

The Validation of the Persian Version of the Infidelity Questionnaire

B. Zare^{1*}, R. Nasir¹, K. A. Mastor² and W. S. Wan Shahrazad¹

¹*School of Psychology and Human Development, Faculty of Social Sciences and Humanities, Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia, 43600 Bangi, Selangor, Malaysia*

²*Centre for General Studies, Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia, 43600 Bangi, Selangor, Malaysia*

ABSTRACT

The present study aims to assess the validity and reliability of the Persian version of the Infidelity Questionnaire (INFQ). Specifically, INFQ assesses the possible elements of sexual and emotional infidelity. The instrument was translated through the back-translation strategy and revised by three panels. The validity and reliability of the INFQ were examined in the current study. Results showed that the Persian version of the infidelity questionnaire has reasonable internal consistency. The validity was achieved when the results showed that there were significant relationships between personality issues and seduction, leisure activities and social background, and between parenting, social background and sexuality. These findings proved the validity and applicability of the Persian version of INFQ in the Iranian community.

Keywords: Infidelity, reliability, concurrent validity

INTRODUCTION

Infidelity is a main factor in justifying marital dissatisfaction and dissolution throughout the world (Bagarozzi & Sperry 2012). Nowadays, infidelity is the most important reason for divorce (Campbell

& Wright 2010). Infidelity is defined as unfaithfulness by virtue of being unreliable and the cheating on a relationship partner that takes place despite a commitment to exclusive devotion (Sims 2011). Drigotas *et. al.* (1999) defined infidelity as a harsh relational misbehavior in which one or both relational partners show extra-dyadic behaviors that infringe relational statutes of exclusivity and monogamy without their partner's prior permission. Unfaithfulness can occur in emotional or physical intimacy.

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received: 13 July 2013

Accepted: 29 October 2013

E-mail addresses:

baharehzare@gmail.com (B. Zare),

rohanyyn@gmail.com (R. Nasir),

kam2000@ukm.my (K. A. Mastor),

shara@ukm.my (W. S. Wan Shahrazad)

* Corresponding author

Based on research reports, 90% of all divorces involve infidelity. Early researchers stated that by the age of 40, more than 25% of married women and 50% of married men had been involved in sexual behavior out of their marriage (Lawson & Samson, 1988). Three decades later, an approximated 40% of women were involved in emotional and/or sexual extramarital relationships while 50% of men sustained similar relationships (Laumann *et. al.*, 2009). Feldman and Cauffman (1999) stated that about two-thirds of young adults in a gravely dedicated dating relationship had either experienced or committed sexual betrayal and other kinds of infidel behavior. There have been some studies done on the disloyalty that happens within dating relationships. Dating is often considered a training for marriage, guiding individuals through the organization of behavioral models, which are characteristically preserved in marriage (McAnulty & Brineman 2007; Russell *et. al.* 2013).

The sexual aspects that individuals learn before marriage may have an important effect on the probability of extramarital engagement afterward (Vaughn Becker *et. al.*, 2004). Additionally, disloyalty in dating may have important interpersonal and emotional consequences (Feldman & Cauffman, 1999), which may also encourage commitments afterward.

Orzeck and Lung (2005) and Babin and Dindia (2005) state that individuals view betrayal as engaging in any acts of petting, necking, kissing, flirting, and/or sexual intercourse with a person outside of

a relationship. Whitty (2005) suggests that emotional relationships, as well as sexual acts, are also thought of by some partners as cheating.

Most frequently, individuals “cheat” to complete needs that are missing in their commitments by seeking them outside of the relationship (Lawson & Samson, 1988; Drigotas *et. al.*, 1999). The theory of investment clarified that an invested psychological motivation and attachment in a relationship forms a long-lasting commitment. This theory also states that individuals are more faithful when they are highly pleased with meeting their needs and balancing the costs of losing a possible high investment with alternative viewpoints. Roscoe *et. al.* (1988) mentioned sexual incompatibility, revenge/anger, general dissatisfaction, variety/experimenting, and jealousy from dating relationships as causes for being infidels.

