

Singapore Management University

Institutional Knowledge at Singapore Management University

Research Collection School of Social Sciences

School of Social Sciences

10-2021

Factors that promote or predict infidelity

Bryan Kwok Cheng CHOY

Singapore Management University, bryan.choy.2020@phdps.smu.edu.sg

Norman P. LI

Singapore Management University, normanli@smu.edu.sg

Follow this and additional works at: https://ink.library.smu.edu.sg/soss_research



Part of the [Applied Behavior Analysis Commons](#), [Gender and Sexuality Commons](#), and the [Social Psychology Commons](#)

Citation

1

This Book Chapter is brought to you for free and open access by the School of Social Sciences at Institutional Knowledge at Singapore Management University. It has been accepted for inclusion in Research Collection School of Social Sciences by an authorized administrator of Institutional Knowledge at Singapore Management University. For more information, please email cherylids@smu.edu.sg.

Factors that promote or predict infidelity

Bryan K. C. Choy and Norman Li
Singapore Management University, Singapore

Published in A. D. Lykins. Encyclopedia of sexuality and gender. 2021. Springer.
DOI: 10.1007/978-3-319-59531-3_43-1

Synonyms

[Adultery](#), [Extrapair relationships](#), [Evolutionary psychology](#), [Mating](#), [Sexual relationships](#)

Definition

Depending on the theoretical perspective taken (e.g., biological, evolutionary, relationships science, individual differences), different factors can promote or predict infidelity. While each factor may independently contribute to infidelity, it is likely that the occurrence of infidelity is contingent on a multitude of factors.

Introduction

Humans are the only species of primates (and one of few mammals) to engage in the formation of long-term, monogamous relationships (Conroy-Beam, Goetz, & Buss, 2015). Indeed, most relationships scholars agree that monogamy overwhelmingly defines how humans mate. Yet for

as long as monogamy has been practiced, so has infidelity. While most people disapprove of infidelity (e.g., Laumann, Gagnon, Michael, & Michaels, 1994; Thompson, 1984), extra-dyadic relationships remain a feature of human relationships. Depending on the definition of infidelity used and the population of interest being studied, estimates for the incidence of infidelity vary substantially (e.g., Martins et al., 2016; Weis & Jurich, 1985; Whisman, Gordon, & Chatav, 2007; Wiederman, 1997). This entry briefly examines evidence from different perspectives that, taken together, paints a complex picture of why infidelity occurs.

Biological Perspectives of Infidelity

From a biological perspective, the nontrivial rates of infidelity that occur universally can be understood by examining the various hormonal mechanisms that facilitate mating behaviors. For instance, arginine vasopressin (AVP) and oxytocin (OT) are two hormones that play a major role in facilitating monogamous behaviors (Walum & Young, 2018). Studies conducted on monogamous animal species have shown that AVP and OT can facilitate attachment, pair-bonding behaviors, and social affiliation (Gobrogge & Wang, 2016; Insel, 2010). In one study, prairie voles injected with either AVP or OT exhibited a greater preference for their partners and displayed higher levels of social behavior (Cho, DeVries, Williams,

& Carter, 1999). Similarly, when AVP receptors were introduced into the ventral forebrains of meadow voles – typically a promiscuous species – preference for familiar partners increased, indicating higher levels of pair-bonding behaviors (Lim et al., 2004). In voles, AVP and OT are also released during copulation, which facilitates the release of dopamine in the reward regions of the brain and conditions an association between bonding with a partner and rewards (Insel, 2010; Lim, Murphy, & Young, 2004).

Several lines of research suggest that similar hormonal pathways may modulate infidelity-related behaviors in humans. For instance, twin studies provide compelling evidence for the influence of genes and hormones on (non-)monogamous behavior in humans. In one such study, men carrying the 334 allele of an AVP receptor gene reported less attachment to their partner, experienced more marital crises, and reported lower satisfaction with their marriages; these effects intensified among individuals with two copies of the 334 allele, further emphasizing the influence of genetics on pair-bonding behavior (Walum et al., 2008). Separately, other twin studies have highlighted similar links between AVP and oxytocin receptors and pair-bonding behaviors (Walum et al., 2012; Zietsch, Westberg, Santtila, & Jern, 2015). Both AVP and oxytocin can also facilitate functioning of the dopaminergic system in humans, which can, in turn, influence sexual behaviors (see Melis & Argiolas, 1995). One study found that individuals with at least one 7R+ allele in the dopamine D4 receptor gene (compared to those without) reported 50% greater instances of previous sexual infidelity (Garcia et al., 2010).

There is also evidence that other neurohormones come into play. Testosterone has been proposed to facilitate behaviors associated with mating, especially for men (Wingfield, Hegner, Duffy, & Ball, 1990). Indeed, testosterone is associated with higher levels of sex drive (Baumeister, Catanese, & Vohs, 2001) and risk-taking behaviors (Ronay & Von Hippel, 2010) like infidelity. Furthermore, whereas men with higher levels of testosterone are less likely to be married, when they do marry, they seem to display lower levels

of commitment (Hooper, Gangestad, Thompson, & Bryan, 2011) and engage in higher levels of infidelity (Booth & Dabbs, 1993; Klimas, Ehler, Lacker, Waldvogel, & Walther, 2019). Finally, women's estradiol (a major form of estrogen) predicted somewhat greater dissatisfaction with and lower commitment to the women's current partner, and a greater self-reported likelihood of flirting, kissing, and having a serious affair with someone other than their primary partner (Durante & Li, 2009). However, the correlational findings do not necessarily indicate a direct causal relationship between estrogen and infidelity *per se*. Women with higher levels of estrogen did not indicate a greater willingness to engage in brief, casual sexual encounters and had indicated having had more long-term, but not short-term, partners. As the researchers suggested, women with high estrogen may be primarily interested in long-term relationships, but because they are considered desirable by more men, they are more able and willing to opportunistically trade-up their long-term partners for a better one.

Evolutionary Perspectives of Infidelity

A fertile line of infidelity research stems from an evolutionary perspective, which contends that engaging in infidelity may, in some cases, have contributed to the survival reproductive success in the evolutionary past (Greiling & Buss, 2000; Schmitt & Buss, 2001). Consequently, humans have evolved and inherited specialized psychological mechanisms that are facultatively employed to promote infidelity behaviors. According to this perspective, men and women are expected to value different types of infidelity and value different traits in their infidelity partners.

