

# EXPLORING JUNGIAN ARCHETYPES AS POTENTIAL PREDICTORS OF INFIDELITY

## DISSERTATION

A Dissertation  
Presented in partial fulfillment of requirements  
for the degree of Doctorate of Philosophy  
in the Department of Leadership and Counselor Education  
The University of Mississippi

by

Katrina Miller-Roach

May 2014

Copyright Katrina Miller-Roach 2013

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

## ABSTRACT

This dissertation used quantitative methods to gain an understanding of psychological choices impacting behaviors of monogamy and infidelity in committed relationships. One hundred and twenty two adults aged 19 and older were assessed regarding their experiences in committed relationships, archetypal preferences, and meaning in life statuses. The evolutionary theory of human sexual behavior and Jungian archetypal theory provide the theoretical framework for the study. It was anticipated that this study would provide answers regarding what psychological factors influence some individuals to adhere to genetic traits of infidelity and what psychological factors influence some individuals to defy genetics and identify with the cultural evolution of monogamy.

## DEDICATION

I dedicate this dissertation to my family. A special feeling of gratitude to my loving parents, Robert L. Miller, Jr. and Ella M. Huey whose words of encouragement and push for tenacity kept me focused and steadfast. To my brother Robert L. Miller, III and my sister-in-law Latwanna Miller, who never doubted my completion. I especially dedicate this dissertation to my loving husband Derrick O. Roach who supported me throughout this entire process and believed in me when I did not believe in myself. His love, support, and encouragement (even during tough times) will forever ring in my ears—for this I declare, this is OUR degree! To my beautiful, most perfect children Derrick Taylor Roach and Katelyn McKenzie Roach, this is also especially dedicated to you. You graciously shared precious “mommy” time to help me reach this goal and were always my biggest cheerleaders.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I wish to thank my committee members who were more than generous with their expertise and precious time. A special thanks to Dr. Tabitha Young Gast, my committee chair for her countless hours of reading and encouraging throughout the entire process. Thank you Dr. Nichelle Boyd Robinson , Dr. Rebekah Reysen, and Dr. Marc Showalter for agreeing to serve on my committee. I would like to acknowledge and thank the administrative staff of my program division for providing assistance and answering questions when requested. A special thanks goes to my cohort members who were supportive throughout this process.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT.....	ii
DEDICATION.....	iii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	iv
LIST OF TABLES.....	vi
CHAPTER ONE-INTRODUCTION.....	1
CHAPTER TWO-LITERATURE REVIEW.....	9
CHAPTER THREE-METHODOLOGY.....	52
CHAPTER FOUR-RESULTS.....	70
CHAPTER FIVE-DISCUSSION.....	75
REFERENCES CITED.....	88
LIST OF APPENDICES.....	109
VITA.....	138

## LIST OF TABLES

TABLE 1.....	110
TABLE 2.....	112
TABLE 3.....	114
TABLE 4.....	116
TABLE 5.....	118

## CHAPTER 1

### INTRODUCTION

Fidelity is a key attribute of committed relationships across many cultures. For most individuals it conveys a sense of purpose, meaning, stability, and direction (Sroufe & Walters, 1997). In a society where the ideal of relationships and belonging holds profound significance, monogamous relationships inform the structural, personal, and legal parameters of intimate human interaction. Rituals such as engagement, marriage, civil unions, and the exchange of promise rings are ways in which society strives to denote relationship exclusivity (Bartholomew, 1991). Despite these symbolic acts of commitment, infidelities in relationship are persistent.

According to the 1994 General Social Survey of 884 men and 1,288 women in a committed relationship, 22.7% of men and 11.6% of women reported having engaged in extramarital sex at least one time in their lives. Similarly, Lauman et al. (1994) reported that 25% of married men and 15% of married women admitted that they engaged in extramarital sex at least once. Shackelford and Buss (1997) estimated that the lifetime prevalence of marital infidelity ranges from 26% to 70% for women and 33% to 75% for men. Due in part to the secretive nature of infidelity and its general social unacceptability, as well as to varying definitions of what constitutes infidelity, estimates of actual infidelity are believed to be higher and remain unreported (Clanchy & Trotter, 1999). Regardless of the specific percentages of people engaging in extramarital relationships, the devastation left in the wake of infidelity is apparent. Infidelity is the most frequently cited reason for divorce and separation among couples

(Shackelford & Buss, 1997). In a national survey of marital therapists, extramarital affairs were second only to physical abuse as being the most damaging problem in romantic relationships (Wiederman, 1997). Gottman (2002) reported that one in every two couples in therapy have participated in acts of infidelity during their relationship.

Although social changes have impacted traditional notions of marriage and coupledness, monogamy continues to serve as the ultimate embodiment of commitment, love, and devotion to one's partner and operates as the fundamental framework of sexual and emotional exclusivity. As such, the phenomenon of why infidelity occurs has been studied by multiple disciplines in effort to understand its origin. Particularly, sociobiologists have studied infidelity and developed theories based on evolutionary explanations (Spillman, Pryor, Ellioseph, & Meyers, 1998). One theory suggested by sociobiologists is that behaviors such as mating patterns and promiscuity occur as an effort to preserve genes in the population. A second theory offered by sociobiologists is that certain genes or gene combinations are thought to influence particular behavioral traits from generation to generation (Spillman, Pryor, Ellioseph, & Meyers, 1998). Thus, as a basis, the evolutionary theory of sexual behavior is a biologically informed explanation for these concepts. By understanding the fundamental need is to survive (pass on genes), human reproduction at any cost is maximized and inherent (Grice & Seely, 2000). Encompassed under the umbrella of the evolution of sexual behavior, natural selection, sexual selection, sexual conflict, parental investment, and sexual strategies further explain genetic dispositions to infidelity (Grice & Seely, 2000).

