

A Study to Investigate The Impact Of Love Styles On The Level of Deception

Rakhi Mehta¹, Akanksha Shinde², Apurva Ghadshi³, Farhin Nathani⁴, Nabila Damra⁵

¹Assistant Professor, ^{2,3,4,5} TYBA Students, Department of Psychology, K.C. College, Mumbai.

Corresponding author: Rakhi Mehta

Email – ashok7171@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

Background: The causes of deception in a close relationship need to be zeroed upon to improve the quality of a relationship. The present study explores the causes of deception in close relationships based upon Alan Lee's Love styles which describe three primary love styles namely Eros (physical love), Ludus (game playing love) and Storge (companionate love).

Methods: The sample consisted of a group of 30 participants in the age group of 18 to 28 years and average number of years of relationship being two years one month. The Love Attitude scale was administered on them to ascertain their love styles and the Tim Cole scale measured their level of deception. Based upon their scores on the Love style scale the sample was grouped into three categories namely Eros, Ludus and Storge.

Results: The highest mean for deception was for Eros style (24.5) followed by Ludus (21.2) and least being for Storge (14.8). An f test was calculated to find out whether the difference between the three means was statistically significant or not. The f value was found to be 6.47 which was found to be statistically significant at the .05 level of significance. In order to find out which of the two means were significantly different the Tukey HSD was calculated and the value was found to be 6.77. The difference between Eros and Storge contributed significantly to the difference.

Conclusion: Thus, to conclude people having different love styles have different levels of deception impacting the relationship.

Keywords: Relationship, Deception, Love styles.

(Paper received – 3rd January 2018, Peer review completed – 10th January 2018)

(Accepted – 16th January 2018)

INTRODUCTION

A relationship is a particular type of connection between two or more entities based upon trust. Thus, a healthy relationship is where both the partners choose each other freely and are honest or do not deceive each other. Deception is the act of causing someone to accept as true or valid what is false or invalid. A relationship free of deception would be the one in which love lasts. Love is a variety of different feelings, states and attitudes that range from interpersonal affection to pleasure. It can refer to an emotion of strong attraction and personal attachment. Love can also be a virtue representing human kindness, compassion, and affection—"the unselfish loyal and benevolent concern for the good of another."

Love can be understood in various ways one of them being the view of a Canadian Psychologist John Alan Lee. He described six love styles based on colour wheel of love. He gave Greek names to these love styles. He categorized the love styles into primary and secondary. Primary love styles are Eros, Ludus, & Storge and three Secondary love styles are Mania, Pragma & Agape.

Primary Love Styles

Eros [Physical Love] - Someone who has Eros love style, focuses on physical attraction & sexual desires. Is eager to develop intense, passionate relationships and likes to experience fairly intense emotional highs, emotional lows are part of this dynamic even after a relationship.

Characteristics of Eros Type lovers - They feel most intense during initial stages of relationship, can often get “hooked on the look” of another and are in search of sexual adventures and variety.

Ludus [Game Playing Love] - Ludus type lovers consider relationships as games to be played. They tend to avoid commitments and see being in a relationship as fun, casual and playful. These type of lovers have concerns about cheating and infidelity.

Characteristics of Ludus Type Lovers - They can have multiple partners, do not disclose personal information, can have narcissistic qualities.

Storge [Companionate Love] - Storgic Lovers have relationships that grow out of friendships, shared values, goals and compatibility. This love style is a mixture of Pragma and Agape love styles. Physical attractiveness is not a priority. They often witness their love transform into companionate type love.

Characteristics of Storge Type Lovers - They are stable and dependable, do not seek out lots of excitement (drama-free), have trust and loyalty as their foundation.

Pragma [Practical Love] – Pragma love types are in search of someone who matches or fits perfectly to a particular image based on their age, financial status, cultural background and so on. Pragmatic lovers mostly use dating apps.

Characteristics of Pragma Type Lovers - They are rational, use empirical knowledge for dating and love, before dating someone they weigh options.

Mania [Possessive Love] - Manic lovers are often demanding, co-dependent and outright possessive. They want to control their partners and want to know what their partners are doing. They may not be trustworthy and may find it difficult to trust their partner in romantic relationships.

Characteristics of Mania Type Lovers - They are obsessed of their lover, are easily hurt, seek validation through relationships

Agape (Unselfish Love) - Agape lovers are considered to be “unselfish” lovers. They are more of 'giving' than 'receiving' in the relationship and also concerned about their partner's well-being. This love style may seem to be ideal but can have issues such as co-dependency.

