

Extending the Prediction of Infidelity Using a Five-Factor Model

by

Erin Logue, M.A.

A dissertation

In

COUNSELING PSYCHOLOGY

Submitted to the Graduate Faculty
of Texas Tech University in
Partial Fulfillment of
the Requirements for
the Degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Approved

Susan. S. Hendrick, Ph.D.
Chair of Committee

Clyde Hendrick, Ph.D.
Co-Chair of Committee

Sheila Garos, Ph.D.

Steve Richards, Ph.D.

Dominick Casadonte
Interim Dean of the Graduate School

August, 2013

Copyright 2013, Erin Logue

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	iv
LIST OF TABLES	vi
CHAPTER	
I. INTRODUCTION	p. 1
The Complexity of Infidelity	p. 2
The Components of Infidelity	p. 4
Current Research	p. 7
Hypotheses	p. 11
II. METHOD	p.17
Participants	p. 17
Measures	p. 18
Procedure	p.26
Research Design and Analyses	p. 27
III. RESULTS	p. 28
Data Screening	p.28
Descriptive Statistics	p. 30
Correlational Analyses	p. 31
Regression Analyses	p. 33
Confirmatory Factor Analysis	p. 39
IV. DISCUSSION	p. 85
Limitations	p. 88

Directions for Future Research	p. 89
REFERENCES	p. 92
APPENDICES	p.102
APPENDIX A, Extended Literature Review	p. 102
APPENDIX B, Pilot Version 1	p. 127
APPENDIX C, Pilot Version 2	p. 135
APPENDIX D, Background Inventory	p. 142
APPENDIX E, Infidelity Scale	p.144
APPENDIX F, International Personality Item Pool Big-Five Items	p. 148
APPENDIX G, Narcissistic Personality Inventory	p. 151
APPENDIX H, Sexual Opinion Survey	p. 153
APPENDIX I, Brief Sexual Attitudes Scale	p. 155
APPENDIX J, The Hurlbert Index of Sexual Narcissism	p. 157
APPENDIX K, Sensation Seeking Scale	p. 158
APPENDIX L, Self-disclosure Index	p. 159
APPENDIX M, Relationship Assessment Scale	p. 160
APPENDIX N, Commitment	p. 161
APPENDIX O, Sexual Communication	p. 162
APPENDIX P, General Measure of Sexual Satisfaction	p. 163
APPENDIX Q, Hurlbert Index of Sexual Compatibility	p. 164
APPENDIX R, Instructions for the COWA FAS	p. 166
APPENDIX S, Instructions for the Trail Making Test A and B	p. 167

ABSTRACT

This research examined the contributions of individual, general relationship, and sexual variables in predicting different types of infidelity. This task was accomplished by examining correlations, as well as the contribution of clusters of variables to initial modeling of each type of infidelity and the relative predictive strength of certain variables to different types of infidelity. The overall goal of this research was to provide evidence that behaviors not traditionally thought of as emotional or sexual infidelity, but which are nevertheless considered unfaithful, are predicted differentially from more traditional forms of emotional and sexual infidelity. It may be that these different predictive constructs are in line with Allen et al.'s (2005) conception of different predictive variables at different points in the development of relationship infidelity. It may also be the case that there are different timelines, an understanding of which could be aided by the current research.

A pilot study and initial study (Study 1) involved item generation and exploratory factor analysis to develop the initial Infidelity Scale. It was hypothesized that infidelity would be a multidimensional construct and that construct validity would be established by showing that the infidelity subscales correlated with other relationship constructs in expected ways. The hypotheses were supported, generating a five-factor Infidelity Scale consisting of 37 items. Study 2 confirmed the five-factor structure of the Infidelity Scale and provided further evidence for construct validity. Confirmatory factor analysis largely supported the hypotheses. However, due to lack of fit with the hypothesized model, two

items were deleted from the scale. Confirmatory analysis was run again and yielded an acceptable model fit to the data.

The current study employed data from 487 college students. The final factor structure of the Infidelity Scale was confirmed. Simultaneous Linear Regression analyses were used to examine the relative contributions of several clusters of variables to predicting the Infidelity subscales. Hierarchical Multiple Regression was used to look at the interactions of these sets of variables with gender. Steps taken toward modeling the subscales revealed that the individual sexual variables emerged as the primary predictor for all of the Infidelity subscales. Also, all subscales that involved some degree of sexual act produced the same sequence of predictors. Gender interacted with the individual sexual variables in predicting Sexual Infidelity and Deviant Involvement such that these variables were more predictive of these subscales for males. Overall, these findings provide evidence that different models for the infidelity subscales may exist. However, subscales with more emotional/cognitive content may have similar models, and subscales with more physical content may have similar models. Additionally, it is possible that there are different models for predicting the subscales by gender. These findings are also discussed in terms of Allen et al.'s proposed temporal sequence. Limitations of this inquiry and directions for future research are discussed.

LIST OF TABLES

1. Factor Loadings on the Infidelity Scale – Study1	p. 40
2. Correlations between the Infidelity Subscales and Other Relationship Measures – Study 1	p. 44
3. Means and T-Values for Infidelity Subscales as a Function of Gender – Study 1	p. 46
4. Factor Loadings on the Infidelity Scale – Study 2	p. 47
5. Correlations between Infidelity Subscales and Relationship Measures – Study 2	p. 51
6. Means, Standard Deviations, and Internal Consistency Coefficient – Current Research	p. 52
7. Correlations of Infidelity Subscales with Individual and Relationship Measures – Current Research	p. 54
8. Simultaneous Multiple Regression Analyses Predicting Emotional Infidelity from Sets of Variables - Current Research	p. 56
9. Simultaneous Multiple Regression Analyses Predicting Contemplation from Sets of Variables - Current Research	p. 58
10. Simultaneous Multiple Regression Analyses Predicting Physical Flirtation from Sets of Variables - Current Research	p. 60
11. Simultaneous Multiple Regression Analyses Predicting Sexual Infidelity from Sets of Variables - Current Research	p. 62
12. Simultaneous Multiple Regression Analyses Predicting Deviant Involvement from Sets of Variables - Current Research	p. 64
13. Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analyses Predicting Emotional Infidelity from Gender and Sets of Variables - Current Research	p. 66
14. Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analyses Predicting Contemplation from Gender and Sets of Variables - Current Research	p. 69
15. Simultaneous Multiple Regression Analyses Predicting Physical Flirtation from Gender and Sets of Variables - Current Research	p. 72

16. Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analyses Predicting Sexual Infidelity from Gender and Sets of Variables - Current Research	p. 75
17. Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analyses Predicting Deviant Involvement from Gender and Sets of Variables - Current Research	p. 78
18. Factor Loadings on the Infidelity Scale – Current Research	p. 81

CHAPTER I

Introduction

When someone mentions infidelity, most people believe they know what is being discussed, and that they understand what that word means. However, many years of research have revealed that the term is a complicated one, situated within historical, cultural, and generational contexts. For example, in the culture of the late 20th century, different attitudes regarding participation in sexual activity were found to exist. DeLamater (1987) identified three primary orientations toward sexuality: procreational, relational, and recreational (as cited in Laumann, Gagnon, Michael, & Michaels, 1994). The former two hold that extramarital/extradyadic sex is considered unfaithful behavior and should thus be avoided; however, this prohibition is not necessarily present in the recreational attitude. Nevertheless, research indicates that having a monogamous sexual relationship is actually more physically and emotionally satisfying than having multiple partners (Laumann et al.).

Participation in unfaithful behavior differs across many constructs and domains, including gender, age, marital status, and nationality. It is generally believed that men are more likely to participate in extradyadic involvement than are women. Even so, it is estimated that approximately 10% of children in the Western world are conceived outside of a marriage without the husband's knowledge (Buunk & Dijkstra, 2000). The incidence of infidelity has been demonstrated to be higher among people who are unmarried, and attitudes toward extradyadic involvement are more permissive among younger people (Buunk & Dijkstra, 2000). Furthermore, even though 85% of Americans disapprove of

extramarital relationships (Pestrak, Martin, & Martin, 1985), academic and popular literatures have noted differences in infidelity across countries. In *An Italian Affair* (2002), Laura Fraser recounts her experience as the "other woman" in an affair with a French citizen. In this autobiographical novel, she discusses how this man and his wife have an understanding regarding his infidelities; that is, as long as he returns to her, his unfaithful behavior on holiday is implied, and no questions are asked. Extramarital sex is also more common in African countries than, for example, in Asian or European countries (Buunk & Dijkstra, 2000). It should thus be emphasized that the current research is focused on college students in the United States, most of whom are unmarried.

The Complexity of Infidelity

Infidelity is a devastating experience for many couples, rated by therapists as one of the most damaging and difficult issues to treat in couples therapy (Whisman, Dixon, & Johnson, 1997). Infidelity has also been associated with symptoms such as depression and anxiety (Cano & O'Leary, 2001; Wagers, 2003; Whitty, 2005) and symptoms similar to post-traumatic stress disorder (Wagers, 2003). It is estimated that two-thirds of young adults have either committed or been the victims of unfaithful behavior (Sheppard, Nelson, & Andreoli-Mathis, 1995). Although that percentage is lower for married couples, 15-25% (Laumann et al., 1994), it is still quite high.

Furthermore, infidelity has been associated directly with several individual and relationship difficulties, including neuroticism (Barta & Kiene, 2005; Orzeck & Lung, 2005; Whisman, Gordon, & Chatav, 2007), insecure attachment styles (Allen & Baucom, 2004), dishonesty, narcissism and substance abuse (Atkins, Baucom, & Christensen,

2005), low marital quality (Previt & Amato, 2004), low relationship satisfaction (Atkins, Baucom, & Jacobson, 2001; Banfield & McCabe, 2001; Glass & Wright, 1985), and sexual dissatisfaction (Atkins et al., 2005; Traeen & Stigum, 1998). Other correlates of infidelity range from demographic characteristics (e.g., gender, age, education level, religiosity, political orientation, race, relationship length), to individual attitudes toward relationships, to dyadic factors (e.g., support from partner, conflict between partners, power imbalances within the relationship, trust, shared social networks, and autonomy within the relationship), and situational factors (e.g., opportunity) (Allen et al., 2005; Blow & Hartnett, 2005).

Although several studies have been conducted on the correlates and predictors of infidelity, operational definitions of infidelity and methods of assessing infidelity vary. Several studies have defined infidelity solely in terms of extradyadic sexual behavior (e.g., Orzeck & Lung, 2005; Previti & Amato, 2004; Whisman & Snyder, 2007). Furthermore, these studies have all assessed infidelity as a dichotomous variable; either it is present, or it is not.

Other research has recognized more thoroughly that more than one type of infidelity exists and has assessed infidelity accordingly: “In a dating relationship, have you ever made an agreement *not* to get involved with anyone else? Did you get involved with someone else, either sexually or emotionally, anyway?” (Barta & Kiene, 2005, p. 346). Even more appropriately, Glass and Wright (1985) recognized the need to assess both emotional and physical infidelity together, in the same study, on continua. This is an advantage because dichotomizing variables causes researchers to lose information about

individual differences on the levels of that variable (MacCallum, Zhang, Preacher, & Rucker, 2002).

To anyone trying to summarize the literature into something meaningful that can perhaps be used by therapists to help individuals prevent or work through and better understand infidelity, these different methods of assessing and defining infidelity pose a problem. Because of this lack of cohesion, it is also difficult to adequately compare the correlates and predictors of infidelity across studies. Several studies have addressed the need for a more thorough assessment of infidelity. For example, Allen et al. (2005, p. 122) recognized that “A major factor constraining the interpretation of findings regarding [infidelity] involves both the conceptual and operational ambiguity of the construct,” and these researchers recommended that investigators studying infidelity work within the context of a theoretical framework using validated measures. It can be argued that because everyone has different opinions as to what constitutes infidelity within their particular relationship, the construct is difficult to define and therefore difficult to measure. However, the purpose of preliminary research discussed later in this document was to take steps to develop a comprehensive, multidimensional, validated measure of infidelity, based on knowledge gained from previous literature about infidelity’s components.

The Components of Infidelity

What exactly are the different components of infidelity? Can infidelity be conceptualized as consisting of physical and emotional factors alone? As mentioned previously, several studies have taken into account these two major components of

infidelity, the physical and the emotional, with men consistently more likely than women to endorse participating in physical infidelity and women consistently more likely than men to endorse participating in emotional infidelity (e.g., Atkins et al., 2005; Banfield & McCabe, 2001; Barta & Kiene, 2005; Drigotas, Safstro, & Gentilia, 1999; Egan & Angus, 2004; Glass & Wright, 1985; Glass & Wright, 1992). Details are provided in Appendix A.

Yet, other studies, also detailed in Appendix A, have identified behaviors independent of emotional and physical infidelity that are considered unfaithful (e.g., Roscoe et al., 1988; Weis & Slosnerick, 1981; Yarab & Allgeier, 1998; Yarab, Sensibaugh, & Allgeier, 1998). Such research indicates that there are behaviors not quite constituting emotional or physical infidelity that are still considered unfaithful, possibly because of their potential to lead to an act of physical or emotional infidelity. This idea fits well with the concept of a contemplation type of infidelity that may exist. Balswick and Balswick (1999) and Lusterman (1997) suggested that having thoughts about engaging in an extradyadic relationship has the potential to lead to acting on those thoughts. In addition, the authors stated that the thoughts alone can have detrimental effects on the primary relationship. Banfield and McCabe (2001) also implied that there is a cognitive component to emotional and physical infidelity. The scale developed in the preliminary studies discussed later included items derived from Roscoe et al. (1988), Weis and Slosnerick (1981), Yarab and Allgeier (1998), and Yarab et al. (1998), as well as additional items that may be seen as constituting a contemplation type of infidelity

(i.e., thoughts and/or behaviors indicating desire or intent to engage in physical or emotional infidelity).

Some scales have been developed regarding infidelity, but these do not measure actual engagement in it. For example, two studies developed scales based on reasons or motivations for participating in infidelity (Barta & Kien, 2005; Yeniceri & Kokdemir, 2006). Yet other studies have assessed actual engagement in infidelity without attempting to develop a validated measure. Instead, researchers have simply put together a questionnaire for the purpose of their study, as did Glass and Wright (1985). Items in their study were adopted from Ehrmann (1969) and included kissing, caressing, sexual intimacy without intercourse, and sexual intercourse. Additional examples of this type of research can be found in Appendix A.

In summary, assessment of infidelity has evolved from single item assessment of sexual infidelity to recognition of the need to include measurement of emotional infidelity and to assess both constructs on continua. More recently, researchers recognized the existence of thoughts, feelings, and behaviors that, although not quite considered emotional or sexual infidelity, nevertheless constitute unfaithful acts. These have yet to be added to the measurement of infidelity. Furthermore, even though several studies have identified and measured different components of infidelity, no one study attempted to gather these components for the purposes of measuring infidelity comprehensively.

Given the importance of maintaining exclusivity within romantic relationships (Boekhout, Hendrick, & Hendrick, 2003), the prevalence of infidelity, its negative

consequences, and the lack of a comprehensive measure of this construct, it was deemed important to develop a solid measure to assess infidelity. Development of this scale will be discussed in the following section, with a detailed presentation found in Appendix A.

Current Research

A pilot study and two preliminary investigations related to the current study were conducted, with the primary goals of developing a comprehensive measure of infidelity that takes into account thoughts, behaviors, and feelings previously assessed and suggested as components of infidelity, that is based on a continuum, to produce a measure that can be used to better examine the predictors and correlates of different types of infidelity. Scale items were generated using the items from previous literature and asking students to list “behaviors, thoughts, and feelings other than what one might typically expect would constitute infidelity.”

Because a question arose about the way items should be worded, a pilot study was conducted to determine whether the wording of items made a difference in participants’ responses to the questionnaire. Another purpose of this pilot study was to determine the level at which participants agreed that the items actually constitute acts of infidelity. Questionnaires for this pilot study can be found in Appendices B and C. Based on the pilot results, five items were deleted.

The primary hypothesis of *Study 1* was that the factor structure of the Infidelity Scale would be multidimensional. Other hypotheses involved correlations with other relationship measures, for construct validation. The hypotheses of the second study were that the factor structure of and relationships found in the initial study would be

confirmed. Discussion of the measures used to test the hypotheses of *Studies 1 and 2* can be found in Appendix A. Hypotheses related to the factor structure of the Infidelity Scale were tested using Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA) and Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA). In *Study 1*, principal axis extraction with promax rotation yielded a five factor solution of 37 items. *Study 2* largely confirmed this factor structure; however, two items were deleted during analysis due to failure to contribute adequately to the model. Both studies provided support for construct validity, in that subscales of the Infidelity Scale correlated with existing relationship measures in expected ways. Interestingly, men endorsed engaging in all types of infidelity more than women.

Given past research and initial studies, it appears that the factor structure of infidelity is indeed multidimensional and that the scale developed has good construct validity. Questions arise as to whether different individual and relationship variables, or patterns and interactions of these variables, differentially predict the infidelity subscales. That is, are there different models for different types of infidelity? Allen et al. (2005) hypothesized similarly in regard to their proposed temporal sequence of infidelity. If there are, indeed, different models for the infidelity subscales, this will invite examination of these subscales within the context of Allen and colleagues' proposed temporal pattern.

As stated above, many individual and relationship predictors of infidelity have been examined by previous research. These studies were the primary basis for variables chosen to take steps toward modeling the different types of infidelity examined in the current study. The author's theory regarding individual and relationship variables that

should differentially drive participation in different types of infidelity was also used to guide variable selection.

Research has shown and suggested several relationships among infidelity and individual and relationship variables. More specifically, most Big 5 personality constructs (i.e., extraversion, agreeableness, emotional stability, and conscientiousness) and narcissism (specifically, the entitlement, exploitiveness, and exhibitionism components) consistently emerge as important predictors of infidelity. Variables related to individuals' sexuality have also emerged as important in predicting extradyadic involvement. The most relevant individual sexual variables in the prediction of infidelity appear to be erotophilia, permissive and instrumental sexual attitudes, sexual narcissism, and sexual sensation seeking.

Literature also suggests many relationship variables, general and sexual, associated with infidelity. Among the most cited relationship variables contributing to engagement in infidelity are communication, relationship satisfaction, and commitment. It has also been demonstrated that sexual dissatisfaction predicts infidelity (e.g., Gonyea, 2004). Greater sexual communication leads to greater sexual satisfaction (Herold & Way, 1988; MacNeil & Byers, 1997), and sexual compatibility influences both sexual communication and sexual satisfaction (Offman and Matheson, 2005). Thus, sexual satisfaction, sexual communication, and sexual compatibility were examined as predictors of infidelity in the current study.

Additionally, deficits in cognitive functioning, namely executive functioning, have been implicated in hypersexual behavior. Although one study found a link between

several self-report measures of executive functioning and hypersexuality in a patient sample (Reid, Karim, McCrory, & Carpenter, 2010), follow-up research failed to find differences between a patient and community sample using neuropsychological measures of executive functioning (Reid, Garos, & Carpenter, 2011). Additionally, Reid et al. (2011) mentioned the need for future research examining the relationship between executive functioning and different components of hypersexuality, one of which is compulsive infidelity. Thus, the current researcher sought to extend the findings of the Reid et al. (2010, 2011) studies by further examining this potential link between relatively impaired cognition and sexual acting-out, using neuropsychological measures. Executive functioning variables included a measure of cognitive flexibility and persistence (Controlled Oral Word Association Test FAS) and a measure of divided attention (Trail Making Test B from the Halstead-Reitan Neuropsychological Battery). The Controlled Oral Word Association Test is traditionally orally administered and asks participants to name as many non-proper noun words as possible beginning with the letters F, A, and S. One minute for this task is given for each letter. The Trail Making Test B is traditionally a paper and pencil test that requires participants to alternate connecting consecutive numbers and letters. Although these measures have not traditionally been used in infidelity research, they were included in the current study as a novel expansion of their use in sexuality research.

Contextual variables (e.g., opportunity) and general demographic variables (e.g., religiosity) have also been cited as predictors of infidelity. However, because these

variables appear to span prediction of many types of extradyadic involvement, and for parsimony, contextual variables will not be considered in the current research.

The Infidelity Scale developed in Logue, 2009, and Logue, Hendrick, & Hendrick, 2010, has five subscales, Contemplation, Emotional Infidelity, Physical Infidelity, Sexual Infidelity, and Deviant Involvement, thought to be differentially predicted by combinations of these individual and relationship variables. Below, hypotheses regarding these relationships are offered. Data for this study were gathered on-line, the details of which are further discussed in the Method chapter.

Hypotheses

All correlational and corresponding model hypotheses, including the ordering of the variables for their contributions to predicting each Infidelity subscale, are based on the literature reviewed in Appendix A, unless otherwise stated.

H1. Emotional Infidelity will be related to the following variables in the following ways:

H1a. General individual variables. It is predicted that neuroticism will be positively related to emotional infidelity.

H1b. Individual sexual variables. It is predicted that permissive and instrumental sexual attitudes will be positively related to emotional infidelity.

H1c. General relationship variables. It is predicted that relationship communication, relationship satisfaction, and commitment will all be negatively related to emotional infidelity.

H1d. Sexual relationship variables. No evidence in the literature exists suggesting these variables should influence emotional infidelity in any way. Therefore, no hypotheses are offered for this subscale, and this is considered an exploratory component of the study. If relationships are present, however, they should be negative.

Because of its status as a new construct, other than studies conducted by the author and colleagues (i.e., Logue, 2009 and Logue et al., 2010), there is no literature linking the construct of Contemplation with infidelity. Therefore, the hypotheses listed below are all based on the author's previous research findings and related rationale.

H2. Contemplation will be related to the following variables in the following ways:

H2a. General individual variables. It is predicted that neuroticism will be positively related and that agreeableness will be negatively related to the Contemplation subscale of the Infidelity Scale. It is also predicted that narcissism will be positively related to this subscale.

H2b. Individual sexual variables. It is hypothesized that Permissiveness and Instrumentality will be positively related to the Contemplation subscale.

H2c. General relationship variables. It is predicted that relationship communication, commitment, and satisfaction will all be negatively related to the Contemplation subscale.

H2d. Sexual relationship variables. It is predicted that all sexual relationship variables will be negatively related to Contemplation.

As with Contemplation, Physical Flirtation is a new construct, and other than studies conducted by the author and colleagues (i.e., Logue, 2009 and Logue et al., 2010), there is no literature linking this construct with infidelity. Therefore, the hypotheses listed below are all based on the author's previous research findings and related rationale.

H3. Physical Flirtation will be related to the following variables in the following ways:

H3a. General individual variables. It is predicted that extraversion will be positively related to the Physical Flirtation subscale of the Infidelity Scale. It is also predicted that narcissism will be positively related to Physical Flirtation.

H3b. Individual sexual variables. It is predicted that Physical Flirtation will be positively related to sexual narcissism, Permissiveness, and Instrumentality.

H3c. General relationship variables. It is predicted that Physical Flirtation will be negatively related to relationship communication, satisfaction, and commitment.

H3d. Sexual relationship variables. It is predicted that Physical Flirtation will be negatively related to all sexual relationship variables.

