

# Gender Differences, Infidelity, Dyadic Trust, and Jealousy among Married Turkish Individuals

Gülşah Kemer<sup>1</sup> · Gökçe Bulgan<sup>2</sup> · Evrim Çetinkaya Yıldız<sup>3</sup>

Published online: 11 January 2015  
© Springer Science+Business Media New York 2015

**Abstract** In the present study, relationships among gender, emotional response to partner's imagined infidelity (emotional and sexual infidelity), and dyadic trust (low and high levels of trust) were investigated as functions of married Turkish individuals' jealousy types (cognitive, emotional, and behavioral). Five hundred thirty seven (276 women and 261 men) married individuals living in urban areas in Turkey participated in the study. Results of the Multivariate Analysis of Variance (MANOVA) revealed significant main effects for gender, infidelity types, and dyadic trust. Particularly, married Turkish men in this study were found to be more emotionally jealous than women. Participants who responded to sexual infidelity as more upsetting had higher levels of emotional jealousy when compared to the participants who found emotional infidelity more upsetting. Moreover, participants with low dyadic trust for their partners were found to be high in their cognitive jealousy and behavioral jealousy reactions. Results are discussed in details with implications for future research and suggestions for mental health practitioners.

**Keywords** Romantic jealousy · Infidelity · Trust · Married individuals

Jealousy, a protective reaction against the threat of losing a valued relationship (Clanton and Smith 1998), is a common human emotion in couple relationships worldwide (e.g., De Silva 2004; Pines and Aronson 1983). While there are numerous types of jealousy, romantic jealousy, in particular, may become problematic in close relationships. Romantic jealousy is defined as “a complex of thoughts, feelings, and actions which follows threats to self-esteem and/or threats to the existence or the quality of the relationship, when those threats are generated by the perception of a real or potential attraction between one's partner and a - perhaps imaginary - rival” (White 1981, p. 24). Having the potential to destroy relationships and decrease satisfaction (e.g., Bevan 2008; Parker, Low, Walker, and Gamm 2005), jealousy was found to be one of the primary reasons of decreased self-perception, marital discord, relationship failure, aggression, violence, and even murder (Daly, Wilson, and Weghorst 1982; Gage and Hutchinson 2006; Telesco 2003).

All human societies experience jealousy in marriage and have cultural rules for handling it (Reiss 1986). Researchers presented that an individual's cultural background may influence their perceptions of behaviors and situations as threats that trigger jealousy (Croucher, DeMaris, Oyer, Yartey, and Ziberi 2012; Delgado, Prieto, and Bond 1997). Men and women's expressions of jealousy are influenced by their relative amount of social power in the society. More specifically, women were presented as less likely to express jealousy in societies which they have little social power in comparison to men (Reiss 1986). Despite being considered as a collectivistic society (Kağıtçıbaşı 1997), Turkey is a rare combination of traditionalism and modernism due to its unique geographical

---

✉ Gülşah Kemer  
gkemer@asu.edu

Gökçe Bulgan  
Gokce.Bulgan@mef.edu.tr

Evrım Çetinkaya Yıldız  
evrim@erciyes.edu.tr

<sup>1</sup> Counseling and Counseling Psychology, Arizona State University, Tempe, AZ, USA

<sup>2</sup> Department of Psychological Counseling and Guidance, MEF University, İstanbul, Turkey

<sup>3</sup> Department of Educational Sciences, Erciyes University, Kayseri, Turkey

and sociocultural location on the European and Asian continents. Holding its collectivistic values, the Turkish society has been experiencing a transition period between Eastern and Western values (Demir and Aydın 1995) by presenting more individualistic attitudes especially in the well-educated upper segments of the society (İmamoğlu 1998). Traditionally, marriage in Turkey has been perceived as a kind of ownership of the partner, in which the men view their spouses as their honor. Similarly, Turkish families tend to be patriarchal in nature. However, the societal changes from traditional to modern worldviews, especially among individuals and families living in urban areas, are expected to influence perceptions regarding marital dynamics, perhaps toward a more egalitarian one. With its unique blend of collectivistic and individualistic structural features in continuous transformation, Turkish married individuals' jealousy tendencies are a promising area for investigation. According to *The Family Structure Survey* (Turkish Statistical Institute 2006), married Turkish couples indicated jealousy as one of the top five commonly experienced problems in their marriage. In the same report, both Turkish men and women reported infidelity as the primary reason for divorces. Similarly, researchers tracked a year of mainstream Turkish newspaper reports on Facebook use and interpersonal relationships (Şahin and Sarı 2009). Results of the content analysis revealed that jealousy due to partner's Facebook activities (e.g., flirting with others, infidelity) was one of the reasons for divorces reported in the Turkish news. Given that jealousy and infidelity are two commonly experienced issues leading to marital problems, in this study, Turkish married men's and women's jealousy perceptions will be examined with related concepts of infidelity and dyadic trust.

