To the Graduate Council:

I am submitting herewith a thesis written by Rebecca E. Furr entitled "Infidelity in Adolescent Romantic Relationships." I have examined the final electronic copy of this thesis for form and content and recommend that it be accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts, with a major in Psychology.

Deborah P. Welsh
Major Professor

We have read this thesis
and recommend its acceptance:

Robert G. Wahler

Kristina Coop Gordon

Accepted for the Council:

Anne Mayhew
Vice Chancellor and
Dean of Graduate Studies

(Original signatures are on file with official student records.)

INFIDELITY IN ADOLESCENT ROMANTIC RELATIONSHIPS

A Thesis

Presented for the

Master of Arts

Degree

University of Tennessee, Knoxville

Rebecca E. Furr

August 2006

DEDICATION

This thesis is dedicated to my parents,

Walter L. Furr III and Judith H. Furr,

who taught me the value of education,

who always believed in me,

and

who encouraged me to ask more questions.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I wish to acknowledge all those who helped me throughout this process. I thank my advisor and mentor Dr. Deborah Welsh for her support and guidance. I also thank Drs. Kristina Coop Gordon and Robert Wahler for serving on my committee and offering invaluable suggestions. In addition, this thesis would not have been possible without the countless hours of data collection and collaborative support of several lab members including the following: Cathy Grello, Peter Haugen, Sharon Risch, Joseph Dickson, Laura Widman, and Katie Little.

I also would like to acknowledge those who have supported me emotionally throughout this process. I would like to thank my family for their encouragement, including my parents, my two beautiful sisters, Mary and Cindy, my brother-in-law, Oren, and my grandfather, Charles Hendricks. I also thank my adopted family in Knoxville: Michael Webb and Nikki Frousakis, who make my heart laugh and have shown me unconditional love and support for the past few years.

ABSTRACT

Infidelity within adolescent dating relationships is a commonplace behavior that has received very little empirical attention. The present study examines multiple facets of this behavior in a sample of 209 middle and late adolescent couples. An ecological model is used to explore factors related to the individual, relationship, and context in both cross-sectional and longitudinal analyses. While multiple variables on all of these levels were significant in cross-sectional analysis, a few stood out as being important predictors of infidelity over time. In particular, participants who had a higher opinion of their own physical attractiveness were more likely to cheat at Time 2. In addition, participants' reports of more externalizing and depressive symptoms at Time 1 predicted their partner's infidelity over time. Longitudinal outcomes of infidelity included lower relationship satisfaction over time for those who had cheated on their partner at Time 1. Curiously, those whose partners had cheated on them at Time 1 experienced an *increase* in self-worth over time. Discussion explores infidelity within the developmental context and across multiple ecological levels.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER PAGE

1 INTRODUCTION 1

An Ecological Approach....3

Goals for the Present Study 7

Questions 9

2 METHODS 11

Participants....11

Measures 12

Demographics 12

Sexual Behaviors 13

Internalizing and Externalizing....13

Depressive Symptomatology 14

Alcohol and Drug Use 14

Self-Worth 15

Gender-Role Orientation....15

Relationship Length....16

Relationship Status 16

Relationship Satisfaction 16

Communication....17

Aggression 17

Trust 18

Friends' and Parents' Regard 18

3 RESULTS 20

Descriptive Statistics 20

Analyses 21

Variables Related to the Partner Engaging in Infidelity 21

Variables Related to the Injured Partner 22

Variables Related to the Relationship 24

Variables Related to the Context 26

4 DISCUSSION 27

Analyses 27

Variables Related to the Partner Engaging in Infidelity 28

Variables Related to the Injured Partner 32

Variables Related to the Relationship 32

Variables Related to the Context 35

Limitations and Future Research 35

Conclusion 36

REFERENCES 38

APPENDICES 47

VITA 53

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE PAGE

A-1 HLM Analysis Predicting Infidelity at Time 1 from Variables at Time 1 48

A-2 HLM Analyses Predicting Infidelity at Time 2 from Individual Variables at Time 1 Using All Follow-Up Participants 49

A-3 HLM Analyses Predicting Infidelity at Time 2 from Relationship and Context Variables at Time 1 Using Follow-Up Participants Still Dating Original Partner at Time 2 50

A-4 HLM Analyses of Infidelity at Time 1 Predicting Outcomes at Time 2 Using All Follow-Up Participants 51

A-5 HLM Analyses of Infidelity at Time 1 Predicting Outcomes at Time 2 Using Follow-Up Participants Still Dating Original Partner at Time 2 51

A-6 Linear Regression Predicting Self Worth at Time 2 from Infidelity at Time 1 Using Follow-Up Participants Who Broke Up with Original Partner 52

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Recent research in adolescent romantic relationships has shown how important these relationships are for this life stage, and has explored such aspects as relationship satisfaction, sexuality and communication patterns. One aspect that has largely been neglected in this field is the study of infidelity in adolescence. While marital infidelity has been studied a great deal, the research on cheating in adolescent dating relationships has been relatively limited. As children develop into adolescents, they become involved in romantic relationships and for the first time in their development are met with the cultural expectation to be "faithful" or exclusive to one individual. The negotiation of this fidelity can be a new challenge in this already confusing and turbulent time.

It is important to study infidelity in adolescent dating relationships for various reasons. First, research on the prevalence of infidelity within dating relationships has shown this to be a surprisingly commonplace behavior in late adolescence (Feldman & Cauffman, 1999a; Hansen, 1987; Knox, Zusman, Kaluzny, & Sturdivant, 2000; Roscoe, Cavanaugh, & Kennedy, 1988; Yarab, Sensibaugh, & Allgeier, 1998). Approximately 40% to 60% of late adolescents admit to having cheated on a dating partner at some point, depending on the definition of infidelity. Not surprisingly, prevalence rates are higher when the cheating behavior entails behaviors such as kissing or dating another person, and lower when it is strictly limited to sexual

intercourse. Thus, the majority of late adolescents have experienced some form of infidelity at some point in their dating history. Feldman and Cauffman (1999a) found that two-thirds of their undergraduate participants had been involved in a romantic relationship in which infidelity had occurred, either as the perpetrator or as the aggrieved.

Clearly infidelity is experienced by many adolescents within their romantic relationships. As such, this behavior must be studied if we are to better understand the complexities of these relationships, as well as comprehend the experiences of the developing adolescent. Infidelity in dating relationships may have detrimental effects on the adolescents who experience it. There is much evidence that infidelity within marriages can negatively impact both the individual as well as the relationship (Cano & O'Leary, 2000; Glass & Wright, 1997; Gordon & Baucom, 1999). Much is still unknown about how infidelity in dating relationships impacts adolescents. There is limited support that infidelity in dating relationships is associated with lower self-esteem (Sheppard, Nelson, & Andreoli-Mathie, 1995). Considering the extent to which this behavior occurs in adolescence, more must be done to understand the nature of dating infidelity.

Dating infidelity has received very little attention thus far in spite of the fact that it is a commonplace behavior that may have negative individual and relational consequences. In addition, all prior research on dating infidelity has been limited to studying this behavior within college-age populations only. While a few of these studies frame their research in a developmental context and label the research in terms of examining late adolescent infidelity (Feldman & Cauffman, 1999a; Feldman

& Cauffman, 1999b; Feldman, Cauffman, Jensen, & Arnett, 2000; Roscoe, Cavanaugh, & Kennedy, 1988), the majority simply describe their findings as relevant to dating relationships. No published study on dating infidelity has included an examination of younger adolescents.

In addition, prior research has been further limited in that some studies have included only college students' attitudes towards hypothetical cheating rather than actual infidelity (Feldman, Cauffman, Jensen, & Arnett, 2000; Liebermann, 1988; Yarab, Allgeier, & Sensibaugh, 1999). In general, it has been found that infidelity in adolescent dating relationships is considered unacceptable behavior to a majority of adolescents. Liebermann (1988) found that seventy percent of college students disapproved of sexual infidelity outside a committed dating relationship. While unacceptable, however, it is considered more acceptable to late adolescents than marital infidelity (Liebermann, 1988; Sheppard, Nelson, & Adreoli-Mathie, 1995). Additionally, the betrayal of a friend's confidence is looked upon more negatively by late adolescents than sexual infidelity by a romantic partner (Feldman, Cauffman, Jensen & Arnett, 2000). Not surprisingly, sexual behavior outside a primary dating relationship that is exclusive is considered more unacceptable than sex outside a less committed, or open, relationship (Yarab, Allgeier, & Sensibaugh, 1999).