Young adults are also influenced by insecurity, boredom, a lack of communication, and immaturity in unfaithfulness (Amato & Previti, 2003). Feldman and Cauffman (1999) proposed that in young adults, the occurrence of unfaithfulness might be the consequence of complementary or contradictory needs, critical to the formation of individuality, which may contain an examination of possible choices. Drigotas and Barta (2001) pointed out, however, that those who avert from possible choices will consequently develop ways that help preserve the relationship with their spouse, thus arising a stronger dedication. A protected attachment style is one in which

persons discover that it is easy to get intimate with others, feel abandoned, or do not worry about becoming too reliant (Knight 2010). Morgan and Shaver (1999) proposed that a protected attachment style in adults can generate more investment and commitment in a relationship, whereas an avoidant attachment style can result in the extinction of the relationship. An avoidant attachment style is developed in those who keep away from intimacy and are less invested in the relationship, typically leaving their spouses. Cheating in relationships has also been shown to be more common among those with avoidant attachment styles than those with protected styles (Feldman & Cauffman, 1999). Cheating in a relationship also increases with tolerant relationship styles (that is, those shortages of limitations) (Flanigan, 2007). Tolerance seems to be associated with experiencing seeking (extraversion), boredom susceptibility and disinhibition (openness) (De Öngen, 2007) .

Cross-culturally, a sexual unfaithfulness committed by a woman, either suspected or actual, is the most important reason for wife homicide and wife battering (Shackelford, 1998). Anguish, humiliation, anger and depression are some examples of the emotional experiences that the spouses of batteriyal partners, will experience (Feeney, 2005). Of the 43 reasons of divorce collected by Betzig (1989) in her ethnographic research of 160 cultures, a partner's unfaithfulness has been the most frequently mentioned reason across cultures. Clearly, 79% of the cultures explicitly note

unfaithfulness as a reason for divorce.

Infidelity is the most common subject that family therapists deal with frequently in their clinical practices. It can be a heart-wrenching and confusing experience for all engaged, counting the therapist who may have her or his own personal values and fears associated with infidelity (Grenz & Bell, 2001). Furthermore, infidelity is the main reason of spousal battering and divorce (Buss & Shackelford, 1997). Infidelity is the number one problem question in a marital relationship. Sexual relationships out of marriage is the most mentioned reason for divorce throughout the world (Betzig, 1989). Although sexual relationships out of marriage may be most frequently covered in secrecy, empirical approximations of affairs during married life varies from 20 to 50% for women and from 30 to 60% for men (De Beauvoir, 2012). Approximations of the combined likelihood that as at least one partner of a married couple will have an affair during married life varies from 40 to 76% (Brown, 2013). Approximations of unfaithfulness over one year of marriage, though, noticeably show lower approximations such as 5% (Brown, 2013). A conventional explanation of these numbers proposes that although perhaps half of all married spouses remain monogamous, the other half will experience unfaithfulness during their married life. Thus, a significant practical and theoretical issue is what can help forecast who remains maritally faithful and who may have affairs.

Sex is the most reliable previously established forecaster of infidelity. As the

mentioned statistics specify, men more than women have affairs (Lammers *et. al.*, 2011). Among those women and men who do have affairs, men usually have affairs with a greater number of partners than do women (Stieglitz *et. al.*, 2012). Men who have affairs are more likely to do so without emotional engagement, whereas women's affairs are more often conveyed by emotional engagement (Brown, 2013). Sex is also associated with the scandal of unfaithfulness. A woman's unfaithfulness is more likely to lead to divorce than a man's unfaithfulness, across a diversity of cultures (Smith, 2010). Women, with infidel husbands, are reported to be more inclined to forgive their husbands than men whose partners are involved in infidelity (Lawson & Samson, 1988). In conclusion, men tend more than women to see their own sexual relationship outside their marriage as defensible, and experience less responsibility when they involve in it (Lammers *et. al.*, 2011).

Infidelity has a different types (Carpenter, 2012). Zhang *et. al.* (2012) classifies infidelity into 3 types: sexual infidelity, emotional infidelity and full investment infidelity. According to Zhang *et. al.* (2012), sexual unfaithfulness is a relationship with someone outside of the long-lasting relationship that is purely or primarily sexual in nature (there is little or no emotional attachment).

Infidelity, as a concept, is expressed in several ways and can be used to refer to a number of actions including "cheating", "extramarital relationships", "having an

affair", "oral sex" "sexual intercourse", "fondling", "emotional connections beyond friendship", "kissing", "pornography use", "internet relationships", "friendship", and so on (Blow & Hartnett, 2005). Studies on couples carried out by therapists show that unfaithfulness is counted as one of the main problems to care for during therapy. It is worth mentioning that about 50-56% of couples under therapy have suffered the experience of unfaithfulness (Glass & Wright, 1985). Some studies provide the evidence suggesting that individuals engage in infidelity because there is something wrong in their primary relationship (Baumeister *et. al.*, 2001; Blow & Hartnett, 2005; Schmitt & Shackelford, 2008). As satisfaction or marital happiness declines, the probability of infidelity increases (Glass & Wright, 1985; Atkins *et. al.*, 2001). Prins *et. al.* (1993)(1993) propose that dissatisfaction in the primary relationship can lead to an increase in the tendency to engage in extramarital relationships.