Despite these genetic explanations for cheating, it is presumed that a psychology develops within certain individuals that suggests infidelity is wrong or not ideal (Ley, 2012). For example, Western culture has implemented laws and sanctions against individuals who

participate in non-monogamous marriages (Gonzalez, 2013). Further, many cultures have imposed accusations of religious and moral infractions regarding acts of infidelity (Anderson, 2003). One possible explanation regarding the developed psychology may reside in understanding the archetypal tendencies of individuals.

Archetypes are universal explanations for behavior and interactions that can be illustrated through symbols, themes, or characters (Toynbee, 1956; Mamchur, 2000). Carl Jung took the ancient concepts of ideals and patterns offered by Plato a step further and developed psychological archetypes. According to Christensen (2009), Jung defined them as characteristics that pre-exist in the psyche of humans that repeat themselves genetically and determine how they function as psychological beings. Jung (1968) and other theorists (Gray, 1996; Stevens, 1982) suggest that archetype tendencies are genetically determined. Further, these genetic preferences are explanations for behaviors, drives, attitudes, and choices that individuals make on a daily basis (McPeck, 2008). As such, archetypes have long been used to explain human motives and intentions as well as to answer questions about self and the world (Fordham, 1982). Expounding on archetypes introduced by Jung, 12 primary archetypal tendencies have emerged from which most individuals identify (Pearson, 1998). The 12 tendencies are distributed into three stages of life development and four subdivisions of intrinsic motivators. According to Pearson (1998), understanding these groupings is key in interpreting the motivational and self-perceptual dynamics of each individual. Therefore, identifying the psychological constructs of individuals based on their archetypal tendencies (which encompass stages of development and intrinsic motivators) may be instrumental in connecting these genetic traits to human choices regarding monogamy or infidelity.

## **Statement of the Problem**

In a society where social monogamy is an expectation, infidelity can be devastating for many couples, exacting a damaging toll on individuals and their families (Glass, 2002). Research suggests that relationship satisfaction (romantic) is instrumental in the mental, emotional, and physical health of individuals (Mark & Murray, 2012). Further, individuals who pair with mates based on same or similar lifestyle choices and needs report feeling better understood and experiencing a greater sense of happiness and relationship satisfaction (Mark & Murray, 2012). By exploring archetypal tendencies as explanations for decisions regarding fidelity, findings from this study have helped to unearth psychological preferences regarding relationships and provide additional insight for individuals and researchers regarding fidelity.

## **Conceptual Framework for the Study**

As noted, sociobiologists have rendered two prominent hypotheses regarding the phenomenon of infidelity (Spillman, Pryor, Ellioseph, & Meyers, 1998). Both concepts are rooted in the theory of evolution, specifically the evolutionary theory of human sexual behavior (Grice & Seely, 2000). Evolutionary theorists suggest that by understanding the need to survive, (i.e., pass on genes), human reproduction at any cost is maximized and inherent (Grice & Seely, 2000). This theoretical perspective serves as the basis for its subtheories: natural selection, sexual selection, sexual conflict, parental investment (Bjorklund & Kipp, 1996; Buss & Schmitt, 1993), and sexual strategies (Cherkas, 2004).

Natural selection is the basic mechanism of evolution. Fundamental principles of natural selection consist of a variation of traits, differential reproduction (the environment cannot handle unlimited reproduction and consequently all individuals will not get to reproduce), heredity, and an end result of the more advantageous trait, the one yielding more offspring, becoming more

common in the population (Charkas, 2004). Sexual selection is a special case of natural selection that acts on the ability of an organism to successfully copulate by any means necessary (Buss & Schmitt, 1993). According to Buss (1998), through natural selection organisms go to extreme lengths for sex that may be harmful to individual survival. Parental investment is a subsidiary of this process that involves the two sexes having conflicting optimum fitness strategies regarding reproduction, particularly mode and frequency (Buss & Schmitt, 1993; Charkas, 2004). Parental investment includes the parental expenditures (i.e. time, energy, and resources) that benefit offspring at the cost of the ability of parents to invest in future offspring (Charkas, 2004). In comparison to males who expend only the time it takes to copulate, women expend far more resources including menstruation, the effort to copulate, pregnancy, birth and labor, and nursing (Charkas, 2004). As a result, females get first choice regarding sexual effort and males must compete to be first choice. Consequently, males participate in short term mating relationships to maximize their ability to spread their DNA more quickly and expand offspring reproduction. Females, armed with high parental investment, prefer long term mating strategies to ensure that their offspring receive the maximum amount of paternal benefits (Bjorklund & Kipp, 1996). These genetic differences explain infidelity in relationships.

Finally, the theory of psychoanalysis as described by Jung (1968), is used to address elements of individual personalities. Research suggests that archetypal tendencies provide explanation for the choices individuals make and how they perceive life events (Mamchur, 2000). Specifically out of this theory, inherited archetypal tendencies are explained individually, across developmental levels, and via groups of intrinsic motivators.