An Ecological Approach

We use an ecological framework to guide our investigation of adolescent infidelity. An ecological framework takes into account characteristics of the developing individual interacting within important relational contexts

(Bronfenbrenner, 1979). In a recent review of marital infidelity, an organizational framework was proposed that is similar to Bronfenbrenner's ecological model. Allen, et al. (2005) proposed a model for infidelity research that encourages the examination of variables related to the "perpetrator", to the "injured" partner, to the relationship, as well as to the greater context.

The ecological approach is an excellent conceptual model for investing adolescent infidelity because it takes into account factors beyond those of the individual. Researchers have begun to explore individual characteristics associated with engaging in infidelity such as individuals' personality characteristics (Barta & Kiene, 2005), and self-esteem (Sheppard, Nelson, & Andreoli-Mathie, 1995). In addition, other characteristics such as sexual permissiveness (Feldman & Cauffman, 1999b, Hansen, 1987; Seal, Agostinelli, & Hannett, 1994) and an accepting attitude towards infidelity have been linked with cheating behavior (Feldman & Cauffman, 1999b; Hansen, 1987).

Hansen (1987) found that in female undergraduates, greater religiosity was predictive of less infidelity and those with a nontraditional gender-role orientation were more likely to report cheating behavior. In a separate study, higher sexual-sensation seeking, a "luduc" (or game-playing) love style, and a self-perceived ability to deceive were predictive of being unfaithful (Wiederman & Hurd, 1999). Feldman and Cauffman (1999b) found that early onset of sex and an avoidant attachment style were both positively associated with dating infidelity. Late adolescents have listed the influence of alcohol or drugs as a reason for their own infidelity (Feldman and Cauffman, 1999a). In yet another undergraduate study, self esteem was lower for

individuals who had engaged in infidelity compared to those who had not (Sheppard, Nelson, & Andreoli-Mathie, 1995).

Gender has been explored as a predictor of infidelity in dating relationships, as well, although there are contradictory findings. Some studies have found that males are more likely to be unfaithful in their dating relationships than females (Hansen, 1987; Sheppard, Nelson, & Andreoli-Mathie, 1995; Wiederman & Hurd, 1999). Similarly, Seal, Agostinelli, and Hannett (1994) found that males indicated greater willingness to cheat on their dating partner. Interestingly, however, they found no gender differences in a behavioral measure of infidelity. Feldman & Cauffman (1999a) also found no gender differences in infidelity. Still other studies have found that females are more likely to be unfaithful in dating relationships (Drigotas, Safstrom, & Gentilia, 1999; Thompson & Zurbriggen, 2006).

Some of the factors related to the individual that are associated with infidelity are seen as problematic. An avoidant attachment style and low self esteem, for example, are certainly not seen as carrying positive psychological benefits. These associations are not particularly surprising in light of the fact that infidelity is seen as an unacceptable behavior. In addition, it makes sense that certain traits related to sexuality, such as sexual permissiveness, acceptance of infidelity, and sexual sensation-seeking are related to infidelity. Early onset of sex has typically been seen as associated with other negative variables such as drug use and trouble in school (Conley, 1999; Little & Rankin, 2001). There has been no examination thus far of the impact that age plays in infidelity. Infidelity may have very different

consequences and meaning for younger adolescents than for late adolescents or adults.

There has also been no examination within the dating infidelity literature of variables related to the injured partner. While there has been limited examination even within the marital literature of characteristics of the partner who is cheated on (Buss, 1991; Buunk, 1980), this is still a worthy avenue of investigation. As Allen and her colleagues (2005) describe, investigating variables related to the injured partner may provide a more nuanced understanding of the context in which infidelity takes place. While it should not be concluded that the injured partner has caused the infidelity to occur, characteristics of the injured partner influence the primary dating relationship, and should be taken into consideration.

While examining these individual factors is important in comprehending infidelity, researchers must go beyond the individual in order to understand the complexities of this behavior. A few studies have examined variables relevant to the unfaithful partner's dating relationship. Lower relationship commitment has been shown to predict infidelity in dating relationships (Drigotas, Safstrom, & Gentilia, 1999), as has lower sexual satisfaction (Oikle, 2003). Finally, Hansen (1987) found that for male participants, relationship length was positively associated with infidelity.

Clearly satisfaction with various aspects of the relationship, commitment to the relationship, and relationship length affect likelihood of infidelity. Other relational factors such as physical aggression in the relationship and communication with ones partner may significantly impact infidelity as well. Within the context of

marriage, infidelity and aggression are associated (Daly & Wilson, 1988; Jankowiak, Nell, & Buckmaster, 2002), and it has been suggested that communication deficits contribute to infidelity (Vangelisti & Gerstenberger, 2004). While these relationship factors have been examined in marital infidelity, they have not been explored as part of dating infidelity. In addition, trust is another variable that has not been examined as it relates to dating infidelity that will be explored in the current study.

There have been no published studies that examine how contextual variables outside the relationship impact infidelity within dating relationships. As part of an ecological framework, it is important to explore characteristics of the greater context. Again, marital researchers have examined contextual variables such as how couples' social network, including peers and family, predict infidelity. Specifically, it has been shown that spouses who like each other's friends and families are less likely to cheat (Treas & Giesen, 2000). Variables pertaining to the participants' larger social sphere should also be examined in relation to adolescent dating infidelity, particularly because family and friendships play such a large role in adolescence (Collins & Laursen, 1999).

Goals for the Present Study

Considering the research that has been conducted on dating relationships thus far, there are four main goals of the present study. The first is to examine infidelity in adolescent dating relationships within a framework that lends itself to studying this behavior from an ecological perspective. Urie Bronfenbrenner (1979) proposed that across lifespan development, one should examine variables that are related to the

individual as well as the larger context or environment. Similarly, Allen and her colleagues (2005) emphasized the need to study variables related to the "perpetrator", to the "injured" partner, to the relationship, as well as to the greater context. The present study will examine variables on each of these levels as they relate to dating infidelity in order to gain a more comprehensive understanding of this behavior.

The second major goal of the current study is to examine adolescent dating infidelity from a developmental perspective. This fits well with the ecological perspective because of Bronfenbrenner's emphasis on development. Studies conducted thus far have examined infidelity only in late adolescence (i.e., college students), the majority of which have not taken a developmental approach. The current study seeks to examine a wider range of adolescence, including both middle and late adolescents. In addition, this study will explore possible similarities and differences between middle and late adolescents in terms of infidelity.

The third goal of the study is to examine infidelity within the context of the couple. Published studies of dating infidelity thus far have failed to examine both partners in a relationship, relying on one individual's report of past or present relationships. The advantage of the present study is that both partners' perspectives are taken into account in the examination of infidelity. This is an important aspect of dating infidelity that has largely been ignored, and much important information can be gleaned with both partners' reports.

Finally, the fourth goal is to study infidelity longitudinally. The majority of the studies on dating infidelity have been cross-sectional, with a few exceptions. In a two-wave study, Drigotas, Safstrom, and Gentilia (1999) found that lower

relationship commitment predicted both emotional and physical infidelity. In another longitudinal study, Oikle (2003) found that lower sexual satisfaction and relationship commitment at Time 1 were predictive of later infidelity. While cross-sectional research has been instrumental in exploring dating infidelity thus far, longitudinal research can give a more complete picture of this behavior. In particular, it is the goal of the present study to examine both predictors and outcomes of infidelity over time.

Questions

Given the goals of the current study, four main questions will be explored. Each of these questions explore possible developmental differences of variables across different ecological levels. In addition, all questions are examined cross-sectionally and longitudinally, and take into account both couple members' perspectives when appropriate.

