their tendency to hold negative views of others in their relationships (Bradbury & Karney, 2014). We predicted that these individuals would view monogamy as a sacrifice to the relationship based on research that they view others as unreliable, unresponsive, and distance themselves from others intimately (Rholes & Simpson, 2004). Finally, we predicted that fearful individuals would experience higher levels of cognitive jealousy based on research that suggests fearful individuals have a higher fear of the loss of their partner (Guerrero, 1998). These individuals were predicted to view monogamy as a sacrifice for the relationship based on research that suggests they tend to stay away from intimacy with the expectation that they will be rejected (Rholes & Simpson, 2004).

Methods

Participants

Participants consisted of 101 undergraduates between the ages of 18 and 50 years of age with the most occurring age being 19. There were 21 males, 79 females, and 1 transgender participant in the study. Of these participants, 60 were involved in a committed relationship, and 41 participants were not involved in a committed relationship. Six participants were eliminated from the data as they did not answer the vast majority of the questions in the survey. Although some of the remaining participants in the study did not answer some of the questions in the study, their responses were included in the analysis for the questions to which they responded to.

Materials

Demographics. Participants completed a small demographics questionnaire that established age, gender, sexual orientation, whether they were in a committed relationship, and if so, if they were in a monogamous relationship.

Experience in Close Relationships – Revised Scale. The Experience in Close Relationships – Revised (ECR-R) Scale, (Fraley, Waller & Brennan, 2000) is a measure of adult attachment. The ECR-R is a 36-question assessment. It assesses individuals on two subscales: avoidance and anxiety. Individuals who are thought to be avoidant feel uncomfortable around intimacy and tend to want more space and independence. Individuals thought to be high in anxiety are thought to have a fear of abandonment and rejection in their relationships. The measure gives statements such as, “I often worry that my partner doesn’t love me”, and “I prefer not to be too close to romantic partners”. These statements were assessed on a seven-point Likert scale.

Multidimensional Jealousy Scale. The Multidimensional Jealousy Scale (MJS) (Pfeiffer & Wong, 1989) is a measure that assesses jealousy as three dimensions: cognitive jealousy, emotional jealousy, and behavioral jealousy. Cognitive jealousy is defined by the suspicions concerning his or her partner's fidelity. Emotional jealousy is defined as how upset you get when presented with jealousy provoking situations. And behavioral jealousy is defined as how often participants engage in detective or protective behaviors. The MJS is a 24-item questionnaire. It gives statements such as, "I suspect that X is secretly seeing someone of the opposite sex", "X is flirting with someone of the opposite sex", and "I look through X's drawers, handbag, or pockets" to assess jealousy.

The Monogamy Attitudes Scale. The Monogamy Attitudes Scale (MAS) (Schmookler & Bursik, 2007) was designed to assess attitudes towards monogamy. The measure is a 16-item questionnaire. Items are assessed on a 7 point Likert scale. The MAS assesses the extent to which individuals feel like monogamy is a sacrifice for the sake of the relationship, or whether it enhances the relationship. The questionnaire asks questions such as, "Being with only one person enriches the quality of the relationship" and "Being with only one person limits my personal growth". Cronbach's alphas were computed for each scale. The enhancing subscale had an alpha of 0.86, and the sacrificing subscale had an alpha of 0.80.

Procedures

Participants logged into SONA systems, an online research participation website for the university's Department of Psychology. The participants were rewarded with extra credit for completing the survey. Once they entered the survey, they were informed of their anonymity and informed consent along with information about the study. By continuing the survey, they agreed to the terms and consented to participate. The first block regarded the demographic questions

which took approximately 1 to 2 minutes. After completing these questions, the participants were directed to a second block. This block was the ECR-R and the MJS combined which took approximately 5 to 10 minutes. The total survey was designed to be completed in 6 to 12 minutes. After completion of the survey, participants were informed of psychological services in the case the survey had caused emotional distress to the participant. Once the participant left the page, the survey was over and extra credit was credited to their SONA system account.

