
Theses and Dissertations

Summer 2009

Gender and infidelity: a study of the relationship between conformity to masculine norms and extrarelational involvement

Christopher Daniel Chuick
University of Iowa

Copyright 2009 Christopher Daniel Chuick

This dissertation is available at Iowa Research Online: <https://ir.uiowa.edu/etd/284>

Recommended Citation

Chuick, Christopher Daniel. "Gender and infidelity: a study of the relationship between conformity to masculine norms and extrarelational involvement." PhD (Doctor of Philosophy) thesis, University of Iowa, 2009.
<https://ir.uiowa.edu/etd/284>.

Follow this and additional works at: <https://ir.uiowa.edu/etd>



Part of the [Educational Psychology Commons](#)

GENDER AND INFIDELITY:
A STUDY OF THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN CONFORMITY TO MASCULINE
NORMS AND EXTRARELATIONAL INVOLVEMENT

by

Christopher Daniel Chuick

An Abstract

Of a thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the
Doctor of Philosophy degree in Psychological and Quantitative Foundations
(Counseling Psychology) in the Graduate College of
The University of Iowa

July 2009

Thesis Supervisors: Clinical Professor Sam V. Cochran
Professor William M. Liu

ABSTRACT

While a great deal of research has been completed on the relationship between biological sex and infidelity, no research currently exists that examines the relationship between masculine gender norms and infidelity. In this study, 202 men and 486 women were recruited from a Midwestern university, the surrounding community, and nationally on line. Their Conformity to Masculine Norms (CMNI) scores were compared to three infidelity measures: a modified version of the Attitudes Toward Marital Exclusivity Scale (ATME), the Justification for Extramarital Infidelity Questionnaire (JEIQ) sexual justifications subscale, and the JEIQ emotional intimacy justifications subscale. Participants' CMNI total score was hypothesized to be correlated with ATME total scores, JEIQ sexual justification, and JEIQ emotional intimacy justification scores. Further, scores on four CMNI subscales ("risk-taking", "dominance", "playboy", and "pursuit of status") were hypothesized to predict ATME total scores, as well as JEIQ sexual and emotional intimacy justification subscales scores for both men and women. Preliminary analysis identified significant variance between men's and women's responses to the ATME and JEIQ sexual intimacy subscales. Results were therefore presented for both men and women separately. Men's, but not women's, CMNI total scores were found to be correlated with their ATME total and JEIQ sexual scores. Both men's and women's scores on identified CMNI subscales scores were found to predict ATME, JEIQ sexual, and JEIQ emotional scores. For men, only "playboy" scores were related to the variance these scores. For women, "playboy" was associated with variance in ATME scores, both "risk-taking" and "playboy" were associated with variance in JEIQ sexual scores, and both "playboy" and "pursuit of status" were associated with variance in

JEIQ emotional scores. From these results, utility of overall conformity to masculine in understanding men's attitudes about infidelity is established. Additionally, masculine nonrelational sexuality norms are found to be useful in understanding attitudes and approval of sex based infidelity.

Abstract Approved:

Thesis Supervisor

Title and Department

Date

Thesis Supervisor

Title and Department

Date

GENDER AND INFIDELITY:
A STUDY OF THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN CONFORMITY TO MASCULINE
NORMS AND EXTRARELATIONAL INVOLVEMENT

by

Christopher Daniel Chuick

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the
Doctor of Philosophy degree in Psychological and Quantitative Foundations
(Counseling Psychology) in the Graduate College of
The University of Iowa

July 2009

Thesis Supervisors: Clinical Professor Sam V. Cochran
Professor William M. Liu

Copyright by

CHRISTOPHER DANIEL CHUICK

2009

All Rights Reserved

Graduate College
The University of Iowa
Iowa City, Iowa

CERTIFICATE OF APPROVAL

PH.D. THESIS

This is to certify that the Ph.D. thesis of

Christopher Daniel Chuick

has been approved by the Examining Committee for the thesis requirement for the Doctor of Philosophy degree in Psychological and Quantitative Foundations (Counseling Psychology) at the July 2009 graduation.

Thesis Committee: _____
Sam V. Cochran, Thesis Supervisor

William M. Liu, Thesis Supervisor

John Westefeld

Timothy Ansley

Steve Duck

To Allison Ruth Seplak

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Thanks are extended to the members of my committee for their patience and understanding as this thesis progressed. The efforts of the primary thesis supervisor, Sam V. Cochran, Ph.D., are singled out for special recognition. His efforts in acting as an advisor and editor are overshadowed only by his role as a mentor in my collective experiences with research in areas of men and masculinity. Without Dr. Cochran's mentorship this study would not have been completed.

In addition to the members of the committee, I would like to extend thanks to four people who offered their support and knowledge to the development and execution of this study. First, thanks it due to Sophie N. Smith for her encouragement to take on the challenges leading up to this thesis. Second, Tammy Hieptas-Wilson, Ph.D. is acknowledged for her roles in the conceptualization of the data analysis portion of this study and in minimizing anxiety throughout the completion of this thesis. Third, Jennifer Kauder is acknowledged for her role in acting as a sounding board for frustrations and in helping bring clarity to the dissertation process. Finally, Allison Chuck receives my undying appreciation for her willingness to share the journey that culminates in the completion of this dissertation. The magnitude of my appreciation for her can not be captured by words.

ABSTRACT

While a great deal of research has been completed on the relationship between biological sex and infidelity, no research currently exists that examines the relationship between masculine gender norms and infidelity. In this study, 202 men and 486 women were recruited from a Midwestern university, the surrounding community, and nationally on line. Their Conformity to Masculine Norms (CMNI) scores were compared to three infidelity measures: a modified version of the Attitudes Toward Marital Exclusivity Scale (ATME), the Justification for Extramarital Infidelity Questionnaire (JEIQ) sexual justifications subscale, and the JEIQ emotional intimacy justifications subscale. Participants' CMNI total score was hypothesized to be correlated with ATME total scores, JEIQ sexual justification, and JEIQ emotional intimacy justification scores. Further, scores on four CMNI subscales ("risk-taking", "dominance", "playboy", and "pursuit of status") were hypothesized to predict ATME total scores, as well as JEIQ sexual and emotional intimacy justification subscales scores for both men and women. Preliminary analysis identified significant variance between men's and women's responses to the ATME and JEIQ sexual intimacy subscales. Results were therefore presented for both men and women separately. Men's, but not women's, CMNI total scores were found to be correlated with their ATME total and JEIQ sexual scores. Both men's and women's scores on identified CMNI subscales scores were found to predict ATME, JEIQ sexual, and JEIQ emotional scores. For men, only "playboy" scores were related to the variance these scores. For women, "playboy" was associated with variance in ATME scores, both "risk-taking" and "playboy" were associated with variance in JEIQ sexual scores, and both "playboy" and "pursuit of status" were associated with variance in

JEIQ emotional scores. From these results, utility of overall conformity to masculine in understanding men's attitudes about infidelity is established. Additionally, masculine nonrelational sexuality norms are found to be useful in understanding attitudes and approval of sex based infidelity.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES		ix
CHAPTER I	INTRODUCTION	1
CHAPTER II	REVIEW OF LITERATURE	10
	Extrarelational Involvement	10
	Infidelity Rates	11
	Stages of Infidelity	12
	General contributing factors	13
	Predisposing factors	14
	Approach factors	19
	Precipitating factors	20
	Maintenance factors	21
	Disclosure of discovery factors	22
	Response factors	22
	ERI and Mental Health	24
	Limitations of Past Research	27
	Defining ERI	27
	Measures and design issues	29
	Population issues	30
	ERI and Biosex	31
	Rates of ERI: Men vs. women	32
	Biosex, Relationship Type, Age, and ERI	33
	Masculinity	35
	Masculinity Theory History	37
	Origins	38
	Androgyny	38
	Masculine ideology	39
	Role strain	40
	Deconstruction	41
	Recent revisions	42
	Social Construction of Masculinity	43
	Measuring Normative and Dysfunctional Masculinity	45
	Masculinity as dysfunctional	46
	Masculinity as normative	51
	Nonrelational Sexuality	57
	Study Purpose	59
CHAPTER III	METHODOLOGY	62
	Participants and Procedures	63
	Instruments	64
	Demographic Questionnaire	65

	Attitudes Toward Marital Exclusivity	66
	Justifications for Extramarital Involvement Questionnaire	72
	Conformity to Masculine Norms Inventory	75
CHAPTER IV	RESULTS	81
	Preliminary Analysis	82
	Participant Demographics	82
	Reliability	86
	Analysis of Variance for Biosex and Study Variables	89
	Variable Intercorrelations	90
	Main Analysis	94
	Regression Analysis	95
	ATME Total Regression Model	96
	JEIQ Sexual Justification Regression Model	98
	JEIQ Emotional Intimacy Justification Regression Model	100
CHAPTER V	DISCUSSION	103
	ATME	103
	JEIQ Sexual Justification	105
	JEIQ Emotional Intimacy Justification	106
	Limitations	108
	Theoretical Implications	110
	Masculinity and ERI	110
	Dysfunctional Nonrelational Sexual Norms	112
	Practice Implications	113
	Research Implications	115
	Summary	116
APPENDIX A	BACKGROUND INFORMATION	119
APPENDIX B	NOONEWS ADVERTISEMENT	121
APPENDIX C	EMAIL SOLICITATION	122
APPENDIX D	FLIER	123
APPENDIX E	INSTRUCTIONS	124
APPENDIX F	ATME	126
APPENDIX G	ATME (REVISED)	127
APPENDIX H	JEIQ (REVISED)	128

APPENDIX I	CMNI	130
REFERENCES		135

LIST OF TABLES

Table

1. Frequencies and Percentages- Sex, Age, Race, Education.....	83
2. Frequency and Percentage - Religiosity, Political Orientation, Relationship Status, Parents Married, Family of Origin Infidelity, Self Infidelity.....	87
3. Analysis of Variance for Biosex.....	90
4. Intercorrelations, Number of Participants, Means, Standard Deviations, and Range of Scores.....	91
5. Intercorrelations, Number of Participants, Means, Standard Deviations, and Range of Scores for Men.....	92
6. Intercorrelations, Number of Participants, Means, Standard Deviations, and Range of Scores for Women.....	93
7. Simultaneous Regression Analysis of Variables Predicting Men's ATME Total.....	96
8. Simultaneous Regression Analysis of Variables Predicting Women's ATME Total.....	97
9. Simultaneous Regression Analysis of Variables Predicting Men's JEIQ Sexual Justifications.....	98
10. Simultaneous Regression Analysis of Variables Predicting Women's JEIQ Sexual Justification.....	99
11. Simultaneous Regression Analysis of Variables Predicting Men's JEIQ Emotional Intimacy Justifications.....	101
12. Simultaneous Regression Analysis of Variables Predicting Women's JEIQ Emotional Intimacy Justification.....	102

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The discovery or disclosure of infidelity outside of a committed relationship often leads to emotional havoc for individuals and conflict between members of the committed relationship, regularly ending in dissolution of important interpersonal connections.

Involvement in romantic relationships outside of one's active committed relationship has also been reported to result in, among other things, a sense of relational betrayal (Allen et al., 2005). Couples who experienced secrecy and betrayal associated with marital infidelity have seen their personal and social expectations for commitment tested. The emotional turmoil and relational ramifications of extra-relational involvement (ERI) are issues therapists confront regularly in their clinical practices (O'Leary, 2005).

ERI has been and continues to be a confusing, difficult, and particularly frustrating experience for both couples and for clinicians who carry their personal fears or values related to infidelity into treatment. Yet, in spite of the negative emotions experienced when addressing infidelity, within contemporary society there has been interest in the occurrence of infidelity and its consequences. For the public, curiosity with ERI has resided more in the distasteful details of infidelity, which have ranged in severity from emotional trauma to crimes of passion.

Typically clinicians' interests have resided within the challenges associated with addressing ERI within treatment. Yet the challenges couples' therapists face have gone beyond in session couple dynamics association with ERI. According to Epstein (2005), therapists who attempt to assimilate study findings on infidelity into their practice have faced limited research methodologies, conflicting results, and a scarcity of practice based

findings. These limitations resulted from the complex interactional effects and multifaceted depictions of relationships found in research on ERI. Further complicating practical application of research findings was the variability in methodologies and sampling used in research on ERI. For example, several studies on extramarital infidelity used samples with little or no experience with infidelity in relation to marriage (Allen & Baucom, 2004; Gordon, Baucom, & Snyder, 2004). The use of such samples enhanced the influence of participant variables on outcomes and has limited the generalizability of findings. Moreover, the over abundance of studies which used sexual intercourse as the defining criterion for ERI has led to under estimations of emotional ERI prevalence (Buunk, 1980; Glass & Wright, 1985; Kinsey, Pomeroy, Martin, & Gebhard, 1953). The variability in research methodology has limited findings to describing tendencies rather than absolute truths. As a result of these methodological issues, clinicians performing individual and couples' therapy have been encouraged to exercise caution when interpreting and applying research results in their practice (Allen et al., 2005).

With these methodological limitations in mind, previous research on infidelity found the majority of adults in the United States to view monogamy as a standard part of marriage and therefore disapproved of infidelity (Buss and Shackelford, 1997; Treas & Giesen, 2000; Wiederman & Allgeier, 1996). Smith (1994) found 90% of respondents supported married individuals refraining from sex with someone other than their partner. In contrast to the expressed opinion that extrarelatinal sex was undesirable, relational commitments continue to be routinely violated as partners engage in some form of infidelity.

Unfortunately, specific findings on rates and correlates have fluctuated in direct relation to how ERI is operationalized. In a review of research on infidelity, Blow and Harnett (2005a) found variables used to study relationship infidelity lacked consistent operational definitions. Infidelity was defined in a myriad of ways and comprised a number of activities, including: “having an affair”, “extramarital relationship,” “cheating,” “sexual intercourse,” “oral sex,” “kissing,” “fondling,” “emotional connection that are beyond friendships,” “friendships,” “internet relationships,” “pornography use”, and others. Within the variation in operational definitions of ERI, there is a historical pattern of narrowly defining of ERI as containing some form of sexual contact. More recent research has used terms such as “affair” to study ERI, but these terms tend to tap into idiosyncratic definitions of infidelity, resulting in decreased reliability of findings. Some researchers have addressed this issue by including a variety of physical modalities outside of sexual intercourse in their operational definitions of infidelity (Blow & Harnett, 2005a). There are other researchers with interest in including “emotional infidelity” in definitions of infidelity to better encapsulate the aspects of extrarelatonal involvement. This line of research used definitions which reflect the presence of emotional intimacy, sexual attractions, and secrecy from the significant other (Glass and Wright, 1988).

Along with changes in operational definitions came changes in rates of extrarelatonal sexual involvement reported by researchers on infidelity. In their groundbreaking research on human sexuality, Kinsey, Pomeroy, and Martin (1948) estimated that one third of men had engaged in extramarital sexual intercourse, while they later estimated one quarter of women had engaged in sex outside of their marriage (Kinsey,

Pomeroy, Martin, and Gebhard, 1953). The research on extrarelational sex that followed over the next 30 years either concurred with the Kinsey groups' finding or found greater rates of extramarital sex. However, more recent studies on extramarital sex have shown lifetime rates at which individuals admit to participating in sexual infidelity to be approximately 25% (Greeley, 1994; Laumann, Gagnon, Michael, & Michaels, 1994; Wiederman, 1997), which represented a decline from previous estimates. These numbers may have been underestimates given the sensitive nature and potential damage such disclosures represent. This tendency to underestimate the prevalence of infidelity was evidenced by couple therapists who estimated 50%-60% of the couples in their clinical practices entered therapy to address some form of extrarelational involvement (Glass and Wright, 1988).

While the prevalence of infidelity has been a focus of ERI research, another commonly researched variable associated with infidelity has been the biologically determined sex (biosex) of the involved partner. Thompson (1983) identified biosex as a qualifier for the major variables that led to the occurrence of extramarital sex. Subsequent research consistently found men engaging in ERI more frequently and having more extrarelational partners than women. Further, men were also theorized to have a lower rate of disapproval for ERI. While the biological consequences and evolutionary ramifications for extra-relational relationships have been theorized to play a role in the differences between men and women, they do not entirely account for these divergent findings. Glass and Wright (1985) suggested assessing sexual involvement separately from emotional involvement would reveal men's and women's characterizations of infidelity to be different. They speculated men's criteria for infidelity would be to focus on sexual

involvement, with women's criteria including a focus on emotional involvement.

According to Allen, et al. (2005), this body of research led to the acceptance of an association between sexual forms of ERI and being biologically male. At the same time, this research resulted in an association between being female and limited infidelity, with more prevalent negative attitudes about ERI.

What this body of research has not addressed is the diversity within each biosex and its influence on ERI attitudes and behaviors. Not all men have endorsed positive attitudes about or engaged in ERI. Similarly, there are women who have sought relationships with people other than their partner and see ERI as a positive experience. No research has been completed that looks at ERI behaviors associated with the endorsement of opposite sex ERI attitudes.

The variability of ERI attitudes within biosex is congruent with both androgyny theory and social constructionist theory. According to androgyny theory, gender represents a set of social attributes used to define masculine and feminine personalities. Androgyny theory posits that men and women who use social definitions of masculinity or femininity as standards for behavior are not the norm in society (Bem, 1974). Social constructivist theory describes gender as a similar set of culturally constructed attitudes imposed on men and women, with individual variability in the degree of conformity to same sex attitudes. Therefore both androgyny and social constructivist theories imply that previous comparisons of biosex and ERI failed to address the role of varied conformity to gendered attitudes about ERI. Given this implication, understanding the role of masculine gender conformity in ERI attitudes and behaviors would provide insight into the within biosex variability in acceptance of sexual forms of infidelity.

Previous research on masculinity, like research on infidelity, developed to include a variety of theoretical perspectives and conceptualizations of masculinity (Smiler, 2004). The development of theories about masculinity coincided with the first stages of development of psychology as a unique scientific discipline. These theories gained momentum from the feminist critique of gender development and the androgyny research movement of the early 1970's. Theorists were attempting to address the manner in which masculine gender affected individuals through prescription or limitation of acceptable behaviors.

A contemporary example of a theory on the limitations of masculine gender is Pleck's (1981) gender role strain theory. His theory proposed a model for masculinity which focused on the effects of masculinity on men's and women's self-concepts and attitudes. This theory suggested gender development occurred at a young age through the interaction of the child with their environment's social expectations. Social cognitive theory proposed children played an active role in the construction of their own gender through their interaction with the environment (Bandura & Bussey, 2004). Given the variability in the contexts to which girls and boys had exposure, endorsement of gender variables (i.e., masculinity and femininity) differed between children in relation to the influence of their social environments.

One mechanism by which social contexts were seen as influencing gender development was gender role norms. As socially developed standards and rules, gender role norms prescribed gender behaviors and attitudes to men and women (Mahalik, Good, & Englar-Carlson., 2003). According to Smiler (2004) both men and women can be influenced toward masculine norms. Like other social norms, gender role norms were

learned through observing the responses of men and women to different social stimuli, through specific instruction by peers in the appropriate behavior or attitudes and through the observed rewards given to other gender congruent males and females.

One such gender role norm was labeled by Levant and Brooks (1997) as “nonrelational sex”. They proposed that masculine views on intimacy describe sex as not related to emotional attachment. However, in spite of observing and receiving instruction on masculine gender role norms, men have been viewed as varying in their conformity to the tenets of the gender assigned to their biosex, including nonrelational sex norms. The distress associated with nonconformity, labeled gender role strain (Pleck, 1995) or gender role conflict (O’Neil, 1981), has received significant amounts of research focus.

In addition to addressing the consequences of gender role non-conformity, researchers also addressed the negative aspects of conformity to gender norms. Theories of gender norms that addressed conformity historically viewed masculinity and femininity as universal constructs. These theories led to instruments that measured the endorsement of masculinity or femininity unilaterally, ignoring the multidimensional nature of gender, such as the Bem Sex Role Inventory (Bem, 1974). In response to this shortcoming, other models of masculinity (e.g., masculine ideology, role strain, social construction of gender) and their instruments were developed to include multiple characteristics of gender (Brannon and Juni, 1984; Thompson and Pleck, 1986; Levant, 1995).

More recently, Mahalik, Locke, et al. (2003) developed the Conformity to Masculine Norms Inventory (CMNI) to measure the degree to which individuals conform to the dimensions of traditional masculinity in the United States. The development of the

CMNI allowed researchers to more broadly assess the normative aspects of masculinity than had been done with previous instruments. Also, having a broad model and instrument allowed researchers to study the ways in which conformity and nonconformity to masculine norms are adaptive as well as maladaptive.

Considering gender in relation to attitudes about ERI will expose assumptions made in past relationship research about how biosex is associated with attitudes about infidelity. Significant questions that can be answered include: how do masculine gender norms influence attitudes and behaviors associated with ERI; which aspects of masculine gender norms influence these attitudes and behaviors in negative ways, and which aspects of masculine gender positively influence ERI attitudes and behaviors; to what degree do masculine gender norms influence acceptance of sexual versus emotional forms of ERI? At this time there is no research directly addressing the association of conformity to masculine gender norms and attitudes about either sexual or emotional forms of ERI.

Implications for the discovery of the associations between masculine gender role norms and ERI include improved understanding of the role socially learned gender norms play in enacting relationships. Better conceptualization of this relationship would provide a basis for the development of further research on socialized gender and its association with ERI. Knowledge about the relationship between masculinity gender and infidelity would result in understanding the adaptive and maladaptive function of ERI in the lives of individuals who conform to masculine gender role norms. This knowledge will aid therapists and clients in addressing ERI as learned behaviors that can be modified rather than as rigid personal characteristics which require some degree of adaptation by the individual and significant others.

This study identifies and describes the relationship between the conformity to masculine norms by men and women and how ERI is viewed. Using the CMNI to measure men's and women's conformity to eleven dimensions of masculinity, an association between their conformity to each dimension and their approval of ERI, as measured by the revised forms of the Attitudes Toward Marital Exclusivity Scale (ATME; Weis & Slosnerick, 1981) and the Justification for Extramarital Involvement Questionnaire (JEIQ, Glass, 1981). Describing this connection will begin the conceptualization of how conformity to masculine role norms is associated attitudes about ERI. The association between conformity to masculinity norms and attitudes about ERI will be described, while the predictive relationship between attitudes about ERI and four components of masculinity will be illustrated.

With the intent of describing the relationship between masculinity and ERI, four hypotheses were developed for this study. Hypothesis one states that CMNI total scores will be positively correlated with ATME total scores and negatively correlated to both JEIQ sexual and JEIQ emotional intimacy subscale scores. Hypothesis two states that CMNI risk-taking, CMNI playboy, CMNI pursuit of status, and CMNI dominance subscale scores will predict ATME total scores for both men and women. Hypothesis three states that CMNI risk-taking, CMNI playboy, CMNI pursuit of status, and CMNI dominance subscale scores will predict JEIQ sexual justification subscale scores for both men and women. Hypothesis four states that CMNI risk-taking, CMNI playboy, CMNI pursuit of status, and CMNI dominance subscale scores will predict JEIQ emotional intimacy justification subscale scores for both men and women.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The connection between attitudes about extrarelational behaviors and social variables has received a great deal of focus in previous research. Past research on men and gender has also investigated a variety of relational aspects of socialized norms of masculinity. Unfortunately the association between the endorsement of masculine norms and extrarelational attitudes or behaviors has yet to be addressed in research.

In this chapter a review of literature on infidelity and on masculinity will be presented. Extrarelational infidelity will be discussed in terms of its prevalence and temporal framework. The relationship between ERI and mental illness will be explored, followed by a review of the limitations of past ERI research and research on biosex and ERI. Finally, a discussion on the interrelationships between biosex, relationship types, age, and ERI will be presented.

Masculinity literature will then be presented beginning with its history. The theory of the social construction of gender will be reviewed, leading to the measurement of masculinity as both normative and dysfunctional. Finally, the masculine norm of nonrelational sexuality will be explored.

Extrarelational Involvement

ERI behaviors occur in community populations, frequently resulting in distress for the individuals who partake in such relationships, their spouses or relationship partners, and their immediate family members (Epstein, 2005). During the 1960's, 1970's, and 1980's, the years when research on romantic relationships was gaining momentum, the research on infidelity focused on extramarital relationships, reflecting traditional

heterosexual social expectations for relationships. This research lacked cohesiveness, in part due to a lack of comprehensive reviews. This limitation was addressed by literature reviews completed by Allen et al. (2005) and Blow and Hartnett (2005b). These reviews focused on predictive and consequential factors associated with infidelity.

In an attempt to give form to the research findings, Allen et al. (2005) placed these factors in a framework encompassing multiple domains across time, with an emphasis on developmental stages of infidelity. The current literature review will begin by describing rates of infidelity and the unique issues associated with infidelity research. This framework will be used to review the different categories of ERI research to date. Finally, issues associated with the role gender plays in ERI behaviors and attitudes will be examined.

Infidelity Rates

Within the United States there has been a universally low level of acceptance for sexual infidelity. Smith (1994) found that 90% of Americans disapproved of sexual ERI within marital relationships. Both married and cohabitating couples reported placing importance on the practice of monogamy in their relationships (Greeley, 1991). However, variance in acceptance of ERI has typically been found to be associated with the type of infidelity, be it sexual, emotional, or both. In two studies conducted by Weis and colleagues (Weis & Felton, 1987; Weis & Slosnerick, 1981), participants were indecisive about which nonsexual behaviors were acceptable, while the majority of participants were certain that sexual behaviors were unacceptable. In spite of evidence that infidelity is not a socially accepted behavior, many men and women continue to engage in sexual or emotional versions of relationship infidelity.

The rate at which of marital infidelity has occurred reflects the low levels of acceptance of ERI in the U.S. From the 1994 General Social Survey of 884 men and 1288 women, 78% of men and 88% of women denied any lifetime occurrence of extramarital sex (Wiederman, 1997). However, conflicting evidence on the rates of sexual infidelity began to be developed early in the history of infidelity research. Beginning with the post World War II Kinsey reports, extramarital sexual intercourse and other forms of extramarital sexual behaviors were estimated to occur for one-third of men (Kinsey, Pomeroy, & Martin, 1948) and one-quarter of women (Kinsey, Pomeroy, Martin, & Gebhard, 1953). The 1992 National Health and Social Life Survey found 15.5% of the 1,717 married men and women surveyed to have engaged in infidelity inclusive of sexual intercourse (Treas & Giesen, 2000). Other contemporary research has conservatively estimated the rate of extramarital sex as between 20% and 25% for all Americans (Greeley, 1994; Laumann, Gagnon, Michael, & Michaels, 1994; Wiederman, 1997).

The identification of these relationships has been dramatically affected by time and operationalization of infidelity. Wiederman & Hurd (1999) found 75% of men and 68% of women sampled had engaged in extradyadic dating or sexual activity while in a committed relationship. The divergence between attitudes and behaviors found in these studies strongly implied a connection between ERI and conflict within individuals and within couple relationships.