Yeniçer and Kokdemir (2006), in an attempt to determine and assess the possible factors behind sexual and emotional infidelity, studied infidelity stories of unidentified cases through a survey. The possible motives behind infidelity were found to be caused by 100 different triggers leading the individual to commit infidelity. Six factors are taken into account in investigating the fundamental motives behind infidelity:

1. Sensation Seeking: describing the reaction to person's action in looking for sensual experience;

2. Social Background: referred to the cultural idiosyncrasies and situations in which the relationship with the partner was launched;
3. Sexuality: describing the feature of the sexual relationship between a spouse and his or her partner;

Seduction: is considered the process of intentionally tempting a person, to direct astray, as from responsibility, morality, or the like; to dishonest, to influence or persuade to engage in sexual behaviour (Startup, 2000). In other words, the effect of a “third person”.

Normalization: that referred that the concept of infidelity is a normal act (Ruza & Ruza, 2012).

Legitimacy: which means the consequence of “revenge”. This factor states that the partner in the relationship deserves to be cheated (Ruza & Ruza, 2012).

These factors, taken together, shape the foundations of the Infidelity Questionnaire (INFQ) developed by Yencier and Kokdemir (2006).

What the present study aims to discover is the degree of the reliability and validity of the Persian version of INFQ. Because the Iranian community is in need of a powerful test of infidelity and a related questionnaire to assess the infidelity triggers in Persian, the validity and reliability of INFQ were measured in this study to provide a good infidelity questionnaire.

THE INFIDELITY QUESTIONNAIRE (INFQ)

The structure of the Infidelity Questionnaire is composed of diverse reasons under six factors which are sensation-seeking, social background, sexuality, seduction, normalization, and legitimacy. Yeniçer and Kokdemir (2006), in order to create a survey to establish and assess the probable factors of sexual and emotional infidelity, studied infidelity stories of unidentified cases. Then, these cases were studied via a Turkish web site (<http://www.itiraf.com>) on which admissions of internet users about diverse subjects had been distributed. They used a single keyword “aldatma” (“infidelity” in Turkish) and 642 infidelity questionnaires were expanded to 738 diverse admissions. These admissions might or might not be accurate; however, for the improvement of the INFQ, it was not the fact of admissions but the expressed reasons were important. Infidelity admissions were read and analysed in terms of the reasons given for them. From the given reasons, 132 diverse causes for being faithless were found.

A questionnaire was developed with 100 items. All of the items were chosen for the qualitative analysis of the issued admissions. Two versions of the INFQ were organized. The first was tagged as “the possible reasons for a woman to commit infidelity”, (INFQ-W), whereas the second version started with the phrase “the possible reasons for a man to commit infidelity”, and was tagged INFQ-M. The statements in both versions were the same except the gender of the person who was recognized as one

who committed an act of infidelity (Yeniceri & Kokdemir, 2006). In the questionnaire a 5-point Likert-type scale was used to indicate the weight of a given reason (1 = not important at all, 5 = very important).

INFQ is a questionnaire about the possible reasons behind infidelity that includes 100 different causes for the act of infidelity. Six factors appeared in the analysis regarding fundamental acknowledgments to infidelity (Table 1). Participants found items including “being in a romantic relationship in which partner is insensitive”, “being in a romantic relationship in which a partner does not show any involvement”, “seeing no future for the relationship” and “thinking that the current relationship is a mistake”, as the main reasons of the legitimacy issues of infidelity. These items were observed as more sensible reasons for infidelity if the perpetrator was a female, not a male. Presumably, from an evolutionary perspective, infidelity on the part of female partners may result from an aspiration for seeking greater dedication (Cann *et. al.*, 2001).

TABLE 1
Infidelity Questionnaire (INFQ) Factors, the
Number of Questions

Factors	Questions
Sensation seeking	1-2-6-7
Social background	10-11-23-24
Sexuality	3-5-14-18
Seduction	9-12-15-22
Normalization	4-13-16-17
Legitimacy	8-19-20-21

