



All Theses and Dissertations

2016-06-01

"Out of Sight, Out of Mind": Examining the Association Between Geographic Distance and the Likelihood of Cheating

Krista Joy Dowdle
Brigham Young University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarsarchive.byu.edu/etd>

 Part of the [Psychology Commons](#)

BYU ScholarsArchive Citation

Dowdle, Krista Joy, "'Out of Sight, Out of Mind': Examining the Association Between Geographic Distance and the Likelihood of Cheating" (2016). *All Theses and Dissertations*. 6362.
<https://scholarsarchive.byu.edu/etd/6362>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by BYU ScholarsArchive. It has been accepted for inclusion in All Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of BYU ScholarsArchive. For more information, please contact scholarsarchive@byu.edu, ellen_amatangelo@byu.edu.

“Out of Sight, Out of Mind”: Examining the Association Between
Geographic Distance and the Likelihood of Cheating

Krista Joy Dowdle

A thesis submitted to the faculty of
Brigham Young University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of
Master of Science

Scott R. Braithwaite, Chair
Scott A. Baldwin
Patrick R. Steffen

Department of Psychology
Brigham Young University

June 2016

Copyright © 2016 Krista Joy Dowdle

All Rights Reserved

ABSTRACT

“Out of Sight, Out of Mind”: Examining the Association Between Geographic Distance and the Likelihood of Cheating

Krista Joy Dowdle
Department of Psychology, BYU
Master of Science

Distance from a partner can put a strain on romantic relationships, especially when one is surrounded by attractive alternatives, as is often the case when moving away to college. Long distance relationships are often associated with increased stress, less relationship stability, and lower levels of relationship satisfaction. Distance may also be associated with cheating on one's romantic partner. The few studies that have examined cheating behavior in college students have found an increase in cheating over a very short, non-representative interval of time when partners were separated (e.g, spring break) but did not control for important variables such as alcohol use or relationship satisfaction. We were interested in determining if these effects could be replicated over a longer, more representative period of time (a full college semester). We examined whether distance predicted cheating among college students in committed relationships while accounting for relationship satisfaction and binge drinking, variables likely to play a role in cheating behavior.

Using a large, aggregated sample (N=1,333) of college students in exclusive dating relationships, 10% percent of respondents reported physical cheating, 15% reported emotional cheating, and 6% reported both. Being 11-200 miles from a romantic partner was associated with a 31% increased likelihood of physical cheating compared to those in the same city as their partner. However, being 200+ miles from a romantic partner was associated with a slight reduction in the likelihood of physical cheating. There were no significant difference in the rates of cheating between men and women in our sample; however, these effects were moderated by gender such that distance was only related to an increased likelihood of physical cheating for women. For emotional cheating, distance was associated with an increased likelihood of cheating for both men and women.

These results suggest that there is a distance danger zone for college students. Being in the same town and being very far away are associated with less likelihood of physical or emotional cheating than being in a middle zone in which your partner is around 100 miles away. Perhaps because those who have chosen to continue a relationship while living across the country are very committed to their partner, whereas living within driving distance but not the same city creates conditions that make cheating more likely.

Keywords: cheating, geographic distance, romantic relationships, relationship satisfaction

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I want to thank Amelia Dunn and Zach Blackhurst for their help in completing this project and for providing feedback for what seems like thousands of times. Thank you to Dr. Frank Fincham for allowing me to use his data. Thank you to Dr. Scott Braithwaite for giving me my first real opportunity in psychology and pushing me to continue to grow in this field and become better. I could never have done this without his continual help, support, and encouragement as my mentor. Thank you to my family for supporting me even when my dreams seem crazy and for teaching me that I can do anything. Finally, thank you to my sweet husband Kyle for his understanding when my life is consumed with research and for loving and supporting me through all of life's ups and downs.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

“Out of Sight, Out of Mind”: Examining the Association Between.....	1
Distance Relationships Among College Students.....	2
Satisfaction.....	3
Problematic Drinking.....	4
The Present Study.....	5
Method.....	6
Participants and Procedure.....	6
Measures.....	7
Data Analysis Plan.....	8
Results.....	9
Descriptive Statistics.....	9
Is Distance from Partner Associated with Physical Cheating?.....	10
Is Distance from Partner Associated with Emotional Cheating?.....	10
Discussion.....	11
Limitations.....	13
Implications and Future Research.....	14
References.....	15
Appendix A.....	21

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1	21
Table 2	22
Table 3	23
Table 4	24
Table 5	25

“Out of Sight, Out of Mind”: Examining the Association Between
Geographic Distance and the Likelihood of Cheating

Extradyadic behavior, or cheating, is common in dating relationships among college students: 20%-75% of men reported cheating on their partner (Vail-Smith, Whetstone, & Knox, 2010), 18%-68% of women reported cheating (Hansen, 1986; Negash, Cui, Fincham, & Pasley, 2014; Widerman & Hurd, 1999), and 50%-75% of college students reported being in a relationship where someone had cheated (Braithwaite, Lambert, Fincham, & Pasley, 2010; Feldman & Cauffman, 1999). In fact, cheating in dating relationships has become so prevalent many college students may consider cheating a standard part of dating (Wilkins & Dalessandro, 2013).