Characteristics of Agape Type Lovers - They have unconditional love for a mate, high degree of passion for a lover, put partner's needs ahead of personal needs

On the basis of the above love styles and their characteristics, one can conclude that for a strong, healthy relationship, ‘deception’ is one feature that has to be avoided. Deception is part of human nature because most of the time the decisions made are based on emotions. Though deception is immediately successful when trying to cover up a situation, it doesn't erase what really happened. Lying may be a quick fix but it won't be able to permanently settle the situation. On the other hand, the best way to destroy trust is to find out that one's significant other is deceiving them. When one person becomes aware that they are being lied to, it becomes difficult to begin to trust the liar again. Healthy relationships depend on trust, so it is very common for a couple to break up because of a lie. Even if the lie doesn't come to light, it still creates a distance between the two people.

Deception seems to be very harmful to a relationship therefore the present paper wishes to explore the reason for deception in relationships.

A large number of researchers have studied the impact of deception on relationships. In a study examining the use of deceptive communication in intimate couple relationships [1-3], a total of 80 romantically involved male and female Australian university students were selected for the study. Six types of deception were examined, namely: omission, distortion, half-truths, blatant lies, white lies and failed lies. Self-reports of satisfaction with the couple relationships were also obtained. Respondents used white lies most often, and blatant lies least often, and perceived their partners as behaving similarly.

In a study, three hypotheses were tested in a sample of 107 non-marital romantically-involved couples [4-8]. Results suggest that both situationally-aroused suspicion and GCS significantly influenced accuracy. Under certain conditions, aroused suspicion substantially improved the accuracy with which individuals could detect the deception of relational partners. Another study investigated communication patterns and subsequent relational outcomes following romantic partners' deception for people with different attachment styles. Outcomes of the 213 participants who reported being deceived by a relational partner were gathered. Analysis revealed that respondents with a secure attachment style were more likely to report talking about the issue, whereas anxious/ambivalents were more likely to report talking around and avoiding the issue. Conversely, respondents with an avoidant attachment style reported being more likely to avoid the person after discovery of the lie, and they tended to report terminating their romantic relationships more than the other two attachment style groups. The results were consistent with the hypothesis that communication patterns following discovery of the partner's deception are related to attachment styles, but information importance and avoiding the person were directly related to relational termination.

Another study explored sex differences in perceptions of discovered deception, and the subsequent emotional reactions that are experienced by relational partners [9]. Several hypotheses were developed and tested in a sample of 190 respondents who had recently discovered the lie of a friend or romantic partner. Women were more likely than men to rate lying as an unacceptable form of behaviour within both friendship and romantic relationships. In addition, women rated the act of lying as more significant, and reported more negative emotional reactions upon discovering deception than did men. Generalized communicative suspicion functioned to enhance the intensity of emotional reactions for women, but not for men. Studies suggest that individuals regularly communicate inauthentic affectionate messages to their romantic partners. In a study a 7-day diary in which participants recorded what they lied about, why they lied, and how they used affection to deceive their romantic partners was analysed [10-12]. Results indicated that participants lied about their own feelings, feelings about their partners, or feelings about the situation. They communicated using verbal messages of confirmation or avoidance. Motives for the deception included face-saving, conflict management/avoidance, and emotion management. This study provides a clearer picture of how deceptive communication may support and maintain romantic relationships.

METHODOLOGY

The aim of the present research is to understand the reason behind deception in close relationships based on Lee's Colour Wheel Theory of love.

Hypothesis

There will be no difference in the level of deception shown by people irrespective of their love styles based on Lee's classification.

Independent variable

The independent variable is the love style (based on the scores of Lee's love style scale.)

Dependent variable

The level of deception (on the basis of scores on Tim Cole scale.)

Design

A Random Groups Design was used

Sample

The sample consisted of a total of 30 participants.

Controls

The age range was 18 to 28 years. The number of years of relationship was on at least two years. Only unmarried romantic relationships were considered.

Scale

- 1) Love Attitude Scale
- 2) Deception Scale

DATA ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION

The demographic variables in terms of age and number of years in a relationship were discussed. A one way ANOVA was formulated to find out significance of difference between means. Since the ANOVA value is significant Tukey HSD value was calculated.

The present research in order to discern the cause of deception in a dating relationship investigated whether differences in love style was the cause of differences in deception. This is because though various studies have investigated various factors such as suspicion, types of lies etc and its impact on relationship, no study has related Lee's Love style to Deception.

The sample of the research consisted of 30 participants in the age group 18-28 years having an average relationship of 2 years one month, residing in the city of Mumbai.

Love style scale was administered on the sample to classify them into three Primary Love styles namely Eros, Ludus and Storge with Secondary Love Styles namely Pragma, Mania and Agape.

Since in the secondary Love styles, none in the sample was found to be high on Agape Love Style which is selfless love further statistical analysis was not conducted.

The Deception scale was also administered on the participants and the results indicated that, the mean for deception score was highest for Eros (24.5) followed by Ludus (21.2) and it was lowest for Storge (14.8). (Table 1)

Table 1 – Shows the mean of deception for the three Primary Love Styles.