The second factor consists of the items, “the other person is handsome/beautiful”, “being seduced by another person”, “feeling a desire to have a sexual relationship with another person” and “getting an opportunity for cheating”. These were associated with being seduced. Obviously, men were inclined to give greater significance to this factor as a reason for unfaithfulness than did women. Furthermore, seduction was accounted as a much more rational reason for unfaithfulness if the perpetrator was declared to be a man, not a woman. Alternatively, when the perpetrator’s gender was supposed to be female, the seduction factor was observed as being much more significant by the male participants. On the contrary, female participants considered the causes linked with seduction more significant if a man committed the acts of unfaithfulness. It can be hypothesized that supercilious heterosexual relationships, both female and male participants assigned the act of infidelity to the “third person”. They might have considered that if their spouse had been disloyal, the cause of this behaviour did not arouse from the traits of their spouse or themselves, but rather came from an external cause. The normalization factor contained of items including “perceiving the act of infidelity as a game”, “just to spite the partner”, “infidelity as a fashion” and “thinking that cheating is a natural human right”; these causes were seen as more critical by men if the betrayer was a woman. It emerges that men demonstrated greater flexibility in thinking of infidelity as a “natural thing”

for women. Even though there was indirect evidence about this, it can be maintained that life stories of female women celebrities, who committed infidelity and their stories are reflected in mass media may cause men to think that unfaithfulness is a natural female human behaviour.

It should be remembered that men did not assert the same unaffectedness for themselves. As it was anticipated, one of the factors was linked to sexuality. The causes, “partner’s unwillingness to have a sexual relationship”, “having a bad sexual relationship with one’s partner”, “being in a romantic relationship in which the partner has sexual taboos” and “decrement in the sexual functionality of the partner”, were observed as being much more sensible if the defector was a man. This result can be described by the spouse selection system that is declared in evolutionary perspectives. As mentioned before, based on evolutionary perspectives, men prefer healthy, young, and physically attractive partners (Buss & Schmitt, 1993). Consequently, the selection criteria associated with sexuality should be significant particularly if there is a decrease in the sexual activities of a man’s spouse. If there is a difficulty in the apparent superiority of sexual life, men have the propensity to find infidelity simply rational. It was found that the sexual aspect was not important only to men. On the one hand, if the betrayer was a man, female participants saw his behaviour as a reply to the difficulties of his sexual life. This finding is compatible with Harris and Christenfeld’s (1996) statement that women believe that

men may have sex without love. On the other hand, if a woman was the betrayer, male participants recognized sexuality as an important aspect of unfaithfulness. “Having an arranged marriage”, “marrying young people”, “having few romantic relationships during adolescence” and “growing up in a conservative culture”, are also significant issues for the reasons behind unfaithfulness. The attributes of social background were accounted as more essential causes for unfaithfulness by women, particularly if the betrayer was a man. This is easily comprehensible because men are believed to have greater liberty in sexual relationship as evaluated by women. Then, if this liberty is limited for any reasons such as the physical environment, culture, or social background, men are predicted to be infidel when they have a passionate relationship (Yeniceri & Kokdemir, 2006).

To outline the modular organization of INFQ, Yeniceri and Kökdemir (2006) performed the Principal Component Analysis (PCA) with varimax revolution. The assessment of the long design indicated that a six-module explanation was appropriate. Then, another Principal Component Analysis was performed with varimax revolution forcing the number of elements in six. The reliability coefficients (alpha) were shown to be ranging from .74 to .84.

In addition, Ruza and Ruza (2012) investigated the causal explanation for infidelity in dating and marital relationships in the Lativan residence, using INFQ as a instrument for finding the reasons for

infidelity. INFQ in their study was adapted for the Latvian and Russian samples. It was reported the reliability coefficients (alpha) were between .80 to .86 .

TRANSLATION

The translation of the INFQ into the Persian language and its validation process were performed through the back-translation strategy and were revised by two expert panels. The text was primarily back-translated into English by someone who was adequately proficient in both English and Persian and had never seen the questionnaire before. Then the original version was duly compared with the back-translated version. As the original questionnaire is in English, in this study it was translated into Persian for participants. The translator was knowledgeable about the English-speaking culture, but his mother tongue was Persian. The translator tried to reproduce the conceptual equivalent of words or phrases, not a word-for-word level, meaning nor a literal translation. Then a bilingual expert confirmed the translation to identify and amend inadequate expressions/concepts in the translation. Next, using the same approach as that outlined in the first step, INFQ was translated back to English by an independent translator, whose mother tongue is English and who had no knowledge of the questionnaire. Then, the translation was sent to the author for review and approval. Finally, the problematic the words or phrases which complicated the concept addressed by the author were omitted. In the last step, the questionnaire was distributed to 20 couples to pre-test the instrument. Pre-

test respondents were asked about any word they did not understand as well as any word or expression that they found unacceptable or offensive. Following that stage, the test was developed out of the final version of the translation and was then validated by three panels.