Despite this, cheating is associated with poorer physical and mental health (Hall & Fincham, 2009), and most individuals report that cheating damages their relationships (Hansen, 1986) and often leads to relationship dissolution (Buunk, 1987; Negash, Cui, Fincham, & Pasley, 2014). Cheating may be particularly problematic for couples who have the expectation of a monogamous relationship, when in fact one of the partners is cheating. Vail-Smith, Whetstone, and Knox (2010) found that only 33.2% of their participants who had cheated told their partner. This, combined with the fact that those in relationships with high levels of trust often do not use condoms (Gerrard, Gibbons, & Bushman, 1996; Weaver, MacKeigan, & MacDonald, 2011), leads to increased susceptibility to sexually transmitted infections (STIs) for the unknowing partner. Partners who have cheated are likely to have cheated multiple times (Widerman & Hurd, 1999) and participated in multiple cheating behaviors (Feldman & Cauffman, 1999), which further compounds risk creating a possible public health problem. It is therefore important to understand what predicts cheating in dating relationships.

Established predictors of cheating in dating relationships include low satisfaction, need for ego bolstering, opportunity, proximity of alternatives, alcohol consumption, seeking revenge against a cheating partner, and suspicion of partner's cheating (Drigotas, Safstrom, & Gentilia, 1999; Feldman & Cauffman, 1999; Maddox Shaw, et al., 2013; Wilkins & Dalessandro, 2013). Physical separation from one's partner has been cited as a reason for cheating (Wilkins & Dalessandro, 2013), but has not been well established as a predictor of cheating. In this study, we will examine how geographic distance, relationship satisfaction, and problematic drinking influence cheating in college dating relationships.

Distance Relationships Among College Students

Long distance dating is common among college students. It is estimated that 25%-70% of college students have a long distance relationship at some point during college (Le et al., 2008; Sahlstein, 2004; Stafford, 2005; Van Horn et al., 1997). A study comparing long distance and close proximity relationships found a similar likelihood of break up across four months for both types of relationship (Kelmer, Rhoades, Stanley, Markman, 2013), suggesting no major differences in breakup between close proximity and long distance relationships when these are examined as groups.

However, many studies that examine the distance between partners find that long distance relationships are associated with negative outcomes. Separation and distance from one's partner has been shown to be a life stressor (Maguire & Kinney, 2010) and the main source of difficulty in long distance relationships (e.g., Helgeson, 1994; Holt & Stone, 1988). Long distance relationships often have lower levels of satisfaction (Maguire & Kinney, 2010) and more unstable (Solomon & Knobloch, 2004; Baxter & Bullis, 1986; Knox, Zusman, Daniels, & Brantley, 2002), with many partners indicating that they would be unwilling to participate in a

long distance relationship in the future (Knox, Zusman, Daniles, & Brantly, 2002). In unstable relationships, partners often feel less secure, which opens the door for more potential jealousy and suspicion of cheating when partners live away from one another (Cameron & Ross, 2007; Schutzwahl, Morjaria, & Alvis, 2011).

A few studies have looked at college students spending short periods of time away from their dating partners (i.e. spring and winter breaks). One study asked participants how physically intimate they were with someone else over winter break and found that higher commitment in the relationship led to missing the partner more which, in turn, led to a lower likelihood of cheating (Le, Korn, Crockett, & Loving, 2010). Also asking how physically intimate participants were with someone other than their partners, another study found higher commitment before separation predicted lower levels of unfaithful behaviors during spring break (Drigotas, Safstrom, & Gentilia, 1999). However, neither of these studies controlled for drinking behaviors, which is concerning as spring break is well known for high levels of drinking. Nor do these studies examine cheating behaviors for more than a couple of weeks. We chose to extend existing research findings by examining cheating during the course of a college semester while controlling for important contextual factors, including alcohol use.

Satisfaction

Frequently researchers define cheating as sexual or emotional involvement with someone outside the agreed monogamous partnership. When defining cheating in this way, those in committed dating relationships indicated that dissatisfaction with the relationship was a key motivation (Barta & Kiene, 2005; Wilkins & Dalessandro, 2013). A lack of relationship satisfaction has also been found to predict both the inclination to cheat as well as cheating behaviors (Maddox Shaw, et al., 2013; Mark, Janssen, & Milhausen, 2011; McAlister, Pachana,

& Jackson, 2005). In one study, Mark, Janssen, and Milhausen (2011) found 72% of men and 62% of women who had cheated reported they had had lower relationship satisfaction before they cheated. In their longitudinal study, Maddox Shaw and colleagues (2013) reported that relationship satisfaction predicted cheating over a 20-month period in both their dating and married samples.

