

Jealousy and Infidelity among Mexican Couples

Sofia Rivera-Aragon

Rolando Diaz-Loving

Pedro Wolfgang Velasco-Matus

Nancy Montero-Santamaria

National Autonomous University of Mexico, Mexico

Abstract

Gender differences in jealousy have been traced back to both socio-cultural, as well as to evolutionary sources. The evolutionary approach predicts similar gender differences to be found in all cultures. Socio-cultural explanations, however, suggest that the patterns of gender differences may be culture-specific. The current study investigated gender differences in the relations between jealousy and infidelity in Mexico. 537 participants (248 men; 289 women) filled out an inventory of jealousy and infidelity, respectively. The results show first a positive relationship among infidelity, anger, fear, suspicion, frustration and distrust. Second, the data reveal a clear gender difference in that men desired sexual and emotional infidelity relationships more often than women. These findings are discussed regarding the importance of culture.

Authors' Note: The authors would like to thank the financial support for the development of this project of PAPIIT, Project No. IN305706-3, Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Sofia Rivera-Aragon, E-mail: sofiar@servidor.unam.mx

When referring to infidelity, references, common knowledge and scientific inquiry are biased towards the sexual experience and disregard the fact that infidelity also has an emotional component. The widespread occurrence of sharing a mate or losing them to other people or other interests across cultures (Buss, 1989) indicates a universal phenomenon that seems to be the leading motivation behind feelings of infidelity and, very often, jealousy (Seidenberg, 1967). In fact, suspicion about the partner's possible infidelity elicits jealousy in men and women (Buss & Shackelford, 1997; Daly & Wilson, 1983; Garcia, Gomez, & Canto, 2001). Although gender difference may attest to both biological and cultural effects, specific studies directed at uncovering cultural idiosyncratic manifestations are absent.

Differences between men and women concerning types of infidelity, either sexual or emotional, have been analyzed by two leading theories: the socio-cultural theory (DeSteno & Salovey, 1996a; Harris & Christenfeld, 1996b; Hupka, 1981) and the evolutionary theory (Buss, 1989; Buss, Larsen, Western, & Semmelroth, 1992; Buunk, Angleitner, Oubaid, & Buss, 1996). Evolutionary theory emphasizes male's greater concern about paternal certainty and, thus, sexual infidelity, while it contends that females' need for protection leads to greater discomfort with the emotional aspects of infidelity, which could include abandonment. The socio-cultural perspective establishes the social function of jealousy: preserving property rights as defined by culture in a specific historical time frame.

According to the socio-cultural perspective, jealousy does not involve a triadic relationship, but rather a quartet consisting of the rival, the member of the couple who is the object of desire, the subject who is the victim of jealousy, and the community, whose function is to secure the fulfillment of rules, promote behaviors that are consistent therewith, and restrict behaviors that contradict them (Garcia et al., 2001). Given that a variety of experiences lead men and women to develop different attitudes concerning proper behaviors in relationships, relevant factors in trying to understand men's and women's responses to the couple's potential crisis are norms, attitudes, and beliefs (Díaz-Loving & Sánchez-Aragón, 2002). Thus, culture is in charge of determining when a situation is threatening, when this situation constitutes danger, and under what conditions the manifestation of jealousy is required (Hupka, 1981).

From the evolutionary position, significant gender differences regarding men's and women's feelings about their partner's infidelity have been explained based on survival needs. From this standpoint, the reason that men are predisposed to feeling distressed by sexual infidelity, while women are predisposed to feeling distressed by emotional infidelity, is linked to reproduction and protection needs (Symons, 1979; Daly, Wilson, & Weghorst, 1982; Buss, 2000). Therefore, differences originate from the various adaptive pressures men and women have gone through throughout evolution. In the case of men, adultery is supposed to have the greatest adaptive advantage and cost, when men are the victims and their partner's infidelity resulted in pregnancy. Then, the affected man would face the risk of investing resources in supporting offspring that do not carry his genes. In order to prevent this, according to this hypothesis, evolution endowed men with a sexual jealousy mechanism that is triggered by their partner's sexual betrayal. Almost as a reflex, this mechanism has been especially designed to respond only to specific input stimuli, and when the former is triggered, affective changes are produced (Barkow, Cosmides, & Tobby, 1992). It should be noted that there is some learning, and thus socio-cultural aspects regarding male jealousy, since the input stimuli might be cognitive, such as the idea that the partner is having sexual relations with someone else, which unleashes jealousy. Females, since they tend to be more selective of mates, have lower levels of adultery, and in consequence did not develop such an accurate sexual jealousy mechanism. Nevertheless, throughout history women have faced a different kind of risk: the loss of resources provided by her partner to her and her offspring. It is believed that this challenge conditioned a response mode in women that is activated by the idea that her partner is developing a sentimental bond with another woman, which would probably lead the man to provide someone else with the needed resources. In other words, women are not afraid of adultery, they are afraid of being abandoned (Sabini & Silver, 2005).

