

2012

Exploring Infidelity: Developing the GEM RIM (Gemmer's Risk of Infidelity Measure)

Stephanie J. Gemmer
Wright State University

Follow this and additional works at: https://corescholar.libraries.wright.edu/etd_all



Part of the [Psychology Commons](#)

Repository Citation

Gemmer, Stephanie J., "Exploring Infidelity: Developing the GEM RIM (Gemmer's Risk of Infidelity Measure)" (2012). *Browse all Theses and Dissertations*. 653.

https://corescholar.libraries.wright.edu/etd_all/653

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Theses and Dissertations at CORE Scholar. It has been accepted for inclusion in Browse all Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of CORE Scholar. For more information, please contact corescholar@www.libraries.wright.edu, library-corescholar@wright.edu.

EXPLORING INFIDELITY: DEVELOPING THE GEM RIM
(GEMMER'S RISK OF INFIDELITY)

PROFESSIONAL DISSERTATION

SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY

OF

THE SCHOOL OF PROFESSIONAL PSYCHOLOGY
WRIGHT STATE UNIVERSITY

BY

STEPHANIE J. GEMMER, Psy.M.

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE
REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE
OF
DEGREE OF PSYCHOLOGY

Dayton, Ohio

September, 2013

COMMITTEE CHAIR: Leon VandeCreek, Ph.D., ABPP

Committee Member: Heather Wilder, Psy.D.

Committee Member: J. Scott Fraser, Ph.D., ABPP

WRIGHT STATE UNIVERSITY
SCHOOL OF PROFESSIONAL PSYCHOLOGY

May 8, 2012

I HEREBY RECOMMEND THAT THE DISSERTATION PREPARED UNDER MY SUPERVISION BY **STEPHANIE J. GEMMER** ENTITLED **EXPLORING INFIDELITY: DEVELOPING THE GEM RIM (GEMMER'S RISK OF INFIDELITY MEASURE)** BE ACCEPTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PSYCHOLOGY.

Leon VandeCreek, Ph.D., ABPP
Dissertation Director

La Pearl Logan Winfrey, Ph.D.
Associate Dean for Academic Affairs

Abstract

Divorce rates in America have soared with many divorces in the United States caused by infidelity; it is the number one reason cited for divorce. Due to the severe consequences of infidelity, researchers have attempted to determine its causes. For example, researchers from evolutionary theory, socialization theory, attachment theory, and investment theory have attempted to explain infidelity from a theoretical perspective. Conversely, based on a literature review Blow and Hartnett (2005) provided numerous categorical findings for infidelity including attachment and infidelity, attitudes towards infidelity, types of infidelity, and numerous demographic variables related to infidelity. Given the vast amount of research on infidelity, the current study sought to create an instrument that could assess individual's risk of infidelity. The current research followed three steps wherein the questionnaire was developed, critiqued, and finally administered and tested by couple's therapists. The item development phase was based on the literature. The critique phase was completed by participants, including mental health practitioners and individuals who identified as having multiple diversity variables (e.g., age, gender, religion) that were also in a heterosexual relationship. These participants critiqued the items for clarity of wording and potential discriminatory impact. Finally, the administration phase of the questionnaire was completed by mental health practitioners that were able to give the questionnaire to individuals seeking couples

therapy or individual therapy with an emphasis on relationship issues. The feedback indicated the questionnaire was helpful and easy to administer.

Table of Contents

Chapter I.	1
Chapter II. Literature Review	5
The Nature of Infidelity	5
Definitions of Infidelity	6
Types of Infidelity	7
Why is Infidelity a Problem?	8
Treatment of Infidelity	9
Mental Health Practitioners	9
Current Infidelity Instruments	11
Theoretical Models	13
Descriptive & Normative Models	13
Attachment Theory	14
Investment Model	15
Socialization Model	16
Evolutionary Model	18
Critiques of the Models' Methodology	20
Categories of Research Findings on Infidelity	25
Justifications for Infidelity	25
Attitudes toward Infidelity	26
Gender Differences in Infidelity	30
Issues in the Primary Relationship	34
Status	34
Satisfaction	34
Sexual Satisfaction	35
Length	36
Religious Affiliation and Infidelity	37
Culture and Infidelity	38
Education Levels & Infidelity	39
Income Levels, Employment	40
Individual Characteristics and Infidelity	40
Interest in Sex	41

Other Potentially Important Considerations	41
Attachment and Infidelity	42
Opportunity and Infidelity	44
Responses and Reactions to Infidelity	45
The Research Study	47
Chapter III. Methods	49
Step 1: Item Development	49
Step 2: Item Refinement	50
Step 3: Field Testing	53
Chapter IV. Considerations	55
Limitations	55
Future Directions	56
Development of User's Manual	57
Chapter V. User's Manual	58
Chapter 1: Development	59
Chapter 2: Administration and Scoring	63
Appendix A: First Edition Questionnaire	66
Appendix B: Additional Forms	71
Appendix C: Second Edition Questionnaire	77
References	81

List of Tables

Table		Page
1.	Demographics of Participants in Item Refinement Process	51
2.	Demographics of Participants in Item Refinement Process (Table in User's Manual)	61

Chapter I

Divorce rates in America have remained unchanged for a number of decades at 50 percent for first marriages, 67 percent for second marriages, and 74 percent for third marriages. Seventeen percent of divorces in the United States are caused, at least in part, by infidelity and infidelity is the number one reason cited for divorce. Due to the severe consequences of infidelity, numerous researchers have attempted to determine the causes of infidelity, as well as provide intervention strategies for clinicians to use when treating couples who have relationship difficulties due to infidelity. Researchers from diverse theoretical orientations, such as evolutionary theory, socialization theory, attachment theory, and investment theory, have attempted to explain infidelity. That is, evolutionary theorists study infidelity in relationships by looking at jealousy as a psychological mechanism that helps individuals resolve the problem of individual reproduction. Socialization theorists examine differences in gender roles and how those differences influence infidelity. Attachment theorists emphasize an individual's attachment style and focus on how an insecure attachment style increases a person's risk of having an affair. Finally, investment theorists focus on the commitment level within a relationship and the amount of investment a person would lose if the relationship were to end. Although proponents of these theoretical models have yet to reach a consensus for why people commit adultery, each theory acknowledges that gender differences exist; the difference between the models result from the theory of *why* gender differences exist, rather than the question of whether they exist.

Blow and Hartnett (2005) reviewed much of the infidelity research and grouped the findings into several categories, including attachment struggles and infidelity, attitudes towards infidelity, types of infidelity, and several demographic variables related to infidelity. Although numerous research studies have been conducted on couples and infidelity, no one has created a screening tool to assess a couple's risk of engaging in infidelity. A few tools have been created to assess couples' relationships more generally. For example, the Relationship Issues Scale (RIS) explores people's attitudes and values, as well as their expectations and behaviors, regarding relationship exclusivity and nonexclusivity (Boekhout, Hendrick, & Hendrick, 2003). Another instrument that has been developed is the Infidelity Questionnaire (INFQ), which assesses reasons couples have cited for engaging in infidelity (Yeniceri & Kokdemir, 2006). Although both of these instruments provide useful information regarding couples and relationships, neither of them is based on infidelity research and neither was developed with the goal of assessing for risks of infidelity.

Aim and Purpose

The purpose of this research is to create a screening tool that will highlight couples' potential risks for relationship difficulties. More specifically, the instrument will be used to assess individual's risk of infidelity within their current relationship. Clinicians could use this tool for work with couples in pre-marital counseling, as well as for work with married couples seeking treatment, and individuals who present with relationship problems. The tool will provide clinicians with initial insight into the risks of infidelity when a couple presents with relationship issues. Further, this tool will give couples an opportunity to inform the clinician about their relationship issues in a paper-

and-pencil format, without having to address the issues in front of the partner, provided that the instrument is administered individually. Oftentimes in the first session, individuals may not be candid about personal problems because of fear, lack of trust, and feelings of vulnerability. Thus, using this instrument will allow individuals to inform the clinician of problems within the relationship without having to openly discuss the issues, which will compensate for the feelings of fear and vulnerability that many individuals may be experiencing.

The items for the screening tool were developed based on reviews of the infidelity literature, such as that completed by Blow and Harnett (2005) and this author, with the goal of providing clinicians with an easy to use tool that will assist in determining the risk a person may pose for being unfaithful. That is, each of the questions within the instrument will be based on research findings on people who have either engaged in an affair or been asked to cite reasons that they would engage in an affair. Clinicians should be aware, however, that none of the research provides the absolute truth about relationships and that every couple's situation is unique. Nonetheless, given that these problems have been cited as core areas of concern for people who have either engaged in infidelity, or provided as reasons why they might engage in infidelity, the questions in the new screening tool could provide useful initial information to a clinician treating couples. Because very little research has been conducted to identify whether indications of infidelity among gay and lesbian couples is the same as those found in heterosexual couples, this risk assessment instrument focuses entirely on work with heterosexual couples.

Chapter II provides a review of the relevant literature on infidelity. Chapter III describes how the new instrument was developed and tested. Chapter IV discusses the future consideration and limitations of the questionnaire and finally, Chapter V describes the initial phases of the User's Manual.

Chapter II

Literature Review

The literature on infidelity is very large. This review covers the research that is most germane to the development of a screening instrument. Specifically, this chapter summarizes the nature of infidelity, treatment of infidelity, theoretical models that attempt to understand infidelity, and major research findings.

Nature of Infidelity

Marriage has been documented in every known culture (Brown, 1991), and data suggest that more than 90% of the world's population will marry at least once (Epstein & Guttman, 1984). When people marry, they often vow to remain faithful to one another until "death do us part." Typically, this vow takes place in front of family, friends, the state, and oftentimes the couple's god (Lusterman, 1998). It is also expected that with this vow comes the unspoken oath to remain sexually exclusive with one another, as well as to reserve a certain level of emotional intimacy for one's partner (Lusterman, 1998). Although monogamy and sexual exclusivity are values prized by many of the citizens of the United States and the expressed cultural norms for the great majority of married, heterosexual couples, the occurrence of adultery and infidelity is widespread (Treas & Giesen, 2000; Wiederman, 1997; Wiederman & Allgeier, 1996).

As social and marital contexts change, so do the attitudes towards infidelity. In one research study, Lawson (1988) found that in the first year of marriage the majority of couples (90% of women and 80% of men) expected sexual exclusivity; however, as the

marriage continued, couples became more tolerant and accepting of sexual infidelity. Research has shown that approximately 20-40% of men and 20-25% of women engage in at least one extramarital affair in their lifetime (Greeley, 1994), creating in the betrayed partner an array of mixed emotions and problems, such as depression, anger, self-reproach, jealousy, posttraumatic stress-like symptoms of shock, damaged self-esteem, and decreased personal and sexual confidence (Chang, 1999; Charny & Parnass, 1995; Glass & Wright, 1999; Humphrey, 1982; Levine, 1998; Lusterman, 1998). Depending on the sample and range of behaviors investigated, the reported prevalence rates of infidelity differ from study to study (Thompson, 1984). In addition, infidelity (real or suspected) is the leading cause of divorce (Betzig, 1989) and among the leading reasons cited as a precursor to wife battering and wife killing (Daly & Wilson, 1988).

Finally, existing evidence based on estimates of blood samples and DNA fingerprinting suggest that approximately 9% to 13% of children have alleged fathers that are not their genetic fathers (Baker & Bellis, 1995). Paternity uncertainty, therefore, is not just a theoretical possibility, but instead a reality that may have occurred throughout evolutionary history.

Definitions of Infidelity. There are numerous definitions of infidelity. According to Weeks, Gambescia, and Jenkins (2003), infidelity is defined as “a violation of a couple’s assumed or stated contract regarding emotional/sexual exclusivity” (p. ix). Infidelity has also been defined as a sexual or emotional interaction that occurs outside of the romantic relationship, which puts into jeopardy the emotional intimacy of that relationship (Milewski-Hertlein, Ray, Wetchler, & Kilmer, 2003). Similarly, Pittman (1989) defined infidelity as “a breach of trust, a betrayal of a relationship, a breaking of

an agreement” (p. 20). Lusterman (1998) posited that “infidelity occurs when one partner in a relationship continues to believe that the agreement to be faithful is still in force, while the other partner is secretly violating it” (p. 3). However infidelity is defined, it is important to note that it may involve behaviors in addition to, or even separate from, a sexual act. That is, most authors agree that an emotional connection with a person outside of one’s primary relationship is enough to constitute an act of infidelity.

Types of Infidelity. Literature has defined and referenced numerous types of infidelity, including one-night stands, philandering, emotional connections, and long-term relationship affairs (Brown, 2001; Lusterman, 1998; Pittman, 1989). Although one-night stands are not as lengthy as long-term affairs, people often report experiencing similar reactions such as breach of trust, anger, loss of respect, and confusion. Also, concern about contracting diseases typically arises from the enactment of a one-night stand (Lusterman, 1998). Philandering is defined as having casual or illicit sex, which often leads to the betrayed partner reacting in ways similar to the reactions typical of a one-night stand (e.g., breach of trust, anger). However, the philanderer often does not understand why it affects the betrayed partner so intensely because the philanderer often reports no meaning or feelings for the third party. Long-term affairs have been reported as one of the most devastating acts of infidelity due to the length and nature of the affair. Further, when the betrayed partner discovers or is informed about the affair, questions about the entire marriage’s legitimacy arise. That is, the betrayed partner often wonders if the entire relationship was a lie and a sham (Lusterman, 1998). Regardless of the type of affair committed, there are usually resultant devastating effects on the stability of the relationship.

Why is Infidelity a Problem? Lying about an affair affects the self-esteem of the betrayed partner, the values within a marriage, and the energy it takes from the relationship to keep the affair hidden from the betrayed spouse (Schneider, Corley, & Irons, 1998). The effect of dishonesty on the marriage's viability about the affair may be greater than the affair itself because more marriages end as a result of maintaining the secret than if the truth has been revealed (Pittman, 1989). Extramarital affairs are kept secret for a variety of reasons and often for many years. Partners who were not aware or expecting their spouse to have an affair can be left feeling a sense of disillusionment by the vast number of lies surrounding the affair (Kaslow, 1993). Therefore, partners whose spouses are honest about the affair may view their spouse's honesty as a genuine attempt to mend the relationship, allowing them to be more open and willing to hearing their partner's explanation and perspective (Gunderson & Ferrari, 2008).

According to Buss (2007), humans are neither solely monogamous, nor solely promiscuous; neither polygynous nor polyandrous. The strategy a person chooses regarding mating is circumstantial. These circumstances include the sex ratio in the mating pool (i.e., the ratio of females to males that are looking for a mate), a person's mate value (how desirable the person is to members of the opposite sex), and cultural norms. (p. 504).