H4. Sexual Infidelity will be related to the following variables in the following ways:

H4a. General individual variables. It is predicted that conscientiousness and agreeableness will be negatively related to the Sexual Infidelity subscale of the Infidelity Scale. It is predicted that extraversion, neuroticism, and narcissism will be positively related to the Sexual Infidelity subscale.

H4b. Individual sexual variables. It is predicted that Sexual Infidelity will be positively related to Permissiveness, Instrumentality, sexual narcissism, and sexual sensation seeking.

H4c. General relationship variables. It is predicted that the Sexual Infidelity subscale will be negatively related to all general relationship variables.

H4d. Sexual relationship variables. It is predicted that the Sexual Infidelity subscale will be negatively related to all sexual relationship variables.

H5. Deviant Involvement will be related to the following variables in the following ways:

H5a. General individual variables. It is predicted that the Deviant Involvement subscale will be negatively related to conscientiousness and agreeableness. It is also predicted that Deviant Involvement will be positively related to extraversion and narcissism.

H5b. Individual sexual variables. It is predicted that the Deviant Involvement subscale will be positively related to erotophilia, Permissiveness, Instrumentality, and sexual sensation seeking.

H5c. General relationship variables. It is predicted that the Deviant Involvement subscale will be negatively related to all of these variables.

H5d. Sexual relationship variables. It is predicted that the Deviant Involvement subscale will be negatively related to all of these variables.

H6a. Performance on the COWA FAS will be negatively related to all infidelity subscales. That is, the better someone is at initiation and perseverance, the less

likely they will be to engage in infidelity. The rationale behind this is that people who are more cognitively flexible may be better at solving problems in their relationships and ignoring the appeal of alternatives. Furthermore, they may be more likely to persevere in ignoring this temptation.

H6b. Performance on Trails B will be positively related to all infidelity subscales. The longer someone takes to complete Trails B (i.e., the worse their performance on a task of divided attention), the more likely they will be to engage in infidelity. The rationale behind this is that people who are unfaithful may be more likely to be distracted by alternatives and have difficulty shifting their attention away from those.

Given this pattern of predicted correlations, the following predictions about initial steps toward modeling using multiple regression analyses were made.

H7. Emotional infidelity. It is predicted that for Emotional Infidelity, the general relationship variables will contribute the most variance in the model. This should be followed by the individual sexual variables. It is predicted that individual general variables and sexual aspects of the relationship will contribute the least amount of variance to the model. Although inclusion of the executive functioning variables is exploratory, it is predicted that they will contribute significantly to the prediction of emotional infidelity.

H8. Contemplation. It is predicted the general relationship variables will contribute the most variance to modeling Contemplation. This should be followed by the individual sexual variables, then by the sexual aspects of the relationship. It is predicted

that the individual general variables will contribute the least amount of variance to this model. Although inclusion of the executive functioning variables is exploratory, it is predicted that they will contribute significantly to the prediction of this subscale.

H9. Physical flirtation. It is predicted that the individual general variables will contribute the most variance to modeling Physical Flirtation, followed by individual sexual variables, then by the general relationship variables. Relationship sexual variables should contribute the least amount of variance to this model. Although inclusion of the executive functioning variables is exploratory, it is predicted that they will contribute significantly to the prediction of physical flirtation.

H10. Sexual infidelity. It is predicted that individual sexual variables will contribute the most variance to this model. These should be followed by the contributions of the individual general variables, then by the relationship sexual variables. Relationship general variables should contribute the least variance to this model. Although inclusion of the executive functioning variables is exploratory, it is predicted that they will contribute significantly to the prediction of sexual infidelity.

H11. Deviant Involvement. It is predicted that the sexual aspects of the relationship will contribute the most variance to predicting the Deviant Involvement subscale. This should be followed by the individual sexual variables, the individual general variables, and, finally, by the general relationship variables. Although inclusion of the executive functioning variables is exploratory, it is predicted that they will contribute significantly to the prediction of this subscale.

CHAPTER II

Method

Participants

Because the confirmatory factor analysis requires the most power, sample size was estimated using rules for this analysis. Kline (2005) suggested 10 to 20 participants per scale item to have enough power when conducting confirmatory factor analysis.

There are 35 items on the Infidelity Scale to be confirmed; thus, at least 350 and up to 700 participants were needed for this study. Participants (N = approximately 600) were recruited from undergraduate students currently enrolled in Introductory Psychology courses or students in advanced Psychology courses at Texas Tech University.

Participants were allowed to participate in the study, whether or not they were currently in a romantic relationship. People who had never been in a romantic relationship were also allowed to participate. The reason for this is that the study was given on-line to students who needed to participate in order to fulfill requirements for their introduction to psychology class. It was reasoned that if these participants were not allowed to participate, they might lie about their relationship status in order to be able to do so. In turn, this could have affected the validity of the results. Therefore, these students were allowed to participate, though their data were dropped for analyses. Even so, enough power remained to find significant effects from the analyses if they did in fact exist.

Measures

A background questionnaire (Appendix D) was used as a self-report assessment of gender, age, and ethnicity. Questions were also included to assess participants' history of and current experiences in romantic relationships.

The Infidelity Scale (Appendix E) (Logue et al., 2010). This is a 35 item self-report measure of engagement in thoughts, feelings, and behaviors that signify being unfaithful toward one's partner. Appendix A details item development and validation for this scale. There was also a preliminary question included in the measure to assess whether participants answered in terms of a current romantic relationship, a past romantic relationship, or a relationship they may have in the future if they had never been in a romantic relationship. The response format is based on a Likert-type scale, with responses ranging from "very often" (5) to "not at all" (1). Higher scores reflect a greater amount of infidelity. There are five subscales, with internal consistency (Cronbach's alpha) values as follows: .94 for Contemplation (thoughts of participating in infidelity or intentional pursuit of an extradyadic partner), .91 for Physical Flirtation (physical displays of affection that do not constitute a sexual act), .96 for Sexual Infidelity (common sexual acts), .79 for Emotional Infidelity (feelings of love for or strong intimacy with an extradyadic partner), and .87 for Deviant Involvement (sexual acts of a deviant nature). Scale scores were used for the analyses.

International Personality Item Pool Big-Five Items (Appendix F) (Goldberg, 2005). This is a 50-item measure, in the public domain, based on the NEO-PI (Costa & McCrae, 1992). It consists of five subscales that measure Extraversion (characterized by

sociability), Agreeableness (characterized by cooperativeness and trust), Conscientiousness (characterized by discipline and dependability), Emotional Stability (i.e., Neuroticism; characterized by emotional stability and impulse control), and Intellect (i.e., Openness; characterized by curiosity and preference for variety). Response options are on a Likert scale, ranging from “strongly agree” (5) to “strongly disagree” (1). Higher scores reflect more of a given construct. The scales have adequate internal consistencies, with the Cronbach’s alphas for each as follows: .87 for Extraversion, .82 for Agreeableness, .79 for Conscientiousness, .86 for Emotional Stability, and .84 for Intellect. Intellect was not used in this study due to the length of the questionnaire. Scale scores were used for the analyses.

Narcissistic Personality Inventory (Appendix G) (Raskin & Terry, 1988).

This is a 40-item measure that consists of seven subscales: Authority (expecting recognition for one’s status or knowledge), Exhibitionism (enjoying exposing and showing off one’s body), Superiority (belief that one is superior to others), Entitlement (a belief that one is deserving, whether or not one actually is deserving), Exploitativeness (use and manipulation of others), Self-Sufficiency (a state of extreme independence), and Vanity (excessive belief in one’s attractiveness). The full scale lambda, reported as .83, indicates acceptable internal consistency. Individually, the scales have lower internal consistencies, with the Guttman’s lambda 3 (equivalent to Cronbach’s alpha) for each as follows: .73 for Authority, .63 for Exhibitionism, .54 for Superiority, .50 for Entitlement, .52 for Exploitativeness, .50 for Self-Sufficiency, and .64 for Vanity. Evidence for convergent validity of the scales was shown by demonstrating expected correlations with

constructs such as Sensation Seeking, Evaluativeness, and Dominance. Of these subscales, Exhibitionism, Entitlement, and Exploitiveness have shown to be the most predictive of relationship difficulties and the ones related to infidelity; therefore, they are the only ones that were used in this study. Response options are on a Likert scale, ranging from “strongly agree” (5) to “strongly disagree” (1). Higher scores reflect more of a given construct. A total narcissism score was used for the analyses.

Sexual Opinion Survey (Appendix H) (Fisher, Byrne, White, & Kelley, 1988).

This is a 21-item bipolar scale designed to measure erotophobia/erotophilia, i.e., the extent to which participants respond to sexual cues in a relatively more negative or positive manner. Response options are on a Likert scale, ranging from “strongly agree” (7) to “strongly disagree” (1). However, this was modified to a 5-point scale for the current study to be consistent with other measures. Similar modifications in past research have not affected results (Sokolski & Hendrick, 1999). Higher scores reflect greater erotophilia, whereas lower scores reflect greater erotophobia. This measure actually consists of three scales that measure open sexual display, sexual variety, and homoeroticism. Fisher et al. provided evidence for adequate internal consistency, ranging from .71-.82, as well as convergent and divergent validity of the scale. They also demonstrated that this measure correlated in expected ways with value orthodoxy, authoritarianism, and sex guilt. Homoeroticism was not used in the current study. A total erotophilia score was used for the analyses.

Brief Sexual Attitudes Scale (Appendix I) (C. Hendrick, Hendrick, & Reich, 2006). The Brief Sexual Attitudes Scale is a 23-item scale, based on the previous Sexual

Attitudes Scale (SAS; S. Hendrick & Hendrick, 1987). This scale actually consists of four scales that measure Permissiveness (casual sexuality), Birth Control (attitudes toward birth control), Communion (idealistic sexuality), and Instrumentality (biological or utilitarian sexuality). Response options are on a Likert scale, ranging from “strongly agree” (5) to “strongly disagree” (1). Higher scores reflect more positive attitudes. The scales have high internal consistencies, with the Cronbach’s alphas for each ranging from .93 to .95 for Permissiveness, .84 to .87 for Birth Control, .71 to .79 for Communion, and .77 to .80 for Instrumentality (C. Hendrick et al., 2006). The scales also have adequate test-retest reliabilities, with test-retest correlations of .92 for Permissiveness, .57 for Birth Control, .86 for Communion, and .75 for Instrumentality (C. Hendrick et al., 2006). C. Hendrick et al. (2006) provided evidence for convergent validity of the scales by showing that they differentially correlate in expected ways with all six scales on the Love Attitudes Scale: Short Form (C. Hendrick et al., 1998), the Relationship Assessment Scale (S. Hendrick, 1988), relationship commitment as measured by four items adapted from Lund (1985), and the Self-Disclosure Index (Miller, Berg, & Archer, 1983). Birth Control and Communion were not used in the current study. Scale scores were used for the analyses.

The Hurlbert Index of Sexual Narcissism (Appendix J) (Hurlbert, Apt, Gasar, Wilson, & Murphy, 1994). This is a 25-item scale measuring egocentric sexual behavior. Response options are on a Likert scale, ranging from “I strongly disagree” (1) to “I strongly agree” (5). Higher scores reflect greater sexual narcissism. Hurlbert and Apt (1991) provided evidence for excellent internal consistency, good test-retest

reliability (.86), and construct validity. This scale was also factor analyzed by Wryobeck and Wiederman (1999), which revealed four subscales with the following internal consistencies: Knowledge and Skill (.76; considering oneself knowledgeable about and skilled in the practice of lovemaking), Sense of Entitlement (.70; considering oneself deserving of sexual satisfaction in all circumstances), Emotional Distance (.65; believing that too much emotional closeness is undesirable), and Sex as Fun (.89; belief that sex should not be taken too seriously). Only the Emotional Distance and Sense of Entitlement subscales were used in this study. A total sexual narcissism score was used for the analyses.

Sexual Sensation Seeking Scale (Appendix K) (Kalichman & Rompa, 1995).

This is an 11-item scale designed to measure disinhibition, thrill seeking, and boredom in sexual encounters. Responses are on a 4-point Likert-type scale, with response options ranging from 1 (Not at all like me) to 4 (very much like me). Higher scores reflect greater sexual sensation seeking. Kalichman and Rompa demonstrated that the scale had an adequate internal consistency of .81 and an acceptable test-retest coefficient of .69. Furthermore, they demonstrated that the scale has convergent validity by showing that it correlated in expected ways with engaging in several risky behaviors. The scale was adjusted to a five-point format to be consistent with other measures.

Self-Disclosure Index (Appendix L) (SDI; Miller et al., 1983). The Self-Disclosure Index is a 10-item scale measuring tendency to reveal self information. Response options are five-point Likert-type scale, with options ranging from “Don’t disclose at all” (1) to “Discuss fully and completely” (5). Higher scores therefore reflect a

tendency to reveal more information about oneself. Miller et al. demonstrated adequate internal consistency and provided evidence for convergent validity of the scale.

Relationship Assessment Scale (Appendix M) (RAS; S. Hendrick, 1988). The RAS is a 7-item scale measuring relationship satisfaction. Response options vary, but are all based on Likert-type scales, ranging from 1-5. Two of these items are reverse scored. Higher scores reflect more relationship satisfaction. The scale has good internal consistency (Cronbach's alpha = .73 to .93) (S. Hendrick, Dicke, & Hendrick, 1998), and test-retest reliability (Test-Retest correlation = .85) (S. Hendrick et al., 1998). S. Hendrick (1988) provided evidence for convergent validity of the RAS by showing that it correlates in expected ways with the Eros, Agape, and Ludus scales of the Love Attitudes Scale (LAS; C. Hendrick, & Hendrick, 1986), the Communion subscale of the Sexual Attitudes Scale (S. Hendrick, Hendrick, Slapion-Foote, & Foote, 1985), self-esteem, relationship commitment, relationship investment, and self-disclosure.

Relationship Commitment (Appendix N) (adapted from Lund, 1985).

Commitment was measured using four items adapted for use in this study from Lund (1985). These items are: How likely is it that your current relationship will be permanent? How likely is it that you and your current partner will be together six months from now? In your opinion, how committed is your partner to this relationship? How committed are you to this relationship? Response options to the first two questions range from "very unlikely" (1) to "very likely" (5). Response options to the last two questions range from "not much" (1) to "very committed" (5). Higher scores reflect greater relationship commitment. C. Hendrick and Hendrick (1988) provided evidence of good internal

consistency for this measure (Cronbach's alpha = .87). There is no information available on the test-retest reliability and convergent validity of this measure.

Sexual Communication (Appendix O) (Byers & Demmons, 1999). This is a 12 item measure of the extent to which partners communicate their sexual likes and dislikes. These items were developed specifically for the cited study. Response options were on a four-point Likert scale, ranging from "strongly agree" (4) to "strongly disagree" (1). The authors reported internal consistency of the scale as .86. The scale was adjusted to a five-point format to be consistent with other measures.

General Measure of Sexual Satisfaction (Appendix P) (GMSEX; Lawrance & Byers, 1995). This is a five-item measure of general sexual satisfaction, drawn from the full Interpersonal Exchange Model of Sexual Satisfaction (Lawrance & Byers, 1995). Response options vary and are scored on a 7-point Likert-type scale, modified to a 5-point scale for the current study in order to maintain consistency. Higher scores reflect greater sexual satisfaction.

Hurlbert Index of Sexual Compatibility (Appendix Q) (Hurlbert, White, Powell, & Apt, 1993). This is a 25-item Likert-type scale with responses ranging from "all of the time" (5) to "never" (1). Higher scores reflect greater similarity of sexual preferences to partner. Hurlbert et al. provided evidence for internal consistency (Cronbach's alpha = .81) and test-retest reliability (.87).

Controlled Oral Word Association Test FAS (Appendix R) (COWA FAS; Spreen & Benton, 1977). This is a test of verbal fluency which consists of three trials, one minute each, asking participants to name as many non-proper noun words as they can

which begin with the letters F, A, and S, respectively. This test was modified for online administration by giving participants appropriate instructions (see Appendix R). The total number of words generated for each trial were added to obtain a total score. Usually, the mean for a particular reference group is subtracted from the score and divided by the standard deviation for that reference group to obtain a z-score that can be interpreted based on its location on the normal curve. However, because the current research was correlational in nature and the researcher was interested in how performance on this measure covaried with participation in different types of infidelity, z-scores were not obtained, especially since means and standard deviations are about the same across age groups for those with 13+ years of education (Spreeen and Strauss, 1998). Snow, Tierny, Zorzitto, and Fisher (1989) provided evidence of test-retest reliability for this measure. Ruff, Light, Parker, and Levin (1997) provided evidence for convergent and divergent validity.

Trail Making Test A and B (Appendix S) (Trails A and B; Reitan & Wolfston, 1985). On Trails A, 25 numbers within circles are represented in an array, and participants are asked to connect the circles in consecutive order as fast as they can. Similarly, on Trails B, 13 numbers and 12 letters are presented. Participants are given the same instructions, except that they must alternate connecting consecutive numbers and letters. Trails A is primarily a test of visual scanning and motor speed, whereas Trails B includes a component of divided attention. Subtracting performance on Trails A from Trails B controls for speed and is better correlated with level of cognitive impairment (Corrigan and Hinkeldey, 1987); thus, this is the method that was used in the current

study. Furthermore, the mean time to complete each subtest for a reference group is subtracted from individuals' scores and divided by the standard deviation for the reference group to obtain a z-score. For on-line administration, instructions to participants were modified appropriately (see Appendix S). Spreen and Strauss (1998) provide information on reliability for this measure.

Procedure

Undergraduates were recruited from Introductory Psychology classes according to the criteria outlined in the document, "Psychology 1300 Research and Testing Participant Pool Policies and Procedures," on file with the Texas Tech University Institutional Review Board. Upon completion of the study, participants received one experimental credit hour. All students who participated remained anonymous, and all responses to the measures were kept confidential.

Participants volunteered, via an on-line recruiting system, to participate in the study as part of their course requirements. Upon signing up to participate in the study, participants were provided a link directing them to a website containing the study's questionnaires. Participants first read an explanation/cover story telling them that the researchers were interested in "how students deal with other potential romantic interests when they already have a primary relationship." They were informed that their answers would be anonymous and kept completely confidential and were asked to answer all items in terms of their true feelings. No questionnaire contained its actual title. The cognitive measures were presented first to ensure that participants were at their most alert when completing these tests. The demographic, general personality, and general

relationships questionnaire blocks were presented next, followed by the sexual personality, infidelity, and sexual relationship questionnaire blocks. Within each block, questionnaires were randomized. The rationale for this was that participants would become more open to answering questions of increasing personal nature as their participation in the study progressed.

Research Design and Analyses

The design for this study was correlational, without experimental manipulation (Heppner, Wampold, & Kivilighan, 2008). Correlational analyses were conducted to provide information about the relationships among the variables. Regression analyses were conducted to provide information about the contribution of each set of variables to the model for each Infidelity subscale. Correlations addressed Hypotheses 1 through 6. Simultaneous Multiple Regression analyses addressed Hypotheses 7 through 11. Additionally, interactions between sets of variables and gender were conducted using Hierarchical Multiple Regression. For these analyses, gender, as a dummy-coded variable, was entered into the first step, followed by the set of variables in question (all centered), followed by the computed interaction term for gender by each variable included in each set. A Confirmatory Factor Analysis was used to confirm the final factor structure of the Infidelity Scale.

CHAPTER III

Results

Data Screening

A total of 642 participants took part in this study. Data were screened for missing information and atypical response patterns. A total of 55 participants were deleted for response patterns indicating that they discontinued the questionnaire after filling out demographics or shortly thereafter. Furthermore, 96 participants were deleted because they indicated that they had never been in a romantic relationship. When Regression analyses were run and assumptions tested, an additional four participants were deleted for being multivariate outliers. The CFA and Regression analyses were run with the final data set that included 487 participants.

Examination of the data also revealed that the Trails B data were invalid, likely due to the fact that these data were collected online and there was too much error. The researcher knew these data were invalid because approximately half the participants took less time to complete Trails B than Trails A, which is an unlikely outcome. This could indicate that participants did not follow directions or that gathering these data online is an unreliable method. Therefore, these data were discarded, and hypotheses regarding Trails B were not examined.

Prior to running correlational and regression analyses, the assumptions of regression were tested using the following procedures recommended by Tabachnick and Fidell (2007).

Multivariate outliers. The presence of multivariate outliers was examined using the following procedure. First, participants with a residual greater than an average residual of plus or minus 3.29 were identified. Then, Mahalanobis' Distance and Cook's D were examined to see whether these data points exhibited high influence and leverage on the regression line. Four of these were found to do so and were therefore deleted.

Normality. Normality of each variable was examined using histograms, normal probability plots, and statistics for skewness and kurtosis. The values for skewness and kurtosis for all independent variables were within acceptable limits. However, these statistics for the dependent variables were significantly skewed. More specifically, the distribution for Contemplation was moderately skewed, the distributions for Physical Flirtation and Emotional Infidelity were substantially skewed, and the distributions for Sexual Infidelity and Deviant Involvement were severely skewed. Therefore, a square root transformation was used for Contemplation, logarithmic transformations were used for Physical Flirtation and Emotional Infidelity, and inverse transformations were used for Sexual Infidelity and Deviant Involvement. These transformations improved distribution normality for all dependent measures and thus improved the normality of the distribution of residuals. Thus, these transformed variables were used for subsequent analyses.

Linearity and homoscedasticity. These assumptions were tested by examining plots of the standardized residuals against the standardized predicted values for each regression. These plots indicated that the assumption of linearity was met for all

regressions; however, homoscedasticity was violated. Therefore, a cut-off value of .01 for interpreting the significance of regressions was used.

Multicollinearity. This assumption was tested by examining tolerance values, variance inflation factors, and correlations between predictors in the analyses. All values were within acceptable limits; thus, multicollinearity was not a problem.

Descriptive Statistics

Tables for the current research began with Table 6. Data for Studies 1 and 2 are shown in Tables 1 through 5. Table 6 provides means, standard deviations, and internal consistency (Cronbach's alpha) coefficients for all variables. There were 161 males (33.4%) and 321 females (66.6%) in the sample. For race/ethnicity, 3.3% of the sample identified as Asian or Pacific Islander, 5.1% identified as African-American or Black, 18.1% identified as Mexican-American or Hispanic, 46.2% identified as Caucasian non-Hispanic, 6.4% identified as Bi- or Multi-Racial, and 20.9% of the sample indicated that they were of "other" race or ethnicity. Most of the participants in the sample were age 19 or less (73.1%), 23.6% of the sample were 20-22, 2.3% were in the 23-30 age range, and the remaining .8% were older than 30. For sexual orientation, 94.9% of the sample identified as heterosexual, and 2.7% identified as bisexual. Only 1.2% of participants identified as lesbian or gay. Approximately half (48.5%) of participants in the sample answered the infidelity questions in terms of a current relationship, and 51.5% answered in terms of a past relationship.

Correlational Analyses

Because several correlations were conducted, type I error was corrected for by using a .01 significance level.

Hypothesis 1. This hypothesis stated that Emotional Infidelity would be positively related to neuroticism, as well as to permissive and instrumental sexual attitudes. This hypothesis further stated that Emotional Infidelity would be negatively related to relationship communication, relationship satisfaction, and commitment. Examination of the correlations between Emotional Infidelity and the relationship sexual variables was exploratory.