### Jealousy in Romantic Relationships

Jealousy is described as a sign of love for one's partner (Pines and Aronson 1983) and is formed by a combination of different emotions like hurt, anxiety, and anger (Parrott and Smith 1993). Jealousy experiences can be expressed cognitively, emotionally, and behaviorally (Guerrero and Andersen 1998a; Pfeiffer and Wong 1989). *Cognitive jealousy* is characterized by distress associated with a partner's possible attraction to another, and suspicion that a rival relationship exists (Pfeiffer and Wong 1989). *Emotional jealousy* is the combination of different emotions (e.g., sadness, fear, rage) accompanied by jealousy that makes it difficult to distinguish the true emotion being experienced (Buss 2000; Guerrero, Trost, and Yoshimura 2005). For example, anger, fear, sadness, envy, sexual arousal, guilt (White and Mullen 1989) and positive affect (Guerrero and Andersen 1998a) were identified as the basic emotional reactions to jealousy. Moreover, these coexisting emotions were reported to affect how individuals communicate and cope with jealousy experiences (Guerrero

and Andersen 1998b). *Behavioral jealousy*, on the other hand, is the covert or overt expression of jealousy. Five general behavioral responses to romantic jealousy were identified as (a) surveillance/restriction, (b) compensatory restoration, (c) manipulation attempts, (d) rival contacts, and (e) violent behaviors (Guerrero, Andersen, Jorgensen, Spitzberg, and Eloy 1995). More specifically, *surveillance/restriction* is comprised of behaviors used to find out more about the rival or to restrict a partner's access to the rival; *compensatory restoration* is made up of behaviors intended to improve the primary relationship; *manipulation attempts* consist of behaviors intended to test the partner's loyalty; *rival contacts* include communication between the self and the rival; and *violent behaviors* comprise of aggressive acts which are not directed at the partner, such as slamming doors (Guerrero, Andersen, Jorgensen, Spitzberg, and Eloy 1995). Taking these points into account, experiences of cognitive, emotional, and behavioral jealousy reactions are one of the important considerations for mental health professionals working with couples.

**Gender differences** Men and women may be more jealous toward specific types of infidelity. The evolutionary perspective (e.g., Buss, Larsen, Westen, and Semmelroth 1992; Buss 2000) considers romantic jealousy as a basic adaptive mechanism designed to protect the pair-bond and, ultimately, promote reproductive success. Buss and colleagues (1992) stated that men and women evolved distinct jealousy systems as a result of different reproductive challenges. Specifically, men may show more distress to partners' sexual infidelity due to paternal uncertainty – not being totally sure that a child is theirs – whereas women may experience more distress to partners' emotional infidelity, due to their focus on parental investment (i.e. “If my husband leaves me, I won't have someone to help raise our children”).

As an alternative to the evolutionary approach, the social cognitive perspective (Harris 2003) suggests that any between-sex differences in jealousy occur as a result of proximal mediators, such as threats to self-concept (which differs between- and within-sexes) and/or the influence of cultural norms and diverse sex roles (Hupka 1991; Salovey and Rothman 1991). In other words, gender differences in human behavior are influenced by (a) socialization into masculine and feminine roles, and (b) the beliefs and schemas attached to these roles (Ward and Voracek 2004). Social cognitive theorists view the socially acquired gender-based belief system as the most important determining factor of sex-typed behavior. In the same line, gender differences in experiences of jealousy are a result of socially acquired belief systems about the genders, the concept of jealousy, and romantic relationships in general. According to this perspective, men are more sexually jealous (i.e., showing more distress by partners' possible sexual relations with another person) than women; and women are more emotionally jealous (i.e., showing more distress by

partners' possible emotional involvement with another person) than men (Ward and Voracek 2004).

Despite theoretical explanations for gender differences in experienced jealousy, there are differing results regarding gender differences in jealousy experiences. Some researchers reported no gender differences in the expressed level of jealousy (e.g., Demirtaş and Dönmez 2006; Pines and Aronson 1983; Pines and Friedman 1998; White 1981) or men and women being more similar than different in their jealousy expressions (Carpenter 2012). Other researchers have found conflicting results on whether men or women experience more jealousy. Specifically, they found that women were more jealous than men (Buunk 1981), married men were more jealous than women in comparable situations (De Moja 1988), or that men experienced more cognitive jealousy, whereas women experienced more behavioral jealousy and overtly communicate their feelings (Aylor and Dainton 2001; Russell and Harton 2005). In a study conducted with Turkish participants, women were found to show more physical, emotional, and cognitive reactions than men in jealousy experiences (Demirtaş and Dönmez 2006). However, frequent reports of wife beating and honor killings due to jealousy and alleged infidelity on the Turkish news indicate higher degree of jealousy experiences of men in comparison to women. Therefore, building on previous study results, described societal shifts from traditional to modern worldviews, and the lack of studies targeting Turkish married individuals, we expect Turkish men and women to vary in different aspects of jealousy and the current study to contribute to our understanding of these differences.