Research examining the association between geographic distance and relationship satisfaction in college students is scant. In one study, the majority of participants indicated the distance either lowered their relationship satisfaction or was a major cause of their break up (Knox, Zusman, Daniles, & Brantly, 2002). This suggests distance from partner decreases satisfaction and as stated earlier, satisfaction can predict cheating or the inclination to cheat (Wilkins & Dalessandro, 2013).

Problematic Drinking

Past research provides strong evidence for an association between problematic drinking and cheating. In one qualitative study of female college students, participants reported alcohol use was an acceptable reason for cheating (Wilkins & Dalessandro, 2013). Alcohol use is a feature of casual sexual encounters; in one study (Grello, Welsh, & Harper, 2006), 65% of those engaging in casual sex reported being under the influence of alcohol or drugs at the time of the encounter. Maddox Shaw and colleagues (2013) found that alcohol use was a significant predictor of participants having had sexual relations with someone other than their partner, even when controlling for other established predictors (e.g., number of previous sexual partners, etc.). College students who binge drink are more likely to cheat on a partner, particularly male college students (Vail-Smith, Whetstone, & Knox, 2010). Because drinking and cheating are closely related, when looking at cheating in distance relationships, it is important to account for the

effect that drinking has on distance and cheating and thus we will control for problematic drinking in our statistical model.

The Present Study

Taken together, existing research suggests a possible relationship between geographic distance and the likelihood of cheating. We chose to investigate this association, while including relationship satisfaction partners who are less satisfied with their relationship are more likely to cheat. We examine this association using a longitudinal design, an important task in view of the fact that previous research using retrospective designs may have found an association between satisfaction and cheating simply because respondents are trying to reduce cognitive dissonance after cheating. Moreover, these associations have yet to be established among emerging adults in college, which is a critical oversight given the prevalence of cheating and STI risk in this population (Braithwaite et al., 2010; Hansen, 1986; Wiederman & Hurd, 1999). Finally, much extant research has not controlled for alcohol consumption when examining the associations between geographic distance, cheating, and relationship satisfaction. Our study is designed to specifically address each of these gaps in the literature.

One difficulty in researching cheating in romantic relationships is the lack of uniform definition of cheating. Most definitions either state (Barta & Kiene, 2005; Feldman & Cauffman, 1999; Vail-Smith, Whetstone, & Knx, 2010) or imply (Maddox Shaw, Rhoades, Allen, Stanley, & Markman, 2013; Wilkins & Dalessandro, 2013; Wiederman & Hurd, 1999) that the participants were in a relationship where there was an understanding of monogamy. Frequently rather than defining cheating behavior outright, researchers rely on self-report and self-definition by the participant (Barta & Kiene, 2005; Feldman & Cauffman, 1999). That is, many researchers have the participant define cheating for themselves. Similarly, we chose to allow participants to

define cheating for themselves. Defining cheating in this way allows us to catch a wider range of cheating behaviors than when the researcher defines cheating for the participant. The difficulty in asking participants to define cheating individually is that it is not clear or consistent what is being studied. Following the lead of Wiederman and Hurd (1999) and in order to mitigate this problem, we included a list of behaviors commonly considered by researchers (Feldman & Cauffman, 1999; Vail-Smith, Whetstone, & Knox, 2010) to be cheating (e.g., kissing, intimate touching, intercourse, etc.) in order have more of an idea of the behaviors the participants are participating in.

Hypothesis: Geographic distance from partner will predict an increase in the likelihood of cheating, even when controlling for binge drinking behaviors, and relationship satisfaction.

Method

Participants and Procedure

Participants were recruited from an undergraduate family science course that filled a university general education requirement at a public university in the Southeastern United States. Students were invited to participate as one of several options to receive course credit. The data come from a larger data collection effort looking at the course of emerging adulthood in college. Our sample is an aggregated sample of participants from four separate semesters, all surveyed at the beginning of the semester and then again at two months after the initial survey. Participants completed an online survey wherever they chose to access the Internet. Prior to collecting data, we obtained institutional review board approval for all procedures.

We only included participants who indicated that they were in an exclusive relationship. To predict cheating behaviors at Time 2, we used geographic distance from partner, satisfaction with the relationship, and binge drinking behaviors assessed at Time 1. Since our questions about

cheating referred to behavior over “the past two months”, we used Time 2 data to capture only cheating that occurred in the relationship described at T1 (approximately two months earlier). To further ensure that our cheating behavior was actually cheating on the partner/in the relationship identified at T1, we only included participants who indicated that they had been in their current relationship for two months or longer at the T2 assessment.