METHOD

Participants and Instruments

The participants were 300 couples who have been married for at least 2 years. One hundred and forty seven of the participants were eliminated from the analysis because they had not sufficiently answered the related questions. The participants were aged 25-55 and were from Shiraz, Iran. The participants filled in two questionnaires including the translated version of INFQ as well as the Enrich Marital Satisfaction Questionnaire. A practically facile sampling procedure was used in this study. The participants were selected randomly from among the couples (married two years) who were referred to a consultation center in Shiraz, Iran over the year prior to the study to receive consultation from a therapist. Approximately, the number of couples who were referred to the center over the year prior to the research was 2000 individuals, 600 of whom were selected randomly for the study, but only 300 of them agreed to be part of the study. The participants came from different demographic backgrounds and the only controlling demographic variable was the length of marriage: the samples were certified to have stayed married for at least 2 years at the time the study was carried out.

The Enrich Marital Satisfaction Questionnaire was administered together with the INFQ. Soleimani (1995) researched the relationship between non-logical thinking and marital satisfaction in Iran. In the study, to measure marital satisfaction, the Enrich inventory was primarily rendered into Persian. Following that, two specialists in psychology confirmed the content validity of the test. Next, the inventory was used to study 11 individuals and its validity coefficient was found to be 0.93 through the coefficient alpha (Seymani, 2012). Because of the large number of questions and fatigue on the part of the participants, a shorter version of the form was then prepared. To do this, the correlation between each of the questions was calculated with a total correlation coefficient. Then, 47 questions which showed considerably high correlations were selected.

Questionnaires were equally chosen from the different scales as a result of which a total of 47 questions was gathered. Again, the validity coefficient of this abridged version of a group of 11 people was calculated via the coefficient alpha and the result of 0.93 obtained. In the present study

this version as a form was used because it includes fewer questions than the original, and it is available in Persian. Navabi et. al.(1994) reported Cronbach's Alpha for the longer form of Enrich to be 0.93 and for the short form of the inventory .95. Also, Mahdavian (1997) calculated the reliability of the Enrich inventory through the retest method .94 (Alahveriani *et. al.*, 2010; Ganji & Navabinezhad, 2012).

RESULTS

Table 2 illustrates the inter correlation of the items. All of the items were significantly and positively correlated. Analogous to what Yeniçeri-and Kökdemir (2006) had observed, the highest significant correlation was found between the sexuality and seduction items of infidelity triggers ($r = .92$, $p < .001$). The next highest correlation was between normalization and legitimacy ($r = .84$, $p < .001$). The inter correlation observed here among infidelity triggers is consistent with the original findings of Yeniçeri and Kökdemir, implying the acceptable validity of the Persian version of INFQ.

The internal consistency of the items using Cronbach's alpha demonstrated a

TABLE 2
Correlation matrix between infidelity questionnaire items

Variables	1	2	3	4	5	6
1-Sensation seeking	1					
2-Social background	.34**	1				
3-Seduction	.49**	.66**	1			
4-Sexuality	.48**	.67**	.92**	1		
5-Noralization	.43**	.30**	.44**	.58**	1	
6-Legitimacy	.72**	.36**	.51**	.61**	.84**	1

** $p \leq 0.001$

moderately good reliability; the results for the related factors are: sensation seeking = .42, social background = .55, seduction = .70, sexuality = .63, normalization = .53, legitimacy = .69. As far as validity is concerned in the Persian INFQ, the infidelity-causing items were correlated with Enrich marital satisfaction items. Table 3 illustrates the significant correlations found between the Enrich factors and INFQ:

As can be seen, the social background factor in INFQ has a significant negative relationship with both leisure activities ($r = -.29$, $p < 0.05$) and the parenting factor in Enrich ($r = -.38$, $p < 0.01$). Also, the sexuality factor in INFQ has a significant negative relationship with the parenting factor in Enrich ($r = -.31$, $p < 0.05$). The seduction factor in INFQ has a significant negative correlation with both personality issues ($r = -.28$, $p < 0.05$) and financial management factors in Enrich ($r = -.34$, $p < 0.05$).

A review on the literature shows that the negative relation between marital satisfaction and infidelity is undeniable (Schmitt & Shackelford, 2008). Simon and Fan (2004) concluded that infidelity has significant a negative relationship with marital satisfaction. A large and growing body of literature has shown the negative relationship between infidelity and marital satisfaction or happiness in marriage (Atkins *et al.*, 2001; Blow & Hartnett, 2005; Schmitt & Shackelford, 2008).