Although the general patterns of behavioral response to sexual or emotional infidelity seem to be universal, socio-cognitive theorists have argued that cognitive valuation plays a significant role in eliciting jealousy and have highlighted the importance of the interpretation of a variety of fears and not only emotional or sexual betrayal (Harris, 2003a; Hupka & Ryan, 1990; Mathes, 1991; Parrott, 1991; Salovey & Rothman, 1991; White, 1981; White & Mullen, 1989). Accordingly, two factors make the partner's involvement with someone else particularly threatening: (a) when it jeopardizes an aspect of the individual's self-concept, self-image, and other self-representations, and (b) when the quality of the primary relationship is deteriorated. For instance, the hypothesis of Salovey and his colleagues (Salovey et al., 1991; Salovey & Rodin, 1991) suggests that jealousy may occur in response to rivals who are superior to us in domains that are particularly important and relevant to self-definition. This is, when the individual perceives that their partner is interested in someone else, the latter may become a rival who is competing for the partner's attention and a prominent target of social comparisons. Particularly, individuals facing this kind of rival will try to assess whether the rival is better or worse based on certain aspects that are deemed important by the betrayed individual. Social comparison with the rival will take place in such dimensions as they are deemed important for the individual's self-esteem and self-concept (DeSteno & Salovey, 1996b), in dimension that the individual considers important for their partner (Schmitt, 1988; White, 1981), or in those that enhance the individual's general appeal as a partner (Mathes, 1991). A rival with superior qualities in these dimensions will provoke feelings of jealousy. It should be noted that all these self-construal dimensions are developed in social interaction (Mead, 1913) and are closely related to socio-cultural norms (Díaz-Guerrero, 1984).

The effects of diverse cognitive sets that were derived from the interaction of evolution with individual and ecosystems are evident when men and women differ in their jealousy responses according to physical appeal and characteristics associated with the rival's status (Dijkstra & Buunk, 2002). For example, Dijkstra and Buunk (1998), Buss, Shackelford, Choe, Dijkstra & Buunk (2000), and Hupka and Eshett (1998) found that women are more jealous in response to a more physically attractive rival, while men are more jealous when they face more socially dominant rivals. An explanation for this is offered by Dijkstra and Buunk (1998) and Buss et al. (2000) on the basis of evolutionary psychology. According to this view, and on account of men's and women's differences in terms of reproductive biology, they also differ in regard to the characteristics that contribute to increase the value they give to each other as partners and will determine the rival's jealousy-provoking characteristics. While women's value is based on their physical appeal, men's value as partners is determined by status-related characteristics such as social dominance.

Socio-cognitive theorists have not usually focused on distinguishing the difference between sexual jealousy and emotional jealousy. An exception to this is DeSteno's et al. (1996a) "double shot" hypothesis and Harris and Christenfeld's (1996a) "two for one" hypothesis, which suggest that both men and women find emotional and sexual infidelity more damaging when they are combined, than being confronted with only one. Moreover, both hypotheses state that men tend to think that a woman is surely in love with another man if she has sexual relations with him. Therefore, sexual infidelity is even worse for men than the emotional one as it implies that both types of infidelity are taking place. This is because men think that it would be impossible for women to have sexual relations with someone they are not in love with. Women, on the other hand, tend to think that men can have sex without being in love and, therefore, sexual infidelity does not necessarily imply emotional infidelity. However, these arguments shift when it comes to emotional infidelity: women believe that if a man is in love, he will also be willing to have sexual relations; hence, emotional infidelity is seen as an attack on the relationship.

An additional link in the emotional vs. sexual perspective is the role of individualism or collectivism on the representation of power and love. Díaz-Guerrero and Díaz-Loving (1988) indicate that in the Mexican culture, power and love are confounded, making it more important in this collectivistic culture to mix sex and emotions in both males and females. In this same

direction, Harris (2003b, 2002) reports data which do not correspond to the universal gender difference contained in the literature. In these studies, more mature male and female samples reported having focused more on emotional aspects of their partner's infidelity, when both men and women faced their unfaithful partner. However, women were significantly more prone to putting an end to the relationship. The fact that both men and women paid significantly more attention to emotional aspects leads us to a couple of interesting remarks: (a) distress caused by sexual infidelity may decrease with age, for both men and women, or (b) in a stable relationship, individuals concentrate more on the potential emotional loss. It would follow that collectivistic cultures which are more in tune with closeness would generally respond like more committed individuals from individualistic cultures. In fact, Díaz-Loving and Sánchez-Aragón (2002) report that Mexican subjects reacting to intimacy stimuli have no anxiety in regards to loss of individuality, while participants in the United States clearly manifest that intimacy is good as long as one does not lose autonomy. The state of affairs should impact the manifestations and reactions to both jealousy and infidelity in different cultures.

