Research Article

A Study on Jealousy Among the Male Postgraduate Students Using social media In Tiruchirappalli, Tamil Nadu

S. Chandni[1] and V. Sethuramalingam[2]

ABSTRACT

Background: Social media plays a vital role in developing and maintaining relationship among friends, relatives and partners through social networking sites. However, when the users share their images, online messages or post likes and comments to pictures of opposite sex, it develops jealousy among them. With this background, the researcher undertook the present study. **Objectives**: To assess the jealousy and its correlates with the background characteristics of the male postgraduate students. **Method:** There were 200male postgraduate students studying incity campus of Bharathidasan University of which, the researcher selected 132respondents as sample using a simple random sampling technique. The data were collected using a self-developedJealousy scale. The reliability values for jealousy scale is Alpha 0.920. **Result:** The one-way ANOVA results also shows that there is a statistically significant difference in the mean score of jealousy across the respondents' current age, parental occupation and income, purpose of using mobile phone, time spent on social media and academic performance. However, there is no significant difference in the mean score of jealousy across the parental education. There is a positive correlation between jealousy score and family income, cost of mobile phone, time spent on social media and academic performance of the respondents. **Conclusion:** Findings indicate the need for providing counselling in order to reduce jealousy so that academic performance of the students will be improved.
Keywords: Jealousy, Male Students, Social Media.

1.INTRODUCTION

Jealousy is a feeling. It means thoughts or feelings of insecurity, fear, concern, over relative lack of possession and status. It consists of emotions like anger, resentment, inadequacy, helplessness or disgust (Draghi-Lorenz, 2000; Hart & Carrington, 2002;

---

[1]PhD Scholar, Department of Social Work, Bharathidasan University, Tiruchirappalli, Email: paulinchand@gmail.com, Mobile: 9790533123.
[2]Professor (Rtd.), Former Head, and Research Supervisor, Department of Social Work, Bharathidasan University, Tiruchirappalli.

Hart et al., 2004; Shackelford et al., 2004; as cited in Petric, 2019). Jealousy can either be suspicious or reactive (Rydell&Bringle, 2007). Jealousy is a negative emotion where an individual resents third party for appearing to take away the affection of the loved one (APA

Dictionary of Psychology, 2020).People do not have control over their feelings, but they have control over their behaviours.It is a sense of threat to a valued relationship where relationship could involve a family member, a friend or a partner (Oz, 2021).There are various types of jealousy namely romantic jealousy (White, 1981), obsessive jealousy and pathological jealousy (Kingham& Gordon, 2004).Buunk (1997) identified another three types of jealousy, namely, reactive, preventive and anxious jealousies. Jealousy is characterized by fear or resentment of a third person that is perceived to be taking away a valued friendship (Casper & Card, 2010; Muise, Christofides, & Desmarais, 2009; Smith & Kim, 2007; as cited in Green, 2018). A person may become jealous of another person if they are constantly witnessing their friend doing things with others on social media. Casper and Card (2010) found jealousy to be one of the most common reasons a friendship can transform into an antipathetic relationship.According to Sharabi (2021), social media also exposes people to ambiguous interaction between their contacts and networks by spending excess time which may lead them to jealousy. Gurrero et al. (2005) identified that fear and anger play vital role in experiencing jealousy. According to Van Ouytsel et al. (2019), images in social media, online messages, snapchat application and likes or comments to pictures of opposite sex are the important sources/causes of jealousy.