The correlation coefficients listed in Table 7 indicate that this hypothesis was partially supported. More specifically, the only portion of this hypothesis not supported was that neuroticism would be positively related to Emotional Infidelity. Additionally, although these relationships were not hypothesized, agreeableness was found to be negatively related to Emotional Infidelity; narcissism, erotophilia, sexual sensation seeking, and sexual narcissism were found to be positively related to Emotional Infidelity. Emotional Infidelity was also negatively related to sexual satisfaction.

Hypothesis 2. This hypothesis stated that Contemplation would be positively related to neuroticism, narcissism, Permissiveness, and Instrumentality. It was further predicted that agreeableness, relationship communication, commitment, relationship satisfaction, and all sexual relationship variables would be negatively related to Contemplation.

The correlation coefficients listed in Table 7 indicate that this hypothesis was partially supported. More specifically, sexual satisfaction was the only sexual relationship variable to which Contemplation was negatively related. Otherwise, Contemplation was negatively related to all other variables predicted, as well as to conscientiousness. Additionally, Contemplation was not only positively related to Permissiveness and Instrumentality, but was also positively related to erotophilia, sexual sensation seeking, and sexual narcissism.

Hypothesis 3. This hypothesis stated that Physical Flirtation would be positively related to extraversion, narcissism, sexual narcissism, permissiveness, and instrumentality. This hypothesis also stated that Physical Flirtation would be negatively related to the general relationship and sexual relationship variables. The correlation coefficients listed in Table 7 indicate that this hypothesis was partially supported. More specifically, Physical Flirtation was not positively related to extraversion and, of the sexual relationship variables, only related to sexual satisfaction. Additionally, although these relationships were not hypothesized, Physical Flirtation was positively related to erotophilia, sexual sensation seeking, and sexual narcissism, as well as negatively related to conscientiousness.

Hypothesis 4. Hypothesis four stated that the Sexual Infidelity subscale would be positively related to extraversion, neuroticism, narcissism, Permissiveness, Instrumentality, sexual narcissism, and sexual sensation seeking. It was also predicted that the Sexual Infidelity subscale would be negatively related to conscientiousness, agreeableness, as well as to all general and sexual relationship variables. The correlation

coefficients listed in Table 7 indicate that this hypothesis was partially supported. More specifically, the only portion of this hypothesis not supported was that Sexual Infidelity would be positively related to extraversion and negatively related to sexual communication and sexual compatibility. Additionally, although not hypothesized, Sexual Infidelity was positively related to erotophilia.

Hypothesis 5. This hypothesis stated that the Deviant Involvement subscale would be positively related to extraversion, narcissism, erotophilia, Permissiveness, Instrumentality, and sexual sensation seeking. It further stated that this subscale would be negatively related to conscientiousness, agreeableness, and to all general relationship and sexual relationship variables. The correlation coefficients listed in Table 7 indicate that this hypothesis was partially supported. More specifically, Deviant Involvement was not related to extraversion, conscientiousness, sexual compatibility, or sexual communication. Additionally, although not hypothesized, Deviant Involvement was related to sexual narcissism.

Hypothesis 6. This hypothesis stated that performance on the COWA FAS would be negatively related to all Infidelity subscales. The correlation coefficients listed in Table 7 indicate that this hypothesis was partially supported. More specifically, performance on the COWA FAS was negatively related to all Infidelity subscales except for Contemplation.

Regression Analyses

To examine hypotheses 7 through 11, a series of Simultaneous Multiple Regression analyses were conducted and qualitatively compared. Each set of variables

was placed into one of four Simultaneous Multiple Regression analyses for each dependent variable. Set one included the individual general variables, Set two included the individual sexual variables, Set three included the relationship general variables, and Set four included the relationship sexual variables. Additionally, a Simple Linear Regression was conducted for each dependent variable, with performance on the COWA FAS as the predictor variable. Due to having twice as many females as males in the sample, different models for men and women were not examined. However, interactions using gender were run. Pairwise deletion was used, resulting in slightly variable numbers of participants across predictors. Furthermore, the number of participants for the COWA FAS was reduced because several participants failed to complete this section of the online survey, possibly due to failure to read directions.

Hypothesis 7. This hypothesis stated that the general relationship variables would contribute the most variance to modeling Emotional Infidelity, followed by the individual sexual variables, individual general variables, and sexual relationship variables. It also predicted that performance on the COWA FAS would significantly contribute the prediction of Emotional Infidelity.

As shown in Table 8, this hypothesis was partially supported. More specifically, the hypothesis was supported except that the individual sexual variables accounted for most the variance in Emotional Infidelity, $R^2 = .20$, $F(5, 472) = 23.24$, $p < .001$. This accounted for 19% of the variance (adjusted $R^2 = .19$). This was followed by the relationship general variables, $R^2 = .14$, $F(3, 460) = 25.57$, $p < .001$, which accounted for 14% of the variance (adjusted $R^2 = .14$). The individual general variables, $R^2 = .11$, $F(5,$

480) = 12.32, $p < .001$ (adjusted $R^2 = .10$), and relationship sexual variables, $R^2 = .11$, $F(3, 465) = 18.94$, $p < .001$ (adjusted $R^2 = .10$) accounted for the least amount of variance (10% each) in Emotional Infidelity. Performance on the COWA FAS also predicted Emotional Infidelity, $R^2 = .03$, $F(1, 369) = 12.89$, $p < .001$. This accounted for 3% of the observed variance in Emotional Infidelity (adjusted $R^2 = .03$).

A separate regression was run to test whether gender was a significant predictor of Emotional Infidelity and whether gender interacted with any set of variables. Although gender was a significant predictor of Emotional Infidelity, it did not interact with any of the variable sets (see Table 13).

Hypothesis 8. This hypothesis stated that the general relationship variables would contribute the most variance to predicting Contemplation, followed by the individual sexual variables, then by the sexual aspects of the relationship, and finally by the individual general variables. It also stated that performance on the COWA FAS would significantly contribute to the prediction of Contemplation.

As shown in Table 9, this hypothesis was partially supported. More specifically, again, the hypothesis was supported except that the individual sexual variables emerged as the largest predictor of Contemplation, $R^2 = .23$, $F(5, 472) = 28.42$, $p < .001$. This accounted for 22% of the variance (adjusted $R^2 = .22$). This was followed by the relationship general variables, $R^2 = .16$, $F(3, 460) = 30.16$, $p < .001$, which accounted for 16% of the variance (adjusted $R^2 = .16$). This was in turn followed by the relationship sexual variables, $R^2 = .14$, $F(5, 465) = 24.93$, $p < .001$ (adjusted $R^2 = .13$), which accounted for 13% of the variance. Contemplation was least predicted by the individual

general variables, $R^2 = .12$, $F(3, 480) = 12.80$, $p < .001$ (adjusted $R^2 = .11$), which accounted for 11% of the variance in Contemplation. Performance on the COWA FAS did not predict Contemplation, $R^2 = .01$, $F(1, 369) = 3.18$, $p = .075$.

A separate regression was run to test whether gender was a significant predictor of Contemplation and whether it interacted with any of the sets of variables. Although gender was a significant predictor, it did not interact with any of the sets of variables to predict Contemplation (see Table 14).

Hypothesis 9. This hypothesis stated that the individual general variables would contribute the most to modeling Physical Flirtation, followed by the individual sexual variables, the general relationship variables, and finally by the relationship sexual variables. It also stated that performance on the COWA FAS would significantly contribute to the prediction of Physical Flirtation.

As shown in Table 10, this hypothesis was partially supported. More specifically, the individual sexual variables continued to predict the most variance, $R^2 = .23$, $F(5, 472) = 28.21$, $p < .001$. This accounted for 22% of the variance (adjusted $R^2 = .22$). This was followed by the individual general variables, $R^2 = .15$, $F(5, 480) = 16.80$, $p < .001$, which accounted for 14 % of the variance (adjusted $R^2 = .14$). This was followed by the relationship general variables, $R^2 = .14$, $F(3, 460) = 25.61$, $p < .001$ (adjusted $R^2 = .14$), which accounted for 14% of the variance. Physical Flirtation was least predicted by the relationship sexual variables, $R^2 = .11$, $F(3, 465) = 18.53$, $p < .001$ (adjusted $R^2 = .10$), which accounted for 10% of the variance. Performance on the COWA FAS predicted

Physical Flirtation, $R^2 = .03$, $F(1, 369) = 12.37$, $p < .001$. This accounted for 3% of the observed variance in Physical Flirtation (adjusted $R^2 = .03$).

A separate regression was run to test whether gender was a significant predictor of Physical Flirtation and whether it interacted with any set of variables. Although gender was a significant predictor of Physical Flirtation, it did not interact with any of the sets of variables to predict Physical Flirtation (see Table 15).

Hypothesis 10. This hypothesis stated that the individual sexual variables would account for the most variance in Sexual Infidelity, followed by the individual general variables, then the relationship sexual variables, and finally by the relationship general variables. It also predicted that performance on the COWA FAS would significantly contribute to predicting Sexual Infidelity.

As shown in Table 11, this hypothesis was partially supported. More specifically, the individual sexual variables did contribute the most variance to Sexual Infidelity, $R^2 = .24$, $F(5, 472) = 29.41$, $p < .001$. This accounted for 23% of the variance (adjusted $R^2 = .23$). This was followed by the individual general variables, $R^2 = .15$, $F(5, 480) = 16.92$, $p < .001$, which accounted for 14 % of the variance (adjusted $R^2 = .14$). This was followed by the relationship general variables, $R^2 = .09$, $F(3, 460) = 15.37$, $p < .001$ (adjusted $R^2 = .09$), which accounted for 9% of the variance. Sexual Infidelity was least predicted by the relationship sexual variables, $R^2 = .07$, $F(3, 465) = 11.42$, $p < .001$ (adjusted $R^2 = .06$), which accounted for 6% of the variance. Performance on the COWA FAS predicted Sexual Infidelity, $R^2 = .05$, $F(1, 369) = 19.40$, $p < .001$. This accounted for 5% of the observed variance in Sexual Infidelity (adjusted $R^2 = .05$).

A separate regression was run to test whether gender was a significant predictor of Sexual Infidelity and whether it interacted with any of the variable sets. Although gender was a significant predictor of this subscale, it only interacted with the set of individual sexual variables to predict Sexual Infidelity (see Table 16), $\Delta R^2 = .03$, $F(11, 462) = 15.15$, $p < .001$.

Hypothesis 11. This hypothesis stated that the Deviant Involvement subscale would be best predicted by the sexual aspects of the relationship, followed by the individual sexual variables, the individual variables, and the general relationship variables. It also stated that performance on the COWA FAS would significantly contribute to predicting Deviant Involvement.

As shown in Table 12, this hypothesis was partially supported. More specifically, the relationship sexual variables actually accounted for the least variance in predicting Deviant Involvement, $R^2 = .07$, $F(3, 465) = 12.35$, $p < .001$. This accounted for 7% of the variance (adjusted $R^2 = .07$). The individual sexual variables contributed the most variance to predicting Deviant Involvement, $R^2 = .29$, $F(5, 472) = 38.14$, $p < .001$. This accounted for 28% of the variance (adjusted $R^2 = .28$). This was followed by the individual general variables, $R^2 = .22$, $F(5, 480) = 26.39$, $p < .001$, which accounted for 21% of the variance (adjusted $R^2 = .21$). This was followed by the relationship general variables, $R^2 = .10$, $F(3, 460) = 17.45$, $p < .001$ (adjusted $R^2 = .10$), which accounted for 10% of the variance. Performance on the COWA FAS predicted Deviant Involvement, $R^2 = .06$, $F(1, 369) = 23.97$, $p < .001$. This accounted for 6% of the observed variance in predicting Deviant Involvement (adjusted $R^2 = .06$).

A separate regression was run to test whether gender was a significant predictor of Deviant Involvement and whether it interacted with any set of variables. Gender was a significant predictor of Deviant Involvement, and it interacted with the set of individual sexual variables to predict Deviant Involvement (see Table 17), $\Delta R^2 = .04$, $F(11, 462) = 22.16$, $p < .001$.

Confirmatory Factor Analysis

It was predicted that the factor structure of study 2 would be confirmed with the current independent data set. This hypothesis was supported, yielding the following solution: Contemplation (11 items; alpha = .95), Deviant Involvement (7 items; alpha = .96), Sexual Infidelity (9 items; alpha = .98), Physical Flirtation (6 items; alpha = .94), and Emotional Infidelity (3 items; alpha = .86). The value statistics for this solution are as follows: CFI = .891 and RMSEA = .05 (CI = .046, .054). Factor loadings are given in Table 18.

Table 1

Factor Loadings on the Infidelity Scale – Study 1

Subscales	Cont	Dev	Sex	Phys	Flir	Emot
<u>Contemplation</u>						
I have thought about how much I would like to date someone I'm attracted to, other than my romantic partner.	.81					
I have thought about how much I would like to date other people in general.	.76					
I have desired emotional intimacy with someone I'm attracted to, other than my romantic partner.	.76					
I have desired emotional intimacy with other potential romantic partners in general.	.72					
I have desired physical intimacy with someone I'm attracted to, other than my romantic partner.	.86					
I have desired physical intimacy with other people in general.	.77					
Aside from someone famous, I have daydreamed or fantasized about someone I'm attracted to, other than my romantic partner.	.81					
I have masturbated while fantasizing about someone I'm attracted to, other than my romantic partner.	.60					
I have consciously made an effort to attract someone other than my romantic partner.	.63					
I have "checked out" someone other than my romantic partner.	.81					
I have casually flirted with someone I'm attracted	.80					

to, other than my romantic partner.

I have talked about sexual preferences with someone I'm attracted to, other than my romantic partner. .55

Deviant Involvement

I have had anal intercourse with someone I'm attracted to, other than my romantic partner. .68

I have viewed pornography with someone I'm attracted to, other than my romantic partner. .54

I have gone to strip clubs for the purpose of fantasizing only. .85

I have had cyber sex with someone other than my romantic partner. .60

I have solicited or engaged in prostitution. .93

I have gone to bars for the purpose of fantasizing only. .75

I have taken drugs that are thought to be "sexual" (Ecstasy, GHB, or any drug that "turns you on") with someone I'm attracted to, other than my romantic partner. .66

I have gone to strip clubs or bars specifically to try and "pick someone up." .70

Sexual Infidelity

I have passionately kissed someone I'm attracted to other than my romantic partner. .45

I have fondled the genitals or other erogenous zones of someone I'm attracted to, other than my romantic partner, outside the person's clothing. .88

I have had my genitals or other erogenous zones fondled by someone I'm attracted to, other than my romantic partner, outside my clothing.	.94
I have stimulated the genitals or other erogenous zones of someone I'm attracted to, other than my romantic partner, under the person's clothing.	.98
I have had my genitals or other erogenous zones stimulated by someone I'm attracted to, other than my romantic partner, under my clothing.	.99
I have engaged in mutual masturbation with someone I'm attracted to, other than my romantic partner.	.84
I have given oral sex to someone I'm attracted to, other than my romantic partner.	.66
I have received oral sex from someone I'm attracted to, other than my romantic partner.	.74
I have had sexual intercourse with someone I'm attracted to, other than my romantic partner.	.70
<u>Physical Flirtation</u>	
I have held hands with someone I'm attracted to, other than my romantic partner.	.83
I have cuddled with someone I'm attracted to, other than my romantic partner.	.79
I have touched someone I'm attracted to, other than my romantic partner, on places like their lower back, neck, cheek, or thigh.	.77
I have massaged someone I'm attracted to, other than my romantic partner.	.71
I have passionately kissed someone I'm attracted to other than my romantic partner.	.48

I have played with or brushed the hair of someone I'm attracted to, other than my romantic partner. .79

Emotional Infidelity

I have told someone I'm attracted to, other than my romantic partner, things I have never told anyone else. .58

I have continued to be involved with someone I'm attracted to, other than my romantic partner, even though I knew I could potentially love that person. .60

I have felt like I was "falling" in love with someone I'm attracted to, other than my romantic partner. .68

Note. Cont = Contemplation; Dev = Deviant Involvement; Sex = Sexual Infidelity; Phys Flir = Physical Flirtation; Emot = Emotional Infidelity.

Table 2

Correlations between the Infidelity Subscales and Other Relationship Measures – Study 1

Measures	Cont	Dev	Sex	Phys Flir	Emot
Love Attitudes					
Eros	-.22**	-.12*	-.09*	-.11*	-.17**
Ludus	.45**	.33**	.40**	.37**	.35**
Storge	-.07	-.06	0	.03	.01
Agape	-.09*	.07	.03	-.05	-.06
Mania	.24**	.16**	.23**	.24**	.16**
Sexual Attitudes					
Permissiveness	.50**	.42**	.45**	.42**	.30**
Instrumentality	.31**	.24**	.29**	.29**	.18**
Communion	-.01	-.04	-.02	-.07	-.03
Other Measures					
Respect	-.30**	-.32**	-.29**	-.20**	-.27**
Relationship Satisfaction	-.42**	-.19**	-.26**	-.29**	-.31**
Commitment	-.35**	-.13**	-.18**	-.22**	-.23**
Deception					
Proneness	.58**	.45**	.54**	.50**	.54**
Consequences	.29**	.27**	.32**	.23**	.24**
Guilt	.20**	.11*	.18**	.16**	.20**

Note. Cont = Contemplation; Dev = Deviant Involvement; Sex = Sexual Infidelity; Phys Flir = Physical Flirtation; Emot = Emotional Infidelity.

* $p < .05$ ** $p < .01$.

Table 3

Means and T-Values for Infidelity Subscales as a Function of Gender – Study 1

Subscales	<i>M</i>		<i>t</i>
	Women	Men	
Contemplation	1.97	2.55	-5.13**
Deviant Involvement	1.09	1.48	-5.19**
Sexual Infidelity	1.07	1.52	-5.10**
Physical Flirtation	1.64	2.09	-3.40**
Emotional Infidelity	1.09	1.48	-3.70**

** $p < .01$.

Table 4

Factor Loadings on the Infidelity Scale – Study 2

Subscales	Cont	Dev	Sex	Phys	Flir	Emot
<u>Contemplation</u>						
I have thought about how much I would like to date someone I'm attracted to, other than my romantic partner.	.82					
I have thought about how much I would like to date other people in general.	.82					
I have desired emotional intimacy with someone I'm attracted to, other than my romantic partner.	.83					
I have desired emotional intimacy with other potential romantic partners in general.	.79					
I have desired physical intimacy with someone I'm attracted to, other than my romantic partner.	.85					
I have desired physical intimacy with other people in general.	.76					
Aside from someone famous, I have daydreamed or fantasized about someone I'm attracted to, other than my romantic partner.	.83					
I have consciously made an effort to attract someone other than my romantic partner.	.70					
I have "checked out" someone other than my romantic partner.	.64					
I have casually flirted with someone I'm attracted to, other than my romantic partner.	.72					
I have talked about sexual preferences with	.65					

someone I'm attracted to, other than my romantic partner.

Deviant Involvement

I have viewed pornography with someone I'm attracted to, other than my romantic partner. .64

I have gone to strip clubs for the purpose of fantasizing only. .72

I have had cyber sex with someone other than my romantic partner. .60

I have solicited or engaged in prostitution. .79

I have gone to bars for the purpose of fantasizing only. .67

I have taken drugs that are thought to be "sexual" (Ecstasy, GHB, or any drug that "turns you on") with someone I'm attracted to, other than my romantic partner. .81

I have gone to strip clubs or bars specifically to try and "pick someone up." .83

Sexual Infidelity

I have passionately kissed someone I'm attracted to other than my romantic partner. .51

I have fondled the genitals or other erogenous zones of someone I'm attracted to, other than my romantic partner, outside the person's clothing. .91

I have had my genitals or other erogenous zones fondled by someone I'm attracted to, other than my romantic partner, outside my clothing. .89

I have stimulated the genitals or other erogenous zones of someone I'm attracted to, other than my .96

romantic partner, under the person's clothing.

I have had my genitals or other erogenous zones stimulated by someone I'm attracted to, other than my romantic partner, under my clothing. .96

I have engaged in mutual masturbation with someone I'm attracted to, other than my romantic partner. .85

I have given oral sex to someone I'm attracted to, other than my romantic partner. .89

I have received oral sex from someone I'm attracted to, other than my romantic partner. .93

I have had sexual intercourse with someone I'm attracted to, other than my romantic partner. .82

Physical Flirtation

I have held hands with someone I'm attracted to, other than my romantic partner. .77

I have cuddled with someone I'm attracted to, other than my romantic partner. .85

I have touched someone I'm attracted to, other than my romantic partner, on places like their lower back, neck, cheek, or thigh. .85

I have massaged someone I'm attracted to, other than my romantic partner. .73

I have passionately kissed someone I'm attracted to other than my romantic partner. .35

I have played with or brushed the hair of someone I'm attracted to, other than my romantic partner. .76

Emotional Infidelity

I have told someone I'm attracted to, other than my

romantic partner, things I have never told anyone else.	.64
I have continued to be involved with someone I'm attracted to, other than my romantic partner, even though I knew I could potentially love that person.	.81
I have felt like I was "falling" in love with someone I'm attracted to, other than my romantic partner.	.76

Note. Cont = Contemplation; Dev = Deviant Involvement; Sex = Sexual Infidelity; Phys Flir = Physical Flirtation; Emot = Emotional Infidelity.

Table 5

Correlations between Infidelity Subscales and Relationship Measures – Study 2

Measures	Cont	Dev	Sex	Phys Flir	Emot
Love Attitudes					
Eros	-.37**	-.18**	-.21**	-.25**	-.23**
Ludus	.48**	.33**	.39**	.46**	.43**
Storge	-.22**	-.15**	-.18**	-.16**	-.09*
Sexual Attitudes					
Permissiveness	.46**	.40**	.38**	.41**	.32**
Instrumentality	.24**	.21**	.20**	.27**	.18**
Other Measures					
Respect	-.30**	-.19**	-.26**	-.28**	-.25**
Satisfaction	-.46**	-.26**	-.27**	-.35**	-.31**
Commitment	-.41**	-.18**	-.21**	-.29**	.22**
Deception					
Proneness	.57**	.25**	.44**	.45**	.45**
Consequences	.34**	.26**	.27**	.26**	.31**
Guilt	.27**	.14**	.18**	.18**	.19**

Note. Cont = Contemplation; Dev = Deviant Involvement; Sex = Sexual Infidelity; Phys Flir = Physical Flirtation; Emot = Emotional Infidelity.

For Love and Sexual Attitudes, only scales for which hypotheses were made are shown.

* $p < .05$ ** $p < .01$.