Our sample started with 3,975 participants. For this study, participants were excluded if they did not fall in the age range associated with emerging adulthood (18-25), if they were not in a romantic relationship at the time of the first survey, and had not been in that relationship for at least two months. Once those people were excluded, our sample comprised 1,333 (1,091 women, 239 men) students. Historically, men have reported higher rates of cheating than women (Vail-Smith, Whetstone, & Knox, 2010); however, more recent research has suggested that the sex difference is narrowing, especially in samples of college students (Maddox Shaw, et al., 2013). Because of the changes in prevalence rates across studies and the imbalance of sex in our sample, we tested for moderation by biological sex.

The overall average age was 19.38 years ($SD = .04$); the average age for women was 19.31 years ($SD = .04$) and the average age for men was 19.72 years ($SD = .10$). Thirty-six percent of respondents were freshmen, 31% sophomores, 23% juniors, and 10% seniors. Caucasians comprised approximately 53% of the sample, African Americans 9%, Latino 9%, Asian 2%, Native Americans/American Indian less than <1%, with 2% reporting “Other.”

Measures

Distance. We assessed geographical distance with the question “How far away from you does your partner live?” with options *0-10 miles*, *11-20 miles*, *21-50 miles*, *51-100 miles*, *101-200 miles*, and *200+ miles*.

Relationship satisfaction. We assessed relationship satisfaction using the Couples Satisfaction Index (Funk & Rogge, 2007). This scale was developed from existing marital satisfaction measures using item response theory analysis and consists of four questions assessing general satisfaction, how rewarding the relationship is, how warm and comfortable the relationship is, and overall happiness in the relationship. For all items, higher scores represented more satisfaction. Scores across the items were summed to get a single satisfaction score. Alpha in this sample was .91. Convergent validity with established satisfaction measures such as the Dyadic Adjustment Scale, Marital Adjustment Test, Quality of Marriage Index, and Relationship Assessment Scale range from $r = 0.84-0.94$.

Cheating. Given the stem “Thinking of your current relationship, during the past 2 months” participants were asked “Have you done anything that you consider to be physically unfaithful?” and “Have you done anything that you consider to be emotionally unfaithful?” Responses were coded 0 = *no* and 1 = *yes*.

Binge drinking. We assessed binge drinking with the question “How often in the last 30 days did do you have five or more drinks on one occasion?” with options *0-Never happened, 1 time, 2 times, 3 times, 4 times, 5-6 times, 7-8 times, 9-10 times* and *More than 10 times*. As it is a single item, behavioral question, there are no reliability and validity statistics to report. However, five or more drinks on one occasion is the accepted operationalization of binge drinking (e. g., Wechsler, Davenport, Dowdall, Moeykens, & Castillo, 1994; Wechsler & Nelson, 2001).

Data Analysis Plan

We used Generalized Structural Equation Models (GSEM) in Stata to examine whether distance from a partner was associated with cheating incidence during the first two months of the semester (cheated = 1, did not = 0), while controlling for binge drinking and satisfaction at Time

1. Structural models offer the ability to examine our entire theoretical model at once rather than running separate regressions for each part of our model. We ran separate models for physical and emotional cheating outcomes. Previous researchers have analyzed physical and emotional cheating separately (Hall & Fincham, 2009), so we chose to do so as well.

Because we aggregated samples from across multiple semesters we accounted for potential clustering using robust standard errors [`vce(cluster semester)`] option in Stata. We also tested for potential moderation by biological sex by regressing emotional and physical cheating on a biological sex and distance interaction term.

Results

Descriptive Statistics

In analyzing descriptive statistics for the distance variable, we decided to collapse the groups given above into three categorical groups. We did this because groups 2 (4% of participants), 3 (1% of participants), 4 (2% of participants), and 5 (11% of participants) did not have enough respondents to suggest that any differences we might find between them or groups 1 and 6 would be meaningful. Further, given that the original groupings were somewhat arbitrary, we did not feel bound by precedent to keep them separate. With the groups collapsed, about 55% of students reported living 0-10 miles from their partner, 17% reported living 11-200 miles, and 29% 200+ miles from their partner. Approximately 10% of students reported cheating on their partner physically in the past two months; 15% reported cheating on their partner emotionally in the past two months. About 6% of participants reported participating in both physical and emotional cheating in the past two months. A description of specific cheating activities is depicted in Table 1.

Is Distance from Partner Associated with Physical Cheating?

Distance from partner was associated with the occurrence of physical cheating such that being 11-200 miles from one's partner resulted in significant increased likelihood ($OR = 1.32$, $CI [1.06, 1.65]$) of cheating physically in comparison to group 1 (0-10 miles); this represents a 31% increased likelihood of cheating physically. Being 200+ miles from one's partner resulted in a nonsignificant decreased likelihood ($OR = .93$, $CI [0.48, 1.80]$) of cheating physically in comparison to group 1 (0-10 miles); this represents a 7% decreased likelihood of cheating physically. These associations held even when accounting for the nonsignificant influence of binge drinking ($OR = 1.13$, $CI [1.00, 1.28]$) and significant relationship satisfaction ($OR = 0.88$, $CI [0.82, 0.94]$). The biological sex interaction term was significant (see Table 2) in that distance did not have a significant effect on cheating for men, but it did for women (see Tables 4 & 5).