**Infidelity as an antecedent of jealousy** Infidelity often signifies deterioration in the affective and emotional realm of the marriage associated with loss of love, betrayal of trust, indifference, and growing apart (Glass and Wright 1997). *Sexual infidelity* occurs in situations such that one partner has sexual relations outside her or his primary romantic relationship. *Emotional infidelity*, on the other hand, takes place when one partner develops an intense emotional attachment outside her or his primary romantic relationship (Carpenter 2012). Suspicion of a partner's infidelity elicits jealousy in men and women (Buss and Shackelford 1997). Men reported more anger, hurt or distress in response to a partner's real or imagined sexual than emotional infidelity in different cultures and age groups (e.g., Kaighobadi, Shackelford, and Buss 2010; Schützwohl 2005); whereas women reported more hurt or anger in response to emotional than sexual infidelity (Buss et al. 1992; Kühle 2011). On the other hand, there are also findings that women reported more anger in response to sexual than emotional infidelity but being equally hurt by sexual and emotional infidelity (Bassett 2005). These differing results and the need for understanding reactions to infidelity in

married Turkish individuals also encouraged us to examine responses to different types of imagined infidelity together with gender differences and jealousy perceptions.

**Role of trust** We propose that trust may be an important dyadic variable in combating the negative effects of different infidelity types that may lead to jealousy. Dyadic trust refers to one's perception of the spouses' commitment to the relationship (Hansen 1985). Being positively related to love and self-disclosure intimacy, trust exists to the extent that a person believes another person is benevolent and honest (Larzelere and Huston 1980). Trust between partners is also reported to increase with relational satisfaction and commitment (Mathes 1986; Rydell, McConnell, and Bringle 2004). In a study examining the associations between relationship commitment and jealousy, individuals in committed relationships were found to experience greater levels of jealousy when they thought they had unattractive relationship alternatives rather than attractive ones (Rydell, McConnell, and Bringle 2004). In addition, receiving negative information about their relationship compatibility evoked more jealousy in individuals with greater relationship commitment than those with lesser commitment. Thus, there is an inverse relationship between trust and jealousy; those who scored lower in trust were found to be experiencing higher levels of jealousy (e.g., Couch and Jones 1997; Dainton and Aylor 2001). Again, the importance of trust for interpersonal relationships as well as the need for exploration of dyadic trust and jealousy in Turkish marital relationships were encouraging for us to further investigate the topic.

## Present Study

In brief, previous research revealed relationships among individuals' gender, responses to infidelity, trust to their partners, and romantic jealousy perceptions. Taking the related literature into account, these variables are important components of individuals' perceptions in their relationships. Despite their prominence, to this date, these concepts have not been examined in a Turkish sample. Thus, in the present study, we aim to examine the relationships between gender, emotional responses to partner's imagined infidelity (emotional, sexual infidelity), and dyadic trust (low and high levels of trust) as functions of married Turkish individuals' jealousy types (cognitive, emotional, and behavioral). Being exploratory in nature, we hope that this study will be a starting point for new research on the married Turkish population. Following are the hypotheses of the current study:

1. There will be significant mean differences between men and women's emotional, behavioral, and cognitive jealousy levels.

2. There will be significant mean differences between participants who find emotional infidelity more upsetting and participants who find sexual infidelity more upsetting in terms of their emotional, behavioral, and cognitive jealousy levels.
3. There will be significant mean differences between participants who have low dyadic trust levels and high dyadic trust levels in terms of their emotional, behavioral, and cognitive jealousy levels.
4. The interaction effects of gender, infidelity, and dyadic trust on the linear combination of participants' emotional, behavioral, and cognitive jealousy levels will be significant.

## Method

### Participants

Participants of the present study were 537 (276 women and 261 men) married Turkish individuals living in urban cities in Turkey. Participants' ages ranged from 20 to 73 with an average of 36.83 years ( $SD=8.51$ ). The average duration of marriage in this sample was 11.37 years ( $SD=8.87$ ). Participants reported being in arranged (%21.6) and unarranged (%78) marriages. Most of the participants held college degrees (%61.6) whereas the rest had pre-college (%28.1) and graduate degrees (%10.3). Convenience sampling method was used to recruit the participants by word of mouth advertising. Our sample was diverse in terms of age and education level.

### Measures

**Demographics** Questions related to gender, age, duration of marriage, type of marriage (arranged marriage or not), education level, and attitudes towards partner's love/sexual affair were included in the survey.

**Jealousy** Jealousy was measured by the *Multidimensional Jealousy Scale* (MDJS) developed by Pfeiffer and Wong (1989). The 24-item scale is composed of three subscales named Cognitive, Emotional, and Behavioral Jealousy. Lower scores obtained from any of the subscales indicate normal jealousy whereas higher scores are the indicator of pathological jealousy.

Karakurt (2001) adapted MDJS to Turkish and found the same factor structure with the original scale. The three-factor solution explained 61 % of the total variance. The alpha reliability of the scale's Turkish version was .91 for cognitive jealousy subscale, .86 for emotional jealousy subscale, and .80 for behavioral jealousy subscale in the pilot study.

**Dyadic Trust** Dyadic Trust was measured by the *Dyadic Trust Scale* (DTS; Larzelere and Huston 1980). Dyadic Trust Scale is an 8-item scale measuring the amount of trust a spouse has regarding his/her partner's honesty, trustworthiness, sincerity, and the like.

Çetinkaya et al. (2008) adapted DTS to Turkish. Results of the study were found to be consistent with the original scale's one factor solution. Due to its low item loading, the 6th item was excluded from the scale in the adaptation study. The alpha reliability of 7-item Turkish version was .89 whereas split-half test reliability was .86.