Table 6

Means, Standard Deviations, and Internal Consistency Coefficient - Current Research

Measures	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	Cronbach's Alpha
Predictor			
Agreeableness	2.01	0.66	.89
Commitment	2.38	1.12	.90
Conscientiousness	2.60	0.66	.85
COWA FAS	31.95	15.67	
Erotophilia	3.00	0.69	.80
Extraversion	2.50	0.77	.90
Instrumentality	3.53	1.01	.89
Narcissism	2.96	0.63	.81
Neuroticism	3.17	0.72	.87
Permissiveness	3.63	1.08	.95
Relationship Satisfaction	2.31	0.92	.85
Self-Disclosure	1.92	0.77	.92
Sexual Communication	2.50	0.96	.94
Sexual Compatibility	2.70	0.49	.87
Sexual Narcissism	3.30	0.75	.82
Sexual Satisfaction	1.85	0.88	.95
Sexual Sensation Seeking	3.24	0.90	.90

Criterion			
Contemplation	3.92	0.96	.95
Deviant Involvement	4.64	0.76	.96
Emotional Infidelity	4.34	0.90	.86
Physical Flirtation	4.21	1.01	.94
Sexual Infidelity	4.52	0.88	.98

Note. For mean values, lower means indicate more of a construct.

Table 7

Correlations of Infidelity Subscales with Individual and Relationship Measures - Current Research

Measures	Cont	Dev	Sex	Phys Flir	Emot
COWA FAS	-.09	-.24*	-.22*	-.18*	-.18*
Individual General					
Extraversion	.10	-.06	-.02	.08	.00
Neuroticism	.06	.18*	.12*	.08	.10
Agreeableness	-.13*	-.40*	-.34*	-.26*	-.22*
Conscientiousness	-.11*	-.12*	-.12*	-.13*	-.09
Narcissism	.32*	.28*	.24*	.32*	.28*
Individual Sexual					
Erotophilia	.28*	.22*	.14*	.16*	.15*
Sex. Sens. Seek.	.42*	.41*	.36*	.35*	.32*
Sexual Narcissism	.39*	.45*	.38*	.40*	.39*
Permissiveness	.43*	.49*	.44*	.44*	.39*
Instrumentality	.38*	.39*	.37*	.36*	.32*
Relationship General					
Self-Disclosure	-.20*	-.24*	-.18*	.17*	-.17*
Satisfaction	-.40*	-.27*	-.29*	-.34*	-.37*
Commitment	-.32*	-.25*	-.26*	-.31*	-.31*

Relationship Sexual

Sexual Compatibility	.03	.10	.08	.07	.04
Sexual Communication	.04	.02	.02	.03	-.02
Sexual Satisfaction	-.33*	-.20*	-.21*	-.28*	-.30*

Note. Cont = Contemplation; Dev = Deviant Involvement; Sex = Sexual Infidelity; Phys Flir = Physical Flirtation; Emot = Emotional Infidelity; Sex. Sens. Seek. = Sexual Sensation Seeking; COWA FAS = Controlled Oral Word Association Test FAS.

* $p < .01$.

Table 8

Simultaneous Multiple Regression Analyses Predicting Emotional Infidelity from Sets of Variables - Current Research

Set	Emotional Infidelity			
	R ²	B	SE B	β
Individual Sexual	.20*			
Erotophilia		.03	.02	.10
Sexual Sensation Seeking		.02	.02	.10
Sexual Narcissism		.06	.02	.23*
Instrumentality		-.01	.01	-.04
Permissiveness		.05	.01	.28*
Relationship General	.14*			
Self-Disclosure		-.01	.01	-.05
Relationship Satisfaction		-.07	.02	-.32*
Commitment		-.01	.01	-.05
Individual General	.11*			
Neuroticism		.00	.01	.00
Extraversion		-.02	.01	-.08
Agreeableness		-.05	.01	-.15*
Conscientiousness		-.01	.01	-.03
Narcissism		.09	.02	.28*

Relationship Sexual	.11*			
Sexual Compatibility		-.06	.02	-.15*
Sexual Communication		-.00	.01	-.01
Sexual Satisfaction		-.08	.01	-.35*
COWA FAS	.03*	-.01	.01	-.18*

* $p < .01$.

Table 9

Simultaneous Multiple Regression Analyses Predicting Contemplation from Sets of Variables - Current Research

Set	Contemplation			
	R ²	B	SE B	β
Individual Sexual	.23*			
Erotophilia		.00	.03	.00
Sexual Sensation Seeking		.07	.03	.19*
Sexual Narcissism		.07	.02	.16*
Instrumentality		-.00	.02	-.00
Permissiveness		.06	.02	.21*
Relationship General	.16*			
Self-Disclosure		-.03	.02	-.07
Relationship Satisfaction		-.13	.02	-.36*
Commitment		-.01	.02	-.02
Relationship Sexual	.14*			
Sexual Compatibility		-.08	.03	-.13
Sexual Communication		-.03	.02	-.09
Sexual Satisfaction		-.14	.02	-.40*
Individual General	.12*			
Neuroticism		.00	.02	.00

Extraversion		-.03	.02	-.07
Agreeableness		-.02	.02	-.04
Conscientiousness		-.04	.02	-.07
Narcissism		.17	.03	.34*
COWA FAS	.01	-.00	.00	-.09

* $p < .01$.

Table 10

Simultaneous Multiple Regression Analyses Predicting Physical Flirtation from Sets of Variables - Current Research

Physical Flirtation				
Set	R ²	B	SE B	β
Individual Sexual	.23*			
Erotophilia		.04	.02	.14
Sexual Sensation Seeking		.03	.02	.12
Sexual Narcissism		.05	.02	.19*
Instrumentality		-.00	.01	-.01
Permissiveness		.06	.01	.32*
Individual General	.15*			
Neuroticism		.01	.01	.03
Extraversion		.00	.01	.01
Agreeableness		-.07	.02	-.21*
Conscientiousness		-.02	.01	-.06
Narcissism		.10	.02	.28*
Relationship General	.14*			
Self-Disclosure		-.01	.01	-.05
Relationship Satisfaction		-.04	.02	-.16
Commitment		-.04	.01	-.22*

Relationship Sexual	.11*			
Sexual Compatibility		-.07	.02	.16*
Sexual Communication		-.01	.01	-.05
Sexual Satisfaction		-.08	.01	-.36*
COWA FAS	.03*	-.01	.01	-.18*

* $p < .01$.

Table 11

Simultaneous Multiple Regression Analyses Predicting Sexual Infidelity from Sets of Variables - Current Research

Set	Sexual Infidelity			
	R ²	B	SE B	β
Individual Sexual	.24*			
Erotophilia		.07	.02	.19*
Sexual Sensation Seeking		.06	.02	.19*
Sexual Narcissism		.05	.02	.14*
Instrumentality		-.00	.02	-.01
Permissiveness		.08	.02	.32*
Individual General	.15*			
Neuroticism		.00	.02	.01
Extraversion		-.01	.02	-.04
Agreeableness		-.12	.02	-.29*
Conscientiousness		-.01	.02	-.02
Narcissism		.09	.02	.21*
Relationship General	.09*			
Self-Disclosure		-.03	.02	-.09
Relationship Satisfaction		-.06	.02	.20*
Commitment		-.02	.02	-.07

Relationship Sexual	.07*			
Sexual Compatibility		-.09	.03	.16*
Sexual Communication		-.01	.01	-.02
Sexual Satisfaction		-.08	.02	.27*
COWA FAS	.05*	-.01	.01	-.22*

* $p < .01$.

Table 12

Simultaneous Multiple Regression Analyses Predicting Deviant Involvement from Sets of Variables - Current Research

Deviant Involvement				
Set	R^2	B	SE B	β
Individual Sexual	.29*			
Erotophilia		.03	.02	.09
Sexual Sensation Seeking		.03	.02	.14
Sexual Narcissism		.08	.02	.24*
Instrumentality		-.02	.02	-.07
Permissiveness		.08	.02	.35*
Individual General	.22*			
Neuroticism		.02	.02	.05
Extraversion		-.03	.02	-.09
Agreeableness		-.12	.02	-.33*
Conscientiousness		.00	.02	.00
Narcissism		.09	.02	.25*
Relationship General	.10*			
Self-Disclosure		-.05	.02	-.17*
Relationship Satisfaction		-.05	.02	-.18
Commitment		-.01	.02	-.06

Relationship Sexual	.07*			
Sexual Compatibility		-.09	.03	.19*
Sexual Communication		-.00	.01	-.01
Sexual Satisfaction		-.07	.01	-.27*
COWA FAS	.06*	-.01	.01	-.25*

* $p < .01$.

Table 13

Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analyses Predicting Emotional Infidelity from Gender and Sets of Variables - Current Research

		Emotional Infidelity			
Predictors		R ²	B	SE B	β
Step 1		.07*			
	Gender		.11	.02	.26*
Step 2		.14*			
	Erotophilia		.03	.02	.11
	Sexual Sensation Seeking		.02	.02	.10
	Sexual Narcissism		.06	.02	.22*
	Instrumentality		-.00	.01	-.02
	Permissiveness		.04	.01	.22*
Step 3		.01			
	Gender x Erotophilia		.01	.04	.01
	Gender x Sexual Sensation Seeking		.03	.04	.07
	Gender x Sexual Narcissism		.06	.03	.13
	Gender x Instrumentality		-.02	.03	-.05
	Gender x Permissiveness		.03	.03	.10
Step 1		.07*			
	Gender		.11	.02	.26*

Step 2	.12*			
Self-Disclosure		-.01	.01	-.02
Relationship Satisfaction		-.07	.01	-.30*
Commitment		-.01	.01	-.05
Step 3	.00			
Gender x Self-Disclosure		-.02	.02	-.03
Gender x Relationship Satisfaction		-.04	.03	-.10
Gender x Commitment		-.02	.03	-.07
Step 1	.07*			
Gender		.11	.02	.26*
Step 2	.10*			
Sexual Compatibility		-.06	.02	-.14*
Sexual Communication		-.00	.01	-.01
Sexual Satisfaction		-.08	.01	-.33*
Step 3	.01			
Gender x Sexual Compatibility		-.08	.05	-.09
Gender x Sexual Communication		-.01	.02	-.01
Gender x Sexual Satisfaction		-.02	.02	-.04
Step 1	.07*			
Gender		.11	.02	.26*
Step 2	.07*			
Neuroticism		.01	.01	.05

Extraversion		-.01	.01	-.04
Agreeableness		-.04	.02	-.12
Conscientiousness		-.01	.01	-.05
Narcissism		.06	.02	.20*
Step 3	.01			
Gender x Neuroticism		.01	.03	.03
Gender x Extraversion		-.00	.03	-.00
Gender x Agreeableness		-.05	.03	-.11
Gender x Conscientiousness		-.03	.03	-.05
Gender x Narcissism		.02	.04	.04
Step 1	.07*			
Gender		.11	.02	.26*
Step 2	.02*			
COWA FAS		-.01	.00	-.14*
Step 3	.00			
Gender x COWA FAS		-.01	.00	-.06

* $p < .01$.

Table 14

Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analyses Predicting Contemplation from Gender and Sets of Variables - Current Research

Contemplation				
Predictors	R^2	B	SE B	β
Step 1	.10*			
Gender		.22	.03	.32*
Step 2	.14*			
Erotophilia		.01	.03	.01
Sexual Sensation Seeking		.07	.03	.18*
Sexual Narcissism		.07	.02	.15*
Instrumentality		-.01	.02	-.04
Permissiveness		.04	.02	.12
Step 3	.01			
Gender x Erotophilia		.01	.06	.01
Gender x Sexual Sensation Seeking		.06	.06	.09
Gender x Sexual Narcissism		.02	.05	.03
Gender x Instrumentality		-.02	.05	-.04
Gender x Permissiveness		.01	.05	.02
Step 1	.10*			
Gender		.21	.03	.32*

Step 2	.13*			
Self-Disclosure		-.01	.02	-.03
Relationship Satisfaction		-.12	.02	-.35*
Commitment		-.00	.02	-.01
Step 3	.00			
Gender x Self-Disclosure		-.02	.04	-.02
Gender x Relationship Satisfaction		-.01	.05	-.02
Gender x Commitment		-.02	.04	-.04
Step 1	.10*			
Gender		.22	.03	.32*
Step 2	.12*			
Sexual Compatibility		-.07	.03	-.11
Sexual Communication		-.03	.02	-.10
Sexual Satisfaction		-.14	.02	-.38*
Step 3	.00			
Gender x Sexual Compatibility		-.04	.07	-.03
Gender x Sexual Communication		-.03	.03	-.04
Gender x Sexual Satisfaction		-.04	.04	-.06
Step 1	.10*			
Gender		.22	.03	.32*
Step 2	.08*			

	Neuroticism	.03	.02	.07
	Extraversion	-.01	.02	-.02
	Agreeableness	-.01	.02	-.02
	Conscientiousness	-.05	.02	-.10
	Narcissism	.12	.03	.24*
Step 3		.01		
	Gender x Neuroticism	.06	.05	.07
	Gender x Extraversion	-.00	.05	-.00
	Gender x Agreeableness	-.01	.05	-.01
	Gender x Conscientiousness	-.07	.05	-.08
	Gender x Narcissism	.01	.06	.01
Step 1		.10*		
	Gender	.21	.03	.32*
Step 2		.00		
	COWA FAS	-.00	.00	-.03
Step 3		.00		
	Gender x COWA FAS	-.00	.00	-.04

* $p < .01$.

Table 15

Simultaneous Multiple Regression Analyses Predicting Physical Flirtation from Gender and Sets of Variables - Current Research

Physical Flirtation				
Predictors	R ²	B	SE B	β
Step 1	.05*			
Gender		.10	.02	.23*
Step 2	.18*			
Erotophilia		.04	.02	.14
Sexual Sensation Seeking		.03	.02	.12
Sexual Narcissism		.05	.02	.19*
Instrumentality		-.00	.01	-.01
Permissiveness		.06	.02	.31*
Step 3	.02			
Gender x Erotophilia		.06	.04	.10
Gender x Sexual Sensation Seeking		.00	.04	.00
Gender x Sexual Narcissism		.06	.04	.11
Gender x Instrumentality		-.01	.03	-.04
Gender x Permissiveness		.00	.03	.00
Step 1	.05*			
Gender		.10	.02	.23*

Step 2	.12*			
Self-Disclosure		-.00	.01	-.02
Relationship Satisfaction		-.03	.02	-.15
Commitment		-.04	.01	-.23*
Step 3	.00			
Gender x Self-Disclosure		-.02	.03	-.05
Gender x Relationship Satisfaction		-.03	.03	-.08
Gender x Commitment		-.03	.03	-.08
Step 1	.05*			
Gender		.10	.02	.23*
Step 2	.11*			
Neuroticism		.00	.02	.01
Extraversion		-.01	.02	-.04
Agreeableness		-.06	.02	-.18*
Conscientiousness		-.02	.02	-.07
Narcissism		.07	.02	.22*
Step 3	.01			
Gender x Neuroticism		.04	.03	.08
Gender x Extraversion		-.01	.03	-.02
Gender x Agreeableness		-.05	.03	-.10
Gender x Conscientiousness		-.01	.03	-.02

	Gender x Narcissism	.01	.04	.02
Step 1		.05*		
	Gender	.10	.03	.23*
Step 2		.10*		
	Sexual Compatibility	-.06	.02	-.15*
	Sexual Communication	-.01	.01	-.03
	Sexual Satisfaction	-.08	.01	-.33*
Step 3		.01		
	Gender x Sexual Compatibility	-.08	.05	-.09
	Gender x Sexual Communication	-.00	.02	-.03
	Gender x Sexual Satisfaction	-.02	.02	-.01
Step 1		.05*		
	Gender	.10	.02	.23*
Step 2		.02*		
	COWA FAS	-.00	.00	-.14*
Step 3		.00		
	Gender x COWA FAS	-.00	.00	-.05

* $p < .01$.

Table 16

Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analyses Predicting Sexual Infidelity from Gender and Sets of Variables - Current Research

Predictors	Sexual Infidelity			
	R ²	B	SE B	β
Step 1	.05*			
Gender		.13	.03	.22*
Step 2	.19*			
Erotophilia		.08	.02	.19*
Sexual Sensation Seeking		.06	.02	.19*
Sexual Narcissism		.05	.02	.14
Instrumentality		-.00	.02	-.00
Permissiveness		.08	.02	.31*
Step 3	.03*			
Gender x Erotophilia		.06	.05	.08
Gender x Sexual Sensation Seeking		.00	.05	.00
Gender x Sexual Narcissism		.13	.05	.21*
Gender x Instrumentality		-.03	.04	-.06
Gender x Permissiveness		.06	.04	.15
Step 1	.05*			
Gender		.13	.03	.22*

Step 2	.11*			
Neuroticism		.02	.02	.04
Extraversion		-.00	.02	-.01
Agreeableness		-.11	.02	-.26*
Conscientiousness		-.01	.02	-.03
Narcissism		.06	.02	.15*
Step 3	.02			
Gender x Neuroticism		.06	.04	.09
Gender x Extraversion		-.01	.04	-.01
Gender x Agreeableness		-.06	.04	-.09
Gender x Conscientiousness		-.00	.04	-.00
Gender x Narcissism		.02	.05	.03
Step 1	.05*			
Gender		.13	.03	.22*
Step 2	.07*			
Self-Disclosure		-.02	.02	-.06
Relationship Satisfaction		-.05	.02	-.18*
Commitment		-.02	.02	-.08
Step 3	.01			
Gender x Self-Disclosure		-.00	.03	-.01
Gender x Relationship Satisfaction		-.10	.04	-.19

	Gender x Commitment		-06	.04	-.13
Step 1		.05*			
	Gender		.13	.03	.22*
Step 2		.06*			
	Sexual Compatibility		-.08	.03	-.15*
	Sexual Communication		-.01	.01	-.03
	Sexual Satisfaction		-.08	.01	-.25*
Step 3		.01			
	Gender x Sexual Compatibility		-.10	.06	-.09
	Gender x Sexual Communication		-.00	.03	-.01
	Gender x Sexual Satisfaction		-.02	.03	-.01
Step 1		.05*			
	Gender		.13	.03	.22*
Step 2		.03*			
	COWA FAS		-.00	.00	-.19*
Step 3		.01			
	Gender x COWA FAS		-.00	.00	-.10

* $p < .01$.

Table 17

Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analyses Predicting Deviant Involvement from Gender and Sets of Variables - Current Research

Deviant Involvement				
Predictors	R ²	B	SE B	β
Step 1	.12*			
Gender		.18	.02	.35*
Step 2	.18*			
Erotophilia		.04	.02	.11
Sexual Sensation Seeking		.04	.02	.14
Sexual Narcissism		.07	.02	.23*
Instrumentality		-.00	.02	-.03
Permissiveness		.06	.02	.26*
Step 3	.04*			
Gender x Erotophilia		.02	.04	.03
Gender x Sexual Sensation Seeking		.01	.04	.01
Gender x Sexual Narcissism		.14	.04	.25*
Gender x Instrumentality		-.05	.03	-.12
Gender x Permissiveness		.06	.04	.17*
Step 1	.12*			
Gender		.18	.02	.35*

Step 2	.15*			
Neuroticism	.04	.02	.12*	
Extraversion	-.01	.02	-.05	
Agreeableness	-.10	.02	-.28*	
Conscientiousness	-.01	.02	-.02	
Narcissism	.06	.02	.17*	
Step 3	.02			
Gender x Neuroticism	.05	.03	.09	
Gender x Extraversion	-.00	.03	-.00	
Gender x Agreeableness	-.07	.03	-.13	
Gender x Conscientiousness	-.01	.03	-.02	
Gender x Narcissism	.04	.04	.06	
Step 1	.12*			
Gender	.18	.02	.35*	
Step 2	.07*			
Self-Disclosure	-.04	.01	-.12	
Relationship Satisfaction	-.04	.02	-.14	
Commitment	-.01	.01	-.06	
Step 3	.01			
Gender x Self-Disclosure	-.01	.03	-.02	
Gender x Relationship Satisfaction	-.05	.03	-.12	

Table 18

Factor Loadings on the Infidelity Scale – Current Research

Subscales	Cont	Dev	Sex	Phys	Flir	Emot
<u>Contemplation</u>						
I have thought about how much I would like to date someone I'm attracted to, other than my romantic partner.	.84					
I have thought about how much I would like to date other people in general.	.82					
I have desired emotional intimacy with someone I'm attracted to, other than my romantic partner.	.87					
I have desired emotional intimacy with other potential romantic partners in general.	.86					
I have desired physical intimacy with someone I'm attracted to, other than my romantic partner.	.89					
I have desired physical intimacy with other people in general.	.88					
Aside from someone famous, I have daydreamed or fantasized about someone I'm attracted to, other than my romantic partner.	.80					
I have consciously made an effort to attract someone other than my romantic partner.	.72					
I have "checked out" someone other than my romantic partner.	.61					
I have casually flirted with someone I'm attracted to, other than my romantic partner.	.70					
I have talked about sexual preferences with	.75					

someone I'm attracted to, other than my romantic partner.

Deviant Involvement

I have viewed pornography with someone I'm attracted to, other than my romantic partner. .84

I have gone to strip clubs for the purpose of fantasizing only. .88

I have had cyber sex with someone other than my romantic partner. .89

I have solicited or engaged in prostitution. .87

I have gone to bars for the purpose of fantasizing only. .83

I have taken drugs that are thought to be "sexual" (Ecstasy, GHB, or any drug that "turns you on") with someone I'm attracted to, other than my romantic partner. .81

I have gone to strip clubs or bars specifically to try and "pick someone up." .87

Sexual Infidelity

I have passionately kissed someone I'm attracted to other than my romantic partner. .50

I have fondled the genitals or other erogenous zones of someone I'm attracted to, other than my romantic partner, outside the person's clothing. .93

I have had my genitals or other erogenous zones fondled by someone I'm attracted to, other than my romantic partner, outside my clothing. .95

I have stimulated the genitals or other erogenous zones of someone I'm attracted to, other than my .95

romantic partner, under the person's clothing.

I have had my genitals or other erogenous zones stimulated by someone I'm attracted to, other than my romantic partner, under my clothing. .95

I have engaged in mutual masturbation with someone I'm attracted to, other than my romantic partner. .86

I have given oral sex to someone I'm attracted to, other than my romantic partner. .86

I have received oral sex from someone I'm attracted to, other than my romantic partner. .92

I have had sexual intercourse with someone I'm attracted to, other than my romantic partner. .88

Physical Flirtation

I have held hands with someone I'm attracted to, other than my romantic partner. .90

I have cuddled with someone I'm attracted to, other than my romantic partner. .92

I have touched someone I'm attracted to, other than my romantic partner, on places like their lower back, neck, cheek, or thigh. .87

I have massaged someone I'm attracted to, other than my romantic partner. .86

I have passionately kissed someone I'm attracted to other than my romantic partner. .32

I have played with or brushed the hair of someone I'm attracted to, other than my romantic partner. .84

Emotional Infidelity

I have told someone I'm attracted to, other than my

romantic partner, things I have never told anyone else.	.72
I have continued to be involved with someone I'm attracted to, other than my romantic partner, even though I knew I could potentially love that person.	.86
I have felt like I was "falling" in love with someone I'm attracted to, other than my romantic partner.	.87

Note. Cont = Contemplation; Dev = Deviant Involvement; Sex = Sexual Infidelity; Phys Flir = Physical Flirtation; Emot = Emotional Infidelity.