Design

Participants were assessed and put in to categories based on how they placed in the four attachment styles: secure, preoccupied, dismissive, fearful. Participants were then evaluated on the three dimensions of jealousy (cognitive jealousy, emotional jealousy, and behavioral jealousy), and their attitude toward monogamy. A series of paired samples t-tests compared each attachment group to mean scores in each jealousy subgroup, and their attitude towards monogamy subgroups.

Results

Participants were separated by attachment style using the Adult Attachment scale. Participants' scores on the attachment scales were categorized into two categories: anxiety, and avoidance. An average score was calculated for both avoidance and anxiety scales. Participants who scored ≤ 50 on the anxiety scale and ≤ 63 on the avoidance scale were placed in the secure attachment group ($n = 41$). Participants who scored > 50 on the anxiety scale and > 63 on the avoidance scale were placed in the fearfully attached group ($n = 34$). Participants who scored ≤ 50 on the anxiety scale and > 63 on the avoidance scale were placed in the dismissively attached group ($n = 9$). Participants who scored > 50 on the anxiety scale and ≤ 63 on the avoidance scale

were placed in the preoccupied attachment group ($n = 17$). Data imputation was used to complete 5 participants attachment styles based on how they answered the rest of the attachment questions.

Participants were evaluated on their primary jealousy type. The Multidimensional Jealousy Scale is separated into three jealousy types: cognitive jealousy, emotional jealousy, and behavioral jealousy. Each subtype of jealousy was assessed through separate sets of questions. Each set of questions was summed to give each participant a single score in each of the three jealousy types, with the highest scoring type being the participant's primary jealousy type.

Participants were evaluated on their attitude toward monogamy using the Attitude Towards Monogamy scale. Participants answered questions to assess their perspectives on whether they view monogamy as enhancing to the relationship, or whether they view monogamy as a sacrifice for the sake of the relationship. Participants' scores were summed on each scale to yield a single score for each dimension. Participants' scores were compared to assess whether they view monogamy as more enhancing or more sacrificing to the relationship.

Secure Participants

We hypothesized that securely attached participants would experience emotional jealousy more than cognitive jealousy and behavioral jealousy, and would view monogamy as enhancing to the relationship. A paired samples t-test was performed to analyze participants' primary jealousy type and view of monogamy among securely attached participants. There was a significant difference in the mean scores for cognitive jealousy and emotional jealousy among securely attached individuals, $t(21) = -15.73, p < .001$. Securely attached participants experienced significantly higher emotional jealousy ($M = 26.18, SD = 3.94$) than they did cognitive jealousy ($M = 10.18, SD = 2.30$). There was no significant difference in the mean scores for cognitive jealousy and behavioral jealousy among securely attached individuals ($p =$

.854). There was a significant difference in the mean scores for emotional jealousy and behavioral jealousy among securely attached individuals, $t(20) = 16.72, p < .001$. Securely attached individuals experienced more emotional jealousy ($M = 26.19, SD = 4.03$) than they did behavioral jealousy ($M = 10.52, SD = 2.54$). These findings confirmed the first part of our hypothesis: securely attached participants would experience emotional jealousy more than cognitive jealousy and behavioral jealousy. There was a significant difference in the mean scores of securely attached participants attitude towards monogamy, $t(38) = -13.04, p < .001$. Specifically, securely attached participants viewed monogamy more enhancing to the relationship ($M = 35.23, SD = 5.23$) than they viewed it as a sacrifice for the sake of the relationship ($M = 14.56, SD = 5.82$). This finding confirmed the second part of our hypothesis: securely attached individual's view monogamy as enhancing to the relationship. See Table 1.

Table 1

Descriptive Statistics and t-test Results for Securely Attached Individuals

	Type	M	SD	<i>t</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>sig.</i>
Pair 1	Cognitive	10.18	2.30	-15.73*	21	.000
	Emotional	26.18	3.94			
Pair 2	Cognitive	10.08	2.14	-0.19	39	.854
	Behavioral	10.15	2.18			
Pair 3	Emotional	26.19	4.03	16.72*	20	.000
	Behavioral	10.52	2.54			
Pair 4	Sacrifice	14.56	5.82	-13.04	38	.000
	Enhance	35.23	5.23			

* $p < .05$.