Because males are physiologically required to contribute relatively less in reproduction – essentially little more than their sex cells – men have evolved to be less choosy and compete more vigorously for access to mates (Trivers, 1972). In turn, the male mating psychology has evolved to comprise a coherent suite of preferences that include: a heavy orientation toward short-term

sexual relationships (Schmitt, Shackelford, & Buss, 2001), a preference for sexual variety (Schmitt, 2003), and partners who possess physical cues to youth and fertility (Buss & Schmitt, 1993; Kenrick & Keefe, 1992; Sugiyama, 2015). More than women, men generally display a more unrestricted sociosexual orientation (Schmitt, 2005), desire a greater number of different sexual partners over a lifetime (Buss & Schmitt, 1993; Schmitt, 2003), are more likely to engage in purely sexual infidelities (Thompson, 1984), and prioritize physical attractiveness in their affair partners (Li & Kenrick, 2006).

On the other hand, because women are obliged to bear substantial costs of reproduction (including gamete production, gestation, lactation), they have evolved to be more discriminating and careful in their choice of mates (Trivers, 1972). Indeed, unlike men, women are much more selective in their choice of short-term partners (Kenrick, Sadalla, Groth, & Trost, 1990) and desire a fewer number of sexual partners over a lifetime (Schmitt, 2003). That said, some women may nonetheless stand to gain substantially from occasional extrapair mating (see Greiling & Buss, 2000). According to the “good genes” hypothesis, women may have evolved to seek extrapair short-term matings at opportune times with men who demonstrate markers of heritable, phenotypic quality (Gangestad & Simpson, 2000; for a review, see Gangestad, Thornhill, & Garver-Apgar, 2015). That is, given the difficulty of obtaining a long-term mate who is a good provider and has good genetic quality, women may settle for good providers over good genes but obtain those good genes through extrapair copulations. Evidence for this dynamic comes from research showing that when ovulating (and most likely to conceive), women have a preference for masculine (Puts, 2005), muscular (Gangestad, Garver-Apgar, Simpson, & Cousins, 2007), symmetrical (Gangestad & Thornhill, 1997), and dominant men (Gangestad, Simpson, Cousins, Garver-Apgar, & Christensen, 2004); ovulating women also report greater sexual desire for men other than their primary partner (Pillsworth & Haselton, 2006), especially when their primary partners are also perceived to be physically

unattractive (Haselton & Gangestad, 2006). Women around ovulation even view charismatic and attractive men (as opposed to nice and reliable ones) as being more committed partners and devoted fathers (Durante, Griskevicius, Simpson, Cantú, & Li, 2012). However, the validity of ovulation-induced shifts in women’s mating behaviors have recently come into question, as recent meta-analyses have documented support for and against ovulation effects (Gildersleeve, Haselton, & Fales, 2014; Wood, Kressel, Joshi, & Louie, 2014). Nonetheless, the mixed findings may reflect, in part, varying methods used to study ovulation effects; thus, more consistent and robust designs will be needed for more stringent tests and greater clarification of the good genes hypothesis (Gangestad et al., 2016; Jones, Hahn, & DeBruine, 2019).

However, a separate (and in some ways, competing) hypothesis proposes that women may engage in infidelity as a way to gain immediate resources through “back-up” mates (e.g., Greiling & Buss, 2000) and that women may assess infidelity partners as potential long-term mates for whom they might abandon their primary partner for (i.e., mate-switching hypothesis; Buss, Goetz, Duntley, Asao, & Conroy-Beam, 2017; Greiling & Buss, 2000). Various studies have found support for such a hypothesis. For instance, women, more than men, tend to fall in love with their infidelity partners (Glass & Wright, 1985, 1992). Support has also been found from studies on hunter-gather societies, which evolutionary psychologists suggest provide a close approximation for the practices of ancestral humans. In one recent study of the Himba hunter-gatherers, Scelza and Prall (2018) documented that while women preferred wealthy husbands, they also preferred generous infidelity partners; even while these back-up mates do not represent a clear “upgrade” on their current primary partner, they may represent potentially beneficial back-up mates.

Additionally, research informed by the evolutionary perspective has also examined how third parties to a relationship engage in infidelity. In particular, this line of research examines the why and how this practice of *mate-poaching* occurs,

where individuals attempt to attract other already-mated individuals. In a cross-cultural study of 53 nations categorized into 10 world regions, Schmitt (2004) found that more than women, men reported having more-frequently attempted short-term mate-poaching and also reported being successfully poached for short-term relationships more frequently – in line with evolutionary predictions that men should have evolved to be more oriented toward short-term sexual relationships. Furthermore, and consistent with extant personality research, individuals who engage in mate poaching, much like individuals who tend to engage in infidelity, generally also display low conscientiousness and agreeableness scores.

Relationships Science Perspectives of Infidelity

A burgeoning body of research conducted by relationships scientists concerns how individuals form and maintain romantic relationships (Finkel, Simpson, & Eastwick, 2017). From this perspective, individuals' satisfaction levels in and commitment to a relationship, as well as attachment styles may be important to predicting the occurrence of infidelity.

Relationship Dissatisfaction and Commitment

One of the most consistently identified major predictor of infidelity is relationship dissatisfaction (e.g., Adamopoulou, 2013; Glass & Wright, 1985; Mark, Janssen, & Milhausen, 2011; Previti & Amato, 2004; Thompson, 1983; Whisman et al., 2007). In one study of over 4000 respondents, compared to those who were "very happy" in their marriages, individuals who reported being "not too happy" were four times more likely to have engaged in extramarital sex (Atkins, Baucom, & Jacobson, 2001). Indeed, marital conflict and a lack of marital support are strong predisposing factors of infidelity (Allen et al., 2005). Some evidence suggests that the relationship between infidelity and relationship dissatisfaction may be bidirectional (Fincham & May, 2017); in one 17-year longitudinal study, individuals who were in unhappy marriages were more likely to

end up engaging in extramarital sex, which in turn negatively predicted marital happiness and positively predicted the likelihood of divorce (Previti & Amato, 2004). One model for understanding the roots of infidelity is Rusbult's (1980, 1983) investment model. According to this model, satisfaction, the quality of alternative partners, and the level of investments made in a relationship contribute to an individual's level of commitment; this, in turn, promotes and motivates the psychological attachment key to maintaining a romantic relationship (Drigotas & Barta, 2001). Consistent with this argument, individuals who report higher (compared to lower) levels of commitment to a relationship also reported less permissive attitudes to infidelity (Rodrigues, Lopes, & Pereira, 2017), intentions to engage in infidelity (Mattingly et al., 2011), and actual engagement in infidelity (Le, Korn, Crockett, & Loving, 2010). In one notable study applying the investment model to the study of infidelity, researchers used both survey and diary methods to measure each of three components of commitment (Drigotas, Safstrom, & Gentilia, 1999). Individuals' commitment levels as measured by these components were demonstrably strong predictors of whether individuals were likely to actually engage in both sexual and emotional infidelity and whether individuals were likely to report greater physical and emotional intimacy in their interactions with opposite-sex, non-primary partner individuals.