A desire is defined as something a person longs or wishes for. In no known culture or region do people have an equal desire to mate with all people. In fact, in each culture, some people are preferred as mates, while others are shunned. People's desires for another human being are central to all components of mating. That is, desires

determine whom we are attracted to, and who is attracted to us. Finally, those who fail to mate fail to become ancestors. As Buss (2007) observed,

If anyone of our ancestors failed to select an appropriate mate, failed to successfully attract a mate, or failed to retain a mate for enough time needed for reproduction, we would not be here to contemplate the successful strategies that led to our existence. (p. 502)

Treatment of Infidelity

Mental Health Practitioners' Role. Mental Health practitioners are often sought out by couples who have experienced infidelity within their marriage or relationship. Researchers have suggested that clinicians report extramarital affairs as one of the most difficult relationship conflicts to treat. In addition, clinicians often report feeling inadequately trained with interventions for infidelity (Whisman, Dixon, & Johnson, 1997). Allen and Atkins (2005) reported that helping couples fully understand what led to the extradyadic behaviors is crucial when addressing infidelity with couples. Similarly, in his book on surviving infidelity, Lusterman (1998) suggested that discussing the conflicts in the couple's marriage prior to the extradyadic relationship can help provide insight into what may have led to the affair. Finally, Gordon, Baucom, and Snyder (2005) provided a couple-based approach to treating infidelity by focusing on three stages. The first stage is dealing with the initial emotional and behavioral disruption that follows the disclosure or discovery of the affair. The second stage emphasizes the factors from both partners that contributed to the affair, and the third stage constitutes reaching a decision about how to move past the affair, either individually or as a couple. Understanding the risk factors that often lead to infidelity

would allow couples and clinicians to intervene prior to the infidelity behaviors. This intervention could help lower couple's relationship difficulties and possibly decrease the overall divorce rate in America.

Given that much of the research on treating couples focuses on those who have already experienced an affair, the current research focuses on identifying risk factors rather than waiting to treat the devastating effects of the behavior. That is, the purpose of this dissertation is to provide a screening tool based on the research that will identify risks of infidelity for couples and clinicians rather than creating an intervention to help couples cope after the act of infidelity has occurred. It is important to note that some of the items on this screening tool refer to personality states whereas other questions capture personality traits. The difference between states and traits is that traits are stable characteristics across time whereas states are temporary feelings or behaviors that depend on a person's current situation or motives (Feist & Feist, 2002). For example, states include feelings such as joy, sadness, and anger, as well as physiological characteristics such as body temperature and heart rate. Conversely, traits are stable and defined by Cattell (1979-1980) as "that which defines what a person will do when faced with a defined situation" (Vol. 1, p. 14). It is important that mental health practitioners understand that just because a couple presents with a list of problems on the questionnaire does not necessarily reflect how the couple would respond to the same questions three months later. Thus, the risk factors should be interpreted as fluid rather than stable wherein treatment can help encourage change in problem states within the couple's relationship dynamic. (There is a substantial amount of literature related to the Big-5 personality traits and mating; however, this area of research is beyond the scope of the

current research. Please see Schmidt and Shakelford (2008) for a more extensive review).

As mental health practitioners would be administering the measure, it is important to consider a few risks that may arise. First, it is important to understand that this measure is not intended to be a scale, meaning there is not a total score once the questionnaire is completed, but rather the questionnaire is used as a guide in order to allow clinicians to screen presenting issues of the couple. By interpreting the questionnaire as a scale, mental health practitioners could pose harm to the client by assuming or attempting to predict the likelihood of an individual engaging in an extramarital affair. Thus, using the questionnaire as a guide allows the clinician to further inquire about and treat issues related to areas the individual marked as significantly distressing.

Finally, mental health practitioners may encounter couples who want to view the partner's answers. Although this decision is at the discretion of the clinician, it is advised to discuss with the couple that the answers provided will be used to inform treatment and are not intended to obtain secrets from each individual. However, if the clinician practices a "no-secrets" policy, then it is recommended that the clinician discuss the overall themes each individual marked as distressing rather than the individual items. This would likely contribute to individuals reporting more honestly, which would allow for a more informed treatment and intervention plan, as well as give the clinician insight into areas that need attention provided they could lead to infidelity behaviors.

Current Infidelity Instruments. Researchers and clinicians have created a few measures for mental health practitioners to use when treating couples; however, these

instruments were not specifically created to identify risk factors for infidelity in relationships. A sample of these instruments is discussed below; this is not an exhaustive list of instruments developed on couples and relationships, but rather a sample of instruments found in the literature.

The Relationship Issues Scale (RIS) was developed by Boekhout, Hendrick, and Hendrick (2003) to explore people's attitudes and values, as well as their expectations and behaviors, regarding relationship exclusivity and nonexclusivity. The scale also assesses participants' beliefs about being in an exclusive relationship, as well as the negative and positive components of their and others' relationships. In addition, the scale examines participants' expectations, perceptions, and behaviors in their relationships. The RIS consists of 37 items that load on 8 subscales (e.g., sexual nonexclusivity, general nonexclusivity, benefits of other relationships, etc.). Although this scale may provide useful information for clinicians treating couples with relationship issues, the scale was not based on current infidelity research and was derived from data from college students rather than couples.

Yeniceri and Kokdemir (2006) developed the Infidelity Questionnaire (INFQ). The researchers examined anonymous infidelity stories and concluded that there were 132 different reasons people cited for cheating on a partner. Based in Turkey, the researchers obtained stories from people on the internet; the questions were not derived from significant evolving research. Furthermore, the instrument was tested on college students rather than couples.

The instrument developed for this project was derived from research literature on infidelity and was tested on couples. It is anticipated that this instrument will be more beneficial for couples and clinicians assessing for risks of extradyadic behavior.

Theoretical Models

Researchers have made numerous attempts to identify predictors and causes of infidelity as well as to understand the reactions of the betrayed partner. The relevant literature can be presented in two ways: by conceptualizing infidelity from numerous theoretical models that have been created to understand the causes of infidelity or by categorizing the research into themes, such as those identified by Blow and Hartnett (2005). Both approaches are presented here to give the reader a better understanding of the breadth of research on this topic. In addition, the purpose of this dissertation was to introduce the literature that is relevant for developing a screening tool for clinicians and couples. The major models are presented next; the categories of research findings are presented in the next major section.

In an effort to explain and understand infidelity, researchers have created numerous models, including the descriptive, normative, attachment, investment, socialization, and evolutionary models. Some of the models have generated significant bodies of research while others have received much less attention. In this section, a description of the less well-developed models will be discussed briefly, and the major models will be described in more detail.

Descriptive and normative models. The descriptive model focuses on documenting the demographics and attitudinal correlates of infidelity. Descriptive approaches look at who is unfaithful and how often they are unfaithful by relying on self-

reported data without regard for why partners are unfaithful and how infidelity impacts partners (Drigotas & Barta, 2001). For example, numerical comparisons between males and females who commit infidelity would be considered descriptive data. Also, data comparing infidelity rates according to race are examples of the descriptive model.

The normative model is similar to the descriptive model in that they both rely on self reported data and retrospective accounts; however, normative approaches hypothesize that societal norms influence the likelihood of engaging in infidelity (Drigotas & Barta, 2001). For example, research suggests that people have an increased chance of engaging in an extramarital affair if they are acquainted with someone who has previously been unfaithful (Buunk & Bakker, 1995). The normative model accounts for both descriptive and injunctive norms (Buunk & Bakker, 1995). Descriptive norms refer to the perceptions of other people's behavior regardless of whether other people approve or not, whereas injunctive norms are the behaviors which are perceived as being approved by other people. Although this model will be referenced in the next section, these models do not lend themselves well to the item development phase of this instrument. Due to the lack of supported research on demographics and infidelity, using descriptive and injunctive norms would not provide relevant information for the screening tool. However, gender is one demographic variable that has been significantly researched and will be addressed in later sections of the chapter, because of its relevance in the development of the screening tool.

Attachment theory. The experiences people have as children with their caregivers are believed to be internalized (Bowlby, 1973). Further, these relationships with caregivers often serve as working models that integrate children's beliefs about

themselves and others that guide their relationships throughout their life. For example, if children receive consistent support and nurturance from their caregivers, they will likely internalize the need to feel loved and cared for by others. Thus, the securely attached children will view others as trustworthy and loving. Given that attachment in childhood is expected to influence an individual's attachment in adulthood, attachment theory suggests that if children have insecure attachments, they will likely feel an insecure attachment in their adult romantic relationships, resulting in expectations that people have negative intentions in relationships and are not trustworthy (Platt, Nalbone, Casanova, & Wetchler, 2008).

The attachment model postulates that infidelity is due, in part, to insecure attachments in early childhood, primarily with the mother (Mitchell, 2000). The insecure attachment leads the person to spend his or her life attempting to fill the void with "objects" or relations (Mitchell, 2000). For example, Mitchell (2000) described infidelity as a defense mechanism employed to avoid internal emptiness rather than the common assumption of a lack of control or a deep desire for passion. Research related to the attachment model will be discussed more thoroughly in the following section and will be used to develop a few questions on the measure being created.

The investment model. The investment model focuses on commitment within the relationship and the investments a person would lose, such as possessions and friends, if the relationship were to end. In this model, investments are positively related to commitment. Commitment represents a psychological attachment and a motivation to continue with the relationship. Two other elements of a relationship work together with investments to make the person more or less committed to the relationship: satisfaction

and alternative quality. Satisfaction represents how happy the individual is within the relationship because of the outcomes one receives from the relationship and is positively related to commitment. Alternative quality signifies potential satisfaction provided outside the relationship such as dating another person, and thus is negatively correlated with commitment (Drigotas et al., 1999; Rusbult, Drigotas, & Verette, 1994).

In addition, the investment model seeks to explain why a seemingly happy person in a relationship might be unfaithful and why a seemingly unhappy person might choose not to have an affair. For example, a happy person might choose to have an affair because of low investments and/or the appearance of an attractive alternative in his or her life. Persons who are unhappy in their relationships might remain faithful because of the amount of investments they might lose if they chose to act on desire. Thus, the investment model contends that commitment directly affects the probability of infidelity (Drigotas et al., 1999). The investment model views highly committed individuals as more likely to refrain from infidelity because they think the long-term consequences associated with the actions are not worth the potential short-term benefits of the behavior (Drigotas et al., 1999).

Socialization model. Another model that attempts to explain infidelity is the socialization model. It theorizes that men and women differ in terms of emotional and sexual infidelity; however, in contrast to the evolutionary model (discussed below), this difference by gender is rooted in socialization processes (Fenigstein & Peltz, 2002). A tenet of this model is that boys and girls learn from same-sex adults how to sexually feel and behave (Bandura, 1977).

There are two prominent socialization theories, the sociocultural or developmental theory (Eagly, 1987; England & Browne, 1992) and social role theory (Eagly, 1987; Eagly & Wood, 1991). The sociocultural theory suggests that gender differences in behavior are a result of differential treatment of the sexes within society. That is, learning and cognitive processes are products of our society and culture. Cultures have unique values, beliefs, and normative behaviors which are taught to children and ultimately contribute to molding who children become as adults.

Social role theory assumes that sex differences of infidelity occur because of the tendency for people to act consistently with their gender roles (Eagly & Wood, 1991). The social role theory expands on the socialization perspective by hypothesizing that men are socialized toward the physical and personal pleasures of sex, whereas women are more concerned with the emotional and relational aspects of sex (Hyde & DeLamater, 2000). Men are taught to express more authoritarian qualities, such as being independent, masterful, assertive, and competent, whereas women are taught to express high levels of shared attributes, including being friendly, unselfish, concerned with others' welfare, and being emotionally expressive (Eagly & Wood, 1991).

Social role theory also explains gender differences in terms of sexual double standards (Sprecher, McKinney, & Orbuch, 1987). The theory posits that men are praised for sexual promiscuity, power, and esteem, whereas women are belittled for these behaviors and attitudes. During developmental processes, such as adolescence, men reportedly masturbate in emotional isolation whereas women seek intimate emotional, but non-sexual, connections among their friends. In addition, during developmental growth, men may have observed other men participating in sexual variety, which makes

short-term relationships acceptable with their particular culture's view on masculinity. Sex difference outcomes are defined as the differences in reactions towards infidelity that men and women experience. For example, men respond with more distress to sexual infidelity, whereas women respond with more distress to emotional infidelity. Social role theory explains the sex-difference outcomes as the product of differences in gender-role expectations (Eagly & Wood, 1991).

Evolutionary model. Evolutionary approaches have tried to understand infidelity in relationships (Barkow, Cosmides, & Tooby, 1992; Buss, 1995) by looking at jealousy as a psychological mechanism to help solve the problem of individual reproduction (Buss, Larsen, Westen, & Semmelroth, 1992; Cosmides & Tooby, 1994; Daly, Wilson, & Weghorst, 1982; Symons, 1979). That is, infidelity helps men in terms of reproductive success because it allows them more opportunity to spread their genes whereas women who have an affair may be trying to ensure potential resources for their children.

Several sub-theories have developed from the evolutionary theory. One view stemming from the evolutionary approach is the jealousy as specific innate module (JSIM) model, which proposes that men and women differ in response to infidelity depending on whether there was an emotional versus sexual relationship threat (Buss et al., 1992). The JSIM theory, developed by Buss et al. (1992) following an initial study on sex differences in jealousy, has been supported by a number of studies (e.g., Abraham, Cramer, Fernandez, & Mahler, 2001; Buss et al., 1999; Buunk, Angleitner, Oubaid, & Buss, 1996; Cramer, Abraham, Johnson, & Manning-Ryan, 2001; Cramer, Manning-Ryan, Johnson, & Barbo, 2000; Fenigstein & Peltz, 2002; Geary, Rumsey, Bow-Thomas,

& Hoard, 1995; Sagarin, Becker, Guadagno, Nicastle, & Millevoi, 2003; Shackelford & Buss, 1997; Wiederman & Allgeier, 1993).

According to this theory, a woman is more likely to have reproductive success by choosing a partner whose contributions are financial and personal in nature with the idea in mind of sheltering her and any current or future children. From this perspective, a woman should be more upset or distressed than a man by emotional infidelities because she faces potential resource, protection, commitment, and effort loss for her offspring, which compromises the viability of her children. On the other hand, men should feel more threatened by sexual infidelity compared to women due to the possibility of paternal uncertainty. If a female partner has been unfaithful and is carrying another man's child, the male partner is losing time, effort, resources, and relationship opportunities while raising that child, thus damaging his overall reproductive success.

Similar to the JSIM evolutionary model is the parental investment model, this states that the gender that invests most in the offspring would be more particular about choosing a mate. Females require a minimum of 9 months to produce a child, whereas men only need one act of sex to invest in the production of a child (Trivers, 1972). Members of the sex that invest less in offspring, according to this theory, should be more competitive with each other for access to members of the high-investing sex. That is, men, if investing less in the relationship, should be more competitive with one another about the women they are choosing, since the women are the ones investing more into the offspring.