Preoccupied Participants

We hypothesized that preoccupied participants would experience behavioral jealousy more than cognitive and emotional jealousy, and would view monogamy as enhancing to the relationship. A paired samples t-test was performed to analyze participants' primary jealousy

type and view of monogamy among preoccupied attached participants. There was a significant difference in the mean scores for cognitive jealousy and emotional jealousy among preoccupied attached individuals, $t(11) = -4.76, p = .001$. Preoccupied attached participants experienced significantly higher emotional jealousy ($M = 23.92, SD = 5.13$) than they did cognitive jealousy ($M = 14.08, SD = 4.44$). There was significant difference in the mean scores for cognitive jealousy and behavioral jealousy among preoccupied attached individuals, $t(15) = 3.01, p = .009$. Preoccupied attached individuals reported having significantly more cognitive jealousy ($M = 14.38, SD = 4.30$) than they did behavioral jealousy ($M = 11.31, SD = 1.70$). There was also a significant difference in the mean scores for emotional jealousy and behavioral jealousy among preoccupied attached individuals, $t(10) = 7.01, p < .001$. Preoccupied attached individuals experienced more emotional jealousy ($M = 24.09, SD = 5.34$) than they did behavioral jealousy ($M = 11.18, SD = 1.94$). These findings did not confirm the first part of our hypothesis. There was a significant difference in the mean scores of preoccupied attached participants attitude towards monogamy, $t(15) = -6.03, p < .001$. Specifically, preoccupied attached participants viewed monogamy more enhancing to the relationship ($M = 33.31, SD = 7.51$) than they viewed it as a sacrifice for the sake of the relationship ($M = 16.50, SD = 5.65$). This finding confirmed the second part of our hypothesis on preoccupied individual's view towards monogamy. See Table 2.

Table 2

Descriptive Statistics and t-test Results for Preoccupied Attached Individuals

	Type	M	SD	<i>t</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>sig.</i>
Pair 1	Cognitive	14.08	4.44	-4.76*	11	.001
	Emotional	23.92	5.13			
Pair 2	Cognitive	14.38	4.30	3.01*	15	.009
	Behavioral	11.31	1.70			
Pair 3	Emotional	24.09	5.34	7.01*	10	.000
	Behavioral	11.18	1.94			
Pair 4	Sacrifice	16.50	5.65	-6.03*	15	.000
	Enhance	33.31	7.51			

* $p < .05$.

Fearful Participants

We hypothesized that fearfully attached participants would experience more cognitive jealousy than emotional and behavioral jealousy and would view monogamy as a sacrifice for the sake of the relationship. A paired samples t-test was performed to analyze participants' primary jealousy type and view of monogamy among fearfully attached participants. There was a significant difference in the mean scores for cognitive jealousy and emotional jealousy among the fearfully attached participants, $t(25) = -6.58, p < .001$. Fearfully attached participants experienced significantly more emotional jealousy ($M = 24.38, SD = 4.17$) than they did cognitive jealousy ($M = 15.08, SD = 5.28$). There was a significant difference in mean scores for cognitive jealousy and behavioral jealousy among fearfully attached participants, $t(32) = 3.50, p = .001$. Fearfully attached participants experienced more cognitive jealousy ($M = 14.97, SD = 5.49$) than they did behavioral jealousy ($M = 11.55, SD = 3.63$). There was a significant difference in mean scores for emotional jealousy and behavioral jealousy among fearfully attached individuals, $t(24) = 10.32, p < .001$. Fearfully attached participants experienced more emotional jealousy ($M = 24.44, SD = 4.24$) than they did behavioral jealousy ($M = 11.04, SD =$

3.25). These findings did not confirm the first part of our hypothesis that fearfully attached participants would experience more cognitive jealousy. There was a significant difference in the mean scores among fearfully attached participants attitude towards monogamy, $t(32) = -6.64, p < .001$. Fearfully attached participants viewed monogamy as more enhancing to the relationship ($M = 31.36, SD = 5.48$), than they viewed it as a sacrifice for the sake of the relationship ($M = 19.18, SD = 6.11$). This finding did not support the second part of our hypothesis that fearfully attached individuals would view monogamy as a sacrifice for the sake of the relationship. See Table 3.