CHAPTER IV

Discussion

This purpose of this study was to confirm the final factor structure of the Infidelity Scale and to examine whether sets of variables (individual general and sexual variables, relationship general and sexual variables) differentially predicted each subscale. This was accomplished using Confirmatory Factor Analysis and Simultaneous Multiple Regression. Interactions between these sets of variables with gender were also examined, using Hierarchical Multiple Regression. Finally, performance on the Controlled Oral Word Association Test FAS was examined as a predictor of each Infidelity subscale using Simple Linear Regression.

The factor structure of the Infidelity Scale was indeed confirmed, reproducing five factors with high internal consistencies and an overall solution with an adequate CFI and RMSEA. Thus, it appears the Infidelity Scale is a viable measure which can be used in future infidelity research. Furthermore, steps taken toward modeling the subscales revealed that each was differentially predicted by the sets of variables examined in this study, with some caveats.

The individual sexual variables emerged as the primary predictor for all of the Infidelity subscales. Also, all subscales that involved some degree of sexual act (Physical Flirtation, Sexual Infidelity, and Deviant Involvement) produced the same sequence of predictors: individual sexual variables, individual general variables, relationship general variables, and relationship sexual variables. There are potential explanations for these findings. The individual sexual variables are all related to heightened interest and

participation in sexual activities. Because Infidelity subscales are correlated, it is likely that participation in each "type" of infidelity also indicates some degree of sexual involvement with someone other than one's primary partner. This is, of course, especially true for endorsers of the Physical Flirtation, Sexual Infidelity, and Deviant Involvement subscales. Thus, it is not necessarily surprising that the individual sexual variables should emerge as the primary predictor for all of the Infidelity subscales, and that the Physical Flirtation, Sexual Infidelity, and Deviant Involvement subscales should have the same pattern of predictors. It may be that participation in all types of infidelity is committed by individuals with heightened interest and participation in sexual activity.

Relatedly, although not tested statistically, it is also interesting to note the differential gradient in prediction for each set of variables. Grossly speaking, the individual (general and sexual) variables were more predictive for the more physical (Deviant Involvement and Sexual Infidelity), rather than the emotional (Emotional Infidelity) or more cognitive (Contemplation), forms of infidelity. Similarly, the relationship (general and sexual) variables were more predictive for the more cognitive and emotional, rather than the primarily physical, forms of infidelity. Perhaps relationship variables are more likely to be involved in the initial stages of infidelity (corresponding with the predisposing and approach phases of the temporal sequence proposed by Allen et al., 2005), whereas individual variables provide the extra "push" into participating in sexual activities with an extra dyadic partner (corresponding with Allen et al.'s precipitation and maintenance phases).

An exploratory component of this study examined how well each of the Infidelity subscales was predicted by a measure of executive functioning: the Controlled Oral Word Association Test FAS. This measure significantly predicted all of the subscales except for Contemplation, though it was always the least predictive measure used in the study.

Gender was a significant predictor of all types of infidelity, with men being more likely than women to participate in all forms of infidelity. After gender was accounted for, the relative variance accounted for by each set of variables changed for Emotional Infidelity and Physical Flirtation. This resulted in Emotional Infidelity and Contemplation having the same sequence of predictors: individual sexual variables, relationship general variables, relationship sexual variables, and individual general variables. Additionally, Physical Flirtation's sequence of predictors (individual sexual variables, relationship general variables, individual general variables, relationship sexual variables) was then distinguishable from the sequence of predictors for Sexual Infidelity and Deviant Involvement. Also, the variance accounted for by each set of variables decreased. This was especially true for the individual sexual and individual general variables, although these decreases were not tested for statistical significance. Gender only interacted with the individual sexual variables in predicting Sexual Infidelity and Deviant Involvement such that these variables were more predictive of these subscales for males.

Overall, these findings provide evidence that different models for the infidelity subscales may exist. However, subscales with more emotional/cognitive content may have similar models, and subscales with more physical content may have similar models.

Additionally, it is possible that there are different models for predicting the subscales by gender.

In addition to these research considerations, this study's findings may also have practical significance, as being helpful to clinicians working with issues of unfaithfulness in couples counseling, individual relationship counseling, or premarital counseling. For example, using the current findings about the predictors of unfaithful behavior, it may be possible to identify those at risk for engaging in infidelity and offer preventative counseling to these individuals. It may also be possible to use this scale to identify people in an earlier, "emotional/cognitive" stage of infidelity to help prevent progression to a later, "physical stage of infidelity.

Limitations

Perhaps the most significant limitation of this study is its use of a college student sample, which means that findings may not generalize to the population as a whole, especially to married or older individuals. This constitutes a threat to external validity. Furthermore, twice as many females as males participated in the study, which means that findings may include a gender bias. This is especially relevant since men were more likely to participate in all types of infidelity.

Another significant limitation to this study involves the possibility of extraneous variance in the experimental setting, a threat to statistical conclusion validity. Participants filled out questionnaires online, so it is unclear how each of their environments may have differed at the time of their participation. In fact, possibly because of this, the Trails B data had to be discarded. However, it is also possible that the method used to obtain these

data, independent of extraneous variance in the experimental setting, invalidated the results obtained from this measure. The Trail Making Test was normed as a paper and pencil measure. Similarly, the Controlled Oral Word Association Test was normed as a measure given face to face, with words spoken aloud rather than typed. Although participants' performance on this measure was not compared to normative data and was used only to examine covariation with participation in different types of infidelity, the possibility of extraneous variance in the experimental setting or measurement error remains.

Finally, based on findings in the research literature, it was surprising that communication and commitment predicted few of the Infidelity subscales. This may be an artifact of the measures used. It is possible that the chosen measures for general relationship communication, sexual communication, and commitment were not optimal for measuring the constructs of interest, particularly in a young, college student sample.

Directions for Future Research

This research takes significant steps in formulating different models for the Infidelity subscales, and future research should use Structural Equation Modeling (SEM) to further elucidate these models. Furthermore, because this research suggests that there may be different models for men and women, future research should be mindful to gather a relatively equal number of men and women to examine this possibility. More specifically, one idea is to extract the top three predictors for each set of variables from the current study and use them in a future modeling study. Additionally, different measures for relationship communication, commitment, and sexual communication

should be used because the literature suggests these variables should be predictive of infidelity, and they were not in this study.

Future research should also examine the factor structure of the Infidelity Scale and model the Infidelity Scale in an older, possibly married, population. Additionally, given the initial results from the COWA FAS, in conjunction with previous research findings using executive functioning measures (Reid, Garos, & Carpenter, 2011; Reid, Karim, McCrory, & Carpenter, 2010;), more research should be conducted using this measure and other executive functioning measures in the prediction of infidelity. Preferably, this will occur using the same method of administration with which the measures were validated.

Another avenue for future research to pursue is comparing groups on their participation in the different types of infidelity. For example, comparing newly married couples (e.g., less than seven years) to couples married more than twenty years and couples married 7-20 years would be an interesting extension of infidelity research.

Finally, it is interesting to think about the implications of this research in terms of the framework developed by Allen et al. (2005) that proposes a temporal sequence for infidelity consisting of “predisposing,” “approach,” “precipitating,” “maintenance,” “discovery,” and “response” factors. Although they discuss how some individual sexual and personality variables contribute to the predisposition and approach phases, the current research indicates that relationship variables may be more important in the stages of infidelity. Perhaps their temporal sequence can indeed be conceived of in terms of the type of infidelity occurring at each stage. Future research should formally examine the

Infidelity Scale within the context of this framework. Clearly, relationship research can benefit from continued inquiry into infidelity with this newly developed and validated scale.

References

- Allen, E. A., Atkins, D. C., Baucom, D. H., Snyder, D. K., Gordon, K. C., & Glass, S. P. (2005). Intrapersonal, interpersonal, and contextual factors in engaging in and responding to extramarital involvement. *Clinical Psychology: Science and Practice, 12*, 101-130. doi: 10.1093/clipsy/bpi014
- Allen, E. S., & Baucom, D. H. (2004). Adult attachment and patterns of extradyadic involvement. *Family Process, 43*, 467-487. doi: 10.1111/j.1545-5300.2004.00035.x
- Allen, E. S., & Rhoades, G. K. (2008). Not all affairs are created equal: Emotional involvement with an extra dyadic partner. *Journal of Sex & Marital Therapy, 34*, 51-65. doi: 10.1080/00926230701620878
- Allen, E. S., Rhoades, G. K., Stanley, S. M., Markman, H. J., Williams, T., Melton, J., Clements, M. L. (2008). Premarital precursors of marital infidelity. *Family Processes, 47*, 243-259. doi: 10.1111/j.1545-5300.2008.00251.x
- Apt. C., & Hurlbert, D. F. (1994). The sexual attitudes, behavior, and relationships of women with histrionic personality disorder. *Journal of Sex & Marital Therapy, 20*(2), 125-133.
- Apt. C., Hurlbert, D. F., Sarmiento, G. R., & Hurlbert, M. K. (1996). The role of fellatio in marital sexuality: An examination of sexual compatibility and sexual desire. *Sexual & Marital Therapy, 11*(4), 383-392.
- Atkins, D. C., Yi, J., Baucom, D. H., & Christensen, A. (2005). Infidelity in couples seeking marital therapy. *Journal of Family Psychology, 19*, 470-473. doi: 10.1037/0893-3200.19.3.470
- Atkins, D. C., Baucom, D. H., & Jacobson, N. S. (2001). Understanding infidelity: Correlates in a national random sample. *Journal of Family Psychology, 4*, 735-749. doi: 10.1037/0893-3200.15.4.735
- Aviram, I., & Amichi-Hamburger, Y. (2005). Online infidelity: Aspects of dyadic satisfaction, self-disclosure, and narcissism. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication, 10*, doi: 10.1111/j.1083-6101.2005.tb00249.x
- Balswick, J. K., & Balswick, J. O. (1999). Extramarital affairs: Causes, consequences, and recovery. *Marriage and Family: A Christian Journal, 2*(4), 420-427.

- Banfield, S., & McCabe, M. P. (2001). Extra relationship involvement among women: Are they different from men? *Archives of Sexual Behavior, 30*, 119-142. doi: 10.1023/A:1002773100507
- Barta, W. D., & Kiene, S. M. (2005). Motivations for infidelity in heterosexual dating couples: The roles of gender, personality differences, and sociosexual orientation. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 22*, 339-360. doi: 10.1177/0265407505052440
- Blow, A. J., & Hartnett, K. (2005). Infidelity in committed relationships II: A substantive review. *Journal of Marital and Family Therapy, 31*, 217-233. doi: 10.1111/j.1752-0606.2005.tb01555.x
- Boekhout, B. A., Hendrick, S. S., & Hendrick, C. (2003). Exploring infidelity: Developing the Relationship Issues Scale. *Journal of Loss and Trauma, 8*, 282-306. doi: 10.1080/15325020305882
- Buss, D. M., & Shackelford, T. K. (1997). Susceptibility to infidelity in the first year of marriage. *Journal of Research in Personality, 31*, 193-221. doi: 10.1006/jrpe.1997.2175
- Buunk, B. P. (1995). Sex, self-esteem, dependency, and extradyadic sexual experiences as related to jealousy responses. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 12*, 147-153. doi: 10.1177/0265407595121011
- 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.
- Byers, E. S., & Demmons, S. (1999). Sexual satisfaction and sexual self-disclosure within dating relationships. *The Journal of Sex Research, 36*, 180-189. doi: 10.1080/00224499909551983
- Byers, E. S., Demmons, S., & Lawrance, K. (1998). Sexual satisfaction with dating relationships: A test of the interpersonal model of sexual satisfaction. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 15*, 257-267. doi: 10.1177/0265407598152008
- Byrne, D., & Schulte, L. (1990). Personality dispositions as mediators of sexual responses. *Annual Review of Sex Research, 1*, 93-117.

- Cano, A., & O'Leary, K. D. (2000). Infidelity and separations precipitate major depressive episodes and symptoms of nonspecific depression and anxiety. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 68*, 774-781. doi: 10.1037/0022-006X.68.5.774
- Costa, P. T., Jr., & McCrae, R. R. (1992). NEO PI-R professional manual. Odessa, FL: Psychological Assessment Resources, Inc.
- Cousins, A. J., & Gangestad, S. W. (2007). Perceived threats of female infidelity, male proprietariness, and violence in college dating couples. *Violence and Victims, 22*, 651-668. doi: 10.1891/088667007782793156
- Daines, B. (2006). Violations of agreed and implicit sexual and emotional boundaries in couple relationships – some thoughts arising from Levine's 'A clinical perspective on couple infidelity.' *Sexual and Relationship Therapy, 21*, 45-53. doi: 10.1080/14681990500430011
- DeFinis, A. L. (2007). *An exploratory investigation of deceptive practices within romantic relationships: How is deception related to respect and relationship satisfaction?* Unpublished Manuscript.
- DeWall, C. N., Lambert, N. M., Slotter, E.B., Pond, R. S., Deckman, T., Finkel, E. J., Luchies, L. B., & Fincham, F. D. (2011). So far away from one's partner, yet so close to romantic alternatives: Avoidant attachment, interest in alternatives, and infidelity. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 101*, 1302-1316. doi: 10.1037/a0025497
- Drigotas, S. M., & Barta, W. (2001). The cheating heart: Scientific explorations in infidelity. *Current Directions in Psychological Science, 10*, 177-180. doi: 10.1111/1467-8721.00143
- Drigotas, S. M., Safstrom, C. A., & Gentilia, T. (1999). An investment model prediction of dating infidelity. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 77*, 509-524. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.77.3.509
- Egan, V., & Angus, S. (2004). Is social dominance a sex-specific strategy for infidelity? *Personality and Individual Differences, 36*, 575-586. doi: 10.1016/S0191-8869(03)00116-8
- Ehrmann, W. W. (1959). *Premarital dating behavior*. New York, NY: Holt.

- Fisher, W. A., Byrne, D., White, L. A., & Kelley, K. (1988). Erotophobia-erotophilia as a dimension of personality. *The Journal of Sex Research, 25*, 123-151. doi: 10.1080/00224498809551448
- Fraser, L. (2002). *An Italian affair*. New York, NY: Knopf Doubleday Publishing Group.
- Garfield District Staff of the Family Service Association (1962). Infidelity in women as a manifestation of a character disorder. *Smith College Studies in Social Work, 32*(3), 180-198.
- Glass, S. P., & Wright, T. L. (1985). Sex differences in type of extramarital involvement and marital dissatisfaction. *Sex Roles, 12*, 1101-1120. doi: 10.1007/BF00288108
- Glass, S. P., & Wright, T. L. (1992). Justifications for extramarital relationships: The association between attitudes, behaviors, and gender. *Journal of Sex Research, 29*, 361-387. doi: 10.1080/00224499209551654
- Goldberg, L. R. (2005). *International Personality Item Pool: A scientific collaboratory for the development of advanced measures of personality traits and other individual differences*. Retrieved February 20, 2011, from the International Personality Item Pool Web site: <http://ipip.ori.org>
- Gonyea, J. L. (2004). Internet sexuality: Clinical implications for couples. *Journal of Family Therapy, 32*, 375-390. doi:
- Hall, J. H., & Fincham, F. D. (2009). Psychological distress: Precursor or a consequence of dating infidelity? *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 35*, 143-159. doi: 10.1177/0146167208327189
- Hendrick, C., & Hendrick, S. S. (1986). A theory and method of love. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 50*, 392-402. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.50.2.392
- Hendrick, C., & Hendrick, S. S. (1988). Lovers wear rose colored glasses. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 5*, 161-183. doi: 10.1177/026540758800500203
- Hendrick, C., Hendrick, S. S., & Dicke, A. (1998). The Love Attitudes Scale: Short form. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 15*, 147-159. doi: 10.1177/0265407598152001
- Hendrick, C., Hendrick, S. S., & Reich, D. A. (2006). The Brief Sexual Attitudes Scale. *The Journal of Sex Research, 43*(1), 76-86.

- Hendrick, S. S. (1988). A generic measure of relationship satisfaction. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 50, 93-98. doi: 10.2307/352430
- Hendrick, S. S. (2004). *Understanding close relationships*. Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Hendrick, S. S., Dicke, A., & Hendrick, C. (1998). The Relationship Assessment Scale. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 15, 137-142. doi: 10.1177/0265407598151009
- Hendrick, S. S., & Hendrick, C. (2006). Measuring respect in close relationships. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 23, 881-899. doi: 10.1177/0265407506070471
- Hendrick, S. S., & Hendrick, C. (1987). Multidimensionality of sexual attitudes. *The Journal of Sex Research*, 23, 502-526. doi: 10.1080/00224498709551387
- Hendrick, S. S., Hendrick, C., Slapion-Foote, M. J., & Foote, F. H. (1985). Gender differences in sexual attitudes. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 48, 1630-1642. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.48.6.1630
- Heppner, P. P., Wampold, B. E., & Kivlighan, D. M. Jr. (2008). *Research design in counseling* (3rd ed.). Belmont, CA: Brooks/Cole.
- Herold, E. S., & Way, L. (1988). Sexual self-disclosure among university women. *The Journal of Sex Research*, 24, 1-14. doi: 10.1080/00224498809551394
- Hicks, T. V., & Leitenberg, H. (2001). Sexual fantasies about one's partner versus someone else: Gender differences in incidence and frequency. *The Journal of Sex Research*, 38, 43-50. doi: 10.1080/00224490109552069
- Horvath, P., & Zuckerman, M. (1993). Sensation seeking, risk appraisal, and risky behavior. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 14, 41-52. doi: 10.1016/0191-8869(93)90173-Z
- Hurlbert, D. F., & Apt, C. (1991). Sexual narcissism and the abusive male. *Journal of Sex & Marital Therapy*, 17(4), 279-292.
- Hurlbert, D. F., Apt, C., Gasar, S., Wilson, N. E., & Murphy, Y. (1994). Sexual narcissism: A validation study. *Journal of Sex & Marital Therapy*, 20(1), 24-34.
- Hurlbert, D. F., Apt, A., & White, L. C. (1992). An empirical examination into the sexuality of women with borderline personality disorder. *Journal of Sex & Marital Therapy*, 18(3), 231-242.

- Hurlbert, D. F., White, L. C., Powell, R. D., & Apt, A. (1993). Orgasm consistency training in the treatment of women reporting hypoactive sexual desire: An outcome comparison of women-only groups and couples-only groups. *Journal of Behavioral Therapy and Experimental Psychiatry*, 24, 3-13. doi: 10.1016/0005-7916(93)90003-F
- Kalichman, S. C., & Rompa, D. (1995). Sexual sensation seeking and sexual compulsivity scales: Reliability, validity, and predicting HIV risk behavior. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 1995, 586-601. doi: 10.1207/s15327752jpa6503_16
- Kline, R. B. (2005). Principles and practice of structural equation modeling (2nd ed.). New York, NY: The Guilford Press.
- Laumann, E. O., Gagnon, J. H., Michael, R. T., & Michaels, S. (1994). *The social organization of sexuality: Sexual practices in the United States*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Lawrance, K., & Byers, E. S. (1995). Sexual satisfaction in long-term heterosexual relationships: The interpersonal exchange model of sexual satisfaction. *Personal Relationships*, 2, 267-285. doi: 10.1111/j.1475-6811.1995.tb00092.x
- Lewis, M. A., Neighbors, C., & Malheim, J. E. (2006). Indulgence or restraint? Gender differences in the relationship between controlled orientation and the erotophilia-risky sex link. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 40, 985-995. doi: 10.1016/j.paid.2005.09.015
- Logue, E. M. (2009). *Development of the Infidelity Scale: Item development, factor analysis, and initial construct validation*. Unpublished manuscript.
- Logue, E., Hendrick, S. S., & Hendrick, C. (2010, May). *Assessing infidelity: Confirmatory factor analysis supports five factor Infidelity Scale*. Poster presented at the Annual Convention of the Association for Psychological Sciences, Boston, MA.
- Lund, M. (1985). The development of investment and commitment scales for predicting continuity of personal relationships. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 2, 3-23. doi: 10.1177/0265407585021001
- Lusterman, D. (1997). Repetitive infidelity, womanizing, and Don Juanism. In R. F. Levant, F. Ronald, & G. R. Brooks (Eds.), *Men and sex: New psychological perspectives* (84-99). Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons Inc.