Is Distance from Partner Associated with Emotional Cheating?

Distance from partner was associated with the occurrence of emotional cheating such that being 11-200 miles from your partner resulted in a significant increased likelihood ($OR = 1.47$, $CI [1.34, 1.6]$) of cheating emotionally in comparison to group 1 (0-10 miles); this represents a 47% increased likelihood of cheating emotionally. Being 200+ miles from your partner resulted in a nonsignificant increased likelihood ($OR = 1.73$, $CI [0.89, 3.36]$) of cheating emotionally in comparison to group 1 (0-10 miles); this represents a 73% increased likelihood of cheating emotionally. These associations held even when accounting for the nonsignificant influence of binge drinking ($OR = 1.07$, $CI [0.97, 1.19]$) and the significant influence of relationship satisfaction ($OR = 0.90$, $CI [0.87, 0.94]$). The biological sex interaction term was not significant. However, given the significant association in physical cheating and the amount of noise in some of our findings (see Table 3), we decided to investigate the interaction further. We found the

same association as in physical cheating: distance did not have a significant effect on the likelihood of cheating for men, but did for women (see Tables 4 & 5).

Discussion

In this study, we found being in the same town and being very far away from a partner is associated with less likelihood of physical or emotional cheating than being in a middle zone in which your partner is about 100 miles away. This suggests a distance “danger zone” for dating relationships. Perhaps being hundreds of miles away from your partner requires an increase in commitment and effort and thus reduces the likelihood of cheating. In contrast, living in the same city as your partner does not allow for as many opportunities to cheat as being within driving distance but not in the same city. Individuals within the “danger zone” may be in less committed relationships and have a greater opportunity to cheat, resulting in a higher amount of cheating. College provides opportunity to meet and interact with possible alternatives to the relationship partner. Those who are less committed are also more likely to seek alternatives to their partner (DeWall et al., 2011). When individuals are in an unstable long distance relationship, they may be more likely to seek alternative partners, which can lead to cheating.

It is also interesting that this “danger zone” appears to have a stronger impact in women than in men; men are equally likely to cheat at any distance from their partners. In a long distance relationship, the potential to satisfy emotional and physical needs is decreased. While likely not as strong or satisfying, emotional needs might be more easily met in long distance relationships, especially with newer technology (i.e., Skype, FaceTime, etc.); thus, finding an emotional connection with someone outside of your partner may be less necessary. This is supported by Maguire and Kinney (2010) who found that good communication and strong emotional connection in long distance relationships can reduce the dissatisfaction caused by

distance. While some aspects of physical needs can be met to a certain degree (i.e., phone sex, mutual masturbation, etc.) because of the technology previously mentioned, not all physical needs can be satisfied at a distance (i.e., kissing, intimate touching, etc.). It is possible that experiencing these effects, without having an extra layer of commitment to mitigate them, affect women more than men. However, more research needs to be done to determine why our sex difference was found.

Previous research on relationship satisfaction established a strong association with cheating, and our data were consistent with these findings as satisfaction predicted both physical and emotional cheating; however, distance still significantly predicted the likelihood of cheating beyond what relationship satisfaction could account for. We included binge drinking as a control variable because problematic drinking is associated with risky behavior in general and risky sexual behavior specifically (Braithwaite, Aaron, Dowdle, Spjut, & Fincham, 2015; Braithwaite, Coulsen, Keddington, & Fincham, 2015). We also controlled for binge drinking because it is common in college populations (Tweksbury, Higgins, & Ehrhardt Mustaine, 2008). By including drinking and satisfaction as controls, we can be more confident that there is an association between geographic distance and cheating.

A strong point of this study was the large aggregated sample collected because it increased our power. We analyzed data from 1,333 participants across different times without significant differences between semesters, which indicated that these results generalize well. Compared to prior studies, we also had a longer period between our assessments with a couple months between rather than a couple weeks. Although previous research may have studied distance over a few days or weeks, our study looked at distance and cheating across a greater time (two months) and in everyday life instead of during a school vacation. As mentioned before,

we found a strong relationship with distance predicting cheating, which is consistent with our hypothesis and another strength of our study.

Limitations

There are a few limitations to be considered. Our data was all self-report, which is an issue because cheating is a socially undesirable behavior so participants might have been less honest in responding. Additionally, we only used one question to assess most of our constructs. However, given that our questions are assessing behaviors and are in line with how binge drinking, distance, and cheating are measured in the literature, we feel that using single-item questions about behaviors is a reasonable approach and is in line with other studies in this area of research (Drigotas, Safstrom, & Gentilia, 1999; Fincham, Lambert, & Beach, 2010; Maddox Shaw et. al., 2013; Negash, Cui, Fincham, & Pasley, 2014).