In reference to the effects of infidelity on other psychological variables, including jealousy, Sabini et al. (2005) looked at the end of an affair. For example, when a man finds out that the woman who he has an affair with is about to resume her relationship with her husband, the former is likely to experience different feelings, one of which would be the acknowledgment that he might be leaving his offspring to another man. This might be positive in terms of reduced personal costs for their maintenance. However, in view of the fact that women usually have certainty as to who the father of her children is, the aforementioned advantage for men does not apply to a woman when her married partner (her affair) is about to resume the relationship with his wife. One of the effects is that, in general, men are less upset and hurt when the affair comes to an end. Interestingly, Díaz-Loving (2004) reports that within ideal love, women tend to voice the pain they would endure (hurt factor of jealousy) if their current relationship came to an end, while men do not.

The role of jealousy could be one of detracting from infidelity. Harris (2003b) suggests that a good strategy to prevent infidelity is to be on the alert for any signal about it. Harris's (2003b) starting point is the idea that infidelity is seldom abrupt; on the contrary, individuals usually begin by flirting (increasing visual contact, smiles, and hugs), behavior that may be a signal of increasing sexual interest, emotional interest, or both. Therefore, contrary to evolutionary psychology hypothesis, specific markers on jealousy for each sex need not have been developed. Rather, both sexes could prevent any type of infidelity by being aware of the social norms and markers set by their own culture and being on the alert for such "flirtation". In fact, Buunk and Dijkstra (2004) remark that when individuals experience preventive jealousy, they might be trying to protect the couple's emotional and sexual exclusivity, which can be achieved by anticipating and watching over the partner's every action. In contrast, when jealousy is due to an infidelity *fait accompli*, this is, a proven fact, individuals are more prone to expressing their anger to their partner or rival, in order to stop extra-dyadic sex from happening again. This partly restores the self-esteem of the affected individual. Although with some limitations, these authors found that the emotional response depends on the type of infidelity: jealousy due to emotional infidelity gives rise to feelings of threat and pain, and those due to sexual infidelity give rise to feelings of betrayal and anger.

Becker, Sagarin, Guadagno, Millevoi, and Nicastle (2004) found that individuals who are affected by infidelity arrange their emotional responses by the following four types: jealousy, anger, pain, and annoyance. These authors discovered that both men and women report pain as the strongest emotional response to infidelity, the emotional aspect of infidelity being the one considered as the worst. They also revealed that both sexes agree that the sexual aspect of infidelity brings about greater anger and distress than the emotional aspect. Only in the case of jealousy, differences by sex were found: women regard the emotional aspect as worse, while for men the sexual one is worse. This is in accordance to existing literature on the subject. Yet, why does sexual infidelity bring greater anger? The authors mention that this may be due to the fact that sexual infidelity entails a decision, and that the latter makes the individual act in a way that

jeopardizes their relationship with their partner. Besides these findings, Lieberman (2004) states that annoyance plays an important role in this kind of situation, acting as a defense mechanism: it tells the unfaithful person that continuing the relationship with that other person might jeopardize the person's integrity.

Given the theoretical, empirical and applied implications of infidelity, jealousy, and their relationship from a universal or indigenous position, the authors set out to develop valid, reliable, and culturally sensitive measures. These were edified over inclusive evolutionary and socio-cognitive perspectives and span from idiographic to nomothetic methodologies, in order to answer the following questions and hypothesis by means of a multivariate correlational model:

Which are the indigenous manifestations of infidelity and jealousy in Mexico?

What are the patterns of infidelity and jealousy in Mexican males and females?

What is the relation between individuals' jealousy and infidelity?

Which types of jealousy are related to sexual and emotional infidelity?

Are there differences by sex in the relationship patterns?

Test hypotheses derived from two different theoretical models of romantic jealousy (evolutionary and social constructivist theories).

Can the results be interpreted from an emic or ethic perspective?

Method

Participants

537 volunteers participated in this study: 248 men and 289 women, with ages ranging from 18 to 72 years, and a mean age of 39.89. As to education level, 47.7% of the participants had college studies and 43.1% had high school or less education. At the time of research, all participants were in a stable relationship: most were married ($n = 410$), the rest lived in cohabitation ($n = 99$). The number of children ranged from 1 to 7, with an average of 2 children. All participants were not randomly selected volunteers contacted in parks, offices, shops, homes, and by using a snowball technique in Mexico City. The requirement was that they be over 18 years and currently in a stable couple relationship. They were asked to participate and if they accepted, they received the instruments indicating that answers were confidential and anonymous.