Attachment Styles

Attachment styles have also been used to account for why some individuals engage in infidelity, but not others. Depending on the amount of positive care and attention received in early childhood, individuals tend to vary in their tendency toward a secure or insecure attachment style (Ainsworth, 1991). Attachment styles have been categorized along four types: (a) secure, with individuals holding positive working models of themselves and others; (b) fearful-avoidant, with negative models of self and others; (c) dismissive-avoidant, with a positive model of self but negative model of others; (d) preoccupied-attachment, with a negative model of self and positive model of others (Bartholomew & Horowitz, 1991).

Because attachment styles can influence how individuals form, maintain, and act in their relationships, this can potentially influence their likelihood of engaging in infidelity (Del Giudice, 2009). Some evidence suggests that different attachment styles may also lead to different motivations for infidelity; for instance, Allen and Baucom (2004) noted that while those with fearful and preoccupied attachment styles viewed infidelity as an avenue for fulfilling self-esteem and intimacy motivations, those with dismissive attachment styles reported autonomy motivations for engaging in infidelity. Nonetheless, researchers contend that anxiously- or avoidantly-attached individuals may be more predisposed to infidelity (Bogaert & Sadava, 2002; Fish, Pavkov, Wetchler, & Bercik, 2012). For instance, avoidantly-attached individuals may be less committed in relationships and, hence, less resistant to temptations of infidelity (DeWall et al., 2011). Across eight studies, avoidant individuals possessed more permissive attitudes to infidelity, were more interested in alternative partners, viewed such alternatives more positively, and engaged in more infidelity over time. As another example, recent evidence showed that attachment anxiety was associated with a stronger fear of being single, which, in turn, predicted self-reported infidelity behaviors – indicating that anxiously-attached individuals engage in infidelity as a strategy to not be alone (Sakman, Urganci, & Sevi, 2021).

However, the influence of attachment styles also depends on the type of primary relationship individuals are in. Contrary to research conducted on dating couples, Russell, Baker, and McNulty (2013) found no significant associations between an avoidant attachment style and infidelity among married couples. Russell and colleagues proposed that married couples were potentially more committed in their relationships and less influenced by antecedents to infidelity; importantly, the authors argued that the ostensible contradiction of their findings with those reported by previous studies (e.g., Allen & Baucom, 2004; Bogaert & Sadava, 2002) indicated a greater need for examining the boundary conditions of the influence of attachment styles.

Individual Differences Perspectives of Infidelity

Personality Factors

Big Five Personality traits as identified in the “Big five” dimensions can reliably predict the occurrence of infidelity. A substantial body of research suggests that individuals who possess low levels of agreeableness and conscientiousness are more likely to engage in infidelity (Apostolou & Panayiotou, 2019; Barta & Kiene, 2005; Schmitt, 2004; Schmitt & Buss, 2001; Shackelford, Besser, & Goetz, 2008). Individuals possessing such traits are often also impulsive, undependable, and unreliable (Buss & Shackelford, 1997) and partners of such individuals experience lower levels of relationship satisfaction, which in turn, can lead to a greater likelihood of infidelity (Shackelford et al., 2008). Consistent with these ideas, a large-scale study of over 16,000 participants from 52 nations (Schmitt, 2004) reported that, universally, low conscientiousness and agreeableness predicted infidelity while extraversion was significantly associated with sexual promiscuity in most regions. More recent findings suggest that while an individual’s personality can account for the likelihood of infidelity, the interactive effects of both partners’ personalities may also play an important role (Altgelt, Reyes, French, Meltzer, & McNulty, 2018). Among newlywed couples who were followed over a 3-year period, both men and women who had a neurotic and extroverted partner were more likely to engage in infidelity. These associations remained significant even after controlling for the effects of relationship satisfaction, further indicating that the effects of personality may manifest in the occurrence of infidelity through (potentially) various mechanisms.

Sociosexual Orientation Some theorists posit that individuals who exhibit a more unrestricted sociosexual orientation may also be more susceptible to infidelity. In their original formulation of this dimension of individual difference, Simpson and Gangestad (1991) defined sociosexuality as

an individual's implicit prerequisites for entering a sexual relationship; whereas sociosexually restricted individuals require more time, attachment, and closeness to a partner before entering a sexual relationship, sociosexually unrestricted individuals require less. Research indicates that individuals with a more unrestricted sociosexual orientation are also inclined toward short-term casual sexual relationships, have more fantasies about extramarital sex, and desire a greater number of sexual partners (Gangestad & Simpson, 1990; Simpson & Gangestad, 1991, 1992). In line with these findings, sociosexually unrestricted individuals report more positive perceptions of infidelity (Greiling & Buss, 2000; Seal, Agostinelli, & Hannett, 1994), lower levels of commitment to their current relationships (Rodrigues et al., 2017; Rodrigues & Lopes, 2017), and engage in higher levels of offline (e.g., Mattingly et al., 2011; Penke & Asendorpf, 2008) and online (Liu & Zheng, 2019; Weiser et al., 2018) infidelity behaviors. In particular, sociosexually unrestricted individuals (as compared to sociosexually restricted ones) perceive their partners as being less desirable mates, which leads to lower levels of commitment to their partner (Hackathorn & Brantley, 2014).