Various studies have been conducted on jealousy among the students. Buunk (1997) found that jealousy is significantly correlated with neuroticism, social anxiety, rigidity and hostility. Only among women was a low self-esteem correlated with jealousy. Utz and Buekeboom (2011) reported that the individuals with low self-esteem experienced higher Social Networking Site (SNS) jealousy. Need for popularity, trait jealousy and monitoring behaviour predicted SNS jealousy for low self-esteem individuals. For high-self-esteem individuals, monitoring behaviour and SNS use for grooming were the main predictors of SNS jealousy. Adams (2012) found that jealousy was negatively associated with the individual defense of sublimation, humour and suppression. The relationship between jealousy and defense was considerably stronger for men than women. Attridge (2013) reported emotional or reactive jealousy as 'good' and cognitive or suspicious jealousy as 'bad'. Jealousy has been associated with low self-esteem, low self-confidence, low generalized trust, low empathy for others, loneliness, a need for approval, neuroticism, depression, and generalized hostility (Bringle, 1981; Buunk, 1997; Buunk& Dijkstra, 2000; Radecki-Bush, Farrell, & Bush, 1993; Rotenberg, Shewchuk, & Kimberley, 2001; Salovey & Rodin, 1985, 1989; Stieger, Preyss, &Voracek, 2012; Tarrier, Beckett, Harwood, & Ahmed, 1989; Thomas, Miller, & Warner, 1988; as cited in Attridge, 2013). Rentzsch et al. (2015) reported that individuals with low academic self-esteem may exhibit hostile tendencies because of feelings of envy, especially in highly competitive contexts. Sitinjak (2016) informed that increase of envy will make students to focus on good destination for self-improvement in their academic performance. Further, it was reported that the envy does not become a pressure that leads to frustration among students but triggers the spirit to boost the ability to compete with the comparison. Demirtas-Madran (2018) found that there are no significant gender differences in Facebook Jealousy scores. Self-esteem and age negatively predicted Facebook jealousy and all aggression subtypes significantly predicted Facebook jealousy. González-Rivera (2019) confirmed that the relationship satisfaction is affected negatively when Facebook intrusion generates jealousy and one of the members in the relationship engages in surveillance behaviour. Humayon and Shoaib (2019) found that there was no significant difference on the current study based on academic years and their competitiveness, whereas, significant difference was found on envy, disgust and jealousy based

on the age of the students. It was also found that the sense of competitiveness increases the negative emotions among the students. Furtado et al. (2020) identified that posts from fashion profiles stimulate envy and this feeling is a motivating factor for consumption in Instagram users.

2. METHODS

2.1. Objective: The objective of the present study is to assess the jealousy and its correlates with the background characteristics of the male postgraduate students.

2.2. Research Design: The researcher has adopted descriptive research design to describe the background characteristics of the respondents. The present research is also cross-sectional in nature since data were collected at only one point in time to assess the socio-demographic characteristics and jealousy.

2.3 Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria: For the purpose of the present research the researcher included only male postgraduate students studying in city campus of Bharathidasan University, Tiruchirappalli.

2.4. Methods and Participants: The researcher purposively selected the city campus of Bharathidasan University to conduct the pilot study on social media usage among the postgraduate students. There were 200 male students studying postgraduation of which 132 respondents were selected for the study. The sample size was determined by using Krejicie and Morgan (1970) formula. The simple random sampling technique using Tippett's number table was adopted to select the individual respondents.

2.5. Ethical Considerations: The informed consent was obtained from the students. The respondents were given chance to withdraw from the interview at any time for any reason.

2.6. Methods of Data Collection: The data were collected through mailed questionnaire. The questionnaire was handed over to the respondents in person and explained the purpose of data collection. The researcher took one month time during the month of March 2018. The questionnaire was collected from all the respondents.

2.7. Tools of Data Collection: A semi-structured questionnaire was prepared to collect the personal information, socioeconomic background and social media related aspects of the respondents. To measure jealousy among the respondents, 15-item instrument was developed by the researcher. The instrument was validated through face validity. The reliability (alpha) value of jealousy scale was 0.920.

2.8. Analysis of Data: After the completion of the data collection, all the interview schedules were checked for completeness of respondents and edited carefully. To analyse the data, the researcher used SPSS software version-24 (IBM Corp., 2017). The analysis was carried out with the help of frequency distributions, one-way ANOVA and correlation analysis.

S. Chandni[1] and V. Sethuramalingam[2]

2.9. Conceptual framework: It is proposed to treat jealousy score as dependent variable and the background characteristics of the respondentswere used as independent variables.

3. RESULTS

3.1. Background characteristic of the respondents: The average age of the respondents was 22 years with the minimum of 21 years and maximum of 25 years. Little more than half (54%) of the respondents' parents live in rural areas. About 58% of the respondents' course of study is science stream.About 61% of them pursue I year postgraduation. The average parental level of education was 8th standard with the minimum of 1st standard and maximum of postgraduation. Most of them were engaged in agriculture (36.4%) and employees in government and private sectors (34.8%). The average monthly family income was Rs.29,053 with the minimum of Rs.1,500 and maximum of Rs.2,50,000.The average cost of mobile phones of the respondents was Rs.15,538 with the minimum of Rs.1,500 and maximum of 60,000. About two third (67%) of the respondents use dual type of sim card for their mobile phones. The single largest majority (41%) of the respondents' used their mobile phones for entertainment. The mobile phones used for study purpose and communication constitute 31% and 28%, respectively. The average hours spent on social media by the respondents was 4.36 hours ranging from 1 hour to 10 hours per day. The average marks obtained by the respondents in their academics during the last semester was 63.9% ranging from 50% to 86%. The mean score of jealousy is 44.41 with the minimum of 15 and maximum of 74. The low and high level of jealousy among the respondents is 49 per cent and 51 per cent, respectively.