## **Purpose of the Study**

Evidence obtained from various disciplines such as biology, sociobiology, and psychology indicate that humans are biologically and genetically hardwired for infidelity. Despite this wiring, some individuals express a desire for pair bonding and monogamy and consequently override biological urges to cheat (Barker, 2013). While social and cultural pressures play influential roles in this suppression, it is plausible that the deciding factor regarding the perception of infidelity (right vs. wrong) and the decision to be monogamous lies in the genetic psychology of the individual. Research suggests that archetypal tendencies in humans are genetic constructs for motives and social behaviors. McPeck (2008) reported that archetypal tendencies are genetic traits that give explanation to behaviors, drives, attitudes, and choices that individuals make daily. While there is evidence to support these archetypal propensities, the predictability of archetypal tendencies on infidelity has not been investigated. As human relationships continue to be impacted by this phenomenon, this has facilitated research that provides answers regarding the psychology behind the fidelity choices of various individuals.

## **Research Questions**

- R1: Does archetypal tendency influence infidelity?
- R2: Does archetypal tendency influence infidelity propensity?
- R3: Does meaning in life influence infidelity?
- R4: Does meaning in life influence infidelity propensity?

## **Definition of Terms**

Definition of terms utilized in the study are listed as follows:

*Alpha male* references a dominant or primary male in a particular group (Tiddi, 2012).

Attraction strategies are employed by both males and females to attract ideal mates based on parental investment needs and desires (Cashdan, 1993).

*Autosomal genome* is a gene on one of the non-sex chromosomes that is always expressed and can determine a dominant pattern (Skinner, 1972).

*Extraversion* is the convention of being predominantly preoccupied with and obtaining satisfaction and fulfillment from things outside the self. Extroverts enjoy human interaction and social events. Extroverted people are less rewarded time spent alone (Jung, 1968).

*Human genome* is the human genome according to Pennisi (2012) is a complete set of genetic DNA information that contains billions of paired chromosomes- the X chromosome (one in males, two in females) and, in males only, one Y chromosome, found in humans.

*Interlocus sexual conflict* is a sexual conflict that occurs between antagonistic males (Stewart, Morrow, & Rice, 2005).

*Intersexual selection*, also called mate selection is a selection process where one sex (typically female) is especially choosy in determining their mates from the opposite sex (Skinner, 1972).

*Intralocus sexual conflict* occurs when selection on shared traits within a sex are displaced from optimum phenotypic performance due to divergent sexual strategies (Bonduriansky & Chenoweth, 2012).

*Intrasexual selection* states that specific evolutionary traits can be explained by intraspecific competition (Skinner, 1972).

*Introversion* references individuals who are less interested in engaging in social settings. Introverts value solitude. Introverted traits are often difficult to detect as they are usually present with other personality traits (Jung, 1968).

*Mate-expulsion tactics* are strategies used by males and females to deprive or remove other males or females from mating pools (Buss & Schmitt, 1993).

*Phenotypic traits* are characteristics of an organism that may be inherited. It is often obvious and observable such as eye color (Campbell & Reece, 2011).

Self Actualization is the fulfillment and realization, by an individual, of potential and talents (Donnellan, 1963).

## CHAPTER 2

### REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Evolutionary psychology is a growing paradigm that attempts to merge the disciplines of cognitive psychology (Brainerd, 1996) and evolutionary biology (Otto, 2009), as related to the human condition (Tinbergen, 1963). In doing so it strives to combine the branches of psychology under an inclusive system of knowledge. Moreover, its framework allows researchers to operate at different levels of explanation (Saad & Gill, 2000). Evolutionary psychology has the ability to be a formative link between social and natural sciences in that it explains the phenomena of culture by its biological foundations with psychology as the transitional link. According to Barkow, Cosmides, and Tooby (1992), evolutionary psychology delves to address the fundamental question: “How does a particular cognition, emotion, behavior, or perception establish a functional explanation to an adaptive obstacle in our evolutionary past?”. The authors go on to note that in divergence to conventional psychological paradigm, evolutionary psychology emphasizes the *beginning* rather than *concluding* explanations. That is, evolutionary psychology attempts to answer *why* a certain thought, emotion, or behavior exists, rather than simply answering *how* it functions.

To further explain evolutionary psychology, Griffiths (1996) offered that it is a concept that examines psychological attributes such as awareness, recollection, and perception from a modern evolutionary context. According to Griffiths (1996), evolutionary psychologists believe that evolutionary psychology is not only a subdiscipline of psychology, but that it also provides a primary, metatheoretical schema (the induction of behaviorism, cognitivism, and natural

selection),and integrates the entire discipline of psychology, in the same way it has for biology. It identifies evolved adaptations of human psychological traits. Specifically, the favorable outcomes of sexual selection or natural selection. Therefore evolutionary psychology serves as a strong foundation for explaining the natural, inherent promiscuity of human behavior.

While working toward understanding the favorable outcomes of sexual selection, Lloyd (1999) suggested that evolutionary psychologists credit the mind as a flexible varied structure much like the body, with varying modular adaptations performing varying roles. In addition, he notes that many evolutionary psychologists believe that human behavior is the exhibition of psychological conversions that evolved to resolve repeating obstacles in human familial environments. Lloyd (1999) went on to state that behaviors or attributes that occur extensively across lineages are favorable successors for evolutionary adaptations. Those adaptations include capabilities to infer the emotions of others, decipher kin from non-kin, cooperate with others, and identify and favor healthier companions. Therefore the mind is capable of determining optimal mating companions and will direct behavior to maximize opportunities with the right person, even at the expense of commitment breaches and relationship dissolution.