1. *What individual characteristics are related to engaging in infidelity in adolescent romantic relationships?* Specifically, we will examine age, gender, externalizing and internalizing symptoms, depressive symptoms, self worth, alcohol and drug use during sex, and gender-role orientation.

2. *Are characteristics of the injured partner related to partner's infidelity?* Age, gender, externalizing and internalizing symptoms, depressive symptoms, self worth, and gender-role orientation will be explored in examining those individuals who have been cheated on.

3. *What characteristics of the adolescent romantic relationship are related to infidelity?* We will examine relationship length, relationship satisfaction, communication, trust, and physical aggression as they pertain to infidelity.

4. *Are characteristics of the context outside of the relationship related to infidelity?* In particular, do friends' and parents' regard for the participant's partner predict infidelity?

CHAPTER 2

METHODS

Participants

This study was a part of the Study of Tennessee Adolescent Romantic Relationships (STARR) project. Participants were recruited from a previous study of 2201 adolescents from seventeen high schools in east Tennessee that represented rural, suburban, and urban communities. Adolescents who were dating someone for four weeks or more were invited to participate in a longer study concerning their relationship. Two age groups were recruited for participation: middle adolescent couples, with both partners between the ages of 14 and 17, and late adolescent couples, with both partners between the ages of 17 and 21. The final sample included 102 middle adolescent couples and 107 late adolescent couples, with the mean length of relationship at 45.5 weeks.

The majority of the sample was Caucasian (90.6%), with the remainder of the sample identifying as African American (6.2%), Asian (1.2%), Hispanic (.7%), Native American (.5%), and Other (.7%). Almost half of the sample reported they lived in a suburban neighborhood (46.7%), followed by those who lived in rural areas (31.6%), and urban areas (20.8%). Parental education level (the highest level of education completed by either parent) was used to gauge socioeconomic status. Fifty-five percent of the participants reported that neither parent had a college degree,

while forty-five percent reported that at least one parent had a college degree or higher.

Couples who agreed to participate came to the University of Tennessee for about three hours of data collection (Time 1). Couple members filled out questionnaires in separate rooms and were assured confidentiality. Participants were reimbursed $30 each for their time. In addition, participants were asked to provide the name and contact information of a same sex friend. This friend was then contacted and offered $10 for filling out a 15 minute questionnaire about their friend who participated in the project. Data was collected from the close friend of both partners for 162 of the couples.

Individual couple members were contacted approximately 1 year following their laboratory participation (median 14 months), to complete a follow-up survey (Time 2). Participants were mailed an informed consent form for themselves and a parent if under 18, a packet of questionnaires, and a self-addressed stamped envelope. Participants were also given the option to complete follow-up questionnaires through a secure email server. Individuals were paid $15 for completing the follow-up survey, and a total of 351 individual couple members participated.

Measures

Demographics

A demographics questionnaire was administered to obtain information about participants' age, race, residence, relationship length (measured in weeks), and parents' education level.

Sexual Behaviors

The Sexual Behaviors Questionnaire (SBQ) was developed for the STARR project to assess sexual activity within romantic relationships. An initial version of the sexual behaviors questionnaire was pilot tested in a previous study with adolescent couples (Rostosky et al., 1999). The version used in the current study is a 45-item measure that includes several frequency ranges, checklists, and open-ended questions which ask about both past and present sexual behaviors. For this study, two items were used to gain information about the participants' experiences of infidelity within their current relationship. Participants were asked "Has your current partner ever cheated on you?" and "Have you ever cheated on your current partner?" Self infidelity was coded if the individual responded that he/she had cheated on his/her partner and partner infidelity was coded if the individual responded that his/her partner had cheated. To examine infidelity that the injured partner does not necessarily know about, partner's actual infidelity was coded in the participant's partner had reported cheating.

Internalizing and Externalizing

The Youth Self Report (YSR) is a 118-item scale used to measure internalizing and externalizing behaviors in adolescents (Achenbach & Edelbrock, 1987). The participant rates the extent to which each behavior is characteristic of him or her on a scale consisting of "0 if not true", "1 if somewhat or sometimes true", or "2 if very true or often true". Example items used for internalizing behaviors include "I cry a lot", "I am afraid I might think or do something bad", and "I am too fearful or

anxious". Sample items used for externalizing behaviors include "I argue a lot", "I destroy things belonging to others", and "I cut classes or skip school". Both the internalizing and externalizing subscales were created by summing 30 items each. The internal reliability for both subscales was good (internalizing: $\alpha = .89$; externalizing: $\alpha = .85$).

Depressive Symptomatology

The Center for Epidemiologic Studies Depression Scale (CES-D) is a 20-item screening tool commonly used to assess depressive symptomatology in the general population (Radloff, 1977). Participants were asked to indicate on a four-point scale the extent to which they had experienced a variety of depressive symptoms during the past week. Sample items include "I felt depressed", "My sleep was restless", and "I felt that people dislike me". This measure demonstrated good internal reliability in the current sample ($\alpha = .85$). This measure was given at both Time 1 and Time 2.

Alcohol and Drug Use

Two items from the Sexual Behaviors Questionnaire (SBQ) was used to gain information about alcohol and drug use during sexual activity. Participants were asked "Have you ever drunk alcohol before or during sexual activities?" and "Have you ever used marijuana or drugs (other than alcohol) before or during sexual activities?" These were dichotomous items that were coded as "0" = no and "1" = yes.

Self-Worth

Participants' feelings of self worth were measured using subscales of the Self-Perception Profile for Adolescents (Harter, 1988). Two of these subscales were used, including a general subscale pertaining to self worth as well as a subscale of physical appearance. Each subscale includes five items that are structured as "two-choice formats" in which the participant picks which of two statements he or she identifies more with, and then chooses the degree to which that statement is true. One sample item for the self worth subscale is "Some teenagers like the kind of person they are BUT Other teenagers often wish they were someone else". After the participants decide which statement is more true for them, they are then asked if it is "sort of true for me" or "really true for me". All items were recoded on a 4-point scale, 1 indicating the lowest sense of self worth and a 4 indicating the highest sense of self worth. A final score was computed by taking the mean of each of the five items in the subscale. Reliability for the self worth scale was acceptable ($\alpha = .79$). The self worth subscale was given at both time points of the study.

Gender-Role Orientation

The Attitudes Toward Women Scale for Adolescents (AWSA) was used as a proxy for gender-role orientation (Galambos, Peterson, Richards, & Gitelson, 1985). There is a correlation between attitudes towards women and gender-role orientation, such that masculinity in females and femininity in males, as well as androgyny in both is associated with egalitarian attitudes towards women. This twelve-item scale measures adolescents' attitudes about traditional gender roles for women. Sample

items include “Swearing is worse for a girl than a boy” and “Boys are better leaders than girls”. Internal reliability for this scale was acceptable ($\alpha = .78$).

Relationship Length

When participants came into the laboratory at Time 1, they were asked how long they had been dating their current partner, in number of weeks. Participants were provided with a conversion chart from years and months to weeks in order to make this task easier. Because couple members’ reports of how long they had been dating were sometimes discrepant, partners’ reports were averaged.

Relationship Status

At follow-up, participants were asked if they were still dating their partner from Time 1. If they answered “no”, they were asked if they were dating anyone new, and information was obtained about this new relationship, including relationship satisfaction and infidelity.

Relationship Satisfaction

Participants’ satisfaction with their current romantic relationship was measured at both Time 1 and Time 2 using Levesque’s (1993) 5-item Relationship Satisfaction Scale. It was developed as a modification to Spanier’s (1976) Dyadic Adjustment Scale and is similar to Hendrick’s (1988) measure of relationship satisfaction. The measure is on a 6-point Likert-type scale from 1 (strongly disagree) to 6 (strongly agree). Sample items include statements such as “In general, I am

satisfied with my relationship" and "Our relationship has met my best expectations". The scores of the five items were summed in order to calculate a total relationship satisfaction score, which could range from as low as 5 to as high as 30. The internal reliability for this scale was acceptable ($\alpha = 0.84$).