EROS	LUDUS	STORGE
24.5	21.2	14.8

Since the level of deception was different for different love styles, the null hypothesis was rejected at an apparent level. But to find out, whether the differences were statistically significant or not, a one way ANOVA was calculated based on deception scores of the three groups belonging to the three primary Love styles. The F value was found to be 6.47 which was found to be significant at the 0.05 level of significance. Thus, the null hypothesis that there will be no difference in the level of deception shown by people irrespective of their love styles based on Lee's classification was rejected and the Alternative hypothesis that love styles determine deception was accepted.

Table 2 – Indicates the impact of 3 Primary Love styles on deception.

SOURCE	SS	DF	MS	F
BETWEEN	486.47	2	243.23	6.47*
WITHIN	1013.7	27	37.54	
TOTAL	1500.17	29		

* $p < 0.05$

In order to find out the difference between which two means led to a significant F value, a Post HOC Tukey HSD value was calculated which was found to be 6.77. The difference between Eros & Storge (9.7) was greater than Tukey value whereas the difference between Ludus & Storge (6.4) and Eros & Ludus (3.3) was lower. Therefore, to conclude, the difference between Eros & Storge was the significant difference. This may be because Eros is when people fall in love with the other person's physical attractiveness & they seek sexual adventures and thrills. It is more of a passionate superficial love. On the other hand, Storge is when the relationship is based on friendship, shared values, goals etc. and they don't rank physical attractiveness as high. It is also a mixture of Pragma i.e Practical Love- when people look for some things in particular for eg: financial status, religion or education. It is more mature and compassionate. Thus, one of the most important causes of Deception are the different Love Styles.

Therefore, when in a relationship, the love style of a partner could be a good indicator of level of deception one would experience in a relationship.

CONCLUSION

On the basis of the results of the study it can be concluded that, people falling under Eros Love Style are high on deception. They look for sexual adventures and thrills in life and give priority to physical attractiveness. They lose interest in the significant other which often leads to deception as an attempt to retain the partner for a short time.

Thus, one of the most important causes of deception are the different Love styles. So, when in a relationship, the Love style of the partner could be a good indicator of the level of deception one would face in a relationship.

Limitations - The sample size was limited. Equal number of males & females were not included in the sample. The sample was only from Mumbai, therefore this study cannot be generalised.

Further studies - The participants could be grouped into different categories according to each partner's love style. For e.g.: both Eros or Eros-Ludus, etc. to find out which grouping has the highest number of deceivers. Several other variables such as gender, different age groups, different varieties of relationships such as marital, non-marital relations could be investigated.

REFERENCES

- Peterson CC. What is a lie? Children's use of intentions and consequences in lexical definitions and moral evaluations of lying. In Children's Interpersonal Trust (pp. 5-19). Springer, New York, NY ; 1991.
- Peterson CC. The role of perceived intention to deceive in children's and adults' concepts of lying. *Br J Dev Psychol* 1995;13(3):237-60.
- Peterson CC, Peterson JL, Seeto D. Developmental changes in ideas about lying. *Child Dev* 1983;11:1529-35.
- Levine TR, McCornack SA. Distinguishing between types of suspicion and measuring a predisposition towards suspicion: Two studies validating a measure of trait suspicion. In annual meeting of the Speech Communication Association, San Francisco 1989.
- McCornack SA, Parks MR. Deception detection and relationship development: The other side of trust. *Ann Int Commun Assoc* 1986;9(1):377-89.
- McCornack SA, Parks MR. What women know that men don't: Sex differences in determining the truth behind deceptive messages. *J Soc Personal Relat* 1990;7(1):107-18.
- Levine TR, McCornack SA. The dark side of trust: Conceptualizing and measuring types of communicative suspicion. *Commun Quart* 1991;39(4):325-40.
- Levine TR, Wheelless LR. Situational intimacy as a predictor of compliance- gaining tactic selection. *Commun Res Reports* 1997;14(2):132-44.
- Horan SM. Affection exchange theory and perceptions of relational transgressions. *West J Communication* 2012;76(2):109-26.
- Horan SM, Booth-Butterfield M. Investing in affection: An investigation of affection exchange theory and relational qualities. *Commun Quart* 2010;58(4):394-413.
- Horan SM, Booth- Butterfield M. Is it worth lying for? Physiological and emotional implications of recalling deceptive affection. *Hum Commun Res* 2011;37(1):78-106.
- Ainsworth MD, Blehar MC, Waters E, Wall SN. Patterns of attachment: A psychological study of the strange situation. Psychology Press; 2015.
- Bartholomew K. Avoidance of intimacy: An attachment perspective. *J Soc Personal Relat* 1990;7(2):147-78.
- Bowlby J. Attachment and loss: Retrospect and prospect. *Am J Orthopsychiatry* 1982;52(4):664-9.
- McCornack SA, Parks MR. What women know that men don't: Sex differences in determining the truth behind deceptive messages. *J Soc Personal Relat* 1990;7(1):107-18.

Acknowledgements – Nil; Conflict of Interest – Nil; Funding – Nil