Finally, the total item correlation was conducted to see whether the subscales were correlated to the total infidelity scores and whether the original inter correlation of the subscales existed in the Persian version. The item total correlation and the inter correlation of the subscales of the INFQ in the present study are illustrated in Table 3. The very high item total correlation confirmed the validity of the test in Persian.

TABLE 3
Results of criterion validity of the INFQ with Enrich

	SS	SB	S	SE	NO	LE
PI	-.144	-.139	-.020	-.284*	.075	-.067
COM	.109	-.127	.052	-.252	.163	0.78
CON	.011	-.150	-.052	-.203	.002	-.142
LA	-.135	-.289*	-.170	-.137	.060	-.327
FM	.041	-.225	-.153	-.304*	-.023	-.254
S	.050	-.153	-.138	-.126	.195	-.195
P	-.181	-.383**	-.312*	-.210	.007	-.213
F	.052	-.200	-.201	.012	-.035	-.133
RO	-.023	-.113	-.115	-.277	.061	-.217

Note: SS=Sensation Seeking, SB=Social Background, S=Sexuality, SE= Seduction, NOM=Normalization, LEG=Legitimacy, PI = Personality Issues, COM = Communication, CON = Conflict Resolution, LA=Leisure Activities, FM=Financial Management, S=Sexual Activities, P=Parenting, F=Family and friends, RO=Religious Orientation

Also, the results are similar to the correlation among components of original INFQ that were presented by Yeniceri (2006) .

DISCUSSION

The purpose of this study was to examine the reliability and validity of the Persian version of INFQ. The items related to infidelity triggers showed acceptable internal consistency. In addition, the results of the study provided evidence for the validity of INFQ. The study showed that the personality issues factor of Enrich marital satisfaction has a significant correlation with the seduction item as a possible cause of infidelity and leisure. The activities factor of Enrich marital satisfaction was significantly correlated with the social background item of infidelity triggers. Also, the financial management factor of Enrich marital satisfaction was significantly correlated with the seduction factor of the infidelity triggers. The parenting factor of marital satisfaction showed a significant correlation with both social background and sexuality as infidelity triggers.

This finding was in accordance with the findings of Shackelford and Buss (2000) and Fan and Lui (2004) who concluded that infidelity has a significant negative relationship with marital satisfaction. A large and growing body of literature has shown the negative relationship between infidelity and marital satisfaction or happiness in marriage (Atkins *et. al.*, 2001; Blow & Hartnett, 2005; Shackelford *et. al.*, 2008). According to Shackelford *et. al.* (2008), spouses who are less pleased with their marriage show

an approximately higher likelihood of having extramarital engagements. One of the clearest predictors of unfaithfulness is having equal opportunity in a marital relationship. From among all possible related variables, the most frequently tested forecaster is marital satisfaction. Wardle (2002) discovered that women's unfaithfulness to the marriage was related to infidelity probability, but the men's unfaithfulness probability was unconnected to the value of marital sex. Buss *et. al.* (1997) showed that gender incredibly is comparable in the connection between being short of love and affection in marriage and vulnerability to extramarital engage. For both men and women, displeasure in marital sex is a forecaster of vulnerability to short-lived affairs.

Another interesting result of their research represents the relation between a partner's marital unhappiness and the probability that the other partner will be disloyal. Women who stated that they were moderately unhappy with their marriage generally expected that their partners would have affairs with other women and leave them. And men who expressed dissatisfaction with their marriage also expected unfaithfulness on the part of their partners. This proposes that not only do people who are not satisfied with their marriage expect to have affairs themselves, they may also anticipate that their partners will have affairs too, which is a phenomenon implying a kind of reciprocity. The results of the study are consistent with relevant literature and confirm the predictive validity

and the internal consistency of the Persian version of INFQ.

CONCLUSION

This paper has argued that INFQ as an instrument for finding the infidelity reasons has acceptance reliability and validity in Persian too. The purpose of the current study was to determine an instrument for measuring the reasons of infidelity in Iranian society as infidelity in relationships is a surprisingly common phenomenon throughout the world especially in some countries such as Iran: 50% of people in close relationships have affairs and one has to wonder whether the people who do not have affairs simply do not have the opportunity to do so, otherwise they would have the tendency to do so. Individuals, abstaining from having affairs are normally afraid of the consequences, rather than having a sense of loyalty to their partners. Remarriage and infidelity have triggered about eight of out ten divorces in Iran (Shiffrin, 2008).