Table 3

Descriptive Statistics and t-test Results for Fearfully Attached Individuals

	Type	M	SD	<i>t</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>sig.</i>
Pair 1	Cognitive	15.08	5.28	-6.58*	25	.000
	Emotional	24.38	4.17			
Pair 2	Cognitive	14.97	5.49	3.50*	32	.001
	Behavioral	11.55	3.63			
Pair 3	Emotional	24.44	4.24	10.32*	24	.000
	Behavioral	11.04	3.25			
Pair 4	Sacrifice	19.18	6.11	-6.64*	32	.000
	Enhance	31.36	5.48			

* $p < .05$.

Dismissive Participants

We hypothesized that dismissively attached participants would experience low levels of all three jealousy types, with the possible exception of cognitive jealousy. We also predicted that these participants would view monogamy as a sacrifice for the sake of the relationship. A paired samples t-test was performed to analyze participants' primary jealousy type and view of monogamy among dismissively attached participants. There was a significant difference in the mean scores for cognitive jealousy and emotional jealousy among the dismissively attached participants, $t(5) = -12.47, p < .001$. Dismissively attached participants experienced significantly

more emotional jealousy ($M = 25.83$, $SD = 4.02$) than they did cognitive jealousy ($M = 10.17$, $SD = 1.72$). There was no significant difference in mean scores for cognitive jealousy and behavioral jealousy among dismissively attached participants ($p = .681$). There was a significant difference in mean scores for emotional jealousy and behavioral jealousy among dismissively attached individuals, $t(5) = 6.09$, $p = .002$. Dismissively attached participants experienced more emotional jealousy ($M = 25.83$, $SD = 4.02$) than they did behavioral jealousy ($M = 10.83$, $SD = 2.71$). These findings did not confirm the first part of our hypothesis that dismissively attached participants would experience low levels of all jealousy types, with the possible exception of cognitive jealousy. There was a significant difference in the mean scores among dismissively attached participants attitude towards monogamy, $t(8) = -5.80$, $p < .001$. Dismissively attached participants viewed monogamy as more enhancing to the relationship ($M = 32.44$, $SD = 5.36$) than they viewed it as a sacrifice for the sake of the relationship ($M = 16.89$, $SD = 4.17$). This finding did not support the second part of our hypothesis that dismissively attached individuals would view monogamy as a sacrifice for the sake of the relationship. See Table 4.

Table 4
Descriptive Statistics and t-test Results for Dismissively Attached Individuals

	Type	M	SD	<i>t</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>sig.</i>
Pair 1	Cognitive	10.17	1.72	-12.47*	5	.000
	Emotional	25.83	4.02			
Pair 2	Cognitive	10.78	1.72	0.43	8	.681
	Behavioral	10.33	2.29			
Pair 3	Emotional	25.83	4.02	6.09*	5	.002
	Behavioral	10.83	2.71			
Pair 4	Sacrifice	16.89	4.17	-5.80*	8	.000
	Enhance	32.44	5.36			

* $p < .05$.

Discussion

As expected, securely attached participants reported having more emotional jealousy compared to cognitive and behavioral jealousy. This is supported Sharpsteen and Kirkpatrick (1997). We also found that securely attached individuals viewed monogamy as enhancing to the relationship, which was predicted based on Rholes and Simpson's (2004) description of securely attached individuals being open to forming intimate relationships. Securely attached individuals were likely to experience higher emotional jealousy than cognitive and behavioral jealousy. These individuals become more upset with the thought that their significant other may be unfaithful to them. Because these individuals are likely to want to form intimate relationships, they also view monogamy as enhancing to the relationship.

Preoccupied individuals were found to also experience higher emotional jealousy compared to cognitive jealousy and behavioral jealousy. This finding did not confirm our hypothesis that preoccupied individuals would experience higher behavioral jealousy compared to cognitive and emotional jealousy. Our prediction was based on previous research by Guerrero (1998) that preoccupied individuals exhibited higher surveillance behaviors than did other attachment groups but this is not to say that preoccupied individuals don't exhibit behavioral jealousy behaviors: it was found that they experience emotional jealousy at a higher rate. One explanation of this finding could be that individuals in the preoccupied group were embarrassed or ashamed to report on behavioral jealousy behaviors such as stalking or going through another's phone. Another explanation could be that the survey we used to determine jealousy types was set up in a way that promoted emotional jealousy as most people would be upset if they found their significant other had been unfaithful. As predicted, preoccupied individuals found monogamy to be enhancing to the relationship. This finding aligns with Marazziti et al.