Communication

Participants' perceptions of relationship communication was measured using another subscale from Levesque's Relationship Experiences Scale (Levesque, 1993). This three-item scale measures the extent to which participants feel they can openly communicate with their partners. Like the relationship satisfaction subscale, these three items were summed in order to calculate a total communication score. Items were as follows: "I never have to lie to my partner", "My partner listens to me when I need someone to talk to", and "I find it easy to tell him how I feel".

Aggression

A modified version of the Conflicts Tactics Scale (Straus, 1979) was used to measure physical aggression within participants' current romantic relationship. This 13-item scale asks participants to report if "you", "your current partner", or "both" have ever acted in a variety of ways during the course of a fight. Self Aggression was coded as a dichotomous variable if the participant endorsed that they themselves or both partners had done any of the following actions during the course of a fight: "pushed, grabbed, or shoved", "hit the other partner with a fist", or "hit or tried to hit the other partner with something hard".

Trust

The Adolescent Couples' Issues Checklist (Welsh, Grello, Dickson, & Harper, 2001) was used in an interaction task that the couple took part in. This checklist includes 21 common issues of disagreement between adolescent couple members, as well as an option to write issues not on the list. The measure was modified for our project from the Partners Issues Checklist (Capaldi & Wilson, 1992) to improve clarity and to include regionally relevant issues. One of the issues on the checklist was about trust: "Sometimes my partner doesn't seem to trust me enough or sometimes I do not trust my partner enough". For the purposes of this study, a dichotomous "trust issue" variable was coded "0" or "1" based on whether the participant had picked this as an issue or not.

Friends' and Parents' Regard

Friends' regard for the participant's partner was assessed by simply asking the participant: "Do your friends like your current partner?" The participants responded on a 6-point scale, with 1 = "none", 2 = "a little", 3 = "some", 4 = "quite a lot", 5 = "a great deal", and 6 = "don't know". If the participants responded with a 6, this was recoded as missing data because of the uncertainty of friends' regard. Similarly, parents' regard for the participant's partner was measured by asking: "Do your parents like your current partner?" The scale format mirrored the question about friends' regard and was scored in the same manner.

In addition to participants' response of how much their friends like their partner, the actual regard of one same-sex friend was measured, as well. Surveys

were distributed to one same-sex friend of each couple member and friends were asked, “How much do you like your friend’s partner?” Again, the scale was formatted in the same manner as the questions above.

CHAPTER 3

RESULTS

Descriptive Statistics

Descriptive analyses revealed that at Time 1, fifty-nine participants (14.1%) reported having cheated on their current partner. Forty-one participants (9.8%) reported that their current partner had cheated on them. While these numbers might lead one to believe that over two-thirds of participants who were cheated on knew about the infidelity, this may be a bit misleading due to certain discrepancies in reporting. Some participants reported that their partner had cheated when in fact, according to their partner, they had not. When examining just the participants who reported cheating, roughly half of their partners (54.2%) definitely knew about the infidelity.

One hundred sixty participants reported that they were still dating their original dating partner at Time 2, 90 were dating a new partner at Time 2, and 91 were not dating anyone. At Time 2, forty-two participants (16.3%) reported having cheated on their current partner, 29 of whom were still dating their partner from Time 1 and 13 of whom were dating a new partner. Twenty-four reported that their partner had cheated on them (9.3%), 17 of whom were still dating the partner from Time 1 and 7 of whom were dating a new partner.

Analyses

Hierarchical Linear Modeling (HLM) was used to account for the non-independence of participants. Because participants are in a couple, their responses are not independent of one another. This violates the assumption of non-independence that is necessary for statistical methods such as multiple regression and as a result there are artificially inflated error terms (Raudenbush & Bryk, 2002). When the outcome variable was dichotomous (such as infidelity), the Bernoulli method was used. The method allows analysis of binary dependent variables.

Variables Related to the Partner Engaging in Infidelity

Several variables were examined as predictors of self infidelity in cross-sectional analyses (Table A-1). Interestingly, neither age nor gender was significantly associated with infidelity at Time 1. Age also did not predict infidelity at Time 2. However, gender was significantly associated with infidelity at Time 2, such that males were more likely to report having cheated on their current dating partner at Time 2, $t(255) = -3.06$, $p < .01$.

At Time 1, those who reported higher levels of internalizing symptoms were more likely to report that they had cheated on their partner, $t(410) = 2.78$, $p < .01$. Additionally, participants who reported more externalizing symptoms were also more likely to have cheated in their current relationship, $t(410) = 4.24$, $p < .001$. Self infidelity was also positively associated with reports of having used alcohol before or during sex, $t(408) = 3.03$, $p < .01$ and with reports of having used drugs before or

during sex, $t(408) = 3.45$, $p < .01$. Depressive symptomatology was unrelated to infidelity at Time 1.

Those who had cheated on their partner at Time 1 reported lower self-esteem at that time, $t(410) = -2.89$, $p < .01$. Perceptions of ones own physical appearance were unrelated to self infidelity at Time 1.

Longitudinal analyses were also conducted to determine possible predictors of infidelity over time (Table A-2). Surprisingly, the only individual variables at Time 1 that significantly predicted later infidelity at Time 2 were gender, gender-role orientation and physical appearance. There was no main effect for gender-role orientation predicting infidelity at Time 2, but there was a significant interaction with gender, $t(247) = 2.25$, $p < .05$. Males who were more traditional in their gender-role orientation were more likely to report cheating at Time 2, and females who were less traditional were more likely to report cheating at Time 2. Individuals who perceived themselves as more attractive at Time 1 were more likely to cheat on their partner at Time 2, $t(251) = 2.23$, $p < .05$.

Longitudinal analyses were also conducted to determine possible individual outcomes of infidelity (Table A-4). Depressive symptomatology and self-worth were the only individual measures examined at follow-up, and neither was significantly related to reports of infidelity at Time 1.

Variables Related to the Injured Partner

Several variables were also examined as predictors of partner infidelity in cross-sectional analyses (Table A-1). None of the individual variables examined were

related to participants' own reports of partner infidelity at Time 1. Additionally, none of these variables were associated with partner's actual infidelity (their partner's report of self infidelity) at Time 1.

However, characteristics of the injured partner at Time 1 did significantly predict partner's infidelity at Time 2, even when controlling for infidelity at Time 1 (Table A-2). Specifically, externalizing symptoms predicted reports of partner infidelity at Time 2, $t(250) = 2.08$, $p < .05$ and depressive symptoms also predicted reports of partner infidelity at Time 2, $t(249) = 2.70$, $p < .01$. None of the other individual characteristics of the injured partner significantly predicted infidelity at Time 2.

Reports of partner infidelity at Time 1 did not predict self worth or depressive symptomatology over time (Table A-4). Surprisingly, HLM analyses indicated that partner's actual infidelity at Time 1 was significantly associated with higher self-worth at Time 2, even when controlling for self-worth at Time 1, $t(346) = 2.17$, $p < .05$. In order to further explore this finding, separate analyses were conducted for those still dating their original partner at Time 2 (Table A-5), and those who were broken up (Table A-6). Linear regression analyses were conducted for those participants who had broken up. It appears that this effect is significant only for those who were still in their original dating relationship at Time 2, $t(159) = 1.99$, $p < .05$. Partner's actual infidelity at Time 1 did not predict depressive symptoms over time.

Variables Related to the Relationship

Relationship length was significantly associated with infidelity. Participants who had been in their current relationship for longer amounts of time were more likely to have cheated on their partner or to have been cheated on at Time 1, $t(207) = 3.50$, $p < .01$. Also, those who were less satisfied with their relationship were more likely to have cheated, $t(410) = -2.22$, $p < .05$. At Time 1, relationship satisfaction and partner infidelity were also negatively associated, such that those who were less satisfied in their relationship were more likely to have been cheated on, $t(410) = -3.04$, $p < .01$.