- MacCallum, R. C., Zhang, S., Preacher, K. J., & Rucker, D. D. (2002). On the practice of dichotomization of quantitative variables. *Psychological Methods, 7*, 19-40. doi: 10.1037/1082-989X.7.1.19
- MacNeil, S., & Byers, S. (1997). The relationships between sexual problems, communication, and sexual satisfaction. *The Canadian Journal of Human Sexuality, 6*(4), 277-283.
- MacNeil, S., & Byers, E. S. (2009). Role of sexual self-disclosure in the sexual satisfaction of long-term heterosexual couples. *The Journal of Sex Research, 46*(1), 3-14.
- Miller, L. C., Berg, J. H., & Archer, R. L. (1983). Openers: Individuals who elicit intimate self-disclosure. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 44*(6), 1234-1244.
- Newcomb, M. D., & McGee, L. (1991). Influence of sensation seeking in general deviance and specific problem behaviors from adolescence to young adulthood. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 61*, 614-628. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.61.4.614
- Offman, A., & Matheson, K. (2005). Sexual compatibility and sexual functioning in intimate relationships. *The Canadian Journal of Human Sexuality, 14*(1-2), 31-39.
- Oikle, J. M. (2003). *The prediction and description of dating infidelity: The role of gender, relationship satisfaction, commitment, and attitude toward dating infidelity*. (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from PsycINFO. (2003-95016-227)
- Orr, D. W. (1963). Sexual relations and marriage. In A. Deutsch, & H. Fishman (Eds.), *The encyclopedia of mental health, volume VI* (1867-1885). New York, NY: Franklin Watts.
- Orzeck, T., & Lung, E. (2005). Big-five personality differences of cheaters and non-cheaters. *Current Psychology, 24*, 274-286. doi: 10.1007/s12144-005-1028-3
- Pesttrak, V. A., Martin, D., & Martin, M. (1985). Extramarital sex: An examination of the literature. *International Journal of Family Therapy, 7*, 107-115. doi: 10.1007/s12144-005-1028-3
- Previti, D., & Amato, P. R. (2004). Is infidelity a cause or a consequence of poor marital quality? *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 21*, 217-230. doi: 0.1177/0265407504041384

- Raskin, R., & Terry, H. (1988). A principal-components analysis of the narcissistic personality inventory and further evidence of its construct validity. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *54*, 890-902. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.54.5.890
- Reid, R., Garos, S., Carpenter, B. N., & Coleman, E. (2011). A surprising finding related to executive control in a patient sample of hypersexual men. *Journal of Sexual Medicine*, *8*, 2227-2236. doi: 10.1111/j.1743-6109.2011.02314.x
- Reid, R., Karim, R., McCrory, E., & Carpenter, B. N. (2010). Self-reported differences on measures of executive function and hypersexual behavior in a patient and community sample of men. *International Journal of Neuroscience*, *120*, 120-127. doi: 10.3109/00207450903165577
- Reitan, R. M., & Wolfston, D. (1985). *The Halstead-Reitan Neuropsychological Test Battery*. Tucson, AZ: Neuropsychology Press.
- Roscoe, B., Cavanaugh, L. E., & Kennedy, D. R. (1988). Dating infidelity: Behaviors, reasons and consequences. *Adolescence*, *23*(89), 35-43.
- Ruff, R. M., Light, R. H., Parker, S. B., & Levin, H. S. (1997). The psychological construct of word fluency. *Brain and Language*, *57*, 394-405. doi: 10.1006/brln.1997.1755
- Russell, L. (1990). Sex and couples therapy: A method of treatment to enhance physical and emotional intimacy. *Journal of Sex & Marital Therapy*, *16*(2), 111-118.
- Schmitt, D. P. (2004). The big five related to risky sexual behavior across 10 world regions: Differential personality associations of sexual promiscuity and relationship infidelity. *European Journal of Personality*, *18*, 301-319. doi: 10.1002/per.520
- Shackelford, T. K., & Buss, D. M. (1997). Cues to infidelity. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *23*, 1034-1045. doi: 10.1177/01461672972310004
- Sheppard, V. J., Nelson, E. S., & Andreoli-Mathis, V. (1995). Dating relationships and infidelity: Attitudes and behaviors. *Journal of Sex & Marital Therapy*, *21*(3), 202-212.
- Snow, W. G., Tierney, M. C., Zorzitto, M. L., & Fisher, R. H. (1989). WAIS-R test-retest reliability in a normal elderly sample. *Journal of Clinical and Experimental Neuropsychology*, *11*, 423-428. doi: 10.1080/01688638908400903v

- Sokolski, D. M., & Hendrick, S. S. (1999). Fostering marital satisfaction. *Family Therapy, 26*(1), 39-49.
- Spreeen, O., & Benton, A.L. (1977). Neurosensory Center Comprehensive Examination for Aphasia: Manual of directions. Victoria, BC, Canada: Neuropsychology Laboratory, University of Victoria.
- Spreeen, O., & Strauss, E. (1998). A compendium of neuropsychological tests: Administration, norms, and commentary (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Sprey, J. (1972). Extramarital relationships: to understand them one must concentrate less on the "extra" and more on the "marital." *Sexual Behavior, 2*(8), 34-40.
- Strean, H. S. (1980). *The extramarital affair*. New York, NY: The Free Press.
- Tabachnik, B. G., & Fidell, L. S. (2007). Using multivariate statistics (5th ed.). Boston, MA: Pearson.
- Træen, B., & Stigum, H. (1998). Parallel sexual relationships in the Norwegian context. *Journal of Community and Applied Social Psychology, 8*, 41-56. doi: 10.1002/(SICI)1099-1298(199801/02)8:1<41::AID-CASP440>3.0.CO;2-3v
- Treas, J., & Giesen, D. (2000). Sexual infidelity among married and cohabiting Americans. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 62*, 48-60. doi: 10.1111/j.1741-3737.2000.00048.x
- Wagers, T. P. (2003). Assessment of infidelity. In K. Jordan (Ed.), *Handbook of couple and family assessment* (pp. 129-145). Hauppauge, NY: Nova Science Publishers.
- Weis, D. L., & Slosnerick, M. (1981). Attitudes toward sexual and nonsexual extramarital involvements among a sample of college students. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 43*, 349-358. doi: 10.2307/351386
- Wheless, L. R., Wheelless, V. E., & Baus, R. (1984). Sexual communication, communication satisfaction, and solidarity in the developmental stages of intimate relationships. *The Western Journal of Speech Communication, 48*, 217-230. doi:
- Whisman, M. A., Dixon, A. E., & Johnson, B. (1997). Therapists' perspectives of couple problems and treatment issues in couple therapy. *Journal of Family Psychology, 11*, 361-366. doi: 10.1037/0893-3200.11.3.361v

- Whisman, M. A., Gordon, K. C., & Chatav, Y. (2007). Predicting sexual infidelity in a population-based sample of married individuals. *Journal of Family Psychology, 21*, 320-324. doi: 10.1037/0893-3200.21.2.320
- Whisman, M. A., & Snyder, D.K. (2007). Sexual infidelity in a national survey of American women: Differences in prevalence and correlates as a function of method of assessment. *Journal of Family Psychology, 21*, 147-154. doi: 10.1037/0893-3200.21.2.147
- Whitty, M. T. (2005). The realness of cybercheating: Men's and women's representations of unfaithful internet relationships. *Social Science Computer Review, 23*, 57-67. doi: 10.1177/0894439304271536
- Witting, K., Santtila, P., Varjonen, M., Jern, P., Johansson, A., von der Pahlen, B., & Sandnabb, K. (2008). Female sexual dysfunction, sexual distress, and compatibility with partner. *Journal of Sexual Medicine, 5*, 2587-2599. doi: 10.1111/j.1743-6109.2008.00984.x
- Wryobeck, J. M., & Wiederman, M. W. (1999). Sexual narcissism: Measurement and correlates among college men. *Journal of Sex & Marital Therapy, 25*, 321-331. doi: 10.1080/00926239908404009
- Wysocki, D. K., & Childers, C. D. (2011). "Let my fingers do the talking": Sexting and infidelity in cyberspace. *Sexuality & Culture: An Interdisciplinary Quarterly, 15*, 217-239. doi: 10.1007/s12119-011-9091-4.
- Yarab, P. E., & Allgeier, E. R. (1998). Don't even think about it: The role of sexual fantasies as perceived unfaithfulness in heterosexual dating relationships. *Journal of Sex Education and Therapy, 23*(3), 246-254.
- Yarab, P. E., Sensibaugh, C. C., & Allgeier, E. R. (1998). More than just sex: Gender differences in the incidence of self-defined unfaithful behavior in heterosexual dating relationships. *Journal of Psychology and Human Sexuality, 10*, 45-57. doi: 10.1300/J056v10n02_03
- Yeniceri, Z., & Kokdemir, D. (2006). University students' perceptions of, and explanations for, infidelity: The development of the infidelity questionnaire (INFQ). *Social Behavior and Personality, 34*, 639-650. doi: 10.2224/sbp.2006.34.6.639

APPENDIX A

Extended Literature Review

When someone mentions infidelity, most people believe they know what is being discussed, that they understand what that word means. However, many years of research have revealed that the term is a complicated one, situated within historical, cultural, and generational contexts. For example, in the culture of the late 20th century, different attitudes regarding participation in sexual activity were found to exist. DeLamater (1987) identified three primary orientations toward sexuality: procreational, relational, and recreational (as cited in Laumann, Gagnon, Michael, & Michaels, 1994). The former two hold that extramarital/extradyadic sex is considered unfaithful behavior and should thus be avoided; however, this prohibition is not necessarily present in the recreational attitude. Nevertheless, research indicates that having a monogamous sexual relationship is actually more physically and emotionally satisfying than having multiple partners (Laumann et al).

Participation in unfaithful behavior differs across many variables, including gender, age, marital status, and nationality. It is generally believed that men are more likely to participate in extradyadic involvement than are women. Even so, it is estimated that approximately 10% of children in the Western world are conceived outside of a marriage without the husband's knowledge (Buunk & Dijkstra, 2000). The incidence of infidelity has been demonstrated to be higher among people who are unmarried, and attitudes toward extradyadic involvement are more permissive among younger people (Buunk & Dijkstra, 2000). Furthermore, even though 85% of Americans disapprove of

extramarital relationships (Pestrak, Martin, & Martin, 1985), academic and popular literatures have noted differences in infidelity across countries. In *An Italian Affair* (2002), Laura Fraser recounts her experience as the "other woman" in an affair with a French citizen. In this autobiographical novel, she discusses how this man and his wife have an understanding regarding his infidelities; that is, as long as he returns to her, his unfaithful behavior on holiday is implied, and no questions are asked. Extramarital sex is also more common in African countries than, for example, in Asian or European countries (Buunk & Dijkstra, 2000). It should thus be emphasized that the current research is focused on college students, most of whom are unmarried, in the United States.

The Components of Infidelity

Historically, infidelity was assessed as a unidimensional construct, engaging in sexual intercourse with a person other than one's primary partner, the formulation of the reason for which was psychoanalytic, explaining reasons for engaging in unfaithful behavior in terms of characterological deficits or "neurosis." Some examples of this are work by the Garfield District Staff of the Family Service Association (1962) and Streaun (1980). The Garfield District Staff were among the first to examine sexual infidelity in women, finding that such behavior was indicative of character disorders that existed before marriage. However, Streaun described sexual infidelity as a neurotic behavior in both men and women.

Questions regarding whether infidelity could be considered as anything other than extradyadic sexual involvement emerged as early as 1963 (Orr). However, further

examination of the other facets of infidelity did not gather steam until the 1980s. Glass and Wright (1985) were among the first to recognize the need to assess both emotional and physical infidelity together, in the same study, on continua. To measure physical infidelity, these researchers borrowed Ehrmann's (1969) 6-point continuum of sexual activities (ranging from "no sexual involvement" to "sexual intercourse") and asked participants to rate, on a Guttman scale "What is the greatest extent that you have been sexually involved with someone other than your spouse while still married?" (p. 1107). Emotional infidelity was measured in a similar manner, by asking "What is the greatest extent that you have been emotionally involved with someone other than your spouse while you have been married?" (p. 1108). Participants responded based on a 5-point continuum of emotional involvement, developed by the authors, ranging from "no emotional involvement" to "extremely deep emotional involvement." Glass and Wright's research has been one of the only attempts to measure infidelity on a continuum while also taking into account its emotional and physical nature simultaneously. This was important given that findings included evidence that men's extramarital affairs were more sexual in nature, and women's were more emotional in nature. Furthermore, marital dissatisfaction was related to emotional and sexual infidelity for both men and women, though women involved in infidelity were more likely to be dissatisfied than men involved in unfaithful behavior.

Similarly, Banfield and McCabe (2001) requested that participants list behaviors they believed constituted emotional and physical involvement outside their primary relationship. These responses were then analyzed by the researchers, who reported that

“Emotional involvement ranged from casual friendship to deep love relationship, and sexual involvement ranged from kissing to intercourse” (p. 125). Participants were then asked to indicate whether they had engaged in five levels of each of the emotional and physical extrarelationship involvements. Unfortunately, the authors do not state every level of these involvements. Another weakness of this study was that participants did not rate each level of involvement on a continuum.

When emotional infidelity and sexual infidelity are examined together, findings indicate similarities and differences in their predictors of consequences. For example, Drigotas et al. (1999) found that commitment longitudinally predicted both types of infidelity, with no differences between men and women. Shackelford and Buss (1997) used factor analysis to analyze several cues, or suggestions, that a partner may be engaging in unfaithful behavior. They found that participants differentially rated diagnostic cues of sexual and emotional infidelity. The following were more diagnostic of sexual infidelity: disinterest in sexual exclusivity, changes in routine of sexual behavior with primary partner, exaggerated increased sexual interest, and sexual boredom with partner. The following were more diagnostic of emotional infidelity: relationship dissatisfaction, emotional disengagement, inconsiderateness or criticalness toward primary partner, reluctance to spend time with partner, not wanting to discuss a “certain other,” and acting guilty. Apathy toward primary partner and increased reference to another person were equally diagnostic of sexual and emotional infidelity. Similarly, Barta and Kiene (2005) examined predictors of emotional versus sexual motives for participation in infidelity. Of note, they found that an unrestricted sociosexual orientation

(similar to a permissive sexual attitude) was more predictive of sexual versus emotional motives for participation in infidelity.

Other researchers realized that a variety of behaviors may be considered unfaithful. The following studies have identified behaviors, independent of emotional and physical infidelity, that are considered unfaithful. Roscoe, Cavanaugh, and Kennedy (1988) examined adolescents' ideas about what behaviors constitute infidelity in dating relationships. One behavior that was consistently listed, "dating/spending time with someone else" (p. 38), has not typically been measured as part of emotional or physical infidelity. However, 59.6 percent of participants listed this as an unfaithful behavior.

Similarly, Weis and Slosnerick (1981) measured attitudes toward nonmarital extrarelationship behaviors. Participants were asked to rate, on a 5-point Likert scale, how acceptable it was to engage in each of several behaviors with another person if their significant other was out of town. Lower numbers represented less acceptability. Mean acceptability ratings for "dancing to stereo" and spending a "few days at a secluded cabin" (p. 352) were 2.58 and 1.71, respectively. The authors noted that it seemed to be the increasing secrecy of the listed behaviors that caused them to be seen as unacceptable.

Yarab and Allgeier (1998) were able to show that, on average, both men and women rated having sexual fantasies about a partner's best friend, both while having sexual relations with that partner and while masturbating, as being unfaithful. In another study, Yarab, Sensibaugh, Allgeier, and Rice (1998) asked participants to list behaviors they considered unfaithful. Participants not only listed behaviors traditionally thought of as constituting physical and emotional infidelity, such as engaging in sexual intercourse

and having a “deep romantic attachment” (p. 51), but also listed fantasies about, attraction to, flirting with, dating, and dancing with someone other than a primary partner as unfaithful behaviors. Drigotas and Barta (2001) noted that women in particular are more likely to identify these types of activities as indicative of unfaithful behavior. Interestingly, however, men's perception of their partners' interest in other men is more predictive of physical aggression and controlling behaviors toward their partners than is their partners' actual interest other men (Cousins & Gangestad, 2007).

Infidelity Scale Examples

In addition to the examples provided in the introduction, the following studies have developed some type of scale related to infidelity, primarily with the goal of measuring several components of extradyadic involvement. Boekhout, Hendrick, and Hendrick (2003) developed a measure to examine college students' beliefs, expectations, communication, and consequences of being in exclusive relationships. Allen and Baucom (2004) developed a questionnaire to measure reasons for involvement in and specific characteristics of the extradyadic relationship, characteristics of the onset of the extradyadic relationship, attitudes toward the extradyadic relationship, and features of the primary relationship before the extradyadic involvement. Of particular interest to the current research, they identified five types of extradyadic relationships: casual (a "fun" relationship with no emotional investment), close (a loving relationship), obsessive (needy, with a high need for attention), ambivalent (a desire for closeness with fear of rejection), and contained (comfort with closeness because the relationship was limited or impermanent). Their questionnaire also asked participants to indicate how often they

engaged in many types of unfaithful behavior (for example, passionate kissing and sexual hugging). The scale was subsequently used in a study by Hall and Fincham (2009), where participants were coded as engaging in infidelity regardless of the act/s they indicated participating in and how often they occurred.

Another example of this type of research is Buss and Shackelford's (1997) study that assessed participants' perceptions of the *likelihood* that both they and their partners would engage in different types of unfaithful behaviors. These estimates were made on an 11-point scale and asked about "flirting, passionately kissing, going on a romantic date, having a one night stand, having a brief affair, and having a serious affair" (p. 199). Again, the suggestion here is that behaviors not traditionally constituting sexual or emotional infidelity can be considered unfaithful.

Further conceptualization for the scale developed in the current research program came from Allen et al. (2005), who developed a framework within which to think about the development of infidelity. This framework not only recognizes that the correlates of infidelity can be organized according to intrapersonal (both of the involved partner and their mate), interpersonal, and contextual factors, but it also recognizes that there tends to be a temporal sequence in which infidelity develops. This temporal sequence suggests that there are "predisposing," "approach," "precipitating," "maintenance," "discovery," and "response" factors to infidelity. Allen et al. discussed these temporal factors as related to intrapersonal, interpersonal, and contextual factors of the relationship. For example, in what Allen et al. termed the "approach" phase, people higher in permissiveness tend to rationalize smaller steps that lead to larger steps toward infidelity

(Brown, 1991, as cited in Allen et al.). This phase seems to correspond to the contemplation type of infidelity discussed above, as there is thinking about and engagement in preliminary steps toward engagement in traditional emotional and sexual infidelity. Also, focus on short-term consequences rather than long-term consequences tends to be a “precipitating” factor for a person to move into “approach.” This tendency may be related to certain personality constructs (e.g., low conscientiousness, exploitiveness) more important, for example, in contributing to involvement in sexual infidelity than in contributing to thoughts and behaviors that may merely lead to this involvement. As such, it is possible that this temporal sequence may be conceived of in terms of the type of infidelity occurring at each stage. Linking temporal sequences with infidelity components is an interesting possibility for future research.

In summary, previous attempts at scale construction have largely focused on components of extradyadic involvement other than engage in unfaithful behavior (for example, attitudes, beliefs, motivations, perceptions). Scales that have focused on actual engagement in infidelity have been limited to engagement in sexual and emotional infidelity, with a limited number of items and/or response choices. Based on a perceived gap in the literature, the researcher developed scale to measure infidelity with the following goals in mind.

Details of Preliminary Research

Given the preceding literature background, the goals in constructing the Infidelity Scale on which this dissertation was based were as follows: 1) to develop a *comprehensive* measure of infidelity that takes into account thoughts, behaviors, and

feelings previously assessed and suggested as components of infidelity, 2) to develop original items, 3) to build on previous research and develop a measure that is based on a *continuum* (by using the appropriate response format), and 4) thus produce a measure that can be used to better examine the predictors and correlates of different types of infidelity. It was thought that this measure could be useful not only to researchers but also to clinicians who are interested in obtaining a more comprehensive picture of infidelity, particularly if it is occurring and causing problems within client relationships.

The operational definition of infidelity for these studies was “behaviors, thoughts, and feelings that constitute an actual, or suggest a potential, betrayal of exclusivity within a serious romantic relationship.” This definition was derived by reviewing the literature to examine what previous authors have defined as infidelity, speaking with colleagues and laypersons about their definitions of infidelity, and then attempting to integrate this information into a working definition for the current research.

Item generation and pilot study. Scale items were initially generated using the items from previous literature. In addition, the researcher obtained permission from the instructor of an undergraduate upper-level psychology course to ask students to list “behaviors, thoughts, and feelings other than what one might typically expect would constitute infidelity.” Items generated by the students that were not redundant with those suggested by previous literature were added to the scale.

This initial list of items was then e-mailed to research lab members for review, after which they formed a focus group for the purposes of adding, deleting, and refining scale items. The list was re-sent to lab members for a second review, and a question arose

about the way items should be worded. An acceptable solution could not be agreed upon, and it was finally determined that a pilot study should be conducted to determine whether the wording of items made a difference in participants' responses to the questionnaire. Another purpose of this pilot study was to determine the level at which participants agreed that the items actually constitute acts of infidelity. In this way, content validity could further be established. Therefore, although the initial studies (Logue, 2009; Logue, Hendrick, & Hendrick, 2010) asked participants how often they had engaged in the behaviors detailed by the items, the pilot study asked participants how much they believed items constitute acts of infidelity. It was reasoned that if there was a difference in whether the participants perceived the items as constituting acts of infidelity, based on the items' wording, there would also be differences in how participants responded to the items in the actual study.

Participants for this pilot study consisted of 100 undergraduate students, recruited from a large Southwestern university. Half of the participants were given the scale items worded one way, and half the participants were given the scale items worded differently. See Appendices B and C for copies of these questionnaires. Instructions to participants asked them to "please rate how much you agree that each of the following acts, if performed by someone in a serious romantic relationship, would constitute an act of being unfaithful to their partner." Response choices were on a Likert scale, ranging from "strongly disagree" (1) to "strongly agree" (5), such that higher scores reflected more agreement that items constituted acts of infidelity.

T-tests (a Bonferroni correction controlled for family-wise error) determined that there were no differences in how participants answered the two questionnaires. It was therefore decided to use the more detailed questionnaire, as this might be a more conservative approach. Mean ratings for how much each item constituted an act of infidelity were examined for both versions of the questionnaire separately and together. Based on these ratings, five items were deleted.

Studies 1 and 2.

Participants and Procedure. In ***Study 1***, participants (N=481) were undergraduate students, recruited from a large Southwestern university. By gender, 29% were men, and 71% were women. For ethnicity, 3% of the sample were Asian or Pacific Islander, 7% were African-American or Black, 20% were Hispanic or Latino, 55% were European-American or Anglo, and 14% identified their ethnicity as “other.” The age distribution of the sample was as follows: 19 or younger (76%), 20 to 22 (18%), with the remainder 23 or older. Some 52% of participants were in a current relationship, and 48% were not. (Due to rounding, totals may not always equal exactly 100%.)

In ***Study 2***, participants (N=525) were recruited in the same way as ***Study 1***. For gender, 30% were men, and 70% were women. Ethnicity was as follows: Asian or Pacific Islander (4%), African-American or Black (5%), Hispanic or Latino (24%), European-American or Anglo (51%), and “other” (16%). The age distribution of the sample included: 19 or younger (79.0%), 20 to 22 (18%), with the remainder 23 or over. For current relationship status, 52% were in a relationship, and 48% were not.

Measures. Participants completed a demographic questionnaire, relationship history questionnaire, the Love Attitudes Scale: Short Form (C. Hendrick, Hendrick, & Dicke, 1998), the Brief Sexual Attitudes Scale (C. Hendrick, Hendrick, & Reich, 2006), the Respect Toward Partner Scale (S. Hendrick & Hendrick, 2006), the Relationship Assessment Scale (S. Hendrick, 1988), Commitment items adapted from Lund (1985), the initial Infidelity Scale, and the Deception Scale (Definis, 2007). It is noted that the following measures were only used for *Studies 1 and 2* and not for the current research: Love Attitudes Scale: Short Form, Respect Toward Partner Scale, and Deception Scale. Specific instructions for the Infidelity Scale used in *Studies 1 and 2* asked participants to “answer in terms of a current serious romantic relationship and anyone else you may have been attracted to while in this relationship. If you are not currently in a relationship, please answer with your most recent relationship in mind. If you have never had a romantic relationship, please answer in terms of how you think you might answer with a future partner.” Participants were then told to, “Please rate how often each of the following has occurred with anyone you may have been attracted to, other than your primary partner.” Specific instructions for other measures were similarly formatted, although specific wording of each set of instructions coincided with the content of each measure.

Hypotheses and Results. The primary hypothesis of the first study was that the factor structure of the Infidelity Scale would be multidimensional. Other hypotheses involved correlations with other relationship measures, for construct validation. It was also hypothesized that men would endorse engaging in infidelity more than would

women. The factor structure of the initial Infidelity Scale is shown in Table 1. The correlations and mean differences for men and women are in Tables 2 and 3, respectively. The hypotheses of the second study were that the factor structure of and relationships found in the initial study would be confirmed. These findings are displayed in Tables 4 and 5, respectively. (Tables may be found on pages 46-90 of this document.) Thus:

H1: It is hypothesized that the factor structure of the Infidelity Scale will be multidimensional and that this structure will be confirmed with an independent sample.

These hypotheses were tested using Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA) and Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA). In **Study 1**, principal axis extraction with promax rotation yielded a five factor solution of 37 items: Contemplation (12 items), Deviant Involvement (8 items), Sexual Infidelity (9 items), Physical Flirtation (6 items), and Emotional Infidelity (3 items). One item, “I have passionately kissed someone other than my primary partner,” loaded on two scales, Sexual Infidelity and Physical Flirtation. **Study 2** largely confirmed this factor structure, with “I have passionately kissed someone other than my primary partner,” loading on Sexual Infidelity and Physical Flirtation; however, two items were deleted during analysis due to failure to contribute adequately to the model, yielding the following solution: Contemplation (11 items; $\alpha = .94$), Deviant Involvement (7 items; $\alpha = .87$), Sexual Infidelity (9 items; $\alpha = .96$), Physical Flirtation (6 items; $\alpha = .91$), and Emotional Infidelity (3 items; $\alpha = .79$). The value statistics for this solution are as follows: CFI = .883 and RMSEA = .038 (CI = .034, .042). It should also be mentioned that an alternate two-factor structure was tested, yielding a less optimal solution than the five-factor structure.