Another limitation was that during data collection, only those who indicated they were in a romantic relationship were asked the questions about cheating; as such, individuals who broke up between Time 1 and Time 2, some of whom likely broke up as a result of geographic distance or cheating, were not included; this attrition could have minimized our effect. It was because of this possible attrition we chose to only use Time 1 and Time 2 instead of examining the association between distance and cheating between Time 1 and Time 3 (at the end of the semester and two months after Time 2). Examining couples who break up due to cheating or geographic distance could be important in understanding the association between cheating and geographic distance.

The way we coded our distance variable could also be a limitation. Though it was statistically sound given our data, we do not have evidence from the research literature to suggest this was the correct way to measure our distance variable. Other researchers have dichotomized

distance as partners being 50 miles or more away from each other (Kelmer, Rhoades, Stanley, & Markman, 2013) or had their participants self-select whether or not they were in a long-distance relationship (Roberts & Pistle, 2009). More research needs to be done in order to determine the most appropriate way to code the distance variable because as of now there is not an empirically supported, standard definition.

Implications and Future Research

It would seem that the old adage “Out of Sight, Out of Mind” is true for some distance college relationships. Because this association seems so intuitive it is even more important that we understand the mechanism through which the distance–cheating relationship works in order to get a complete picture of dating relationships. Some interesting variables to explore as mediators include loneliness, proximity of alternatives, and commitment, as stated earlier. As we continue to learn about how dating relationships work we can improve the quality of dating relationships by preventing damaging patterns and encouraging healthy ones.

References

- Baxter, L. A., & Bullis, C. (1986). Turning points in developing romantic relationships. *Human Communication Research, 12*(4), 469-493. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2958.1986.tb00088.x>
- 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*(2), 339-360. doi:10.1177/0265407505052440
- Braithwaite, S. R., Aaron, S. C., Dowdle, K. K., Spjut, K., & Fincham, F. D. (2015). Does pornography consumption increase participation in friends with benefits relationships? *Sexuality & Culture*, doi:10.1007/s12119-015-9275-4
- Braithwaite, S. R., Coulsen, G., Keddington, K., & Fincham, F. D. (2015). The influence of pornography on sexual scripts and hooking up among emerging adults in college. *Archives of Sexual Behavior, 44*(1), 111-123. doi:10.1007/s10508-014-0351-x
- Braithwaite, S. R., Lambert, N. M., Fincham, F. D., & K. Pasley (2010). Does college-based relationship education decrease extradyadic involvement in relationships. *Journal of Family Psychology, 24*(6), 740-745. doi:10.1037/a0021759
- 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. doi:10.1006/jrpe.1997.2175
- Buunk, B. (1987). Conditions that promote breakups as a consequence of extradyadic involvements. *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology, 5*(3), 271-284.
- Cameron, J. J., & Ross, M. (2007). In times of uncertainty: Predicting the survival of long-distance relationships. *The Journal of Social Psychology, 147*(6), 581-606.

- DeWall, C. N., Slotter, E. B., Finkel, E. J., Luchies, L. B., Lambert, N. M., Pond, R. S., . . . Fincham F. D. (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. doi:10.1037/a0025497
- Drigotas, S. M., Safstrom, C. A., & Gentilia, T. (1999). An investment model of prediction of dating infidelity. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *77*(3), 509-524.
- Feldman, S. S., & Cauffman, E. (1999). Your cheatin' heart: Attitudes, behaviors, and correlates of sexual betrayal in late adolescents. *Journal of Research on Adolescence*, *9*(3), 227-252. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1207/s15327795jra0903_1
- Gerrard, M., Gibbons, F. X., & Bushman, B. J. (1996). Relation between perceived vulnerability to HIV and precautionary sexual behavior. *Psychological Bulletin*, *119*(3), 390-409. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.119.3.390
- Grello, C. M., Welsh, D. P., & Harper, M. S. (2006). No strings attached: The nature of casual sex in college students. *Journal of Sex Research*, *43*(3), 255-267. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00224490609552324
- Guldner, G. T. (1996). Long-distance romantic relationships: Prevalence and separation-related symptoms in college students. *Journal of College Student Development*, *37*(3), 289-296.
- Hall, J. H., & Fincham, F. D. (2009). Psychological distress: Precursor or consequence of dating infidelity? *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *35*(2), 143-159. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0146167208327189
- Hansen, G. L. (1987). Extradadic relations during courtship. *Society for the Scientific Study of Sexuality*, *23*(3), 382-390. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00224498709551376