3.2.One-way ANOVA between jealousy and background characteristics of the respondents

Table - 1: One-way analysis of variance in the mean score of jealousy of the respondents by their demographic, socio-economic and social media related aspects

Variables	N	Mean	S. D	Df	F/t	p
1.Current Age						
22 Years or <	80	49.54	16.077	1	21.013	**0.001**
23 Years +	52	36.52	15.734	130		
Total	132	44.41	17.117			
2. Parents' Place of Living						
Rural	71	37.79	15.158	1	5.259	**0.001**
Urban	61	52.11	16.107	130		
Total	132	44.41	17.117			
3. Course of Study						
Science	77	46.16	17.828	2	5.998	**0.01**
Arts	36	47.06	11.583	129		
Professional Course	19	32.32	18.658			
Total	132	44.41	17.117			
4. Year of Study						
I - Year	80	49.54	16.077	1	4.985	**0.001**
II - Year	52	36.52	15.734	130		

	N	Mean	SD	df	F	p
Total	132	44.41	17.117			
5. Parental Education						
Illiterate	22	38.23	16.333	5	0.931	0.463
Primary School	21	43.90	18.942	126		
Middle school	18	44.00	18.506			
High school & HSC	33	48.30	17.001			
Undergraduate	24	45.21	16.971			
Postgraduate	14	44.86	13.988			
Total	132	44.41	17.117			
6. Occupation of the Head of the Household						
Govt./Private Empl.	46	49.15	16.082	3	4.251	**0.01**
Business	11	36.82	15.348	128		
Agriculture	48	46.04	16.152			
Wage Labourers	27	36.52	18.241			
Total	132	44.41	17.117			
7. Monthly Family Income (Rs.)						
10000 or <	47	30.02	11.667	2	99.909	**0.001**
10001 - 20000	34	40.32	12.252	129		
20001 +	51	60.39	8.768			
Total	132	44.41	17.117			
8. Cost of the Mobile (Rs.)						
7500 or <	35	31.23	11.469	2	59.272	**0.001**
7501 - 15000	51	39.47	14.114	129		
15000 +	46	59.91	11.125			
Total	132	44.41	17.117			
9. Types of Sim Cards						
Single	44	32.41	11.298	1	6.541	**0.001**
Dual	88	50.41	16.397	130		
Total	132	44.41	17.117			
10. Primary Purpose of Mobile Phone						
Entertainment	54	60.37	8.783	2	290.734	**0.001**
Communication	37	44.11	6.389	129		
Studies	41	23.66	5.940			
Total	132	44.41	17.117			
11. Hours Spent on Social Media						
2 or < hrs.	31	24.23	8.464	2	158.967	**0.001**
2.1 - 4 hrs.	50	40.16	9.281	129		
4.1 + hrs.	51	60.84	9.704			
Total	132	44.41	17.117			
12. Academic Performance						
59 or <	47	62.96	5.583	2	491.186	**0.001**
60 - 69	45	43.76	6.336	129		
70 +	40	23.35	5.673			
Total	132	44.41	17.117			

Current Age and Jealousy Score: The mean score of jealousy in panel 1 of Table 1 is higher among the respondents who belong to the age group of 22 years or less (49.54) when compared to those who belong to 23 years and above (36.52). Moreover, the independent sample t-test shows that there is a very highly statistically significant difference (p<0.001) between the age group of the respondents in the mean score of jealousy.

Parents' Place of Living and Jealousy Score: Panel 2 of Table 1 depicts that the mean score of jealousy is higher among the respondents' parents who live in urban areas (52.11) than those parents living in rural areas (37.79). Further, the independent sample t-test revealed that there is a very highly statistically significant difference (p<0.001) between respondents' parents' place of living in the mean score of jealousy. Hence the null hypothesis that 'there is no statistically significant difference between respondents' parents' place of living in the mean score of jealousy' is rejected.