In long-term relationships, members of both sexes typically invest heavily in any offspring produced. According to the parental investment theory, sexual selection should

favor, in both sexes, high levels of selectivity. In earlier times, poor long-term relationship choices would have been costly for both women and men because they would have risked wasting their considerable investments. However, not all relationships are long-lasting. Relationships that are considered brief can last a few months, a few weeks, a few days, or even a few minutes. These types of relationships are referred to as short-term relationships.

Similar to the evolutionary model, the sexual strategies theory hypothesizes that men and women have evolved alternative relationship strategies, which allow for certain adaptive functioning to increase reproductive success. For instance, in long-term relationship, men often seek qualities involving signs of fertility (e.g., age, attractiveness), whereas women place greater emphasis on resources and long-term commitment. Furthermore, in short-term relationships, women are able to gain access to some males with many resources (Symons, 1979), or to gain access to many males with some resources (Hrdy, 1981). In contrast, men seeking short-term relationship are able to have more opportunities of reproductive success, as well as sexual variety (Symons, 1979).

Critique of the models' methodology. Although many theorists agree that the evolutionary model is useful in interpreting gender differences in reactions to romantic and sexual infidelity, several researchers have critiqued this model's methodology (i.e., forced-choice format) (Beall & Sternberg, 1993; DeSteno & Salovey, 1996; Eagly, 1987; Eagly & Wood, 1991; England & Browne, 1992, Harris, 2000; Harris, 2003, Voracek, 2001). For example, Desteno, Bartlett, and Salovey (2006) explained that the research on the evolutionary sex differences was methodologically limited by the use of a forced-

choice response format for research participants. For example, in Buss et al.'s original study (1992), participants were asked two questions: to imagine their partner forming a deep emotional bond to another person and to imagine their partner engaging in sexual intercourse with another person. The participants were then asked to rate which would cause the most significant distress. This is viewed as a forced-choice question because it forces participants to choose between two scenarios without any other options. The researchers who have argued against the use of the forced-choice method have contended that if it is valid, the evolutionary sex difference should occur on many types of self-report formats other than the forced-choice response format. To support their hypothesis, Desteno et al. (2006) conducted an experiment in which they asked participants to fill out the traditional forced-choice format, as well as a number of continuous measures that assessed responses to sexual and emotional infidelity. The hypothesis of evolutionary sex differences was found in the forced-choice format. However, on all continuous measures, men and women both reported more distress from sexual compared to emotional infidelity. Other critics, who favor socialization theory, believe sex differences are due to society's differential treatment of the sexes. Some researchers have claimed that using a forced-choice format, as opposed to other formats, leads participants to make a comparison by considering the trade-offs of each possibility (Payne, 1982). Thus, the double-shot hypothesis was developed to account for these trade-offs.

The double-shot hypothesis explains the gender differences in reaction to infidelity by saying that, in a forced-choice format, an individual chooses whichever infidelity he or she believes most likely implies the occurrence of the other (Buunk et al., 1996). For example, a man who chooses sexual infidelity as most distressing does so

because he believes, if his wife were sexually active with another man, she must also be in love with him. Conversely, a woman who chooses emotional infidelity as most distressing may do so because she believes, if her husband is in love with another woman, he must also be sexually active with her. The idea of a “double shot” is that people are distressed because they instinctively assume that if their spouse is engaging in infidelity, both types of infidelity are involved rather than an either/or scenario like other theories suggest.

Buss, Larsen, and Westen (1996) examined the limitations to the double-shot hypothesis. The researchers explained that one problem with the double-shot hypothesis is that it fails to provide a reason for why the sexes differ in their beliefs about the two types of infidelities. They reported that both the double-shot and the logical belief hypotheses (discussed below) imply sex differences occur, but they fail to explain why the sex differences occur. They argued that evolutionary psychology provides a straightforward rationale for the sex differences, explaining that evolved sex differences occur in the actual conditional probabilities of the two events. In particular, men and women have evolved different sexual strategies and as descendants, modern men and women continue the evolved psychology that led to the success of their ancestors.

The second limitation of the double-shot hypothesis is the idea that if an alternative reason or origin (i.e., not evolutionary) is found for the sex difference, then the sex difference is somehow counterfeit. Buss et al. (1996) argued that the sex difference is quite real and is based on data from numerous research studies.

The third problem with the double-shot hypothesis is that it infers that sex differences stem from socialization. That is, the double-shot hypothesis implies that sex

differences are not psychologically evolved from evolution or genetics, but instead are derived from social influences.

Finally, Buss et al. (1996) argued against the double-shot hypothesis by stating that sex differences in beliefs regarding infidelity do not imply that beliefs cause or are responsible for those reactions. That is, the difference in men's and women's distress with regard to infidelity may be accounted for by a person's individual beliefs; however, a person's beliefs may also cause the difference in distress that men and women experience. Thus, correlation does not imply causation; therefore, any number of variables could cause the differences that men and women experience in their beliefs and reactions to infidelity.

Harris and Christenfeld (1996), critics of the evolutionary hypothesis, argued that, when participants choose in a forced-choice format, the form of infidelity (i.e., emotional or sexual) that most distresses them, they logically choose the one that implies their partner has engaged, or will soon engage, in the other infidelity. The researchers refer to this as the logical belief hypothesis. The argument is that men think women have sex only when they are in love, and women think men have sex without being in love. Thus, the sex difference stems from the way men and women logically relate the infidelities, rather than the evolved mate-selection strategies proposed by the evolutionary hypothesis. For example, women realize that men often have sex without being in love; therefore, women are less distressed by sexual infidelity. Men, on the other hand, are less distressed by emotional infidelity because they recognize that women can be in love without having sex.

Voracek (2001) argued that the evolutionary research has been done primarily on undergraduate students. He proposed that the past research should not be generalized to the entire population because younger, non-pregnant females, who are higher in reproductive potential, are predicted to be more intensely guarded by their male partners than older or pregnant females, who have a lower reproductive rate. That is, according to Voracek (2001), a male who is with someone older, someone pregnant, or someone with whom he already has children, will not experience as much jealousy (since he already has reproduced) towards his partner's sexual infidelity as he would if he was younger and had no offspring (like the majority of undergraduate students).

One alternative model to the evolutionary theory is the attachment fertility theory (AFT), which states that basic human relationship strategies of men and women consist of the desire to mate with a single sex partner for life (Miller & Fishkin, 1997). This theory states that all humans have been designed by evolution to develop a secure attachment in childhood. The basic interpersonal orientation normally manifests itself in adulthood in a healthy desire for a high-investment, long-term marriage. Thus, according to the AFT proponents, the benefits of fidelity include the desire for emotional trust, sexual satisfaction, and the increased survivability of offspring (Miller & Fishkin, 1997).

The importance of understanding the models and the critiques of these models is to allow readers and future researchers to realize the dilemma in assuming there is only one reason or hypothesis for marital infidelity. As discussed above, numerous models attempt to explain infidelity and each model provides supporting research with regards to its hypothesis about what triggers infidelity. However, given the inconsistent results

among the theories, an attempt to understand infidelity from a categorical perspective rather than a theoretical perspective is provided in the following section.

Categories of Research Findings on Infidelity

The following section provides a sample of relevant studies that are useful for the current research project, which is to create a clinical tool to assist clinicians and couples in determining specific infidelity risk areas that couples might be experiencing within their relationship. This summary identifies variables that consistently appear to contribute to infidelity.

Justifications for engaging in infidelity. Research conducted by Leigh (1989) supports the evolutionary theory that women are more likely to engage in emotional infidelity, whereas men are more likely to engage in sexual infidelity. Specifically, results revealed that women were more motivated to engage in sexual intercourse because of emotional reasons, such as to become psychologically closer to a partner, whereas men were shown to be more motivated by physical reasons, such as enhancing feelings of personal power, a physical release, or simply being “turned on.”

Other research found that women were more likely to cheat because of unhappiness in their current relationship and because they were made to feel attractive by a prospective partner (Brand, Markey, Mills, & Hodges, 2007). Glass and Wright (1992) reported that 77% of women and 43% of men believe falling in love justifies an extramarital affair; however, 75% of men and 53% of women reported sexual excitement as a justification for cheating on a partner. Similarly, Allen and Baucom (2004) reported that women justified infidelity when they experienced rejection or neglect from their partner and when they had a desire to experience a feeling of closeness.

Eaves and Smith (2007) reported that all the research explanations for why people cheat share the commonality of having a desire to fulfill one's needs, feelings, and behaviors, which is directly related to a person's sense of self-worth. For example, dissatisfaction in one's family life, loneliness, revenge, the need for excitement, fear of too much intimacy with one's spouse, the need for emotional closeness, and feeling taken for granted are all explanations of why people cheat (Greeley, 1994; Shackelford & Buss, 1997). That is, a person's self-worth could be the underlying factor in all the variables associated with cheating.

Another study found that individuals who are inclined to engage in sex outside of their primary relationship reported that their friends did the same (Thompson, 1984). Thompson (1984) suggested that friends and acquaintances who engaged in extramarital affairs may have served as adult socialization agents, whereby extramarital behaviors become likely and desirable. This theory is similar to the normative model's descriptive (i.e., what others are doing) and injunctive norms (i.e., what you should do). Injunctive norms have been shown to affect a variety of sexual behaviors, including premarital sex and contraceptive behavior (Ajzen & Fishbein, 1980).

While each of these reasons seems like common sense, researchers have tried to gain a deeper understanding of the correlates and causes of infidelity, and a sample of that research is described next.

Attitudes toward infidelity. Prior to examining the extensive research on attitudes toward infidelity, Meston and Buss (2007) created a Why Have Sex? (YSEX?) questionnaire to determine the reasons people engaged in sexual intercourse. A total of 1,253 questionnaires were collected and a few of the most frequently supported reasons

for having sexual intercourse were as follows: (a) pure attraction to the other person; (b) experiencing physical pleasure; (c) expression of love; (d) feeling desired by the other; (e) curiosity or seeking new experiences; (f) mere opportunity; and (g) sex just happening due to seemingly uncontrollable circumstances. In addition, 20 out of the top 25 reasons for engaging in sexual intercourse were similar for men and women. Out of the 237 reasons, women only surpassed men on three items: “I wanted to feel feminine”; “I wanted to express my love for the person”; and “I realized that I was in love.” Some of these reasons will be seen throughout this research as reasons people engage not only in sexual intercourse with one’s current partner, but also in sexual and emotional infidelity.

A number of studies were conducted in the 1990s to identify predictors of extramarital relationships. In 1992, Glass and Wright reported that sexual excitement was a reason people engaged in extramarital affairs. In addition, they suggested that more men (75%) than women (53%) approved of sexual excitement as a valid reason for infidelity. However, the researchers also found that 77% of women compared to only 43% of men endorsed “falling in love” as a good reason for an extramarital relationship. Five years later, Shackelford and Buss (1997) reported that a lack of interest in sexual exclusivity was a predictor of infidelity. Each of these results has been supported by a number of other studies (e.g., Boekhout, Hendrick, & Hendrick, 1999; Hill & Preston, 1996; Lewandowski & Ackerman, 2006).

Boekhout et al. (1999) found, in a study on college students, that men cheated because of boredom in the relationship, sexual incompatibility, having a geographically distant partner, wanting the sexual excitement in a new relationship, the variety and experimentation within an affair, or boosts in their ego. In the same study, women were

found to cheat because of a lack of attention, a lack of commitment, a lack of communication and understanding, falling in love with someone else, emotional satisfaction, companionship, intellectual sharing, advancing of their career, a way to feel younger, or an increase in their sexual attractiveness.

More recent studies have found similar predictors. For example, Lewandowski and Ackerman (2006) assessed college students on need fulfillment and self expansion. They found that low sex frequencies, as well as the opportunity to cheat, were predictors of infidelity. When a person's needs (whatever they may be for that particular individual) are not met, there is higher susceptibility to infidelity. Strong or permissive sexual interest, dissatisfaction with the relationship, sexual opportunities, and lack of support for the relationship have all been found to be correlated with an increased risk for infidelity (Buss & Shackelford, 1997; Sprecher & Felmlee, 1992; Treas & Giesen, 2000).

Besides marital satisfaction and differences in infidelity types, research has been conducted on gender differences in short-term relationships and number of sexual partners. For example, Clarke and Hatfield (1989) conducted a behavioral study to determine how likely males and females were to consent to sex with someone after a short period of time. The researchers found that 50% of women agreed to go out on a date with the male experimenter; 6% agreed to go back to his apartment; and 0% agreed to have sex. Regarding the experiment, some women expressed their feelings of being insulted and some thought the approach was bizarre. A female experimenter then approached the men with the same questions. The researchers found that 50% would go out on a date with her, 69% agreed to go back to her apartment, and 75% agreed to have sex with her. Similar to this study, Wright and Reise (1997) found that men engaged in

and sought short-term relationships more often than did women. In addition, in contrast to women, men reported that casual, low investment sex was more desirable, permissible, and arousing. Men, in comparison to women, seem to lower their standards significantly in short-term relationship opportunities (Buss & Schmitt, 1993).

In a research study on sexual strategy theory, defined in the theoretical models section above, Schmitt, Shackelford, Duntley, Tooke, and Buss (2001) reported that men desired more sexual partners in their lifetime than did women. Also, the researchers found that women were willing to have sex with someone they found desirable, after knowing a person for 6 months, whereas men were willing to have sex after a week. The researchers concluded that the existence of monogamous relationships seems unlikely with 58% of men and 40% of women preferring more than one mating partner for a lifetime. In previous research on short-term relationships, studies revealed that men would like an average of 18 partners in their lifetime, whereas women reported wanting an average of 4.5 (Buss & Schmitt, 1993).

Although evidence has clearly determined that men desire a greater number of sexual partners than women, men never could have progressed with this desire without compliant women. Furthermore, the average number of sex partners for men and women must be equal, assuming that the sex ratio in the population is the same. Every time a man has sex with a woman, with whom he has not previously had sex, a woman is simultaneously having sex with a man with whom she has never had sex (Buss, 2007). This information, however, does not discount that both sexes are predicted to become distressed by both emotional and sexual infidelity. Nevertheless, the hypothesis predicts a sex difference in the “weighting” of the cues to infidelity (Buss, 2007). That is, both

sexes are thought to experience distress about infidelity, but it is the level of distress for each type of infidelity that shows gender differences. People's attitudes tend to positively correlate with infidelity and therefore these items will be represented on the measuring tool.

Gender differences in infidelity. A vast amount of research has identified gender differences regarding sexual, emotional, and combined sexual and emotional infidelity, and it appears to be the attribute most researched when studying infidelity (Atkins, Baucom, & Jacobson, 2001; Buss et al., 1992; Glass & Wright, 1985). Although numerous studies have found gender differences in infidelity, consensus on the reasons for these differences has not yet been achieved (Blow & Hartnett, 2005).

As mentioned and defined in the previous section, the jealousy as specific innate module (JSIM) model proposes that men and women differ in response to infidelity depending on whether there was an emotional versus sexual relationship threat (Buss et al., 1992).