Stages of Infidelity

While the prevalence of ERI has been an elusive domain to measure, research on extramarital behaviors has been widespread. In their review of literature on extramarital infidelity, Allen et al. (2005) described six temporal factors in infidelity: 1) predisposing,

2) approach, 3) precipitating ERI, 4) maintenance, 5) disclosure or discovery, and 6) response. These stages were developed to describe infidelity as adaptive responses to the individual and environmental variables unique to each act of infidelity, rather than as rigid reactions across all incidents of infidelity. Using these six temporal stages, the following will review the attitudinal, reasoning, and communicative variables which contribute to infidelity.

General contributing factors. Factors thought to have contributed to infidelity among committed couples include personal values of the individual, opportunities for extrarelational sex, and the couple's relationship. In a study of sexual behaviors and attitudes, Smith (1994) found permissive sexual attitudes to contribute to higher rates of sexual infidelity compared to those with strict attitudes. Opportunities which facilitate ERI include the maintenance of secrecy, availability of social environments without inclusion of partner, and social networks with permissive attitudes about infidelity. Primary relationship factors that contributed to relationships outside of one's committed relationship included the potential relational costs of infidelity, which are mediated by the perceived quality and duration of the relationship.

Two primary models of justification for engaging in ERI behaviors have been predominant (Thompson, 1984b; Weis & Slosnerick, 1981): the deficit model and the personal growth model. The deficit model suggests that some people actively pursue ERI because they are unhappy with their current relationships. These individuals are pushed away from their primary relationships by different forms of conflict. This model took into account factors outside the individual in decisions to engage in ERI.

The personal growth model posited partners who engage in ERI take advantage of opportunities to participate in these relationships to enhance their sense of self, not because they were dissatisfied with their primary committed relationships (Thompson, 1984b). These partners were interested in experiencing a wider range of activities and companions in the interest of self-discovery. This model focused on individual factors of the involved partner, separate from outside influences on the ERI decision making process.

The risk of relational conflicts associated with ERI was found to be exacerbated by several factors. Communication of individual attitudes and poor formulation of relational expectations for ERI were two prominent factors in conflicts over infidelity (Weis & Felton, 1987). In a study of marital communication, Lieberman (1988) found many couples to be vague and ambiguous about their expectations for exclusivity. This poor communication often resulted from fear the affected partner will misinterpret extrarelational behaviors as rejection of the primary relationship (Petrack, Martin, & Martin, 1985). The deception associated with this fear often resulted in the most negative outcomes by producing feelings of disappointment and betrayal for the affected partners who invested faith in their mates (Kaslow, 1993). The ultimate result was uncertainty within couples about what behaviors can be shared and the effects the behaviors would have on their relationships. This uncertainty is inherent in the debate about the exclusiveness of love which many couples enter into after infidelity is revealed (Thompson, 1984a).

Predisposing factors. Allen et al. (2005) defined predisposing factors as variables present prior to the development of infidelity. While these factors were catalysts, they

were not causes for attitudes or behaviors related to infidelity. Predisposing factors have been the focus of the majority of research on ERI. This area of research typically used two groups of participants: those who had participated in infidelity and those who had not. The intent of this methodology was to establish the degree to which different variables applied to each group. For example, age of the unfaithful spouse has been shown to affect the lifetime rates of ERI. Extramarital relationships occurred most frequently in early adulthood (Choi, Catania, & Dolcini, 1994; Treas & Giesen, 2000), with a plateau in frequency of infidelity in late adulthood (Atkins, Baucom, & Jacobson, 2001). A limitation of past research on age and ERI was the use of cross-sectional designs with poor control of cohort effects.

Education was another variable studied using comparison groups. Findings were mixed with only a marginal association found between education and ERI. For example, although higher education was associated with more accepting attitudes about infidelity (Smith, 1994), higher education's relationship to more frequent ERI was less defined. Research showed a slightly positive relationship between ERI and education (Atkins et al. 2001), while other studies found higher rates of infidelity among individuals with less than high school levels of education (Choi et al., 1994). Atkins, Baucom, and Jacobson (2001) found level of education to be positively related to extramarital involvement only for those with a history of divorce. Treas and Giesen (2000) found infidelity to be related to the extremes of the educational distribution, suggesting level of education was only minimally associated with extramarital behaviors.

Comparison groups have also been used to study the relationship between religiosity and infidelity. While no evidence existed for religious denomination predicting

prevalence of infidelity (Forste & Tanfer, 1996), those who endorse no religious affiliation reported higher rates of ERI (Greeley, 1994). The attendance frequency of religious services and level of religiosity were both found to be protective factors for positive attitudes toward infidelity (Smith, 1994) and extramarital relationships (Amato and Rogers, 1997; Choi, et al., 1994; Kinsey et al., 1953). Atkins, Baucom, & Jacobson (2001) found religiosity to be negatively related to extrarelatinal infidelity in participants who described their primary relationships as “very happy”, but not for religious participants who described their relationships as “pretty happy” or “not happy at all”. While greater religiosity was related to lower rates of ERI, this research showed the protective effects of religious involvement to be low compared to other variables, including relationship satisfaction.

Race is another variable studied in relation to ERI. Findings have shown that African Americans and Hispanic Americans report higher rates of sexual infidelity (Amato & Rogers, 1997; Greeley, 1994; Treas & Giesen, 2000), with African Americans identifying more approving attitudes toward extrarelatinal sex (Smith, 1994). The differences in rates of ERI between racial minority and Caucasian participants have been connected with social forces which impacted relational and sexual attitudes (Penn, Hernandez, & Bermudez, 1997). These included the history of slavery for African Americans, and histories of poverty and gender imbalances within both African American and Hispanic groups.

Other variables examined in research on infidelity have been based in individuals' experiences and their relation to ERI behaviors. For example, history of divorce has been shown to be positively related to current rates of extrarealtional behaviors (Atkins,

Baucom, & Jacobson, 2001; Greeley, 1994), with divorced or separated spouses reporting more permissive attitudes about extrarelational sex (Smith, 1994). Amato and Rogers (1997) found spouses in marriages where one or both partners had divorce histories were 48% more likely to report infidelity as present in their current marriage. A family history of divorce was also positively associated with ERI behaviors, especially when a parent was reported to have engaged in infidelity (Brown, 1991). The study of experiential variables in relation to ERI show promise for being predictive of ERI attitudes and behaviors, especially in comparison to ethnicity, religiosity, or education.

In addition to demographic and family variables, intrapersonal variables and their association with ERI have been studied. The findings of this line of research have been inconsistent across variables. Intrapersonal factors found to be positively related to the occurrence of infidelity include stronger overall sexual interest (Treas & Giesen, 2000), higher levels of testosterone (Booth & Dabbs, 1993), and larger percentages of sexual fantasies about someone other than one's partner (Hicks & Leitenberg, 2001). Kinsey et al. (1953) found a history of premarital sex in women to be related to higher incidents of extramarital involvement, regardless of their reported attitudes about sex outside of marriage. Forster and Tanfer (1996) found that for both men and women, accepting attitudes about premarital sex was indicative of a positive relationship between frequency of premarital sex and rates of infidelity.

Although some researchers have focused on the relationship between a history of ERI and various factors, others have studied the relationship of interpersonal variables to motivation for ERI and specific types of ERI. Allen (2001) compared romantic attachment and infidelity, finding high levels of attachment-avoidance to be associated

with seeking independence as a justification for ERI behaviors. High-levels of abandonment anxiety were associated with intimacy and self-esteem as reasoning for ERI behaviors. Similarly, sexual justification in men and emotional justification in women were related to higher rates of extramarital relationships (Glass, 2003; Glass & Wright, 1985, 1992).

While limited evidence has developed for a connection between non-relationship specific personality variables and infidelity, empirical and theoretical literature has suggested an association between psychological problems and ERI. For instance, ERI has been associated with symptoms of depression, substance abuse, and personality disorders (Hurlbert, Apt, Gasar, Wilson, & Murphy, 1994). Greeley (1994) found individuals who used mental health services were more likely to have a history of ERI. Beach, Jouriles, and O'Leary (2005) found spouses who had engaged in ERI also reported higher rates of depression. The positive relationship between infidelity and mental health issues has been rebuked by empirical findings that showed self-esteem and positive views of physical appearance to be associated with men and women who had a history of extramarital involvement (Spanier & Margolis, 1983; Buunk, 1980).

A final approach to predisposing factors research was to study participants' intrapersonal motivators for infidelity. Intrapersonal reasons for engaging in ERI included curiosity, seeking variety, sensation seeking, experiential motives, reassurance of worth, fun seeking, a need to conquest, combating inadequacy, escapism, addressing difficulties with intimacy, and exploring sexual orientation (Atwood & Seifer, 1997; Glass & Wright, 1992). These results illustrated the variety of intrapersonal catalysts

available for ERI while they demonstrated the vast number of variables associated with this area of research.

In summary, the literature on predisposing factors for perpetrators of ERI revealed many variables being researched with only a few of these variables showing significant association to ERI attitudes and behaviors. Among the variables studied with a significant association with ERI are age, divorce history, race, permissive attitudes, poor interpersonal connections, and substance abuse. Less consistent relationships were found between ERI, education, and premarital sexual behaviors. With changing patterns in extrarelational infidelity (e.g., women's rate of ERI approaching men's rate) and the growing use of multivariable analyses (e.g., interaction between religiosity and marital satisfaction), the lack of longitudinal research on predisposing factors became a constraining feature of ERI research.

Approach factors. Allen et al. (2005) defined approach factors as variables related to the encouragement or discouragement of progression toward previously considered infidelity. While not all individuals with predisposing factors endorsed positive attitudes about infidelity or engage in ERI, there are individuals with ERI histories without known predisposing factors. Approach factors provide information on the temporal variables associated with individual's decision to engage in infidelity. More importantly, approach factors help men and women determine whether they should participate in ERI given the perceived payoffs and consequences of a specific opportunity.

These cost-benefit evaluations were found to be influenced by time and subjective reasoning. Decision making around infidelity consisted of a series of smaller decisions leading to the development of ERI (Brown, 1991). Some individuals may have tried to

avoid developing feelings for their eventual affair partners by suppressing thoughts related to their committed relationship partner. Given research findings on cognitive coping through thought suppression (Wenzlaff & Wegner, 2000), efforts to suppress thoughts of their committed partner would have led to increased frequency and intensity of such thoughts. Atwood and Seifer (1997) posit people typically have not started with intent to engage in ERI. Instead, they suggest people became involved in an unfolding process where positive attitudes about ERI behaviors develop over time. This theory was supported by findings that the majority of married participants in infidelity reported not actively looking for an extramarital relationship at the time of their affair (Allen, 2001).

Precipitating ERI factors. Variables that trigger extrarelatinal infidelity were labeled by Allen et al. (2005) as precipitating ERI factors. These factors contribute to the first sexual contact with a partner or contribute to the first expression of sexual or loving feelings in emotional ERI. While ambiguity about relationships with potential ERI partners may represent an approach or a precipitating factor, decision-making in crossing the line into ERI includes moving past the ambiguity into cost-benefit analysis of the decision to actively engage in the relationship. This process is focused on short-term outcomes and often includes inadequate cost-benefit evaluations. For example, Atwood and Seifer (1997) found participants sometimes indicated ERI began during a time of vulnerability or arousal, suggesting the presence of these emotional states acted as precipitating factors in their affairs. They also found that participants often identified drug or alcohol abuse as precipitating their participation in ERI.

Research on partner and relational factors which precipitated ERI have not been an area receiving significant research focus at this point. Allen et al. (2005) points to

anecdotal clinical reports suggesting participants in ERI may have seen times of relationship conflict, threats of divorce/disconnection by the partner, and refusal of their partner to discuss relationship concerns as catalysts for their crossing the line into infidelity. Atwood and Seifer (1997) identified permissive standards for ERI within relationships or social support systems and the experiencing of direct advances from another person, labeling them as contextual facilitating factors.

Maintenance factors. Allen et al. (2005) labeled factors serving to maintain or terminate ERI behaviors as maintenance factors. They proposed that individuals who engaged in infidelity experienced internal tension due to conflict between their values of fidelity and their ERI practices. It was suggested that affair participants find themselves associating guilt and internal conflict with their committed partners, while their affair partners are associated with acceptance and a sense of vitality. These associations promote further investment in ERI and stronger feelings for the affair partner, making it more difficult to end ERI. These associations reflect a process similar to that of addiction. Both addiction and ERI were proposed to lead to a progressive inability to end a behavior in spite of increasingly negative consequences. By proposing this comparison, Martin (1989) suggested addressing ongoing infidelity within couple's therapy with an addiction model of intervention.

In spite of a variety of factors thought to influence the maintenance of ERI, there has been a paucity of research addressing this stage of ERI. Hulbert (1992) was the only study found relating to the maintenance of ERI. Using a sample of women only, this study showed that longer ERI relationships were predicted by positive attitudes toward sex and loving feelings toward the ERI partner.

Disclosure or discovery factors. One aspect of the addiction treatment model is disclosure of the negative behavior to those affected by the perpetrator's choices. Allen et al. (2005) labeled variables that increase or decrease the likelihood disclosure of infidelity will occur as disclosure or discovery factors. Given the range of responses after the discovery of ERI by a partner, the temporal placement of these factors is arbitrary. Unfortunately, in spite of the heightened risk for sexual transmission of disease (Choi, et al., 1994), there is little research on the factors that influence the discovery or disclosure of ERI.

The research completed on these factors found suspicion of infidelity to be rarely unsupported by later disclosures of an affair (Blumstein & Schwartz, 1983). In other studies, individuals were found to expect they would eventually inform their partners of their affairs (Weiderman & Allgeier, 1996). Allen et al. (2005) hypothesized that disclosure was more likely when relational satisfaction and probability of discovery were both high, and there was a history of successful conflict resolution within the relationship. Additionally, they hypothesized that disclosure was more likely when used as a way of expressing dissatisfaction with the relationship or when ending a committed relationship. Type of ERI was found to be a factor in discovery, with casual sex based ERI less likely to be discovered in comparison to ongoing infidelity with emotional connection (Allen & Baucom, 2004). In contradiction to what individuals without experience in extrarelational involvement believed, involved partners reported that their committed partners did not know they had already engaged in infidelity (Allen, 2001).

Response factors. Allen et al. (2005) labeled variables affecting the individual and relational outcomes for the involved partners and uninvolved partners as response factors.

While responses to short and long term extramarital relationships varied, ERI was typically associated with relational discord, conflict, and ending of the relationship (e.g., divorce; Buss, 1991; Kinsey et al., 1953). Relationships where a partner engaged in ERI experienced less commitment (Beach, Jouriles, & O'Leary, 1985), increased relational distress, greater conflict, and were more likely to experience dissolving of the relationship (Glass, 2003). In their longitudinal study on marital predictors of divorce, Amato and Rogers (1997) found infidelity to be the strongest proximal predictor. These findings supported South and Lloyd's (1995) report that at least one third of all marriages ending in divorce contained one or more spouses who have been involved with another person prior to dissolution. Amato and Previti (2003) found extramarital involvement to be the most prevalent cause for divorce in their sample. Infidelity was also cited as a prominent catalyst for domestic abuse (Vandello & Cohen, 2003), as well as being among the most difficult issues addressed in therapeutic settings (Whisman, Dixon, & Johnson, 1997).

While the impact of infidelity has been found to be negative to the vast majority of couples and individuals, Charny and Parnass (1995) found couples who used their experiences with ERI as a precipitant to address relationship issues had stronger relationships. In this research, therapists provided one detailed description and consequence of an extramarital relationship they observed in their practice. Of the 62 cases provided, 34% ended in divorce and 49.5% of the cases were left intact, but were empty or negative in atmosphere. However, 14.5% of couples were characterized as improved or experiencing growth after the revelation of infidelity.

Inconsistency in responses to ERI was associated with variations in the characteristics and behaviors of the involved partner. These characteristics included the sex of the perpetrator (Atwood & Seifer, 1997; Beach, Jouriles, & O'Leary, 1985; Lusterman, 1997; Spanier & Margolis, 1983), with women's engagement in ERI being a stronger predictor of relationship disillusion (Glass, 2003; Kinsey et al., 1953). Researchers and couples therapists reported skepticism around the reliability of these attitudes (Allen et al., 2005), with direct disclosure by the involved partner being theoretically associated with relationship stability when compared to staggered disclosure (Glass & Wright, 1992). Further, when the affected partner's emotional pain was acknowledged and an apology was offered by the involved partner, the affected spouse was more likely to develop empathy and forgiveness for the infidelity (McCullough, Worthington, & Rachel, 1997).

ERI and Mental Health

Engaging in ERI, including sexual and emotional infidelity, has consequences for both individuals and relationships. Revealing of ERI attracts significant interest from immediate family and friends. While the result of such ERI has affected interpersonal relationships, a less evident implication of ERI is its role as a catalyst for psychiatric distress, including depression, anxiety, and trauma. Buunk (1995) found partners affected by the extramarital infidelity have been found to experience strong negative emotional reactions, including shame, anger, disappointment, and self-doubt (Buunk, 1995). He also found that when these symptoms co-occur and are severe in nature, the affected partner can experience trauma indicative of post-traumatic stress disorder.

O'Leary (2005) provided commentary on factors involved with infidelity, including the emotional effects on the aggravated partner. Along with threats of relationship dissolution and physical abuse, Cano and O'Leary (2000) identified infidelity as precipitating depression among wives within one month of the infidelity. They found that women who experienced some form of negative event in their committed relationship (e.g., the discovery of an affair) were more likely to report non-descript symptoms of depression than women who experienced similar relational discord without such an event. In a separate study, women who had no history of mood disturbance became depressed at a rate of 38% following the discovery of the ERI (Christian-Herman, O'Leary, & Avery-Leaf, 2002). Finally, Cano, O'Leary, and Heinz (2004) compared women who recently experienced severe marital stressors with a control group of women reporting similar levels of discord without a specific severe stressor. They found marital stressors to be associated with more intense symptoms of depression. In the same study, women experiencing marital discord without severe stressors were found to have greater levels of depression. These women were also more likely to be separated a month after the initial survey.

In another study on relational discord and depression, Whisman and Bruce (1999) found dissatisfied partners to be three times more likely to develop depression over a 12 month period compared to satisfied partners. In their analysis, the association between relational discord and depression remained significant when demographic differences and history of depression were controlled for. Further, the researchers suggested this association was not moderated by biosex or history of depression. These results provide evidence for relational discord as a contributing factor to the etiology of depression.

While there are no studies which examine the emotional and psychological affects of ERI on men, the lack of moderation of sex suggests both men and women are at risk for depression due to negative relational events like ERI.

A growing body of research has begun to address the different phases of responding to ERI and temporal influences on the various responses. Gordon and Baucom (1999) proposed three stages of recovery from infidelity: impact, meaning, and moving on. These stages describe both positive and negative outcomes focused on the role of forgiveness in relational stability and individual development. Incorporating these stages into forgiveness therapy was found to decrease individual and relationship distress within couples addressing infidelity (Gordon, Baucom, & Snyder, 2004). Given the dramatic effects ERI had on individuals and relationships, continued research on personal and relational recovery from ERI is warranted.

As this research suggests, there is an association between relational discord, including ERI, and the onset, course, and treatment of adult psychiatric disorders. The etiology of relational discord in relation to psychiatric disorders has been debated between researches who see relational dissatisfaction as a causal factor (Beach, Sandeen, & O'Leary, 1990; Kleiner & Marshall, 1987; Frankenstein, Hay, & Nathan, 1985), and researchers who view relational conflict as a result of mental health issues (Buglass, Clarke, Henderson, & Presley, 1977). Regardless of its catalysts, relational discord has been shown to covary with severe psychiatric disorders, including depression, anxiety disorders, alcohol abuse, and psychosis (Halford & Bouma, 1997). In a comparison of the marital satisfaction of participants with and participants without comorbid psychiatric

disorders, Whisman and Bruce (1999) found higher levels of marital discord reported by individuals with mood disorders, anxiety disorders, or substance abuse disorders.

Limitations of Past Research

While there has been a paucity of research in a variety of areas of ERI, there has also been inconsistency in methodological and theoretical approaches in current ERI research. Blow and Hartnett (2005a) recognized the overall lack of thorough study related to infidelity, as well as divergence on the aspects of ERI to be studied. They identified a shortage of diversity in samples, inconsistency in operational definitions, variability in methodology, and poor focus on changing relational norms. They proposed that infidelity research has also been limited by problems in correlation studies that have not included multiple predictors in a single statistical model. Sample limitations have been exacerbated by participant fear of confidentiality violations and emotional consequences of revealing infidelity, resulting in distorted responses. Given these inconsistencies and limitation, it remains difficult to predict who will engage in ERI. The following is a review of issues in ERI research, including definitions, measures and design, samples, and population limitations.

Defining ERI. The measurement of extrarelatinal infidelity has taken many forms, with correlates, patterns of development, and consequences of ERI differing with the variation in type of infidelity. The conceptual and operational uncertainty of ERI has been a major constraint on the interpretation of findings. In their review of extramarital involvement literature, Allen et al. (2005) reported considerable variety in the way infidelity was operationalized, including the manner in which participants were asked about extramarital sex, affairs, or marital problems related to a spouse having sex with

someone else. They recommend using methodologies that incorporate a continuum of sexual behaviors and a continuum of emotional involvement. They also suggested that measuring both sexual and emotional involvement in infidelity allowed for the analysis of correlates of sexual intercourse, as well as the broader spectrum of experiences with ERI.

In their review of research on infidelity, Blow and Harnett (2005a) identified common labels for ERI as: “emotional connections that are beyond friendships”, “friendships”, “internet relationships”, “kissing”, “fondling”, “extramarital relationships”, “cheating”, “sexual intercourse”, and “oral sex”. They noted the use of the term “sex” caused variability in findings given the variety of behaviors individuals’ assigned to this term. The inconsistent operationalization of terms resulted in vague or misleading findings which acted as a barrier to the transfer of results to clinicians. Variability in definitions of ERI also led to questions about the validity of research and has dramatically limited the comparability of studies.

Variability within couples and context also influenced the validity of ERI research and the therapeutic implications of findings. Blow & Hartnett (2005b) reported that when partners within a relationship differed in their definition of infidelity, implications for behaviors were different for each member of the relationship. Further, they reported each type of relationship (marriage, cohabitating, heterosexual, homosexual) influenced the rules regarding what was defined as infidelity. Finally, because behaviors in one type of relationship are viewed differently than in other types, comparisons of behaviors that occur during infidelity between different types of relationships are problematic.

Measure and design issues. In relation to issues with defining ERI, researchers have historically suffered through poor study construction and the use of measures that were inapplicable to the ERI being studied. Allen et al. (2005) proposed that researchers have entered into studies with insufficient theoretical frameworks and measures with poor validity. Because ERI does not lend itself to experimental manipulation, there is also an over abundance of correlation studies. These studies have asked about ERI history and variables of current relationships, often resulting in unwarranted assignment of causation for ERI.

In light of the problematic nature of these past correlation studies on infidelity, longitudinal and qualitative studies have been undertaken to provide a greater understanding of previous findings and to reveal new avenues of research (Blow & Harnett, 2005a). Collecting longitudinal data on ERI, however, has been problematic as well. For example, because of the low occurrence of ERI, a great amount of time is needed to accumulate an adequate sample. In an attempt to avoid the slow rate of sampling, Allen et al. (2005) suggested asking participants to provide data on variables by recalling their own experiences. However, this method does not control for retrospective bias. They also suggested researchers use a combination of longitudinal and cross-sectional methods. This hybrid methodology would provide insight into group differences in their recalled account and potential encounters in which there is information on predictors of ERI.

Recent studies have improved the body of research on infidelity by including multi-variable modeling (Atkins et al., 2001). The inclusion of explanatory variables, according to Blow and Hartnett (2005a), provided more accurate representations of

predictors than correlational studies by including demonstrations of the joint effects of predictors and the interactions between these predictors in explaining ERI. They went on to suggest that while multivariable modeling has provided ERI research with a new way of understanding infidelity, it has limited the understanding of predictor variables across time by depending too heavily on recalled ERI encounters.

Population issues. Issues with sampling populations have been an ongoing limitation of ERI. The sensitive nature of ERI has resulted in it being a private issue for most participants and therefore difficult to study in representative samples. In response to recruitment issues, researchers of infidelity have typically used samples from university populations (i.e., Barta & Kiene, 2005; Harris, 2000) and volunteer samples (Orzeck & Lung, 2005). Unfortunately, the selection factors associated with these samples resulted in inflated rates of reported ERI. For example, Laumann et al. (1994) noted differences in responses about sexual behavior from self-selected samples compared to findings in a national probability sample. These same selection factors have led to the contamination of findings regarding causes of and responses to ERI. Allen et al. (2005) reported several differences in findings from community versus clinical samples in their review of infidelity research. One remedy they suggested was to increase sample sizes and the breadth of responses by using hypothetical questions about ERI or asking about attitudes toward ERI. Unfortunately, this remedy has yet to be shown as an effective replacement for responses to actual ERI events.

Given the extensive use of convenience samples and the difficulties in sampling for infidelity research, controlling for sampling effects has been particularly important. According to Treas and Giesen (2000), participant anonymity and the use of social

desirability indexes have been features used to successfully control for both representative and convenient sampling effects. Presenting ERI as inoffensively as possible has also been an important method limiting sampling effects (Allen et al., 2005). Further, comparing innocuous ERI questions (i.e., number of intercourse partners in the last year) with data from other portions of the survey (i.e., length of current marriage) has been used to infer extrarelational behaviors (Wiederman, 1997). While this method does not provide the optimal richness of findings, it has avoided restrictions related to the sensitive nature of ERI and theoretically provided more honest responses.

A final limitation of sampling in ERI research has been the lack of emphasis given to diversity within and between samples. Except in studies using large national samples reporting data on prevalence, research on the intricacies of ERI has been limited by overly heterosexual, middle-class, married, Caucasian samples (Blow & Hartnett, 2005a). Beyond individual demographic information, research on extradyadic relationships has also tended to lack differentiation of results between marital, cohabitating, committed, dating, and same-sex couples. The emphasis on married couples has resulted in a limited number of studies on cohabitating, separated, and divorces couples.

ERI and Biosex

Among the all variables studied in association with infidelity, biosex has been examined more than any other (Atkins, et al., 2001). In spite of the attention given to the relationship between biosex and infidelity there is surprisingly little concrete information about whether men or women engage in more ERI. This difference in rate of ERI between the sexes has decreased as research becomes less focused on using sexual

intercourse as the defining criteria. Research on infidelity has historically conceptualized biosex dichotomously as male versus female (Allen et al., 2005). This conceptualization assumes biosex determines ERI attitudes and behaviors, including the degree to which gender expectations for sexuality are endorsed. The following is a review of the ERI literature comparing men and women on rates of infidelity and other demographic variables studied in connection with extra-relational infidelity.