In terms of modular structures, evolutionary psychologists posit that human lucidity is comprised of hundreds of cognitive mechanisms (modular structures), each naturally selected by way of previous ancestral interactions with the environment. Each mechanism added to the reproduction and survival of ancestors who retained it and thus was naturally selected (Cosmides & Tooby, 1992). Mechanisms that promote human survival are preserved in the *human genome* and continue to appear in and shape human behavior. There are extensive evolutionary examples of adaptive modules such as mate preference, attachment behavior, jealousy, basic assumptions, and cheating detection (Barkow, Cosmides, & Tooby 1992; Buss, 1999; Crawford & Krebs,

1998; Pinker, 1994). These modules, according to evolutionary psychologists, are common to all humans and are inherent (Samuels, 1998). Therefore it is plausible that because human behavior is innate, as explained in this theory, infidelity will continue to be an issue of high concentration for counselors. Working to identify individualized cheating propensities and attitudes gives insight into the phenomenon of infidelity.

According to Grice and Seely (2000) evolutionary psychologists have successfully tested theoretical predictions related to various adaptive modules as well as predictions related to parental investment, promiscuity, and marriage and relationship patterns. Thus, evolutionary psychology spawns numerous themes and schools of thought that help to further explain human adaptation and survival. By understanding the evolutionary need to survive, human reproduction, at any cost (parental investment) is maximized and inherent. Therefore, various sexual strategies and mating preferences have emerged to accomplish this goal. Using this premise as an understanding of infidelity tendencies, this study will help to explore ways in which these embedded, unconscious, tendencies can be brought into awareness and consequently be addressed and altered.

### **Theory of Evolution**

Evolutionary theory, a derivative of evolutionary psychology, is a biologically informed rationale to the study of human behavior (Crouch, 2013). Evolutionary theorists offer that much, if not all of human behavior can be explained by examining the influence of innate psychological components. That is, evolutionary theory is distinguishable from cognitive theory in that it proposes that human tendencies that help them to thrive in the world, survive, and reproduce are adaptations based on natural selection rather than learned behavior. (Barkow, Cosmides, & Tooby, 1992). The theory of evolution encompasses several key concepts that further explain

human nature, specifically regarding survival, reproduction, and mating patterns. These concepts as they relate to natural selection and sexual selection are thoroughly described in the proceeding paragraphs.

### **Natural Selection**

Evolution through natural selection is the method by which genetic alterations that compliment reproduction cultivate and are sustained in succeeding generations. According to Brink-Roby (2009) evolution has often been called a self-evident mechanism because it follows three truths which include (a) heritable differences exist within living populations, (b) organisms generate more offspring than can survive, and (c) the offspring will vary in their reproductive and survival capabilities. Brink-Roby (2009) goes on to note that these truths encourage competition for survival and reproduction between organisms. As a consequence, organisms with attributes that give them dominance over their rivals pass these dominant attributes on, while attributes that do not provide dominance are not delivered to succeeding generations. Thus, the literature suggests that human beings will continue to evolve reproductively and consequently the competition for survival will continue to yield dissolution of commitment in relationships (Brink-Roby, 2009).

The principle ideology of natural selection is the evolutionary fitness of a living thing (Westendorp, Van Dunne, Kirkwood, Herlmerhurst, & Huizinga, 2001). Fitness is assessed by the ability of an organism to survive and reproduce, which influences the size of its genetic endowment to the succeeding generation. However, fitness is different from the total number of offspring. Fitness is determined by the percentage of succeeding generations that transmit the genes of the organism. For example, Westendorp, et al. (2001) noted that if an organism can survive adequately and reproduce promptly, but its offspring are all too small and weak to

endure, this organism would make little genetic contribution to subsequent offspring and would thus have a limited level of fitness.

According to Amos and Acevedo-Whitehouse (2009), if an allele (i.e., one of a number of alternate forms of the same gene) strengthens fitness more than other alleles of that gene, then with each generation the allele will become more prevalent in the population. These attributes are said to be selected for, that is, the desired trait will progressively increase across generations of reproduction. Lancaster, Hipsley, and Sinervo (2009) noted that improved survival strategies and increased fertility are among the examples of fitness increasing traits. Conversely, the lessened fitness incited by having limited benefits or detrimental alleles results in the alleles becoming rarer, or selected against, that is, having undesired traits that progressively decrease across generations of reproduction. Of note, the fitness of an allele is not a secure trait in that there is no guarantee that fitness (desirability) will survive genetically. If the environment is altered, formerly damaging or neutral traits may become favorable and formerly favorable traits may become damaging. For example the perpetual cycle starts with traits that enhance male reproduction and favor male persistence. These favorable traits within males will cause a reduction in the fitness of females due to the male persistence. As a counter-adaptation, females develop new favorable traits that decrease the direct costs implemented by males. After this, the cycle begins again. Examples of this in living species often occur during sexual conflict before and during mating. One such is infanticide, the killing of younger members of a species by older members, in which the male initiates to ensure paternal success (Marks, 2008). However, if the course of selection does vary in this way, previously forfeited traits may not re-evolve in an exact form (Lancaster, Hipsley, & Sinervo, 2009). Therefore the ultimate goal for humans is not

only reproduction, but also genetic dominance-ensuring that their particular genes are carried forward through generations. As such, infidelity and mate variation are highly likely.