- Helgeson, V. S. (1994). Long-distance romantic relationships: Sex differences in adjustment and breakup. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 20(3), 254-265.
doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0146167294203003>
- Holt, P. A., & Stone, G. L. (1988). Needs, coping strategies, and coping outcomes associated with long-distance relationships. *Journal of College Student Development*, 29(2), 136-141.
- Kelmer, G., Rhoades, G. K., Stanley, S., & Markman, H. J. (2013). Relationship quality, commitment, and stability in long-distance relationships. *Family Process*, 52(2), 257-270.
doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1545-5300.2012.01418.x>
- Knox, D., Zusman, M. E., Daniels, V., & Brantley A. (2002). Absence makes the heart grow fonder?: Long distance dating relationships among college students. *College Student Journal*, 36(3), 364-366.
- Le, B., Dove, N. L., Agnew, C. R., Korn, M. S., & Mutso, A. A. (2010). Predicting nonmarital romantic relationship dissolution: A meta-analytic synthesis. *Personal Relationships*, 17, 377-390. doi:10.1111/j.1475-6811.2010.01285.x
- 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. doi:10.1177/0265407510384898
- Le, B., Loving, T. J., Lewandowski, G. W., Fienberg, E. G., Johnson, K. C., Fiorentino, R., & Ing, J. (2008). Missing a romantic partner: A prototype analysis. *Personal Relationships*, 15, 511-532.
- Lee, J., & Pistole, M. (2012). Predictors of satisfaction in geographically close and long-distance relationships. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 59(2), 303-313.

- London, A. S., Allen, E., & Wilmoth, J. M. (2012). Veteran status, extramarital sex, and divorce: Findings from the 1992 national health and social life survey. *Journal of Family Issues*, 34(11), 1452-1473. doi:10.1177/0192513X12460510
- Maddox, A. M., Rhoades, G. K., & Markman, H. J. (2011). Viewing sexually-explicit materials alone or together: Associations with relationship quality. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 40, 441-448. doi:10.1007/s10508-009-9585-4
- Maddox Shaw, A. M., Rhoades, G. K., Allen, E. S., Stanley, S. M., & Markman, H. J. (2013). Predictors of extradyadic sexual involvement in unmarried opposite-sex relationships. *Journal of Sex Research*, 50(6), 598-610. doi:10.1080/00224499.2012.666816
- Maguire, K. C., & Kinney, T. A. (2010). When distance is problematic: Communication, coping, and relational satisfaction in female college students' long-distance dating relationships. *Journal of Applied Communication Research*, 38(1), 27-46. doi:10.1080/00909880903483573
- Mark, K. P., Janssen, E., & Milhausen, R. R. (2011). Infidelity in heterosexual couples: Demographic, interpersonal, and personality-related predictors of extradyadic sex. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 40, 971-982. doi:10.1007/s10508-011-9771-z
- McAlister, A. R., Pachana, N., & Jackson, C. J. (2005). Predictors of young dating adults' inclination to engage in extradyadic sexual activities: A multi-perspective study. *British Journal of Psychology*, 96, 331-350. doi:10.1348/000712605X47936
- Merolla, A. (2012). Connecting here and there: A model of long-distance relationship maintenance. *Personal Relationships*, 19, 775-795.

- Negash, S., Cui, M., Fincham, F. D., & Pasley, K. (2014). Extradysadic involvement and relationship dissolution in heterosexual women university students. *Archives of Sexual Behavior, 43*, 531-539. doi:10.1007/s10508-013-0213-y
- Roberts, A., & Pistole, M. (2009). Long-distance and proximal romantic relationship satisfaction: Attachment and closeness predictors. *Journal of College Counseling, 12*, 4-17.
- Sahlstein, E. M. (2004). Relating at a distance: Negotiation being together and being apart in long-distance relationships. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 21*(5), 689-710. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0265407504046115
- Schutzwohl, A., Morjaria, S., & Alvis, S. (2011). Spatial distance regulates sex-specific feelings to suspected sexual and emotional infidelity. *Evolutionary Psychology, 9*(3), 417-429.
- Solomon, D. H., & Knobloch, L. K. (2004). A model of relationship turbulence: The role of intimacy, relational uncertainty, and interference from partners in appraisals of irritations. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 21*(6), 795-816. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0265407504047838
- Stafford, L. (2005). *Maintaining long-distance and cross-residential relationships*. Mahwah, New Jersey, United States: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers
- Tewksbury, R., Higgins, G. E., & Ehrhardt Mustaine, E. (2008). Binge drinking among college athletes and non-athletes. *Deviant Behavior, 29*(3), 275-293. doi:10.1080/01639620701588040
- Vail-Smith, K., Whetstone, L. M., & Knox D. (2010). The illusion of safety in “monogamous” undergraduate relationships. *American Journal of Health Behaviors, 34*(1), 12-20.