In Buss et al.'s original study (1992) on gender differences regarding jealousy, the researchers examined differences in male and female responses to sexual and emotional infidelity (by forced choice questions) and they measured electrodermal activity (EDA), pulse rate, and electromyographic activity (EMG) while having members of each sex look at images simulating sexual or emotional infidelity. Results from the forced choice question supported the evolutionary hypothesis that men show greater distress to sexual infidelity and women show greater distress to emotional infidelity. The results from the EDA showed significant increases in males during the sexual imagery and significant increases in females during the emotional imagery. A similar pattern emerged while

tracking the male and female pulse rates. Men had substantially higher pulse rates to both images, but significantly more during the sexual imagery whereas women showed insignificant elevations in both images. The results for the EMG data were similar to the others, but less strong.

Prior to Buss et al's (1992) initial study on gender differences in sexual and emotional infidelity, research supported similar hypotheses. For example, in Francis's 1977 study, he reported that, among women, a partner spending time or talking with a third person turned out to elicit the most jealousy, whereas among men, sexual involvement with a third person evoked the most jealousy. Glass and Wright (1985) found similar results in that men were more likely to be involved in an extramarital sexual relationship without emotional involvement, whereas women were more likely to be involved in both sexual and emotional extramarital relationships. Glass and Wright (1992) also found that both married and non-married men were more likely to approve of an affair if the affair was based on sexual reasons rather than emotional reasons. Both of these studies support the hypothesis that men are more likely to engage in sexual infidelity than emotional infidelity. Conversely, the researchers found that women were more likely to engage in emotional infidelity and reportedly experience more of an emotional connection than men who engage in emotional infidelity. Considering that emotional connections involve more communication and emotional intimacy, women are more likely to fall in love with their extramarital partner than men.

Additional research has extended the evolutionary hypothesis about gender differences in regards to infidelity by asking participants numerous questions related to emotional and sexual infidelity without asking the traditional forced-choice format. For

example, in one study (Cramer et al., 2000) participants were asked to rate which of the following would be most distressing: a partner gaining a 100 lbs. or a partner losing a job. In accordance with the evolutionary hypothesis that men prefer physical attractiveness and fertility, whereas women prefer resources, results revealed that men were more distressed by their partner gaining 100 lbs, and women were more distressed by their partner losing their job.

Another study focused on examining content and response rates to personal ads. Research found that women who received the highest response rate mentioned physical attractiveness and young age as part of their self-description in their ads, whereas men received more responses if they mentioned excellent financial resources (Baize & Schroeder, 1995). Similarly, Buss (2007) reported that because women are so invested in selecting a good mate with whom to produce children, women often discriminate in their selection. He found that the qualities women often select in men vary with men's ability to invest in resources, their ability to protect women physically, their ability to be a good parent, and whether or not they will be compatible with women's goals and values. Conversely, Buss (2007) found that men in this study value physical appearance because of the information it provides about a woman's youth and health, and therefore, her reproductive capacity. Examples of these characteristics associated with youth include full lips, lustrous hair, white teeth, absence of sores, clear skin, symmetrical features, smooth skin, and a low ratio of hips to waist.

A study of actual marriages in 29 cultures confirmed that men do choose younger women (Buss, 1989). On average, grooms were older than brides in each of the 29 cultures by three years. Moreover, as men increased in age, they were likely to marry

women younger than they were. Furthermore, men were generally older by three years at the first marriage, five years at the second marriage, and eight years at the third marriage.

In other research that supports gender differences in regards to emotional and sexual infidelity, Fenigstein and Peltz (2002) examined the reactions of parents towards their child's partner committing infidelity. They found that it was not the gender of the parent that determined whether or not emotional or sexual infidelity would be most distressing for the parent in terms of their child's partner, but instead the gender of the child. That is, if the parents (regardless of their gender) had a daughter, they experienced more distress if the daughter's partner committed emotional infidelity, and if they had a son, they experienced more distress over the son's partner committing sexual infidelity.

Michalski, Shackelford, and Salmon (2007) found comparable results in a follow-up study. Their study looked at gender differences in a sibling's reaction to a brother or sister's partner's infidelity. This study also found that it was not the gender of the participant, but the gender of the sibling that determined the type of infidelity that warranted stress. For example, participants who had a sister were more distressed by their sister's partner's emotional infidelity, and participants that had a brother were more distressed by their brother's partner's sexual infidelity. The results from these three studies support the evolutionary hypothesis that men are more distressed by sexual infidelity, whereas women are more distressed by emotional infidelity.

Finally, Atkins et al. (2001) found differences between gender and age with regards to infidelity that differ from the research previously discussed. They concluded that women ages 40-45 and men ages 55-65 were likely to report having engaged in infidelity at some point in their lifetime. However, they suggested that men and women

younger than 45 had no significant difference in their frequency of reporting infidelity. Note that there is no way to separate out cohort effects from developmental effects and, therefore, these findings may not be indicative of age effects alone. Due to the significant amount of research on gender differences and infidelity, numerous questions on the measuring tool will originate from this section.

Issues in the primary relationship and their connections to infidelity. Issues in a person's primary relationship could stem from a variety of variables. In this section, a couple's status, length of relationship, and sexual and relationship satisfaction will be discussed in regards to infidelity.

Primary relationship status. Research conducted on women who are married compared to women who are dating or cohabiting has found significant differences. That is, women who are married are less likely to engage in infidelity than are women who are dating or in cohabiting relationships (Forste & Tanfer, 1996; Treas & Giesen, 2000). Further, Treas and Giesen (2000) expanded their findings by suggesting that once women who were cohabiting get married, their views on sexual exclusivity are similar to those of married women. Thus, it appears that marriage may serve as a protective factor for couples against engaging in an extramarital affair (Blow & Hartnett, 2005).

Primary relationship satisfaction. When it comes to contemplating an extramarital affair, women seem to approach it from the perspective of their marital relationship; conversely, men approach cheating from an individual perspective (Glass & Wright, 1985). That is, women often engage in extramarital relationships when they are not satisfied in their marriage, whereas men typically do not think of the consequences of their actions affecting their primary relationship because men, compared to women, are

more likely to separate sex from love. Similarly, men who refrain from sexual affairs often do so because of their personal attitudes and beliefs, not their lack of desire (Pesttrak, Martin, & Martin, 1985).

In a 17-year longitudinal study (N = 1,475), Previti and Amato (2004) sought to determine whether infidelity was a cause or a consequence of poor marital quality. Their results indicated that high levels of divorce proneness (e.g., thinking about divorce, talking about divorce with spouse or others, and thinking that marriage was in trouble) predicted that at least one person in the relationship would engage in infidelity. Unexpectedly, the results indicated that marital happiness did not predict marital fidelity. That is, unhappiness does not directly affect infidelity, although the researchers suggested that unhappiness may have an indirect effect on infidelity by increasing divorce proneness. Regardless of how unhappy people are within their marriages, it seems that once they begin discussing and considering divorce, sexual partners outside of the relationship are more likely to be sought out. Overall, the researchers suggested that infidelity lowers marital happiness, increases divorce proneness, and increases the chances of divorce within a relationship. Furthermore, infidelity is both a cause and a consequence of poor marital quality (Previti & Amato, 2004).

Sexual satisfaction in the primary relationship. In marriage, women often regard compatibility as a high priority whereas men believe sexual satisfaction is more important (Kimmel & Van Der Veen, 1974). More recent studies provide similar results. For example, Liu (2000) concluded that there is an increased risk for infidelity within marriage once there is a decrease in the sexual frequency, especially for men. Furthermore, Liu (2000) suggested that there could also be an increased risk of infidelity

if the quality of the sexual relationship decreased. These results are similar to those of Buss et al.'s (1992) evolutionary hypothesis. That is, men are more likely to engage in sexual infidelity, whereas women are more likely to engage in emotional infidelity.

Length of the primary relationship. Glass and Wright (1977) conducted a study on marital satisfaction and length of marriage in husbands and wives who had admitted to cheating on their partner. Subjects were divided into thirds, wherein “old” marriages consisted of people who had been married for 12 or more years, “middle” marriages consisted of people who had been married for three to 11 years, and finally, “young” marriages consisted of people who had been married for 2 years or less. The results suggested that husbands in older marriages, who cheated, were more likely to report greater marital satisfaction than husbands in older marriages who had never cheated. In middle length marriages, both husbands and wives who cheated were less satisfied with their marriages than their counterparts who did not cheat. Finally, in younger marriages, husbands who cheated were less satisfied than husbands who had not cheated. The researchers also found that wives in older or middle length marriages, who cheated, were less satisfied with their marriage than their counterparts who had not cheated. Wives in younger marriages who cheated did not differ in marital satisfaction from wives who had not cheated. When considering infidelity, the earlier a man has his first extramarital relationship the lower his marital satisfaction is likely to be; however, the later a woman has her first extramarital relationship, the lower her marital satisfaction is likely to be. Given the significant results found throughout this particular category, a few questions will be included on the measuring tool that is indicative of a couple's relationship status,

as well as their sexual and relationship satisfaction. However, questions about the length of a couple's relationship will not be included due to the lack of significant findings.

Religious affiliation, religiosity, and infidelity. Earlier research provided no correlation between religious attendance (i.e., attending church) and infidelity (e.g., Blumstein & Schwartz, 1983); however, more current research indicates that religious attendance is associated with a decrease in a person's risk of engaging in infidelity (e.g., Amato & Rogers, 1997; Atkins, Baucom, & Jacobson, 2001; Atkins & Kessel, 2008). Atkins and Kessel (2008) conducted a research study with 1,439 participants, and found that attendance, but not faith, nearness to God, prayer, or other religious variables, were inversely related to infidelity. The researchers explained that the attendance variable in the study was the only variable that included interactions with others, including the spouse. That is, attendance is a more public commitment than praying, which would be considered more private. Therefore, attendance might be interpreted as a more costly commitment not only because of the time and energy spent attending, but also how the social community and norms of society may interpret the behavior (Atkins & Kessel, 2008; Liu, 2000).

Another reason attendance might be negatively correlated with infidelity is that couples who are connected with one another and experience relationship happiness are less likely to engage in infidelity behaviors (Atkins et al., 2001; Atkins, Yi, Baucom, & Christensen, 2005). Thus, attending church provided couples with connections to other couples and may provide a sense of relationship happiness.

Burdette, Ellison, Sherkat, and Gore (2007) conducted a study to determine whether religious affiliation, participation, or biblical beliefs explained differences in infidelity.

The data provided insight into infidelity that had yet to be highlighted. For example, the researchers found that holding any religious affiliation (e.g., Catholic, Baptist, Protestant), with the exception of nontraditional conservatives and non-Christian faiths, decreased a person's chances of engaging in infidelity compared to those with no religious affiliation. The researchers also found that those who attend church regularly reduce their chances of engaging in infidelity. Finally, people who consider the *Bible* as the literal word of God were less likely to engage in infidelity compared to those who did not believe this. This may be due to the explicit scriptures that condemn extramarital sexual behavior (e.g., Exodus 20:14, Matthew 5:27-32).

Blow and Hartnett (2005) concluded that, although religion appears to influence a person's decision to engage in infidelity, the research is still quite limited. In particular, research on spirituality is needed because some people may identify as either spiritual or religious and some may identify as both. Religion simply means that a person identifies with a particular religion, whereas spirituality refers to a relationship or ongoing journey with one's god. Spirituality is often viewed as an attachment to values and morals, but not necessarily those of a religious affiliation. In addition, research related to different religious affiliations and infidelity is lacking. Given the lack of research on religion, questions on the tool derived from this section will only include attendance of religious services, since that appears to be the most supported variable.

Culture and Infidelity. The majority of the research on infidelity has been conducted on the United States population. However, some researchers have extended their infidelity studies to other cultures such as China and the Netherlands to compare responses and reasons people engage in infidelity behaviors.

Cross-cultural gender differences. Considering gender differences cross-culturally, researchers have compared results from the United States and China; similar results have been found. In both China and the United States men were more distressed by sexual infidelity and women were more distressed by emotional infidelity (Geary, Rumsey, Bow-Thomas, & Hoard, 1995). However, overall, U.S. men and women reported greater distress over sexual infidelity than their Chinese peers when the researchers did not account for gender. Other interesting results from the study found that U.S. females showed higher ratings than U.S. males for all six of the emotional intensity items (e.g., imagining one's partner forming a deep emotional bond with someone else) included on the questionnaire, and Chinese males reported more intense hurt feelings and jealousy in response to sexual infidelity than Chinese females, whereas there was no difference in the U.S. sample (Geary, Rumsey, Bow-Thomas, & Hoard, 1995).

Buss, Shackelford, Choe, Buunk, and Dijkstra (2000) tested the evolutionary predictions in the Netherlands and Korea. Men and women were threatened by different qualities in rivals of the same sex. When a rival interested in a man's partner exceeded him on financial and job prospects, as well as physical strength, the men in each of the cultures reported greater distress. However, women in each of the cultures reported greatest distress when a rival exceeded them on bodily and facial attractiveness. Due to the limited research on culture and infidelity, questions from this section will not be included on the screening tool.

Education levels and infidelity. The research on education and infidelity is limited and reveals conflicting results. For example, Atkins et al. (2001) suggested that

the more education individuals have, the more likely they are to engage in infidelity. In particular, people with graduate degrees were significantly more likely to engage in infidelity than people with less than a high school diploma. In another research study, Forste and Tanfer (1996) concluded that educated married women were more likely to cheat, but only if her husband's education level differed from her own education level. That is, if a woman has more education than her partner, she is more likely to engage in infidelity. Because of the lack of research and inconsistent findings on this topic, this category will not be used in creating questions for the infidelity measure.

Income levels, employment, and infidelity. Similar to education, income levels and employment are lacking in research and do not provide a wide range of results. Atkins et al. (2001) found that individuals were more likely to engage in infidelity if they earned more than \$30,000 a year. However, the researchers explained that these results may not be due solely to money, but it might be because of factors such as opportunity and education. In addition, Treas and Giesen (2000) concluded that employment was positively correlated with infidelity, but also suggested that it might be due more to the opportunity that a work environment provides rather than the employment itself. Given the lack of research and inconsistent variables associated with income levels and employment, this category will not be used when creating the questions for the infidelity measure.

Individual characteristics and infidelity. Given that every person's life experience is unique, certain characteristics, such as number of sexual partners prior to marriage, related to infidelity should be individually considered rather than generalized to a group such as gender or religious affiliation.