Physical aggression and infidelity were significantly associated at Time 1, as well. Participants who had cheated were more likely to have engaged in physical aggression, $t(410) = 2.70$, $p < .01$. In addition, participants who had been cheated on were also more likely to have engaged in physical aggression towards their partner, $t(410) = 2.34$, $p < .05$.

Cross-sectional analyses also revealed that communication and infidelity were negatively associated. Individuals who felt they could talk openly with their partners were less likely to have cheated, $t(410) = -3.72$, $p < .001$, as well as less likely to have been cheated on, $t(410) = -2.27$, $p < .05$. In addition, participants who reported partner infidelity were more likely to select trust as a problem in their relationship, $t(411) = 2.42$, $p < .05$. Those who had cheated themselves were not more likely to select trust as an issue.

Longitudinal analyses were also conducted to explore if relationship variables at Time 1 predicted infidelity over time (Table A-2). Analyses of the participants

who were still dating their original partner at Time 2 were conducted for this portion of the study. None of the relationship variables from Time 1 significantly predicted infidelity at Time 2.

Infidelity was examined as a predictor for relational outcome variables such as relationship status and relationship satisfaction (Table A-4). HLM analyses revealed that there was no significant relationship between infidelity at Time 1 and dating status at Time 2. Infidelity did not predict whether or not a couple would be dating one year later.

For those still dating the same partner at follow-up, infidelity reported at Time 1 did significantly predict lower relationship satisfaction at Time 2, even when controlling for satisfaction at Time 1, $t(157) = -2.26$, $p < .05$ (Table A-5). That is, individuals' own relationship satisfaction was lower over the course of a year if they had cheated. Surprisingly, participants' reports of partner infidelity at Time 1 were unrelated to relationship satisfaction over time. In addition, partners' actual infidelity was also unrelated to participants' relationship satisfaction over time. Thus, ones own infidelity predicted declines in ones own relationship satisfaction over time, but was unrelated to ones partners' relationship satisfaction over time.

For those who were dating a new partner at Time 2, having experienced self or partner infidelity in the first relationship did not significantly predict experiencing any type of infidelity in the next.

Variables Related to the Context

Cross-sectional analyses revealed that the participants' perceptions of how much their friends like their current partner were significantly associated with infidelity (Table A-1). Specifically, the more participants thought their friends didn't like their partner, the more likely they were to cheat, $t(372) = -2.34$, $p < .05$. Participants' perceptions of their friends' regard was not significantly related to partner infidelity. Interestingly, actual friends' regard was not significantly related to self or partner infidelity. In addition, parents' regard does not predict the participants' or their partners' infidelity.

For those still in their original dating relationship at Time 2, longitudinal analyses were conducted (Table A-3). Friends' and parents' regard for the partner at Time 1 did not significantly predict infidelity over time.

CHAPTER 4

DISCUSSION

Analyses

Infidelity was significantly associated with multiple individual, relationship, and contextual variables when analyzed in cross-sectional analyses. However, only individual variables significantly predicted infidelity over time. This finding differs from research on marital infidelity indicating that characteristics of the relationship play a strong role in infidelity (Brown, 1991; Glass & Wright, 1992). The fact that relationship and contextual variables did not predict adolescent infidelity longitudinally is fascinating and suggests that there may be developmental influences at work. Characteristics of the romantic relationship may be less influential in predicting adolescent infidelity because these relationships have not yet become as salient as they will become in adulthood. Adolescents are only just beginning the transition from experiencing parents and peers as primary attachment figures to that of the romantic partner (Collins & Sroufe, 1999; Furman & Wehner, 1997). It is possible that characteristics of the romantic relationship may play a more substantial role as individuals approach adulthood and these relationships play more of an attachment role.

Another possible reason that individual characteristics are more predictive of infidelity is that this reflects the world-view of the developing adolescent. Elkind (1967) discussed a special kind of egocentrism that occurs in adolescence, in which

individuals at this stage simultaneously are aware that others have unique subjective thoughts and feelings, and yet continue to project their own feelings about self onto others. Welsh and Dickson (2005) found additional support for adolescents' propensity for projection within the specific context of their romantic relationships. It is not very surprising that while adolescents are still struggling to gain a better understanding of themselves and others, that individual characteristics play such a pivotal role in predicting infidelity.

In spite of the fact that relational variables did not appear to predict infidelity, once infidelity occurs, it does appear to have an impact on the individual and the relationship. Findings from this study suggest that while there may be negative outcomes of cheating relatively soon after the betrayal occurs, adolescents who experience infidelity have the ability to adapt over time. In the remainder of this discussion, we will focus on the characteristics of the individual, relationship, and context as they relate to infidelity, and further explore the meaning of this behavior in adolescence.

Variables Related to the Partner Engaging in Infidelity

The present study found that a better perception of ones' own physical appearance predicted self infidelity over time. This finding could be interpreted in a couple of ways. Participants' high opinion of their own physical appearance may be related to narcissistic tendencies, which has been shown to predict infidelity in married men (Hurlbert, Apt, Gasar, Wilson, & Murphy, 1994). Another possible explanation is that participants who are more physically attractive may have more

alternatives and opportunities to cheat. Drigotas, Safstrom, and Gentilia (1999), provide support for the latter possibility in their study showing that perceived alternatives play an important role in predicting infidelity over time.

Although there were no gender differences in infidelity in the initial year of the study, a year later, males were more likely to cheat than females. It is unclear why males would be more likely to cheat later in the course of relationships, but not earlier in relationships. However, this finding has been found in a previous study with a college sample. Hansen (1987) found relationship length and infidelity were significantly associated for males only.

The only gender interaction found was for gender-role orientation, such that males with traditional gender role orientations were more likely to cheat, and females with non-traditional gender role orientations were more likely to cheat. It is likely that this reflects a certain sexual permissiveness on the part of each gender. Typically, males with more traditional gender roles are more sexually permissive, while more sexually permissive females tend to have non-traditional gender roles (Simpson, Wilson, & Winterheld, 2004; Walker, Tokar, & Fischer, 2000). This fits with the cultural sexual double-standard in which males are traditionally encouraged to be sexually promiscuous and females are discouraged from such sexual permissiveness (Crawford & Popp, 2003). Sexual permissiveness has been shown to predict infidelity (Feldman & Cauffman, 1999b; Seal, Agostinelli, & Hannett, 1994), so it probable that these differentiated gender-roles are linked a certain sexual permissiveness, which in turn is linked with infidelity. That more traditional males are likely to be unfaithful, particularly over time and in the same relationship, is not

surprising. There is a long cultural history of male infidelity within marriages (Lawson & Samson, 1988), and adolescent males who endorse traditional male attitudes or gender roles are likely acting out this cultural template.

Infidelity may be associated with a constellation of problem behaviors such as internalizing, externalizing, and drug and alcohol use. Participants who showed more internalizing and externalizing symptoms were more likely to cheat. It is not surprising that externalizing symptoms, in particular, are associated with infidelity, as cheating on ones partner can reflect a certain amount of "acting out" impulsively, much like other externalizing behaviors. Alcohol and drug use before or during sex were both shown to predict self infidelity, as well. Substance abuse has been linked with infidelity in the marital literature (Atkins, Yi, Baucom, & Christensen, 2005). It also supports the previous finding that adolescents claim alcohol or drug use as a precipitating factor of their own infidelity (Feldman & Cauffman, 1999b). Certainly alcohol and drugs reduce inhibitions, and adolescents who are under the influence of such substances are less likely to turn down advances made by an individual who is not their primary dating partner.

While infidelity may be associated with a certain constellation of problem behaviors, this finding must be interpreted carefully. Historically researchers have considered all adolescent sexual behavior to be associated with a syndrome of high-risk, and it is important to acknowledge that some adolescent sexuality is a normative and healthy part of development (Welsh, Rostosky, & Kawaguchi, 2000). It may be that infidelity is one type of sexual behavior that is detrimental, or it may be that infidelity is simply symptomatic of this constellation. Certainly this behavior is

considered unacceptable by most adolescents, suggesting that those who cheat on their partners are breaking an important code of ethics at this time. It makes sense that such individuals report greater psychological symptoms, either as a cause or result of cheating.