### **Sexual Selection**

Sexual selection, another key concept, is a feature of natural selection in which some individuals out reproduce others in a population because they are better at securing mates (Gwynne & Lorch, 2013). According to Gwynne and Lorch (2013), the concept of sexual selection emerges from the recognition that many living things develop attributes whose role is not to help with personal survival, but to help with reproductive success and generational survival. Further, according to Veuille (2010), Darwin (1871) offered that sexual selection is not a competition for survival but rather a competition between males for the attainment of females. The result of the rivalry is not demise, but few or no offspring. The sexual struggle is twofold. In one case, the struggle lies amidst individuals of the same sex (usually males) to ward off or eliminate rivals with the female remaining indifferent. In a second case, the struggle continues between members of the same sex, but with a goal of charming the no longer passive but more agreeable opposite sex (female). Essentially, through intersexual selection males make themselves attractive to the females and through intrasexual selection males intimidate and defeat same-sex rivals in an effort to be selected by females. For each, the ultimate goal is access to the decisive sex, the sex with the higher parental investment, the female (Veuille, 2010).

Nakadera and Koene (2013) report although motivation for each gender is reproductive success, the two sexes have varying strategies. Whereas males desire to monopolize access to fertile females, females want to capitalize on the energy they invest in reproduction, ensuring that their offspring survive into adulthood-particularly into alpha males with well-developed and sexually appealing traits that sire them many offspring. In addition, because of their limited

number of breeding opportunities, females have much more reason to be selective because male and female investment in rearing offspring is not equal. The female energy expenditure on gestation and parental care is much higher. In contrast, males are more interested in germination and use every opportunity they have to mate. Thus, they are less invested in individual offspring (Sato & Karino, 2010).

### **Sexual Conflict/Sexual antagonism**

Sexual conflict or sexual antagonism develops when the two sexes have oppositional ideal strategies regarding regeneration. In particular, the method and frequency of mating. This conflict potentially leads to an evolutionary contest between females and males. In essence, while males may gain more from indiscriminate mating experiences, such experiences may endanger or harm females (Makinen, Panova, & Andre', 2007; Gay et al., 2011). It is widely thought that this sexual dimorphism, observable difference between males and females, evolved primarily in response to sexual selection and or natural selection arising from differences in reproductive roles (Darwin 1871; Andersson 1994). Males and females share an autosomal genome (a gene that determines dominant patterns) and demonstrate many of the same phenotypic traits (observable, inherited characteristics) yet the sexes frequently have considerably different fitness culminations for these common traits. This sexually antagonistic choice gives rise to intralocus sexual conflict (shared traits within a sex are lost due to sexual strategies) because genes that are beneficial when expressed in males are often detrimental when expressed in females. When manifested across multiple loci, the genomic tug-of-war can result in a gender load that neutralizes sexual selection and maintains genetic variation for fitness (Fedorka and Mousseau 2004; Pischedda and Chippindale 2006; Foerester et al. 2007).

An example of an interlocus sexual conflict is that of mating frequencies. Males generally have a greater optimal mating rate than females because in the vast majority of animal species, males expend fewer resources on their offspring than do females. Therefore, males have diverse adaptations to coax females to mate with them (Dominic, 2010).

Hayle and Gilburn (2010) noted that sexual conflict may induce antagonistic co-evolution, in which one sex, generally the male, evolves an advantageous trait that is balanced by a countering trait in females. Thus a perpetual pattern ensues with the attributes that support male reproductive competition, which ultimately brings forth male persistence and polygamy. According to Hayle and Gilburn (2010), those supportive attributes will cause females to decline in their fitness. Consequently, females will likely acquire a counter-adaptation, that is, a supportive trait that minimizes the direct costs created by males. This phenomenon, according to Gay, et. al. (2011), is known as female resistance. After modification of traits, the fitness decline of the female diminishes and the pattern starts once more.

This cycle for reproduction propels males to compete for the attention of females in effort to increase mating opportunities. Interlocus sexual conflict reflects the interplay between mates to reach their optimal fitness strategies and can be rationalized through evolutionary concepts. This agonistic coevolution describes a process by which either sex evolves a set of adaptations that are detrimental to the fitness of the other sex. This conflict can occur over various aspects of interaction including fertilization, mating frequency, and mating behavior such as infidelity (Friberg, Lew, Byrne, Rice, & Tregenza, 2005). Therefore, inherent reproductive traits can be used to explain tendencies towards infidelity for both males and females. In essence, males repeatedly mate to reproduce and females repeatedly mate to find optimal paternal figures to

enhance offspring survival. This suggests that cycles of infidelity are persistent and warrant intervention that focuses on innate reasons for its occurrence.

### **Parental Investment**

A final key concept within evolutionary theory is that of parental investment. Parental investment theory accounts for many of the differences between males and females. As previously noted, these differences were evolved in order to survive and reproduce. From an evolutionary frame of reference, parental investment is a method of enhancing the reproductive gain of the parent (Kaitala & Mappes, 1997). Parental investment as defined by Trivers (1972) is any expenditure by the parent in an individual offspring that improves the chances of survival (reproductive success) of the offspring at the possible setback of parental ability to invest in future offspring.