Interest in sex and prior sexual experience. Research has often reported that a person with strong sexual interest or permissive sexual values will engage in infidelity more often (Buss & Shackelford, 1997; Liu, 2000; Sprecher & Felmlee, 1992; Treas & Giesen, 2000). Levin (1975) found that the probability of extramarital sex (EMS) occurring and the number of EMS partners increased with a woman's premarital sexual experience. That is, the more sexual partners a woman had prior to marriage, the higher the woman's likelihood of having an extramarital affair. Similarly, Treas and Giesen (2000) found that for every sexual partner an individual had between 18 years old and his/her first marriage, the likelihood of that person committing adultery increased by 1%. Thus, if an individual had sexual relations with 10 people from the time he or she was 18 until his or her first marriage, that person would have increased his or her odds of cheating by 10%. Forste and Tanfer (1996) also suggested that women were more likely to engage in infidelity if they had 4 or more sexual partners prior to their primary relationship. Given the consistent findings, questions from this section will be included on the instrument.

Other potentially important considerations. Characteristics such as a person's age when beginning a relationship, number of prior marriages, and parental divorce can influence a person's risk of engaging in infidelity. For example, people who come from a divorced family have been cited as engaging in infidelity more than their counterparts (Amato & Rogers, 1997). However, this variable may be related to a person's attachment style more than the parent's divorce. Nonetheless, research has shown that the more marriages and divorces persons have, the more likely they will be to engage in

extramarital affairs (Atkins et al., 2000; Christopher & Sprecher, 2000; Wiederman, 1997).

The age that people begin dating is another variable that has been shown to be related to infidelity; specifically, the younger the couple, the higher the chances of engaging in extramarital behaviors (Amato & Rogers, 1997; Atkins et al., 2001). In addition, one study found that the earlier a person began engaging in infidelity behaviors, the more episodes of infidelity the person engaged in over time (Wiggins & Lederer, 1984). Given that number of marriages and divorces, as well as the age a couple was married, will be accounted for on the demographics questionnaire, no items from this section will be included on the infidelity measure.

Attachment and Infidelity. As mentioned previously, attachment theorists have examined infidelity. In an empirical study examining mating style with attachment style, Schmitt et al. (2002) found that men who preferred high numbers of sexual partners often had a dismissive attachment style. Women who reported restricting their number of sexual partners often had secure attachment styles. In addition, women who reported needing more time before consenting to sex tended to exhibit a fearful attachment style.

Allen and Baucom (2004) conducted a study on 504 undergraduate students that reported having a dating relationship for at least 1 month in duration within the past 2 years and 251 adults from the community that reported either having a current or previous marriage. Of the 504 undergraduate students, 345 (69%) reported some type of extradyadic involvement as did 115 (46%) of the 251 community sample. The researchers examined frequency, motivations, and types of extradyadic involvement. Results from both samples indicated that dismissive individual's (i.e., individuals with

low anxiety and high avoidance with regards to relationships) motivation for engaging in extradyadic relationships was to obtain autonomy (e.g., space and freedom). Conversely, respondents from both samples indicated that preoccupied (i.e., high levels of anxiety and low levels of avoidance in relationships) and fearful (i.e., high levels of both anxiety and avoidance in relationships) individual's motivations were to fulfill intimacy needs (e.g., loneliness, desire to feel cared about).

Regarding frequency of extradyadic relationships and attachment style, undergraduate males, with a dismissive attachment style, were more likely to engage in infidelity than any other group. In addition, undergraduate females, with a preoccupied attachment style, reported more extradyadic partners compared to females with a secure attachment style. However, when considering the community sample, individuals with a dismissive attachment style were more likely to engage in infidelity, and males, more than females, were more likely to report an affair.

Finally, the researchers determined that all undergraduate participants exhibiting fearful and preoccupied attachment styles, as well as males from the community sample identifying with fearful and preoccupied attachment styles, were more likely to engage in an obsessive and needy extradyadic relationship, which allowed anxiety to continue within the extradyadic relationship. In addition, participants in both groups with fearful attachment styles were more likely to feel ambivalence in regards to intimacy with the extradyadic partner. Individuals with a fearful attachment style often express a desire for intimacy, but avoid it because of their fear of rejection from the partner.

Overall, the researchers concluded that in both samples, women reported more intimacy reasons (e.g., loneliness, neglect) as motivations for infidelity, whereas men

reported engaging in extradyadic affairs due to casual reasons (e.g., extradyadic involvement seen as fun instead of intimate, wanting “no strings attached” relationships). These findings are similar to the numerous other studies discussed throughout the current review which state that men engage more often in sexual infidelity whereas women engage more often in emotional infidelity. Although the attachment category does not provide a significant amount of literature, the results indicate that insecure attachment increases a person’s risk of engaging in infidelity. However, given that there is no way to determine if a person has insecure versus secure attachment, no questions from this section will be included on the measure.

Opportunity and infidelity. One variable that is difficult to examine is opportunity because researchers operationalize it differently (Blow & Hartnett, 2005). For example, opportunity could refer to the amount of people a person comes into contact with on a daily basis, or it could be used to describe individuals who are often away from home or spend considerable amounts of time apart from their partner. Early research found that approximately one-half of participants engaged in extramarital affairs with their coworkers (Wiggins & Lederer, 1984). Another study reported that women were more likely to cheat to advance their career (Boekhout et al., 1999), which could be viewed as having the opportunity and also engaging with coworkers. The researchers concluded that opportunities in the workplace were significant contributors to infidelity (Wiggins & Lederer, 1984). Other studies have revealed similar results (Treas & Giesen, 2000; Lewandowski & Ackerman, 2006).

Blumstein and Schwartz (1983) found that couples who lived “separate” lives were more likely to engage in infidelity, which is similar to the findings of Boekhout et

al. (1999) that suggested that men who had geographically distant partners were more likely to cheat. This may be because of the opportunities made available to people given that their partner is not consistently around. However, it could also mean that distant partners already have strained relationships, which may contribute to infidelity behaviors.

Numerous studies have examined opportunities outside of the workplace but without notable findings. For example, the size of community (i.e., rural vs. urban) and likelihood of infidelity did not produce significant results (Smith, 1991; Treas & Giesen, 2000; Wiederman, 1997). An important note to remember is that given the opportunity, all couples are vulnerable to infidelity, regardless of a strong positive relationship. That is, even couples who report happy relationships are susceptible to acts of infidelity if the right opportunity arises (Blumstein & Schwartz, 1983; Glass, 2002). Given that opportunity has significant consistent results with regards to infidelity, questions from this category will be included on the measuring tool.

Responses and reactions to infidelity. When people find out about a partner cheating on them, it is inevitable that some type of reaction will arise. Research suggests that women's first question upon hearing of an unfaithful partner is likely to include "do you love her" whereas men's first question is "did you sleep with him" (Daines, 2006). Similarly, Francis (1977) found that jealous reactions from men were related to their wives' sexual involvement with another man, whereas women's jealous reactions were related to their husbands talking with or sharing common interests with another woman. One study looked at three types of infidelity: (a) strongly emotional (in love) but not sexual intercourse, (b) sexual intercourse but not emotional (in love), and (c) emotional (in love) and sexual intercourse (Thompson, 1984). Results indicated that emotional and

sexual intercourse is felt to be the most “wrong” and most disparaging to the primary relationship, with sexual intercourse rated as the second most “wrong,” and emotional involvement as the least “wrong.”

In a cross-cultural study (Geary et al., 1995) on China and U.S. populations, interesting reactions to infidelity were found. First, U.S. females who reported greater distress to sexual infidelity reported that they would confront the other person, while the majority of females who reported greater distress to emotional infidelity reported that they would ignore the other individual. Second, the researchers found that sexually jealous U.S. males reported that they would break off the relationship, whereas men who were upset by emotional jealousy were more likely to discuss and try to work things out with their partner. Overall, sexually jealous individuals were more likely to react assertively or break off the relationship whereas emotionally jealous individuals were more likely to make attempts to repair the relationship following infidelity. Also, individuals were more likely to experience hurt than anger from emotional infidelity, but more anger than hurt from sexual infidelity.

Boekhout et al. (1999) found that men were perceived to react to infidelity by terminating the current relationship, seeking revenge on the partner, or having their own affair. Women were more likely to forgive and confront their partner to find out his reason for the betrayal. Jankowiak, Nell, and Buckmaster (2002) reported three types of responses towards infidelity, including self-help, use of a higher authority, and general public. Self-help is defined as attempting to resolve the infidelity within the relationship without the help of outside influences. Higher authority requires taking the relationship to a formal institution to seek help (e.g., therapy), and general public refers to using gossip

to friends or family members to get emotional help as well as to shame and correct the partner. The researchers found that in terms of self help, men reacted more physically violent whereas women reacted more by distancing themselves from their partner. They also found that men preferred to deal with infidelity in a formal manner (higher authority), whereas women chose to gossip more to family and friends for support (general public). In 2007, Brand et al. found that women were more likely to break up and begin a new relationship after cheating, compared to men who were more suspicious about cheating and more likely to discover it.

The research study. The large percentage of divorces that are reported are due, at least in part, to infidelity. As mentioned, the general consensus about marriage is one of sexual exclusivity; however, as discussed in the literature, the vast majority of people engage in some type of infidelity. This has contributed to an increasing need for more useful tools to assist clinicians in assessing and treating couples with relationship difficulties.

Given this problem, the current research developed an instrument that clarifies individual's risk of infidelity in relationships. Understanding unsatisfied areas and areas of risk within a relationship prior to marriage can help couples and clinicians intervene and treat these areas before more severe problems arise (e.g., infidelity, divorce). In addition, the proposed instrument provided useful information about the risks of infidelity for couples already married. The instrument's items are not considered stable, but rather provide fluid, state-like qualities that can fluctuate over time. The purpose of the instrument is to initially assess the state an individual is experiencing and to help the couple develop healthy coping strategies in the areas they are struggling with. For

example, if an individual expresses a lack of communication within the relationship, it does not mean that there can never be healthier communication styles between the partners. As an alternative, it allows the clinician to intervene and help the couple develop healthier communication styles to improve their overall relationship satisfaction. In addition, this measure is not considered a scale with psychometric features, but rather a guide for clinicians to use for initial assessment of a couple. Therefore, when completed, the measure does not provide the clinician with an overall score, but rather the clinician can identify themes of difficulties within the couple's relationship. The second step of the current research included field testing the tool and revising it based on participants' feedback. Finally, the third step asked clinicians to evaluate the usefulness of the tool by administering it to couples and receiving feedback from them. It is important to note that this instrument, if not used according to the instructions, can be harmful to clients. Thus, when using this instrument, it is extremely important to discuss with the couple the reason they will not see their partner's answers to the questions. More specifically, harm (e.g., emotional pain; abuse) could occur as a result of sharing individual items, and thus, this is not considered as part of the instructions on this questionnaire. In addition, using this tool as a predictor to infidelity, rather than a guide for assessing couples, could result in harm to one or both of the individuals. This instrument does not predict infidelity in relationships, but rather it provides clinicians with insight into a couple's relationship difficulties that are similar to items found to increase the risk of infidelity. Therefore, as with any assessment measure, it is important to follow the instructions and only use the instrument for the purposes for which it was created.

Chapter III

Methods

The current research can be conceptualized as a 3-step process. The first step entailed creating the items for the initial questionnaire. The second part of the process involved refining the items created in step one. Finally, the third part of the process included administering the final version of the tool and determining how useful it is in clinical practice.

Step 1: Item Development

The first step in creating the screening tool included developing the items for the questionnaire. All of the questions were developed in a Likert scale format scaled from 1 to 4 and were derived from the literature. For a question to be created, at least two research studies must have shown consistent results. For example, numerous research studies have determined that women are more likely to engage in emotional infidelity, whereas men are more likely to engage in sexual infidelity. Therefore, a few questions for the instrument were developed to capture the different areas of emotional infidelity (e.g., *I feel my partner does not listen to me*), as well as the different areas of sexual infidelity (e.g., *I am not sexually satisfied in my current relationship*). The number of items on the questionnaire was determined by the content of the literature. The initial edition of the screening tool consisted of 37 items. The items were created to screen for “yea-” and “nay-sayer” responding. That is, 14 items were written in a positive format, with the remaining items written in a negative manner. In addition, 5 items were created

to identify individuals who might be exaggerating their responses (i.e., Defensiveness Scale). Specifically, the Defensiveness Scale was created to screen for responses meant to present an individual in an excessively favorable manner. See Appendix A for a copy of the first 37-item questionnaire.

Step 2: Item Refinement

The second step in developing the screening tool consisted of hand-selecting 15 individuals to critique the items. Participants were selected based on prior work experience with couples, as well as age, gender, race, and religious affiliation. The goal was to include individuals who could identify items that might be endorsed based on diversity variables rather than on item content related to infidelity. Of the 15 participants, 2 were mental health practitioners who had extensive education and experience working with couples. The other 13 participants were individuals selected based on age, gender, religious affiliation, relationship status, and race. Of the 15 participants, 9 were female and 6 were male. Ages ranged from 23 to 53 years old with a mean age of 34.6 years. Further, participants' race included 9 Caucasian, 3 African Americans, and 3 Hispanics with all 15 identifying as heterosexual. Ten participants revealed that they were married and living together, 4 stated that they were dating and living together, and one participant reported that he was dating and living separately. The length of the participants' relationship ranged from 3 months to 300 months (i.e., 25 years) with a mean of 92.7 months (i.e., 7 years and 7 months). Participants' religious affiliation included 10 Christians, 2 Atheists/Agnostics, 1 Muslim, 1 Jew, and 1 Jehovah Witness. Finally, the participants' education levels ranged from a high school diploma to a graduate school degree. Specifically, 1 person received a high school diploma, 3 people had received

their B.S./B.A. degree, and 11 people were currently taking graduate courses or had completed graduate work. More detailed information about demographics is displayed in Table 1 below.

Table 1

Demographics of Participants in Item Refinement Process

Ages:	23-53	Mean: 34.6 years	
Gender:	9 Females	6 Males	
Race:	9 Caucasian	3 African American	3 Hispanic
Sexual Orientation:	15 Heterosexual		
Education:	11 Graduate Work	3 B.S./B.A degree	1 H.S. Diploma
Religious Affiliation:	10 Christian 1 Jewish	1 Jehovah Witness 2 Atheist/Agnostic	1 Muslim
Partner's Religious Affiliation:	12 Christian 1 Atheist/Agnostic	1 Jehovah Witness 1 Jewish	
Religious Attendance:	3 Never 6: Few times a year	4: 1-2 times per month 2: Every Week	
Partner's Religious Attendance:	3 Never 2: Every Week	6: 1-2 times per month	
Relationship Status:	10 Married and Living Together	4 Dating and Living Together	1 Dating and Living Separate
Length of Relationship:	3-300 Months	Mean: 92.7 Months 7 Years- 7 Months	

Each participant was provided a packet containing the instructions for this task, a demographics form, and the questionnaire (See Appendix A for a copy of the questionnaire; See Appendix B for a copy of the demographic form). They were then asked to read the instructions and complete the demographics form. In addition, the participants were each instructed to critique the questionnaire with regards to readability but were explicitly asked not to answer the questions. When the participants finished critiquing the questionnaire, they placed all of the forms back into the packet and handed it to the researcher.