Dark Triad Traits that make up the Dark Triad (i.e., narcissism, psychopathy, and Machiavellianism), which promote self-centered, antisocial, and manipulative behaviors have also been linked to infidelity (Dane, Jonason, & McCaffrey, 2018; Paulhus & Williams, 2002). Potentially, those high in the Dark Triad tend to also possess a callous nature that may facilitate infidelity (Jonason & Buss, 2012; Jonason, Li, & Buss, 2010). Trait psychopathy characterizes a willingness to break rules – such as the normative rules that undergird monogamous relationships – without remorse (Josephs, 2018) and individuals who score highly on such a trait report more previous experience with infidelity (Jones & Weiser, 2014; Sevi, Urganci, & Sakman, 2020) and greater intentions to commit infidelity (Brewer, Hunt, James, & Abell, 2015). Comparatively, trait Machiavellianism is defined by marked distrust for others and the use of manipulative tactics in

interpersonal relationships. Various studies suggest that high trait Machiavellianism predicts engaging in infidelity for various self-benefitting reasons (e.g., boosting one's self-esteem, status, resources, revenge; Brewer & Abell, 2015) and the use of deceptive tactics (Dussault, Hojjat, & Boone, 2013), especially in the absence of culpability (McHoskey, 2001). In comparison, whereas Machiavellianism and psychopathy are perceptibly negative traits, narcissistic individuals often create more positive first impressions; interestingly, some evidence suggests that the very traits contributing to a positive first impression can be detrimental to the long-term success of interpersonal relationships (Back, Schmukle, & Egloff, 2010). In particular, the self-centered nature of narcissistic individuals – such as an inflated sense of self-worth and entitlement – can facilitate infidelity intentions and behaviors (Brewer et al., 2015). Indeed, among married couples, narcissism has been shown to predict infidelity (Buss & Shackelford, 1997). Narcissistic individuals are also more tolerant of the risk involved while engaging in infidelity (Adams, Luevano, & Jonason, 2014), which potentially emboldens these individuals. Additionally, narcissistic individuals are more likely to engage in infidelity and also attract narcissistic partners – the very people likely to be unfaithful (Campbell, Foster, & Finkel, 2002).

Non-Personality Factors

While reviews elsewhere have comprehensively discussed, the role of various individual differences factors in influencing the likelihood of infidelity (Blow & Hartnett, 2005; Haseli, Shariati, Nazari, Keramat, & Emamian, 2019; Tsapelas, Fisher, & Aron, 2010), here we review five factors: sex, income, education, religiosity, technology.

Sex Sex differences are apparent in infidelity. On average, men tend to desire a greater number of sexual partners over a lifetime (Schmitt, 2003), perceive opposite-sex individuals as displaying more sexual interest than they actually are (Abbey, 1982; Perilloux & Kurzban, 2015), and display a more unrestricted sociosexual

orientation (Schmitt, 2005). More than women, men also display greater intentions to commit infidelity (Apostolou & Panayiotou, 2019; Prins, Buunk, & Van Yperen, 1993), report more experience with infidelity (Adamopoulou, 2013; Atkins & Kessel, 2008; Brand, Markey, Mills, & Hodges, 2007), are less likely to condemn marital affairs (Lopes, Holub, Savolainen, Schwartz, & Shackelford, 2020), and are less motivated by love or relationship dissatisfaction when committing infidelity (Glass & Wright, 1985, 1992; Prins et al., 1993). Furthermore, women (but not men) who perceive their relationship as being inequitable report a greater desire to engage in extradyadic behaviors (Prins et al., 1993); indeed, women who report greater satisfaction with their relationship also report a lower propensity to engage in infidelity (Apostolou & Panayiotou, 2019). Consistent with these findings, women's experiences with infidelity are also more likely to be comprised of emotional than sexual infidelities (Spanier & Margolis, 1983; Thompson, 1983, 1984).

Religiosity Religiosity of partners involved in a relationship is also related to infidelity. Individuals who report placing a greater emphasis on religion in their lives engage less in infidelity (DeMaris, 2009; Whisman et al., 2007). It is worth noting that, at least among American samples, variant of religious affiliation displayed no significant influence on likelihood of infidelity (Burdette, Ellison, Sherkat, & Gore, 2007). Among married or previously married individuals, higher attendance of religious services was related to a lower likelihood of infidelity (Atkins & Kessel, 2008; Burdette et al., 2007). In an experimental set up, Fincham, Lambert, and Beach (2010) examined the effects of praying for a partner on infidelity; in one study, individuals were assigned to either pray for their partners, think positive thoughts of their partners, or to do nothing (i.e., control). More than those who thought positive thoughts of their partners and the control group, individuals who prayed more frequently for their partners viewed their relationships as more sacred and engaged in less extradyadic romantic behaviors. These individuals

were also rated as more committed to their partners.

Income Income may also be predictive of infidelity, though the current evidence for this relationship remains unclear. Some scholars have reported that income and reported infidelity may be positively correlated (Allen et al., 2005; Atkins et al., 2001; Glass & Wright, 1985) as higher-earning individuals may encounter more opportunities in their professional lives to engage in infidelity. Consistent with this evidence, one study showed that individuals who perceived themselves as having greater power at work also reported greater actual and intended infidelity (Lammers, Stoker, Jordan, Pollmann, & Stapel, 2011). On the other hand, others found no such difference (e.g., Jackman, 2015; Mark et al., 2011), though it is worth noting that sampling issues may obscure any potential income effects on infidelity (Jackman, 2015).

Education Educational attainment may be related to infidelity. Although some studies indicate that less-educated individuals are more likely to engage in infidelity (Treas & Giesen, 2000; Weis & Jurich, 1985), others document that more highly educated individuals are more susceptible instead (Atkins et al., 2001). However, it is likely that such effects are more contingent on other factors as well; for instance, Atkins et al. (2001) showed that the positive effects of education on infidelity were more likely for those who had previously undergone divorce (Atkins et al., 2001), while others have shown that the influence of one's own educational status relative to one's partner may be more important in predicting infidelity (Blow & Hartnett, 2005).