Measures

Two scales were applied: the Jealousy Inventory (Díaz-Loving, Rivera, Ojeda, & Reyes, 2000) and the Infidelity Inventory (Romero, Rivera, & Díaz-Loving, 2007). In both cases, the conceptual definition of the construct was extracted from the literature and was used as stimuli with indigenous samples who were asked to indicate the feelings, thoughts and behaviors attached to each concept. Once the local manifestations were obtained, these were set on Likert-type scales and applied to larger samples. The psychometric characteristics of both inventories are offered.

The Jealousy inventory consists of two areas (emotions and feelings; cognitions and styles) with twelve factors. The scale is set on a five-point Likert-type continuum, spanning from total disagreement to total agreement with each item. Construct validity was derived from a principal components factor analysis with an orthogonal rotation that yields twelve factors with Eigenvalues over 1, which explain 69.8% of the total variance. Items with factor weights superior to .40 for each dimension were selected. According to their conceptual content, these factors were divided into components. The first six factors refer to emotions and feelings elicited by the jealousy stimuli, and the next six factors refer to cognitions and behavioral response

styles. Cronbach alpha for the whole inventory is .98. Table 1 shows each factor, its definition, sample items, and the reliability coefficient for each one.

Table 1

Jealousy Factor Definitions and Indicators

Factor	Definition	Sample Items	Cronbach Alpha
Jealousy (Emotions and Feelings)			
Emotional responses produced by Jealousy	In this scale, jealousy is the detonator. It measures the intensity of emotions, as a response to jealousy.	I would feel like dying if my mate left me.	.95
Anger	In this scale, the individual gets angry or upset because he/she is not the partner's center of attention. Annoyance is caused by any intrusions on exclusivity.	That my mate has other friends annoys me. It disgusts me that my mate goes out with other people.	.91
Negative Attitude	Expression of disagreement with the partner's relationships with other people, because the former should only establish them with him/her.	I do not like my mate looking at other people with desire. I do not like it when my mate greets someone with a kiss who is of the opposite sex and whom I do not know.	.82
Pain	The individual expresses a feeling of despair, which is accompanied by depressive aspects.	I would feel great pain if my mate cheated on me. If my mate betrayed me, it would be a long time before the pain went away.	.82
Control	Annoyance due to a lack of control over the partner.	It threatens me to see my mate talking to someone else. I do not like it when my mate has fun with his/her friends.	.76
Fear	Fear and anxiety emotions vis-à-vis the possible loss of the partner.	It frightens me to think that my mate could cheat on me. I fear my mate will leave me if he/she meets someone else.	.78
Jealousy (Cognitions And Styles)			
Obsession	Continuous and recurrent thoughts about the partner's possible deceit.	I want my mate to think only about me. I want to know who my mate is with at all times.	.98
Intrigue and Suspicion	The individual distrusts and is constantly suspicious of his/her partner, keeping an eye on him/her all the time.	I think I can lose my mate at any moment. Occasionally, I suspect my mate is with someone else.	.91
Trust-Distrust	Fluctuation between Insecurity and Security concerning the partner' transgression of the exclusivity rule.	I feel jealous of the air my mate breathes. I generally trust my mate.	.85
Trust	Feelings of self-confidence.	When one has self-confidence, jealousy is needless. I trust my mate eyes closed.	.77

Factor	Definition	Sample Items	Cronbach Alpha
Frustration	Disappointment because of the partner's transgression.	I hate imagining my mate has sex with another person. I see my relationship in jeopardy when my mate hangs out with his/her ex.	.75
Distrust	Insecurity due to the partner's disloyalty.	I think my mate wants to cheat on me. I think there is somebody else in my mates life	.70

For the Infidelity Inventory (Romero, Rivera, & Diaz-Loving, 2007), two conceptually clear subscales are present. One of which assesses behavior on a five-point frequency Likert-type scale, spanning from never to always, while the other one measures consequences, also on a five-point scale, which in this case spans from total disagreement to total agreement with each statement.

As with the precious inventory, principal components factor analysis with an orthogonal rotation was used to obtain construct validity. For the unfaithful behavior component, four factors with Eigenvalues over 1 explained 70.16% of the test variance and yield a Cronbach alpha for this section of .98. Items with factor weights over .40 for each dimension were selected and the factors with their definition, sample items, and reliability scores are presented in Table 2.

Table 2

Definitions for Unfaithful Behavior Subscale Factors

Factor	Definition	Sample Items	Cronbach Alpha
Sexual Infidelity	Behaviors that denote the existence of a sexual tie to someone besides the primary partner.	I have had sex with other people besides my mate.	.97
Emotional Infidelity Desire	It refers to a desire for a romantic tie to someone besides than the primary partner, which is not necessarily fulfilled.	I wish to kiss other people besides my mate. I have desired other people besides my mate.	.96
Sexual Infidelity Desire	Desire for a sexual tie to someone besides the primary partner, which is not necessarily fulfilled.	I have desired having sexual contact with others besides my mate. I have desired having sexual intercourse with others besides my mate.	.96
Emotional Infidelity	Conducts that denote the existence of a romantic emotional tie with someone besides the primary partner.	I have loved others besides my mate. I have related sentimentally with others besides my mate.	.87

The same statistical procedures were conducted for the section that measures consequences of the unfaithful behavior. Two factors with Eigenvalues over 1.5 that explain 56% of the total test variance were selected for their conceptual clarity. Their total Cronbach alpha was .73 and their definitions and sample items are presented in Table 3.