Rates of ERI: Men vs. Women

Some researchers contend that more men than women engage in infidelity (Allen & Baucom, 2004; Atkins, et al., 2001) and identify men as having more permissive attitudes about extrarelatonal infidelity (Lieberman, 1988; Thompson, 1983). Men report to having had significantly more sexual partners outside of their marriages (Wiggins & Lederer, 1984). Other researchers suggest men are only marginally more likely to engage in infidelity than women (Choi et al., 1994). Support for the theory that biosex is not a significant predictive factor in ERI is found in research showing that women's rates of ERI as beginning to approach those of men (Oliver & Hyde, 1993). Prins, Buunk, and Yperen (1993) reported that while men had greater desire to engage in infidelity, younger cohorts of females have ERI behaviors that resemble those of their male counterparts. Laumann et al. (1994), using a 1992 national survey, found higher rates of extramarital relationships for men, except in the 18-29 year old cohort, where women reported higher rates of infidelity than men. Further, Wiederman (1997) found no difference in the rate of infidelity for men and women under the age of 40. These results suggest the cohort effects which influence rates of ERI may have more influence on infidelity than biosex.

Biosex, Relationship Type, Age, and ERI

With differences between men's and women's rates of infidelity being scrutinized, research was developed to examine the relationship between biosex and types of ERI. Glass and Wright (1992) showed biosex to interact with type of infidelity and the meaning attached to the extramarital relationships. They found women emphasized the emotional connection in these relationships, while men placed more importance on the sexual experiences included in their extramarital relationships. They also found women to be more prone to fall in love with their ERI partner, while men were shown to be more likely than women to see their ERI partners as good friends, but not love interests. Spanier and Margolis' (1983) found women to be more likely than men to engage in combined emotional and sexual extramarital relationships. In contrast to women, men's extrarelatational infidelity has been shown to include more physical contact and contain more sexual intercourse (Glass & Wright, 1985).

Lusterman (1997) identified several social influences on ERI attitudes and behaviors have been defined. Specifically, he identified greater societal condoning of male infidelity, women being depicted more prominently as sexual objects, and men's vulnerability to seeking power and engaging in conquest sex. He further linked societal pressures on men to attain career success with men's neglect of their feelings about their relationships. Lusterman's description mirrors evolutionary theory's identification of greater instinctual pressures as social factors that contribute to differences in ERI. Wright (1994) posited that evolutionary goals pressured men to have multiple sex partners. Greiling & Buss (2000) reported greater instinctual pressures on women to have one sexual partner who is invested in the relationship. Unfortunately, ERI research has

neglected to address the differences in men's and women's social attitudes about sexuality in relation to ERI attitudes and behavior.

The dynamics of ERI have been shown to vary by biosex and type of primary relationships. Hansen (1987) found males in significant dating relationships engaged in more sexual behaviors outside of their relationships than did women in similar relationships. Studying same sex couples, Blumstein and Schwartz (1983) reported lesbian women were less likely to engage in infidelity outside of their committed relationships than gay men in committed relationships. Further, they found gay men to have more partners and seek more variety in their sexual partners. In a study using both heterosexual and homosexual samples, Worth, Reid, & McMillian (2002) found relationship type to be unrelated to increases in possessiveness when one partner has concern about their partner being engaged in a meaningful affair.

Finally, research has shown a relationship between biosex and age in reporting ERI. Atkins, et al., (2001) found men 55-65 years of age and women 40-45 years of age to be most likely to report participating in infidelity at least once in their lifetime. Men and women outside these age ranges were less likely to report engaging in extrarelational sex, and with no differences in rate of in extrarelational sex for men and women under age 40 (Wiederman, 1997). It is important to note, however, that these findings are influenced by cohort effects due to the cross-sectional nature of the research design.

In summary, past research on infidelity has center on rates of infidelity, contributing factors, and predisposing variables for ERI. This research has found rates of infidelity to historically be higher for men, but more recent figures showing the discrepancy between ERI rates decreasing as new definitions of infidelity inclusive of

emotional infidelity are applied. Contributing factors research has shown to include permissive sexual attitudes, low consequences for ERI, and relationship dissatisfaction. These findings led to the development of two models of justification for ERI: the deficit model and the personal growth model. Research on predisposing variables established positive relationships between ERI and education levels, low religiosity, some races, experiences with divorce, proclivity of sexual fantasies not about one's partner, and premarital sexual experiences. The effects of engaging in ERI have included greater rates of clinical anxiety and depression in partners of ERI perpetrators and relationship dissolution.

The limitations of research on infidelity include a general lack of rigorous studies, inconsistent definitions of infidelity across studies, an over abundance of correlation studies and a lack of studies that establish predictive relationships for ERI, and poor sample diversity. The limitation this study addresses is the over use of biosex as a variable related to ERI attitudes and behaviors. Past research that has shown men to be more likely to have taken part in infidelity and to be more accepting of sexual infidelity is being challenged. These challenges are based in new definitions of infidelity that include emotional and sexual types of infidelity, which are directly related to the decreasing variability in the rates of ERI for women compared to men. What has not been investigated in past ERI research is the role of socially constructed gender norms in attitudes about infidelity and ERI behaviors for men and women.

Masculinity

Like research on ERI, studies on gender have been undertaken almost since psychology was identified as a unique science. In this section the gender research

literature on masculinity will be reviewed. Masculinity has a history of being defined and redefined by gender researchers. Prior to the gender revolution of the 1960's and 1970's masculinity and femininity were seen as sets of attributes naturally and actively sought during the maturation process. Beginning in the 1970's, as the feminism was having an impact on popular society, gender theorists and researchers began quantifying the differences between the genders. For men, this movement represented a change in how they were perceived, transforming them the idealized, gender normal humans into distinctive representations of gender (Smiler, 2004). Later, views on masculinity changed due to the developing of the androgyny prospective and concepts of gender as all-encompassing social roles (Bem, 1974).

During the 1980's, research on masculinity began to examine the maladaptive limitations gender placed on men (Pleck, 1981). By the 1990's, the increasing application of the social construction theory of gender led to changes in the field toward recognizing social influences on how masculinity was defined. As the 1990's ended, theories of masculinity began to explain issues beyond the maladaptive aspects of being masculine (Mahalik et al., 2003b). Researchers conceptualized multiple characteristics of masculinity, both normative and maladaptive aspects of conformity to masculine norms, and the differing degrees to which individuals endorse a variety of components of masculinity.

Male sexuality is an example of a social component of masculinity. Levant and Brooks (1997) described a "crisis of connection" for men in relationships, proposing that socially enforced masculine norms for sexuality often result in impractical expectations for men and their sexual partners. The expectations for nonrelational sexuality were

based in a tendency of men to experience sex as a lustful pursuit, utterly devoid of relational intimacy or emotional connection. Nonrelational sexuality, as with many masculine role norms, was described as developing during childhood and as representing a script for enacting masculinity. Like all aspects of masculinity, the endorsement of this script has been both adaptive and dysfunctional, depending on the context in and degree to which they are expressed.

In this section, a history of the study of masculinity will be provided, with a brief explanation of social construction theory of gender and its implication for individuals' experiences of sexuality. Measures of both normative and dysfunctional masculine patterns will be described and critiqued. Within this description, masculine scripts constructed within society will be presented, as well as the different aspects of masculine norms being employed in this study. Finally, a review of the theory of men's nonrelational sexuality will be provided to explain the sexual focus and lack of emotional connection in men's sexuality.

Masculinity Theory History

The history of masculine gender research includes several defining periods. Prior to the sexual revolution and feminist movement, masculinity was seen as biologically based and static. As the feminist movement gained momentum it acted as a catalyst for research on gender which led to masculinity being identified as an unchanging social construct. At the same time, the masculine ideology movement introduced the idea of masculinity as a distinct, all encompassing role. With a set masculine ideology in place, role strain theory provided a vehicle for the examination of the dysfunctional aspects of masculine role endorsement. As the history of masculine role norms was becoming of

more interest, the focus on dysfunction shifted from the endorsement of a masculine ideology to the degree of endorsement of different aspects of the ideology. Finally, as the century ended researchers began to focus on the development of masculinity from a universal gender norms perspective.

Origins. Theory on gender and its implications has been present since the beginning of psychology as a science (Smiler, 2004). Prior to the feminist movement of the 1960's and early 1970's, masculinity was viewed as a biological identity males developed as they matured. This emphasis on biology as the causal factor for the development of masculinity excluded the influence of social and cultural factor on how masculinity was expressed. Because masculinity was seen as determined only by biology, it was seen as an unwavering construct endorsed by all men. According to Morawski (1985), the prototype for masculinity was a man who was physically active, rational rather than emotional, physically and emotionally strong, and community-oriented. Men who failed to achieve the ideal masculinity were susceptible to expressions of femininity and were seen as suffering from mental health issues (Pleck, 1981). On the other hand, over endorsement of the masculine ideal was not initially viewed as problematic, but eventually aggressiveness and conduct disordered behaviors were associated to excessive masculinity or hypermasculinity (Pleck, 1995).

Androgyny. As the feminist movement began to influence social science research, the polar relationship between masculinity and femininity began to be challenged. With the development of androgyny theory, the concept of gender as socially driven was introduced and views of gender as solely determined by biology began to subside. Gender began to be seen as a set of social attributes used to define masculine and feminine

personalities. Specifically, masculinity was defined by personality traits which differentiated males from females.

According to Smiler (2004), because social influences on gender was a new concept in masculine theory, support continued for gender development as an individual process continued, but with masculinity still being seen as a rigid construct. In contrast to this rigid view on masculinity, androgyny researchers broke from their gender theorist predecessors by removing masculinity and femininity from their polar positions. Androgyny researchers redefined masculinity and femininity endorsable to varying degrees by both males and females in varying degrees (Bem, 1974).

Masculine ideology. At the same time masculinity was being redefined by androgyny researchers as distinct and variable in endorsement among men and women, social psychologists began to define masculinity as a distinct and all-encompassing social role (Brannon, 1976). A socioculturally determined masculine ideology was developed that influenced all aspects of individuals' behavior. Paradoxically, this new masculine ideology was internalized and described as residing within individuals, as well as within the environment.

According to Pleck (1995) the concept of internalized masculinity is evidence for the endorsement of a belief system about masculinity. Social psychologists theorized that the endorsement of these masculine beliefs varied within individuals and in different social groups. Masculine ideology contrasted social psychologist when it contended the variability in standards for masculinity was still based in rigid stereotypes of masculinity. According to Smiler (2004), these standards were being antifeminine, valuing autonomy, placing importance on gaining status, abhorrence for homosexuality, being resilient, and

embracing risk. In contrast to androgyny theory, the antifeminine standard of masculine ideology repositioned masculinity in a polar position with femininity, connecting poor endorsement of these masculine standards with mental distress and poor outcomes.

Role Strain. As gender research continued into the 1980's, the mental distress and poor outcomes of nonconformity to socially constructed gender roles became a more significant focus of gender research and theory. Prominent in this period was the concept of the masculine role strain paradigm. Developed and restructured by Pleck (1995) to describe the difficulties associated with conforming to masculine gender roles, the masculine role strain paradigm identified aspects of masculine role norms which contribute to internal conflict. He identified three specific ways in which socially developed gender roles have negative effects for individuals. First, gender role discrepancy described low self-esteem related to failure to endorse masculine role norms. Second, gender role trauma described distress resulting from the masculine role socialization process. Finally, gender role dysfunction described role strain associated with views that identify male role norms as inherently objectionable because they lead to negative outcomes for men and those around them.

With the development of masculine role strain paradigm came an increasing association between masculinity and dysfunction. According to Smiler (2004), this association deviated from the previous emphasis on low endorsement or excessive endorsement of masculinity as inducing problems. Also, in spite of the variability with which individuals endorsed these norms, masculine role strain supported the concept of a singular masculinity, but avoided idealizing it by describing its problematic nature. Finally, masculine role strain theory supported the concept of gender as socially

constructed and gender as residing within individuals, as previous gender theorists had suggested.

Deconstruction. As masculine role strain theory was developed and empirically supported (Eisler, 1995; O'Neil, 2002), the social construction of the multiple masculinities was being developed. Historians chronicled the changes in masculine norms from communal manhood during the 1700's, to masculinity as an idiosyncratic ideal in the early 1800's, and the valuing of men's activities at the beginning of the 1900's (Rotundo, 1993). These changes were described as a shift from the descriptions of men in the early nineteenth century as refined leaders, portrayals men in the marketplace in the late nineteenth century (Kimmel, 1996). Shifts in masculinity were also described in terms of emotional styles (Stearns, 1994) from emotionally zealous masculinity to emotionally devoid masculinity.

Historical accounts of masculinity have consistently described it as based in common ideologies that organize the characteristics associated with masculinity, even as gender role norms have varied over time (Smiler, 2004). Unlike the ideology perspective, the historical perspective identifies common ideas which are increasingly relevant to some variations in the expression of masculinity than others. This historical position allowed the dysfunctional characteristics of masculinity to be deconstructed, shifting the emphasis from the degree of endorsement of a singular masculinity to the endorsement of a variety of characteristics that make up masculinity.

The historical descriptions of different masculinities and evidence of changes in masculinity offered evidence for the presence of multiple masculinities in a given society or culture. With the validation of this position came descriptions of masculinity in terms

of demographically defined groups, such as homosexual, African American, Hispanic, Native American, and Asian men (Harrison, 1995; Lazur & Majors, 1995; Haldeman, 2005; Caldwell & White, 2005; Casas, Turner, & Ruiz de Esparza, 2005; Sue, 2005). Today, the idea of multiple masculinities has been well received by masculinity researchers, with dramatic increases in publications that address the topic since the introduction of the term in the late 1980's (Smiler, 2004).

Recent revisions. The end of the 1990's saw the development of new theories of masculinity based in multiple roles, identities, and ideologies of gender. In reformulating his theory of gender role strain, Pleck (1995) suggested social constructivists' emphasis on power was the only significant differentiation from his previous theories. He stressed the importance of the variability in individuals' beliefs about adhering to culturally defined expectations for male behavior. Finally, he argued that his approach allowed for variation in the degree of adherence to the set masculine components, but he stopped short of endorsing the theory of multiple masculinities.

Wade (1998) drew on gender acquisition theories focused on peer group influences to suggest an alternate, identity-based conception of masculinity. According to his reference group identity dependence theory, individuals used views of self and their male peers to create internal representations of what being male means. This theory specifically allowed for multiple masculinities by allowing different reference groups to define a different version of masculinity. The theory balanced the socially constructed nature of masculinity, while maintaining the individual influences on masculinity found in the early descriptions of gender development.

Both Pleck (1995) and Wade (1998) provided views that placed masculinity within the individual, with social influences on the defining of the masculine constructs. While neither researcher defined specific criteria for maladaptive masculinity, both researchers suggested rigid adherence to masculine norms led to psychological distress. Their identification of over endorsement of masculine norms was a subtle shift in masculinity theory. Problems no longer rested in the structure of masculinity, but rather in the lack elasticity in the behavioral enactment of masculine gender norms. This rethinking of gender based psychological distress resembled the concept of variability in gender endorsement originally put forth by Bem (1974) and was seen as the ideal.

In another break from previous theories on masculinity, neither Pleck (1995) nor Wade (1998) contrasted masculinity with femininity. Given the importance they placed on antifemininity by previous theories, the absence of a description of the relationship between genders intriguing. The absence of comparison between the genders reflected the androgyny theory's stance on endorsement of gender norms across biosex without a direct statement of endorsement by either theorist.

Social Construction of Masculinity

According to Brickell (2006), social constructionism describes environmentally established concepts, such as masculinity, as behaviors which often appear to be natural, but in reality are artifacts of a specific culture. Therefore, social construction theories of gender proposed that males and females learned to behave in ways which met the socially developed expectations for their biosex. He goes on to propose that operating through cultural scenarios, interpersonal interactions, and intrapsychic contemplation, socially constructed scripts are flexible across time and as reflecting changes in the social

expectations as they are defined by the members of a specific culture. The enactment of gendered behavior was associated with adherence to socially constructed sexual scripts, language patterns, and specific collections of behaviors found within a society (Gagnon, 1999). The learning and enactment of scripts developed from these social expectations resembles social learning theories of gender development. Social construction's emphasis on the individual's role as an active agent in the construction of gendered meaning (i.e., reciprocal determinism) was the concept which differentiated it from other social learning theories (Addis & Cohane, 2005).

Along with gender role strain, social construction theories of gender have emerged as an important perspective on masculinity. Applying social construction to masculinity reduced the importance of being biologically male in the development of masculinity and increased the focus given to the process of becoming gendered. This process has been described by Pleck (1995) as a complex interaction with individuals' cultures, during which gender scripts were learned and modified to make them more agreeable.

The learning of gender scripts proposed by gender constructionists resembles the socialization of gender purposed by gender strain theorists. In view of this compatibility, gender role strain has been viewed as representative of social constructionists' implication that masculinity can have negative consequences. Others would suggest that because masculine gender role strain was developed prior to theories on social construction of gender, social construction of gender is an extension of gender role strain concepts (Pleck, 1995).

While there are obvious similarities between masculine role strain theory and theories on social construction of masculinity, they have not been described as analogous. Critics of the masculine role strain theory pointed to its supposedly static view of masculinity and promotion of white, middle class gender standards. Finally, critics emphasized masculine role strains exclusion of power dynamics as a defining characteristic of masculinity compared to femininity (Kimmel & Messner, 1989). In contrast, criticism of social construction theories of gender has proposed the existence of an over-emphasis on power differentials between the sexes in the development of sex roles (Pleck, 1995). Other criticisms of social construction gender theories included its limiting view of sex and gender as developing only from socially constructed gender role norms, its failure to describe the influence of socially constructed ethnic norms, and its lack of description of the intrapsychic processes involved in enacting socially constructed gender role norms (Brickell, 2006).

Measuring Normative and Dysfunctional Masculinity

The contemporary study of masculinity has taken two paths: addressing the dysfunctional outcomes of over-adherence or non-adherence to masculine role norms and studying the normative aspects of masculine role norms as they relate to other variables in daily life. The study of dysfunctional masculine norms has been strongly associated with the gender role strain paradigm (Pleck, 1995) and focuses on the ways in which men experience distress associated with their gender norms. The study of normative masculine norms was undertaken in an effort to describe both the maladaptive and adaptive aspects of masculinity. The following is a description of each area of research, with a review of relevant literature.

Masculinity as dysfunctional. Some research on masculine ideology has been based in the maladaptive aspects or dysfunctional execution of role norms which result in distress. Pleck (1981) suggested this distress is caused by a number of factors including contradictory demands imposed by masculinity, concern about violating these socially imposed norms, and difficulty in adjusting to temporal changes in the norms. Studies have found a positive relationship between the endorsement of traditional masculine role norms and an increased presence of a variety of issues, including low-self esteem (Counoyer & Mahalik, 1995).

In an attempt to organize and describe the dysfunctional aspect of masculine ideology, clinicians developed an array of masculine scripts tied to issues of clinical importance. The first of these descriptions, strong-and-silent script (Brannon, 1976), illustrated the central importance of men and boys appearing to be in control of their emotions or as unemotional. This restricted emotionality has been found to be connected to alexithymia (Fischer & Good, 1997), fear of intimacy (Counoyer & Mahalik, 1995), greater levels of depression (Good & Mintz, 1990; Good, Robertson, Fitzgerald, Stevens, & Bartels, 1996), and greater levels of hostile personality styles (Blazina & Watkins, 1996).

The tough-guy script illustrated men's tendency to use emotional suppression as a means of coping with vulnerability. Men who engage in emotional suppression of sadness or grief have been found to use alternate, often unhealthy methods of coping, including substance abuse, aggression, and fearlessness (Mahalik, Good, & Englar-Carlson, 2003). The existence of this script has been evidenced by research showing over one third of men experienced some degree of psychological dependence on alcohol

during their lifetime (Lemle & Mishkind, 1989) and reporting men to be three times more likely to die of alcohol-related ailments (Cooper, Russell, Skinner, Frone, & Mudar, 1992).

Another description, called the give-'em-hell script, portrayed men as socialized toward violent behaviors. Pollack (1998) discussed this description as being connected to sports which promote violence. This masculinity script has been associated with violence perpetrated by men against their partners (Vass & Gold, 1995) and more supportive attitudes about husbands' violence against their wives (Finn, 1986).

The homophobic script described the imposed contempt for feminine expressions and was based on a traditional polar view of masculinity and femininity. Research showed a positive relationship between the restriction of affectionate behavior with other men and immature psychological defense mechanisms (Mahalik, Cournoyer, DeFranc, Cherry, & Napolitano, 1998). The homophobic script was also positively related to paranoia, greater psychoticism, and personal inadequacy (Good et al., 1996).

The independent script depicted the lack of comfort with attaching to or needing assistance from others. This tendency of men to isolate from others' support was hypothesized to begin with early detachment of mothers from sons (Pollack, 1998). This characteristic of masculinity has been shown to lead to greater psychological distress and less willingness to seek psychological help (Mahalik, Good, et al., 2003).

Two descriptive characteristics developed to illustrate the dysfunctional aspect of masculine ideology which are particularly relevant to this study were the playboy script and the winner script. The playboy script depicted the effects of emotional suppression on the sexual development of males. Specifically, the suppression of emotions imposed by

traditional masculine role norms was described as leading to men or boys not valuing emotional connections with their romantic partners or allowing themselves to experience caring for their sexual partners (Mahalik, Good, et al., 2003). Research has shown this view of sexuality to be harmful to others through the positive relationship it has with the endorsement of the playboy norms and hostility, as well as preferences for inequitable relationships (Mahalik, Locke, et al. 2003). While the adherence to this script was shown to be adaptive in its ability to allow exploration during early stages of sexual maturation, it was also shown to be a problematic and self-perpetuating stage many men have difficulty progressing from (Good & Sherrod, 1997)

Finally, the winner script is relevant to this paper in its depiction of the central importance of competition and attaining success for men in this society (Mahalik, Good, et al., 2003). Although competition can be pleasurable and has been an important aspect of working culture, it was identified as a significant source of stress which contributed to cardiovascular health issues in men (Good, Sherrod, & Dillon, 2000). The psychosocial implications of the winner script were greater displays of controlling and rigid interpersonal behavior (Mahalik, 2000) and increased paranoia (Good et al., 1996), as well as greater hostility and social discomfort (Mahalik, Good, et al., 2003). This social discomfort can take the form of discomfort with their sexual performance, resulting in the solidification of sexual ability as a significant motivation for participation in extrarelational activities.

The adherence to masculine ideology and the masculine scripts set for men and boys were the basis for the theories of gender role strain. Implicit in gender role strain theory were three broader ideas about how cultural standards for masculinity have the

potential to result in negative effects on individuals (Pleck, 1995). First, the significant numbers of males who exhibit long-term failure in adherence to masculine role norms are prone to experience low-self esteem and other psychological consequences. Second, even when these masculine role norms are adhered to, the process of meeting such social standards is inherently traumatic with long-term negative side effects. Third, in spite of the avoidance of intrapsychic distress related nonadherence to masculine role norms, negative side effects for this adherence may occur in relation to inherent negative side effects for men and others around them. O'Neil, Helms, Gable, David, & Wrightsman (1986) summed up the negative outcome of masculine role norms as the restriction of the person's actualization of their potential or the restriction of someone else's potential actualization.

Studies addressing gender role strain in men typically used measures of conflict associated with gender role strain, such as the Gender Role Conflict Scale (GRCS, O'Neil et al., 1986). This scale was developed on the premise that gender role conflict results from distress and divergence from men's gender-role socialization. Research using the GRCS has supported its conceptual model. For example, dimensions of the GRCS were positively related to low self-esteem (Cournoyer & Mahalik, 1995), sexual orientation (Simonsen, Blazina, & Watkins, 2000), excessive levels of perceived stress (Sharpe & Heppner, 1991), and increased prevalence of depression and anxiety in men (Cournoyer & Mahalik, 1995; Good & Wood, 1995). Greater scores on the GRCS were also found to be related with hostility and rigid interpersonal behaviors (Mahalik, 2000), shame (Thompkins & Rando, 2003), racial identity statuses (Wade, 1996), and acculturation (Fragoso & Kashubeck, 2000). Finally, the GRCS was used to show a

relationship between decreased relationship satisfaction and intimacy struggles (Sharpe & Heppner, 1991).

The limitations of the research on masculine scripts and the gender role paradigm are similar to those discussed in the research on infidelity. First, the constructs associated with masculine ideology lacked consistent definition. For example, when discussing the playboy script and the lack of emotional connection men experience, there is no clear definition or established level of emotional connection that should be experienced in romantic or sexual relationships. Further, the amount of connection experienced by men in romantic and sexual relationships is subject to other cultural standards and relationship types. Questions which address the influence of relationship type and racial influence on playboy scripts have not been fully explored (Pleck, 1995).

Second, like research on ERI, masculine ideology and role strain research has relied extensively on a few research methodologies. The most problematic methodology found in this research is the over reliance on self-report instruments. When discussing relational issues associated with masculinity, few studies have incorporated the views of men's significant others (Fischer & Good, 1997; Franchina, Eisler, & Moore, 2001; Mahalik, Locke, et al., 2003). Given the unconscious nature of socially constructed masculine norms, the repression of emotion (strong-and-silent script) and men's tendency to avoid appearing weak (tough-guy script; Mahalik, Good, et al., 2003), men's reports of emotional experiences, especially experiences with vulnerability, are subject to unconscious underreporting.

Again, like ERI research, the number of studies on gender role conflict which employed convenience samples of college aged men (O'Neil, Good, & Holmes, 1995)

suggests problems with the generalizability of findings to older men and men from diverse backgrounds. While the over use of one demographic population is an issue for this area of research, it should not be taken as indicative of an absence of variability in population age (Sharpe & Heppner, 1991; Courmoyer & Mahalik, 1995) or race/ethnicity (Stillson, O'Neil, & Owen, 1991).

Finally, the most prevalent limitation of research on masculine role strain and masculine ideology has been its lack of focus on the adaptive aspects of masculinity (Mahalik, Good, et al., 2003; Mahalik, Locke, et al., 2003b; Smiler, 2004). By exploring only the maladaptive aspects of masculinity, this line of research has been limited in its ability to comprehensively describe experiences with masculinity. For example, the GRCS has been empirically validated by factor analysis (O'Neil, et al., 1986) and is a strong measure of pathology related to traditional masculinity, but not the degree of conformity or nonconformity to gender role norms (Mahalik, Locke, et al., 2003).

Masculinity as normative. As described in the history portion of this section on research in masculinity, the acquisition of masculinity was at one time seen as an innate or natural process for males. Failing to develop an appropriate sex role identity was identified as a catalyst for psychological distress. Later masculinity was seen as being innately dysfunctional in some respects. Therefore, the development of appropriate sex role identity in men was speculated to naturally cause distress or masculine role strain. This new view of masculinity identified variability in sex roles over time and therefore variation in the degree of endorsement of sex roles within individuals. The result was a high rate of sex role violation and masculine role strain within men (Pleck, 1981).