The researcher reviewed the responses and searched for common themes. For example, the researcher noted that numerous individuals commented on the similarity between questions 4 and 10. Question 4 was deleted due to the overlap. In addition, two participants noted that leaving space for clients to leave comments under each question could provide the clinician with important information. Specifically, clinicians would have the opportunity to review more in-depth information on clients' issues and it would offer clients the chance to write about their personal experiences or thoughts about specific questions. Thus, the final version of the questionnaire provides space for clients to leave additional comments. Further, a few participants asked if question 7 was referring to actual infidelity or consideration of infidelity; the question was reworded to more clearly reflect actual incidences of infidelity rather than considerations of infidelity. Finally, participants suggested adding questions about substance use, communication, past infidelity behaviors, and finances. However, in order to keep the questionnaire tied closely to prior research, questions about those topics were not added because sufficient

research has not investigated those topics. For a complete list of the changes, see Appendix C for the Second Edition questionnaire (34-items).

Step 3: Field Testing

The final step in developing the questionnaire consisted of hand-selecting mental health practitioners within the community who would administer the questionnaire to at least 3 couples. Six mental health practitioners were identified as potential participants wherein two practitioners responded and agreed to participate. However, one practitioner never followed through on the administration of the questionnaire and the other finally reported that the practice was not currently seeing any couples. Therefore, two different practitioners were identified and agreed to participate by signing an informed consent form; a proposal was submitted to the Institutional Review Board asking permission to administer the questionnaire to these new practitioners. Upon acceptance of the proposal, the two practitioners were each mailed 5 copies of the revised questionnaire (Appendix C), the Demographics form, the Clinician Rating Form, and 2 informed consent forms. The first informed consent is Consent for Participation in Research which was created for the clinician. The second informed consent is Client Consent for Participation in Research (See Appendix B for all forms).

The first practitioner was able to have five couples complete the demographics form and questionnaire, which took approximately 10-20 minutes for individuals to complete. The practitioner was asked to identify any issues that were raised due to the individuals completing the questionnaire. The questionnaire raised issues of honesty and understanding for two of the five couples. That is, one couple wanted to know her partner's answers to the questions, which resulted in the partner becoming upset and

angry. Another couple found that the questionnaire identified individual's different perceptions of the relationship. Finally, it appeared that the main problem was logistics. For example, some individuals forgot to complete the back of the questionnaire because they were unaware that questions were listed on the back side of the page.

The clinician was asked to rate the overall helpfulness of the questionnaire, which she indicated was somewhat helpful. In addition, she stated the questionnaire was extremely representative of relationship issues and was easy to administer. Finally, she reported that she was unsure about whether or not she would administer this questionnaire within the first two therapy sessions with a client; however, she did indicate that she would be more willing to administer the questionnaire after the fourth or fifth session once trust and rapport was able to be successfully established. When asked about questions she thought were missing from the questionnaire, the clinician suggested adding a question that reads, "Have you ever been unfaithful to your partner?" "If so, do you believe you and your partner will be able to heal (e.g., rebuild trust)?" Unfortunately, this question would not be congruent with the literature and thus was not added to the questionnaire.

The second clinician was only able to administer the questionnaire to one individual who was seeking individual therapy for couple's issues. Therefore, the feedback from this clinician was not as useful due to the lack of participants. The clinician stated that the questionnaire was easy to administer but did not provide any other relevant information with regards to the process or the feedback received from the individual.

Chapter IV

Considerations

Limitations

Given that this research was aimed at developing the GEM RIM, there are some limitations that need to be addressed. Although the questionnaire has content validity because it was created based on the literature, there is a lack of other validity and reliability information. In addition, the questionnaire has no formal scoring system for clinicians to use for interpretation. Currently clinicians can use the individual responses for interpretation and insight into problems within the relationship. Other limitations include the lack of a normative sample and the small number of participants used to gather data for the development of the questionnaire. Given that a normative sample is required in order for a scoring system to be developed this would be a step to complete in future research. With regards to the small number of participants, it was difficult to find clinicians who were working with couples and who agreed to participate in the project. This type of research faces these challenges because clinicians see it as taking up valuable time and they may not be sure how the time spent will benefit them and their clients.

Currently, the questionnaire could be administered to couples; however, caution should be used with interpretation due to the lack of reliability, validity, and a scoring system. Thus, interpretation can only be done on each individual item. As mentioned, given that there is a lack of normative data, it cannot be stated with 100% certainty

whether the Defensiveness Scale indicates an individual's attempt to present in a favorable manner. This will need to be determined after validity and reliability have been obtained.

Future Considerations

As mentioned above in the limitations section, there is a lack of reliability and validity for the questionnaire. In addition, the current research is lacking a large normative sample and a formal scoring system. Thus, future research will need to focus on each of these areas in order to continue the development of the questionnaire.

Specifically, in terms of validity several lines of research should be completed. First, data should be gathered on a large normative sample of couples in order to assess construct validity. One way to assess construct validity is to administer this tool along with one or more other established measures of relationship and review their intercorrelations. This step permits an assessment of whether the questionnaire is measuring the construct it was intended to measure (i.e., infidelity). For example, if an individual's results on an already reliable and valid relationship measure indicated that the individual was content within the relationship, it would be hypothesized that the current questionnaire would not indicate relationship difficulties for that particular individual.

It also will be useful to conduct a factor analysis wherein items on this instrument would be identified as loading together on a particular set of factors or constructs. For example, numerous items might load under a factor of sexual infidelity whereas other items might load on emotional infidelity. If two or more significant factors are identified, then it may be wise to create subscales within the measure and to create a scoring system

for the subscales. Moreover, once a scoring system is established, the instrument could be administered to determine whether higher scores on the instrument, or subscales, are related to factors that have been linked to infidelity.

Test-retest reliability should be established from couples within the normal and the clinical populations. This will help assess whether the questionnaire is reliable across a period of time. Finally, protective factors for infidelity should be identified and included in the questionnaire. That is, even if someone endorsed many risk factors for infidelity, based on the literature, but had numerous protective factors in place, the person might not be at an increased risk for infidelity. Thus, obtaining some research to further this area of infidelity would significantly contribute to the literature.

Development of the User's Manual

In order for a test to be published, a technical manual or user's manual must be developed (Hogan, 2007). The manual is created to describe the questionnaire's rationale, purpose, and structure, as well as directions for administration, interpretation, and development of norming samples, when statistical data are desired. In addition, the manual includes estimates of the reliability and validity of the questionnaire, when such data are relevant. Simple tests typically include a test booklet, a scoring key, and a short manual covering directions and the characteristics of the questionnaire (Hogan, 2007). Given that norming samples and reliability and validity estimates have yet to be obtained, the User's Manual is quite brief. Chapter VI presents the User's Manual.

Chapter V

User's Manual

Purpose

The GEM RIM (Gemmer's Risk of Infidelity Measure) is a 34-item self-report questionnaire that measures risk factors of infidelity in individuals or couples. This instrument was developed from relevant literature about reasons for, and predictors of infidelity in heterosexual couples. The instrument can be used as a screening tool to highlight couples' potential risks for relationship difficulties. More specifically, the instrument can be used to assess individuals' risk of infidelity within their current relationship. Clinicians can use this tool for work with couples in pre-marital counseling, as well as with married couples seeking treatment and individuals who present with relationship problems. The tool provides clinicians with initial insight into the risks of infidelity when a couple presents with relationship issues. Further, this tool gives couples an opportunity to inform the clinician about their relationship issues in a paper-and-pencil format, without having to address the issues in the presence of the partner, provided that the instrument is administered individually. Oftentimes in the first session, individuals may not be candid about personal problems because of fear, lack of trust, and feelings of vulnerability. Thus, using this instrument allows individuals to inform the clinician of problems within the relationship without having to openly discuss the issues in the presence of a partner, which will compensate for the feelings of fear and vulnerability that many individuals may be experiencing.

Development

The items for the screening tool were developed based on reviews of the infidelity literature, such as that completed by Blow and Harnett (2005) and this author, with the goal of providing clinicians with an easy-to-use tool that will assist in determining the risk a person may pose for being unfaithful. Each of the questions within the instrument is based on research findings on people who have either engaged in an affair or been asked to cite reasons that they would engage in an affair. Clinicians should be aware, however, that none of the research provides the absolute truth about relationships and that every couple's situation is unique. Nonetheless, given that these problems have been cited as core areas of concern for people who have either engaged in infidelity, or provided as reasons why they might engage in infidelity, the questions in the screening tool can provide useful initial information to a clinician treating couples. Because very little research has been conducted to identify whether indications of infidelity among gay and lesbian couples are the same as those found in heterosexual couples, this risk assessment instrument is relevant for work only with heterosexual couples.

The items were developed through a 3-step process, which included item development, item refinement, and field testing. Specifically, all of the questions were developed in a Likert scale format scaled from 1 to 4 and were derived from the literature. For a question to be created, at least two research studies must have shown consistent results. For example, numerous research studies have determined that women are more likely to engage in emotional infidelity, whereas men are more likely to engage in sexual infidelity. Therefore, a few questions for the instrument capture the different areas of emotional infidelity (e.g., *I feel my partner does not listen to me*), as well as the

different areas of sexual infidelity (e.g., *I am not sexually satisfied in my current relationship*). Based on the literature review, 32 items were created and an additional 5 items were created to identify individuals who might be exaggerating their responses (i.e., Defensiveness scale). Thus, the first edition of the questionnaire contained 37 items.

The second step in developing the screening tool consisted of hand-selecting 15 individuals to critique the items. Participants were selected based on prior work experience with couples, as well as age, gender, race, and religious affiliation. Table 2 below describes the demographics of each participant:

Table 2

Demographics of Participants in Item Refinement Process

Ages:	23-53	Mean: 34.6 years	
Gender:	9 Females	6 Males	
Race:	9 Caucasian	3 African American	3 Hispanic
Sexual Orientation:	15 Heterosexual		
Education:	11 Graduate Work	3 B.S./B.A degree	1 H.S. Diploma
Religious Affiliation:	10 Christian 1 Jewish	1 Jehovah Witness 2 Atheist/Agnostic	1 Muslim
Partner's Religious Affiliation:	12 Christian 1 Atheist/Agnostic	1 Jehovah Witness 1 Jewish	
Religious Attendance:	3 Never 6: Few times a year	4: 1-2 times per month 2: Every Week	
Partner's Religious Attendance:	3 Never 2: Every Week	6: 1-2 times per month	
Relationship Status:	10 Married and Living Together	4 Dating and Living Together	1 Dating and Living Separate
Length of Relationship:	3-300 Months	Mean: 92.7 Months 7 Years- 7 Months	

Once each participant had critiqued the items, the researcher reviewed the responses and searched for common themes. For example, the researcher noticed that numerous individuals commented on the similarity between question 4 and 10. Thus,

question 4 was deleted due to the overlap. For an extensive summary of the participants' comments and rationale for revisions or for a copy of the Second Edition Questionnaires, please contact this author.

The final step in developing the screening tool consisted of hand-selecting mental health practitioners within the community who would administer the questionnaire to at least 3 couples. Six mental health practitioners were identified as potential participants; only 2 currently had access to clients presenting for couples therapy. Feedback from the clinicians stated that the questionnaire was easy and quick to administer. In addition, one clinician indicated that the questionnaire was extremely representative of relationships issues and she would likely administer the questionnaire in the future; however, she did explain that administration might be better during the fourth or fifth session as opposed to the first or second session in order to establish trust and rapport. Although the clinicians offered suggestions for new items (e.g., *Have you ever been unfaithful to your partner*), the items proposed were not mentioned in previous literature and thus, could not be added at this time.

Clinical Use

The GEM RIM provides an assessment of risk factors of infidelity for individuals or couples in relationships. The instrument was developed as a way to allow clinicians the opportunity to assess presenting relationship problems in the beginning of treatment, not as a way to predict infidelity. Thus, just because an individual has endorsed numerous risk factors does not mean the individual is engaging in infidelity or will do so. It does, however, suggest that the individual has some areas of concern within the current relationship that are consistent with a higher than average probability of infidelity.

Because infidelity can result in numerous reactions and consequences, it is important that the clinician be careful interpreting and reporting the individual's results to the client's partner.

Administration and Scoring

Administration: General Considerations

Testing conditions. The GEM RIM presents few difficulties with regards to test administration. That is, the test does not require a variety of materials to administer. It is important that the individuals completing the instrument have ample illumination for reading purposes and minimal noise for concentration purposes. Participants complete the instrument separately so that confidentiality can be assured between members of the couple.

If needed, the test items may be read aloud by the examiner to the individual; however, it is possible that the results may be skewed if the individual feels compelled to present in a favorable manner. As of this time, no field testing has been completed to determine if results would be skewed due to oral administration.

Administration time. The GEM RIM takes approximately 10 to 20 minutes to complete and can easily be administered during the intake session. However, it can also be administered after the first session when some alliance has been established and the client is more apt to respond in an honest manner.

Self-administration. The directions for the GEM RIM are as follows:

Instructions: *Please answer the following questions as truthfully as possible as they relate to your current relationship. In order to provide the best treatment, please do not ask your partner about his or her answers. This allows each person to be*

completely forthcoming about relationship issues and will provide the clinician with a better understanding of the current difficulties within the relationship.

Place a 1, 2, 3, 4 or N/A on the line beside the question using the following options:

1	2	3	4	N/A
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Not applicable

Oral administration. If the GEM RIM is administered orally, the following instructions are provided:

This is a questionnaire. On the questionnaire are statements about your current relationship. I will read the statement to you; then I would like you to either tell me or circle which number is more truthful about your relationship. Here is a copy for you so that you can follow along and use the 1 through 4 rating scales to answer the statements.

Hand a copy of the GEM RIM to the examinee so that she or he can follow along as you read and so she or he is able to see what the numbers on the Likert scale mean. Make sure the client understands and then begin by reading question 1.

Directions and Guidelines for Clinicians. Given that this measure is completed by each individual within the dyad, it is important to clarify confidentiality prior to administration. It is possible that the couple will want to see or know the answers to the partner's responses, which could decrease the likelihood that each individual will be completely open and honest about the responses. In addition, harm (e.g., emotional pain; abuse) could occur as a result of sharing individual items and no research supports a conclusion that individual items identify infidelity. Thus, informing the couple that

individual responses will not be shared with partners is necessary; however, overall themes or significant issues mentioned on the questionnaire can be addressed throughout treatment. It is recommended that clinicians explain to the couple the reasons for not sharing individual answers. Reasons for this might include wanting to get very honest answers from each individual in order to better serve the dyad and giving the couple the opportunity to express thoughts and feelings when they are ready.

Scoring

A scoring system and norms have not yet been developed. The next step in the development of the GEM RIM will be to develop norms and a scoring system. Thus, the GEM RIM is currently not able to be formally scored. However, the interpretation of scores can proceed as described below.

Interpretation of scores. Given that the instrument does not currently have a formal scoring system, the interpretation of each participant's answers is subject to the clinician's discretion. That is, clinicians can use the individual questions and responses to assess relevant information to be discussed in therapy sessions.