(2010) finding that preoccupied individuals had a high fear of loss in their relationship. These individuals prefer monogamous relationships to prevent abandonment due to options presented to their partner.

The current research found that fearfully attached individuals experienced higher emotional jealousy than cognitive and behavioral jealousy. This did not confirm our hypothesis that fearfully attached individuals would experience high cognitive jealousy based on previous research by Guerrero (1998) that they experience high fear of loss of their partner. One explanation that could be that similarly to preoccupied individuals, the survey used in this study is set up to promote emotional jealousy by the question type. It was also found that fearfully attached individuals viewed monogamy as enhancing to the relationship. This did not support our hypothesis that fearfully attached individuals would view monogamy as a sacrifice based on Rholes and Simpson's (2004) discussion that they tend to avoid intimacy out of a high fear of loss and rejection. This finding could be due to fearfully attached individuals preferring monogamous relationships as preferring an open relationship would leave the possibility of abandonment by their partner if they were to find somebody else.

Finally, this study found that dismissively attached individuals experienced high emotional jealousy compared to cognitive and behavioral jealousy. This did not support our hypothesis that dismissively attached individuals would have overall low jealousy levels in all three categories with the possible exception of cognitive jealousy based on previous research by Bradbury and Karney (2010) that these individuals tend to hold negative views of others. Guerrero (1998) found that dismissively attached individuals' experience less fear in jealousy, and this could be one explanation to why these individuals didn't have a spike in cognitive jealousy. If they didn't experience cognitive jealousy, they would not experience as much fear in

their relationships. Our study also found that dismissively attached individuals viewed monogamy as enhancing to the relationship. This also did not confirm our hypothesis that these individuals would view monogamy as a sacrifice for the sake of the relationship due to Rholes and Simpson's (2004) discussion that dismissively attached individuals view others as unreliable and unresponsive in a relationship, and that they tend to distance themselves from intimacy. One explanation, although entirely speculative, would be the opposite of our prediction in that these individuals would view monogamy as enhancing to the relationship because if they were able to hold a monogamous relationship, they would have somebody who is not unreliable and unavailable.

There are several limitations to this study. The first, and the most problematic is that there was a low response rate for the survey in parts such as the emotional jealousy component. Because not every participant answered every question, there was small variation in each subscales response rate. Another limitation to the study is the low participant response rate to the study. With only 101 participants, it is hard to make strong inferences from the results after they were split into 4 separate, non-equal groups. With dismissively attached individuals only consisting of 9 of the 101 participants, we lack statistical power in numbers. A third limitation to the study is the constricted diversity of the sample. The sample consisted of undergraduate psychology students between the ages of 18 and 50. Of those participants, 21 were male, 79 were female, and 1 transgender. Because of the lack of diversity in population sample, we lack generalizability to the general population. A fourth limitation to the study is the emotional jealousy subscale. Pfeiffer and Wong (1989) stated that "Although emotional jealousy is a fairly common experience in reaction to threats from rivals to a valued relationship, cognitive and behavioural jealousy may be pathological, especially when they are not justified by reality"

(Pfeiffer & Wong, 1989, p. 194). It could be a possibility that a rise in cognitive or behavioral jealousy did not show in any of the attachment styles due to the measure using “common” emotional experiences and “pathological” cognitions and behaviors to measure jealousy.

Future research should focus on getting a more diverse sample of participants in gender, geographic area, and also a higher *N*. Future research should also focus on reworking and/or using a different jealousy scale due to the emotional jealousy subscale being loaded to elicit high emotional jealousy from participants. It makes sense that participants would be upset given that their significant other had been unfaithful. The final thoughts on future research would be to take into consideration the Monogamy Attitudes Scale. The questions assessing if the participant views monogamy as a sacrifice for the sake of the relationship are all worded towards the biological drive, paying no attention to a person’s desire to remain in a nonmonogamous relationship.