Participants who cheated experienced lower self-esteem closer to the time of the betrayal. It is unlikely that low self-worth led to cheating because it was not predictive of cheating one year later. This finding may suggest that low self-esteem is a consequence of adolescents' guilty feelings about their own infidelity. Given that infidelity is seen as an unacceptable behavior, most adolescents probably feel a certain degree of guilt after cheating, which would certainly be detrimental to their self-worth. This interpretation is made cautiously, however, as infidelity did not predict self-worth over time either. What this suggests, perhaps, is that participants who cheat on their partner experience a temporary decrease in sense of self-worth, but that their self-esteem "rebounds" later on.

Age was not found to significantly predict infidelity, nor were there any age interactions for any of the models. While this indicates that the process and outcomes of cheating is similar across adolescence, it appears that infidelity within adolescent romantic relationships may be different from that within adult marriages. Personality characteristics may play a larger role within adolescence, for example. Due to range restriction in participants' ages, it was not within the scope of the current study to empirically examine differences between adolescent and marital infidelity. It is possible that developmental differences will be found if examining a broader age range than was examined in this study.

Variables Related to the Injured Partner

Our findings revealed that psychological symptoms, specifically externalizing and depressive symptoms, were associated with an increased likelihood of one's partner cheating. This has important implications for both dating and marital researchers as they examine infidelity. While it is important to avoid "blaming the victim" and labeling the injured partner as responsible for driving the engaging partner to cheat, it is also necessary to recognize that cheating does not occur in a vacuum. In adolescent relationships, if one partner is demonstrating psychological maladjustment, it could certainly impact the relationship and make it more likely that the other partner seeks intimacy elsewhere.

Surprisingly, partners' actual infidelity predicted higher self-worth later on for those who stayed in their original relationship. It appears that this finding is due to lower self-worth closer to the time of the betrayal, with a significant increase in self-worth one year later. It appears that individuals who have experienced cheating in their relationships and choose to stay with their unfaithful partner adapt to the situation over time. This increase in self-worth may reflect a process that injured partners go through, perhaps similar to the process of forgiveness described by Gordon (2005). More research must be done to make sense of this unexpected finding, and to better understand the process that occurs for these individuals.

Variables Related to the Relationship

Although several relationship variables were associated with infidelity cross-sectionally, none of these were significant predictors of infidelity over time. This

demonstrates that for adolescents, perhaps, the dating relationship is impacted by infidelity more than it predicts cheating. We found that individuals who engaged in physical aggression towards their partner were both more likely to have cheated and to have been cheated on. Individuals who are cheated on may behave aggressively towards their partner as a method of revenge. This is supported by previous findings that after infidelity occurs in a marriage, physical aggression on the part of the injured partner is more common (Daly & Wilson, 1988). Also, the co-occurrence of infidelity and physical aggression could reflect an externalizing approach to these relationships, as well. The externalizing adolescent is likely to be both more aggressive towards his/her partner and more impulsive in terms of being unfaithful.

In addition, we found that adolescents who felt they could openly communicate with their partner were less likely to have experienced both self and partner infidelity. This parallels marital research that has suggested an association between communication deficits and infidelity (Vangelisti & Gerstenberger, 2004). While very little research has been conducted on communication in adolescent romantic relationships thus far, it appears that this is an important component of these relationships. As adolescents are learning to communicate in their relationships, one essential aspect is negotiating conflict with their romantic partner (Shulman, 2003). It may be that some adolescents have more difficulty with this aspect of communication than others, and negative relationship outcomes, such as infidelity, result. Many researchers and clinicians have examined the occurrence of infidelity within relationships that no longer have trust or open communication between

partners. Communication is often seen as the foundation of relationships, and when this is not present, fidelity and loyalty to ones partner often fades as well.

It is clear that for many of the individuals who experienced cheating in their relationships, the infidelity forced them to face difficult issues concerning trust. Participants who had been cheated on were more likely to choose trust as a main problem in their relationship. In addition, participants were asked to describe what they had learned from their original dating relationship one year after they first participated. An overwhelming number of participants who had been cheated on made statements about trust—either they had learned that they couldn't trust future partners, or they had learned that trust is a necessary quality in relationships. It was evident from several such comments that, for better or worse, infidelity has significant impacts on adolescents' views of romantic relationships.

Not surprisingly, relationship length was a significant predictor of infidelity. This is likely due to the fact that individuals who have dated for longer periods of time have had more opportunity to cheat on their partner. Similarly, marital researchers have found the risk of infidelity to be higher as time passes (Treas & Giesen, 2000). Relationship satisfaction is also significantly related to infidelity. Individuals who cheated and those who had been cheated on had lower relationship satisfaction. Longitudinal data suggests that lower relationship satisfaction is more an outcome, rather than a predictor, of infidelity in adolescent dating relationships.

For participants who cheated on their partner and stayed in the same relationship, their relationship satisfaction decreased over time. In their infidelity, it is possible that these individuals were made more aware of the attractiveness of

alternative partners, and their primary dating relationship suffered as a consequence. It is uncertain why such individuals would choose to stay in the relationship, and more research must be done to better understand adolescents' decisions to stay after infidelity has taken place.

Variables Related to the Context

Of the contextual variables we examined, the only one that significantly predicted infidelity was one's own report of friends' regard for their romantic partner. Actual friends' regard was not a significant predictor of infidelity. It is likely that what matters most is the perception of friends' regard rather than the actual friends' regard. Adolescents' close friends are extremely influential at this stage of development (Laursen, 1993), and it appears that adolescents are influenced in this case by their own perception of friends' attitudes toward their partner.

Limitations and Future Research

While there are several variables associated with infidelity in the cross-sectional analyses, these results must be interpreted cautiously as it is difficult to tease apart directionality. We feel that these analyses nonetheless provide rich information about the environment in which dating infidelity occurs. Longitudinal analyses in the current study enabled a more nuanced examination of infidelity and we were able to begin teasing apart some causal relationships. Future research should continue to examine dating infidelity at multiple time points in order to better understand predictors and outcomes associated with this complex behavior.

An additional limitation of this study is that it is unknown what behaviors participants labeled as "cheating". Participants were asked to fill in a brief answer of what constituted as cheating, and responses ranged from having fantasies about someone else to sexual intercourse with someone else. However, it is impossible to know what cheating behaviors actually occurred. Future researchers should ask participants who have experience with infidelity what specific behaviors constituted cheating. In addition, this area of research could benefit greatly by a qualitative study examining the meaning of infidelity within these relationships.

Finally, this study was only able to theorize about developmental differences between adolescent dating infidelity and marital infidelity. While this study made an important first step in looking at this behavior through a developmental and ecological lens, future researchers should expand the age range of participants to include both adolescents and adults. In this way, we can better understand the role that infidelity plays in the developing individual throughout the life course.

Conclusion

Findings from this study have given much insight into the infidelity of adolescents in romantic relationships and revealed that it is a complex and multifaceted behavior that warrants further research. It is evident that individual characteristics of both partners are instrumental in predicting infidelity. However, it is also clear that infidelity impacted both the individual as well as the relationship, demonstrating the importance of examining infidelity from an ecological approach.

It is important to note that infidelity did not predict dating status. This is reflected in participants' written, open-ended comments about what they learned from their relationship one year later. One female participant commented bitterly that her partner had been cheating on her without her knowledge, even on the day they had participated in the original study. She had a very negative experience of infidelity and her comment indicated that she would probably go into her next relationship a bit guarded. Other participants, however, stayed together in spite of the infidelity. Three couples who had experienced infidelity ended up getting married, and one was engaged one year after the initial study. These participants had very positive comments about their partners, and seemed to have gotten past the infidelity. One particular couple in which the male had cheated before the original study showed that they had tackled issues of trust successfully: the male commented that he had learned "how to be trustworthy" and she stated that she had learned "how to trust".