Technology Finally, rapid technological progress can facilitate short-term mating and infidelity by increasing the ease with which people access, get acquainted with, and arrange clandestine meetings with a wider variety of potential mates. On the one hand, given the ease with which infidelities can be conducted through modern electronic platforms (e.g., messaging applications, online dating sites), such platforms may

attract individuals looking to engage in extrapair relationships. Consistent with such reasoning, among individuals in a committed relationship, users (versus non-users) of the popular dating application *Tinder* are more likely to report being low on agreeableness and conscientiousness – traits that reliably predict infidelity (Timmermans, De Caluwé, & Alexopoulos, 2018). Relatedly, technological developments that increase one's real and perceived mating options can also result in the increasing destabilization of long-term relationships and marriages (Abbasi & Alghamdi, 2018; Li & Choy, *in press*). Indeed, when exposed to images of opposite-sex others with highly attractive qualities, people evaluate their current relationships less favorably (Kenrick, Neuberg, Zierk, & Krones, 1994; see also Yong, Li, Valentine, & Smith, 2017).

Conclusion

This entry has provided a nonexhaustive review of various factors that promote or predict infidelity. Research conducted from the biological, evolutionary, relationships science, and individual differences perspectives has provided a rich understanding on the causes of infidelity. Summarily, individuals with certain genetic and biological dispositions, dissatisfactory relationships, a lack of commitment to their relationships, an avoidant or preoccupied attachment style, disagreeable and unconscientious dispositions (or who have neurotic and extraverted partners), and who have Dark Triad personalities are more susceptible to infidelity. Moreover, such factors are also contingent on various demographic factors, including sex, religiosity income, and education. Lastly, we close by noting that because technology increases one's access to potential mates, infidelity may become increasingly prevalent while long-term relationships and marriage may become increasingly rare.

Cross-References

- [Circumstantial/Opportunistic Infidelity](#)
- [Effects on Pre-existing Relationships](#)
- [Pair Bonding \(Human\)](#)
- [Polyandry](#)
- [Polygamy](#)
- [Polygyny](#)
- [Romantic/Emotional Infidelity](#)
- [Sexual Infidelity](#)

References

- Abbasi, I. S., & Alghamdi, N. G. (2018). The pursuit of romantic alternatives online: Social media friends as potential alternatives. *Journal of Sex & Marital Therapy*, 44(1), 16–28.
- Abbey, A. (1982). Sex differences in attributions for friendly behavior: Do males misperceive females' friendliness. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 830–838.
- Adamopoulou, E. (2013). New facts on infidelity. *Economics Letters*, 121(3), 458–462.
- Adams, H. M., Luevano, V. X., & Jonason, P. K. (2014). Risky business: Willingness to be caught in an extrapair relationship, relationship experience, and the Dark Triad. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 66, 204–207.
- Ainsworth, M. D. S. (1991). Attachments and other affectional bonds across the life cycle. In C. M. Parkes, J. Stevenson-Hinde, & P. Marris (Eds.), *Attachment across the life cycle* (pp. 33–51). New York: Routledge.
- 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(2), 101–130.
- Allen, E. S., & Baucom, D. H. (2004). Adult attachment and patterns of extradyadic involvement. *Family Process*, 43(4), 467–488.
- Altgelt, E. E., Reyes, M. A., French, J. E., Meltzer, A. L., & McNulty, J. K. (2018). Who is sexually faithful? Own and partner personality traits as predictors of infidelity. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 35(4), 600–614.
- Apostolou, M., & Panayiotou, R. (2019). The reasons that prevent people from cheating on their partners: An evolutionary account of the propensity not to cheat. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 146, 34–40.
- Atkins, D. C., Baucom, D. H., & Jacobson, N. S. (2001). Understanding infidelity: Correlates in a national random sample. *Journal of Family Psychology*, 15(4), 735–749.
- Atkins, D. C., & Kessel, D. E. (2008). Religiousness and infidelity: Attendance, but not faith and prayer, predict

- marital fidelity. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 70(2), 407–418.
- Back, M. D., Schmukle, S. C., & Egloff, B. (2010). Why are narcissists so charming at first sight? Decoding the narcissism–popularity link at zero acquaintance. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 98(1), 132–145.
- 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(3), 339–360.
- Bartholomew, K. J., & Horowitz, L. M. (1991). Attachment styles among young adults: A test of a four-category model. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 61(2), 226–244.
- Baumeister, R. F., Catanese, K. R., & Vohs, K. D. (2001). Is there a gender difference in strength of sex drive? Theoretical views, conceptual distinctions, and a review of relevant evidence. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 5(3), 242–273.
- Blow, A. J., & Hartnett, K. (2005). Infidelity in committed relationships II: A substantive review. *Journal of Marital & Family Therapy*, 31(2), 217–233.
- Bogaert, A. F., & Sadava, S. (2002). Adult attachment and sexual behavior. *Personal Relationships*, 9(2), 191–204.
- Booth, A., & Dabbs, J. M. (1993). Testosterone and men's marriages. *Social Forces*, 72, 463–477.
- Brand, R. J., Markey, C. M., Mills, A., & Hodges, S. D. (2007). Sex differences in self-reported infidelity and its correlates. *Sex Roles*, 57(1–2), 101–109.
- Brewer, G., & Abell, L. (2015). Machiavellianism and sexual behavior: Motivations, deception and infidelity. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 74, 186–191.
- Brewer, G., Hunt, D., James, G., & Abell, L. (2015). Dark Triad traits, infidelity and romantic revenge. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 83, 122–127.
- Burdette, A. M., Ellison, C. G., Sherkat, D. E., & Gore, K. A. (2007). Are there religious variations in marital infidelity? *Journal of Family Issues*, 28(12), 1553–1581.
- Buss, D. M., Goetz, C., Duntley, J. D., Asao, K., & Conroy-Beam, D. (2017). The mate switching hypothesis. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 104, 143–149.
- Buss, D. M., & Schmitt, D. P. (1993). Sexual strategies theory: An evolutionary perspective on human mating. *Psychological Review*, 100(2), 204–232.
- Buss, D. M., & Shackelford, T. K. (1997). Susceptibility to infidelity in the first year of marriage. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 31(2), 193–221.
- Campbell, W. K., Foster, C. A., & Finkel, E. J. (2002). Does self-love lead to love for others? A story of narcissistic game playing. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 83(2), 340–354.
- Cho, M. M., DeVries, A. C., Williams, J. R., & Carter, C. S. (1999). The effects of oxytocin and vasopressin on partner preferences in male and female prairie voles (*Microtus ochrogaster*). *Behavioral Neuroscience*, 113(5), 1071–1079.
- Conroy-Beam, D., Goetz, C. D., & Buss, D. M. (2015). Why do humans form long-term mateships? An evolutionary game-theoretic model. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, 51, 1–39.
- Dane, L. K., Jonason, P. K., & McCaffrey, M. (2018). Physiological tests of the cheater hypothesis for the Dark Triad traits: Testosterone, cortisol, and a social stressor. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 121, 227–231.
- Del Giudice, M. (2009). Sex, attachment, and the development of reproductive strategies. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 32(01), 1–21.
- DeMaris, A. (2009). Distal and proximal influences on the risk of extramarital sex: A prospective study of longer duration marriages. *Journal of Sex Research*, 46(6), 597–607.
- DeWall, C. N., Lambert, N. M., Slotter, E. B., Pond Jr., R. S., Deckman, T., Finkel, E. J., et al. (2011). So far away from one's partner, yet so close to romantic alternatives: Avoidant attachment, interest in alternatives, and infidelity. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 101(6), 1302–1316.
- Drigotas, S. M., & Barta, W. (2001). The cheating heart: Scientific explorations of infidelity. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 10(5), 177–180.
- Drigotas, S. M., Safstrom, C. A., & Gentilia, T. (1999). An investment model prediction of dating infidelity. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 77(3), 509–524.
- Durante, K. M., Griskevicius, V., Simpson, J. A., Cantú, S. M., & Li, N. P. (2012). Ovulation leads women to perceive sexy cads as good dads. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 103(2), 292–305.
- Durante, K. M., & Li, N. P. (2009). Oestradiol level and opportunistic mating in women. *Biology Letters*, 5(2), 179–182.
- Dussault, M., Hojjat, M., & Boone, R. T. (2013). Machiavellianism and dating: Deception and intimacy. *Social Behavior & Personality: An International Journal*, 41(2), 283–294.
- Fincham, F. D., Lambert, N. M., & Beach, S. R. H. (2010). Faith and unfaithfulness: Can praying for your partner reduce infidelity? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 99(4), 649–659.
- Fincham, F. D., & May, R. W. (2017). Infidelity in romantic relationships. *Current Opinion in Psychology*, 13, 70–74.
- Finkel, E. J., Simpson, J. A., & Eastwick, P. W. (2017). The psychology of close relationships: Fourteen core principles. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 68, 383–411.
- Fish, J. N., Pavkov, T. W., Wetchler, J. L., & Bercik, J. (2012). Characteristics of those who participate in infidelity: The role of adult attachment and differentiation in extradyadic experiences. *The American Journal of Family Therapy*, 40(3), 214–229.
- Gangestad, S. W., Garver-Apgar, C. E., Simpson, J. A., & Cousins, A. J. (2007). Changes in women's mate