References

- Ainsworth, M. D., Blehar, M. C., Waters, E., & Wall, S. (1978). *Patterns of attachment: A psychological study of the strange situation*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Ainsworth, M. S. (1989). Attachments beyond infancy. *American Psychologist*, 44(4), 709-716.
doi:10.1037/0003-066X.44.4.709
- Bradbury, T. N., & Karney, B. R. (2014). *Intimate relationships* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: W. W. Norton & Company, Inc.
- Brennan, K. A., Clark, C. L., & Shaver, P. R. (1998). Self-report measure of adult romantic attachment: An integrative overview. Retrieved from
<https://internal.psychology.illinois.edu/~rcfraley/measures/brennan.html>
- Buss, D. M., (2000). *The dangerous passion: Why jealousy is as necessary as love and sex*. New York, NY: The Free Press.
- Collins, N. L., & Read, S. J. (1990). Adult attachment, working models, and relationship quality in dating couples. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 58(4), 644-663.
doi:10.1037/0022-3514.58.4.644
- Fraley, C. R., (2010). A brief overview of adult attachment theory and research. Retrieved from
<https://internal.psychology.illinois.edu/~rcfraley/attachment.htm>
- Fraley, R. C., Waller, N. G., & Brennan, K. A. (2000). An item-response theory analysis of self-report measures of adult attachment. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 78, 350-365.
- Guerrero, L. K. (1998). Attachment-style differences in the experience and expression of romantic jealousy. *Personal Relationships*, 5(3), 273-291. doi:10.1111/j.1475-6811.1998.tb00172.x

- Hazan, C., & Shaver, P. (1987). Romantic love conceptualized as an attachment process. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 52(3), 511-524. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.52.3.511
- Hosking, W. (2014). Australian gay men's satisfaction with sexual agreements: The roles of relationship quality, jealousy, and monogamy attitudes. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 43(4), 823-832. doi:10.1007/s10508-013-0197-7
- Knobloch, L. K., Solomon, D. H., & Cruz, M. G. (2001). The role of relationship development and attachment in the experience of romantic jealousy. *Personal Relationships*, 8(2), 205-224. doi:10.1111/j.1475-6811.2001.tb00036.x
- Marazziti, D., Consoli, G., Albanese, F., Laquidara, E., Baroni, S., & Dell'Osso, M. C. (2010). Romantic attachment and subtypes/dimensions of jealousy. *Clinical Practice and Epidemiology in Mental Health*, 6 doi:10.2174/1745017901006010053
- Pfeiffer, S. M., & Wong, P. T. (1989). Multidimensional jealousy. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 6(2), 181-196. doi:10.1177/026540758900600203
- Rholes, S. W., Simpson, J. A. (2004). *Adult attachment: Theory, research, and clinical implications*. New York, NY: The Guilford Press.
- Schmookler, T., & Bursik, K. (2007). The value of monogamy in emerging adulthood: A gendered perspective. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 24(6), 819-835. doi:10.1177/0265407507084185
- Sharpsteen, D. J., & Kirkpatrick, L. A. (1997). Romantic jealousy and adult romantic attachment. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 72(3), 627-640. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.72.3.627

Whitton, S. W., Weitbrecht, E. M., & Kuryluk, A. D. (2015). Monogamy agreements in male same-sex couples: Associations with relationship quality and individual well-being. *Journal of Couple & Relationship Therapy, 14*(1), 39-63. doi:10.1080/15332691.2014.953649

VITAAuthor

Zachary M. Szabrowicz

Educational Credentials

2015 – Eastern Washington University – Bachelor of Arts in Psychology

2013 – Spokane Community College – Associates of Arts

Professional Experience

Practicum – Spokane Public Schools [Eagle Peak Trek Program], April 2017 – June 2018

Professional Organizations

Member – Psi Chi International Honor Society in Psychology

Conference Presentations

Szabrowicz, Z., Martin, T., Kern, J., Rygiel, R., Knesek, A., & Mies, B. (2015) *Out of sight does not mean out of mind; Long distance relationships and relationship satisfaction*. Poster presentation at the 2015 Association for Psychological Science conference.