Table 3*Definitions for Factors in the Infidelity Consequences Subscale*

Factor	Definition	Sample Items	Cronbach Alpha
Negative consequences of infidelity	It refers to the damage that infidelity might cause to the primary relationship, promoting even the dissolution of the same.	Having another relationship deteriorates the primary one. Infidelity destroys couple relationships.	.91
Positive consequences of infidelity	It refers to the benefit that the infidelity might bring to the primary relationship, promoting rapprochement and helping the partners to solve the problem in the relationship.	Infidelity can help save a relationship. Having an alternative mate helps endure marriage problems.	.86

Results

In order to find the relation between jealousy and infidelity, *Pearson's product-moment correlation coefficient* was applied. Data obtained for both men and women show that jealousy and infidelity are related. It was observed that the greater the sexual and emotional infidelity, together with both the sexual and emotional desire involved in behavioral infidelity, the higher the level of emotional responses generated by jealousy, and the greater the anger, control, fear, obsession, suspicion, frustration, and distrust. Likewise, there was no correlation in men or in women between infidelity and trust. On the other hand, different correlations were found in men and women. The former recorded a positive correlation between infidelity and the negative attitude concerning jealousy, while the latter showed no significant association between these variables. Nevertheless, in the case of women, there is a negative correlation between infidelity and pain due to jealousy, which in the case of men does not present a significant correlation (Tables 4 and 5).

As to the consequences of infidelity in men, it was found that the higher the level of pain caused by jealousy and the greater the trust in the partner, the greater the negative consequences of infidelity. However, when there is greater suspicion-intrigue concerning the partner and greater distrust, less negative consequences are perceived (Table 4). For women, the greater the pain and the more negative their attitude, the greater the negative consequences of infidelity. Likewise, results indicated that the greater the suspicion, the less negative consequences appeared. As to the positive consequences of infidelity, the latter increases when jealousy increases, except when there is pain, which produces an inverse relation (Table 5).

Table 4*Correlations between Infidelity and Jealousy in Men*

Jealousy Factors	Behavioral Infidelity			Consequences of Infidelity		
	Sexual Infidelity	Emotional Infidelity Desire	Sexual Infidelity Desire	Emotional Infidelity	Negative	Positive
Emotional responses produced by jealousy	.257**	.264**	.255**	.226**		.253**
Anger	.291**	.259**	.273**	.247**		.290**

Negative attitude	.167**	.251**	.227**	.167**		.196**
Pain					.275**	-.119*
Control	.280**	.266**	.266**	.200**		.178**
Fear	.214**	.209**	.193**	.177**		.287**
Obsession	.197**	.212**	.216**	.181**		.171**
Suspicion-Intrigue	.310**	.267**	.268**	.244**	-.146**	.355**
Trust-Distrust	.124*	.178**	.146**	.183**		.164**
Trust					.291**	
Frustration	.187**	.267**	.244**	.185**		.196**
Distrust	.343**	.318**	.342**	.299**	-.179**	.280**

**p ≤ 0.01

* p ≤ 0.05

Table 5*Correlations between Infidelity and Jealousy in Women*

Jealousy Factors	Behavioral Infidelity				Consequences of Infidelity	
	Sexual Infidelity	Emotional Infidelity Desire	Sexual Infidelity Desire	Emotional Infidelity	Negative	Positive
Emotional responses produced by jealousy	.144**	.243**	.201**	.158**		.202**
Anger	.131*	.203**	.161**	.126*		.176**
Negative attitude					.127*	
Pain	-.170**	-.114*	-.186**	-.174**	.271**	
Control	.103*	.174**	.152**			.128*
Fear	.135**	.210**	.168**	.123*		.161**
Obsession		.156**	.129*			.119*
Suspicion-Intrigue	.260**	.346**	.353**	.245**	-.124*	.306**
Trust-Distrust	.135**	.125*	.110*	.111*		
Frustration	.142**	.239**	.209**	.147**		.116*
Distrust		.144**	.168**	.113*		

**p ≤ 0.01

* p ≤ 0.05

In order to test the sex-differences hypothesis, *t-student test* were conducted with the purpose of comparing each factor by sex. Data obtained for the jealousy scale show significant differences in three factors: negative attitude, frustration, and distrust, with women being the ones with the highest means in the three factors (Table 6).