As previously described, parental investment is limited, and parents are forced to make choices regarding how to distribute their resources between offspring. Klug and Bonsall (2007) indicate it is not assumed that parents will invest equally in all children. Rather, it is expected that parents will favor children on the establishment of their genetic relatedness and reproductive value. That is, the probable future reproductive success of the child.

Parental investment theory suggests that the female (who is usually the higher investing sex) will likely become a more limiting resource for males (the lower investing sex). In essence, the sex investing the most and having the most to lose (the female) in reproduction will be the choosier sex, causing the opposite sex (the male) to be more competitive and aggressive in pursuing it (Andrade & Kasumovic, 2005). Thus, this theory can also be used to explain male tendency towards infidelity as well as female tendency towards multiple mate selection. Males invest less than females to ensure the transmission of their DNA as much as possible. Females

invest more in one single offspring and thus select partners based on their long-term potential to ensure the survival of their offspring.

### **Sexual Strategies Theory**

According to Buss (1998), sexuality in sexually reproducing organisms is the most closely linked domain to evolution. That is, males and females have struggled with and confronted adaptive sexual problems throughout history. These struggles are called sexual strategies (Andersson, 1994). Specifically, sexual strategies theory describes an evolutionary theory of human sexuality. According to this theory, attraction and desire lie at the base of sexuality and human mating, centering on pinpointing desires and all the ramifications that emerge from desired sexual actions (Buss, 1998).

Concepts associated with this theory come from interpersonal communication such as attraction strategies, conflict between the sexes, down grading of competitor, causes of conjugal dissolution, mate-expulsion tactics, strategies for mate-retention, and compatibility between sexes (Buss, 1998). Further, Buss (1998) adds that these desires are the motivational processes that lead members of human species to short-term and long-term relations and sexual encounters. Additionally, sexual strategies theorists contend that humans have multifaceted strategies, both long and short-term, each triggered authentically depending on context (Buss, 1998). Humans specifically have evolved a complex inventory of strategies ranging from marriage to dating.

Different adaptive processes must take place when pursuing long-term or short-term sexual strategies (Buss, 1998). A short-term sexual strategy can be sustained by sexual motivation and the ease of access one has to multiple partners. Physical attractiveness and financial well-being are determining factors in this strategy. Long-term sexual strategies occur after evaluating reproductive qualities such as security, financial and social standing, aspirations,

and education. In regards to short-term mating, men devote a greater percentage of their total mating endeavor than women (Buss, 1998). Strategic pluralism (i.e., the notion that multiple, perhaps contradictory behavior strategies are adaptive in certain environments) broaches that for the most part women should enlist in long-term mating strategies. However, if the benefits (specifically genetic benefits for offspring) offset the costs in short-term mating (e.g., partner loss, unwanted pregnancy, less parental investment), then women are likely to engage in short-term mating opportunities as well (Gangestad & Simpson, 2000).

Anthropological records suggest that men have sex with multiple women in order to increase reproduction through mating (Symons, 1979). As such, men have a biological predisposition to have short-term mating experiences with a variety of female partners. Contemporary examples of this type of mating include, but are not limited to dating, prostitution, extramarital affairs, and one-night stands. Men who desire a variety of partners require a level of sexual accessibility to partners. Therefore, they must have certain physical traits to attract women and a strategy for minimizing time and energy expended in achieving this criteria (Buss, 1998). However, not all men benefit from short-term sexual contact. Males who do not adapt to short-term methods are said to have failed or be out-reproduced by other males who successfully adapt to short-term mating. For those desiring long-term accessibility, men look for cues in women that identify their reproductive value (i.e., fertility and ability to produce offspring), probability of paternity, and quality of parental skills (Buss, 1998).

According to Sacco, Young, Brown, Bernstein, and Hugenberg (2012), short-term and long-term mating in regards to women also varies. Although women do not benefit as much as men do in short-term dating, they engage in adaptive sexual strategies in effort to offset their inconveniences. Women who participate in short-term mating have access to immediate

resources for their children and themselves, mating alternatives in the event the long-term mate becomes insufficient, and genetic benefits from mating with genetically preferable men (short-term male seekers) (Buss, 1998). Cues that women look for in short-term mating are physical attractiveness or fertility and ease of sexual access.

Women who pursue a long-term strategy use different adaptive sexual approaches. In these instances women look for men who have good financial prospects, cues such as hard work and ambition that can lead to resources, education, and social status (Buss, 1998). In addition women tend to shun men who practice short-term mating strategies, but again, will engage if the benefits ensure survival for their offspring. Lastly, different sexual environments trigger which strategies are to be used among men and women (Buss, 1998). For example, if a female is in a situation where there are limited mating opportunities, her strategy may include immediate copulation without being particular. By contrast, should there be multiple mating opportunities, the female is able to be particular and thus create male competition in determining the suitor. Those who look for short-term mating will seek a partner who is also seeking a short-term relation and vice versa.