Course of Study and Jealousy Score: The respondents who study arts stream (47.06) have higher mean score of jealousy than those who study science stream (46.16) and professional course (32.32) (see panel 3 of Table 1). The course of study decreases with the increase in the mean score of jealousy. Besides, the ANOVA results show that there is a highly statistically significant difference (p<0.01) between course of study of the respondents in the mean score of jealousy. Therefore, the research hypothesis that 'there is a statistically significant difference between course of study of the respondents in the mean score jealousy' is accepted.

Year of Study and Jealousy Score: Panel 4 of Table 1 indicated that the mean score of jealousy is lower among the respondents who study II year (36.52) while I year students (49.54) have high mean score of jealousy. Moreover, the independent sample t-test shows that there is a very highly statistically significant difference (p<0.001) between year of study of the respondents in the mean score of jealousy.

Parental Education and Jealousy Score: The findings obtained from panel 5 of Table 1 highlighted that the mean score of jealousy is higher among the respondents' parents who were educated till high school and higher secondary school (48.30) when compared to their counterparts. However, the ANOVA results revealed that there is no statistically significant difference (p>0.05) between parental education in the mean score of jealousy. Hence, the null hypothesis that 'there is no statistically significant difference between parental education in the mean score jealousy' is accepted.

Occupation of the Head of the Household and Jealousy Score: The mean score of jealousy in panel 6 of Table 1 illustrated that the mean score of jealousy is higher among the head of the household who work in government/private sector (49.15) than those who were engaged in other sectors like Agriculture (46.04), Business (36.82) and Wage labourers (36.52), respectively. Further, there is a highly statistically significant difference (p<0.01) between the occupation of the head of the household in the mean score of jealousy.

Monthly Family Income and Jealousy Score: Panel 7 of Table 1 revealed that the respondents who earn Rs.20,001 and above (60.39) have high mean score of jealousy than those who earn Rs.10,001-20,000 (40.32) and Rs.10,000 or less (30.02). As the monthly family income

increases, the mean score of jealousy decreases. Moreover, there is a very highly statistically significant difference ($p<0.001$) between monthly family income in the mean score of jealousy. Therefore, the research hypothesis that 'there is a statistically significant difference between monthly family income in the mean score of jealousy' is accepted.

Cost of Mobile and Jealousy Score: The respondents whose cost of mobile phone ranging from Rs.15,001 and above (59.91) have highest mean score of jealousy when compared to those cost of mobile phones ranging from Rs.7,501-15,000 (39.47) and Rs.7,500 or less (31.23) (see panel 8 of Table 1). The cost of mobile phones increases with the increase in the mean score of jealousy. Moreover, the ANOVA test results shows that there is very highly statistically significant difference ($p<0.001$) between cost of mobile phone of the respondents in the mean score of jealousy.

Types of Sim cards and Jealousy Score: The mean score of jealousy in panel 9 of Table 1 is higher among the respondents who use dual type of sim card (50.41) when compared to the respondents who use single type of sim card (32.41). Further, the independent sample t- test reveals that there is a very highly statistically significant difference ($p<0.001$) between type of sim card in the mean score of jealousy. Hence, the null hypothesis that 'there is no statistically significant difference between type of sim card in the mean score of jealousy' is rejected.

Primary Purpose of Mobile Phone and Jealousy Score: The findings obtained from panel 10 of Table 1 indicated that the mean score of jealousy is higher among the respondents who use their mobile phone for entertainment (60.37) than those who use their mobile phones for communication (44.11) and studies (23.66). Further, the ANOVA results show that there is a very highly statistically significant difference ($p<0.001$) between primary purpose of using mobile phone in the mean score of jealousy.

Hours Spent on Social Media and Jealousy Score: Panel 11 of Table 1 illustrated that the mean score of jealousy is higher among the respondents who spend their time on social media for more than 4.1 hours (60.84) when compared to those who spend their time on social media for 2.1 to 4 hours (40.16) and 2 hours or less (24.23). As the hours spent on social media increases, the mean score of jealousy also increases. Moreover, there is a very highly statistically significant difference ($p<0.001$) between hours spent on social media in the mean score of jealousy. Hence, the research hypothesis that 'there is a statistically significant difference between hours spent on social media in the mean score of jealousy' is accepted.