Table 6*Differences in Jealousy Factors by Sex*

Factors	Means by sex		Theoretic al Mean	t	p
	Men	Women			
Emotional responses produced by jealousy	2.1902	2.2832	3	-1.047	.296
Anger	2.0524	2.0980	3	-.575	.565
Negative attitude	2.5806	2.8478	3	-2.878	.004**
Pain	3.6637	3.7640	3	-1.078	.282
Control	2.1573	2.2886	3	-1.565	.118
Fear	2.2782	2.4104	3	-1.445	.149
Obsession	2.5573	2.6734	3	-1.507	.132
Suspicion-Intrigue	1.8161	1.8997	3	-1.041	.298
Trust-Distrust	2.8000	2.8166	3	-.273	.785
Trust	3.5944	3.4927	3	1.164	.245
Frustration	2.3333	2.5920	3	-2.799	.005**
Distrust	1.8508	2.0720	3	-1.882	.050*

** $p \leq 0.01$ * $p \leq 0.05$

Finally, a *t-student test* was applied in order to establish comparisons between men and women in the infidelity scale. Data show a significant difference among mean values, with men recording a higher mean in all infidelity factors, involving desire and behavior. As to consequences, no significant differences were found by sex (Table 7).

Table 7*Differences in Infidelity Factors by Sex*

Factors	Means by sex		Theoretical Mean	t	p
	Men	Women			
Sexual Infidelity	1.5226	1.3322	3	2.453	.014**
Emotional Infidelity Desire	2.0242	1.7772	3	3.072	.002**
Sexual Infidelity Desire	1.8484	1.5017	3	4.139	.000**
Emotional Infidelity	1.5774	1.4187	3	2.132	.033*
Negative consequences of infidelity	4.0000	4.0166	3	-.154	.877
Positive consequences of infidelity	2.0138	1.9709	3	.501	.617

** $p \leq 0.01$ * $p \leq 0.05$

Discussion

One of the solutions to the etic-emic dilemma present in cross-cultural psychology has been indigenous research that has incorporated the methods and themes of mainstream psychology together with ideographic autochthonous measures (Díaz-Loving, 1998). The present research is a good example of this process, considering universal hypothesis derived from evolutionary theory with methods that incorporate the idiosyncratic manifestations of the phenomenon in a specific ecosystem. According to the results, concerning the partner, there is a strong relation between any type of infidelity and the appearance of jealousy and trust. Thus, the universal hypothesis that general suspicion about the partner's possible infidelity in sexual or emotional form elicits jealousy in men and women is confirmed (Buss, Shackelford, Kirkpatrick, Choe, Hasegawa, Hasegawa, & Bennett, 1999; Daly et al., 1983). However, a cultural difference is identified when in contrast to Drenick's (2003) findings that infidelity is more related to

jealousy in the case of women (as compared to men) in an individualistic culture, the present data show a similar correlation pattern between jealousy and infidelity in men and women.

On the other hand, the positive relation found between infidelity (of any type) and pain, in the case of women, reinforces the findings of Oikle (2003), who suggested that men and women differ as to the nature of their infidelity, women being more prone than men to add an emotional component to the sexual component of infidelity. Thus, when women have an affective bond to a new relationship, they feel less pain concerning their fixed partner's possible infidelity.

In connection with differences found in reference to three of the jealousy factors (negative attitude, frustration, and distrust), it can be said that, in general terms, women become more emotional and sensitive in response to a situation of jealousy, and yet they are also ambivalent, since they show a negative attitude concerning jealousy. That is, they disagree with their partners' engaging in relationships with other people, and feel frustrated and distrustful concerning the relationship. According to Harris and Christenfeld (1996a), gender differences in terms of jealousy are based on men's and women's knowledge about the relation between love and sex. Thus, men think that women have sex only when they are in love, and women think that men have loveless sex.

As to differences in unfaithful behavior, men desire sexual and emotional infidelity relationships more often; this predisposes them to engage in such kind of relationship. These results are consistent with Regan and Atkins (2006), who state that men tend to focus more on enjoying and even remember having experienced sexual desire to a greater degree than women. These authors say that this behavior is due to the different reinforcement and punishment patterns which men and women are exposed to in connection with their sexual conduct, as combined with existing normative beliefs regarding masculinity and femininity. According to Wiederman and Kendall (1999), men see sexual infidelity as a threat, while, for most women, emotional infidelity is more disturbing. However, in the present study, men get involved in both types of infidelity. Another way to account for these differences has to do with the evolutionary perspective that states that women's procreation capacity is limited; hence, they are less motivated to engage in infidelity relations (Fisher, 1999; Yela, 2000). However, no differences were found as to the consequences of infidelity by sex, which contradicts other researchers' (Lamanna & Riedmann, 2003) presumptions.