H2: Infidelity will be positively related to game-playing love and negatively related to passionate, friendship, and altruistic love. In **Study 1**, Pearson product moment correlation coefficients revealed moderate positive correlations between the infidelity subscales and game-playing love and low negative correlations between passionate love and the infidelity subscales. However, there was no relationship between the infidelity subscales and friendship love. There was also no relationship between most of the infidelity subscales and altruistic love, except for one low negative correlation between Contemplation and altruistic love. Unexpected low positive correlations between possessive, dependent love (Mania) and the infidelity subscales were found. Therefore, this hypothesis was partially supported. **Study 2** largely confirmed these relationships, though low negative relationships were found between infidelity and friendship love.

H3: Infidelity will be negatively related to communion sexuality and positively related to permissive and instrumental sexuality. This hypothesis was also partially supported. Indeed, correlation coefficients revealed moderate positive correlations between the infidelity subscales and permissiveness, and there were low positive correlations between the infidelity subscales and instrumentality. However, there was no relationship between the infidelity subscales and communion. This pattern of relationships was confirmed in **Study 2**.

H4: Infidelity will be negatively related to respect toward partner. This hypothesis was supported, with moderate negative correlations between all infidelity subscales and respect toward partner. This pattern was confirmed in **Study 2**.

H5: Infidelity will be negatively related to relationship satisfaction. This hypothesis was supported, with moderate negative correlations between all infidelity subscales and relationship satisfaction. This patterns was confirmed in **Study 2**.

H6: Infidelity will be negatively related to relationship commitment. This hypothesis was supported, with moderate negative correlations between all infidelity subscales and relationship commitment. **Study 2** confirmed these relationships.

H7: Infidelity will be positively related to deception within romantic relationships. Indeed, these relationships were all positive. Low to rather strong correlations were found between all infidelity subscales and deception proneness, consequences, and guilt. **Study 2** confirmed these relationships.

Hypothesis 8: Men will endorse engaging in more infidelity than women. Males and females were compared on the Infidelity subscales using t-tests. Men endorsed all subscales more than women. Therefore, Hypothesis 8 was supported. **Study 2** confirmed this finding.

In summary, these studies provided a preliminary factor structure for the Infidelity Scale with evidence of construct validity provided by showing that the subscales correlated in predicted ways with existing relationship measures.

Current Research Background - Variables under Consideration

As mentioned previously, research has provided evidence for relationships among infidelity and several individual (personality) and relationship (for example, general relationship and sexual satisfaction) variables. Additionally, deficits in cognitive functioning, namely executive functioning, have been implicated in hypersexual behavior

and may thus be implicated in participation infidelity. A review of the variables examined in conjunction with infidelity in the current study is provided below.

Individual general variables. Studies have consistently made it clear that “personality dispositions are crucial determinants of sexual behavior” (Byrne & Schulte, 1990, p. 109). Furthermore, Buunk and Dijkstra (2000) asserted that individual personality problems are among the primary reasons people are unfaithful. Though many personality variables have been examined in conjunction with sexual behavior and specifically with infidelity, the following consistently emerge as important in predicting infidelity.

Studies regularly demonstrate four Big-Five factors as prominent in predicting infidelity: extraversion, conscientiousness, agreeableness, and neuroticism (e.g., Barta & Kiene, 2005; Orzeck & Lung, 2005; Schmitt, 2004; Whisman, Gordon, & Chatav, 2007). Barta and Kiene’s research examined relationships between Big-Five factors and self-chosen adjectives indicative of extradyadic involvement. They found that in North America, lower agreeableness and conscientiousness were related to greater numbers of self-chosen adjectives that identified one as being unfaithful to her or his partner. Additionally, for men, less openness and more extraversion were related to a greater number of chosen adjectives. The authors concluded that, universally, agreeableness and conscientiousness are negatively related to infidelity. People higher in neuroticism may tend to feel more neglected by their partners, and people higher in extraversion are estimated as more likely to be dissatisfied with their primary relationship; both

personality factors may therefore influence persons to be more likely to engage in emotional and sexual infidelity, respectively (Barta & Kiene, 2005).

Schmitt (2004) measured infidelity by asking participants if, in a relationship in which they had agreed not to become involved with someone else, they did anyway, either sexually or emotionally. This study found that people who were unfaithful were more likely to be neurotic and less likely to be agreeable and conscientious than people who did not have a history of being unfaithful. Furthermore, for females, extraversion accounted for a large part of the variance in dissatisfaction as a motive for infidelity. Neuroticism predicted neglect as a motive for males and females.

Orzeck and Lung (2005) found that cheaters tended to be more extraverted, open (in contrast to Schmitt's [2004] finding for United States males), and less conscientious than non-cheaters. Cheating in this study was defined solely in terms of sexual infidelity, which consisted only of having sexual intercourse with someone other than one's primary partner. Whisman et al. (2007) also examined sexual infidelity's relationship to neuroticism. They found that neuroticism predicted sexual infidelity even after controlling for relationship dissatisfaction.

In summary, the research just discussed found that emotional infidelity and sexual infidelity are predicted by lower conscientiousness, higher extraversion, lower agreeableness, and higher neuroticism. Other studies have consistently shown that narcissism is related to engagement in infidelity (e.g., Atkins et al., 2005; Aviram & Amichi-Hamburger, 2005; Lusteran, 1997). Aviram and Amichi-Hamburger found that the specific manipulation and exhibitionism components of narcissism contributed to

higher expectations for internet-based unfaithful relationships. This finding was discussed in terms of the manipulator's need to have interpersonal fantasies fulfilled. The internet seems to offer an ideal arena for people more prone to manipulation because it provides the ability to create themselves as they wish to be seen, thereby increasing the likelihood of another's acquiescence to fulfilling their fantasy. Similarly, the internet provides an ideal ground for people prone to exhibitionism, i.e., the desire for attention and need to overcome feelings of inadequacy. The authors mentioned that internet communication fosters hyperintimacy via increased self-disclosure, sexualization, and "verbal exhibitionism." Incidentally, given that internet use has become ubiquitous, internet infidelity is likely to continue and perhaps worsen. A survey conducted by Wysocki and Childers (2011) found that younger cohorts were more likely than older cohorts to engage in unfaithful behavior using the internet.

Related to the prediction of infidelity by narcissism, Lusterman wrote of repetitive infidelity and "Don Juanism," or strong pursuit behavior of females by males. Entitlement, another aspect of narcissism, tends to be present in this phenomenon because these men tend to feel more entitled, and when their expectations at home are not met, they are more prone to involvement in extradyadic relationships.

Furthermore, researchers have indicated that the exhibitionism and exploitiveness aspects of narcissism tend to be among the most problematic for relationships, especially for their sexual facets (Apt & Hurlbert, 1994; Hurlbert, Apt, & White, 1992). Apt and Hurlbert found that women with Histrionic Personality Disorder were more likely to enter into an affair than people without this illness. This was explained partly in terms of such

women's tendency to be exploitive and exhibitionistic, similar to those with Narcissistic Personality Disorder. Akin to this, women with Borderline Personality Disorder tend to be more exploitive in sexual relationships, as do sexual narcissists (Hurlbert et al., 1992).

These variables, i.e., conscientiousness, extraversion, agreeableness, neuroticism, and narcissism, were therefore examined as general individual predictors in the current study.

Individual sexual variables. Variables related to individuals' sexuality have also emerged as important in predicting risky and deviant sexual behavior, including extradyadic involvement. The most relevant individual sexual variables in the prediction of infidelity appear to be erotophilia, permissive and instrumental sexual attitudes, sexual narcissism, and sexual sensation seeking.

People who are more erotophilic tend to engage in more sexual fantasy behavior and have greater responses to erotic imagery than do people less erotophilic (Fisher, Byrne, White, & Kelly, 1988). They also tend to be more permissive. Furthermore, Hicks and Leitenberg (2001) found a relationship between extradyadic fantasy and extradyadic involvement such that people who had more fantasies about being involved with someone other than their primary partner were likely to act on those fantasies. Contradictory to these findings, people with Histrionic Personality Disorder tend to be more erotophobic, yet engage in extramarital affairs more than people who are not histrionic (Apt & Hurlbert, 1994). However, these authors suggested that aspects of this personality such as exhibitionism and manipulation, as mentioned above, may override erotophobia in contributing to unfaithful behavior. Another interesting finding regarding erotophilia is

its relationship to control. Lewis, Neighbors, and Malheim (2006) found that there was a stronger link to erotophilia and risky sex among people who had a more controlled orientation.

Similarly, studies have found positive relationships between permissive and instrumental sexual attitudes and sexual infidelity (e.g., Logue, 2009; Logue, Hendrick, & Hendrick, 2010; Treas & Geisen, 2000). It makes sense that permissiveness and instrumentality (often thought of as a utilitarian attitude to sex) are related to sexual infidelity, all of which can be thought of as self-oriented variables (see C. Hendrick et al., 2006). Furthermore, these relationships are stronger than relationships between sexual infidelity and general relationship variables such as commitment and relationship satisfaction. Relatedly, Schmitt (2004) found that sociosexual orientation (similar to a permissive sexual attitude) predicted and accounted for a large proportion of variance in sex as a motive for relationship infidelity.

Related to C. Hendrick et al.'s (2006) conceptualization of self-oriented variables being likely to correlate with each other, sexual narcissists engage in egocentric patterns of sexual interaction (Hurlbert et al., 1994). Indeed, people who score higher on the entitlement subscale of sexual narcissism, viewing sex as a right, tend to be more preoccupied with sex, and place higher importance on sexual involvement than do people who score lower on this construct. Lusterman (1997) indicated that sexual narcissism was actually more important than general narcissism in predicting extradyadic sexual involvement. However, he was referring to men in particular.

General sensation seeking has been studied for several years. More recently, researchers have identified sexual sensation seeking as a more specific construct measuring a similar underlying proclivity. Just as sensation seekers tend to prefer more generally stimulating experiences (Newcomb & McGee, 1991), sexual sensation seekers tend to prefer sexual experiences that are more arousing and stimulating. There is also evidence that sexual sensation seeking is strongly correlated with deviant or dangerous sexual behaviors (e.g., number of sexual partners) (Kalichman & Rompa, 1995), similar to sensation seekers who are more likely to engage in risky behavior than non-sensation seekers (Horvath & Zuckerman, 1990). As such, sexual sensation seeking is likely correlated with infidelity, particularly the typical sexual and deviant types.

Relationship general variables. It is generally accepted that some combination of individual and relationship variables contributes to multiple types of infidelity (Sprey, 1972). Much research has been conducted on the assumption that infidelity occurs due to primary relationship problems (Glass & Wright, 1992). Even Lusterman (1997) noted that most men experience infidelity as a solution to problems in the primary relationship. Among the most cited relationship variables contributing to engagement in infidelity are communication, satisfaction, and commitment.

Self-disclosure is one of the most central aspects of relationship communication (S. Hendrick, 2004). Disclosure of personal information is an intimacy-increasing behavior that can have negative consequences for relationships if withheld (Jourard, 1964, as cited in S. Hendrick, 2004). Intimate self-disclosure communicates trust and a willingness to be trusted in by another. It also communicates that “we are friends”

(Dindia, 1997, as cited in S. Hendrick, 2004). It may be that low levels of communication lead to low satisfaction, which in turn leads to less relationship commitment. All of these variables are components of relationship quality, a multiconstruct variable that has been shown to be negatively related to infidelity (Previti & Amato, 2004). Communication, satisfaction, and commitment are particularly important to the health of a relationship (S. Hendrick, 2004).

Poor communication can be seen as a relationship stressor. Couples who show more problematic communication patterns before marriage, characterized by low levels of positive interaction and high levels of negative interaction, are more likely to experience marital infidelity (Allen et al., 2008). Allen and Rhoades (2008) found that dissatisfaction with intimacy in the primary relationship was related to emotional involvement in an affair. Daines (2006) cited communication as a crucial relationship component to improve when clinically working with couples who have experienced an infidelity in their relationship. Lack of communication among partners has also been linked to internet infidelity (Aviram & Amichi-Hamburger, 2005; Gonyea, 2004), perhaps partly because of its importance for the sexual aspects of a relationship (Russell, 1990). On-line affairs tend to be more sexual sooner, and Aviram and Amichi-Hamburger found that people who disclose less in their primary relationship tend to have higher expectations of on-line relationships.

Satisfaction also predicts the inclination to engage in infidelity (McAlister, Pachana, & Jackson, 2005), as well as actual infidelity (Atkins et al., 2001; Banfield & McCabe, 2001; Drigotas et al. 1999; Glass & Wright, 1985). Dissatisfaction is especially

predictive of emotional infidelity for women (Banfield & McCabe, 2001; Glass & Wright, 1985). However, Glass and Wright noted that dissatisfaction was predictive of emotional and sexual infidelity for both men and women. Although Hall and Fincham (2009) failed to find that relationship satisfaction predicts infidelity over time, one reason for this may be due to the problematic way in which they operationalized infidelity as a unidimensional construct. It also seems that general relationship satisfaction does not necessarily influence expectations for on-line relationships (Aviram & Amichi-Hamburger, 2005). Therefore, these authors hypothesized that there may be different bases for traditional sexual infidelity and on-line infidelity.

Commitment, “psychological attachment to and motivation to continue in a relationship,” (Drigotas & Barta, 2001, p. 178) consists of satisfaction, perceived quality of alternative relationships, and relationship investment. Numerous studies have found that commitment is negatively related to relationship infidelity (e.g., Banfield & McCabe, 2001; Drigotas et al. 1999; Drigotas & Barta, 2001; Logue, 2009; Logue et al., 2010). Oikle (2003) conducted a longitudinal study finding that between time 1 and time 2, low commitment was indeed one predictor of infidelity. Within the investment model, satisfaction tends to increase commitment, and people who are more committed are less likely to be unfaithful because they denigrate alternatives (Drigotas et al., 1999). Buunk (1995) obtained similar findings.

Also within the context of the investment model, DeWall et al. (2011) found that people with an avoidant attachment style had more permissive attitudes about infidelity, paid more attention to alternatives to their primary partner and perceived them more

positively, and were more interested in meeting these alternatives. They also engaged in more sexual and emotional infidelity, which was mediated by commitment. The authors' theory was that people with an avoidant attachment style are less committed to their primary partners and thus more likely to be attracted to and actually engage in unfaithful behavior.

Relationship sexual variables. Similar to the communication-satisfaction link discussed above, greater sexual communication also leads to greater sexual satisfaction (Herold & Way, 1988; MacNeil & Byers, 1997). MacNeil and Byers found that for both men and women, when they experienced more sexual problems in their relationship, sexual satisfaction decreased. The authors found that it was particularly important to resolution of these sexual problems and to increasing sexual satisfaction for couples to communicate sexual likes and dislikes. Furthermore, it has also been demonstrated that sexual dissatisfaction predicts infidelity, especially for men (e.g., Gonyea, 2004). Another predictor of sexual satisfaction is general relationship satisfaction (Byers, Demmons, & Lawrance, 1998; Lawrance & Byers, 1995; MacNeil & Byers, 2009). Relatedly, sexual communication satisfaction is one way of marking the developmental level of relationships. That is, people who are more satisfied with the sexual communication of their relationship are likely to be in a later and more intimate and committed stage of relationship development (Wheeless, Wheeless, & Baus, 1984).

Sexual compatibility influences both sexual communication and sexual satisfaction for men and women (Offman and Matheson, 2005). Women may use sexual compatibility as an indicator of the level of intimacy in their relationship. Furthermore,

Witting et al. (2006) found that women who perceived less sexual compatibility in their relationships were more likely to be more distressed and experience more sexual dysfunction. Apt, Hurlbert, Sarmiento, and Hurlbert (1996) demonstrated that sexual compatibility affected sexual desire among partners. Because of this construct's demonstrated relationship to sexual communication, sexual satisfaction, and general sexual functioning and desire within a particular relationship, sexual compatibility may also affect engagement in infidelity. Thus, the current research examined individual general variables, individual sexual variables, relationship general variables, and relationship sexual variables as predictors of various types or aspects of infidelity.

Appendix B

Pilot Version 1

WHILE IN A SERIOUS RELATIONSHIP...

1. I have held hands with someone I'm attracted to, other than my romantic partner.

Is this infidelity?

2. I have cuddled with someone I'm attracted to, other than my romantic partner.

Is this infidelity?

3. I have touched someone I'm attracted to, other than my romantic partner, on places like their lower back, neck, cheek, or thigh.

Is this infidelity?

4. I have massaged someone I'm attracted to, other than my romantic partner.

Is this infidelity?

5. I have rubbed sunscreen on someone I'm attracted to, other than my romantic partner.

Is this infidelity?

6. I have played with or brushed the hair of someone I'm attracted to, other than my romantic partner.

Is this infidelity?

7. I have passionately kissed someone other than my romantic partner.

Is this infidelity?

8. I have "made out" with someone other than my romantic partner.

Is this infidelity?

9. I have seen someone I'm attracted to, other than my romantic partner, naked.

Is this infidelity?

10. I have been naked around someone I'm attracted to, other than my romantic partner.

Is this infidelity?

11. I have fondled the genitals or other erogenous zones of someone I'm attracted to, other than my romantic partner, outside the person's clothing.

Is this infidelity?

12. I have had my genitals or other erogenous zones fondled by someone I'm attracted to, other than my romantic partner, outside my clothing.

Is this infidelity?

13. I have stimulated the genitals or other erogenous zones of someone I'm attracted to, other than my romantic partner, under the person's clothing.

Is this infidelity?

14. I have had my genitals or other erogenous zones stimulated by someone I'm attracted to, other than my romantic partner, under my clothing.

Is this infidelity?

15. I have engaged in mutual masturbation with someone I'm attracted to, other than my romantic partner.

Is this infidelity?

16. I have given oral sex to someone I'm attracted to, other than my romantic partner.

Is this infidelity?

17. I have received oral sex from someone I'm attracted to, other than my romantic

partner.

Is this infidelity?

18. I have had sexual intercourse with someone I'm attracted to, other than my romantic partner.

Is this infidelity?

19. I have had anal intercourse with someone I'm attracted to, other than my romantic partner.

Is this infidelity?

20. I have told someone I'm attracted to, other than my romantic partner, things I only tell close friends.

Is this infidelity?

21. I have told someone I'm attracted to, other than my romantic partner, things I would usually only tell my romantic partner.

Is this infidelity?

22. I have told someone I'm attracted to, other than my romantic partner, things I have never told anyone else.

Is this infidelity?

23. I have continued to be involved with someone I'm attracted to, other than my romantic partner, even though I knew I could potentially love that person.

Is this infidelity?

24. I have felt like I was "falling" in love with someone I'm attracted to, other than my romantic partner.

Is this infidelity?

25. I have been in love with someone I'm attracted to, other than my romantic partner.

Is this infidelity?

26. I have been attracted to someone other than my romantic partner.

Is this infidelity?

27. I have been aroused by someone I'm attracted to, other than my romantic partner.

Is this infidelity?

28. I have thought about how much I would like to date someone I'm attracted to, other than my romantic partner.

Is this infidelity?

29. I have thought about how much I would like to date other people in general.

Is this infidelity?

30. I have desired emotional intimacy with someone I'm attracted to, other than my romantic partner.

Is this infidelity?

31. I have desired emotional intimacy with other potential romantic partners in general.

Is this infidelity?

32. I have desired physical intimacy with someone I'm attracted to, other than my romantic partner.

Is this infidelity?

33. I have desired physical intimacy with other people in general.

Is this infidelity?

34. Aside from someone famous, I have daydreamed or fantasized about someone I'm attracted to, other than my romantic partner.

Is this infidelity?

35. I have masturbated while fantasizing about someone I'm attracted to, other than my romantic partner.

Is this infidelity?

36. I have fantasized about someone I'm attracted to, other than my romantic partner, while engaging in sexual relations with my romantic partner.

Is this infidelity?

37. I have viewed pornography alone.

Is this infidelity?

38. I have viewed pornography with someone I'm attracted to, other than my romantic partner.

Is this infidelity?

39. I have masturbated while viewing pornography.

Is this infidelity?

40. I have gone to strip clubs or bars for the purpose of fantasizing only.

Is this infidelity?

41. I have had phone sex with someone other than my romantic partner.

Is this infidelity?

42. I have had cyber sex with someone other than my romantic partner.

Is this infidelity?

43. I have solicited or engaged in prostitution.

Is this infidelity?

44. I have consciously made an effort to attract someone other than my romantic partner.

Is this infidelity?

45. I have “checked out” someone other than my romantic partner.

Is this infidelity?

46. I have casually flirted with someone I’m attracted to, other than my romantic partner.

Is this infidelity?

47. I have flirted with someone, other than my romantic partner, in order to try to date or have sex with that person.

Is this infidelity?

48. In a public place, I have groped or spanked someone other than my romantic partner.

Is this infidelity?

49. I have danced provocatively with someone I’m attracted to, other than my romantic partner.

Is this infidelity?

50. I have talked about sexual preferences with someone I’m attracted to, other than my romantic partner.

Is this infidelity?

51. I have called someone I’m attracted to, other than my romantic partner, “just to talk.”

Is this infidelity?

52. I have pretended to be single while still in a relationship with my romantic partner.

Is this infidelity?

53. I have promised someone I'm attracted to that I would break up with my romantic partner, knowing I wouldn't do it.

Is this infidelity?

54. I have promised someone I'm attracted to that I would break up with my romantic partner, intending to do it.

Is this infidelity?

55. I have bought gifts for someone I'm attracted to, other than my romantic partner.

Is this infidelity?

56. I have written "love letters" to someone I'm attracted to, other than my romantic partner.

Is this infidelity?

57. I have "hung out" with someone I'm attracted to, other than my romantic partner.

Is this infidelity?

58. I have asked someone I'm attracted to, other than my romantic partner, on a date.

Is this infidelity?

59. I have gone on a casual date with someone I'm attracted to, other than my romantic partner.

Is this infidelity?

60. I have gone on a romantic date with someone I'm attracted to, other than my

romantic partner.

Is this infidelity?

61. I have slept in the same bed with someone I'm attracted to, other than my romantic partner, without kissing, purposely touching, or having oral, anal, or vaginal sex with that person.

Is this infidelity?

62. I have taken drugs that are thought to be "sexual" (Ecstasy, GHB, or any drug that "turns you on") with someone I'm attracted to, other than my romantic partner.

Is this infidelity?

63. I have gone to strip clubs or bars specifically to try and "pick someone up."

Is this infidelity?

64. I have engaged in activities that allowed me to see someone I'm attracted to, other than my romantic partner, naked (e.g., skinny dipping, strip poker).

Is this infidelity?

65. I have engaged in activities that allow others of mixed company to see me naked (e.g., skinny dipping, strip poker) when my romantic partner is not present.