Appendix A

First Edition Questionnaire

Gemmer's Risk of Infidelity Measure

Instructions: Please answer the following questions as truthfully as possible as they relate to your current relationship. Place a 1, 2, 3, 4 or N/A on the line beside the statement, using the following options:

1	2	3	4	N/A
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Not applicable

1. I feel my partner and I are close. _____

2. My partner makes me feel attractive. _____

3. I am in love with my partner. _____

4. My partner neglects me. _____

5. I feel lonely in my relationship. _____

6. My partner takes me for granted. _____

7. Some of my current friends cheat on their partners. _____

8. My sex life is exciting. _____

9. My partner and I communicate well. _____

10. My partner does not pay attention to me. _____

11. Sexual exclusivity is important to me in a relationship. _____

12. I am bored in my relationship. _____

13. I am satisfied with my current sexual relationship. _____

14. My partner meets my needs. _____

15. I am dissatisfied in my relationship. _____

16. I am physically attracted to my partner. _____

17. My partner listens to me. _____

18. My partner provides what I need in my relationship. _____

19. I wish my partner were more attractive. _____

20. Overall, I am satisfied with my relationship. _____

21. I think about divorce/breaking-up. _____

22. It is acceptable to cheat in relationships. _____

23. Divorce is acceptable. _____

24. I have discussed divorcing/breaking up with
my partner with someone in my life other than my partner. _____

25. Sex is important to me in a relationship. _____

26. My sex life with my partner has changed for the worse. _____

27. I wish there was more sexual variety in my relationship. _____

28. Prior to my current relationship, I was sexually active with others. _____

29. I have the opportunity to meet other potential partners. _____

30. My partner and I both sleep in the same home every night. _____

31. I wish my partner were home more often. _____

32. If I wanted to cheat on my partner, I have the opportunity. _____

33. My partner and I agree on everything. _____

34. I always let my partner have his or her way. _____

35. I have never said anything hurtful to my partner. _____

36. I never get frustrated with my partner. _____

37. I have never found anyone else attractive since
meeting my partner _____

Overall Comments

Appendix B

Additional Forms

Demographics

Instructions: Please complete the following information as accurately and completely as possible.

AGE _____

GENDER (check one)

_____ Male

_____ Female

RELATIONSHIP STATUS (check one)

_____ Married & Living Together

_____ Married & Separated

_____ Dating & Living Together

_____ Dating & Living Separately

LENGTH OF RELATIONSHIP

(Fill in only one)

_____ # of Years, or

_____ # of Months

RACE (check one)

_____ American Indian/Alaskan Native

_____ Asian

_____ Black/African American

_____ Caucasian

_____ Hispanic/Latina/Latino

_____ Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander

_____ Other (specify)

EDUCATION (check one)

_____ Less Than High School

_____ High School Diploma/GED

_____ Some College

_____ BA or BS Degree

_____ Graduate Work

SEXUAL ORIENTATION (check one)

_____ Heterosexual

_____ LGBTQ

_____ Other (Specify)

YOUR RELIGIOUS AFFILIATION

(check one)

_____ Christian

_____ Buddhist

_____ Jewish

_____ Hindu

_____ Muslim

_____ Atheist/Agnostic

_____ Other (specify)

PARTNER'S RELIGIOUS

AFFILIATION (check one)

_____ Christian

_____ Buddhist

_____ Jewish

_____ Hindu

_____ Muslim

_____ Atheist/Agnostic

_____ Other (specify)

YOUR RELIGIOUS SERVICE

ATTENDANCE (check one)

_____ Never

_____ Few Times a Year

_____ 1-2 Times per Month

_____ Every Week

_____ Other (Specify)

PARTNER'S RELIGIOUS SERVICE
ATTENDANCE (check one)

- Never
- Few Times a Year
- 1-2 Times per Month
- Every Week

Other (Specify)

Clinician Rating Form

Thank you for taking the time to administer the questionnaire to your clients. It is greatly appreciated and will hopefully provide clinicians with better information when working with couples. Please complete the following questions each time you receive a questionnaire back from an individual (One sheet per couple).

To Be Completed for EVERY Individual Participant

Partner #1

1. How long did it take the participant to complete the form? _____

2. Did the participant struggle with any of the questions? ____ Yes ____ No
If so, which number(s)? _____
If so, was it: (circle all that apply)

Comprehension Readability Irrelevant Offensive _____Other

3. Did the questionnaire raise any issues for the client/couple?
Explain:

Partner #2

1. How long did it take the participant to complete the form? _____

2. Did the participant struggle with any of the questions? ____ Yes ____ No
If so, which number(s)? _____
If so, was it: (circle all that apply)

Comprehension Readability Irrelevant Offensive _____Other

3. Did the questionnaire raise any issues for the client/couple?
Explain:

To Be Completed ONE TIME Only

Please answer the following questions by using the following rating scale:

1	2	3	4	5
Not at all	Very Little	Not Sure	Somewhat	Extremely

4. How helpful did you find the information on the questionnaire? _____

5. Do you feel the questionnaire is representative of relationship issues? _____

6. Was it easy to administer? _____

7. How likely would you be to administer this to your clients either at the intake or after one or two sessions? _____

8. Were there any topics/questions that you feel were missing that would be considered relevant to the topic of infidelity and couples? _____Yes _____No

If yes, please explain:

9. Additional Comments, Critiques, Questions:



School of Professional Psychology
Duke E. Ellis Human Development Institute
9 North Edwin C. Moses Blvd.
Dayton, OH 45402-6837
(937) 775-4300
FAX (937) 775-4323

CLIENT CONSENT FOR PARTICIPATION IN RESEARCH

PURPOSE AND PROCEDURES

Stephanie J. Gemmer, Psy.M., in the School of Professional Psychology at Wright State University, is conducting research to help determine risk factors associated with infidelity in relationships.

If I agree to participate, I understand that I will fill out two forms, one that asks for demographic data and one that asks about my relationship with my partner. This process will take about 15-20 minutes.

I understand that no identifying information will be provided on any forms and this consent form will be given to my clinician and placed in my chart. This will ensure that my identity is not disclosed to anyone beyond my clinician. My clinician will send the demographic data form and the survey to the researcher without any identifying information.

I understand that some questions might result in my feeling distress or embarrassment; however, I do not have to answer any questions that I do not feel comfortable answering and I may stop answering the questions at any time by alerting my clinician.

I will not receive any compensation for completing this questionnaire. In addition, there are no anticipated benefits to me for participating in this research.

CONSENT

I will be given a copy of this consent form to keep.

PARTICIPATION IN THIS RESEARCH IS VOLUNTARY. I am free to decline to be in this study, or to stop participating at any point. My decision to participate in this study will have no influence on my present or future status as a client.

If I have any questions about this research study I can contact the primary investigator at gemmer.2@wright.edu. If I have general questions about giving consent or participating or my rights as a research participant in this research study, I can call the Wright State University Institutional Review Board at 937-775-4462.

I am agreeing to participate by signing below:

Date

Signature of Client

Date

Signature of Clinician Obtaining Consent



School of Professional Psychology
Duke E. Ellis Human Development Institute
9 North Edwin C. Moses Blvd.
Dayton, OH 45402-6837
(937) 775-4300
FAX (937) 775-4323

CONSENT FOR PARTICIPATION IN RESEARCH

PURPOSE AND PROCEDURES

Stephanie J. Gemmer, Psy.M., in the School of Professional Psychology at Wright State University, is conducting research to help determine risk factors associated with infidelity in relationships.

If I agree to participate, I understand that I will administer the demographics form and the questionnaire to clients I personally select within my practice.

I understand that no identifying information will be provided on any forms and the client's consent form will be placed in his/her chart. This will ensure that his/her identity is not disclosed to anyone beyond me. I will send the demographic data form and the survey to the researcher without any identifying information.

I understand that some questions might result in my clients feeling distress or embarrassment; however, I understand that they do not have to answer any questions that they do not feel comfortable answering and they may stop answering the questions at any time by alerting me.

I will not receive any compensation for completing this questionnaire. In addition, there are no anticipated benefits to me or my clients for participating in this research other than the receipt of the data.

CONSENT

I will be given a copy of this consent form to keep.

PARTICIPATION IN THIS RESEARCH IS VOLUNTARY. I am free to decline to be in this study, or to stop participating at any point.

If I have any questions about this research study I can contact the primary investigator at gemmer.2@wright.edu. If I have general questions about giving consent or participating or my rights as a research participant in this research study, I can call the Wright State University Institutional Review Board at 937-775-4462.

I am agreeing to participate by signing below:

Date

Signature of Clinician

Appendix C

Second Edition Questionnaire

Instructions: Please answer the following questions as truthfully as possible as they relate to your current relationship. Please note that some questions could have different meanings, but you are to answer the questions from your perception of the meaning. In addition, there is space provided in case you want to leave additional comments about a particular question. Place a 1, 2, 3, 4 or N/A on the line at the right beside the statement, using the following options:

1	2	3	4	N/A
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Not applicable

1. I feel my partner and I are close. _____

2. I wish there was more sexual variety in my relationship. _____

3. I always let my partner have his or her way. _____

4. I feel lonely in my relationship. _____

5. My partner takes me for granted. _____

6. I have friends that cheat on their partners. _____

7. My sex life is exciting. _____

8. My partner and I communicate well. _____

9. My partner does not pay attention to me. _____

10. Being sexually faithful is important to me in a relationship. _____

11. I am bored in my relationship. _____

12. I am satisfied with my current sexual relationship. _____

13. I never get frustrated with my partner. _____

14. I am physically attracted to my partner. _____

15. My partner listens to me. _____

16. I have never said anything hurtful to my partner. _____

17. Overall, I am satisfied with my relationship. _____

18. I think about divorce/breaking-up. _____

19. I am dissatisfied in my relationship. _____

20. I am in love with my partner. _____

21. I have discussed ending my current relationship with someone other than my current partner. _____

22. Sex is important to me in a relationship. _____

23. My partner and I agree on everything. _____

24. My partner makes me feel attractive. _____

25. Prior to my current relationship, I was sexually active with others. _____

26. I have the opportunity to meet other potential partners. _____

27. Divorce is acceptable. _____

28. I wish my partner were home more often. _____

29. It is acceptable for me to cheat in relationships. _____

30. My sex life with my partner has changed for the worse. _____

31. My partner and I both sleep in the same home every night. _____

32. My partner provides what I need in the relationship. _____

33. I have never found anyone else attractive since meeting my partner. _____

34. If I wanted to cheat on my partner, I have the opportunity. _____

Overall Comments:

References

- Abraham, W. T., Cramer, R. E., Fernandez, A. M., & Mahler, E. (2001). Infidelity, race, and gender: An evolutionary perspective on asymmetries in subjective distress to violations-of-trust. *Current Psychology, 20*, 337-348.
- Ajzen, I., & Fishbein, I. (Eds.), (1980). *Understanding attitudes and predicting social behavior*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Allen, E. S., & Atkins, D. C. (2005). The multidimensional and developmental nature of infidelity: Practical applications. *Journal of Clinical Psychology, 61*(11), 1371-1382.
- Allen, E. S., & Baucom, D. H. (2004). Adult attachment and patterns of extradyadic involvement. *Family Process, 43*(4), 467-488.
- Amato, P. R., & Rogers, S. J. (1997). A longitudinal study of marital problems and subsequent divorce. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 59*, 612–624.
- Atkins, D. C., Baucom, D. H., & Jacobson, N. S. (2001). Understanding infidelity: Correlates in a national random sample. *Journal of Family Psychology, 15*, 735–749.
- Atkins, D. C., & Kessel, D. E. (2008). Religiousness and infidelity: Attendance, but not faith and prayer, predict marital fidelity. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 70*, 407-418.
- Atkins, D. C., Yi, J., Baucom, D. H., & Christensen, J. (2005). Infidelity in couples seeking marital therapy. *Journal of Family Psychology, 19*, 470-473.

- Baize, H. R., & Schroeder, J. E. (1995). Personality and mate selection in personal ads: Evolutionary preferences in a public mate selection process. *Journal of Social Behavior and Personality, 10*, 517-536.
- Baker, R. R., & Bellis, M. A. (1995). *Sperm competition: Copulation, masturbation, and infidelity*. London: Chapman and Hall.
- Bandura, A. (1977). *Social learning theory*, Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Barkow, J. H., Cosmides, L., & Tooby, J. (Eds.). (1992). *The adapted mind: Evolutionary psychology and the generation of culture*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Beall, A. E., & Sternberg, R. J. (Eds.) (1993). *The psychology of gender*. New York: Guilford.
- Betzig, L. (1989). Causes of conjugal dissolution: A cross-cultural study. *Current Anthropology, 30*, 654-676.
- Blow, A. J., & Hartnett, K. (2005). Infidelity in committed relationships II: A substantive review. *Journal of Marital and Family Therapy, 31*(2), 217-233.
- Blumstein, P., & Schwartz, P. (1983). *American couples: Money, work, sex*. New York: William Morrow.
- Boekhout, B. A., Hendrick, S. S., & Hendrick, C. (1999). Relationship infidelity: A loss perspective. *Journal of Personal and Interpersonal Loss, 4*, 97-123.
- Boekhout, B. A., Hendrick, S. S., & Hendrick, C. (2003). Exploring infidelity: Developing the Relationship issues scale. *Journal of Loss and Trauma, 8*, 283-306.
- Bowlby, J. (1973). *Attachment and loss: Vol. 2. Separation: Anxiety and anger*. New York: Basic Books.

- Brand, R. J., Markey, C. M., Mills, A., & Hodges, S. D. (2007). Sex differences in self reported infidelity and its correlates. *Sex Roles, 57*, 101-109.
- Brown, D. E. (1991). *Human universals*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Brown, E. M. (2001). *Patterns of infidelity and their treatment* (2nd ed.). Philadelphia, PA: Brunner-Routledge.
- Burdette, A. M., Ellison, C. G., Sherkat, D. E., & Gore, K.A. (2007). *Journal of Family Issues, 28(12)*, 1553-1581.
- Buss, D. M. (1989). Sex differences in human mate preferences: Evolutionary hypotheses testing in 37 cultures. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences, 12*, 1-49.
- Buss, D. M. (1995). Evolutionary psychology: a new paradigm for psychological science: *Psychology Inquiry, 6*, 1-30.
- Buss, D. M. (2004). *Evolutionary Psychology. The new science of the mind* (2nd Edition). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Buss, D. M. (2007). The evolution of human mating. *Acta Psychologica Sinica, 39(3)*, 502-512.
- Buss, D. M., Larsen, R. J., Westen, D., & Semmelroth, J. (1992). Sex differences in jealousy: Evolution, physiology, and psychology. *Psychological Science, 3*, 251-255.
- Buss, D. M., Larsen, R. J., Westen, D. (1996). Sex differences in jealousy: Not gone, not forgotten, and not explained by alternative hypothesis. *Psychological Science, 7(6)*, 373-375.
- Buss, D. M., & Schmitt, D. P. (1993). Sexual strategies theory: An evolutionary perspective on human mating. *Psychological Review, 100(2)*, 204-232.