Academic Performance and Jealousy Score: The respondents who have obtained less than 59 per cent of marks(62.96)have scored high mean score of jealousy than those who have scored 60-69 per cent (43.76) and more than 70 per cent (23.35) in their academics (see panel 12 of Table 1). The academic performance of the respondents increases with the decrease in mean score of jealousy. Further, the ANOVA test results show that there is a very highly statistically significant difference ($p<0.001$) between the academic performance of the respondents in the mean score of jealousy.

3.3. The correlation between jealousy score and background characteristics of the respondents.

S. Chandni[1] and V. Sethuramalingam[2]

The correlation analysis was used to find out the association between jealousy score and the background characteristics of the respondents.

Table 2:Zero-order correlations between background characteristics of therespondents and their jealousy score

Variables	Age (1)	Domicile (2)	YS (3)	FI (4)	MC (5)	HS (6)	AP (7)	Jeal. (8)
1. Age	1							
2. Domicile (Urban)	*-.199	1						
3. Year of Study	***.944	**-.250	1					
4. Income	**-.234	***.348	**-.273	1				
5. Mobile Cost	**-.265	***.313	***-.309	***.899	1			
6. Hours Spent	***-.361	***.456	***-.386	***.665	***.656	1		
7. Academic Perf.	***.355	***-.368	***.397	***-.573	***-.564	***-.833	1	
8. Jealousy	***-.334	***.419	***-.373	***.608	***.601	***.858	***.954	1

Table 2 revealed that the jealousy score is positively correlated with domicile (p<0.001), family income (p<0.001), cost of mobile phone (p<0.001), hours spent on social media (p< 0.001) and academic performance (p<0.001), whereas, it is negatively correlated with current age (p<0.001) and year of study (p<0.001) of the respondents.

4. CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTIONS

All the selected respondents were male students, studying postgraduation. Their average age was 22 years. A little more than half of the respondents' hail from rural areas. The average level of the parents' education was middle school. The average monthly income of their parents was Rs. 29,053. Majority of them were pursuing science stream. All the respondents were using mobile phones to access social media and the average cost of mobile phones of the respondents was Rs.15,538. Most of the respondents were using mobile phones for entertainment purpose. The average time spent on social media by the male students was 4.4 hours per day. The average marks obtained during their last semester was 64%.The mean score of jealousy was higher among I year PG students with urban background. Students who are studying arts stream have higher mean score of jealousy than those students who are studying other courses. The students of employed parents working in government/ private sectors with higher family income were found to have higher jealousy score. The mean score of jealousy is found higher among the students who own costliest mobile phone with dual sim. The jealousy score is found higher

among the students who used their mobile phones mostly for entertainment purpose and those who are spending more time on social media which results in poor academic performance. The one-way ANOVA results also shows that there is a statistically significant difference in the mean score of jealousy across the respondents' current age, domicile, course and year of study, parental occupation and income, cost of mobile phone owned by the respondents, type of sim card, purpose of using mobile phone, time spent on social media and academic performance. However, there is no significant difference in the mean score of jealousy across the parental education.The correlational analysis shows that, jealousy score increases, family income, cost of mobile phone, time spent on social media and academic performance also increases, whereas, the current age and year of study increases, the jealousy score decreases.

It is suggested that counselling should be provided to those who spend more time on social media so as to improve their academic performance and to reduce their jealousy. The sports, games, cultural events, coaching for competitive exams etc., can be organised to the students to spend their time usefully. The social media users should develop positive outlook towards 'images, online messages, likes and dislikes, comments etc.,' posted in the social media platform and able to enjoy it. Cognitive behavioural therapy and counselling should be provided to the students who have extreme jealousy, so that anxiety, stressanddepression will be reduced. As 51 per cent of the respondents have high level of jealousy, the educational institutions must have counselling centres for the students who spent excessive time on social media.