**Infidelity Types** Infidelity types were measured by an adapted version of a forced-choice hypothetical scenario designed by Buss et al. (1992). The participants were asked to indicate which situation would be more upsetting: having their partner (1) fall in love with someone else or (2) engage in physical/sexual interaction with someone else. This forced-choice format has been used as the primary jealousy measure in studies worldwide (Harris 2003).

## Results

In the present study, a 2 (gender) X 2 (emotional-sexual infidelity) X 2 (high-low trust) multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was conducted to investigate the differences between gender, infidelity types, and dyadic trust of participants in terms of their emotional, behavioral, and cognitive jealousy levels. Before running the analysis, data was screened and prepared for the MANOVA. All three of the dependent variables were continuous and multicollinearity was not observed in the present study. All of the independent variables were dichotomous. One of the independent variables, dyadic trust, was originally a continuous variable that researchers used median split to make it categorical.

The multivariate results of the MANOVA revealed significant multivariate main effects for gender (Partial  $\eta^2 = .034$ ), infidelity types (Partial  $\eta^2 = .031$ ), and dyadic trust levels (Partial  $\eta^2 = .077$ , see Table 1). According to generally accepted criteria (Cohen 1988), the obtained partial eta square values obtained in this study were considered as quite small in their effect sizes. Interaction effects of gender and infidelity types, gender and dyadic trust, infidelity types and dyadic trust, and gender, infidelity types, and dyadic trust were not found as statistically significant.

In order to examine whether gender, infidelity types, and dyadic trust differed on all jealousy types (i.e., emotional, behavioral, and cognitive jealousy) or just one or two of them, further investigations were conducted (see Table 2). Using the Bonferroni adjustment, the original alpha level of .05 was divided by the number of dependent variables. Accordingly, results were considered as significant as the probability value

**Table 1** MANOVA results of emotional, behavioral, and cognitive jealousy

Effect	df <sub>i</sub>	df <sub>E</sub>	Pillai's trace	F	Partial η <sup>2</sup>
Gender	3	468	.034	5.51*	.034
Infidelity Types	3	468	.031	5.05**	.031
Dyadic Trust	3	468	.077	12.94*	.077
Gender*Infidelity Types	3	468	.009	1.44	.009
Gender*Dyadic Trust	3	468	.004	.68	.004
Infidelity Types*Dyadic Trust	3	468	.007	1.10	.007
Gender*Infidelity Types*Dyadic Trust	3	468	.011	1.71	.011

\* $p < .001$ , \*\*  $p < .01$

was less than .016. Results revealed that the univariate analysis of variance (ANOVA) for gender on emotional jealousy was significant. Indicating small effect, gender explained 2 % of the variance in emotional jealousy scores. Particularly, emotional jealousy levels of male participants ( $M = 40.89$ ,  $SD = .570$ ) were found higher than female participants ( $M = 38.38$ ,  $SD = .523$ ). On the other hand, ANOVA results for gender on neither behavioral jealousy, nor cognitive jealousy were significant.

Similar to gender, ANOVA results for infidelity types on emotional jealousy were also significant. Again, revealing a small effect size, infidelity types accounted for approximately 3 % of the variance in emotional jealousy scores. Participants who found sexual infidelity more upsetting appeared to have higher levels of emotional jealousy ( $M = 41.07$ ,  $SD = .525$ ) than participants who found emotional infidelity more upsetting ( $M = 38.19$ ,  $SD = .568$ ). Similar to gender, ANOVA results for infidelity types on both behavioral jealousy and cognitive jealousy were insignificant.

Different than the results of gender and infidelity types, ANOVA results for dyadic trust on emotional jealousy were not significant. However, ANOVA results for dyadic trust on both behavioral jealousy and cognitive jealousy were significant. With small effect sizes, dyadic trust accounted for approximately 4 % of the variance in behavioral jealousy

**Table 2** Univariate ANOVA results for gender, infidelity types, and dyadic trust

Effect	Dependent Variable	df <sub>i</sub>	df <sub>E</sub>	F	Partial η <sup>2</sup>
Gender	Emotional	1	470	10.57*	.022
	Cognitive	1	470	.00	.00
	Behavioral	1	470	2.84	.006
Infidelity Types	Emotional	1	470	13.91*	.029
	Cognitive	1	470	.32	.001
	Behavioral	1	470	1.23	.003
Dyadic Trust	Emotional	1	470	4.11	.009
	Cognitive	1	470	18.55*	.038
	Behavioral	1	470	25.68*	.052

\* $p < .016$

whereas 5 % of the variance in cognitive jealousy. Participants with low levels of trust in their partners ( $M = 17.24$ ,  $SD = .786$ ) appeared to have higher levels of behavioral jealousy than participants with high dyadic trust ( $M = 21.80$ ,  $SD = .709$ ). Similarly, participants with low levels of trust in their partners ( $M = 10.23$ ,  $SD = .732$ ) indicated higher levels of cognitive jealousy than the participants with higher dyadic trust levels ( $M = 15.22$ ,  $SD = .660$ ).