The theory of masculine role strain proposed that sex roles were defined by sex role stereotypes and that norms were imposed on children by their families, peers, and others in their environment (Levant, Hirsch, Celentano, Cozza, Hill, MacEachern, et al., 1992). Where stereotypes are descriptions of what people think men are like, norms are prescriptive and refer to what people believe men should be like. Previous research on masculine role strain used instruments intended to measure the incongruence between the stereotypes of men and the norms for men. A more contemporary area of research sought to understand the normative, as well as maladaptive outcomes by studying the actual stereotypes and standards for masculine role norms.

Theories which focus on the normative standards of masculinity, rather than the consequences of masculinity, maintained the concept of multiple masculinities. The theories further proposed variations in masculinity were not the results of changing norms, but the different degrees to which the same masculine norms were endorsed. The conformity to these norms was comprised of affective, behavioral, and cognitive components that occurred along a continuum ranging from extreme nonconformity to extreme conformity. The degree to which these norms were weighted was further posited to be due, in part, to sociocultural influences (Pleck, Sonenstein, & Ku, 1993). Specifically, while the most powerful groups in our society (i.e., media, religion, political forces) communicated their influence on gender role norms, research which focused on standards of masculinity proposed that group and individual factors (i.e., socioeconomic status, racial identity, characteristics of same sex peers) filtered these norms (Mahalik, Good, et al., 2003). These group and individual factors accounted for variability in the patterns of conformity to masculine role norms across cultural groups and individuals

(Weisbuch, Beal, & O'Neal, 1999). Sociological theories supported the presence of this influence by describing gender based behavior as the result of known, contextually specific stereotypes, combined with individual's willingness to conform to these stereotypes (Smiler, 2004). The influences of cultural groups and contextually specific stereotypes on gendered behavior were indicative of the movement of masculinity outside of the individual and a refuting of gender role strain theory which placed masculinity within the individual (Pleck, 1995).

With these changes in placement of masculinity from solely within the individual (e.g. biological determinants of gender) to outside the individual (e.g. cultural influences on gender) and an acceptance of masculinity as a flexible construct, measurement of masculinity became focused on identifying the varying degrees in which individuals endorse traditional masculine scripts. This change in the course of masculinity research resulted in creation of the Conformity to Masculine Norms Inventory (CMNI; Mahalik, Locke, et al., 2003). The purpose of this instrument was to measure the extent to which individuals conform to masculine role norms given group and individual factors which filter them. Using a non-exhaustive list of gender role norms found in dominant culture, the measure was developed from the concept of variability in conformity to masculinity norms across men.

The measurement of specific norms was an update to measures that evaluated masculinity unidimensionally, like the Bem Sex Role Inventory (Bem, 1974), the Psychological Attributes Questionnaire (Spence & Helmreich, 1980), and the Macho Scale (Villemez & Touhey, 1977). The measurement of these norms was also a change from the GRCS (O'Neil, et al., 1986), which measured multiple dimensions of

masculinity norm conflict, but overlooked the adaptive aspects of masculinity. While the CMNI extended the examination of masculine gender roles by providing a measure of both their dysfunctional and normative aspects, it was not the first measure designed to accomplish this. Brannon and Juni's (1984) Brannon Masculinity Scale, Thompson and Pleck's (1986) Male Role Norms Scale, and Levant et al.'s (1992) Male Role Norms Inventory all attempted to measure masculinity in a similar manner. While these instruments assessed masculinity in more complex ways than the global measures, they either lacked factor validation (e.g., Brannon Masculinity Scale) or measured only a few masculine norms (e.g., Male Role Norms Scale and the Male Role Norms Inventory; Mahalik, Locke, et al., 2003). While the concept of the CMNI was strongly based in these previous instruments, it advanced the measure of masculine norms by using factor analysis to develop a broader spectrum of factor-validated norms and increased the number of norms measured to eleven.

The CMNI has been used in recent research to address the relationship between its eleven masculine norm scales and a variety of other variables. It was used to measure men's conformity to masculinity in relation to their responses to clinical depression. A positive relationship was shown between conformity to masculine norms and the most likely ("Talk to a best friend [not your wife or partner]") and least likely ("Join an anonymous Internet chat room to discuss the problem,") of men's responses to depression (Mahalik & Rochlen, 2006). In an attempt to extend empirical data regarding the social constructionist perspective of gender roles, Tager and Good (2006) compared the cross-cultural conformity to masculine norms in Italian and U.S. male college students. They found Italian males showed significantly less conformity to nine of the eleven subscales

compared to their U.S. counterparts. Mahalik, Lagan, and Morrison (2006) compared the health behaviors of Kenyan and U.S. male college students, finding 32 of 50 health behaviors were related to conformity to masculine norms, nationality, and the interaction between these two variables. Liu and Iwamoto (2007), used the CMNI to measure the relationship of Asian college men's conformity to masculine norms and their endorsement of Asian values, coping strategies, peer influence, and substance use. While peer drug use was the most robust predictor of substance use, CMNI subscales of winning, disdain for homosexuality, playboy, and violence predicted marijuana use; power over women, emotional control, and risk taking predicted alcohol use.

Research of interest to this study was completed by Burn and Ward (2005). They used the CMNI to measure the relationship between conformity to masculine norms and relationship satisfaction. As discussed in the review of literature on ERI, the decision to engage in infidelity can be based on high levels of marital dissatisfaction. Building on previous research which found associations between gender role conflict and relationship satisfaction, Rochlen and Mahalik (2004) found men's conformity to masculine norms was found to be negatively related to men's relationship satisfaction. However, they also found women's ratings of their male partners' conformity were also found to be positively related to women's relationship satisfaction when women rated their male partners using the CMNI.

Finally, contrary to the proposal that masculine ideology was a naturally acquired set of norms for men and that measures of masculine ideology did not compare the sexes (Thompson & Pleck, 1995), the CMNI has been shown to be useful in measuring women's conformity to masculine norms. Smiler (2006) examined the convergent and

divergent validity of the CMNI by comparing men's and women's conformity to masculine norms across four age groups: (1) 18-23 year old college students; (2) 18-29 year old non-college students; (3) 30-49 year old "middle" adults; (4) 50-83 year old "older" adults . He found group differences to be similar within biosex and mostly similar across biosex. However, biosex differences, which were expected to be significant given masculine ideology theory, were insignificant for younger and older adults on the CMNI dominance and self-reliance subscales. The CMNI work primacy subscale varied significantly between the sexes for only the middle adult group, while no sex differences were found for CMNI pursuit of status subscale scores. These results provided evidence of the endorsement of masculine role norms by females and therefore supported the stance that gender, while biologically influenced, has socially constructed features.

A limitation of research on conformity to masculine norms, like research on ERI and gender role conflict, has been the over use of college student samples. The reliance on these samples limits generalizability to different age groups, socioeconomic statuses, and cultural backgrounds. In spite of this weakness, the validity of the CMNI has been established through studies which used participants from across age groups (Smiler, 2006) and from across cultures (Tagar & Good, 2006).

Also in the same vein as ERI research, a limitation for studies on masculine role norms has been the defining of masculinity. The CMNI, unlike the Male Role Norms Scale (Thompson & Pleck, 1986) and the Male Role Norms Inventory (Levant et al., 1992), was developed using factor analysis, a study on its internal consistency, and studies of its construct and concurrent validity (Mahalik, Good, et al., 2003). Unfortunately, while the CMNI assumes a fixed set of masculine norms, studies

comparing CMNI scores of international and U.S. samples show significant between group variability in the endorsement of these norms (Mahalik, Lagan, and Morrison, 2006; Tager and Good, 2006). To date, no research exists on the CMNI that provides cultural norms for minority populations.

Nonrelational Sexuality

A masculine role norm not currently addressed in research on gender roles is nonrelational sexuality. Levant (1997) defined this construct as the gendered tendency of men to view sex as a lustful endeavor that lacked intimacy, and emotional attachment. He proposed that socially constructed masculinity influenced men to view sex as an important part of self perception, to isolate themselves from nonsexual aspects of relationships, and to view sexual feelings as an emotional experience accepted as unmasculine. He further suggests that masculinity influences individuals to perceive sex and aggression as similar, and to view sexuality as a measure of success or achievement. Finally, he proposed this masculine sexuality is both adaptive and harmful to men. Brooks argued that the construction of masculine sexuality is a natural social learning process which occurs in conjunction with other social expectations as individuals interact with their environment. Litewka (1974) described this masculine role norm as containing three main elements: objectification of women by viewing them as non-individuals; an excessive focus on women's unique or sexual anatomy, and approaching sex as a conquest.

Given the negative connotation associated with socially constructed masculine sexuality, Levant (1997) posited that masculinity is in a state of crisis due to nonrelational standards of sexuality. He connected experiences with lust based intimacy

to the objectification of sexual partners. Books (1997) theorized that the pursuit of this type of intimacy was undertaken to meet one's own need for closeness, connection, and nurturance, as well as to release sexual tension, and the need to confirm one's gender competence.

Research findings support the presence of nonrelational sexuality as a normative characteristic of masculinity in men. Men report fantasizing about sex more often than do women, to think about sex on a daily basis, and to have more varied sexual experiences (Michael, Gagnon, Laumann, & Kolata, 1994). Men's fantasies were more sexually explicit, with less emotional or romantic emphases (Leitenberg & Henning, 1995). In their meta-analysis on difference men's and women's sexuality, Oliver and Hyde (1993) reported that men purchase more autoerotic material, reported masturbating more frequently than do women, and hold more permissive attitudes about less relationship based sex.

Findings that suggest nonrelational sexuality is normative have supported theories of nonrelational sex being natural and unchanging for men. Some evolutionary psychologists have suggested these sexual attitudes are adaptively advantageous for men when considering the role of male reproductive success (Buss and Schmitt, 1993). In contrast to evolutionary theorists' notion that nonrelational sexuality is natural and stable, Levant (1997) took the stance that while this type of sexuality may be normative, it is not essential or unchangeable. He cited his own research (Levant et al., 1992) that showed changing attitudes about nonrelational sexuality. Employing a sample of 120 undergraduate males and the MRNI, they reported men rejecting traditional male role norms of nonrelational sexuality, including disagreeing that men should be ready for sex,

should always initiate sex, and should not worry about birth control. These changing attitudes support the suggestion that nonrelational sexuality is a result of flexible socially constructed masculine norms.

In summary, theory on gender began during the early stages of the development of psychology as a science. Historically, theories on masculinity have historically advanced the definition of masculinity from a natural developmental of idealized characteristics in males, to less idealized characteristics associated with biosex, to a set of characteristics endorsed to varying degrees by both sexes, to a the set of maladaptive gender characteristics afflicted on men, finally ending in masculinity being defined by a set of socially constructed characteristics seen as both adaptive and maladaptive.

The measurement of masculinity has followed a developmental process that reflected the evolution of masculinity as a construct. Recently the CMNI (Mahalik, Locke et al, 2003) was developed with a deconstructionist view of masculinity. Its items and subscales were developed to measure eleven paradigms of traditional masculine social norms as well as to measure individuals' total conformity to these traditional norms. One of the paradigms addressed by the CMNI is nonrelational sexuality norms. This construct reflects the socialization of individuals to see sex as a lustful pursuit devoid of emotional attachment. Nonrelational sexuality norms is theorized to lead to seeing sex as an excessively related to self-esteem, isolation from emotional parts of relationships, and to associate unmasculine views to experiencing sex as an emotional experience.

Study Purpose

Neither researchers of ERI nor researchers of conformity to masculine norms have developed studies on the influence endorsement of socially constructed gender

norms have on attitudes about extramarital sex. The purpose of this study is to examine the relationship between masculine role norms and how extra-relational infidelity is viewed. Men have been shown to engage in infidelity based more on sexual needs while women engage in infidelity based on more emotional needs (Glass & Wright, 1985). In light of these results, this study will address the relationship between masculine norms, as measured by the CMNI (Mahalik, Locke, et al., 2003), attitudes toward ERI inclusive of sexual and emotional infidelity, as measured by the Attitudes Toward Marital Exclusivity Scale (ATME; Weis & Slosnerick, 1981), and attitudes toward common sexual and emotional justifications given for taking part in infidelity as measured by the Justifications for Extramarital Involvement Questionnaire (JEIQ; Glass, 1981). Both the ATME and JEIQ have been revised to reflect the broader construct of committed relationships rather than only marital relationships. Because masculine role norms have been theorized to be socially constructed (Kimmel, 1996) and to be endorsed by both sexes (Smiler, 2006), the sample used for this study will include both men and women.

This study will test five hypotheses that examine the relationship between masculine norms and infidelity. First, hypothesis addresses the overall relationship between masculinity and infidelity by stating that CMNI total scores will be positively correlated with both ATME total scores and negatively correlated to JEIQ sexual and emotional intimacy subscale scores. Hypothesis two looks at the ability of specific subfactors of masculinity to predict attitudes about infidelity in general by stating that scores on the risk-taking, playboy, pursuit of status, and dominance subscales of the CMNI will predict ATME total scores for both men and women. Hypothesis three address the ability of specific subfactors of masculinity to predict approval of sexual

motivations for infidelity by stating that scores on the risk-taking, playboy, pursuit of status, and dominance subscales of the CMNI will predict JEIQ sexual subscale scores for both men and women. Finally, hypothesis four addresses the ability of specific subfactors of masculinity to predict approval of emotional intimacy justifications for infidelity by stating that scores on the risk-taking, playboy, pursuit of status, and dominance subscales of the CMNI will predict JEIQ emotional intimacy subscale scores for both men and women.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

The purpose of this chapter is to present the methodology used in this study. First, the process used to recruit participants will be described. Given the literature on the limitations of past relationship research and similar critiques of research on masculinity, this study used online survey methodology intended to reach a wider sample of the population in order to increase sample diversity. Next, the instruments used in the study are described. These instruments include a brief demographic questionnaire (see Appendix A) which reflects previous ERI research on the associations between ERI and religiosity, education, political tendencies, personal history of infidelity behaviors, and family origin histories of infidelity. Two instruments that measure ERI are then described. One of these instruments measured attitudes about extrarelatinal infidelity (ATME), while the other measured approval for sexual and emotional justifications for extrarelatinal involvement (JEIQ). Finally, a description of the instrument used to measure conformity to masculine norms (CMNI) is provided.

While the ATME and the JEIQ were chosen for their ability to measure infidelity using both sexual and emotional criteria, a focus group was used to revise the ATME and JEIQ to reflect extrarelatinal attitudes and justifications rather than only extramarital relationships. In addition to revising the items to reflect a broader spectrum of relationships, the focus group also updated the ATME items in order to better match the experiences of participants in younger age groups.

Participants and Procedures

Past research on infidelity has been criticized for its lack of diversity due to the excessive use of samples of convenience (Blow and Hartnett, 2005a). Included in this criticism was concern for poor age diversity in sampling. In an attempt to address this criticism in this study, recruitment of subjects did not solely focus on a convenience sample. Instead participants were recruited from several sources locally and nationally through newspaper advertisements and the World Wide Web. Participants were recruited by (a) an advertisement (see Appendix B) placed in a newsletter distributed within the University of Iowa Hospitals and Clinics, (b) an email advertisement (see Appendix C) distributed to all undergraduate email accounts at the University of Iowa, and by (c) distributing the same email advertisement and a flier (see Appendix D) through three online listservs. These listservs were associated with the APA Division 51- Society for the Study of Men and Masculinity, the APA Division 43-Society of Family Psychology, and with the Minnesota Association of Marriage and Family Therapy. Appendix C and Appendix D were electronically attached to emails requesting assistance from listserv members in distributing the study advertisements to adults who may wish to take part in the study.

All participants who responded to the advertisements were volunteers and were not compensated for their participation. Participants were directed to a website that provided a description of the study, what was asked of the participant, the voluntary nature of participation, and appropriate contact information. Participants were instructed to confirm their willingness to participate by using a link that took them to a website with more detailed instructions (see Appendix E) and the measures. The survey provided the

following definitions and asked participants to apply them when answering questions about ERI:

“Infidelity”: a sexual and/or emotional act engaged in by one person outside of their primary committed romantic relationship. This act constitutes a breach of trust and/or violation of agreed upon rules for the exclusivity of that committed relationship.

“Committed relationship”: any romantic relationship with shared relationship rules that include emotional and sexual obligation between the members of the relationship. These relationships are based in expectations for long term commitment. Examples include heterosexual and homosexual couples who have been exclusive for a minimum of one year, are cohabitating, are engaged to be married/united, or are currently married/united.

These definitions were repeated at the top of the first survey on attitudes about extrarelational behaviors. The website continued with the next two instruments used to measure acceptance of justifications for extrarelational involvement, and masculinity. At the conclusion of the online study, participants were provided an email address through which they could contact the primary investigator with comments or questions about the study.

Instruments

First, a demographic questionnaire (see Appendix A) was developed that reflected previously established predisposing variables of ERI. A revised version of the ATME (see Appendix G) measured individuals’ attitudes toward varying degrees of ERI, while a revised version of the JEIQ (see Appendix H) was used to measure individuals’ acceptance for both sexually and emotionally based ERI. The CMNI (see Appendix I) was used to assess the degree to which individuals endorse socially constructed norms for masculinity. While these measures were chosen for their unique strengths, like all other instruments they have limitations.

Demographic Questionnaire.

Participants completed a demographic questionnaire that provided data about age, sex, and ethnicity. In response to previous research on predictor variable for ERI (Weis & Slosnerick, 1981; Weis & Felton, 1987), participants also provided information about their education, religiosity, and their political conservativeness or liberalism. Smith (1994) found self-reported level of religiosity to be a predisposing factor for positive attitudes about infidelity. With these findings in mind, information about religiosity was provided by participants through their responses to one question ("How religious are you?"). Response options were provided representing a six point scale, with 0= *Not at all* and 5= *Very*.

Findings on the relationship between political orientation and infidelity are mixed, but there is a generally accepted conclusion that political conservatism is less associated with ERI than liberalism (Cochran, Chamlin, Beeghley, and Fenwick, 2004). With these findings in mind, political conservativeness or liberalism was also measured using one question ("Please describe your political outlook?"). Response options were provided representing a six point scale, with 0=*Liberal* and 5= *Conservative*.

Participants also provided information about their current relational history. They identified their current relational status, as well as their personal and family of origin histories of infidelity. Their relational status provided some information about personal history with divorce, which has been shown to be associated with more accepting attitudes about ERI and taking part in ERI behaviors (Atkins, Baucom, & Jacobson, 2001; Greeley, 1994; Amato and Rogers, 1997). Finally, participants provided

information about the marital status of their biological parents, which has been shown to influence attitudes about infidelity (Brown, 1991).

Attitudes Toward Extrarelatonal Infidelity (ATME; Weis & Felton, 1987).

A revised version of the original ATME (see Appendix F) was developed to measure participants' attitudes toward extrarelatonal relationships (see Appendix G). The ATME uses an infidelity scenario format first employed in a study by Neubeck and Schletzer (1962) where participants responded to the scenario during a structured interview. Several years later, the same scenario was used by Johnson (1970) without the structured interview format. He opted to use a list of seven related extrarelatonal activities to be rated by participants. Johnson's rationale for employing a descriptive situation was based in the findings of Straus (1964), which suggests sexually oriented data developed using interviews or explicit questions results in responses that reflect socially desirable values rather than personal views. Weis and Slosnerick (1981) used the same scenario and items, established reliability and validity with a group of male and female college students, and labeled the measure the ATME.

Unlike instruments which measure attitudes about extramarital relationships based on sexual behaviors (e.g., Reiss, Anderson, & Sponaugle, 1980), the ATME measures participants attitudes toward sexual and nonsexual (emotional) extramarital behaviors that occur in secrecy (Weis & Slosnerick, 1981). The ATME's inclusion of sexual infidelity, emotional infidelity, and secrecy was congruent with the definition of ERI used in this study. This definition was based on the characterization of infidelity described in Glass and Wright's (1985) seminal paper on sexual and emotional infidelity. They characterized infidelity as a relationship that occurs secondary to one's marital

commitment, which contains some form of romantic attraction that is intentionally kept undisclosed to the noninvolved member of the marriage. The ATME was therefore chosen for its ability to measure participants' acceptance of infidelity behaviors in a manner reflecting the operational definition of extrarelational relationships used in this study.

The original ATME used the "spouse is out of town" scenario (Neubeck & Schletzer, 1962) to assess projective attitudes about extrarelational involvement. The scenario consists of a man or woman whose spouse is out of town at the same time the spouse of a married friend is also out of town. Thus, two in-town partnered individuals have an opportunity to be together. The respondent, identified as one of the in-town partners, is asked to identify the extent to which he or she would accept or reject the opportunity to participate in five extrarelational activities. Each of the seven items represents a presumed degree of intimacy, with item one depicting friendship level intimacy and item seven depicting physical intimacy. Response options are provided representing a five point Likert Scale: 1= *Total rejection*, 2= *Moderate rejection*, 3= *No feelings either way*, 4= *Moderate acceptance*, 5= *Total acceptance*. A total score is computed ranging from 7 to 35, with higher item scores representing greater acceptance of extrarelational behaviors and lower scores representing greater rejection of extrarelational behaviors.

The reliability of the Weis and Slosnerick (1981) version of the ATME was initially established using a sample of 321 undergraduate students selected from variety of classes at a state university in New England. Participants in the study were 112 male and 209 female undergraduates selected from a variety of majors, with an age range of 18

to 57 (mean age=22.68). Of the 321 participants, 84 were married, with average length of their marriages being 7 years. Reliability was strong ($\alpha = .87$), with all items being significantly correlated ($p < .001$) with the sum of responses. Also, biosex was significantly correlated ($r = .25, p < .001$) with sexual involvement, but not with overall attitudes about extramarital involvement ($r = .16, p > .001$).

In a second study (Weis & Felton, 1987) using a sample of 379 unmarried female undergraduates (mean age= 20.4, range=17-45; 89% Caucasian; 10% African American; 1% Asian) at a university in the Northeastern region of the U.S., ATME reliability was again reported to be strong ($\alpha = .81$). A third study employing the ATME by Weis, Rabinowitz, and Ruckstuhl (1992) examined extramarital attitudinal changes using a sample of 172 university students enrolled in a human sexuality course at a Northeastern university. The sample was made up of 48 males and 124 females (mean age=20.79; 60% Catholic, 16% Protestant, 13% Jewish, 10% no affiliation). Internal reliability for the ATME was again reported to be strong ($\alpha = .84$). Validity was found to be satisfactory by establishing correlations between items and predictor variables measured by the Sex-Love-Marriage Scale ($r = .40, p < .001$; Weis, Slosnerick, Cate, & Sollie, 1986).

While the ATME was selected for its ability to measure attitudes about extrarelational relationships, it has limitations. First, the method by which the scenario and seven items were developed is unclear. The literature suggests that the scenario was developed to reflect a population of husbands in professional career paths and their homemaker wives (Neubeck & Schletzer, 1962). Second, the populations used to establish reliability and validity were predominantly Caucasian college student (Weis & Felton, 1987; Weis, Rabinowitz, & Ruckstuhl, 1992; Weis & Slosnerick, 1981; Weis et

al., 1986), a common limitation in the body of research on relationships. Third, the ATME's small number of items limits its use in comparisons of attitudes about sexual versus nonsexual extramarital attitudes. Finally, the ATME was exclusively a measure of infidelity in relation to marital relationships. This limitation excluded the collection of data from groups who cohabit, who do not possess the right to legally marry (e.g., homosexuals or polyamorous relationships), or who maintain relational commitment without cohabiting or legally marrying. This limitation restricts generalizability of findings based on the ATME to populations in nontraditional committed relationships.

In light of these limitations and concerns about the ability of the original ATME to measure ERI attitudes of the target population of this study, the instrument was revised. Of particular concern was the original measure's focus on marital relationships and younger participants' limited experience with committed relationships. With these concerns in mind, a focus group was developed to review the measure and make changes that would update the measure instructions and items. The focus group consisted of five doctoral students in counseling psychology (1 Caucasian male, 1 Hispanic male, 3 Caucasian females). This focus group was selected for its representation of the spectrum of relationship commitment (1 single and not in a relationship, 1 engaged/committed, 1 married less than two years, 1 married seven years, 1 divorced for one year). The focus group was given the ATME and the JEIQ to review. They later discussed their revisions with the primary investigator. This discussion focused on the groups suggested changes to (a) increase clarity of the instructions and provide sensitivity to commitment in different types of relationships (e.g., traditional marital relationships and polyamorous

relationships), (b) discuss the applicability of the items to the target population, (c) amend items to reflect more current relationship behaviors.

Like the original ATME, the revised ATME (see Appendix G) maintained the “spouse is out of town” scenario (Neubeck & Schletzer, 1962) to assess participants' attitudes about extrarelational involvement. It also maintained the five point Likert scale response format, but the items themselves were updated. Focus group suggestions for changes of the original ATME (see Appendix F) included the inclusion of the definitions for infidelity and committed relationship provided in the instructions (see Appendix G). These definitions were repeated from the instruction page and are meant to be inclusive of a broad variety of committed relationships, whether they be traditional marriage, a same sex union, a romantic couple practicing co-habitation, a sexually open relationships, or a polyamorous relationship.

Another significant change was in the instructions for the ATME. The original version of the ATME had the following instructions:

Indicate the extent to which you would reject or accept each of the following situations by writing your answer in the blank.

To answer, use these responses:

1. Total rejection
2. Moderate rejection
3. No feelings either way
4. Moderate acceptance
5. Total acceptance

(If you are single, answer as you would if you were married.)

Suppose that you were very close friends with several married couples in the area. As it happened, your husband/wife had gone on an extended trip, leaving you home alone. A similar thing happened to some of your close friends. That is, the wife/husband of one of these acquaintances left the state to visit relatives, leaving her husband/his wife home alone.

These instructions were described by the focus group as lacking inclusivity of nontraditional views on committed relationships. They had specific concern was about using the term “married” resulting in the elimination of participants in common law marriages or who are prohibited by law from marrying their committed partner. They also expressed concern about the use of the terms “rejection”, suggesting this term may elicit socially constructed values rather than personal degree of approval. Their input resulted in the following revised instructions:

Instructions: Identify the degree of acceptability you would attach to each of the following situations.

To answer, use these responses:

1. Totally unacceptable
2. Moderately unacceptable
3. No feelings either way
4. Moderately acceptable
5. Totally acceptable

(Answer as you would if you were in a committed relationship.)

Suppose that you were very close friends with several committed couples in the area. Your partner had gone on an extended trip, leaving you home alone. A similar thing happened to some of your close friends. That is, the partner of one of these acquaintances left the state to visit relatives, leaving his/her partner home alone. The partner left at home alone was of the gender to which you are attracted.