Based on the above, it can be said that once you make concepts equivalent in terms of their indigenous manifestations, jealousy and infidelity are similar in that they involve a will to hurt others and the individuals themselves, and may lead to several kinds of individual, communitarian, and social problems. As Hatfield (2006) states, passion seems to span across cultures, what can differ is the way people interpret or manifest their emotion. In this same line of thought, thus, socialization and enculturation have a differential effect on biological parameters creating long-term damaging results that may affect others and themselves by preventing them from doing well at work or impairing their social relations, leaving a significant imprint on individuals which is difficult to erase. A final set of questions arise as to the intervening variables that might explain the evolutionary and gender differences across cultures. In fact, Marlow (2006) shows similar patterns among North Americans and Koreans that are congruent with evolutionary theory, but then alludes to Hofstede's (1998) research on masculine and feminine cultures to explain the importance of gender on tendencies within cultures.

Reference

- Barkow, J. H., Cosmides, L., & Tooby, J. (Eds.) (1992). *The adapted mind: evolutionary psychology and the generation of culture*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Becker, D. V., Sagarin, B. J., Guadagno, R. E., Millevoi, A., & Nicastle, L. D. (2004). When the sexes need not differ: Emotional responses to the sexual and emotional aspects of infidelity. *Personal Relationships, 11*, 529-538.

- Buss, D. M. (1989). Sex differences in human mate preferences: Evolutionary hypotheses tested in 37 cultures. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, *12*, 1-49.
- Buss, D. M. (2000). *The dangerous passion: Why jealousy is as necessary as love and sex*. New York: Free Press.
- Buss, D. M., Larsen, R. J., Westen, D., & Semmelroth, J. (1992). Sex differences in jealousy: Evolution, physiology and psychology. *Psychological Science*, *3*, 251-255.
- Buss, D. M., & Shackelford, T. K. (1997). Susceptibility to infidelity in the first year of marriage. *Journal of Research in Personality*, *31*, 193-221.
- Buss, D. M., Shackelford, T. K., Choe, J., Dijkstra, P., & Buunk, B. P. (2000). Distress about mating rivals. *Personal Relationships*, *7*, 235-243.
- Buss, D. M., Shackelford, T. K., Kirkpatrick, L. A., Choe, J., Hasegawa, M., Hasewaga, T., & Bennett, K. (1999). Jealousy and the nature of beliefs about infidelity: Tests of competing hypotheses about sex differences in the United States, Korea, and Japan. *Personal Relationships*, *6*, 125-150.
- Buunk, B. P., Angleitner, A., Oubaid, V., & Buss, D. M. (1996). Sex differences in jealousy in evolutionary and cultural perspective: Test from the Netherlands, Germany, and the United States. *Psychological Science*, *7*, 359-363.
- Buunk, B. P., & Dijkstra, P. (2004). Gender differences in rival characteristics that evoke jealousy in response to emotional versus sexual infidelity. *Personal Relationships*, *11*, 395-408.
- Daly, M., & Wilson, M. (1983). *Sex, evolution, and behavior*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Daly, M., Wilson, M., & Weghorst, S. J. (1982). Male sexual jealousy. *Ethology and Sociobiology*, *83*, 1103-1116.
- DeSteno, D. A., & Salovey, P. (1996a). Evolutionary origins of sex differences in jealousy? Questioning the "fitness" of the model. *Psychological Science*, *7*, 367-372.
- DeSteno, D. A., & Salovey, P. (1996b). Jealousy and the characteristics of one's rival: A self-evaluation maintenance perspective. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *22*, 920-932.
- Díaz-Guerrero, R. (1994). *Psicología del Mexicano: el descubrimiento de la etnopsicología*. [Psychology of the Mexican: the discovery of ethnopsychology]. México: Editorial Trillas.
- Díaz-Guerrero, R., & Díaz-Loving, R. (1988). El poder y el amor en México [Power and love in Mexico]. In AMEPSO (Coordinator), *La Psicología Social en México* (Vol. 2, pp. 153-159). Mexico City: Asociación Mexicana de Psicología.
- Díaz-Loving, R. (2004). Configuration and integration of psychosocial components in mexican couple relations. *Interdisciplinaria*, *21*, 53-70.
- Díaz-Loving, R., Rivera, A. S., Ojeda, G. A., & Reyes, D. D. (2000). Construcción y validación de la escala multidimensional de celos [Construction and validation of a jealousy multidimensional scale]. *La Psicología Social en México*, *8*, 24-31.
- Díaz-Loving, R., & Sánchez-Aragón, R. (2002). *Psicología del amor: una visión integral de la relación de pareja*. [Psychology of love: an integral perspective on couple interaction]. México: Editorial Miguel Angel Porrua.
- Dijkstra, P., & Buunk, B. P. (1998). Jealousy as a function of rival characteristics: An evolutionary perspective. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *24*, 1158-1166.
- Dijkstra, P., & Buunk, B. P. (2002). Sex differences in the jealousy-evoking effect of rival characteristics. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, *32*, 829-852.
- Dreznick, M. T. (2003). Sexual and emotional infidelity: A meta-analysis. *Dissertation Abstracts International: Section B: The Sciences and Engineering*, *63(9-B)*, 4415.
- Fisher, J.V. (1999). Therapy as moral discourse. *Sexual and Marital Therapy*, *14*, 205-218.
- García, L.P., Gómez, J.L., & Canto, J.M. (2001). Relación de celos ante una infidelidad: Diferencias entre hombres y mujeres y características del rival [Jealousy reactions to infidelity: Differences between men and women and differences in rival's characteristics]. *Psicothema*, *13*, 611-616.
- Harris, C. R. (2002). Sexual and romantic jealousy in heterosexual and homosexual adults. *Psychology Science*, *13*, 7-12.