Is this infidelity?

Appendix C

Pilot Version 2

WHILE IN A SERIOUS RELATIONSHIP...

1. I have held hands with someone else.

Is this infidelity?

2. I have cuddled with someone else.

Is this infidelity?

3. I have touched someone else on places like their lower back, neck, cheek, or thigh.

Is this infidelity?

4. I have massaged someone else.

Is this infidelity?

5. I have rubbed sunscreen on someone else.

Is this infidelity?

6. I have played with or brushed the hair of someone else.

Is this infidelity?

7. I have passionately kissed someone else.

Is this infidelity?

8. I have “made out” with someone else.

Is this infidelity?

9. I have seen someone else naked.

Is this infidelity?

10. I have been naked around someone else.

Is this infidelity?

11. I have fondled the genitals or other erogenous zones of someone else outside the person's clothing.

Is this infidelity?

12. I have had my genitals or other erogenous zones fondled by someone else outside my clothing.

Is this infidelity?

13. I have stimulated the genitals or other erogenous zones of someone else under the person's clothing.

Is this infidelity?

14. I have had my genitals or other erogenous zones stimulated by someone else under my clothing.

Is this infidelity?

15. I have engaged in mutual masturbation with someone else.

Is this infidelity?

16. I have given oral sex to someone else.

Is this infidelity?

17. I have received oral sex from someone else.

Is this infidelity?

18. I have had sexual intercourse with someone else.

Is this infidelity?

19. I have had anal intercourse with someone else.

Is this infidelity?

20. I have told someone else things I only tell close friends.

Is this infidelity?

21. I have told someone else things I would usually only tell my romantic partner.

Is this infidelity?

22. I have told someone else things I have never told anyone else.

Is this infidelity?

23. I have continued to be involved with someone else, even though I knew I could potentially love that person.

Is this infidelity?

24. I have felt like I was “falling” in love with someone else.

Is this infidelity?

25. I have been in love with someone else.

Is this infidelity?

26. I have been attracted to someone else.

Is this infidelity?

27. I have been aroused by someone else.

Is this infidelity?

28. I have thought about how much I would like to date another specific person.

Is this infidelity?

29. I have thought about how much I would like to date other people in general.

Is this infidelity?

30. I have desired emotional intimacy with another specific person.

Is this infidelity?

31. I have desired emotional intimacy with other potential romantic partners in general.

Is this infidelity?

32. I have desired physical intimacy with another specific person.

Is this infidelity?

33. I have desired physical intimacy with other people in general.

Is this infidelity?

34. Aside from someone famous, I have daydreamed or fantasized about someone else.

Is this infidelity?

35. I have masturbated while fantasizing about someone else.

Is this infidelity?

36. I have fantasized about someone else, while engaging in sexual relations with my romantic partner.

Is this infidelity?

37. I have viewed pornography alone.

Is this infidelity?

38. I have viewed pornography with someone else.

Is this infidelity?

39. I have masturbated while viewing pornography.

Is this infidelity?

40. I have gone to strip clubs or bars for the purpose of fantasizing only.

Is this infidelity?

41. I have had phone sex with someone else.

Is this infidelity?

42. I have had cyber sex with someone else.

Is this infidelity?

43. I have solicited or engaged in prostitution.

Is this infidelity?

44. I have consciously made an effort to attract someone else.

Is this infidelity?

45. I have “checked out” someone else.

Is this infidelity?

46. I have casually flirted with someone else.

Is this infidelity?

47. I have flirted with someone else in order to try to date or have sex with that person.

Is this infidelity?

48. In a public place, I have groped or spanked someone else.

Is this infidelity?

49. I have danced provocatively with someone else.

Is this infidelity?

50. I have talked about sexual preferences with someone else.

Is this infidelity?

51. I have called someone else “just to talk.”

Is this infidelity?

52. I have pretended to be single while still in a relationship with my romantic partner.

Is this infidelity?

53. I have promised someone else I would break up with my romantic partner, knowing I wouldn't do it.

Is this infidelity?

54. I have promised someone else I would break up with my romantic partner, intending to do it.

Is this infidelity?

55. I have bought gifts for someone else.

Is this infidelity?

56. I have written “love letters” to someone else.

Is this infidelity?

57. I have “hung out” with someone else.

Is this infidelity?

58. I have asked someone else on a date.

Is this infidelity?

59. I have gone on a casual date with someone else.

Is this infidelity?

60. I have gone on a romantic date with someone else.

Is this infidelity?

61. I have slept in the same bed with someone else, without kissing, purposely touching, or having oral, anal, or vaginal sex with that person.

Is this infidelity?

62. I have taken drugs that are thought to be “sexual” (Ecstasy, GHB, or any drug that “turns you on”) with someone else.

Is this infidelity?

63. I have gone to strip clubs or bars specifically to try and “pick someone up.”

Is this infidelity?

64. I have engaged in activities that allowed me to see someone else naked (e.g., skinny dipping, strip poker).

Is this infidelity?

65. I have engaged in activities that allow others of mixed company to see me naked (e.g., skinny dipping, strip poker) when my romantic partner is not present.

Is this infidelity?

Appendix D

Background Inventory

1. I am a: (A) Male (B) Female
2. My ethnic heritage is:
 - (A) Asian or Pacific Islander
 - (B) African American (Black), not of Hispanic origin
 - (C) Mexican-American, Hispanic
 - (D) European-American (Anglo)
 - (E) Other
3. My age is:
 - (A) 19 or less (B) 20-22 (C) 23-30 (D) 31-40 (E) 41 or over
4. What is your relationship status?
 - (A) Casual dating (B) Serious dating (C) Engaged (D) Married
 - (E) Divorced
5. Are you in love now? If “yes”, how long?
 - (A) No
 - (B) yes, one month or less
 - (C) Yes, one to three months
 - (D) Yes, three months to one year
 - (E) Yes, over one year
6. If you are currently involved in a romantic relationship, is your relationship a sexual relationship?
 - (A) Not in a relationship

- (B) No, it is not sexual
- (C) Yes, it is a sexual relationship
7. How many previous romantic relationships have you had?
- (A) None (B) One (C) Two (D) Three (E) Four or more
8. How many previous sexual relationships have you been involved in?
- (A) None (B) One (C) Two (D) Three (E) Four or more
9. Is your romantic partner:
- (A) Male (B) Female (C) not in a relationship
10. What is your sexual orientation?
- (A) Gay (B) Lesbian (C) Bisexual (D) Heterosexual
11. How religious do you consider yourself to be?
- (A) Extremely religious (B) Somewhat religious (C) Not very religious (E) Not at all religious
12. How many times have you been unfaithful to a close romantic partner?
- (A) None (B) Once (C) Twice (D) 3-10 times (E) over 10 times
13. How many times has a close romantic partner been unfaithful to you?
- (A) None (B) Once (C) Twice (D) 3-10 times (E) over 10 times
14. The way I feel about myself generally is:
- (A) Very positive (B) Positive (C) Average (D) Negative (E) Very negative
15. I would describe my life right now as:
- (A) Very happy (B) Happy (C) Okay (D) Unhappy (E) Very unhappy

Appendix E

Infidelity Scale

For each item below, please answer in terms of a current serious romantic relationship and anyone else you may have been attracted to while in this relationship. “Anyone else you may have been attracted to” does not have to be the same person throughout; this person can change. If you are not currently in a relationship, please answer with your most recent relationship in mind. If you have never had a romantic relationship, please answer in terms of how you think you might answer with a future partner. Using the 5-point scale below, please rate how often each of the following has occurred with anyone you may have been attracted to, other than your primary partner.

A = Very Often

B = Often

C = Occasionally

D = Seldom

E = Not at all

1. I am answering these questions in terms of:

(A) A current, serious romantic relationship

(B) Not in a current relationship, answering about my most recent serious relationship

(C) Never been in a serious relationship

WHILE IN A SERIOUS RELATIONSHIP...

2. I have held hands with someone I’m attracted to, other than my romantic partner.

3. I have cuddled with someone I'm attracted to, other than my romantic partner.
4. I have touched someone I'm attracted to, other than my romantic partner, on places like their lower back, neck, cheek, or thigh.
5. I have massaged someone I'm attracted to, other than my romantic partner.
6. I have played with or brushed the hair of someone I'm attracted to, other than my romantic partner.
7. I have passionately kissed someone other than my romantic partner.
8. I have fondled the genitals or other erogenous zones of someone I'm attracted to, other than my romantic partner, outside the person's clothing.
9. I have had my genitals or other erogenous zones fondled by someone I'm attracted to, other than my romantic partner, outside my clothing.
10. I have stimulated the genitals or other erogenous zones of someone I'm attracted to, other than my romantic partner, under the person's clothing.
11. I have had my genitals or other erogenous zones stimulated by someone I'm attracted to, other than my romantic partner, under my clothing.
12. I have engaged in mutual masturbation with someone I'm attracted to, other than my romantic partner.
13. I have given oral sex to someone I'm attracted to, other than my romantic partner.
14. I have received oral sex from someone I'm attracted to, other than my romantic partner.
15. I have had sexual intercourse with someone I'm attracted to, other than my romantic partner.

16. I have told someone I'm attracted to, other than my romantic partner, things I have never told anyone else.

17. I have continued to be involved with someone I'm attracted to, other than my romantic partner, even though I knew I could potentially love that person.

18. I have felt like I was "falling" in love with someone I'm attracted to, other than my romantic partner.

19. I have thought about how much I would like to date someone I'm attracted to, other than my romantic partner.

20. I have thought about how much I would like to date other people in general.

21. I have desired emotional intimacy with someone I'm attracted to, other than my romantic partner.

22. I have desired emotional intimacy with other potential romantic partners in general.

23. I have desired physical intimacy with someone I'm attracted to, other than my romantic partner.

24. I have desired physical intimacy with other people in general.

25. Aside from someone famous, I have daydreamed or fantasized about someone I'm attracted to, other than my romantic partner.

26. I have viewed pornography with someone I'm attracted to, other than my romantic partner.

27. I have gone to strip clubs for the purpose of fantasizing only.

28. I have had cyber sex with someone other than my romantic partner.

29. I have solicited or engaged in prostitution.
30. I have consciously made an effort to attract someone other than my romantic partner.
31. I have “checked out” someone other than my romantic partner.
32. I have casually flirted with someone I’m attracted to, other than my romantic partner.
33. I have talked about sexual preferences with someone I’m attracted to, other than my romantic partner.
34. I have gone to bars for the purpose of fantasizing only.
35. I have taken drugs that are thought to be “sexual” (Ecstasy, GHB, or any drug that “turns you on”) with someone I’m attracted to, other than my romantic partner.
36. I have gone to strip clubs or bars specifically to try and “pick someone up.”

Appendix F

International Personality Item Pool Big-Five Items

Please answer how much you agree that each of the items below corresponds with your personality, using the following:

For each statement:

A = Strongly agree with the statement

B = Moderately agree with the statement

C = Neutral - neither agree nor disagree

D = Moderately disagree with the statement

E = Strongly disagree with the statement

1. Am the life of the party.
2. Feel comfortable around people.
3. Start conversations.
4. Talk to a lot of different people at parties.
5. Don't mind being the center of attention.
6. Don't talk a lot.
7. Keep in the background.
8. Have little to say.
9. Don't like to draw attention to myself.
10. Am quiet around strangers.
11. Am relaxed most of the time.
12. Seldom feel blue.
13. Get stressed out easily.

14. Worry about things.
15. Am easily disturbed.
16. Get upset easily.
17. Change my mood a lot.
18. Have frequent mood swings.
19. Get irritated easily.
20. Often feel blue.
21. Am always prepared.
22. Pay attention to details.
23. Get chores done right away.
24. Like order.
25. Follow a schedule.
26. Am exacting in my work.
27. Leave my belongings around.
28. Make a mess of things.
29. Often forget to put things back in their proper place.
30. Shirk my duties.
31. Am interested in people.
32. Sympathize with others' feelings.
33. Have a soft heart.
34. Take time out for others.
35. Feel others' emotions.

- 36. Make people feel at ease.
- 37. Am not really interested in others.
- 38. Insult people.
- 39. Am not interested in other people's problems.
- 40. Feel little concern for others.

Appendix G

Narcissistic Personality Inventory

Please answer how much you agree that each of the items below corresponds with your personality, using the following:

For each statement:

A = Strongly agree with the statement

B = Moderately agree with the statement

C = Neutral - neither agree nor disagree

D = Moderately disagree with the statement

E = Strongly disagree with the statement

1. Modesty doesn't become me.
2. I would do almost anything on a dare.
3. If I ruled the world it would be a much better place.
4. I can usually talk my way out of anything.
5. I like to be the center of attention.
6. I find it easy to manipulate people.
7. I insist upon getting the respect that is due me.
8. I can read people like a book.
9. I want to amount to something in the eyes of the world.
10. I am apt to show off if I get the chance.
11. Everybody likes to hear my stories.
12. I expect a great deal from other people.
13. I will never be satisfied until I get all that I deserve.

14. I have a strong will to power.
15. I like to start new fads and fashions.
16. I really like to be the center of attention.
17. I can make anybody believe anything I want them to.
18. I get upset when people don't notice how I look when I go out in public.

Appendix H

Sexual Opinion Survey

Please respond to each item as honestly as you can. There are no right or wrong answers, and your answers will be completely confidential. After each item, the following response scale appears:

I strongly agree : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : I strongly disagree

1 2 3 4 5

1. I think it would be very entertaining to look at erotica (sexually explicit books, movies, etc.).
2. Erotica (sexually explicit books, movies, etc.) is obviously filthy and people should not try to describe it as anything else.
3. Swimming in the nude with a member of the opposite sex would be an exciting experience.
4. Masturbation can be very exciting.
5. If people thought I was interested in oral sex, I would be embarrassed.
6. Engaging in group sex is an entertaining idea.
7. I personally find that thinking about engaging in sexual intercourse is arousing.
8. Seeing an erotic (sexually explicit) movie would be arousing to me.
9. Almost all erotic (sexually explicit) material is nauseating.
10. It would be emotionally upsetting to me to see someone exposing themselves publicly.
11. Watching a stripper of the opposite sex would not be very exciting.
12. I would not enjoy seeing an erotic (sexually explicit) movie.
13. The thought of engaging in unusual sex practices is highly arousing.

14. Manipulating my genitals would probably be an arousing experience.
15. I do not enjoy daydreaming about sexual matters.
16. I am not curious about explicit erotica (sexually explicit books, movies, etc.).
17. The thought of having long-term sexual relations with more than one sex partner is not disgusting to me.

Appendix I

Brief Sexual Attitudes Scale

Listed below are several statements that reflect different attitudes about sex. For each statement, click the response that indicates how much you agree or disagree with that statement. Some of the items refer to a specific sexual relationship, while others refer to general attitudes and beliefs about sex. Whenever possible, answer the questions with your current partner in mind. If you are not currently dating anyone, answer the questions with your most recent partner in mind. If you have never had a sexual relationship, answer in terms of what you think your responses would most likely be.

For each statement:

A = Strongly agree with the statement

B = Moderately agree with the statement

C = Neutral - neither agree nor disagree

D = Moderately disagree with the statement

E = Strongly disagree with the statement

1. I do not need to be committed to a person to have sex with him/her.
2. Casual sex is acceptable.
3. I would like to have sex with many partners.
4. One-night stands are sometimes very enjoyable.
5. It is okay to have ongoing sexual relationships with more than one person at a time.
6. Sex as a simple exchange of favors is okay if both people agree to it.
7. The best sex is with no strings attached.

8. Life would have fewer problems if people could have sex more freely.
9. It is possible to enjoy sex with a person and not like that person very much.
10. It is okay for sex to be just good physical release.
11. Sex is best when you let yourself go and focus on your own pleasure.
12. Sex is primarily the taking of pleasure from another person.
12. The main purpose of sex is to enjoy oneself.
14. Sex is primarily physical.
15. Sex is primarily a bodily function, like eating.

Appendix J

The Hurlbert Index of Sexual Narcissism

Please answer how much you agree that each of the items below corresponds with your personality, using the following:

For each statement:

A = I strongly agree

B = I agree

C = I am undecided

D = I disagree

E = I strongly disagree

1. In sex, I like to be the one in charge.
2. In a close relationship, sex is an entitlement.
3. Too much relationship closeness can interfere with sexual pleasure.
4. In certain situations, sexually cheating on a partner is justifiable.
5. In a close relationship, I would expect a partner to fulfill my sexual wishes.
6. In a relationship where I commit myself, sex is a right.
7. In order to have a good sexual relationship, at least one partner needs to take charge.
8. Relationships that are too close are often too demanding.
9. Emotional closeness can easily get in the way of sexual pleasure.

Appendix K

Sexual Sensation Seeking Scale

Please choose the letter for each item which best answers that item for you.

A = Very much like me

B = Somewhat like me

C = Neither like me nor unlike me

D = Somewhat unlike me

E = Not at all like me

1. I like wild “uninhibited” sexual encounters.
2. The physical sensations are the most important thing about having sex
3. I enjoy the sensation of intercourse without a condom.
4. My sexual partners probably think I am a “risk taker.”
5. When it comes to sex, physical attraction is more important to me than how well I know the person.
6. I enjoy the company of “sensual” people.
7. I enjoy watching “X-rated” videos
8. I have said things that were not exactly true to get a person to have sex with me.
9. I am interested in trying out new sexual experiences.
10. I feel like exploring my sexuality.
11. I like to have new and exciting sexual experiences and sensations.

Appendix L

Self-disclosure Index

To what extent are you willing to discuss the following with your partner? Choose one for each statement.

5 = discuss fully and completely

4 = discuss most things

3 = discuss somewhat

2 = discuss a little

1 = don't discuss at all

1. My personal habits
2. Things I have done which I feel guilty about
3. Things I wouldn't do in public
4. My deepest feelings
5. What I like and dislike about myself
6. What is important to me in life
7. What makes me the person I am
8. My worst fears
9. Things I have done which I am proud of
10. My close relationships with other people

Appendix M

Relationship Assessment Scale

Please choose the letter for each item which best answers that item for you.

1. How well does your partner meet your needs?

A	B	C	D	E
Poorly		Average		Extremely Well

2. In general, how satisfied are you with your relationship?

A	B	C	D	E
Unsatisfied		Average		Extremely Satisfied

3. How good is your relationship compared to most?

A	B	C	D	E
Poor		Average		Excellent

4. How often do you wish you hadn't gotten into this relationship?

A	B	C	D	E
Never		Average		Very Often

5. To what extent has your relationship met your original expectations?

A	B	C	D	E
Hardly at all		Average		Completely

6. How much do you love your partner?

A	B	C	D	E
Not much		Average		Very Much

7. How many problems are there in your relationship?

A	B	C	D	E
Very few		Average		Very many

Appendix N
Commitment

Please choose the letter for each item which best answers that item for you.

1. How likely is it that your current relationship will be permanent?

A	B	C	D	E
Very Unlikely		Uncertain		Very likely

2. How likely is it that you and your current partner will be together six months from now?

A	B	C	D	E
Very Unlikely		Uncertain		Very likely

3. In your opinion, how committed is your partner to this relationship?

A	B	C	D	E
Not Much		Average		Very Committed

4. How committed are you to this relationship?

A	B	C	D	E
Not Much		Average		Very Committed

Appendix O

Sexual Communication

Please choose the letter for each item which best answers that item for you.

A = Strongly Agree

B = Agree

C = Neither Agree nor Disagree

D = Disagree

E = Strongly Disagree

1. I have indicated to my partner how I like to be kissed.
2. I have indicated to my partner how I like to be sexually touched.
3. I have indicated to my partner my likes related to receiving oral sex.
4. I have indicated to my partner my likes related to sexual intercourse.
5. I have indicated to my partner my likes related to giving oral sex.
6. I have indicated to my partner my likes related to sexual variety.
7. I have indicated to my partner how I dislike being kissed.
8. I have indicated to my partner my dislikes related to sexual touching.
9. I have indicated to my partner my dislikes related to receiving oral sex.
10. I have indicated to my partner my dislikes related to sexual intercourse.
11. I have indicated to my partner my dislikes related to giving oral sex.
12. I have indicated to my partner my dislikes related to sexual variety.

Appendix Q

Hurlbert Index of Sexual Compatibility

Please choose the letter for each item which best answers that item for you.

A = All of the time

B = Most of the time

C = Some of the time

D = Rarely

E = Never

1. My sexual beliefs are similar to those of my partner.
2. I think my partner understands me sexually.
3. My partner and I share the same sexual likes and dislikes
4. I think my partner desires too much sex.
5. My partner is unwilling to do certain sexual things for me that I would like to experience.
6. I feel comfortable during sex with my partner
7. I am sexually attracted to my partner.
8. My partner sexually pleases me.
9. My partner and I argue about the sexual aspects of our relationship.
10. My partner and I share the same level of interest in sex.
11. I feel uncomfortable engaging in some of the sexual activities that my partner desires.
12. When it comes to sex, my ideas and values are different from those of my partner.
13. I do Not think my partner meets my sexual needs.
14. My partner and I enjoy the same sexual activities.
15. When it comes to sex, my partner and I get along well.

16. I think my partner is sexually attracted to me.
17. My partner enjoys doing certain things that I dislike.
18. It is hard for me to accept my partner's view on sex.
19. In our relationship, my partner places too much importance on sex.
20. My partner and I disagree over the frequency in which we should have sex.
21. I have the same sexual values as my partner.
22. My partner and I share similar sexual fantasies.
23. When it comes to sex, my partner is willing to do certain things that I would like to experience.
24. I think I can sexually satisfy my partner.
25. My partner and I share about the same level of sexual desire.

Appendix R

Instructions for the Controlled Oral Word Association Test FAS

You will be given a letter of the alphabet, displayed at the top of each page. You are to type as many words that begin with that letter as quickly as you can. Please separate the words with a comma, and do not be concerned with correct spelling. For instance, if the letter is “B”, you might type “bad, battle, bed...” Do not use words which are proper names such as ‘Boston, Bob, or Buick.’ Also, do not use the same word again with a different ending such as ‘eat’ and ‘eating’. If you should draw a blank, keep trying until the time is up. You will have one minute (60 seconds) for each letter. The minute for the first letter will begin when you click the Next button at the bottom of this page. Thus, in the space provided, you should immediately begin typing words that begin with this letter. The page will automatically advance after 60 seconds, and you will be given a new letter. Again, you should immediately begin typing words that begin with this letter because this page will also automatically advance after 60 seconds to the page with the final letter. In turn, the page with the final letter will automatically advance after 60 seconds to the rest of the experiment. Please press the next button below when you are ready to begin.

Appendix S

Instructions for the Trail Making Test A and B

On this page, there are numbers from 1 to 25. When you are ready, click the numbers inside the blue circles in consecutive order, beginning with #1 (1, 2, 3, 4...), until you reach the end. Do this as quickly as possible.

On this page, there are both numbers and letters. When you are ready, click the letters and numbers inside the blue circles in ALTERNATING consecutive order, beginning with #1 (1, A, 2, B, 3, C...), until you reach the end. Remember, first you have a number, then a letter, and so on. Do not skip around but go from one circle to the next in the proper order. Do this as quickly as possible.