### Discussion

In the present study, we examined the relationships among gender, emotional responses to a partner's imagined infidelity, and dyadic trust as functions of married Turkish individuals' jealousy types. We found significant differences between individuals' gender, dyadic trust levels, and infidelity types in terms of their emotional, behavioral, and cognitive jealousy levels.

### Gender Differences in Jealousy Experiences

The male and female participants in our study differed on their emotional jealousy levels, but not on their cognitive and behavioral jealousy levels. Particularly, men's emotional jealousy levels were higher than that of women's. Different than our findings, Demirtaş and Dönmez (2006) found married Turkish women as emotionally, cognitively, and behaviorally more jealous than married Turkish men. Similar to our findings, regarding cognitive and behavioral jealousy, Parker (1996) and Alpay (2009) reported no significant gender differences in the expressions of jealousy. Other studies also reported differing results regarding gender differences for romantic jealousy (e.g., Buunk 1981; De Moja 1988). Revealing somewhat similar and different results with the previous research, we believe our findings reflect cultural features as well as changes.

Married Turkish men being more emotionally jealous than married Turkish women, but not differing on cognitive and behavioral representations of jealousy were somewhat

anticipated, but also interesting findings of this study. In the Turkish society, men are expected to be more jealous and show their jealousy more than women (i.e., media reports and statistics on wife beating and honor killings due to jealousy). However, Turkish men are also not as good as talking about their emotions when compared to women (Deniz, Hamarta, and Ari 2005) and are not expected to show those emotions, which are considered as signs of weakness and disappearance of manhood. Our findings revealed almost exact opposites of these assumptions. Turkish men in this study were more emotionally jealous and more expressive of their jealousy, but did not think and behave differently than their women counterparts. These findings may be explained in several ways. Having the chance to share their true emotions in an anonymous study could have allowed Turkish men to be open and honest about themselves. Furthermore, Turkish men may be taking ownership of their emotions as the Turkish society is moving from a traditional way of living to a modern one. In other words, carrying both collectivistic and individualistic characteristics, the gender roles and expressions of married Turkish individuals may be altering. This finding may indicate that both married men and women have started to look at the picture of marriage in more equal terms and realize that there are alternatives for both parties and women are not disempowered any more. As a result, married Turkish men may be becoming more aware of their feelings regarding these changes, specifically their vulnerability against the feelings of jealousy, and – speculating further – fear of losing their partner to a rival. Therefore, we may claim that married Turkish men feel and express more emotional jealousy than they have ever done. Furthermore, both married Turkish men and women were found to think and act similarly in jealousy situations. This may also indicate equality between men and women in their reactions to jealousy cases.

On the other hand, we need to acknowledge that the obtained gender difference regarding emotional jealousy had a small effect size – which may reflect a starting point for all of these claimed changes. Moreover, these findings may well be representing the characteristics of our sample in this study. Such a change in the society may be observed more in the urban areas when compared to the rural areas, and our sample was composed of participants living in the urban areas.

### Infidelity Types in Jealousy Experiences

Similar to gender, there were differences in participants' emotional jealousy levels in terms of different infidelity types. Specifically, participants who found sexual infidelity more upsetting appeared to have higher levels of emotional jealousy reactions than participants who found emotional infidelity more upsetting. Infidelity was emphasized with the deterioration in the affective and emotional realm of the marriage

(Glass and Wright 1997). Thus, the present finding supported the emotional aspect of sexual infidelity and jealousy association. Moreover, this finding might also be explained by Turkish people's relationship styles and cultural inclinations. Traditionally, marriage in Turkey tends to be perceived as a kind of ownership of the partner. Thus, one might perceive sexual infidelity as the end of physical and emotional ownership of the partner, which potentially reveals feelings of resentment, sadness, and betrayal. These feelings are considered as strongly tied to the emotional component of jealousy rather than cognitive and behavioral aspects.

On the other hand, we did not find any gender differences interacting with different infidelity types in explaining any of the jealousy dimensions. This finding was in the same line with a recent meta-analyses study suggesting that men and women were more similar in their reactions to both emotional and sexual infidelity (Carpenter 2012) and our earlier discussions in the gender differences section.

### Trust Levels in Jealousy Experiences

Structural Exchange Theory emphasizes the negative relationship between dyadic trust and jealousy (Hansen 1985). We obtained supportive findings for this relationship. Similar to previous research findings (e.g., Couch and Jones 1997; Muise et al. 2009), participants who had low dyadic trust for their partners were more suspicious about their partners' relationships with potential rivals (cognitive jealousy) and more inclined to show overt or covert reactions (behavioral jealousy). In collectivist societies like Turkey, overbearing, passionate, and jealous lovers' obsession and mistrust in their relationships were caused by the fear of not being able to establish a relationship with another person when the existing relationship ends (Büyükşahin, Hasta, and Hovardaoğlu 2005). Therefore, with a more individual-oriented explanation, married Turkish individuals' low trust levels related to higher cognitive and behavioral jealousy might be considered as a function of their fear towards isolation and loneliness in a collectivist society.