The current study demonstrates the complexity of infidelity in adolescent dating relationships. It appears to be a fairly commonplace behavior that is related to individual factors, at least in adolescence. Infidelity was associated with some negative outcomes, but perhaps not as many as one might encounter in marriages. It is clear that infidelity in these relationships forces adolescents fairly early on to deal with issues of trust, love, and commitment. For some, it appears that infidelity may have such a negative impact that it shapes their ideas of what relationships are like. For others, it may make the individuals stronger. Negotiating a relationship after such a betrayal has occurred is certainly difficult, but may provide important learning experiences about relationship setbacks for the future.

REFERENCES

Achenbach, T. M., & Edelbrock, C. S. (1987). *Manual for the Youth Self-Report and Profile.* Burlington, VT: University Associates in Psychiatry.

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.

Atkins, D. C., Yi, J., Baucom, D. H., & Christensen, A. (2005). Infidelity in couples seeking marital therapy. *Journal of Family Psychology, 19*, 470-473.

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.

Bronfenbrenner, U. (1979). *The ecology of human development: Experiments by nature and design.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Brown, E. M. (1991). *Patterns of infidelity and their treatment.* New York: Bruner/Mazel.

Buss, D. M. (1991). Conflict in married couples: Personality predictors of anger and upset. *Journal of Personality, 59,* 663-687.

Buunk, B. (1980). Extramarital sex in the Netherlands. *Alternative Lifestyles, 3,* 11-39.

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.

Capaldi, D. M., & Wilson, J. (1992). *The Partners Issues Checklist.* (Unpublished questionnaire available from the Oregon Social Learning Center, 160 E. 4th Ave., Eugene, OR, 97401-2426).

Collins, W. A., & Laursen, B. (1999). *Relationships as developmental contexts.* Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Collins, W. A., & Sroufe, L. A. (1999) Capacity for intimate relationships: A developmental construction. In W. Furman, B. B. Brown, & C. Feiring (Eds.), *The Development of Romantic Relationships in Adolescence.* New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Conley, O. S. (1999). *Early sexual onset: A study of the relationship between social and psychological factors in the National Longitudinal Survey of Adolescent Health.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Virginia Commonwealth University.

Crawford, M., & Popp, D. (2003). Sexual double standards: A review and methodological critique of two decades of research. *Journal of Sex Research, 40,* 13-26.

Daly, M., & Wilson, M. (1988). *Homicide.* New York: Aldine de Gruyter.

Drigotas, S. M., Safstrom, C. A., & Gentilia, T. (1999). An investment model prediction of dating infidelity. *Journal of Personal and Social Psychology, 77,* 509-524.

Elkind, D. (1967). Egocentrism in adolescence. *Child Development, 38,* 1025-1034.

Feldman, S., & Cauffman, E. (1999a). Sexual betrayal among late adolescents: Perspectives of the perpetrator and the aggrieved. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 28,* 235-258.

Feldman, S., & Cauffman, E. (1999b). Your cheatin' heart: Attitudes, behaviors, and correlates of sexual betrayal in late adolescents. *Journal of Research on Adolescence, 9,* 227-252.

Feldman, S., Cauffman, E., Jensen, L. A., & Arnett, J. J. (2000). The (un)acceptability of betrayal: A study of college students' evaluations of sexual betrayal by a romantic partner and betrayal of a friend's confidence. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 29,* 499-523.

Furman, W., & Wehner, E. A. (1997). Adolescent romantic relationships: A developmental perspective. In S. Shulman & W. A. Collins (Eds.), *Romantic relationships in adolescence: Developmental perspectives* (pp. 21-36). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Galambos, N. L., Petersen, A. C., Richards, M., & Gitelson, I. B. (1985). The Attitudes Toward Women Scale for Adolescents (AWSA): A study of reliability and validity. *Sex Roles, 13,* 343-356.

Glass, S. P., & Wright, T. L. (1992). Justifications for extramarital relationships: The association between attitudes, behaviors, and gender. *The Journal of Sex Research, 29*(3), 361-387.

Glass, S. P., & Wright, T. L., (1997). Reconstructing marriages after the trauma of infidelity. In W. K. Halford & H. J. Markman (Eds.), *Clinical handbook of marriage and couples intervention* (pp. 471-507). New York: Wiley.

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. (2005). Treating couples recovering from infidelity: An integrative approach. *Journal of Clinical Psychology, 61,* 1393-1405.

Hansen, G. L. (1987). Extradyadic relations during courtship. *Journal of Sex Research, 23,* 382-390.

Harter, S. (1988). *Manual for the self-perception profile for adolescents.* Denver, CO: University of Denver.

Hendrick, C., & Hendrick, S. S. (1991). Dimensions of love: A sociobiological interpretation. *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology, 10,* 206-230.

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.

Jankowiak, W., Nell, M. D., & Buckmaster, A. (2002). Managing infidelity: A cross-cultural perspective. *Ethnology, 41,* 85-101.

Knox, D., Zusman, M. E., Kaluzny, M., & Sturdivant, L. (2000). Attitudes and behaviors of college students toward infidelity. *College Student Journal, 34,* 162-164.

Laursen, B. (1993). The perceived impact of conflict on adolescent relationships. *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly, 39,* 535-550.

Lawson, A., & Samson, C. (1988). Age, gender, and adultery. *British Journal of Sociology, 39,* 408-440.

Levesque, R. J. (1993). The romantic experience of adolescents in satisfying love relationships. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 22*, 219-251.

Liebermann, B. (1988). Extrapremarital intercourse: Attitudes toward a neglected sexual behavior. *Journal of Sex Research, 24*, 291-299.

Little, C. B., & Rankin, A. (2001). Why do they start it? Explaining reported early-teen sexual activity. *Sociological Forum, 16*, 703-729.

Oikle, J. M. (2003). *The prediction and description of dating infidelity: The role of gender, relationship satisfaction, commitment, and attitude toward dating infidelity.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Kansas.

Radloff, L. S. (1977). The CES-D Scale: A self-report depression scale for research in the general population. *Applied Psychological Measurement, 1*, 385-401.

Raudenbush, S. W., & Bryk, A. S. (2002). *Hierarchical linear models: Applications and data analysis methods* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Roscoe, B., Cavanaugh, L. E., & Kennedy, D. R. (1988). Dating infidelity: Behaviors, reasons, and consequences. *Adolescence, 23*(89), 35-43.

Rostosky, S. S., Welsh, D. P., Kawaguchi, M. C., & Galliher, R. V. (1999). Commitment and sexual behaviors in adolescent dating relationships. In J. M. Adams & W. H. Jones (Eds.), *Handbook of interpersonal commitment and relationship stability* (pp. 323-338). New York: Kluwer Academic Plenum Publishers.

Seal, D. W., Agostinelli, G., & Hannett, C. A. (1994). Extradyadic romantic involvement: Moderating effects of sociosexuality and gender. *Sex Roles: A Journal of Research, 31*, 1-22.

Sheppard, V. J., Nelson, E. S., & Andreoli-Mathie, V. (1995). Dating relationships and infidelity: Attitudes and behaviors. *Journal of Sex and Marital Therapy, 21*, 202-212.

Simpson, J. A., Wilson, C. L., & Winterheld, H. A. (2004). Sociosexuality and romantic relationships. In J. H. Harvey, A. Wenzel, & S. Sprecher (Eds.), *The handbook of sexuality in close relationships* (pp. 87-112). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Spanier, G. B. (1976). Measuring dyadic adjustment: New scales for assessing the quality in marriage and similar dyads. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 38*, 15-38.

Straus, M. A. (1979). Measuring intrafamily conflict and violence: The Conflict Tactics (CT) Scale. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 41*, 75-88.

Thompson, E. M., & Zurbriggen, E. L. (2006, March). *Late adolescent experiences with cheating: How "cheaters" differ from "non-cheaters"*. Poster presented at the biennial meeting at the Society for Research on Adolescence, San Francisco, CA.

Treas, J., & Giesen, D. (2000). Sexual infidelity among married and cohabitating Americans. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 62*, 48-60.