REFERENCES

1. Adams, S. (2012). Jealousy in romantic relationships, self-esteem and ego defense (Doctoral dissertation, Victoria University).
2. APA Dictionary of Psychology. (2020). Jealousy. Retrieved from https://dictionary.apa.org/ jealousy
3. Attridge, M. (2013). Jealousy and relationship closeness: Exploring the good (reactive) and bad (suspicious) sides of romantic jealousy. SAGE open, 3(1), 2158244013476054.
4. Bringle, R. G. (1981). Conceptualizing jealousy as a disposition. Alternative Lifestyles, 4, 274-290.
5. Buunk, B. P. (1997). Personality, birth order and attachment styles as related to various types of jealousy. Personality and Individual Differences, 23, 997-1006.
6. Buunk, B. P., & Dijkstra, P. (2000). Extradyadic relationships and jealousy. In C. Hendrick & S. S. Hendrick (Eds.), Close relationships: A sourcebook (pp. 317-329). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.
7. Casper, D. M., & Card, N. A. (2010). "We Were Best Friends, But … ": Two Studies of Antipathetic Relationships Emerging From Broken Friendships. Journal of Adolescent Research, 25(4), 499-526.
8. Demirtaş-Madran, H. A. (2018). Relationship among Facebook jealousy, aggression, and personal and relationship variables. Behaviour & Information Technology, 37(5), 462-472.
9. Dhanabalan, T., Subha, K., Shanthi, R., & Sathish, A. (2018). Factors influencing consumers' car purchasing decision in Indian automobile industry. *International Journal of Mechanical Engineering and Technology*, *9*(10), 53-63.

10. Draghi-Lorenz, R. (2000, July). Five-month-old infants can be jealous: Against cognitivist solipsism. In a symposium convened for the XIIth Biennial International Conference on Infant Studies (ICIS) (pp. 16-19).
11. IBM Corp. (2017). IBM SPSS-AMOS Statistics for Windows, Version 24.0. Armonk, NY: IBM Corp.
12. Kingham, M., & Gordon, H. (2004). Aspects of morbid jealousy. Advances in Psychiatric Treatment, 10(3), 207-215.
13. Krejcie, R. V., & Morgan, D. W. (1970). Determining sample size for research activities. Educational and psychological measurement, 30(3), 607-610.
14. 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.
15. N. Ramar, Dr.C.K. Muthukumaran, (2016). An Outline on Green Product Development and Its Export Marketing Environment, Pune Research Scholar, Vol: 2, Issue: 5, Pages: 1 -7.
16. N. Ramar, Dr.C.K. Muthukumaran, (2017). Role of Business Incubation Centre's In Promoting Entrepreneurship in Tamilnadu, Pune Research Scholar, Vol: 3, Issue: 4, Page: 1
17. N. Ramar, Dr.C.K. Muthukumaran, (2018). Green Marketing: An Attitudinal And Behavioral Analysis Of Consumers In Coimbatore District, International Journal For Innovative Research In Multidisciplinary Field, Vol: 4, Issue: 11, Pages: 163 -166.
18. N. Ramar, Dr.C.K. Muthukumaran, (2018). Role of Business Incubators in Emergent Entrepreneurship and Creating New Business in Tamilnadu, International Journal For Innovative Research In Multidisciplinary Field, Vol: 4, Issue: 11, Page: 156-158.
19. N. Ramar, Dr.C.K. Muthukumaran, (2019). Role of Business Incubation Centres In Promoting Entrepreneurship in Tamilnadu, International Journal of Advanced Research in Management and Social Science, Vol: 8, Issue 6, Page: 125 – 133.
20. N. Ramar, Dr.C.K. Muthukumaran, (2019). Role of Women Entrepreneurship in Virudhunagar District Tamilnadu, India, International Journal of Advanced Research in Management and Social Science, Vol: 8, Issue: 6, Jan/Feb 2020, Page: 119- 124.
21. N. Ramar, Dr.C.K. Muthukumaran, (2020). Role of Business Incubation Centres in Promoting Entrepreneurship with Special Reference to Tamilnadu, International Journal Of Scientific & Technology Research, Page: 4344-4346
22. N. Ramar, Dr.C.K. Muthukumaran, V. Prabakaran, S. Rajendran. Role of Technology Incubation Centers in Promoting Small - Scale Business: A Case with Special Reference to Tamilnadu, Test Engineering and Management, Vol: 82, Issue: Jan/Feb 2020, Page: 9279 – 9286.
23. N. Ramar, Dr.C.K. Muthukumaran, V. Prabakaran, S.Rajendran (2020). FDI in India: Leading to Economic Growth, International Journal of Recent Technology and Engineering, Vol: 8, Issue: 2S10, Pages: 182 – 186.
24. N. Ramar, Dr.C.K. Muthukumaran, V. Prabakaran, S.Rajendran. Entrepreneurship: - Tool for altering Livelihood of Street Vendors in Madurai City, Test Engineering and Management, Vol:82, Issue: Jan/Feb 2020, Page: 9269 – 9274.
25. N.Ramar, Dr.C.K. Muthukumaran, (2016). A Pilot study on Consumer Behaviour towards Online Shopping, Pune Research Times, Vol: 1, Issue: 1, Pages: 1 -8.