On the other hand, approaching from a systems-approach in a collectivistic society, maintaining the face of one's family union within the immediate community is important to Turkish families. Partner's infidelity not only ruins the relationship between the couple, but also puts a shame on the deceived party and the kids as well as deceiving party's family. Therefore, for the married individuals with low dyadic trust, maintaining the face of the family may become an objective and motivation behind the acts of jealousy thoughts and suspicions to control and prevent the distrusted partner's actions. In other words, married Turkish individuals with low trust to their partners may take functional – or dysfunctional – steps towards preventing negative consequences (e.g.,

infidelity, divorce) and sustaining the family union by thinking extensively and acting on their jealousy. Some of these behaviors may reveal themselves as surveillances or restrictions on the partner's actions or freedom, compensatory repair and manipulation attempts, contacting and confronting the rival/s, and/or direct and indirect violent behaviors (Guerrero et al. 1995).

In conclusion, the current study revealed results that appear to reflect collectivistic characteristics as well as individualistic ones in married Turkish individuals' jealousy perceptions as functions of gender, imagined infidelity reactions, and trust to their partners. We believe this study reports important findings regarding the changing nature of Turkish cultural tendencies within a married individuals sample and provides significant bases for further research.

## Limitations

As with all other research studies, this study also holds some limitations. The data was collected through convenience sampling method from various urban cities in Turkey. Despite the diversity advantage of this study sample, the participants from different cities may have held different background characteristics (e.g., SES, couples resources) that may have had confounding effects on the results. Similarly, participants do not reflect the characteristics of a rural sample. Therefore, the results of the present study cannot be generalized to the Turkish population. Moreover, participants in the current study had different educational backgrounds (i.e., pre-college, college, graduate), different marriage types (i.e., arranged, not arranged), and varying durations of marriages. All of these variables may have had influences on the participants' perceptions and experiences of jealousy, infidelity, as well as trust. Due to the unequal group sizes, none of these variables were included in the analysis to control their effects; rather they were presented as demographic information.

## Implications for Future Research and Mental Health Practice

In this study, we found that gender, infidelity type, and dyadic trust may explain the jealousy experiences of married Turkish individuals. However, married Turkish individuals' jealousy reactions may also be functions of some individual traits. Different components of jealousy may be examined with different individual trait variables (e.g., emotional dependency, personality characteristics) in future research studies. Further research with dyadic couples (e.g., dating, same-sex couples) could also advance our understanding of the jealousy phenomenon as well as dyadic trust in the Turkish society.

This study also has implications for Turkish mental health practitioners. From a systems-perspective, practitioners may help married Turkish men and women understand societal expectations and how much these expectations influence the way they are treating and treated by their partners in their relationships. Married Turkish men and women may also focus on understanding the similarities and differences in their partners' personal perceptions of jealousy, infidelity, and trust. Empathizing with their partners regarding their personal needs and expectations, married individuals could build bases for compromise and adjustment within their relationships. As a result, understanding the fundamentals of jealousy and trust in relation to infidelity perceptions within their unique relationships and working towards building and maintaining trust to cope with jealousy and infidelity perceptions may become main areas of mental health work. In brief, recognizing how they function in extended family- and community-systems, and obtaining new perspectives within their relationships could help married Turkish individuals change the dynamics of their relationships for the better.

**Acknowledgments** The authors gratefully acknowledge Dr. Esin Tezer and Dr. Ashley Randall's contributions to this study. The authors were at the Department of Educational Sciences at Middle East Technical University of Turkey during the data collection procedures and did not have financial or any other interests with the participants of the current study.

## References

- Alpay, A. (2009). *Yakın ilişkilerde bağışlama: Bağışlamanın; bağlanma, benlik saygısı, empati ve kıskançlık değişkenleri yönünden incelenmesi [Forgiveness in close relationship: The investigation of forgiveness in terms of attachment, self-esteem, empathy and romantic jealousy]*. Ankara University, Ankara, Türkiye: Unpublished master's thesis.
- Aylor, B., & Dainton, M. (2001). Antecedents in romantic jealousy: experience, expression, and goals. *Western Journal of Communications*, 65(4), 370–391. doi:10.1080/10570310109374717.
- Bassett, J. F. (2005). Sex differences in jealousy in response to a partner's imagined sexual or emotional infidelity with a same or different race other. *North American Journal of Psychology*, 7(1), 71–84.
- Bevan, J. L. (2008). Experiencing and communicating romantic jealousy: Questioning the investment model. *Southern Communication Journal*, 73, 42–67. doi:10.1080/10417940701815626.
- Buss, D. M. (2000). *The dangerous passion: Why jealousy is as necessary as love and sex*. New York, NY: Free Press.
- Buss, D. M., Larsen, R. J., Westen, D., & Semmelroth, J. (1992). Sex differences in jealousy: Evolution, physiology, and psychology. *Psychological Science*, 3(4), 251–255. doi:10.1111/j.1467-9280.1992.tb00038.x.
- Buss, D. M., & Shackelford, T. K. (1997). From vigilance to violence: Mate retention tactics in married couples. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 72(2), 346–361. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.72.2.346.
- Buunk, B. (1981). Jealousy in sexually open marriages. *Alternative Lifestyles*, 4(3), 357–372. doi:10.1007/BF01257944.