### **Infidelity**

As evolutionary literature explains, males and females are innately driven to be polygamous in various environments and contexts including committed relationships where monogamy is expected. Idealized as monogamous individuals, partners in these relationships are said to commit acts of infidelity when acting upon their innate desires (Hansen, 1987). Infidelity is often described as a secret sexual, emotional, or romantic extradyadic involvement that breaches the commitment within the framework of a monogamous relationship (Fincham, 2006). Infidelity is considered to be one of the most significant threats to the solidity of adult

relationships, including romantic commitments such as marriage. Betzig (1989) identified infidelity as the single most cited cause of separation and marriage dissolution. In the United States and other countries, romantic relationships are primary elements in defining pleasure and life satisfaction (Stack & Eshleman, 1998). While many facets of modern-day relationships have been altered, the expectation of monogamy is steadfast and infidelity persists as a painful and damaging circumstance for those in romantic relationships (Sweeney & Horwitz, 2001; Thornton, 1989).

Couples therapists observe infidelity to be one of the most challenging issues to attend to and note that extradyadic affairs are amid the most adverse and hurtful tribulations in relationship sustainment, second only to physical abuse (Weeks, Gambescia, & Jenkins, 2003; Whisman, Dixon, & Johnson, 1997). Infidelity is not only afflictive, but also pervasive. In a study of approximately 17,000 participants across 53 countries it was found that 63% of men actively participated in sex with someone other than their committed partner and 45% of women reported likewise (Schmitt & David, 2004). In a similar U.S. nationally representative sample of over 2,000 people, 12% of women and 23% of men revealed participating in marital infidelity (Wiederman, 1997). Extramarital affairs are not freely disregarded in marriages, and are the most often cited reason in both the U.S. and internationally for divorce (Amato & Previti, 2003; Betzig, 1989). A mixed methods analysis on extramarital sex in contemporary China revealed that men and women exhibit equal engagement in extramarital sex at a reported 15%. Moreover prevalence of extradyadic relationships range from 30% to 60% for males and 20% to 50% for females ( Spongaugle, 1989; Vangelisti & Gerstenberger, 2004).

Many studies regarding infidelity conclude that men disclose greater percentages of infidelity than women. However, there is data that suggests the difference in percentages is

curtailing (Walters & Berger, 2013). In Wiederman's (1997) research of gender variances in extramarital sex, respondents less than 40 years of age had no difference in gender in lifetime occurrence of infidelity. Likewise, another study revealed that whereas men reported more incidents of cheating than women during later adulthood, women and men under 45 exhibited no difference (Atkins, Baucom, & Jacobson, 2001). Comparably, adolescents exhibited no gender difference in carrying out acts of infidelity (Feldman & Cauffman, 1999). Likewise, neither did younger adults, when infidelity was specifically denoted as intercourse (Brand, Markey, Mills, & Hodges, 2007). In a study conducted by Weiderman and Hurd (1999), it was found that amongst participants involved in committed relationships, 68% of women and 75% of men had participated in at least one form of extradyadic activity.

Extradyadic behaviors include, but are not limited to, acts such as romantic kissing, intimate conversations, dating, and sexual activity. Most literature divides infidelity into specific categories including sexual, emotional, and combined (Glass, 1985). Each classification of infidelity can be detrimental to a committed partner. However, the level and likelihood of detriment varies amongst sexes as well as for each individual. For example, in a study completed by Fernandez, Vera-Villarroel, Sierra, & Zubeidat, (2007) it was observed that men are more reactive to sexual infidelity whereas women are more reactive to emotional infidelity.

As evolutionary literature suggests, this is likely due to parental investment and the expenditure of parental resources involved. In essence, men who engage in emotional infidelity are presumed to be in search of long-term sexual contact and women involved in sexual infidelity are presumed to be in search of short-term sexual contact. Both behaviors are direct contradictions to optimal evolutionary strategies previously discussed for each sex and consequently may lead to a decline in fitness or survival. In regards to human males and females,

this declination may manifest direct consequences such as depression, relationship dissolution, poor self-esteem, and familial instability (Lessells, 2005). Clancy and Trotter (1999) found that infidelity follows paths similar to abuse cycles and are repetitive in nature. As such, there emerges a need by the individual to better understand why he or she engages in the behavior or is susceptible to the behavior.

### **Sexual Infidelity**

Sexual infidelity involves situations where one partner engages in sexual activity outside his or her primary romantic relationship (Buss, Larsen, Westen, & Semmelroth, 1992; Harris, 2003a; Sagarin, 2005). The acts of sexual activity can vary from interaction with sex workers such as prostitutes or strippers, engaging in various types of sexual acts, to same sex encounters (Blow & Hartnett, 2005). According to Mackenzie (2011), sexual infidelity may or may not include an emotional connection. Further, she suggested that sexual infidelity is a connection with someone external to the committed relationship that is essentially physical in intent. These extramarital sex acts include some form of physical stimulation and consist of genital intercourse with someone other than a committed partner.

### **Emotional Infidelity**

Emotional infidelity involves an affair that does not consist of direct physical stimulation or intimacy, but involves emotional closeness and affection. Emotional infidelity is often termed an *affair of the heart* in that typically, individuals involved in emotional affairs engage in an extramarital bond that has a distinct bearing on the amount of balance, emotional intimacy, and distance in the committed relationship (Beatriz, 2007). Emotionally unfaithful partners may spend extreme or unacceptable amounts of personal time with someone other than their committed partners. Over time, they tend to divulge more to the friend than the committed

partner. Individuals in this type of affair may also disclose more impassioned affectionate secrets and feelings with their friend than with their committed partner (Rubin, 1986).