- Harris, C. R. (2003a). A review of sex differences in sexual jealousy, including self-report data, psychophysiological responses, interpersonal violence, and morbid jealousy. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 7, 102-128.
- Harris, C. R. (2003b). Factors associated with jealousy over real and imagined infidelity: an examination of the social and evolutionary perspectives. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 27, 319-329.
- Harris, C. R., & Christenfeld, N. (1996a). Gender, jealousy, and reason. *Psychological Science*, 7, 364-366.
- Harris, C. R., & Christenfeld, N. (1996b). Jealousy and rational responses to infidelity across gender and culture. *Psychological Science*, 7, 378-379.
- Hatfield, E. (2006). Preface. In R. Sánchez-Aragón (Ed.), *Pasión romántica: Más allá de la intuición, una ciencia del amor. [Romantic passion: More than intuition, the science of love]* (pp. 9-11). Mexico: Miguel Angel Porrúa.
- Hofstede, G. (1998). *Masculinity and femininity: The taboo dimension of national cultures*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Hupka, R. B. (1981). Cultural determinants of jealousy. *Alternative Lifestyles*, 4, 310-356.
- Hupka, R. B., & Ryan, J. M. (1990). The cultural contribution to jealousy: cross-cultural aggression in sexual jealousy situations. *Behavioral Science Research*, 24, 51-71.
- Lamanna, M. A., & Riedmann, A. (2003). *Marriages and families: Making choices and facing change*. USA: Thomson Learning.
- Lieberman, D. (2004). Investigating the cues mediating kin detection: Disgust and the development of sexual aversions. Symposium presented at the International Society of Personality and Social Psychology – Evolutionist Preconference, Austin, TX.
- Marlow, D. D. (2006). Jealousy as a sex-specific stimulus: a comparison of Americans and Koreans (Doctoral dissertation). Available from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses Database. (UMI No. 1251848761)
- Mathes, E. W. (1991). A cognitive theory of jealousy. In P. Salovey (Ed.), *The psychology of jealousy and envy* (pp. 52-78). New York: Guilford.
- Mead, G. H. (1913). The social self. *The Journal of Philosophy, Psychology and Scientific Methods*, 10, 374-380.
- Oikle, J. M. (2003). The prediction and description of dating infidelity: The role of gender, relationship satisfaction, commitment, and attitude toward dating infidelity. *Dissertation Abstracts International: Section B: The Sciences and Engineering*, 64(2-B), 1004.
- Parrott, W. G. (1991). The emotional experience of envy and jealousy. In P. Salovey (Ed.), *The psychology of jealousy and envy* (pp. 3-30). New York: Guilford Press.
- Regan, P. C., & Atkins, L. (2006). Sex differences and similarities in frequency and intensity of sexual desire. *Social Behavior and Personality*, 34, 95-101.
- Romero, P. A., Rivera A. S., & Diaz-Loving, R. (2007). Desarrollo del Inventario Multidimensional de Infidelidad (IMIN) [Development of an Infidelity Multidimensional Inventory]. *Revista Iberoamericana de Diagnóstico y Evaluación Psicológico*, 1, 121-148.
- Sabini, J., & Silver, M. (2005). Gender and jealousy: Stories of infidelity. *Psychology Press*, 19, 713-727.
- Salovey, P., & Rodin, J. (1991). Some antecedents and consequences of social-comparison jealousy. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 47, 780-792.
- Salovey, P., & Rothman, A. (1991). Envy and jealousy: Self and society. In P. Salovey (Ed.), *The Psychology of jealousy and envy* (pp. 271-286). New York: Guilford Press.
- Schmitt, B. H. (1988). Social comparison in romantic jealousy. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 14, 374-387.
- Seidenberg, R. (1967). Fidelity and jealousy: Socio-Cultural considerations. *Psychoanalytic Review*, 54, 27-52.
- Symons, D. (1979). *The evolution of human sexuality*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- White, G. L. (1981). A model of romantic jealousy. *Motivation and Emotion*, 5, 295-310.
- White, G. L., & Mullen, P. E. (1989). *Jealousy: Theory, research, and clinical strategies*. New York: Guilford Press.