- Büyükaşahin, A., Hasta, D., & Hovardaoğlu, S. (2005). İlişki istikrarı ölçeği: geçerlik ve güvenilirlik çalışması [relationship stability scale (RSS): a study of validity and reliability]. *Türk Psikoloji Yazıları*, 8(16), 25–37.
- Carpenter, C. J. (2012). Meta-analyses of sex differences in response to sexual versus emotional infidelity: Men and women are more similar than different. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 36(1), 25–37. doi:10.1177/0361684311414537.
- Clanton, G., & Smith, L. G. (Eds.). (1998). *Jealousy* (3rd ed.). Lanham, MD: University Press of America.
- Cohen, J. W. (1988). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Couch, L. L., & Jones, W. H. (1997). Measuring levels of trust. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 31, 319–336. doi:10.1006/jrpe.1997.2186.
- Croucher, S. M., DeMaris, A., Oyer, B. J., Yartey, F. N. A., & Ziberi, L. (2012). Jealousy in India and the United States: A cross-cultural analysis of three dimensions of jealousy. *Human Communication*, 15(4), 139–158. Retrieved from [http://www.uab.edu/Communicationstudies/humancommunication/04\\_03\\_Croucher.pdf](http://www.uab.edu/Communicationstudies/humancommunication/04_03_Croucher.pdf).
- Çetinkaya, E., Kemer, G., Bulgan, G., & Tezer, E. (2008). İkili İlişkiler Güven Ölçeği'nin geçerlik ve güvenilirlik çalışmaları [The reliability and validity studies of the Dyadic Trust Scale]. *Türk Psikolojik Danışma ve Rehberlik Dergisi*, 29, 65–74.
- Dainton, M., & Aylor, B. (2001). A relational uncertainty analysis of jealousy, trust, and maintenance in long-distance versus geographically close relationships. *Communication Quarterly*, 49(2), 172–188. doi:10.1080/01463370109385624.
- Daly, M., Wilson, M., & Weghorst, S. J. (1982). Male sexual jealousy. *Ethology and Sociobiology*, 3(1), 11–27.
- Delgado, A. R., Prieto, G., & Bond, R. A. (1997). The cultural factor in lay perception of jealousy as a motive for wife battery. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 27, 1824–1841. doi:10.1111/j.1559-1816.1997.tb01627.x.
- Demir, A., & Aydın, G. (1995). Student counseling in Turkish universities. *International Journal for the Advancement of Counseling*, 18, 287–302. doi:10.1007/BF01408102.
- Demirtaş, H. A., & Dönmez, A. (2006). Yakın ilişkilerde kıskançlık: Bireysel, ilişkisel ve durumsal değişkenler [Jealousy in close relationships: Personal, relational, and situational variables]. *Türk Psikiyatri Dergisi*, 17(3), 181–191.
- De Moja, C. A. (1988). Jealousy in South-Italian married couples. *Psychological Reports*, 62, 677–678. doi:10.2466/pr0.1988.62.2.677.
- De Silva, P. (2004). Jealousy in couple relationships. *Behavior Change*, 21(1), 1–13.
- Deniz, M. E., Hamarta, E., & Arı, R. (2005). An investigation of social skills and loneliness levels of university students with respect to their attachment styles in a sample of Turkish students. *Social Behavior and Personality*, 33(1), 19–32.
- Gage, A. J., & Hutchinson, P. L. (2006). Power, control and intimate partner sexual violence in Haiti. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 35, 11–24. doi:10.1007/s10508-006-8991-0.
- Glass, S. P., & Wright, T. L. (1997). Reconstructing marriages after the trauma of infidelity. In W. K. Halford & H. Markham (Eds.), *Clinical handbook of marriage and couples interventions*. New York, NY: Wiley.
- Guerrero, L. K., & Andersen, P. A. (1998a). The experience and expression of romantic jealousy. In P. A. Andersen & L. K. Guerrero (Eds.), *Handbook of communication and emotion: Research, theory, applications, and contexts* (pp. 155–188). San Diego, CA: Academic.
- Guerrero, L. K., & Andersen, P. A. (1998b). The dark side of jealousy and envy: Desire, delusion, desperation, and destructive communication. In B. H. Spitzberg & W. R. Cupach (Eds.), *The dark side of close relationships* (pp. 33–70). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Guerrero, L. K., Andersen, P. A., Jorgensen, P. F., Spitzberg, B. H., & Eloy, S. V. (1995). Coping with the green-eyed monster: Conceptualizing and measuring communicative responses to romantic jealousy. *Western Journal of Communication*, 59(4), 270–304. doi:10.1080/10570319509374523.
- Guerrero, L. K., Trost, M. R., & Yoshimura, S. M. (2005). Romantic jealousy: Emotions and communicative responses. *Personal Relationships*, 12, 233–252. doi:10.1111/j.1350-4126.2005.00113.x.
- Hansen, G. L. (1985). Perceived threats and marital jealousy. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 48(3), 262–268.
- Harris, C. R. (2003). A review of sex differences in sexual jealousy, including self-report data, psychophysiological responses, interpersonal violence, and morbid jealousy. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 7(2), 102–128. doi:10.1207/S15327957PSPR0702\_102-128.
- Hupka, R. B. (1991). The motive for the arousal of romantic jealousy: Its cultural origin. In P. Salovey (Ed.), *The psychology of jealousy and envy* (pp. 252–270). New York, NY: Guilford Press.
- İmamoğlu, E. O. (1998). Individualism and collectivism in a model and scale of balanced differentiation and integration. *Journal of Psychology*, 132(1), 95–105. doi:10.1080/00223989809599268.
- Kağıtçıbaşı, Ç. (1997). Individualism and collectivism. In J. W. Berry, M. H. Segall, & Ç. Kağıtçıbaşı (Eds.), *Handbook of Cross-Cultural Psychology, Vol 3*. Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
- Kaighobadi, F., Shackelford, T., & Buss, D. M. (2010). Spousal mate retention in the newlywed year and three years later. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 48, 414–418. doi:10.1016/j.paid.2009.11.008.
- Karakurt, G. (2001). *The impact of adult attachment styles on romantic jealousy*. Middle East Technical University, Ankara, Türkiye: Unpublished master's thesis.
- Kuhle, B. X. (2011). Did you have sex with him? Do you love her? An in vivo test of sex differences in jealousy interrogations. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 51, 1044–1047. doi:10.1016/j.paid.2011.07.034.
- Larzelere, R. E., & Huston, T. L. (1980). The dyadic trust scale: Toward understanding interpersonal trust in close relationships. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 42, 595–604. doi:10.2307/351903.
- Mathes, E. W. (1986). Jealousy and romantic love: A longitudinal study. *Psychological Reports*, 58(3), 885–886. doi:10.2466/pr0.1981.49.1.23.
- Muise, A., Christofides, E., & Desmarais, S. (2009). More information than you ever wanted: Does Facebook bring out the green-eyed monster of jealousy? *CyberPsychology & Behavior*, 12(4), 441–444. doi:10.1089/cpb.2008.0263
- Parker, J. G., Low, C. M., Walker, A. R., & Gamm, B. K. (2005). Friendship jealousy in young adolescents: Individual differences and links to sex, self-esteem, aggression, and social adjustment. *Developmental Psychology*, 41, 235–250. doi:10.1037/0012-1649.41.1.235.
- Parker, R. G. (1996). *An examination of the influence of sexual infidelity, verbal intimacy, and gender upon secondary appraisal processes in romantic jealousy. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Western States Communication Association*. CA: Pasadena.
- Parrott, W. G., & Smith, R. H. (1993). Distinguishing the experiences of envy and jealousy. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 64(4), 906–920. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.64.6.906.
- Pfeiffer, S. M., & Wong, P. T. (1989). Multidimensional jealousy. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 6, 181–196. doi:10.1177/026540758900600203.
- Pines, A., & Aronson, E. (1983). Antecedents, correlates, and consequences of sexual jealousy. *Journal of Personality*, 51(1), 108–136. doi:10.1111/j.1467-6494.1983.tb00857.x.
- Pines, A. M., & Friedman, A. (1998). Gender differences in romantic jealousy. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 138, 54–71. doi:10.1080/00224549809600353.