Also of note are the changes in the items. Item one was changed from, “Spending an evening or evenings with him/her in his/her living room?” to “Using email or text-messaging to invite him/her to meet at a coffee shop?” Item two was changed from, “Going to the movies or theater together?” to “Watching movies together in his/her living room?” Item three was changed from, “Going out to dinner with him/her at a secluded place?” to “Going out to dinner together at a quiet restaurant?” Item four was changed from, “Dancing with him/her to the stereo?” to “Going out with just him/her for drinks at a club or bar?” Item five was changed from, “Spending a couple of days at a secluded cabin with him/her near a beautiful lake where no one would find out?” to “Going on a trip together to a beautiful lake where no one would find out?” Item six was changed from, “Harmless necking or petting?” to “Kissing or touching?” Item seven was changed from, “Becoming sexually involved?” to “Engaging in sexual contact?” Within this study internal reliability of the revised ATME was strong ($\alpha=.82$).

Justifications for Extramarital Involvement Questionnaire (JEIQ; Glass, 1981).

The JEIQ was selected for its ability to assess participants' degree of endorsement for both sexual and emotional rationales for ERI. The JEIQ was originally developed by Glass (1981). Items were 17 justifications for extramarital relationships developed from a

review of clinical and empirical literature on marital satisfaction and justifications for extramarital behaviors. The selection of these items was based on two factors: 1) being frequently cited in literature on extramarital relationships; and 2) because they were related to a particular need in the marital relationship which could be supplemented in an extramarital relationship (Glass, 1981). In later research the endorsement of specific rationales for infidelity were found to be more associated with actual extramarital experiences than individuals' attitudes about marital unfaithfulness (Glass & Wright, 1992).

The JEIQ (Glass, 1981) was developed to measure men's and women's endorsement of different justifications for extramarital involvement. Responses to the 17 items used a Likert scale, represented on a 4-point continuum (1= "I would feel completely justified; 2= "I would feel partially justified; 3= "I would feel not justified"; 4= "I would feel completely unjustified"). The JEIQ includes four subscales: (a) sexual justification, which employs four items to measure approval of justifications based in sexual enjoyment, curiosity, or excitement; (b) emotional intimacy justification, which employs five items to measure approval of justifications based in emotional understanding, interpersonal companionship, increases in self-esteem, and interpersonal respect; (c) extrinsic motivation, which employs two items to measure approval of justifications based in revenge or career advancement; and (d) love, which employs two items to measure approval of justifications based in affection acquisition or feelings of falling-in-love. Subscale scores are averages of the corresponding item values, with lower scores representing greater endorsement.

Subscales were established after Glass (1981) reviewed factor loading. Items assigned to subscales had primary loadings of at least .60 and secondary loadings of less than half that of the primary loadings. The items related to the four subscale factors of sexual gratification, emotional intimacy, extrinsic motivation, experiences of love, accounted for 74% of the total variance. Four original items met primary loading criteria but not secondary loading criteria. They were included in the JEIQ, but were not included in subscale calculations. Subscales scores were calculated by averaging items scores, with lower scores representing greater endorsement.

Construct validity was established in the study that originally developed the JEIQ (Glass, 1981). Within that study comparing men's and women's justifications for extramarital involvement, JEIQ scores were found to predict reports of extramarital behavior. Participants were 148 Caucasian men and 155 Caucasian women who returned forms distributed to travelers at the Baltimore International Airport and outdoors in downtown Baltimore. Mean age for men was 40.4 (SD= 9.4) and mean age for women was 36.5 (SD= 9.4). Divorced and separated respondents were excluded. Mean length of marriage was 14.6 years for males and 13.1 for females. Of the respondents, 25% of women and 44% of men reported having participated in extramarital sexual intercourse; 47% of women and 63% of men reported participating in either intercourse or emotional/sexual involvement short of intercourse.

Zero-order correlations were completed using JEIQ scales and reports of extramarital sexual and emotional involvement. Results indicated the correlation between justifications for infidelity and extramarital sexual involvement was significantly more than between justifications for infidelity and extramarital emotional involvement for men

(Male $r = .55, .23$; $Z = 4.46, p < .001$) and for women (Female $r = .52, .38$; $Z = 2.86, p < .01$). Results also indicated that for men, Love Justification was associated more with extramarital emotional involvement than with extramarital sexual involvement ($r = .54, .26$; $z = 3.87, p < .001$).

For this study, the JEIQ was altered to represent committed relationships rather than marital relationships only. The focus group deemed that the only alteration required to make this change in type of relationship was to replace the term “Married people” in the first line of the instructions to read “People in committed relationships”. All 17 items were found to be applicable to infidelity across types of committed relationships. For this study, internal consistency of the revised version of the JEIQ was strong ($\alpha = .91$).

Conformity to Masculine Norms Inventory (CMNI; Mahalik, Locke, et al., 2003).

The CMNI was used to assess participants’ adherence to socially constructed masculine norms (see Appendix I). Unlike previous instruments that measured endorsement of gender role strain, the CMNI was developed to assess the degree of conformity to socially constructed masculine ideologies within the dominant culture of the U.S. The CMNI was chosen for its ability to assess individuals’ conformity to masculine ideologies and its utility in measuring the endorsement of some masculine norms across biosex (Smiler, 2006)

Using 94 items, the CMNI provides examination of eleven distinct components of masculinity: Emotional Control (e.g., “It is best to keep your emotions hidden”); Dominance (e.g., “I should be in charge”); Disdain for Homosexuals (e.g., “I would be furious if someone thought I was gay”); Playboy (e.g., “If I could, I would frequently change sexual partners”); Power over Women (e.g., “In general, I control the women in

my life”); Pursuit of Status (e.g., “It feels good to be important”); Risk Taking (“Taking dangerous risks helps me to prove myself”); Self-Reliance (e.g., “I hate asking for help”); Violence (e.g., “I like fighting”); Winning (e.g., “In general, I will do anything to win”); and Work Primacy (e.g., “I am often absorbed in my work”). Respondents identify their level of agreement with the items on a 4-point scale (0=*strongly disagree* and 3=*strongly agree*) where SD= *strongly disagree*, D= *disagree*, A= *agree*, and SA= *strongly agree*. Subscale scores are calculated as averages of item scores and range from 0 to 3, with higher scores indicating greater conformity to specific masculine norms.

The items for the CMNI were developed using two focus groups who reviewed literature on masculinity literature (Mahalik, Locke, et al., 2003). The focus group identified items representative of dominant masculine norms found in the literature. Twelve items were constructed for each masculine norm. Each norm had three items that described behavior, three that described thoughts, and three that described emotions. The items were also reviewed to determine the extent to which they identified conformity or nonconformity to these same norms.

In total, the focus groups came to consensus on 144 items. These 144 items were then piloted using three different samples of undergraduates to solicit their reaction to the items and develop internal consistency estimates. Based on results of these pilot studies, the items were revised to improve readability and internal consistency of the twelve subscales. Following these revisions, three raters (two Asian American male graduate students and one Caucasian female undergraduate) were asked to again judge which of the components each item measured to determine which measured conformity or nonconformity to masculine norms, and to decide whether the items described a

behavioral, affective, or cognitive dimension. Kappas for the judgments ranged from .96 to .98 ($p < .001$) categorizing items into the 12 norms, .97 to 1.00 ($p < .001$) identifying items as conforming to the norm or deviating from the norm, and .83 to .99 ($p < .001$) identifying the behavioral, affective, or cognitive dimension of the items (Mahalik, Locke, et al., 2003).

After the original twelve subscales were developed, Mahalik, Locke, et al. (2003) completed factor analysis. This analysis used 752 college and graduate students from college campuses in the Northeast, Mid-Atlantic, Southeast, and Midwest regions of the U.S. (mean age=20.0, $SD=3.42$; 639 Caucasian, 41 African American, 19 Asian American, 19 Hispanic, 11 biracial, and 18 other). As a result of the factor analysis, one subscale factor was removed due to poor interpretability of its items, leaving the CMNI with eleven masculine norm subscales.

Using the same sample of 752 male college and graduate students in combination with 245 women the CMNI's internal consistency, the intercorrelations among the subscales, and its ability to differentiate between men and women was examined (Mahalik, Locke, et al., 2003). The women in the study were all college students (mean age=19.68, $SD=3.21$; 202 Caucasian, 9 African American, 13 Asian American, 12 Hispanic, 5 biracial, 4 other). Men's internal consistency estimates for the 11 masculine norms subscales to range from .75 (Dominance) to .91 (Emotional Control). In a later study using a sample of men and women, Smiler (2006) reported internal consistency of CMNI total as $\alpha = .94$, with good subscale consistency ranging from $\alpha = .70$ to .92, with the exception being Pursuit of Status subscale ($\alpha = .64$). Using a sample of Asian American male college students, Liu and Iwamoto (2007) report internal consistency for

CMNI total $\alpha = .94$, and subscale consistency ranging from $\alpha = .58$ (Dominance) to $\alpha = .88$ (Disdain for Homosexuals). Finally, in a study using a sample of men reporting on their own masculinity and women reporting on the conformity to masculine norms of their last male romantic partner, Burns and Ward (2005) reported CMNI total score consistency of $\alpha = .78$, with subscales reliability ranging from $\alpha = .66$ to $.90$. Internal consistency of the CMNI for this study was strong ($\alpha = .93$).

Mahalik, Locke, et al. (2003) developed intercorrelations for men's subscales and total score. Their intercorrelations showing all subscales to be significantly and positively correlated to total score, while the subscale intercorrelation ranging from nonsignificant to $.49$ (Power over Women and Playboy). Comparison of subscale and total scores for men and women showed men to have scored significantly higher on total score and nine of 11 scales (Pursuit of Status $t(996) = -0.85$; Primacy of Work $t(996) = -0.46$). This suggested the CMNI does differentiate between biosex on all but two of its scales. These results were replicated by Smiler (2006), when he found no significant difference between mean scores for men and women on Primacy of Work ($p > .01$) and Pursuit of Status ($p > .01$) subscales.

To examine evidence for concurrent validity of the CMNI (Mahalik, Locke, et al., 2003), 157 men from the factor analysis (mean age = 20.29, $SD = 5.51$; 124 Caucasian, 5 African American, 17 Asian American, 6 Hispanic, 2 biracial, and 3 other) also completed the Social Dominance Orientation Scale (SDO; Pratto, Sidanius, Stallworth, & Malle, 1994), the Aggression Questionnaire (TAQ; Buss & Perry, 1992), and the Drive for Muscularity Scale (DMS; McCreary & Sasse, 2000). Results showed CMNI total

scores to significantly and positively correlate to the SDO ($r = .48$; $p < .001$), the TAQ ($r = .55$; $p < .001$), and the DMS ($r = .29$; $p < .01$).

In another attempt to develop concurrent validity, 269 men who participated in the factor analysis (mean age=19.70, SD= 2.01; 224 Caucasian, 11 African American, 15 Asian, 7 Hispanic, 3 biracial, 9 other) completed the CMNI and three measures used to assess masculinity (Mahalik, Locke, et al., 2003). First, the Brannon Masculinity Scale (BMS; Brannon & Juni, 1984) measures the endorsement of seven aspects of masculine gender roles (Avoiding Femininity, Concealing Emotions, Breadwinner, Admired-Respected, Tough, Male Machine, and Violence and Adventure) to measure endorsement of the traditional North American masculine gender role. Second, the Gender Role Conflict Scale (GRCS; O'Neil et al., 1986) measures four factors of masculinity related to gendered experiences with distress: (Success, Power, and Competition, Restrictive Emotionality, Restrictive Affectionate Behavior between Men, and Conflict between Work and Family Relations). Finally, the Masculine Gender Role Stress Scale (MGRS; Eisler & Skidmore, 1987) measures five factors (Emotional Inexpressiveness, Physical Inadequacy, Subordination to Women, Intellectual Inferiority, and Performance Failure) associated with gender role stress. The CMNI total score were significantly and positively correlated with the BMS total ($r = .79$) and subscales ($r = .54$ to $.67$), the GRCS total ($r = .56$) and its three subscales ($r = .41$ to $.51$; CBWF $r = .09$), as well as the MGRS total ($r = .40$) and its subscales ($r = .26$ to $.40$).

Test-retest reliability of the CMNI was examined using stability of scores across time (Mahalik, Locke, et al., 2003). Thirty-two men from the factor analysis study repeated the CMNI two to three weeks after the first administration. Eight men who did

not participate in the factory analysis study also completed the CMNI twice, with a two week interval. Test-retest coefficients were $r = .95$ for CMNI total score, with subscale coefficients of $r = .96$ (Disdain for Homosexuals), $r = .91$ (Playboy), $r = .90$ (Emotional Control), $r = .88$ (Risk-taking), $r = .87$ (Winning), $r = .80$ (Self-Reliance), $r = .76$ (Violence), $r = .74$ (Power Over Women), $r = .75$ (Dominance), $r = .67$ (Primacy of Work), and $r = .51$ (Pursuit of Status).

While studies using the CMNI have supported its reliability and validity while establishing it as effective method of identifying masculine norms as predictive variables, the CMNI has shortcomings. During the development, no clear definitions were established for the constructs upon which each subscale was based. From a multicultural perspective, the CMNI's emphasis on the dominant culture's masculine ideology is not inclusive of deviations in masculine norms across cultures.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

This chapter describes and summarizes the sample and statistical analyses used to evaluate the research hypotheses established in the previous chapters. Several preliminary analyses were performed to provide a description of the sample and variables of interest. First, demographic data are presented. The measures of reliability of the scales used in the sample are then presented. Next, an analysis of variance is presented that establishes a relationship between sex and the variables identified in the hypotheses. Finally, zero-order correlations of these variables are presented as they apply to the sample as a whole, men in the sample, and women in the sample.

Following the preliminary analyses, the main analyses are summarized. Regression equation results are presented to address the hypotheses regarding the predictability of masculine gender constructs and ERI. The regression models used in this study included the predictor variables as they apply to the men in the sample, and the women in the sample.

The alpha level used in the analysis of the study was set at .05. The independent variables included scores on measures of participants conformity to masculine norms for risky behaviors (CMNI risk-taking), desire to be dominant of others (CMNI dominance), attitudes about sexual behaviors (CMNI playboy), and the seeking of status (CMNI pursuit-of-status). Dependent variables for the study included overall acceptance of ERI (ATME total score), the level of approval attached to sexual justifications for ERI (JEIQ sexual), and the level of approval attached to emotional justifications for ERI (JEIQ emotional intimacy).

Preliminary Analyses

The preliminary analyses for this study seek to describe the sample, internal reliability for the sample, an analysis of variance of the study variables across sex, and a description of the intercorrelation of these same variables. The sample description includes two tables, the first describing general demographic information, with the second describing frequencies and percentages of variables previously identified as predisposing infidelity. Intercorrelation data is provided for the sample as a whole and separately for men and women.

Participant Demographics.

The descriptive analyses completed determined the frequency and percentages of participants' responses on demographic variables (see Table 1). Respondents to the survey advertisements were 738 adult volunteers. Of these 738 original respondents, 50 (6.8%) failed to provide complete demographic information, did not meet the 18 year old age requirement, or did not adequately complete the surveys and were removed from the study. Of the remaining 688 participants, 202 (29.3%) were men and 486 (70.7%) were women. Age data was collected by groups: 18-24, 25-34, 35-44, 45-54, 55-64, and 65 or older. In spite of efforts to develop an age diverse sample, respondents were decidedly representative of an undergraduate college population.

The racial make up of the sample was predominantly Caucasian, with racial minority populations making up less than one-tenth of sample (n= 66; 9.6%). The education level of the participants is representative of a well-educated population. This is evidenced by 650 (94.5%) of the participants having some college level education.

Table 1. *Frequencies and Percentages- Sex, Age, Race, Education.*

	Frequency	Percentage
Total	688	
Removed	50	6.8
Sex		
Total	688	
Male	202	29.3
Female	486	70.7
Age		
Total	688	
18-24	463	67.3
25-34	128	18.6
35-44	46	6.7
45-54	35	5.1
55-64	15	2.2
65+	1	0.1
Race		
Total	688	
African American	5	0.7
Hispanic	13	1.9
Latino	6	0.9
Asian American	15	2.2
Native American	1	0.1
Caucasian/White	614	89.3
Multiracial	18	2.6
Other	8	1.2
Rather not say	8	1.2
Education		
Total	688	
Some HS	1	0.1
HS grad	37	5.4
Some College	435	63.3
College grad	97	14.1
Some grad school	32	4.6
Master's	59	8.6
Doctoral	27	3.9

Demographic data was also collected on several other variables (i.e. religiosity, political orientation, relationship status, parents married, family of origin infidelity, self identity) identified in previous research as predictive of behaviors and beliefs about infidelity (see Table 2). The sample represented a population which tended to be only slightly religious ($n=687$; $M=2.41$, $SD=1.16$) and somewhat politically liberal ($n=688$; $M=2.34$, $SD=1.08$). Relationship status data reveals that while a large portion of the sample is not currently in relationships, a slight majority is in exclusive relationships. Data on participants' family of origin indicates approximately two-thirds have biological parents who are currently married. Reports of infidelity within the family revealed that approximately one in three participants were aware of some form of infidelity within their family of origin. Roughly the same proportion of participants indicated that they had participated in some form of infidelity in their lifetime.

While no analysis was performed on the variance between participants' scores on measures of infidelity and masculinity and previous research using these measures, they were seen as typical in their attitudes toward ERI overall, but somewhat atypical in their approval for sexual and emotional infidelity than results from previous research. For the sample as a whole, mean total scores on the revised version of ATME ($M=16.93$; see Table 4) were .81 (2.81%) points lower than the mean total scores ($M=17.74$; Weis & Slosnerick, 1981) on the original version of the ATME. Standard deviation of total score for the revised ATME ($SD=5.45$) was 1.22 points lower than that of the same version of the ATME ($SD=6.67$; Weis & Slosnerick, 1981).

Compared to a previous study using the JEIQ (Glass & Wright, 1992), men's and women's scores in the current study provided mean scores that are seen as being

atypically high for approval for sexual and emotional forms of ERI. For men, mean JEIQ sexual justification subscale scores ($M = 3.52$; see Table 5) in the current study were 1.40 (35%) points higher than the mean score for the subscale found in previous mean scores ($M = 2.13$). Men's mean JEIQ emotional intimacy subscale scores ($M = 3.04$; see Table 5) in the current study were 1.00 (20%) points higher than the mean score for the subscale found in previous mean scores ($M = 2.04$). For women, mean JEIQ sexual justification subscale scores ($M = 3.73$; see Table 6) in the current study were 2.06 (41.2%) points higher than the mean score for the subscale found in previous mean ($M = 1.67$). For women, mean JEIQ emotional intimacy subscale scores ($M = 3.17$) in the current study were .47 (9.4%) points higher than the mean score for the subscale found in previous mean scores ($M = 2.70$) found in previous research.

Compared to men who participated in the Mahalik, Locke, et al. (2003) CMNI developmental study, men's CMNI scores in the current study are seen as typical in their endorsement of the masculine norms. For men, mean scores (see Table 5) for the CMNI total scores ($M = 124.41$, $SD = 25.34$), risk-taking scores ($M = 15.91$, $SD = 3.94$), dominance scores ($M = 5.58$, $SD = 1.89$), playboy scores ($M = 12.24$, $SD = 6.53$), and pursuit-of-status scores ($M = 11.65$, $SD = 2.51$) were between .04 (.25%; CMNI dominance) and 10.04 (2.67%; CMNI total) points different than in the CMNI developmental study, with similar standard deviations between groups.

Compared to women who participated in the Mahalik, Locke, et al. (2003) CMNI developmental study, the scores produced by women in the current study are, like men in the study, seen as typical in their endorsement of masculine norms. For women in the current study, mean scores (see Table 6) for their CMNI total scores ($M = 103.65$; $SD =$

21.67), risk-taking scores ($M= 13.85$; $SD=4.01$), dominance scores ($M = 5.52$; $SD= 1.97$), playboy ($M = 8.67$; $SD= 5.59$), and pursuit-of-status ($M = 11.09$; $SD= 2.21$) were between .00 (0%; CMNI dominance) and 8.78 (2.34%; CMNI total) points different from women in the CMNI developmental study, with similar standard deviations between the groups.

Reliability

Estimates of internal consistency were examined for the ATME total, the JEIQ sexual and emotional intimacy subscales, the CMNI total, and the CMNI risk-taking, dominance, playboy, and pursuit-of-status subscales. Alpha coefficients for the measures of infidelity were as follows: .82 for ATME total, .84 for the JEIQ sexual justification subscale, .85 for the JEIQ emotional intimacy justification. This initial estimate of reliability suggested that this revised version of the ATME has an acceptable level of reliability with this Midwestern sample. Similarly, Weis, Rabinowitz, and Ruckstuhl (1992) reported an alpha coefficient of .84 for the ATME total. Estimates of reliability also suggested that the JEIQ sexual justification and JEIQ emotional intimacy justification subscales have acceptable levels of reliability with this sample.

Alpha coefficients for the CMNI subscales and CMNI total were as follows: .86 for the CMNI risk-taking subscale, .74 for the CMNI dominance subscale, .88 for the CMNI playboy subscale, .72 for the CMNI pursuit-of-status subscale, and .93 for the CMNI total scale. These initial estimates of reliability indicate that the CMNI total and the four subscales have acceptable levels of reliability with this Midwestern sample. These estimates are not unlike to those reported by Mahalik, Lock, et al. (2003), who

Table 2. *Frequencies and Percentages - Religiosity, Political Orientation, Relationship Status, Parents Married, Family of Origin Infidelity, Self Infidelity.*

	n	Percentage
		Religiosity
Not at all	183	26.6
Only slightly	210	30.5
Same as most others	158	22.9
More than most others	106	15.4
Very	30	4.4
		Political Orientation
Very Liberal	166	24.1
Somewhat Liberal	258	37.4
Moderate	154	22.4
Somewhat Conservative	85	12.3
Very Conservative	25	3.6
		Relationship
Single	282	40.9
Exclusive Relationship	190	27.6
Engaged/Committed	49	7.1
Married/United	133	19.3
Separated/Committed- Living Apart	7	1.0
Divorced/Ended Comment	25	3.6
Widowed/Committed Partner Died	1	0.1
		Parents Married
Yes	466	67.6
No	213	30.9
Not Sure	6	0.9
		Family of Origin Infidelity
Yes	235	34.1
No	453	65.7
		Self Infidelity
Yes	228	33.1
No	461	66.9

reported alpha coefficients of .82, .73, .88, .72, and .94 for the CMNI risk-taking, dominance, playboy, pursuit-of-status subscale, and CMNI total respectively.

Estimates of internal consistency for the ATME, JEIQ, and CMNI scales were also examined by sex. Alpha coefficients for men were as follows: .85 for the ATME total, .88 for the JEIQ sexual justification subscale, .85 for the JEIQ emotional intimacy justification subscale, .83 for the CMNI risk-taking subscale, .73 for the CMNI dominance subscale, .89 for the CMNI playboy subscale, .75 for the CMNI pursuit-of-status subscale, and .93 for the CMNI total scale. Alpha coefficients for women were as follows: .79 for the ATME total, .79 for the JEIQ sexual justification subscale, .89 for the JEIQ emotional intimacy justification subscale, .86 for the CMNI dominance subscale, .74 for the CMNI dominance subscale, .86 for the CMNI playboy subscale, .70 for the CMNI pursuit-of-status subscale, and .92 for the CMNI total scale.

Like the estimates of internal consistency for the sample as a whole, the initial alpha coefficients for men were acceptable and not unlike those found in previous research on the ATME and CMNI, with reliability estimates for the JEIQ subscales that suggest acceptable levels of reliability with this sample of men. Women's estimates of internal consistency for the CMNI subscales were also acceptable and were not unlike results found in a sample developed by Mahalik, Lock, et al. (2003). Women's reliability estimates for the JEIQ subscales also suggest acceptable levels of reliability with this sample of men. However, women's alpha coefficient for the ATME, while acceptable, was somewhat atypical to the alpha coefficient established with a sample used by Weis, Rabinowitz, and Ruckstuhl (1992) of .84.

Analyses of Variance for Biosex and Study Variables

To determine if there were statistically significant differences on scores produced by men and women, a one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) procedure was performed (see Table 3). Results revealed that there was a statistically significant effect of sex on the ATME total, the JEIQ sexual justification, the CMNI risk-taking, the CMNI playboy, on the CMNI pursuit-of-status, and on the CMNI total. Men produced higher ATME total scores, and lower scores on JEIQ sexual subscales, indicating greater approval for infidelity in general, as well sexual rationales for infidelity. Men also produced higher scores on the CMNI risk-taking, playboy, pursuit-of-status, and total scores. This result indicates, compared to women, men reported greater conformity to social gender standards for participating in risky behaviors, nonrelational sexuality, seeking of social status, and masculinity in general. Due to the significant interaction between biosex and these variables, the correlation data will be presented for men and women separately, as well as the sample as a whole.

Results did not reveal a significant difference in the mean scores of men and women for JEIQ emotional intimacy justification or CMNI dominance. These outcomes do not support previous research on biosex and ERI that suggest men and women view emotional forms of ERI differently (Glass & Wright, 1992; Lieberman, 1988; Spanier & Margolis, 1983; Thompson, 1984a). Findings were inconsistent with previous research that showed significant difference between men's and women's endorsement of masculine norms for dominance in a similar sample (Smiler, 2006).

Variable Intercorrelations

A Pearson correlation analysis was completed to assess the relationship between all independent and dependent variables. An intercorrelation matrix of the ATME total, the JEIQ sexual justification and JEIQ emotional intimacy justification subscales, the CMNI total, and CMNI risk-taking, dominance, playboy, and pursuit-of-status subscales was developed for the sample as a whole (see Table 4). The instruments that measured infidelity were moderately correlated suggesting that the three variables are somewhat interrelated. There was a negative correlation between the ATME total scale and the two JEIQ subscales that reflects congruence in measuring approval of ERI (i.e., higher scores on the ATME=more approval, higher scores on the JEIQ=less approval).

Table 3. Analysis of Variance of Study Variables and Biosex.

Source	df	F
ATME	1, 686	8.26**
JEIQ sexual	1, 679	19.48***
JEIQ emotional	1, 676	3.56
CMNI risk taking	1, 675	37.54***
CMNI dominance	1, 679	.55
CMNI playboy	1, 671	51.00***
CMNI pursuit of status	1, 677	8.24***
CMNI total	1, 590	102.37***

p < .01. *p < .001

The CMNI subscales were also moderately correlated for the sample as a whole. Contrasting these correlations to those developed by Mahalik, Lock, et al. (2003) revealed slightly different correlations between CMNI total and all subscale scores within the current sample than in the original sample used to develop in the instrument. This

difference, while not statistically validated, suggests that the within the current sample, indicators of adherence to masculine norms about risk-taking, valuing dominance, finding worth in sexual prowess, and placing importance on one's social status were better gauges of participants' overall adherence to masculine norms than in the original sample.