- preferences across the ovulatory cycle. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 92(1), 151–163.
- Gangestad, S. W., Thornhill, R., & Garver-Apgar, C. E. (2015). Women's sexual interests across the ovulatory cycle. In D. M. Buss (Ed.), *The handbook of evolutionary psychology: Foundations* (2nd ed., Vol. 1, pp. 403–426). Hoboken: John Wiley & Sons.
- Gangestad, S. W., Haselton, M. G., Welling, L. L. M., Gildersleeve, K., Pillsworth, E. G., Burriss, R. P., et al. (2016). How valid are assessments of conception probability in ovulatory cycle research? Evaluations, recommendations, and theoretical implications. *Evolution and Human Behavior*, 37, 85–96.
- Gangestad, S. W., & Simpson, J. A. (1990). Toward an evolutionary history of female sociosexual variation. *Journal of Personality*, 58(1), 69–96.
- Gangestad, S. W., & Simpson, J. A. (2000). The evolution of human mating: Trade-offs and strategic pluralism. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 23(4), 573–587.
- Gangestad, S. W., Simpson, J. A., Cousins, A. J., Garver-Apgar, C. E., & Christensen, P. N. (2004). Women's preferences for male behavioral displays change across the menstrual cycle. *Psychological Science*, 15(3), 203–207.
- Gangestad, S. W., & Thornhill, R. (1997). The evolutionary psychology of extrapair sex: The role of fluctuating asymmetry. *Evolution and Human Behavior*, 18(2), 69–88.
- Garcia, J. R., MacKillop, J., Aller, E. L., Merriwether, A. M., Wilson, D. S., & Lum, J. K. (2010). Associations between dopamine D4 receptor gene variation with both infidelity and sexual promiscuity. *PLoS One*, 5(11), e14162.
- Gildersleeve, K., Haselton, M. G., & Fales, M. R. (2014). Do women's mate preferences change across the ovulatory cycle? A meta-analytic review. *Psychological Bulletin*, 140, 1205–1259.
- Glass, S. P., & Wright, T. L. (1985). Sex differences in type of extramarital involvement and marital dissatisfaction. *Sex Roles*, 12(9), 1101–1120.
- 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.
- Gobrogge, K., & Wang, Z. (2016). The ties that bond: Neurochemistry of attachment in voles. *Current Opinion in Neurobiology*, 38, 80–88.
- Greiling, H., & Buss, D. M. (2000). Women's sexual strategies: The hidden dimension of extra-pair mating. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 28, 929–963.
- Hackathorn, J., & Brantley, A. (2014). To know you is (not) to want you: Mediators between sociosexual orientation and romantic commitment. *Current Psychology*, 33(2), 89–97.
- Haseli, A., Shariati, M., Nazari, A. M., Keramat, A., & Emamian, M. H. (2019). Infidelity and its associated factors: A systematic review. *The Journal of Sexual Medicine*, 16(8), 1155–1169.
- Haselton, M. G., & Gangestad, S. W. (2006). Conditional expression of women's desires and men's mate guarding across the ovulatory cycle. *Hormones and Behavior*, 49(4), 509–518.
- Hooper, A. E. C., Gangestad, S. W., Thompson, M. E., & Bryan, A. D. (2011). Testosterone and romance: The association of testosterone with relationship commitment and satisfaction in heterosexual men and women. *American Journal of Human Biology*, 23(4), 553–555.
- Insel, T. R. (2010). The challenge of translation in social neuroscience: A review of oxytocin, vasopressin, and affiliative behavior. *Neuron*, 65, 768–779.
- Jackman, M. (2015). Understanding the cheating heart: What determines infidelity intentions? *Sexuality & Culture*, 19(1), 72–84.
- Jonason, P. K., & Buss, D. M. (2012). Avoiding entangling commitments: Tactics for implementing a short-term mating strategy. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 52(5), 606–610.
- Jonason, P. K., Li, N. P., & Buss, D. M. (2010). The costs and benefits of the Dark Triad: Implications for mate poaching and mate retention tactics. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 48(4), 373–378.
- Jones, B. C., Hahn, A. C., & DeBruine, L. M. (2019). Ovulation, sex hormones, and women's mating psychology. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 23, 51–62.
- Jones, D. N., & Weiser, D. A. (2014). Differential infidelity patterns among the Dark Triad. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 57, 20–24.
- Josephs, L. (2018). Fatal attractions: The Dark Triad and infidelity. In *The dynamics of infidelity: Applying relationship science to psychotherapy practice* (pp. 89–111). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Kenrick, D. T., & Keefe, R. C. (1992). Age preferences in mates reflect sex differences in human reproductive strategies. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 15(1), 75–91.
- Kenrick, D. T., Neuberg, S. L., Zierk, K. L., & Krones, J. M. (1994). Evolution and social cognition: Contrast effects as a function of sex, dominance, and physical attractiveness. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 20(2), 210–217.
- Kenrick, D. T., Sadalla, E. K., Groth, G., & Trost, M. R. (1990). Evolution, traits, and the stages of human courtship: Qualifying the parental investment model. *Journal of Personality*, 58(1), 97–116.
- Klimas, C., Ehlert, U., Lacker, T. J., Waldvogel, P., & Walther, A. (2019). Higher testosterone levels are associated with unfaithful behavior in men. *Biological Psychology*, 146, 107730.
- Lammers, J., Stoker, J. I., Jordan, J., Pollmann, M., & Stapel, D. A. (2011). Power increases infidelity among men and women. *Psychological Science*, 22(9), 1191–1197.
- 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.