- Buss, D. M., & Shackelford, T. K. (1997). Susceptibility to infidelity in the first year of marriage. *Journal of Research in Personality, 31*, 193-221.
- Buss, D. M., & Shackelford, T. K. (1997). From vigilance to violence: Mate retention tactics in married couples. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 72*, 346-361.
- Buss, D. M., Shackelford, T. K., Choe, J., Buunk, B. P., & Dijkstra, P. (2000). Distress about mating rivals. *Personal Relationships, 7*, 235-243.
- Buss, D. M., Shackelford, T. K., Kirkpatrick, L. A., Choe, J. C., Lim, H. K., Hasegawa, M., et al. (1999). Jealousy and the nature of beliefs about infidelity: Tests of competence hypotheses about sex differences in the United States, Korea, and Japan. *Personal Relationships, 6*, 125-150.
- Buunk, B. P., Angleitner, A., Oubaid, V., & Buss, D. M. (1996). Sex differences in jealousy in evolutionary and cultural perspective: Tests from the Netherlands, Germany, and the United States. *Psychological Science, 7*, 359-363.
- Buunk, B. P., & Bakker, A. (1995). Extradyadic sex: The roles of descriptive and injunctive norms. *Journal of Sex Research, 32*, 313-318.
- Cattell, R. B. (1979-1980). *Personality and learning theory: Vol. 1. The structure of personality in its environment. Vol. 2. A systems theory of maturation and structure learning*. New York: Springer.
- Chang, J. S. (1999). Scripting extramarital affairs: Marital mores, gender politics, and infidelity in Taiwan. *Modern China, 25*, 69-99.
- Charny, I. W., & Parnass, S. (1995). The impact of extramarital relationships on the continuation of marriages. *Journal of Sex and Marital Therapy, 21*, 100-115.

- Christopher, C. F., & Sprecher, S. (2000). Sexuality in marriage, dating, and other relationships: A decade review. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 62, 999–1017.
- Clarke, R. D., & Hatfield, E. (1989). Gender differences in receptivity to sexual offers. *Journal of Psychology and Human Sexuality*, 2, 39-55.
- Cosmides, L., & Tooby, J. (1994). Origins of domain specificity: the evolution of functional organization. In A. Hirschfeld, & S. A. Gelman (Eds.), *Mapping the mind: domain specificity in cognition and culture* (pp. 85-116). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Cramer, R. E., Abraham, W. T., Johnson, L. M., & Manning-Ryan, B. (2001). Gender differences in subjective distress to emotional and sexual infidelity: Evolutionary or logical inference explanation? *Current Psychology*, 20, 327-336.
- Cramer, R. E., Manning-Ryan, B., Johnson, L. M., & Barbo, E. (2000). Sex differences in subjective distress to violations of trust: Extending an evolutionary perspective. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology*, 22, 101-109.
- Daines, B. (2006). Violations of agreed and implicit sexual boundaries in couple relationships- some thoughts arising from Levine's 'A clinical perspective on couple infidelity'. *Sexual and Relationship Therapy*, 21(1), 45-53.
- Daly, M., & Wilson, M. (1988). *Homicide*. Hawthorne, NJ: Aldine de Gruyter.
- Daly, M., Wilson, M., & Weghorst, S. J. (1982). Male sexual jealousy. *Ethology and Sociobiology*, 3, 11-27.

- Desteno, D. A., Bartlett, M. Y., & Salovey, P. (2006). Constraining accommodative homunculi in evolutionary explorations of jealousy: A reply to Bartlett et al. (2006). *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *91*(3), 519-523.
- DeSteno, D. A., & Salovey, P. (1996). Evolutionary origins of sex difference in jealousy? Questioning the “fitness” of the model. *Psychological Science*, *7*, 367-372.
- Drigotas, S. M., & Barta, W. (2001). The cheating heart: Scientific explorations of infidelity. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, *10*(5), 177-180.
- Drigotas, S., Safstrom, C., & Gentilia, T. (1999). An investment model prediction of dating infidelity. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *77*, 509-524.
- Eagly, A. (1987). *Sex differences in social behavior: A social role interpretation*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Eagly, A., & Wood, W. (1991). Explaining sex differences in social behavior: A meta-analytic perspective. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *17*, 306-315.
- Eaves, S. H., & Robertson-Smith, M. (2007). The relationship between self-worth and marital infidelity: A pilot study. *The Family Journal: Counseling and Therapy for couples and Families*, *15*(4), 382-386.
- England, P., & Browne, I. (1992). Internalization and constraint in women’s subordination. In B. Agger (Ed.), *Current perspectives in social theory* (Vol 12, pp. 97-123). Greenwich, CT: JAI.
- Epstein, E., & Guttman, R. (1984). Mate selection in man: Evidence, theory, and outcome. *Social Biology*, *31*, 243-278.
- Feist, J., & Feist, G. J. (2002). *Theories of personality* 5th ed. Boston: McGraw Hill.

- Fenigstein, A., & Peltz, R. (2002). Distress over the infidelity of a child's spouse: A crucial test of evolutionary and socialization hypotheses. *Personal Relationships*, 9, 301-312.
- Forste, R., & Tanfer, K. (1996). Sexual exclusivity among dating, cohabiting, and married women. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 58, 33-47.
- Francis, J. L. (1977). Towards the management of heterosexual jealousy. *Journal of Marriage and Family Counseling*, 3, 61-69.
- Geary, D. C., Rumsey, M., Bow-Thomas, C. C., & Hoard, M. K. (1995). Sexual jealousy as a facultative trait: Evidence from the pattern of sex differences in adults from China and the United States. *Ethology and Sociobiology*, 16, 355-383.
- Glass, S. P. (2002). *Not "just friends": Protect your relationship from infidelity and heal the trauma of betrayal*. New York: Free Press.
- Glass, S. P., & Wright, T. L. (1977). The relationship of extramarital sex, length of marriage, and sex differences on marital satisfaction and romanticism: Athanasiou's data reanalyzed. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 39(4), 691-703.
- Glass, S. P., & Wright, T. L. (1985). Sex Differences in type of extramarital involvement and marital dissatisfaction. *Sex Roles*, 12, 1101-1120.
- 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.

- Glass, S. P., & Wright, T. L. (1999). Reconstructing marriages after the trauma of infidelity. In W. K. Halford & H. J. Markman (Eds.), *Clinical handbook of marriage and couples interventions*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Gordon, K. C., Baucom, D. H., & Snyder, D. K. (2005). Treating couples recovering from infidelity: An integrative approach. *Journal of Clinical Psychology, 61*(11), 1393-1405.
- Greeley, A. (1994). Marital infidelity. *Society, 31*(4), 9-13.
- Gunderson, P. R., & Ferrari, J. R. (2008). Forgiveness of sexual cheating in romantic relationships: Effects of discovery method, frequency of offense, and presence of apology. *North American Journal of Psychology, 10*(1), 1-14.
- Harris, C. R. (2000). Psychophysiological responses to imagined infidelity: Te specific innate modular view of jealousy reconsidered. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 78*, 1082-1091.
- Harris, C. R., & Christenfeld, N. (1996). Gender, jealousy, and reason. *Psychological Science, 7*, 364-366.
- Hill, C. A., & Preston, L. K. (1996). Individual differences in the experience of sexual motivation: Theory and measurement of dispositional sexual motives. *Journal of Sex Research, 33*, 27-45.
- Hogan, T. P. (2007). *Psychological testing: A practical introduction*. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons Inc.
- Hrdy, S. B. (1981). *The woman that never evolved*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

- Humphrey, F. G. (1982). Extramarital affairs: Clinical approaches in marital therapy. *Psychiatric Clinics of North America*, 5, 581-593.
- Hyde, J. S., & DeLamater, J. (2000). *Understanding human sexuality* (7th ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Jankowiak, W., Nell, M. D., & Buckmaster, A. (2002). Managing infidelity: A cross-cultural perspective. *Ethnology*, 41, 85-101.
- Kaslow, F. (1993). Attraction and affairs: Fabulous and fatal. *Journal of Family Psychotherapy*, 4, 1-34.
- Kimmel, D., & Van Der Veen, F. (1974). Factors of marital adjustment in Locke's Marital Test. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 36, 57-63.
- Lawson, A. (1988). *Adultery: An analysis of love and betrayal*. New York: Basic Books.
- Leigh, B. C. (1989). Reasons for having and avoiding sex: Gender, sexual orientation, and relationship to sexual behavior. *Journal of Sex Research*, 26, 199-209.
- Levin, R. J. (1975). The *Redbook* report on premarital and extramarital sex. *Redbook* (October): 38ff.
- Levine, S. B. (1998). Extramarital sexual affairs. *Journal of Sex and Marital Therapy*, 24, 207-216.
- Lewandowski Jr., G. W., & Ackerman, R. A. (2006). Something's missing: Need fulfillment and self-expansion as predictors of susceptibility to infidelity. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 146(4), 389-403.
- Lishner, D. A., Nguyen, S., Stocks, E. L., & Zillmer, E. J. (2008). Are sexual and emotional infidelity equally upsetting to men and women? Making sense of forced choice responses. *Evolutionary Psychology*, 6(4), 667-675.

- Liu, C. (2000). A theory of marital sexual life. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 62, 363–374.
- Lusterman, D. D. (1998). *Infidelity: A survival guide*. California: New Harbinger Publications.
- Meston, C. M., & Buss, D. M. Why humans have sex. *Arch Sex Behavior*, 36, 477-507.
- Michalski, R. L., Shackelford, T. K., & Salmon, C. A. (2007). Upset in response to a sibling's partner's infidelities. *Human Nature*, 18(1), 74-84.
- Milewski-Hertlein, K., Ray, R., Wetchler, J., & Kilmer, J. (2002). The role of differentiation in extradyadic relationships. *Journal of Couple & Relationship Therapy*, 2, 33-50.
- Miller, L. C., & Fishkin, S. A. (1997). On the dynamics of human bonding and reproductive success: seeking windows on the adapted-for human-environment interface. in J. A. Simpson & D. T. Kenrick (eds), *Evolutionary psychology* (pp. 197-235). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Mitchell, L. (2000). Attachment to the missing object: Infidelity and obsessive love. *Journal of Applied Psychoanalytic Studies*, 2(4), 383-395.
- Payne, J. W. (1982). Contingent decision behavior. *Psychological Bulletin*, 92, 382-402.
- Pestrak, V. A., Martin, D., & Martin, M. (1985). Extramarital sex: An examination of the literature. *International Journal of Family Therapy*, 7, 107-115.
- Pittman, F. (1989). *Private lies: Infidelity and the betrayal of intimacy*. New York: W. W. Norton Co.

- Platt, R. A., Nalbone, D. P., Casanova, G. M., & Wetchler, J. L. (2008). Parental conflict and infidelity as predictors of adult children's attachment style and infidelity. *The American Journal of Family Therapy, 36*, 149-161.
- Previti, D., & Amato, P. R. (2004). Is infidelity a cause or a consequence of poor marital quality? *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 21*(2), 217-230.
- Rusbult, C. E., Drigotas, S. M., & Verette, J. (1994). The investment model: An interdependence analysis of commitment processes and relationship maintenance phenomena. In D. Canary & L. Stafford (Eds.), *Communication and relationship maintenance* (pp. 115-139). San Diego: Academic Press.
- Sagarin, B. J., Becker, D. V., Guadagno, R. E., Nicastle, L. D., & Millevoi, A. (2003). Sex differences (and similarities) in jealousy: The moderating influence of infidelity experience and sexual orientation of the infidelity. *Evolution and Human Behavior, 24*, 17-23.
- Schmitt, D.P., and Shackelford, T.K. (2008). Big Five traits related to short-term mating: From personality to promiscuity across 46 nations. *Evolutionary Psychology, 6*(2): 246-282.
- Schmitt, D. P., Shackelford, T. K., Duntley, J., Tooke, W., & Buss, D. M. (2001). The desire for sexual variety as a key to understanding basic human mating strategies. *Personal Relationships, 8*, 425-455.
- Schneider, J. P., Corley, D. M., & Irons, R. R. (1998). Surviving disclosure of infidelity: Results of an international study of 164 recovering sex addicts and partners. *Sexual Addiction & Compulsivity, 5*, 189-217.

- Shackelford, T. K., & Buss, D. M. (1997). Cues to infidelity. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 23, 1034-1046.
- Smith, T. W. (1991). Adult sexual behavior in 1989: Number of partners, frequency of intercourse, and risk of AIDS. *Family Planning Perspectives*, 23, 102–107.
- Sprecher, S., & Felmlee, P. (1992). The influence of parents and friends on the quality and stability of romantic relationships: a three wave investigation. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 54, 888-901.
- Sprecher, S., McKinney, K., & Orbuch, T. L. (1987). Has the double standard disappeared? An experimental test. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 50, 24-31.
- Symons, D. (1979). *The evolution of human sexuality*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Thompson, A. P. (1984). Extramarital sexual crisis: Common themes and therapy implications. *Journal of Sex and Marital Therapy*, 10, 239-254.
- Treas, J., & Giesen, D. (2000). Sexual infidelity among married and cohabiting Americans. *Journal of Marriage & the Family*, 62, 48-61.
- Trivers, R. (1972). Parental investment and sexual selection. In B. Cambell (ed.), *Sexual selection and the descent of man 1871-1971* (pp. 136-179).. Chicago: Aldine.
- Voracek, M. (2001). Marital status as a candidate moderator variable of male-female differences in sexual jealousy: The need for representative population samples. *Psychological Reports*, 88, 553-566.
- Weeks, G., Gambescia, N., & Jenkins, R. (2003). *Treating infidelity*. New York: Norton.

- Whisman, M. A., Dixon, A. E., & Johnson, B. (1997). Therapists' perspectives of couples problems and treatment issues in couple therapy. *Journal of Family Psychology, 11*, 361-366.
- Wiederman, M. (1997). Extramarital sex: Prevalence and correlates in a national survey. *The Journal of Research, 34*, 167-174.
- Wiederman, M. W., & Allgeier, E. R. (1993). Gender differences in sexual jealousy: Adaptionist or social learning explanation? *Ethology and Sociobiology, 14*, 115-140.
- Wiederman, M. W., & Allgeier, E. R. (1996). Expectations and attributions regarding extramarital sex among young married individuals. *Journal of Psychology and Human Sexuality, 8*, 21-35.
- Wiggins, J. D., & Lederer, D. A. (1984). Differential antecedents of infidelity in marriage. *American Mental Health Counselors Association Journal, 6*, 152-161.
- Wright, T. M., & Reise, S. P. (1997). Personality and unrestricted sexual behavior: Correlations of sociosexuality in Caucasian and Asian college students. *Journal of Research in Personality, 31*, 166-192.
- 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*(6), 639-650.