Table 4. *Intercorrelations, Number of Participants, Means, Standard Deviations, and Range of Scores.*

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1) ATME total	-							
2) JEIQ sexual	-.37**	-						
3) JEIQ emotional	-.25**	.50**	-					
4) CMNI risk-taking	.08*	-.19**	-.13**	-				
5) CMNI dominance	.06	-.09*	-.08*	.20**	-			
6) CMNI playboy	.26**	-.46**	-.27**	.30**	.17**	-		
7) CMNI status	.06	-.07	-.16*	.24**	.42**	.15**	-	
8) CMNI total	.05	-.24**	-.13**	.49**	.51**	.56**	.40**	-
n	687	680	677	676	680	672	678	592
M	16.93	3.67	3.13	14.46	5.53	9.71	11.26	109.92
SD	5.45	0.56	0.81	4.1	1.95	6.10	2.31	24.7
Range	7-35	4-16	5-20	2-29	0-11	0-29	3-18	36-210

Note. JEIQ sexual= JEIQ sexual justification; JEIQ emotional=JEIQ emotional intimacy justification; CMNI status=CMNI pursuit of status.

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

A Pearson correlation analysis was also completed separately for men in the sample and for women in the sample. An intercorrelation matrix of the ATME total, JEIQ sexual justification and emotional intimacy justification subscales, the CMNI total, and CMNI risk-taking, dominance, playboy, and pursuit-of-status subscales were developed for each biosex. For the sample of men, the instruments that measured infidelity were moderately correlated suggesting that the three variables are somewhat interrelated (see

Table 5). Like the sample as a whole, there was a negative correlation between the ATME total scale and the two JEIQ subscales that reflects congruence in the scales' measure of approval for ERI. The CMNI subscales were also moderately correlated for the sample as a whole. Like the correlation values found for the entire sample, men's correlations between CMNI subscales and the CMNI total were seen as being different than to those found in the original sample used by Mahalik, Lock, et al. (2003) to develop the instrument. This difference, while not statistically validated, suggests that the within this sample of men, indicators of adherence to masculine norms about risk-taking, valuing dominance, finding worth in sexual prowess, and placing importance on one's social status were better gauges of participants' overall adherence to masculine norms than in the original sample used to develop the instrument.

Table 5. *Intercorrelations, Number of Participants, Means, Standard Deviations, and Range of Scores for Men.*

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1) ATME total	-							
2) JEIQ sexual	-.50**	-						
3) JEIQ emotional	-.23**	.51**	-					
4) CMNI risk-taking	.07	-.05	-.13	-				
5) CMNI dominance	.01	-.09	-.08	.25**	-			
6) CMNI playboy	.24**	-.44**	-.29**	.21**	.17*	-		
7) CMNI status	.03	-.01	-.14*	.32**	.44**	.19*	-	
8) CMNI total	.28**	-.23**	-.15*	.43**	.57**	.54**	.39**	-
n	202	197	199	200	199	195	198	176
M	17.86	3.52	3.04	15.91	5.58	12.24	11.65	124.41
SD	5.82	0.71	0.81	3.94	1.89	6.53	2.51	25.34
Range	7-35	4-16	6-20	5-29	1-11	0-27	6-18	61-192

Note. JEIQ sexual= JEIQ sexual justification; JEIQ intimacy=JEIQ emotional intimacy justification; CMNI status=CMNI pursuit of status.

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

For the sample women, the instruments that measured infidelity variables were also moderately correlated, again suggesting that the three factors are somewhat interrelated (see Table 6). Like the sample as a whole, there was a negative correlation between the ATME total scale and the two JEIQ subscales that reflects agreement in the scales' measure of approval for ERI. However, compared to men in this sample, women's ATME total scores were less correlated with the JEIQ sexual scores.

Table 6. *Intercorrelations, Number of Participants, Means, Standard Deviations, and Range of Scores for Women.*

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1) ATME total	-							
2) JEIQ sexual	-.26**	-						
3) JEIQ emotional	-.25**	.51**	-					
4) CMNI risk-taking	.05	-.22**	-.10*	-				
5) CMNI dominance	.07	-.09*	-.08	.18**	-			
6) CMNI playboy	.24**	-.44**	-.26**	.27**	.17**	-		
7) CMNI status	.07	-.09*	-.16**	.18**	.41**	.09*	-	
8) CMNI total	.01	-.19**	-.10*	.45**	.54**	.49**	.38**	-
n	485	483	478	476	481	477	480	416
M	16.55	3.73	3.17	13.85	5.52	8.67	11.09	103.65
SD	5.25	0.48	0.81	4.01	1.97	5.59	2.21	21.67
Range	7-31	4-16	5-20	2-28	0-11	0-29	3-18	36-210

Note. JEIQ sexual= JEIQ sexual justification; JEIQ intimacy=JEIQ emotional intimacy justification; CMNI status=CMNI pursuit of status.

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

This difference, while not statistically validated, suggests that the women in the sample might have different views on sexual forms of infidelity compared to men. Additionally, the similar correlation between ATME total scale and the JEIQ emotional intimacy

justification for women and men suggests that their views on the emotional forms of ERI may affect their attitudes toward ERI in a similar way.

Women's CMNI subscales were also moderately correlated for the sample as a whole. Like the correlation values found for the entire sample, women's correlations between CMNI risk-taking, dominance, and pursuit-of-status subscales and the CMNI total were different than to those found in the original sample used by Mahalik, Lock, et al. (2003) to develop the instrument. Unlike the sample as a whole, the CMNI playboy subscale correlation with CMNI total score did not differ from the original sample. These differences, while not statistically validated, suggests that the within this sample women, indicators of adherence to masculine norms about risk-taking, valuing dominance, and placing importance on one's social status were better gauges of participants' overall adherence to masculine norms than in the original sample used to develop the instrument. However, for women finding worth in sexual prowess was not a better indicator of conformity to masculine norms.

Main Analyses

The main analyses will restate the hypotheses established in chapter 1 of this study. For the first hypothesis, the correlation data for the sample as a whole will be used to establish support. For the remaining hypotheses, simultaneous regression equations were developed for men in the sample, and for women in the sample. The percentage of the variance in the dependent variables accounted for by the independent variables will be described. Finally, the CMNI subscales with significant associations with the variance will be identified.

Hypothesis 1 states, "CMNI total scores will be positively correlated with both ATME total scores and negatively correlated with JEIQ sexual and emotional intimacy subscale scores". This hypothesis predicted a relationship between masculinity and acceptance of infidelity where greater endorsement of masculine norms would be related to greater acceptance of ERI. This hypothesis also predicted a positive association between masculinity and justifications for ERI based in either sexual motivations or emotional motivations. The intercorrelation matrix presented in Table 4 revealed an insignificant correlation between ATME total scores and CMNI total scores and only a small correlation between JEIQ emotional and CMNI total scores. The same matrix identified a medium negative correlation between CMNI total scores and JEIQ sexual justification scores. This suggests that within the sample, greater endorsement of masculine norms was associated with a greater sense of justification for sexual justifications for ERI.

A correlation matrix was also developed for men in the sample and for women in the sample. For men, CMNI total score had a medium correlations with both ATME total and JEIQ sexual subscale, but only a small correlation with the JEIQ emotional subscale. For women, CMNI total only had small correlations with ATME total, JEIQ sexual, and JEIQ emotional subscales. This suggests overall adherence to masculine norms differed across biosex in how it was related to attitudes about and approval of ERI.

Regression Analyses

To address hypotheses two, three, and four, the predictor variables (CMNI risk-taking, CMNI playboy, CMNI pursuit of status, and CMNI dominance) were entered into the simultaneous regression models predicting ATME total scores, JEIQ sexual

justification, and JEIQ emotional intimacy justification. Models were developed to address these variables' predictive value for both men in the sample and women in the sample. Results indicate the regression models for each of the sexes varied in predictive significant, with some differences in the CMNI subscales significantly associated with variance in the dependent variables for men versus women.

ATME regression model

Hypothesis 2 states, "The CMNI risk-taking, CMNI playboy, CMNI pursuit of status, and CMNI dominance subscale scores will predict ATME total scores for both men and women". For men in the sample, ATME total scores were correlated (see Table 7) to CMNI playboy scores ($r = .24, p < .01$), but not CMNI risk-taking ($r = .07$), CMNI dominance ($r = .01$), or CMNI pursuit-of-status scores ($r = .03$).

Table 7. *Simultaneous Regression Analysis of Variables Predicting Men's ATME Total (N=188).*

Variable	B	SE B	β	t
CMNI risk-taking	.08	.11	.06	.70
CMNI playboy	.21	.07	.24	3.23***
CMNI pursuit of status	-.16	.20	-.07	.43
CMNI dominance	-.05	.25	-.02	.85

Note: $R^2 = .06$

*** $p < .001$

The regression equation result showed the model (see Table 8) was significant, $F(4, 183) = 2.98, p < .05$, and accounted for 6% of the variance in the ATME total scores (adjusted $R^2 = .06$). Only CMNI playboy was found to be significantly associated with the variance in men's the ATME total scores. These findings indicate that men's conformity to the four masculine norms explain a small amount of the variation in their

ATME scores, with only conformity to sexual norms significantly associated with this variation.

For women in the sample ATME total scores were correlated (see Table 6) to CMNI playboy scores ($r = .24, p < .01$), but not CMNI risk-taking ($r = .05$), CMNI dominance ($r = .07$), or CMNI pursuit-of-status scores ($r = .07$). The simultaneous regression model (see Table 8) was significant, $F(4,453)=7.60, p < .001$, also accounting for 6% of the variance in the ATME total scores (adjusted $R^2=.06$). Again, only CMNI playboy was found to be significantly associated with the variance in women's ATME total scores for the women. These findings indicate that, like men, women's conformity to masculine sexual norms is associated with a small amount of the variation in their ATME scores. Their conformity to masculine norms of risk-taking behaviors, pursuit of status, with only conformity to sexual norms significantly associated with this variation.

Table 8. *Simultaneous Regression Analysis of Variables Predicting Women's ATME Total (N=458).*

Variable	B	SE B	β	t
CMNI risk-taking	-.01	.06	.01	-.14
CMNI playboy	.23	.05	.24	5.11***
CMNI pursuit of status	.06	.12	.02	.47
CMNI dominance	.07	.13	.03	.51

Note: $R^2=.06$

*** $p < .001$

The findings related to men's and women's scores on the CMNI subscales predict a medium but significant percentage of the variance in their attitudes about ERI is predicted by their conformity to masculine norms as measured by the independent

variables. For both men and women, only conformity to masculine norms related to nonrelational sexual attitudes and behaviors was found to be associated to the variance. Hypothesis 2 is supported by these findings.

JEIQ sexual justification regression model. Hypothesis three states, "The CMNI risk-taking, CMNI playboy, CMNI pursuit of status, and CMNI dominance subscale scores will predict JEIQ sexual justification subscale scores for both men and women". For men, the independent variables were correlated with the JEIQ sexual subscale score (see Table 5) and also entered into the simultaneous regression model predicting JEIQ sexual justification scores for the men in the sample (see Table 9). Their JEIQ sexual subscale scores were correlated to CMNI playboy scores ($r = -.44, p < .01$), but not CMNI risk-taking ($r = -.05$), CMNI dominance ($r = -.09$), or CMNI pursuit-of-status scores ($r = -.01$). The regression equation result showed that the model (see Table 11) was significant, $F(4, 179) = 12.64, p < .001$ and accounted for 22% of the variance in the JEIQ sexual justification score (adjusted $R^2 = .22$). For men only CMNI playboy was found to be significantly associated to the variance in their JEIQ sexual justification scores.

Table 9. *Simultaneous Regression Analysis of Variables Predicting Men's JEIQ Sexual Justifications (N=184).*

Variable	B	SE B	β	t
CMNI risk-taking	.00	.05	.00	.02
CMNI playboy	-.20	.03	-.47	-6.86***
CMNI pursuit of status	.15	.09	.13	1.70
CMNI dominance	-.10	.11	-.07	-.94

Note: $R^2 = .22$

*** $p < .001$

These findings indicate that men's conformity to masculine sexual norms explain some variation in their JEIQ sexual subscale scores. Their conformity to masculine norms of risk-taking behaviors, pursuit of status, and desire to dominate were not significantly associated with their acceptance these sexual justifications.

Women's dependent variables were also correlated with JEIQ sexual subscale scores and entered into the simultaneous regression model predicting JEIQ sexual justification scores (see Table 10). Their JEIQ sexual subscale scores were correlated to CMNI risk-taking ($r = -.22, p < .01$) and CMNI playboy scores ($r = -.44, p < .01$), but not CMNI dominance ($r = -.09$), or CMNI pursuit-of-status scores ($r = -.09$). The regression equation result showed that the model (see Table 12) was significant, $F(4,451) = 29.15, p < .001$ and accounted for 21% of the variance in the JEIQ sexual justification score (adjusted $R^2 = .21$). Unlike the men, for women in the sample both the CMNI risk-taking and CMNI playboy were found to be significantly associated with the variance in their JEIQ sexual justification scores. These findings indicate that women's conformity to

Table 10. *Simultaneous Regression Analysis of Variables Predicting Women's JEIQ Sexual Justification (N=456).*

Variable	B	SE B	β	t
CMNI risk-taking	-.06	.02	.12	-2.63**
CMNI playboy	-.14	.02	.41	-9.22***
CMNI pursuit of status	-.03	.04	.04	-.76
CMNI dominance	.01	.05	.01	.27

Note: $R^2 = .21$

** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$

masculine norms about taking risks and sexual attitudes explain some variation in their JEIQ sexual subscale scores. Women's conformity to masculine norms of pursuit of status, and desire to dominate were not significantly associated with their acceptance these sexual justifications.

The findings related to men's and women's scores on the JEIQ sexual justification subscale indicated that a significant percentage of the variance in their attitudes about ERI is predicted by their conformity to masculine norms as measured by the independent variables. For both men and women, conformity to masculine norms related to sexual attitudes and behaviors was found to be significantly associated with this variance. For women, but not for men, conformity to masculine risk-taking norms was also found to be significantly associated with this variance. Hypothesis 3 is partially supported by these findings.

JEIQ emotional intimacy justification regression model. Hypothesis 4 states, "The CMNI risk-taking, CMNI playboy, CMNI pursuit of status, and CMNI dominance subscale scores will predict JEIQ emotional intimacy justification subscale scores for both men and women." Men's independent variables were correlated with the JEIQ emotional subscale score (see Table 5) and entered into the simultaneous regression model predicting JEIQ emotional intimacy justification scores (see Table 11).

JEIQ emotional subscale scores were correlated to CMNI playboy scores ($r = -.29, p < .01$), but not CMNI risk-taking ($r = -.13$), CMNI dominance ($r = -.08$), or CMNI pursuit-of-status scores ($r = -.14$). The regression equation result showed that the model was significant, $F(4, 180) = 4.20, p < .01$ and accounting for 9% of the variance in the JEIQ emotional intimacy justification score (adjusted $R^2 = .09$).

Table 11. *Simultaneous Regression Analysis of Variables Predicting Men's JEIQ Emotional Intimacy Justifications (N=185).*

Variable	B	SE B	β	t
CMNI risk-taking	-.10	.08	-.10	-1.22
CMNI playboy	-.16	.05	-.25	-3.42***
CMNI pursuit of status	-.05	.14	-.03	-.39
CMNI dominance	.05	.17	.02	.28

Note: $R^2 = .09$

*** $p < .001$

For men, only CMNI playboy was found to be significantly associated to the variance in their JEIQ emotional intimacy scores. Men's CMNI risk-taking, pursuit of status, and dominance subscales scores did not predict their JEIQ emotional justification subscale scores.

Women's independent variable were also correlated with the JEIQ emotional subscale score (see Table 6) and entered into the simultaneous regression model predicting JEIQ emotional intimacy justification scores (see Table 12). JEIQ emotional subscale scores were correlated to CMNI playboy scores ($r = -.26, p < .01$), but not CMNI risk-taking ($r = -.10$), CMNI dominance ($r = -.08$), or CMNI pursuit-of-status scores ($r = -.16$). The regression equation result showed that the model was significant, $F(4,446) = 10.53, p < .001$, accounting for 9% of the variance in the JEIQ emotional intimacy justification score (adjusted $R^2 = .09$). Unlike the men in the sample, for the women both CMNI playboy and CMNI pursuit of status were found to be significantly associated with variance in their JEIQ emotional intimacy scores. Their CMNI risk-taking and dominance subscale scores were not associated with variance in their JEIQ emotional intimacy justification subscale scores.

Table 12. *Simultaneous Regression Analysis of Variables Predicting Women's JEIQ Emotional Intimacy Justification (N=451).*

Variable	B	SE B	β	t
CMNI risk-taking	-.02	.05	-.02	-.48
CMNI playboy	-.17	.03	-.25	-5.18***
CMNI pursuit of status	-.24	.09	-.13	-2.70**
CMNI dominance	.03	.10	.01	.26

Note: $R^2 = .09$

p < .01. *p < .001

The findings related to men's and women's scores on the JEIQ emotional intimacy justification subscale indicated that a small percentage of the variance in their attitudes about ERI is predicted by their conformity to masculine norms as measured by the independent variables. For both men and women, conformity to masculine norms related to emotional intimacy attitudes and behaviors was found to predict this variance. For women, but not for men, conformity to masculine pursuit of status norms was also found to predict this variance. In spite of the small portion of variance in men's and women's JEIQ emotional justification subscale scores, hypothesis 4 is supported.

CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION

This study examines the relationship between socially constructed norms of masculinity and perceptions about infidelity. The findings contribute to literature on predisposing factors for infidelity by replacing biosex with masculine gender in an examination of what predicts approving attitudes about infidelity. In this chapter results emphasizing attitudes about ERI will be discussed, followed by discussions about the intersection of masculinity and both sexual infidelity and emotional infidelity. Next, the study's limitations are reviewed, as well as implications results have for theory and research. Finally, suggestions for future research in the intersection of gender and infidelity are made.

ATME

Hypotheses that questioned the interaction and predictive value of the independent variables as they applied to the ATME total score were only partially supported. Hypothesis one stated total conformity to masculine norms would be found to be positively correlated to attitudes about ERI. The correlation between CMNI total scores and ATME total scores was not significant for the sample as a whole or for women, but the correlation was significant for men. The independent variables did predict a small portion of the ATME scores for both men and women, thereby supporting hypothesis two. Of the four CMNI subscales, only the endorsement of nonrelational sexual norms was significantly associated with attitudes about ERI. The other masculine norms used as independent variables were not significantly related to variance in these attitudes. Taken together, these findings indicate that overall compliance with the socially

constructed nonrelational sexual norms can be viewed as related to general attitudes about ERI behaviors for men and women. However, conformity to the specific masculine norms for risk-taking, dominance, or pursuit-of-status should not be viewed as predictive of overall attitudes about infidelity for either men or women.

The difference across biosex in the correlation between overall conformity to masculine norms and attitudes about infidelity suggests the endorsement of some masculine norms, in conjunction with being biologically male, is related to ERI attitudes. These results supported previous research that showed men to be more open to infidelity and to take part in infidelity more than women (Buunk, 1980). They also support the social constructivist view of gender development (Bandura & Bussey, 2004) in that being biologically male appears to increase exposure to masculine norms and the degree to which these norms for masculinity are endorsed. This endorsement included masculine norms for nonrelational sexuality that affected participants' attitudes about sexual forms of infidelity.

Findings from this study also added to previous research on ERI and gender (Choi et al., 1994; Lieberman, 1988; Prins, Buunk, & Van Yperen, 1993; Thompson, 1984a) that identified other aspects of socially constructed gender which are related to attitudes about infidelity when controlling for biological variables. Specifically, results added to Wiederman's (1997) findings suggest frequency and types of infidelity do not differ for men and women in that endorsement of masculinity in men and women were associated with variance in attitudes about infidelity in very similar ways. This suggests that if women endorse masculine norms of nonrelational sexuality, their attitudes about different types of infidelity are affected in similar ways as men who endorse the same norms.

JEIQ Sexual Justification

Hypotheses that examined the association and predictive value of the independent variables on the JEIQ sexual justification subscale were supported. Hypothesis one stated total conformity to masculine norms would have a positive relationship to approval of sexual rationales for ERI. The relationship between endorsement of these norms and the degree of acceptance individuals held for sexual rationales for infidelity was significant for separately for both men and women. Findings from the simultaneous regression analysis, as stated in hypothesis three, indicate the independent variables were found to predict men's and women's approval of sexually motivation for ERI. For men, endorsement of nonrelational sexual values was the only variable significantly associated to the approval of these motivations in the sample as a whole. Conformity to masculine norms about risk-taking behaviors, dominance of others, and seeking of status were not significantly associated of their approval level. For women, both conformity to non-relational sexual and to risk taking norms of masculinity were significantly related of their degree of approval attached to sexual justifications.

These findings support previous research that suggests men and women both endorse approval for sexual explanations for ERI to some degree (Glass & Wright, 1992). However, the discrepancy between the variables associated with the variance in attitudes toward sexual justifications for ERI for women compared to men suggests that other socially constructed gender factors may play a role in the motivations behind these attitudes. Evolutionary theory would see these differences in motivation for sexual ERI as related to men's instinctual pressures to procreate and women's instinctual pressures to seek relational investment of partners (Wright, 1994). Social constructionist theory

(Bandura & Bussey, 2004) would see these differences as related to biosex or culture specific socialization norms about nonrelational sexuality for men in contrast to combined sexual and relational expectation norms for women's sexuality. Masculine gender theorists would point to the presence of multiple masculinities (Smiler, 2004) as influencing variation in attitudes about sexuality and therefore ERI.

These results were also consistent with previous research that found permissive sexual attitudes, or being open to sex only relationships, to contribute to higher rates of sexual infidelity (Smith, 1994). Specifically, the results of this study suggest that conformity to masculine nonrelational sexual norms was related to more open attitudes about infidelity and likely increase risk of ERI behaviors in both men and women. Along with increased risk of ERI behaviors comes an increased risk of mental health disorders for the perpetrating partner (Beach, et al., 1990). While there has been no research evidence of the directional causality of ERI attitudes or behaviors and mental health disorders, their co-occurrence is consistent enough to make the findings of this study relevant to treatment of mental health diagnoses in the context of gender sensitive couples therapy.

JEIQ Emotional Intimacy Justification

Hypotheses that questioned the interaction and predictive value of the independent variables on individuals' approval of ERI inspired by the need for emotional intimacy were also only partially supported. Hypothesis one stated that greater total conformity to masculine norms would be related to greater approval of emotionally motivated ERI. This hypothesis was not supported in the sample as a whole, by men in the sample, or by women in the sample.

The predictive value of men's and women's dependent variables, as stated in hypothesis 4, was found to be small. For men, only non-relational sexual norms were significantly associated with variations in their approval of these emotional motives for ERI. Their conformity to masculine norms about risk-taking behaviors, dominance of others, and seeking of status was not significantly predictive of their approval level. Again, women in the sample produced different results than did men. For women, both conformity to non-relational sexual and status seeking norms were associated with the variance in approval of emotional justifications for ERI.

These results provide mixed support for research findings about how men and women differ in their views on emotionally based ERI (Glass & Wright, 1992). First, the analysis of variance showed no significant relationship between biosex and approval of emotional bases of ERI for either men or women. These results do not support the contention that men and women differed in their approval of emotional forms of ERI.

Second, by showing men's conformity to the four CMNI subscales predicted their attitudes about emotional forms of ERI, previous findings (Glass & Wright, 1985) that men approve of sexual justifications but not emotional justifications was not supported. In fact, these results suggest that men and women internalize masculine norms are similar in their endorsement of combined sexual and emotional types of ERI, when previously only women were associated with approval of combined types of ERI. Specifically, conforming to socially constructed norms for nonrelational sexuality by men and women was positively related to acceptance of combined types of ERI. The congruence of these findings across biosex does support Smith's (1994) research that identified accepting attitudes about sex as being associated with more open attitudes about ERI in general.

The findings also provides some validation with previous research that shows men's and women's rates of infidelity and attitudes about infidelity are becoming more alike than dissimilar (Prins, et al., 1993), particularly when using research participant samples under the age of 40 (Wiederman, 1997).

Limitations

As with all studies, this study has several limitations. In spite of efforts to recruit from a broad population through online solicitations and public advertisements, as well as improved access to the study provided by the online format, the sample was limited in demographic diversity. The restriction on generalizability of findings becomes more salient when considering the effects of age (Prins, Buunk, & Van Yperen, 1993), education (Smith, 1994), religiosity (Atkins et al. 2001), and ethnicity (Amato & Rogers, 1997; Greely, 1994; Liu & Iwamota, 2007; Mahalik, Lagan, & Morrison, 2006; Tager & Good, 2006; Treas & Giesen, 2000) on conformity to masculine norms and attitudes about infidelity. The homogeneous characteristics of the sample in this study show elevated levels of approval for infidelity may be inflated in comparison to the general population. One specific concern was the over use of a sample of convenience that represented an undergraduate college population. This portion of the sample resulted in a low level of familiarity with committed relationships, which limited the relational experience upon which responses were based and therefore restricts generalizability of findings to populations with personal experiences with infidelity. The majority of research on attitudes about infidelity is afflicted with this same limitation (Blow & Hartnett, 2005).

Another aspect of the demographic limitations of the sample is the biosex ratio in the sample. Androgyny (Bem, 1972) and social constructionist (Bandura, & Bussey, 2004) views on gender would suggest that men and women endorse some aspects of both masculinity and femininity. Smiler (2006) found the degree and expression of masculine gender to vary across biosex. The findings that masculinity varies across biosex were supported by this study's results. With this in mind, the approximately two to one women to men ratio in the sample suggests that findings may represent a more female oriented view of infidelity and masculinity than would be seen in the general population.

The methodology used in the study also has limitations. First, self-identification of participants represents a selection bias. Respondents to the advertisement may be more comfortable discussing issues of relationships, including sexual aspects of committed relationships, therefore representing more liberal attitudes about sexuality than the population as a whole. Previous research has shown these open attitudes to be positively related to approval of ERI (Smith, 1994). Second, the online format is more susceptible to respondent sabotage of the data set. While care was given to address incomplete responses, methods of identifying intentional deception or multiple responses were not used in this study.

The instruments used in this study also represent a limitation of this study. Most prominently, the revisions made to the ATME for this study utilized a focus group that represented a variety of relationships. While the demographics of the group was initially congruent with the expected sample for the study, the final sample of the study was younger and had less experience with committed relationships than the focus group. This

may have reflected in the items chosen for the ATME being unrepresentative of scenarios where the sample may commonly address issues of infidelity.

In addition to the limitations of the revised ATME, the definitions of infidelity and a committed relationship that were used for the study represent a limitation. While these definitions were inclusive of many types of relationships, they provided neither specific criteria for behaviors that may be identified as infidelity nor tangible criteria for commitment in a romantic relationship. These shortcomings allow for interpretation and therefore variation in how participants applied the definitions to the measures, resulting in increased random error in the findings.