Infidelity can strongly influence the functioning of the relationship and stability of a marriage. In addition, infidelity is the main issue in causing marital termination and displeasure all over the world (Schmitt, 2004). A relationship is a promise held to by the parties involved, when apart or together. Infidelity has an effect on the degree of trust in a relationship. Infidelity shatters the faith that one has for his or her partner when apart. The need for trust may cause constant interrogation and suspicion. This can make

the atmosphere a hostile and stressful one at home, even if the issue is over. The distressful sentiment that remains after an affair can cause unstructured disagreements, highlighting the need for studying these phenomena. The evidence from this study suggests that validation of a instrument for finding reasons for infidelity and follow up to prevent it in society, is a timely and worthy research in the field of couple therapy.

REFERENCES

- Alahveriani, K., Rajaie, H., Shakeri, Z., & Lohrasbi, A. (2010). Studying the relationship between sexual disorder and marriage satisfaction in those suffering from depression. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 5, 1672-1675.
- Amato, P. R., & Previti, D. (2003). People's reasons for divorcing gender, social class, the life course, and adjustment. *Journal of Family Issues*, 24(5), 602-626.
- Atkins, Baucom., & Jacobson. (2001). Understanding infidelity: Correlates in a national random sample. *Journal of Family Psychology*, 15, 735-749.
- Babin, B., & Dindia, K. (2005). Sex differences and similarities in emotional and sexual infidelity. *National Communication Association Convention*, 3, 1-29.
- Bagarozzi, D. A., & Sperry, L. (2012). Couples Assessment Strategy and Inventories. *Assessment of Couples and Families*, 18, 12-25.
- 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.

- Betzig, L. (1989). Causes of conjugal dissolution: A cross-cultural study. *Current Anthropology*, 30(5), 654-676.
- Blow, A. J., & Hartnett, K. (2005). Infidelity in committed relationship: A substantive review. *Journal of Marital and Family Therapy*, 31(2), 217-233.
- Brown, E. M. (2013). *Patterns of infidelity and their treatment*. Routledge.
- 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, K., & Wright, D. W. (2010). Marriage today: Exploring the incongruence between americans' beliefs and practices. *Journal of Comparative Family Studies*, 7, 329-345.
- Cann, A., Mangum, J. L., & Wells, M. (2001). Distress in response to relationship infidelity: The roles of gender and attitudes about relationships. *Journal of Sex Research*, 38(3), 185-190.
- Carpenter, C. J. (2012). Meta-analyses of sex differences in responses to sexual versus emotional infidelity: Men and women are more similar than different. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 36(1), 25-37.
- De Beauvoir, S. (2012). *The second sex*. Random House Digital, Inc.
- DE Öngen, D. E. (2007). The relationships between sensation seeking and gender role orientations among Turkish university students. *Sex Roles*, 57(1-2), 111-118.
- 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), 509-515.
- Fan, C. S., & Lui, H. K. (2004). Extramarital affairs, marital satisfaction, and divorce: Evidence from Hong Kong. *Contemporary Economic Policy*, 22(4), 442-452.
- Feeney, J. A. (2005). Hurt feelings in couple relationships: Exploring the role of attachment and perceptions of personal injury. *Personal Relationships*, 12(2), 253-271.
- Feldman, S. S., & Cauffman, E. (1999). Sexual betrayal among late adolescents: Perspectives of the perpetrator and the aggrieved. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 28(2), 235-258.
- Flanigan, C. M. (2007). *Staying with a partner who cheats: The influence of gender and relationship dynamics on adolescents' tolerance of infidelity*. (Master of Art's Thesis). Bowling Green State University.
- Ganji, A. A., & Navabinezhad, D. (2012). The relationship between locus of control and marital satisfaction of couples. *Life Science Journal*, 9(4), 294-298.
- Glass, S. P., & Wright, T. L. (1985). Sex differences in type of extramarital involvement and marital dissatisfaction. *Sex Roles*, 12(9), 1101-1120.
- Grenz, S. J., & Bell, R. D. (2001). *Betrayal of trust: Confronting and preventing clergy sexual misconduct*. Baker Books.
- Harris, C. R., & Christenfeld, N. (1996). Jealousy and rational responses to infidelity across gender and culture. *Psychological Science*, 7(6), 378-379.
- Knight, E. A. (2010). *Gender differences in defining infidelity*. (Master of Arts' Thesis in Counseling Psychology). Humboldt State University.
- 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., Glasser, D. B., Neves, R. C. S., & Moreira, E. D. (2009). A population-based survey of sexual activity, sexual problems and associated help-seeking behavior patterns in mature adults in the United States of America. *International Journal of Impotence Research*, 21(3), 171-178.
- Lawson, A., & Samson, C. (1988). Age, gender and adultery. *British Journal of Sociology*, 409-440.
- Mahdavian, F. (1997). *The effect of relationship education on the marital satisfaction and mental health*. (Master of Science's Thesis). Tehran University, Tehran.
- McAnulty, R. D., & Brineman, J. M. (2007). Infidelity in dating relationships. *Annual Review of Sex Research*, 18(1), 94-114.
- Morgan, H. J., & Shaver, P. R. (1999). Attachment processes and commitment to romantic relationships. In *Handbook of interpersonal commitment and relationship stability* (pp. 109-124). Springer.
- Navabi, N. S., Dokanei, F. F., & Aghajani, F. (2010). Relationship between attachments styles and happiness and marital satisfaction among married employees in Tehran Khatamolanbia hospital. *Woman & Study of Family*, 2(6), 107-120.
- Orzeck, T., & Lung, E. (2005). Big-five personality differences of cheaters and non-cheaters. *Current Psychology*, 24(4), 274-286.
- Prins, K. S., Buunk, B. P., & VanYperen, N. W. (1993). Equity, normative disapproval and extramarital relationships. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 10(1), 39-53.
- Roscoe, B., Cavanaugh, L. E., & Kennedy, D. R. (1988). Dating infidelity: Behaviors, reasons and consequences. *Adolescence*, 23(89), 35-43.
- 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.
- Ruza, I., & Ruza, A. (2012). Causal explanation for infidelity of Latvian residents in dating and marital relationships. *Journal of Family Psychology*, 28(1), 236-242.
- Schmitt, D. P. (2004). The Big Five related to risky sexual behaviour across 10 world regions: Differential personality associations of sexual promiscuity and relationship infidelity. *European Journal of Personality*, 18(4), 301-319.
- Seymani, M. (2012). Effect of psychological intervention on marital satisfaction of mothers with slow pace under 5 years children. *Iranian Rehabilitation Journal*, 10(15), 20-30.
- Shackelford, T. K. (1998). Divorce as a consequence of spousal infidelity. *Romantic Love and Sexual Behavior*, 135-153.
- Shackelford, T. K., Besser, A., & Goetz, A. T. (2008). Personality, marital satisfaction, and probability of marital infidelity. *Individual Differences Research*, 6(1), 13-25.
- Shackelford, T. K., & Buss, D. M. (2000). Marital satisfaction and spousal cost-infliction. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 28(5), 917-928.
- Shiffrin, S. V. (2008). Promising, intimate relationships, and conventionalism. *Philosophical Review*, 117(4), 481-524.
- Sims, D. (2011). *What happens after shattered? Finding hope and healing after infidelity*. United Kingdom: CrossBooks.
- Smith, D. J. (2010). Promiscuous girls, good wives, and cheating husbands: Gender inequality, transitions to marriage, and infidelity in southeastern Nigeria. *Anthropological Quarterly*, 83(1), 123-152.