- Reiss, I. R. (1986). *Journey into sexuality: An exploratory voyage*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Russell, E. B., & Harton, H. C. (2005). The “other factors”: Using individual and relationship characteristics to predict sexual and emotional jealousy. *Current Psychology, 24*(4), 242–257. doi:10.1007/s12144-005-1026-5.
- Rydell, R. J., McConnell, A. R., & Bringle, R. G. (2004). Jealousy and commitment: Perceived threat and the effect of relationship alternatives. *Personal Relationships, 11*(4), 451–468. doi:10.1111/j.1475-6811.2004.00092.x.
- Salovey, P., & Rothman, A. J. (1991). Envy and jealousy: Self and society. In P. Salovey (Ed.), *The psychology of jealousy and envy* (pp. 271–286). New York, NY: Guilford Press.
- Schützwohl, A. (2005). Sex differences in jealousy: The processing of cues in infidelity. *Evolution and Human Behavior, 26*, 288–299. doi:10.1016/j.evolhumbehav.2004.09.003.
- Şahin, M. & Sarı, S. V. (2009). Basında “Facebook istismarı” ve toplumdaki yansımaları [Facebook abuse in press and its reflections on society]. *Journal of Süleyman Demirel University Institute of Social Sciences, 1*(9), 51–69.
- Telesco, G. A. (2003). Sex role identity and jealousy as correlates of abusive behavior in lesbian relationships. *Journal of Human Behavior in the Social Environment, 8*, 153–169. doi:10.1300/J137v08n02\_10.
- Turkish Statistical Institute (2006). *Family Structure Survey*. Retrieved January 31, 2012 from [http://www.tuik.gov.tr/VeriBilgi.do?tb\\_id=41&ust\\_id=11](http://www.tuik.gov.tr/VeriBilgi.do?tb_id=41&ust_id=11)
- Ward, J., & Voracek, M. (2004). Evolutionary and social cognitive explanations of sex differences in romantic jealousy. *Australian Journal of Psychology, 56*(3), 165–171. doi:10.1080/00049530412331283381.
- White, G. L. (1981). Jealousy and partner’s perceived motives for attraction to a rival. *Social Psychology Quarterly, 44*(1), 24–30.
- White, G. L., & Mullen, P. E. (1989). *Jealousy*. New York, NY: Guilford Press.