Theoretical Implications

The results of the study have theoretical implications for understanding the intersection of ERI and masculinity. The following will discuss the theoretical relevance of masculine norms in understanding ERI. The theoretical implication of the relationship of findings to the debate about masculinity as dysfunctional versus normative are also explored.

Masculinity and ERI. One of the goals of this study was to begin to investigate the relevance of masculine social norms to infidelity. Previous research on ERI had not addressed how socially constructed aspects of gender influence attitudes and behaviors related to infidelity. Instead, the previous research on infidelity almost exclusively used biosex as a variable to define men's and women's tendencies toward/away from acceptance of ERI (Atkins, Baucom, & Jacobson, 2001). This study showed that for men overall degree of conformity to socially constructed norms for masculinity is correlated to attitudes about ERI and acceptance of different rationales for infidelity. It also showed

that emotional forms of infidelity may be viewed in similar ways across biosex. Finally, this study showed that socially constructed masculine norms for sexuality may reasonably be viewed as influencing attitudes about ERI for men and women. Future theories of relationship exclusivity, commitment to monogamy, and relationship disillusion related to infidelity should include discussion of men's internalization of socially constructed masculine messages about relationships and infidelity.

While not all the masculine norms identified as independent variables were found to be predictive of views on ERI, nonrelational sexual norms were consistently identified as a factor in approval of infidelity. Previous research identified several predisposing factors for ERI, including stronger sexual interests (Treas & Giesen, 2000), higher levels of testosterone (Booth & Dabbs, 1993), and sexual fantasies about someone other than one's partner (Hicks & Leitenberg, 2001). This study provides evidence that masculine gender norms, particularly nonrelational sexual norms, can also be added to this list of predictors or seen as interacting with predisposing factors to influence ERI. The development and testing of theories on the interaction between masculine gender norms and other predisposing factors in ERI attitudes and behaviors is therefore warranted.

Finally, the study took steps to identify new views of how men and women may view emotional infidelity in similar ways. Instead of men and women viewing emotional rationales for infidelity differently as previously indicated (Glass & Wright, 1992), this study found that men's and women's approval of emotional reasons for ERI are not divergent, but similar. Further, conformity to masculine nonrelational sexual norms did not influence this relationship for men and women.

Dysfunctional nonrelational sexual norms. In addition to the implications the study's results have on ERI, support for the dysfunctional perspective on masculinity is present. The results indicated that conformity to masculine norms for non-relational sexuality (Levant, 1997) is associated with more approving attitudes about ERI and increased acceptance of justifications for infidelity. This association suggests that by endorsing this norm individuals are more likely to have views on infidelity which are detrimental to their committed relationships. Acting on this view increases risk of partner depression (Cano & O'Leary, 2000; Cano, O'Leary, & Heinz, 2004; Christian-Herman, O'Leary, & Avery-Leaf, 2001), as well as anxiety disorders, alcohol abuse, and psychosis (Halford & Bouma, 1997; Whisman, 1999). Future theory about the effects of dysfunctional levels of conformity to masculine nonrelational sexual norms should include the experiences of their committed partners with pathology as a precursor to and a successor of ERI behaviors.

In addition to the effects of non-relational sexuality norms' on partner mental health, the relationship between conformity to masculine norms and ERI has implications on the perpetrator's mental health. Using Pleck's (1995) three types of gender role strain, men who prescribe to non-relational sexual norms or practice ERI may find themselves experiencing gender role dysfunction. Specifically, men who conform to society's sexual norms by expressing higher levels of approval and acceptance of ERI may also experience gender role dysfunction related to society's disapproving stance on infidelity. For men who support social standards for disapproving ERI, low self-esteem may develop related to gender role discrepancy, or their failure to meet social gender expectations. Finally, men are subjected to gender role trauma as they navigate the

conflict between mixed messages about expectations for their views on infidelity. This trauma develops when they attempt to integrate societal expectations for exclusivity in committed relationships and societal message about men's approval of sexual forms of ERI. Theories on ERI and gender should address the psychological aftermath of ERI on perpetrators, the distress associated with not meeting the nonsexual norms through ERI attitudes and behaviors, or the long term psychological implications of the gendering of these norms.

Practice Implications

The results of this study have implications for the treatment of distress related to infidelity. As identified by Whisman, Dixon, and Johnson (1997), therapists who provide couples' therapy view relational infidelity as one of the most damaging and most difficult issues to treat. The correlation between men's CMNI total scores and their ATME total scores provide evidence for therapeutic assessment of how couple's endorsement of gender norms impacts their views and practice of fidelity within their committed relationships. Further, the predictive ability of conformity to nonrelational sexuality norms across biosex provides evidence that supports therapeutic assessment of conformity to this masculine norm in both men and women.

The results of this study also suggest therapists treating couples struggling with infidelity may find value in Philpot's (2005) gender sensitive family therapy techniques. These techniques would start with the validation of each member's experience and normalizing of their distress as it related to their gender socialization around sexuality. Then the therapist would engage in psychoeducation about the role of gender socialization in the development of nonrelational sexuality and risk of resulting gender

role strain. The results of this study support engaging in discussion about the traditional social messages about sexuality for men and the conflict that can arise when men attempt to gain the emotional connection or nurturance through sexual behaviors. The results of this study also support discussion of how emotional infidelity can be viewed similarly by men and women in spite of evolutionary theory that would suggest otherwise.

In the next phase of Philpost's (2005) gender sensitive therapy, the therapist would work to unite the individuals as a couple against the forces that led to their socialization toward nonrelational sexuality. The therapist then inserts himself/herself into the relationship as a triangulated interpreter of gender language between the couple. This step would help the couple improve their understanding of unspoken meanings and their partner's gender socialized expectations for relational fidelity. The therapist as gender interpreter would also model gendered understanding which aids the couple in comprehension of their partners.

As the couple begins to comprehend their partners' gendered socialized views and their gendered communication about sexuality, the therapist would help members of the couple learn to empathically communicate. This type of communication improves couples' comprehension of confusing sexual communication based in their gender socialization. The final step in gender sensitive family therapy for ERI would be to explore the gendered messages each member received across their development. This examination would promote the couple's discovery of the influence masculine messages about nonrelational sexuality have on the male's fidelity and how divergent messages about sexuality may be at the core of their conflicts around fidelity. Exploring these

messages also reveals each member's role in the relationship infidelity, resulting in an enhanced opportunity to produce change.

The results of this study also have implications for individual treatment of distress associated with the perpetration of infidelity. Therapists treating men experiencing gender role strain related to infidelity can assess their conformity to masculine norms, identify their conformity to nonrelational sexual norms, and use the results to open a discussion on the role of socialized norms for masculinity in attitudes and behaviors which contribute to infidelity. This conversation should include the role of seeking purely sexual intimacy as an attempt to seek emotional nurturance in a masculine manner (Brooks, 1997) while avoiding gender role strain. The drive to seek nurturance in this way can be normalized using an evolutionary description of the utility of this instinct. Using this description can easily segue into a discussion of how to evolve the behavior used to satisfy this drive with less maladaptive methods than to take part in infidelity.

Research Implications

The results of this study challenge previous research on the views of ERI using biosex as a correlated or predictive variable. The findings suggest that using biosex alone as a variable in determining trends in attitudes about ERI may not accurately capture how social messages about infidelity influence views on sexual and emotional ERI. Conformity to masculine social norms was shown to be inconsistent with the Glass and Wright (1992) model where men were more accepting of sexual ERI and women were accepting of emotional or combined ERI. Future research on how men and women view or enact infidelity should include further investigation of the relationship between social gender norms and ERI.

Future research should also begin to look at the role of Pleck's (1995) gender role strain in the enactment of infidelity. According to this theory, being unable to enact aspects of internalized masculine norms or experiencing negative consequences of enacting masculine norms can lead to psychological distress and maladaptive coping. Researchers would further the understanding of gender norms and interpersonal distress through an examination of the relationship between this gender informed distress and infidelity. Specifically, investigating the effects of ERI behaviors for both perpetrators and their committed partners would provide insight into how these norms and infidelity promote or discourage infidelity.

Finally, the way men's and women's endorsement of masculine norms were related to approval of sexually motivated ERI warrants further investigation. Specifically, the inclusion of risk-taking norms in predicting women's approval, but not men's approval, of sexual justifications for ERI implies the presence of other factors that affect that relationship. The results of this study can be used to promote future research on common factors in women who endorse masculine norms for nonrelational sexuality and who have approving attitudes about sexual infidelity.

Summary

The results of this study indicate significant variance in both dependent and independent variable across biosex, with the exception of conformity to norms for dominance and approval of emotionally based justifications for ERI. Results also indicate conformity to masculine norms is significantly related to men's, but not women's, attitudes about ERI. However, conformity to nonrelational sexual norms was found to be correlated to the entire sample's attitudes about infidelity, as well as approval for both

sexually and emotionally motivated ERI for men and for women. Conformity to nonrelational sexual norms was found to be significantly correlated to attitudes about infidelity for both men and women, while infidelity was not significantly related to masculine norms for dominance, risk-taking, or pursuit of status for men or women. Approval of sexually motivated and emotionally motivated ERI was not correlated to masculine norms for dominance, risk-taking, or pursuit of status for the sample as a whole. Additionally, women's endorsement of masculine norms for risk-taking was also found to be associated with their variance in approval for sexually motivated ERI.

This study has implications for theories, practice, and research and should be applied to theories on the intersection of masculinity, biosex, and ERI. Theories based in the dysfunctional perspective of masculinity can begin to discuss the psychological implications of maladaptive conformity to nonrelational sexuality norms for both men and women. Practice implications of this study's findings include using gender sensitive family therapy techniques (Philpot, 2005) to explore conformity to nonrelational sexuality norms to promote understanding within couples in therapy. Identifying the presence of these norms, their origins, divergence in how members of the couple view sexuality and the impact of these views on the couples' relationship can be used to reduce the risks of future infidelity and reduce the negative consequences of previous infidelity. Additionally, results have implications for the individual treatment of masculine role strain related to the internalization of nonrelational sexual norms. Research implications of the findings include evidence for further research on the divergence and convergence of men's and women's attitudes about infidelity related to their conformity to nonrelational sexual norms. Future research on the implications of infidelity on gender

role strain experiences for men is also warranted given this study's findings. Finally, research on nonrelational sexuality norms and pursuit-of-status norms predicting approval of sexually based infidelity for women is warranted given findings that only nonrelational sexuality norms predicted approval of the same type of infidelity for men.

APPENDIX A

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

This section of the survey will focus on your background and family history. Please answer each question to the best of our ability.

1) What is your age?

<input type="checkbox"/> Under 18	<input type="checkbox"/> 18-24
<input type="checkbox"/> 25-34	<input type="checkbox"/> 35-44
<input type="checkbox"/> 45-54	<input type="checkbox"/> 55-64
<input type="checkbox"/> 65 or older	

2) Are you male or female? M F

3) What is your ethnicity? (check all that apply)

<input type="checkbox"/> African American	<input type="checkbox"/> Asian American
<input type="checkbox"/> Hispanic/Latino(a)	<input type="checkbox"/> Native American
<input type="checkbox"/> Caucasian	<input type="checkbox"/> Multiracial
<input type="checkbox"/> Other	

4) Regarding your education, what is the highest grade level you completed or the highest degree you have earned?

<input type="checkbox"/> Less than 8 th grade	<input type="checkbox"/> Some high school
<input type="checkbox"/> High school graduate	<input type="checkbox"/> Some college
<input type="checkbox"/> College graduate	<input type="checkbox"/> Some graduate school
<input type="checkbox"/> Masters degree	<input type="checkbox"/> Doctoral degree

5) How religious are you?

Not at all					Very
0	1	2	3	4	5

6) Please describe your general political outlook?

Liberal						Conservative
0	1	2	3	4	5	

7) What is your current relational status?

Single (never married) In exclusive relationship

Engaged/Committed Married/United

Separated/Committed but Living Apart

Divorced/Ended Committed Relationship

Widowed/Committed Partner Died

8) Are your biological parents currently married to each other?

Yes No Not Sure

9) Have you ever been made aware of any infidelity by any member of your immediate family?

Yes No

10) Have you ever been unfaithful to a person to whom you were committed?

Yes No N/A

APPENDIX B

NOONEWS ADVERTISEMENT

Volunteers invited for online research study of gender and relational attitudes.

Participants must be 18 years of age or older. If you would like to participate go to

<http://survey.uiowa.edu/wsb.dll/715/consentform.htm>

For more information, please email the primary investigator, Christopher Chuick, M.S.

at: genderandinfidelity@yahoo.com.

APPENDIX C

EMAIL SOLICITATION

Hello:

You are being invited to participate in an online research study of relational attitudes and gender. All participants should be 18 years of age or older. Men are encouraged to take part in this study. The study will take approximately 15 minutes, but not more than 30 minutes to complete. A short demographic form is presented, asking for information about, but not limited to, religiosity, political stance, history of divorce in one's family, and experiences with infidelity. Following the demographic form is a measure of attitudes about a situation within which infidelity could occur, a measure of attitudes about reasons for not being exclusive in committed relationships, and a measure of conformity to gender norms.

If you feel that you might like to take part in the study, you can access the survey at:

<http://survey.uiowa.edu/wsb.dll/715/consentform.htm>.

You will be asked to read additional information about the study before beginning the survey.

If you would like to ask a question, get more information prior to deciding to take part in the survey online, or comment on the study, please feel free to contact the primary investigator at:

genderandinfidelity@yahoo.com.

Thank you for taking the time to consider participating,

Christopher D. Chuick, M.S.
Doctoral Candidate
University of Iowa

APPENDIX D

FLIER

**On-line Research
Study: *Gender
and
Relationships!***

**VOLUNTEERS MUST BE 18 OR
OLDER TO PARTICIPATE IN
THIS STUDY ON RELATIONSHIP
ATTITUDES AND GENDER.**

**If you are interested, go to:
<http://survey.uiowa.edu/wsb.dll/715/consentform.htm>
For more information, email:
genderandinfidelity@yahoo.com**

APPENDIX E

INSTRUCTIONS

Thank you deciding to take part in this study.

If you have any questions, please contact the primary investigator at genderandinfinity@yahoo.com.

Instructions

You have been invited to participate in this research experiment because you 18 years of age or older and responded to a solicitation for participants. Your participation is voluntary and may be terminated at any point. This study will ask you to complete a short demographic questionnaire that asks you to describe, among other things, your degree of religiosity, political orientation, and experiences with infidelity. Please respond to each item as honestly as you can. If you feel uncomfortable answering a question, you are free to skip it and continue with the next item.

After completing the demographic form, you will be asked to complete three surveys. Two of these surveys will look at infidelity in committed relationships. People view relationships differently and therefore may address these surveys from dramatically different viewpoints. In order to ensure that all participants are clear on what is meant by 'infidelity' and 'committed relationship', definitions have been provided below. Please read these definitions carefully and use them in developing your answers to questions in this study about our opinion regarding exclusive relationships:

Infidelity: *a sexual and/or emotional act engaged in by one person outside of their primary committed romantic relationship. This act constitutes a breach of trust and/or violation of agreed upon rules for the exclusivity of that committed relationship.*

Committed relationship: *any romantic relationship with shared relationship rules that include emotional and sexual obligation between the members of the relationship. These relationships are based in expectations for long term commitment. Examples include heterosexual and homosexual couples who have been exclusive for a minimum of one year, are cohabitating, are engaged to be married/united, or are currently married/united.*

The first measure will ask you to imagine you are currently in a committed relationship and part of a scenario described at the beginning of the measure. After reading the description you will be asked to rate the degree to which you would reject or accept a list of the seven behaviors connected to the scenario. Please read the instructions carefully and answer the questions as if you are actually a participant in the situation. There are no correct or incorrect answers on this measure.

The second measure will again ask you to imagine you are currently in a committed relationship. You will be presented with several reasons people have given for extra-relational infidelity. You will be asked to indicate the extent to which, given each reason, you would feel justified engaging in a relationship outside your committed relationship. Again, to ensure all participants are clear about the type of relationships and behaviors being investigated, the definitions for “committed relationship” and “infidelity” will be provided at the beginning of this instrument. There are no right or wrong answers for the statements on this measure.

The third and final measure you will be asked to complete is a measure of conformity to gender expectations. This measure consists of 94-items that identify your degree of agreement with statements about how people think, feel, and behave. Please read the instructions carefully and answer all the questions possible. There are no right or wrong answers for the statements on this measure.

If you have any technical difficulties with the study or have questions about the study, please contact the primary investigator via email at genderandinfidelity@yahoo.com or by phone at (319) 541-3469.

Let's begin the study:

APPENDIX F

ATME

Indicate the extent to which you would reject or accept each of the following situations by writing your answer in the blank.

To answer, use these responses:

1. Total rejection
2. Moderate rejection
3. No feelings either way
4. Moderate acceptance
5. Total acceptance

(If you are single, answer as you would if you were married.)

Suppose that you were very close friends with several married couples in the area. As it happened, your husband/wife had gone on an extended trip, leaving you home alone. A similar thing happened to some of your close friends. That is, the wife/husband of one of these acquaintances left the state to visit relatives, leaving her husband/his wife home alone.

How would you feel about:

- _____ 1. Spending an evening or evenings with him/her in his/her living room?
- _____ 2. Going to the movies or theater together?
- _____ 3. Going out to dinner with him/her at a secluded place?
- _____ 4. Dancing with him/her to the stereo?
- _____ 5. Spending a couple of days at a secluded cabin with him/her near a beautiful lake where no one would find out?
- _____ 6. Harmless necking or petting?
- _____ 7. Becoming sexually involved?

APPENDIX G

ATME (REVISED)

Infidelity: *a sexual and/or emotional act engaged in by one person outside of their primary committed romantic relationship. This act constitutes a breach of trust and/or violation of agreed upon rules for the exclusivity of that committed relationship.*

Committed relationship: *any romantic relationship with shared relationship rules that include emotional and sexual obligation between the members of the relationship. These relationships are based in expectations for long term commitment. Examples include heterosexual and homosexual couples who have been exclusive for a minimum of one year, are cohabitating, are engaged to be married/united, or are currently married/united.*

Instructions: Identify the degree of acceptability you would attach to each of the following situations.

To answer, use these responses:

1. Totally unacceptable
2. Moderately unacceptable
3. No feelings either way
4. Moderately acceptable
5. Totally acceptable

(Answer as you would if you were in a committed relationship.)

Suppose that you were very close friends with several committed couples in the area. Your partner had gone on an extended trip, leaving you home alone. A similar thing happened to some of your close friends. That is, the partner of one of these acquaintances left the state to visit relatives, leaving his/her partner home alone. The partner left at home alone was of the gender to which you are attracted.

How would you feel about:

- _____ 1) Using email or text-messaging to Invite him/her to meet at a coffee shop?
- _____ 2) Watching movies together in his/her living room?
- _____ 3) Going out to dinner together at a quiet restaurant?
- _____ 4) Going out with just him/her for drinks at a club or bar?
- _____ 5) Going on a trip together to a beautiful lake where no one would find out?
- _____ 6) Kissing or touching?
- _____ 7) Engaging in sexual contact?

APPENDIX H

JEIQ (REVISED)

Instructions: People in committed relationships frequently are involved in another relationship with a friend or acquaintance. These relationships vary in degree of intimacy and may include emotional and/or sexual involvement. Here is a list of reasons that people sometimes give to explain why they have been in an emotional/sexual relationship with someone outside their primary committed relationship.

To what extent would each of the following reasons justify either emotional/sexual extra-relational involvement for you?

I would feel completely justified 1	I would feel partially justified 2	I would feel not justified 3	I would feel completely unjustified 4
-------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------	------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------

I would feel _____ justified having an extramarital relationship:

	I would feel completely justified	I would feel partially justified	I would feel not unjustified	I would feel completely unjustified
1. For fun	1	2	3	4
2. For intellectual sharing	1	2	3	4
3. For romantic experience	1	2	3	4
4. To feel young	1	2	3	4
5. To relieve sexual deprivation or Frustration	1	2	3	4
6. For someone to understand problems and feelings	1	2	3	4
7. To enjoy sexual relations	1	2	3	4
8. For sexual experimentation or curiosity	1	2	3	4
9. For companionship	1	2	3	4
10. For sexual excitement	1	2	3	4

11. To get love and affection	1	2	3	4
12. To enhance self-confidence and self-esteem	1	2	3	4
13. For novelty and change	1	2	3	4
14. To be respected	1	2	3	4
15. Falling in love with another person	1	2	3	4
16. To get even with spouse	1	2	3	4
17. To advance in my career	1	2	3	4
18. Other:_____	1	2	3	4

APPENDIX I

CMNI

The following pages contain a series of statements about how people might think, feel or behave. The statements are designed to measure attitudes, beliefs, and behaviors associated with both traditional and non-traditional masculine gender roles.

Thinking about your own actions, feelings and beliefs, please indicate how much you personally agree or disagree with each statement by circling:

SD for “Strongly Disagree”
D for “Disagree”
A for “Agree”
SA for “Strongly Agree”

There are no right or wrong responses to the statements. You should give the responses that most accurately describe your personal actions, feelings and beliefs. It is best if you respond with your first impression when answering.

- | | | | | | |
|-----|---------------------------------------------------------------------|----|---|---|----|
| 1. | It is best to keep your emotions hidden | SD | D | A | SA |
| 2. | In general, I will do anything to win | SD | D | A | SA |
| 3. | If I could, I would frequently change sexual partners | SD | D | A | SA |
| 4. | If there is going to be violence, I find a way to avoid it | SD | D | A | SA |
| 5. | It is important to me that people think I am heterosexual | SD | D | A | SA |
| 6. | In general, I must get my way | SD | D | A | SA |
| 7. | Trying to be important is the greatest waste of time | SD | D | A | SA |
| 8. | I am often absorbed in my work | SD | D | A | SA |
| 9. | I will only be satisfied when women are equal to men | SD | D | A | SA |
| 10. | I hate asking for help | SD | D | A | SA |
| 11. | Taking dangerous risks helps me to prove myself | SD | D | A | SA |
| 12. | In general, I do not expend a lot of energy trying to win at things | SD | D | A | SA |
| 13. | An emotional bond with a partner is the best part of sex | SD | D | A | SA |
| 14. | I should take every opportunity to show my feelings | SD | D | A | SA |
| 15. | I believe that violence is never justified | SD | D | A | SA |

16.	Being thought of as gay is not a bad thing	SD	D	A	SA
17.	In general, I do not like risky situations	SD	D	A	SA
18.	I should be in charge	SD	D	A	SA
19.	Feelings are important to show	SD	D	A	SA
20.	I feel miserable when work occupies all my attention	SD	D	A	SA
21.	I feel best about my relationships with women when we are equals	SD	D	A	SA
22.	Winning is not my first priority	SD	D	A	SA
23.	I make sure that people think I am heterosexual	SD	D	A	SA
24.	I enjoy taking risks	SD	D	A	SA
25.	I am disgusted by any kind of violence	SD	D	A	SA
26.	I would hate to be important	SD	D	A	SA
27.	I love to explore my feelings with others	SD	D	A	SA
28.	If I could, I would date a lot of different people	SD	D	A	SA
29.	I ask for help when I need it	SD	D	A	SA
30.	My work is the most important part of my life	SD	D	A	SA
31.	Winning isn't everything, it's the only thing	SD	D	A	SA
32.	I never take chances	SD	D	A	SA
33.	I would only have sex if I was in a committed relationship	SD	D	A	SA
34.	I like fighting	SD	D	A	SA
35.	I treat women as equals	SD	D	A	SA
36.	I bring up my feelings when talking to others	SD	D	A	SA
37.	I would be furious if someone thought I was gay	SD	D	A	SA
38.	I only get romantically involved with one person	SD	D	A	SA
39.	I don't mind losing	SD	D	A	SA
40.	I take risks	SD	D	A	SA
41.	I never do things to be an important person	SD	D	A	SA

42.	It would not bother me at all if someone thought I was gay	SD	D	A	SA
43.	I never share my feelings	SD	D	A	SA
44.	Sometimes violent action is necessary	SD	D	A	SA
45.	Asking for help is a sign of failure	SD	D	A	SA
46.	In general, I control the women in my life	SD	D	A	SA
47.	I would feel good if I had many sexual partners	SD	D	A	SA
48.	It is important for me to win	SD	D	A	SA
49.	I don't like giving all my attention to work	SD	D	A	SA
50.	I feel uncomfortable when others see me as important	SD	D	A	SA
51.	It would be awful if people thought I was gay	SD	D	A	SA
52.	I like to talk about my feelings	SD	D	A	SA
53.	I never ask for help	SD	D	A	SA
54.	More often than not, losing does not bother me	SD	D	A	SA
55.	It is foolish to take risks	SD	D	A	SA
56.	Work is not the most important thing in my life	SD	D	A	SA
57.	Men and women should respect each other as equals	SD	D	A	SA
58.	Long term relationships are better than casual sexual encounters	SD	D	A	SA
59.	Having status is not very important to me	SD	D	A	SA
60.	I frequently put myself in risky situations	SD	D	A	SA
61.	Women should be subservient to men	SD	D	A	SA
62.	I am willing to get into a physical fight if necessary	SD	D	A	SA
63.	I like having gay friends	SD	D	A	SA
64.	I feel good when work is my first priority	SD	D	A	SA
65.	I tend to keep my feelings to myself	SD	D	A	SA
66.	Emotional involvement should be avoided when having sex	SD	D	A	SA
67.	Winning is not important to me	SD	D	A	SA

68.	Violence is almost never justified	SD	D	A	SA
69.	I am comfortable trying to get my way	SD	D	A	SA
70.	I am happiest when I'm risking danger	SD	D	A	SA
71.	Men should not have power over women	SD	D	A	SA
72.	It would be enjoyable to date more than one person at a time	SD	D	A	SA
73.	I would feel uncomfortable if someone thought I was gay	SD	D	A	SA
74.	I am not ashamed to ask for help	SD	D	A	SA
75.	The best feeling in the world comes from winning	SD	D	A	SA
76.	Work comes first	SD	D	A	SA
77.	I tend to share my feelings	SD	D	A	SA
78.	I like emotional involvement in a romantic relationship	SD	D	A	SA
79.	No matter what the situation I would never act violently	SD	D	A	SA
80.	If someone thought I was gay, I would not argue with them about it	SD	D	A	SA
81.	Things tend to be better when men are in charge	SD	D	A	SA
82.	I prefer to be safe and careful	SD	D	A	SA
83.	A person shouldn't get tied down to dating just one person	SD	D	A	SA
84.	I tend to invest my energy in things other than work	SD	D	A	SA
85.	It bothers me when I have to ask for help	SD	D	A	SA
86.	I love it when men are in charge of women	SD	D	A	SA
87.	It feels good to be important	SD	D	A	SA
88.	I hate it when people ask me to talk about my feelings	SD	D	A	SA
89.	I work hard to win	SD	D	A	SA
90.	I would only be satisfied with sex if there was an emotional bond	SD	D	A	SA
91.	I try to avoid being perceived as gay	SD	D	A	SA
92.	I hate any kind of risk	SD	D	A	SA

- | | | | | | |
|-----|--------------------------------|----|---|---|----|
| 93. | I prefer to stay unemotional | SD | D | A | SA |
| 94. | I make sure people do as I say | SD | D | A | SA |

REFERENCES

- Addis, M.E., & Cohane, G.H. (2005). Social scientific paradigms of masculinity and their implications for research and practice in men's mental health. *Journal of Clinical Psychology, 61*, 633-647.
- Allen, E.S. (2001). *Attachment styles and their relation to patterns of extradyadic and extramarital involvement*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill.
- Allen, E.S., Atkins, D.C., Baucom, D.H., Snyder, D.K., Gordon, K.C., & Glass, S.P. (2005). Intrapersonal, interpersonal, and contextual factors in engaging in and responding to extramarital involvement. *Clinical Psychology: Science and Practice, 12*, 101-130.
- Allen, E.S., & Baucom, D.H. (2004). Adult attachment and patterns of extradyadic involvement. *Family Process, 43*, 467-488.
- Amato, P.R., & Previti, D. (2003). People's reasons for divorcing: Gender, social class, the life course, and adjustment. *Journal of Family Issues, 24*, 602-626.
- 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.
- Atwood, J.D., & Seifer, M. (1997). Extramarital affairs and constructed meanings: A social constructionist therapeutic approach. *The American Journal of Family Therapy, 25*, 55-74.
- Bandura, A., & Bussey, K. (2004). On broadening the cognitive, motivational and sociostructural scope of theorizing about gender development and functioning: Comment on Martin, Ruble, and Szkrybala (2002), *Psychological Bulletin, 130*, 691-701.
- Barta, W.D., & Kiene, S.M. (2005). Motivations for infidelity in heterosexual dating couples: The roles of gender, personality differences, and sociosexual orientation. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 22*, 339-360.
- Beach, S.R.H., Jouriles, E.N., & O'Leary, K.D. (1985). Extramarital sex: Impact on depression and commitment in couples seeking marital therapy. *Journal of Sex and Marital Therapy, 11*, 99-108.