- Soleimani, A. A. (1995). *The examination of the effects of irrational thoughts (the cognitive approach) on marital non-satisfaction*. (Master Teacher Training Thesis). University Tehran, Tehran.
- Startup, R. (2000). *Damaging females: representations of women as victims and perpetrators of crime in the mid-nineteenth century*. (Master's Thesis). University of London, London.
- Stieglitz, J., Gurven, M., Kaplan, H., & Winking, J. (2012). Infidelity, jealousy, and wife abuse among Tsimane forager farmers: Testing evolutionary hypotheses of marital conflict. *Evolution and Human Behavior*, 33(5), 438-448.
- Vaughn Becker, D., Sagarin, B. J., Guadagno, R. E., Millevoy, A., & Nicastle, L. D. (2004). When the sexes need not differ: Emotional responses to the sexual and emotional aspects of infidelity. *Personal Relationships*, 11(4), 529-538.
- Wardle, L. (2002). Parental infidelity and the 'no-harm' rule in custody litigation. *Catholic University Law Review*, 52, 81-132.
- Whitty, M. T. (2005). The realness of cybercheating men's and women's representations of unfaithful internet relationships. *Social Science Computer Review*, 23(1), 57-67.
- Yeniceri, Z., & Kokdemir, D. (2006). University student perceptions of and explanations for infidelity: The development of the infidelity questionnaire (INFQ). *Social Behavior and Personality: An International Journal*, 34(6), 639-650.
- Zhang, R., Ting-Toomey, S., Dorjee, T., & Lee, P. S. (2012). Culture and self-construal as predictors of relational responses to emotional infidelity: China and the United States. *Chinese Journal of Communication*, 5(2), 137-159.