- Le, B., Korn, M. S., Crockett, E. E., & Loving, T. J. (2010). Missing you maintains us: Missing a romantic partner, commitment, relationship maintenance, and physical infidelity. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 28(5), 653–667.
- Li, N. P., & Choy, B. K. C. (in press). Partner evaluation and selection. In J. K. Mogilski & T. Shackelford (Eds.), *The oxford handbook of evolutionary psychology and romantic relationships*. Oxford University Press.
- Li, N. P., & Kenrick, D. T. (2006). Sex similarities and differences in preferences for short-term mates: What, whether, and why. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 90(3), 468–489.
- Lim, M. M., Murphy, A. Z., & Young, L. J. (2004). Ventral striatopallidal oxytocin and vasopressin V1a receptors in the monogamous prairie vole (*Microtus ochrogaster*). *Journal of Comparative Neurology*, 468(4), 555–570.
- Lim, M. M., Wang, Z., Olazábal, D. E., Ren, X., Terwilliger, E. F., & Young, L. J. (2004). Enhanced partner preference in a promiscuous species by manipulating the expression of a single gene. *Nature*, 429(6993), 754–757.
- Liu, Y., & Zheng, L. (2019). Influences of sociosexuality and commitment on online sexual activities: The mediating effect of perceptions of infidelity. *Journal of Sex & Marital Therapy*, 45(5), 395–405.
- Lopes, G. S., Holub, A. M., Savolainen, J., Schwartz, J. A., & Shackelford, T. K. (2020). Sex differences in cognitive and moral appraisals of infidelity: Evidence from an experimental survey of reactions to the petraeus affair. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 156, 109765.
- Mark, K. P., Janssen, E., & Milhausen, R. R. (2011). Infidelity in heterosexual couples: Demographic, interpersonal, and personality-related predictors of extra-dyadic sex. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 40(5), 971–982.
- Martins, A., Pereira, M., Andrade, R., Dattilio, F. M., Narciso, I., & Canavarro, M. C. (2016). Infidelity in dating relationships: Gender-specific correlates of face-to-face and online extradyadic involvement. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 45(1), 193–205.
- Mattingly, B. A., Clark, E. M., Weidler, D. J., Bullock, M., Hackathorn, J., & Blankmeyer, K. (2011). Sociosexual orientation, commitment, and infidelity: A mediation analysis. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 151(3), 222–226.
- McHoskey, J. W. (2001). Machiavellianism and sexuality: On the moderating role of biological sex. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 31(5), 779–789.
- Melis, M. R., & Argiolas, A. (1995). Dopamine and sexual behavior. *Neuroscience & Biobehavioral Reviews*, 19(1), 19–38.
- Paulhus, D. L., & Williams, K. M. (2002). The Dark Triad of personality: Narcissism, Machiavellianism, and psychopathy. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 36(6), 556–563.
- Penke, L., & Asendorpf, J. B. (2008). Beyond global sociosexual orientations: A more differentiated look at sociosexuality and its effects on courtship and romantic relationships. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 95(5), 1113–1135.
- Perilloux, C., & Kurzban, R. (2015). Do men overperceive women's sexual interest? *Psychological Science*, 26(1), 70–77.
- Pillsworth, E. G., & Haselton, M. G. (2006). Male sexual attractiveness predicts differential ovulatory shifts in female extra-pair attraction and male mate retention. *Evolution and Human Behavior*, 27(4), 247–258.
- Previti, D., & Amato, P. R. (2004). Is infidelity a cause or a consequence of poor marital quality? *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 21(2), 217–230.
- 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.
- Puts, D. A. (2005). Mating context and menstrual phase affect women's preferences for male voice pitch. *Evolution and Human Behavior*, 26(5), 388–397.
- Rodrigues, D., & Lopes, D. (2017). Sociosexuality, commitment, and sexual desire for an attractive person. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 46(3), 775–788.
- Rodrigues, D., Lopes, D., & Pereira, M. (2017). Sociosexuality, commitment, sexual infidelity, and perceptions of infidelity: Data from the second love web site. *Journal of Sex Research*, 54(2), 241–253.
- Ronay, R., & von Hippel, W. (2010). The presence of an attractive woman elevates testosterone and physical risk taking in young men. *Social Psychological and Personality Science*, 1(1), 57–64.
- Rusbult, C. E. (1980). Commitment and satisfaction in romantic associations: A test of the investment model. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 16(2), 172–186.
- Rusbult, C. E. (1983). A longitudinal test of the investment model: The development (and deterioration) of satisfaction and commitment in heterosexual involvements. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 45(1), 101–117.
- Russell, V. M., Baker, L. R., & McNulty, J. K. (2013). Attachment insecurity and infidelity in marriage: Do studies of dating relationships really inform us about marriage? *Journal of Family Psychology*, 27(2), 242–251.
- Sakman, E., Urganci, B., & Sevi, B. (2021). Your cheating heart is just afraid of ending up alone: Fear of being single mediates the relationship between attachment anxiety and infidelity. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 168, 110366.
- Scelza, B. A., & Prall, S. P. (2018). Partner preferences in the context of concurrency: What Himba want in formal and informal partners. *Evolution and Human Behavior*, 39(2), 212–219.
- Schmitt, D. P. (2003). Universal sex differences in the desire for sexual variety: Tests from 52 nations,