- Beach, S.R.H., Sandeen, E.E., & O'Leary, K.D. (1990). *Depression in marriage: A model for etiology and treatment*. New York: Guilford Press.
- Bem, S.J. (1974). The measurement of psychological androgyny, *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 42, 155-162.
- Blazina, C., & Watkins, C.E., Jr. (1996). Masculine gender role conflict: Effects on college men's psychological well-being, chemical substance usage, and attitudes toward help-seeking. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 43, 461-465.
- Blow, A.J., & Hartnett, K. (2005a). Infidelity in committed relationships I: A methodological review. *Journal of Marital and Family Therapy*, 31, 183-216.
- Blow, A.J., & Hartnett, K. (2005b). Infidelity in committed relationships II: A substantive review. *Journal of Marital and Family Therapy*, 31, 217-233.
- Blumstein, P., & Schwartz, P. (1983). *American couples: Money, work, sex*. New York: William Morrow.
- Booth, A., & Dabbs, J.M. (1993). Testosterone and men's marriages. *Social Forces*, 72, 463-477.
- Brannon, R. (1976). The male sex role: Our culture's blueprint for manhood and what it's done for us lately. In D. David & R. Brannon (Eds.), *The forty-nine percent majority: The male sex role* (pp. 1-48). Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Brannon, R., & Juni, S. (1984). A scale for measuring attitudes about masculinity. *Psychological Documents*, 14, 6-7.
- Brickell, C. (2006). The sociological construction of gender and sexuality. *Sociological Review*, 54, 87-113.
- Brooks, G.R. (1997). The centerfold syndrome. In R.F. Levant & G.R. Brooks (Eds.) *Men and sex: New psychological perspectives* (pp. 28-57). Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons Inc.
- Brown, E.M. (1991). *Patterns of infidelity and their treatment*. New York: Brunner/Mazel.
- Buglass, P., Clarke, J., Henderson, A.S., & Presley, A.S. (1977). A study on agoraphobic housewives. *Psychological Medicine*, 7, 73-86.
- Burn, S.M., & Ward, A.Z. (2005). Men's conformity to traditional masculinity and relationship satisfaction. *Psychology of Men and Masculinity*, 6, 254-263.

- Buss, A.H., & Perry, M. (1992). The aggression questionnaire. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *63*, 452-459.
- Buss, D.M. (1991). Conflict in married couples: Personality predictors of anger and upset. *Journal of Personality*, *59*, 663-687.
- Buss, D.M., & Schmidt, D.P. (1993). Sexual strategies theory: An evolutionary perspective on human mating. *Psychological Review*, *100*, 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.
- Buunk, B. (1980). Extramarital sex in the Netherlands. *Alternative Lifestyles*, *3*, 11-39.
- Caldwell, L.D., & White, J.L. (2005). African-centered therapeutic and counseling interventions for African-American Males. In G.E. Good & G.R. Brooks (Eds.) *The new handbook of psychotherapy and counseling with men* (pp.323-336). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Cano, A., & O'Leary, K.D. (2000). Infidelity and separations precipitate major depressive episodes and symptoms of nonspecific depression and anxiety. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, *68*, 774-781.
- Cano, A., O'Leary, K.D., & Heinz, W. (2004). Short-term consequences of severe marital stressors. *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology*, *20*, 24-40.
- Casas, J.M, Turner, J.A., & Ruiz de Esparza, C.A. (2005). Machismo revisited in a time of crisis: Implications for understanding and counseling Hispanic men. In G.E. Good & G.R. Brooks (Eds.) *The new handbook of psychotherapy and counseling with men* (pp.337-356). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- 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.
- Choi, K.H., Catania, J.A., & Dolcini, M.M. (1994). Extramarital sex and HIV risk behavior among US adults: Results from the National AIDS Behavioral Survey. *American Journal of Public Health*, *84*, 2003-2007.
- Christian-Herman, J., O'Leary, K.D., & Avery-Leaf, L. (2002). The impact of negative events in marriage on depression. *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology*, *20*, 23-40.
- Cochran, J.K., Chamlin, M.B., Beeghley, L., & Fenwick, M. (2004). Religion, religiosity, and nonmarital sexual conduct: An application of reference group theory. *Sociological Inquiry*, *74*, 102-127.

- Cooper, M.L., Russell, M., Skinner, J.B., Frone, M.R., and Mudar, P (1992). Stress and alcohol use: Moderating effects of gender, coping, and alcohol expectancies. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 101*, 139-152.
- Cournoyer, R.J., & Mahalik, J.R. (1995). Cross-sectional study of gender role conflict examining college-aged and middle aged men. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 42*, 11-19.
- Eisler, R.M. (1995). The relationship between masculine gender role stress and men's health risk: The validation of a construct. In R.F. Levant & W.S. Pollack (Eds.), *A new psychology of men* (pp. 207-225). New York: Basic Books.
- Eisler, R.M., & Skidmore, J.R. (1987). Masculine gender role strain: Scale development and component factors in the appraisal of stressful situations: *Behavior Modification, 11*, 123-136.
- Epstein, N.B. (2005). Extramarital involvement: A core relationship issue in need of a coherent model, comprehensive research, and empirically based intervention. *Clinical Psychology: Science and Practice, 12*, 139-143.
- Finn, J. (1986). The relationship between sex role attitudes and attitudes supporting marital violence. *Sex Roles, 14*, 235-244.
- Fischer, A. R., & Good, G. E. (1997). Masculine gender roles, recognition of emotions, and interpersonal intimacy. *Psychotherapy, 34*, 160-170.
- Forste, R., & Tanfer, K. (1996). Sexual exclusivity among dating, cohabiting, and married women. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 58*, 33-47.
- Fragoso, J. M., & Kashubeck, S. (2000). Machismo, gender role conflict, and mental health in Mexican American men. *Psychology of Men and Masculinity, 1*, 87-97.
- Frankenstein, W., Hay, W.M., & Nathan, P.E. (1985). Effects of intoxication on alcoholics' marital communication and problem solving. *Journal of Studies on Alcohol, 46*, 1-6.
- Franchina, J. J., Eisler, R. M., & Moore, T. M. (2001). Masculine gender role stress and intimate abuse: Effects of masculine gender relevance of dating situations and female threat on men's attributions and affective responses. *Psychology of Men and Masculinity, 2*, 34-41.
- Gagnon, J. (1999). Sexual conduct: as today's memory serves, *Sexualities, 2*, 115-126.

- Glass, S.P. (1981). Sex differences in the relationship between satisfaction with various aspects of marriage and types of extramarital involvement (Doctoral dissertation, The Catholic University of America, 1981). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 41, 3889.
- Glass, S.P. (2003). *Not "just friends": Protect your relationship from infidelity and heal the trauma of betrayal*. New York: Free Press.
- Glass, S.P., & Wright, T.L. (1985). Sex differences in type of extramarital involvement and marital dissatisfaction. *Sex Roles*, 12, 1104-1120.
- Glass, S.P., & Wright, T.L. (1988). Clinical implications of research on extramarital involvement. In R.A. Brown & J.R. Field (Eds.), *Treatment of sexual problems in individual and couples therapy* (pp. 301-346). New York: PMA.
- 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.
- Good, G. E., & Mintz, L. B. (1990). Gender role conflict and depression in college men: Evidence for compounded risk. *Journal of Counseling & Development*, 69, 17-21.
- Good, G. E., Robertson, J.M., Fitzgerald, L.F., Stevens, M., & Bartels, K.M. (1996). The relations between masculine role conflict and psychological distress in male university counseling center clients. *Journal of Counseling and Development*, 75, 44-49.
- Good, G. E., & Sherrod, N. (1997). Men's resolution of non-relational sex across the lifespan. In R. Levant & G. Brooks (Eds.), *Men and sex: New psychological perspectives* (pp. 182-204). New York: Wiley.
- Good, G. E., Sherrod, N., & Dillon, M. (2000). Masculine gender role stressors and men's health. In R. Eisler & M. Hersen (Eds.), *Handbook of gender, culture, and health* (pp. 63-81). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Good, G. E., & Wood, P. K. (1995). Male gender role conflict, depression, and help-seeking: Do college men face double jeopardy? *Journal of Counseling and Development*, 74, 70-75.
- Gordon, K.C., & Baucom, D. H. (1999). A multitheoretical intervention for promoting recovery from extramarital affairs. *Clinical Psychology: Science and Practice*, 6, 382-399.
- Gordon, K.C., Baucom, D.H., & Snyder, D.K. (2004). An integrative intervention for promoting recovery from extramarital affairs. *Journal of Marital and Family Therapy*, 30, 213-231.

- Greeley, A.M. (1991). *Faithful attraction*. New York: A. Tom Doherty Associates Book.
- Greeley, A. (1994). Marital infidelity. *Society*, 31, 9-13.
- Greiling, H., & Buss, D.M. (2000). Women's sexual strategies: The hidden dimension of extra-pair mating. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 28, 929-963.
- Haldeman, D.C. (2005). Psychotherapy with gay and bisexual men. In G.E. Good & G.R. Brooks (Eds.) *The new handbook of psychotherapy and counseling with men* (pp.369-383). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Halford, W.K., & Bouma, R. (1997). Individual psychotherapy and marital distress. In W.K. Halford & H.J. Markman (Eds.), *Clinical handbook of marriage and couples intervention* (pp 291-321). New York: Wiley.
- Hansen, G.I. (1987). Extradyadic relations during courtship. *Journal of Sex Research*, 23, 382-390.
- Harris, C.R. (2000). Psychophysiological responses to imagined infidelity: The specific innate modular view of jealousy reconsidered. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 78, 1082-1091.
- Harrison, J. (1995). Roles, identities, and sexual orientation: Homosexuality, heterosexuality, and bisexuality. In R.F. Levant & W.S. Pollack (Eds.), *A new psychology of men* (pp. 359-382). New York: Basic Books.
- Hicks, T.V., & Leitenberg, H. (2001). Sexual fantasies about one's partner versus someone else: Gender differences in incidence and frequency. *The Journal of Sex Research*, 38, 43-50.
- Hurlbert, D.F. (1992). Factors influencing a woman's decision to end an extramarital sexual relationship. *Journal of Sex and Marital Therapy*, 18, 104-113.
- Hurlbert, D.F., Apt, C., Gasar, S., Wilson, N.E., & Murphy, Y. (1994). Sexual narcissism: a validation study. *Journal of Sex and Marital Therapy*, 20, 24-34.
- Johnson, R.D. (1970). Extramarital sexual intercourse: A methodological note. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 32, 279-282.
- Kaslow, F. (1993). Attraction and affairs: Fabulous and fatal. *Journal of Family Psychotherapy*, 4, 1-34.
- Kimmel, M.S. (1996). *Manhood in America: A cultural history*. New York: Free Press.

- Kimmel, M.S., & Messner, M. (1989). Introduction. In M.S. Kimmel & M. Messner (Eds.), *Men's lives* (pp. 1-14). New York: Macmillian.
- Kinsey, A.C., Pomeroy, W.B., & Martin, C.E. (1948). *Sexual behavior in the human male*. Philadelphia: Saunders.
- Kinsey, A.C., Pomeroy, W.B., & Martin, C.E., & Gebhard, P.H. (1953). *Sexual behavior in the human female*. Philadelphia: Saunders.
- Kleiner, L., & Marshall, W.L. (1987). The role of interpersonal problems in the development of agoraphobia with panic attacks. *Journal of Anxiety Disorders, 1*, 313-323.
- Laumann, E.O., Gagnon, J.H., Michael, R.T., & Michaels, S. (1994). *The social organization of sexuality: Sexual practices in the United States*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Lazur, R.F., & Majors, R. (1995). Men of color: Ethnocultural variations of male gender role strain. In R.F. Levant & W.S. Pollack (Eds.), *A new psychology of men* (pp. 337-358). New York: Basic Books.
- Leitenberg, H., & Henning, K. (1995). Sexual fantasy. *Psychological Bulletin, 117*, 469-496.
- Lemle, R., & Mishkind, M. E. (1989). Alcohol and masculinity. *Journal of Substance Abuse Treatment, 6*, 213-222.
- Levant, R. (1995). Toward the reconstruction of masculinity. In Levant, R., & Pollack, W.S. (Eds.), *A new psychology of men* (pp. 229-251). New York; Basic Books.
- Levant, R.F. (1997). Nonrelational sexuality in men. In R.F. Levant & G.R. Brooks (Eds.) *Men and sex: New psychological perspectives* (pp. 9-27). Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons Inc.
- Levant, R.F., & Brooks, G. R. (1997). Men and the problem of Nonrelational sex. In R.F. Levant & G.R. Brooks (Eds.), *Men and sex: New psychological perspectives* (1-8). Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons Inc.
- Levant, R.F., Hirsch, L.S., Celentano, E., Cozza, T.M., Hill, S., MacEachern, M., et al. (1992). The male role: An investigation of contemporary norms. *Journal of Mental Health Counseling, 14*, 325-337.
- Lieberman, B. (1988). Extramarital intercourse: Attitudes toward a neglected sexual behavior. *Journal of Sex Research, 24*, 291-299.

- Litweka, J. (1974). The socialized penis. *Liberation*, 18, 61-69.
- Liu, W.M., Iwamoto, D.K. (2007). Conformity to masculine norms, Asian values, coping strategies, peer group influences and substance use among Asian American men. *Psychology of Men and Masculinity*, 8, 25-39.
- Lusterman, D. (1997). Repetitive infidelity, womanizing and Don Juanism. In R.F. Levant & G.R. Brooks (Eds.), *Men and sex; New psychological perspectives* (pp. 84-99). New York: Wiley.
- Mahalik, J. R. (2000). Gender role conflict in men as a predictor of self-ratings of behavior on the interpersonal circle. *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology*, 19, 276-292.
- Mahalik, J. R., Cournoyer, R. J., DeFranc, W., Cherry, M., & Napolitano, J. M. (1998). Men's gender role conflict and use of psychological defenses. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 45, 247-255.
- Mahalik, J.R., Good, G.E., & Englar-Carlson, M. (2003). Masculinity scripts, presenting concerns, and help seeking: Implications for practice and training. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice*, 34, 123-131.
- Mahalik, J.R., Lagan, H.D., & Morrison, J.A. (2006). Health behaviors and masculinity in Kenyan and U.S. male college students. *Psychology of Men and Masculinity*, 7, 191-202.
- Mahalik, J.R., Locke, B.D., Ludlow, L.H., Diemer, M.A., Scott, R.P.J., Gottfried, M., and Freitas, G. (2003). Development of the conformity to masculine norms inventory. *Psychology of Men and Masculinity*, 4, 3-25.
- Mahalik, J.R., & Rochlen, A.B. (2006). Men's likely responses to clinical depression: What are they and do masculinity norms predict them? *Sex Roles*, 55, 659-667.
- Martin, G.L. (1989). Relationship, romance, and sexual addiction in extramarital affairs. *Journal of Psychology and Christianity*, 8, 5-25.
- McCullough, M.E., Worthington, E.L., Jr., & Rachel, K.C. (1997). Interpersonal forgiving in close relationships. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 73, 321-336.
- McCreary, D.R., & Sasse, D.K. (2000). An exploration of the drive for masculinity in adolescent boys and girls. *Journal of American College Health*, 48, 297-304.
- Michael, R.T., Gagnon, J. H., Laumann, E.O., & Kolata, G. (1994). *Sex in America: A definitive survey*. Boston: Little, Brown.

- Morawski, J.G. (1985). The measurement of masculinity and femininity: Engendering categorical realities. *Journal of Personality, 53*, 196-223.
- Neubeck, G., & Schletzer, V. M. (1962). A study of extramarital relationships. *Marriage and Family Living, 24*, 279-281.
- Oliver, M.B., & Hyde, J.S. (1993). Gender differences in sexuality: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin, 114*, 29-51.
- O'Leary, K.D. (2005). Commentary on intrapersonal, interpersonal, and contextual factors in extramarital involvement. *Clinical Psychology: Science and Practice, 12*, 131-133.
- O'Neil, J. (1981). Patterns of gender role conflict and strain: Sexism and fear of femininity in men's lives. *Personnel & Guidance Journal, 60*, 203-210.
- O'Neil, J.M. (2002). *Twenty years of gender-role conflict research: Summary of 130 studies*. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Psychological Association, Chicago, IL.
- O'Neil, J.M., Helms, B.J., Gable, R.K., David, L., & Wrightsman, L.S. (1986). Gender Role Conflict Scale: College men's fear of femininity. *Sex Roles, 28*, 335-350.
- O'Neil, J.M., Good, G.E., and Holmes, S. (1995). Fifteen years of theory and research on men's gender role conflict. In R.F. Levant & W.S. Pollack (Eds.), *A new psychology of men* (pp. 165-206). New York: Basic Books.
- Orzeck, T., & Lung, E. (2005). Big-five personality differences of cheaters and non-cheaters. *Current Psychology: Developmental, Learning, Personality, 24*, 274-286.
- Penn, C.D., Hernandez, S.L., & Bermudez, J.M. (1997). Using a cross-cultural perspective to understand infidelity in couples therapy. *The American Journal of Family Therapy, 25*, 169-185.
- Pestrack, V.A., Martin, D., & Martin, M. (1985). Extramarital sex: An examination of the literature. *International Journal of Family Therapy, 7*, 107-115.
- Philpot, C.L. (2005). Family therapy for men. In G.E. Good & G.R. Brooks (Eds.), *The new handbook of psychotherapy and counseling with men: A comprehensive guide to settings, problems, and treatment approaches* (pp278-288). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Pleck, J.H. (1981). *The myth of masculinity*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

- Pleck, J.H. (1995). Gender role strain paradigm: An update. In R.F. Levant & W.S. Pollack (Eds.), *A new psychology of men* (pp. 11-32). New York: Basic Books.
- Pleck, J.H., Sonenstein, F.L., & Ku, L.C. (1993). Attitudes toward male roles: A discriminant validity analysis. *Sex Roles, 30*, 481-501.
- Pollack, W. (1998). *Real boys: Rescuing our sons from the myths of boyhood*. New York: Random House.
- Pratto, F., Sidanius, J., Stallworth, L.M., & Malle, B.F. (1994). Social dominance orientation: A personality variable predicting social and political attitudes. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 67*, 741-763.
- Prins, K.S., Buunk, B.P., & Van Yperen, N.W. (1993). Equity, normative disapproval, and extramarital relationships. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 10*, 39-53.
- Reiss, I.L., Anderson, R., & Sponaugle, G.C. (1980). A multivariate model of the determinants of extramarital sexual permissiveness. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 42*, 395-411.
- Rochlen, A.B., & Mahalik, J.R. (2004). Women's perceptions of male partners' gender role conflict as predictors of psychological well-being and relationship satisfaction. *Psychology of Men and Masculinity, 5*, 147-157.
- Rotundo, E.A. (1993). *American manhood: Transformations in masculinity from the revolution to the modern era*. New York: Basic Books.
- Sharpe, M. J., & Heppner, P. P. (1991). Gender role, gender role conflict, and psychological well-being in men. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 38*, 323-330.
- Simonsen, G., Blazina, C., & Watkins, E., Jr. (2000). Gender role conflict and psychological well-being among gay men. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 47*, 85-89.
- Smiler, A.P. (2004). Thirty years after the discovery of gender: Psychological concept and measures of masculinity. *Sex Roles, 50*, 15-26.
- Smiler, A.P. (2006). Conforming to masculine norms: Evidence for validity among adult men and women. *Sex Roles, 54*, 767-775.
- Smith, T.W. (1994). Attitudes toward sexual permissiveness: Trends, correlates, and behavioral connections. In A.S. Rossi (Ed.), *Sexuality across the life course* (pp. 63-97). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

- South, S.J., & Lloyd, K.M. (1995). Spousal alternatives and marital dissolution. *American Sociological Review*, 60, 21-35.
- Spanier, G.B., & Margolis, R.L. (1983). Marital separation and extramarital sexual behavior. *Journal of Sex Research*, 19, 23-48.
- Spence, J.T., & Helmreich, R.L. (1980). Masculine instrumentality and feminine expressiveness: Their relationship with sex-role attitudes and behaviors. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 5, 147-163.
- Stearns, P.N. (1994). *American cool: Constructing a twentieth-century emotional style*. New York: New York University Press.
- Stillson, R.W., O'Neil, J.M., & Owen, S.V. (1991). Predictors of adult men's gender-role conflict: Race, class, unemployment, age, instrumentality-expressiveness, and personal strain. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 38, 48-464.
- Straus, M.A. (1964). Measuring families. In T. Christensen (Ed.), *Handbook of marriage and the family* (pp. 335-400). Chicago: Rand McNally and Company.
- Sue, D. (2005). Asian American masculinity and therapy: The concept of masculinity in Asian American males. In G.E. Good & G.R. Brooks (Eds.) *The new handbook of psychotherapy and counseling with men* (pp.357-368). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Tager, D., & Good, G. E. (2006). Italian and American masculinities: A comparison of masculine gender role norms. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity*, 6 , 264-274.
- Thompkins, C. D., & Rando, R. A. (2003). Gender role conflict and shame in college men. *Psychology of Men and Masculinity*, 4, 79-81.
- Thompson, A.P. (1983). Extramarital sex: A review of research literature. *Journal of Sex Research*, 19, 1-22.
- Thompson, A.P. (1984a). Emotional and sexual components of extramarital relations. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 46, 35-42.
- Thompson, A.P. (1984b). Extramarital sexual crisis: Common themes and therapy implications. *Journal of Sex and Marital Therapy*, 10, 239-254.
- Thompson, E.H., & Pleck, J.H. (1986). The structure of male role norms. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 29, 531-543.
- Thompson, E.H., & Pleck, J.H. (1995). Masculinity ideologies: A review of research instrumentation on men and masculinities. In R.F. Levant & W.S. Pollack (Eds.) *A new psychology of men* (pp. 129-163). New York: Basic Books.

- Treas, J., & Giesen, D. (2000). Sexual infidelity among married and cohabitating Americans. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 62, 48-60.
- Vandello, J.A., & Cohen, D. (2003). Male honor and female fidelity: Implicit cultural scripts that perpetuate domestic violence. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 84, 997-1010.
- Vass, J. S., & Gold, S. R. (1995). Effects of feedback on emotion in hypermasculine males. *Violence and Victims*, 10, 217-226.
- Villemez, W. J., & Touhey, J.C. (1977). A measure of individual differences in sex stereotyping and sex discrimination: The Macho Scale. *Psychological Reports*, 41, 411-415.
- Wade, J. C. (1996). African American men's gender role conflict: The significance of racial identity. *Sex Roles*, 34, 17-33.
- Wade, J.C. (1998). Male reference group identity dependence: A theory of male identity. *Counseling Psychologist*, 26, 49-383.
- Weis, D.L., & Felton, J.R. (1987). Marital exclusivity and the potential for marital conflict. *Social Work*, 32, 45-49.
- Weis, D.L., Rabinowitz, B., & Ruckstuhl, M.F. (1992). Individual changes in sexual attitudes and behavior within college-level human sexuality courses. *The Journal of Sex Research*, 29, 43-59.
- Weis, D.L., & Slosnerick, M. (1981). Attitudes toward sexual and nonsexual extramarital involvements among a sample of college students. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 43, 349-358.
- Weis, D.L., Slosnerick, M., Cate, R., & Sollie, D.L. (1986). A survey instrument for assessing the cognitive association of sex, love, and marriage. *Journal of Sex Research*, 22, 206-220.
- Weisbuch, M., Beal, D., & O'Neal, E.C. (1999). How masculine ought I be? Men's masculinity and aggression. *Sex Roles*, 40, 583-592.
- Wenzlaff, R.M., & Wegner, D.M. (2000). Thought suppression. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 51, 59-91.
- Whisman, M.A., & Bruce, M.L. (1999). Marital dissatisfaction and incidence of major depressive episode in a community sample. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, 108, 674-678.

- Whisman, M.A., Dixon, A.E., & Johnson, B. (1997). Therapists' perspectives of couple problems and treatment issues in couple therapy. *Journal of Family Psychology, 11*, 361-366.
- Wiederman, M.W. (1997). Extramarital sex: Prevalence and correlations in a national survey. *Journal of Sex Research, 34*, 167-174.
- 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.
- Wiederman, M.W. & Hurd, C. (1999). Extradyadic involvement during dating. *Journal of Social Relationships and Personal Relationships, 16*, 265-274.
- Wiggins, J.D., & Lederer, D.A. (1984). Differential antecedents of infidelity in marriage. *American Mental Health Counselors Association Journal, 6*, 152-161.
- Worth, H., Reid, A., & McMillian, K. (2002). Somewhere over the rainbow: Love, trust, and monogamy in gay relationships. *Journal of Sociology, 38*, 237-253.
- Wright, R. (1994). *The moral animal: The new science of evolutionary psychology*. New York: Pantheon Books.