26. Oz, S. (2021). Characteristics of a Jealous friend. Retrieved from https://oureverydaylife.com/ characteristics-jealous-friend-8167.html
27. Park, J. Y., & Thangam, D. (2019). What Makes Customers Repurchase Grocery Products from Online Stores in Korea. International Journal of E-Business Research (IJEBR), 15(4), 24-39.
28. Petric, D. (2019). Envy vs. jealousy. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication /330523544_Envy_vs_jealousy
29. Radecki-Bush, C., Farrell, A. D., & Bush, J. P. (1993). Predicting jealous responses: The influence of adult attachment and depression on threat appraisal. Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 10, 569-588.
30. Rentzsch, K., Schröder-Abé, M., &Schütz, A. (2015). Envy mediates the relation between low academic self-esteem and hostile tendencies. Journal of Research in Personality, 58, 143-153.
31. Rotenberg, K. J., Shewchuk, V.-A., & Kimberley, T. (2001). Loneliness, sex, romantic jealousy, and powerlessness. Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 18, 55-79.
32. Rydell, R. J., &Bringle, R. G. (2007). Differentiating reactive and suspicious jealousy. Social Behavior and Personality: an international journal, 35(8), 1099-1114.
33. Salovey, P., & Rodin, J. (1985). The heart of jealousy. Psychology Today, 19, 22-25, 28-29.
34. Salovey, P., & Rodin, J. (1989). Envy and jealousy in close relationships. In C. Hendrick (Ed.), Close relationships (pp. 221-246). Newbury Park, CA: SAGE
35. Shackelford, T. K., Voracek, M., Schmitt, D. P., Buss, D. M., Weekes-Shackelford, V. A., & Michalski, R. L. (2004). Romantic jealousy in early adulthood and in later life. Human Nature, 15(3), 283-300.
36. Sharabi, L. (2021). Jealousy: Why Your Social Media Habit Is Making You Jealous, Psychology Today. Retrieved from https://www.psychologytoday.com/intl/blog/dating-in-the-digital-age/202102/why-your-social-media-habit-is-making-you-jealous
37. Sitinjak, C. (2016, February). Envious increasing student's academic performance. In Proceeding from the ASEAN Conference: 2nd Psychology & Humanity, "Optimalizing Human Strenght for Productivity and Well Being (pp. 716-722).
38. Smith, R. H., & Kim, S. H. (2007). Comprehending envy. Psychological Bulletin,133(1), 46-64.
39. Stieger, S., Preyss, A. V., &Voracek, M. (2012). Romantic jealousy and implicit and explicit self-esteem. Personality and Individual Differences, 52, 51-55.
40. Tarrier, N., Beckett, R., Harwood, S., & Ahmed, Y. (1989). Comparison of a morbidly jealous and a normal female population on the Eysenck Personality Questionnaire. Personality and Individual Differences, 10, 1327-1328.
41. Thomas, R. K., Miller, T. M., & Warner, S. (1988, April). The effects of personality and relationship variables on romantic jealousy. Paper presented at the Midwestern Psychological Association annual convention, Chicago, IL.
42. Utz, S., &Beukeboom, C. J. (2011). The role of social network sites in romantic relationships: Effects on jealousy and relationship happiness. Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication, 16(4), 511-527.
43. Van Ouytsel, J., Walrave, M., Ponnet, K., Willems, A.-S., & Van Dam, M. (2019). Adolescents' perceptions of digital media's potential to elicit jealousy, conflict and monitoring behaviors within romantic relationships. Cyberpsychology: Journal of

S. Chandni[1] and V. Sethuramalingam[2]

Psychosocial Research on Cyberspace, 13(3), 1-21. Retrieved from https://biblio.ugent.be/publication/8623394/file /8623396.pdf