Vangelisti, A. L., & Gerstenberger, M. (2004). Communication and marital infidelity. In J. Duncombe, K. Harrison, G. Allen, & D. Marsden (Eds.), *The state of affairs: Explorations in infidelity and commitment* (pp. 59-78). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Walker, D. F., Tokar, D. M., & Fischer, A. R. (2000). What are eight popular masculinity-related instruments measuring? Underlying dimensions and their relations to sociosexuality. *Psychology of Men and Masculinity, 1,* 98–108.

Welsh, D. P., & Dickson, J. W. (2005). Video-recall procedures for examining subjective understanding in observational data. *Journal of Family Psychology, 19,* 62-71.

Welsh, D. P., Grello, C. M., Dickson, J. W., & Harper, M. S. (2001). *The Adolescent Couples' Issues Checklist.* (Unpublished questionnaire available from The University of Psychology, University of Tennessee, Knoxville, TN 37996-0900).

Welsh, D. P., Rostosky, S. S., & Kawaguchi, M. C. (2000). A normative perspective of adolescent girls' developing sexuality. In C. B. Travis & J. W. White (Eds.), *Sexuality, society, and feminism* (pp. 111-140). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Wiederman, M. W., & Hurd, C. (1999). Extradyadic involvement during dating. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 16,* 265-274.

Yarab, P. E., Allgeier, E. R., & Sensibaugh, C. C. (1999). Looking deeper: Extradyadic behaviors, jealousy, and perceived unfaithfulness in hypothetical dating relationships. *Personal Relationships, 6,* 305-316.

Yarab, P. E., Sensibaugh, C. C., & Allgeier, E. R. (1998). More than just sex: Gender differences in the incidence of self-defined unfaithful behavior in heterosexual dating relationships. *Journal of Psychology and Human Sexuality, 10*(2), 45-57.

APPENDICES

Table A-1

HLM Analyses Predicting Infidelity at Time 1
from Variables at Time 1

Predictor Variables	Own Infidelity Coefficient (SE)	Partner's Infidelity Coefficient (SE)	Partner's Actual Infidelity Coefficient (SE)
Gender	0.29(0.30)	0.15(0.34)	-0.22(0.29)
Age	-0.09(0.11)	0.03(0.10)	-0.05(0.11)
Externalizing	0.09(0.02)***	0.01(0.02)	0.02(0.02)
Internalizing	0.05(0.02)**	0.02(0.02)	0.02(0.02)
Depressive Symptoms	0.03(0.02)	-0.01(0.02)	0.02(0.02)
Self Worth	-0.74(0.26)**	-0.03(0.29)	-0.23(0.26)
Physical Appearance	-0.28(0.21)	0.32(0.24)	0.14(0.21)
Alcohol Use Before Sex	0.99(0.33)**	0.65(0.35)	0.48(0.32)
Drug Use Before Sex	1.18(0.33)**	0.44(0.37)	0.74(0.33)
Gender-Role Orientation	0.01(0.35)	-0.03(0.38)	-0.50(0.34)
Relationship Length	0.01(0.00)**	0.01(0.00)**	0.01(0.00)**
Relationship Satisfaction	-0.08(0.04)*	-0.10(0.04)**	-0.11(0.04)**
Physical Aggression	1.03(0.38)**	0.75(0.40)	0.90(0.38)*
Communication	-0.19(0.05)***	-0.11(0.06)	-0.12(0.05)*
Trust	0.43(0.35)	0.88(0.36)*	0.64(0.34)
Friend's Regard for Partner	-0.42(0.18)*	-0.44(0.64)*	-0.24(0.18)
Friend's Actual Regard	-0.01(0.16)	-0.24(0.17)	-0.22(0.15)
Parents' Regard for Partner	-0.02(0.20)	-0.11(0.22)	0.08(0.21)

* = $p \leq .05$, ** = $p \leq .01$, *** = $p \leq .001$

Controlling for length of relationship

Table A-2

HLM Analyses Predicting Infidelity at Time 2
from Individual Variables at Time 1
Using All Follow-Up Participants

Predictor Variables	Own Infidelity Coefficient (SE)	Partner Infidelity Coefficient (SE)
Gender	-1.42 (0.41)**	0.52 (0.53)
Age	0.14 (0.12)	-0.13 (0.16)
Externalizing	0.03 (0.03)	0.05 (0.03)*
Internalizing	-0.02 (0.02)	0.03 (0.03)
Depressive Symptoms	-0.01 (0.02)	0.07 (0.03)**
Self Worth	0.63 (0.33)	-0.46 (0.38)
Physical Appearance	0.61 (0.27)*	-0.22 (0.33)
Alcohol Use Before Sex	-0.02 (0.40)	0.17 (0.50)
Drug Use Before Sex	0.76 (0.40)	0.32 (0.50)
Gender-Role Orientation	-0.49 (0.41)	-0.45 (0.55)

* = $p \leq .05$, ** = $p \leq .01$, *** = $p \leq .001$

Controlling for Time 1 infidelity

Table A-3

HLM Analyses Predicting Infidelity at Time 2
from Relationship & Context Variables at Time 1
Using Follow-Up Participants Still Dating Original Partner at Time 2

Predictor Variables	Own Infidelity Coefficient (SE)	Partner Infidelity Coefficient (SE)
Relationship Length	0.00 (0.00)	0.00 (0.00)
Relationship Satisfaction	0.16 (0.08)	-0.02 (0.07)
Physical Aggression	0.16 (0.79)	-1.28 (0.82)
Communication	0.22 (0.11)	-0.19 (0.10)
Trust	0.21 (0.45)	0.07 (0.58)
Friends' Regard for Partner	0.02 (0.30)	-0.59 (0.37)
Friend's Actual Regard	0.04 (0.26)	0.01 (0.30)
Parents' Regard for Partner	-0.01 (0.34)	-0.37 (0.42)

* = $p \leq .05$, ** = $p \leq .01$, *** = $p \leq .001$

Controlling for Time 1 infidelity

Table A-4

HLM Analyses of Infidelity at Time 1
Predicting Outcomes at Time 2
Using All Follow-Up Participants

Infidelity	Dating Status Coefficient (SE)	Depression Coefficient (SE)	Rel. Satisfaction Coefficient (SE)	Self Worth Coefficient (SE)
Own	-0.04(0.46)	2.29(1.35)	-2.60(0.94)**	-0.11(0.08)
Partner	-0.28(0.53)	1.95(1.65)	0.79(1.20)	0.07(0.10)
Partner (actual)	-0.05(0.47)	-1.38(1.39)	0.26(1.01)	0.18(0.08)*

* = $p \leq .05$, ** = $p \leq .01$, *** = $p \leq .001$

Controlling for Time 1 variables

Table A-5

HLM Analyses of Infidelity at Time 1
Predicting Outcomes at Time 2
Using Follow-Up Participants Still Dating Original Partner at Time 2

Infidelity	Rel. Satisfaction Coefficient (SE)	Self Worth Coefficient (SE)
Own	-2.54(1.12)*	-0.12(0.13)
Partner	-0.56(1.33)	0.02(0.14)
Partner (actual)	-0.09(1.18)	0.25(0.13)*

* = $p \leq .05$, ** = $p \leq .01$, *** = $p \leq .001$

Controlling for Time 1 variables

Table A-6

Linear Regression Predicting Self Worth at Time 2
from Infidelity at Time 1
Using Follow-Up Participants Who Broke Up With Original Partner

	Self Worth		
Infidelity	B	β	R^2
Own	-0.119	-0.07	0.37
Partner	0.151	0.07	0.37
Partner (actual)	0.075	0.04	0.37

* = $p \leq .05$, ** = $p \leq .01$, *** = $p \leq .001$

Controlling for Time 1 variables

VITA

Rebecca Elaine Furr was born in Chapel Hill, NC on September 23, 1981. She spent her childhood in Riyadh, Saudi Arabia, and Augusta, GA. She attended high school in Chapel Hill, NC at East Chapel Hill High School, where she graduated in June 1999. In August of that year, she began her undergraduate career at the University of North Carolina at Asheville. She received her Bachelor of Arts degree with a major in psychology from UNC-Asheville in 2003.

Rebecca is currently pursuing her doctorate in clinical psychology at the University of Tennessee in Knoxville, Tennessee.