- Van Horn, K. R., Arnone, A., Nesbitt, K., Desilets, L., Sears, T., Giffin, M., & Brudi, R. (1997). Physical distance and interpersonal characteristics in college students' romantic relationships. *Personal Relationships, 4*(1), 25-34. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1475-6811.1997.tb00128.x>
- Weaver, A. D., MacKeigan, K. L., & MacDonald, H. A. (2011). Experiences and perceptions of young adults in friends with benefits relationships: A qualitative study. *The Canadian Journal of Human Sexuality, 20*(1-2), 41-53.
- Wechsler, H., Davenport, A., Dowdall, G., Moeykens, B., & Castillo, S. (1994). Health and behavioral consequences of binge drinking in college: A national survey of students at 140 campuses. *Journal of the American Medical Association, 272*, 1672-1677.
- Wechsler, H., & Nelson, T. F. (2001). Binge drinking and the American college student: What's five drinks?. *Psychology of Addictive Behaviors, 15*(4), 287-291. doi:[10.1037//0893-164X.15.4.287](https://doi.org/10.1037//0893-164X.15.4.287)
- Wideman, M. W., & Hurd C. (1999). Extradynamic involvement during dating. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 16*(2), 265-274. doi:[10.1177/0265407599162008](https://doi.org/10.1177/0265407599162008)
- Wilkins A. C., & Dalessandro C. (2013). Monogamy lite: Cheating, college, and women. *Gender & Society, 27*(5), 728-751. doi:[10.1177/0891243213483878](https://doi.org/10.1177/0891243213483878)

Appendix A

Table 1

Cheating Behaviors in Percentage by Cheating Behavior Type

	Total Sample	Physical	Emotional	Both
Kissing	13%	77%	35%	74%
Hugging	31%	78%	57%	79%
Dating	1%	8%	5%	9%
Intimate Touching	7%	44%	18%	44%
Intercourse	6%	35%	13%	32%
Condom Use (% of intercourse)	80%	82%	73%	72%

Table 2

Odds Ratios for Physical Cheating

	OR	Std. Err.	p	95% CI
Distance 0-10 Miles	Reference	-	-	-
Distance 11-200 Miles	1.31*	0.15	0.01	1.06-1.63
Distance 200+ Miles	0.91	0.30	0.78	0.48-1.72
Satisfaction	0.88*	0.03	0.00	0.82-0.94
Binge Drinking	1.13	0.07	0.05	1.00-1.28
Sex (Main Effect)	0.35	0.25	0.14	0.08-1.43
Sex x Distance (Interaction)	1.64*	0.35	0.02	1.09-2.49

*Indicates significant at $p < .05$ level.

Table 3

Odds Ratios for Emotional Cheating

	OR	Std. Err.	p	95% CI
Distance 0-10 Miles	Reference	-	-	-
Distance 11-200 Miles	1.46*	0.07	0.00	1.33-1.60
Distance 200+ Miles	1.71	0.58	0.11	0.88-3.32
Satisfaction	0.90*	0.02	0.00	0.87-0.94
Binge Drinking	1.07	0.06	0.18	0.97-1.19
Sex (Main Effect)	0.91	0.40	0.84	0.38-2.17
Sex x Distance (Interaction)	0.95	0.57	0.78	0.67-1.34

*Indicates significant at $p < .05$ level.

Table 4

Coefficients for Men's Cheating

	Physical Cheating				Emotional Cheating			
	Coefficient	Std. Err.	p	95% CI	Coefficient	Std. Err.	p	95% CI
Distance 0-10 Miles	Reference	-	-	-	Reference	-	-	-
Distance 11-200 Miles	-0.38	0.66	0.56	-1.67-0.90	0.29	0.15	0.05	-0.00-0.59
Distance 200+ Miles	-0.02	0.27	0.95	-0.55-0.51	0.57	0.33	0.08	-0.07-1.21
Satisfaction	-0.17	0.05	0.00	-0.28--0.70	-0.09	0.04	0.02	-0.17--0.02
Binge Drinking	-0.05	0.07	0.20	-0.14-0.03	-0.01	0.82	0.90	-0.17-0.15
Constant	1.72	1.33	0.19	-0.87-4.32	0.23	0.84	0.78	-1.42-1.89

Table 5

Coefficients for Women's Cheating

	Physical Cheating				Emotional Cheating			
	Coefficient	Std. Err.	p	95% CI	Coefficient	Std. Err.	p	95% CI
Distance 0-10 Miles	Reference	-	-	-	Reference	-	-	-
Distance 11-200 Miles	0.90	0.18	0.00	0.56-1.25	0.34	0.16	0.04	0.02-0.66
Distance 200+ Miles	0.93	0.27	0.00	0.40-1.46	0.45	0.08	0.00	0.30-0.60
Satisfaction	-0.11	0.04	0.00	-0.19--0.04	-0.10	0.02	0.00	-0.14--0.06
Binge Drinking	0.19	0.06	0.00	0.07-0.32	0.10	0.04	0.02	0.01-0.19
Constant	-0.95	0.77	0.22	-2.46-0.56	-0.12	0.36	0.73	-0.83-0.59