- 6 continents, and 13 islands. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 85(1), 85–104.
- Schmitt, D. P. (2004). Patterns and universals of mate poaching across 53 nations: The effects of sex, culture, and personality on romantically attracting another person's partner. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 86(4), 560–584.
- Schmitt, D. P. (2005). Sociosexuality from Argentina to Zimbabwe: A 48-nation study of sex, culture, and strategies of human mating. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 28(2), 247–275.
- Schmitt, D. P., & Buss, D. M. (2001). Human mate poaching: Tactics and temptations for infiltrating existing mateships. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 80(6), 894–917.
- Schmitt, D. P., Shackelford, T. K., & Buss, D. M. (2001). Are men really more “oriented” toward short-term mating than women? A critical review of theory and research. *Psychology, Evolution & Gender*, 3(3), 211–239.
- Seal, D. W., Agostinelli, G., & Hannett, C. A. (1994). Extradyadic romantic involvement: Moderating effects of sociosexuality and gender. *Sex Roles*, 31(1–2), 1–22.
- Sevi, B., Urganci, B., & Sakman, E. (2020). Who cheats? An examination of light and dark personality traits as predictors of infidelity. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 164, 110126.
- Shackelford, T. K., Besser, A., & Goetz, A. T. (2008). Personality, marital satisfaction, and probability of marital infidelity. *Individual Differences Research*, 6(1), 13–25.
- Simpson, J. A., & Gangestad, S. W. (1991). Individual differences in sociosexuality: Evidence for convergent and discriminant validity. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 60(6), 870–883.
- Simpson, J. A., & Gangestad, S. W. (1992). Sociosexuality and romantic partner choice. *Journal of Personality*, 60(1), 31–51.
- Spanier, G. B., & Margolis, R. L. (1983). Marital separation and extramarital sexual behavior. *The Journal of Sex Research*, 19(1), 23–48.
- Sugiyama, L. S. (2015). Physical attractiveness: An adaptationist perspective. In D. M. Buss (Ed.), *The handbook of evolutionary psychology: Foundations* (Vol. 1, 2nd ed., pp. 317–384). Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons.
- Thompson, A. P. (1983). Extramarital sex: A review of the research literature. *The Journal of Sex Research*, 19(1), 1–22.
- Thompson, A. P. (1984). Emotional and sexual components of extramarital relations. *Journal of Marriage & Family*, 46(1), 35–42.
- Timmermans, E., De Caluwé, E., & Alexopoulos, C. (2018). Why are you cheating on tinder? Exploring users' motives and (dark) personality traits. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 89, 129–139.
- Treas, J., & Giesen, D. (2000). Sexual infidelity among married and cohabiting Americans. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 62(1), 48–60.
- Trivers, R. (1972). Parental investment and sexual selection. In B. Campbell (Ed.), *Sexual selection and the descent of man* (pp. 136–179). Chicago: Aldine.
- Tsapelas, I., Fisher, H. E., & Aron, A. (2010). Infidelity: When, where, why. In W. H. Cupach & B. H. Spitzberg (Eds.), *The dark side of close relationships II*. Routledge.
- Walum, H., Lichtenstein, P., Neiderhiser, J. M., Reiss, D., Ganiban, J. M., Spotts, E. L., et al. (2012). Variation in the oxytocin receptor gene is associated with pair-bonding and social behavior. *Biological Psychiatry*, 71(5), 419–426.
- Walum, H., Westberg, L., Henningsson, S., Neiderhiser, J. M., Reiss, D., Igl, W., et al. (2008). Genetic variation in the vasopressin receptor 1a gene (AVPR1A) associates with pair-bonding behavior in humans. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, 105(37), 14153–14156.
- Walum, H., & Young, L. J. (2018). The neural mechanisms and circuitry of the pair bond. *Nature Reviews. Neuroscience*, 19(11), 643–654.
- Weis, D. L., & Jurich, J. (1985). Size of community of residence as a predictor of attitudes toward extramarital sexual relations. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 47(1), 173–178.
- Weiser, D. A., Niehuis, S., Flora, J., Punyanunt-Carter, N. M., Arias, V. S., & Hannah Baird, R. (2018). Swiping right: Sociosexuality, intentions to engage in infidelity, and infidelity experiences on tinder. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 133, 29–33.
- Whisman, M. A., Gordon, K. C., & Chatav, Y. (2007). Predicting sexual infidelity in a population-based sample of married individuals. *Journal of Family Psychology*, 21(2), 320–324.
- Wiederman, M. W. (1997). Extramarital sex: Prevalence and correlates in a national survey. *The Journal of Sex Research*, 34(2), 167–174.
- Wingfield, J. C., Hegner, R. E., Dufty, A. M., & Ball, G. F. (1990). The “challenge hypothesis”: Theoretical implications for patterns of testosterone secretion, mating systems, and breeding strategies. *The American Naturalist*, 136(6), 829–846.
- Wood, W., Kressel, L., Joshi, P. D., & Louie, B. (2014). Meta-analysis of menstrual cycle effects on women's mate preferences. *Emotion Review*, 6, 229–249.
- Yong, J. C., Li, N. P., Valentine, K., & Smith, A. (2017). Female virtual intrasexual competition and its consequences: An evolutionary mismatch perspective. In M. L. Fisher (Ed.), *The oxford handbook of women and competition* (pp. 657–680). Oxford University Press.
- Zietsch, B. P., Westberg, L., Santtila, P., & Jern, P. (2015). Genetic analysis of human extrapair mating: Heritability, between-sex correlation, and receptor genes for vasopressin and oxytocin. *Evolution and Human Behavior*, 36(2), 130–136.