According to Potter and Potter (2008), marriage and family therapists have found that any time an individual expends more emotionally in a relationship with someone other than his companion, the current partnership will be impaired. As noted, emotional infidelity is riddled with deception and secrecy. Those muddled in the affair may not tell the truth to their partners about the length of time invested in or with the friend. Literature offered by Hertlein and Piercy (2006) suggested that an individual concerned with this form of affair might convince his partner that he is doing a particular activity when he is actually meeting with the emotionally attached friend. Similarly, the unfaithful partner may leave out any indication of the other person when explaining the events of the day in effort to hide the rendezvous.

According to Potter and Potter (2008), though no physical intimacy may occur, the dishonesty demonstrates that those entangled retain some sense of wrong doing that challenges the existing relationship. In essence, if there was no actual detriment in congregating with a friend, both participants would feel content revealing the truth about where they are meeting, what they are discussing, and frequency with their partners. Secrecy and deception would not be necessary. Examples of emotional infidelity may include long distance phone calls, cyber relationships, private lunches or other common meeting arrangements, excessive secret time together, and sharing of intimate thoughts (Blow & Hartnett, 2005).

### **Physical Infidelity**

In situations of physical infidelity, a person gives intimate physical attention to someone other than his committed partner (Kafeel, 2011). Often times the attention, such as kissing, is not considered cheating, but when encompassed with the preparation of the act (including the desire,

intimate emotion, and momentary lust), the sense of betrayal is heightened and trust is consequently broken (Kafeel, 2011). Similar to other types of infidelity, in physical infidelity a key issue is that the unfaithful party made a conscious decision to participate in the act. Acts in this sense may include fondling, kissing, manual genital stimulation without actual intercourse, and heavy petting. In other words, it is any physical contact that creates sexual arousal without engaging in actual genital intercourse. Hall and Fincham (2006) added that physical infidelity consists of engaging in sexual intimacy that defies relational and societal norms.

### **Consequences of Infidelity**

Infidelity exacts a devastating toll on relationships. Studies show that only a small number of couples who experience infidelity can salvage their relationship following an affair (Charny & Parnass, 1995; Hansen, 1987). Most studies on the ramifications of infidelity indicate negative outcomes such as loss of trust, damaged self-esteem, fear of being alone, rage, and decreased confidence (Charny & Parnass, 1995). In one article, research shows that the psychological impact of an affair is similar in nature to the trauma of sexual or physical abuse (Clancy & Trotter, 1999). Despite the amount of pain infidelity brings to victims and perpetrators, it remains remarkably common.

According to the General Social Survey of 1994 of 884 men and 1,288 women in committed relationships, 22.7% of men and 11.6% of women reported having participated in extradyadic sex (Davis & Smith, 1994). Shachelford and Buss (1997) projected that the lifetime frequency of relationship infidelity spans from 26% to 70% for women and 33% to 75% for men. Laumen et al. (1994) found that 25% of married men and 15% of married women admitted to engaging in extramarital sex. Shackelford et al. (2000) reported that women and men who face varying adaptive dilemmas over evolutionary history relevant to diverse forms of infidelity have

diverse reactions to infidelity committed by their partner. Thus, it is more challenging for men to exonerate sexual infidelity than emotional infidelity and men are more likely to end a committed relationship following sexual infidelity by a partner. The same is true for women in regards to acts of emotional infidelity (Shackelford et al, 2002). Lusterman (1998), demonstrated that women are more likely to link sex with love and emotional connection, when men are involved for primarily sexual purposes.

Comparatively to situations of trauma and abuse, the offended partner generally experiences feelings of intense shame, despair, guilt, and abandonment (Clancy & Trotter, 1999). The victims often find it difficult to confide in friends and family and often struggle alone with their emotions for fear that they are different or share no commonality with others in this respect. Perpetrators of infidelity experience similar emotions. Often they are wrought with guilt, embarrassment, and regret. In addition, perpetrators may harbor subconscious feelings of self-doubt and loathing. These feelings have the potential to manifest into low self-worth, inadequacies, inability to foster trust, and confusion about why they commit acts of infidelity (Charny & Parnass, 1995).

Affairs differ in their causes, functions, meanings, and impact. Thus, it is integral that individuals and couples understand that their actions and experiences may be symbolized and patterned by evolutionary drives. Like other traumatic events, the cycle-like or patterned behavior (whether victim or perpetrator) beseeches understanding and a sense of commonality. Toplin (2002) noted that it is important for individuals to understand that extradyadic affairs can have both growth seeking and repetitive innate components. Stolorow, Brandshaft, and Atwood (1987) added that affairs have an innate self-objective and repetitive dimension that needs to be understood by those involved. Further, they noted that in terms of a repetitive dimension,

extradyadic affairs develop from intricate, innate self-organizing principles such as personal expectations of relationships and beliefs about how relationships change. As such, it is not uncommon to find a history of affairs or repeat occasions of being cheated on by a partner in committed relationships.

From a clinical standpoint, Atkins, Yi, Baucom, and Christensen, (2005) suggested it may be advantageous for couples to distinguish unfaithfulness as an evolutionary process rather than a one-time event. In their studies, Atkins et al. (2005) found that couples who had an affair that was not kept secret improved more in relationship satisfaction than others who kept the affair a secret. The researchers also found that the unfaithful partner is more distressed than the partner who is not unfaithful and both partners share similar advances in therapy. In contrast, Gordon, Coop, Baucom, and Snyder (2005) concluded that the partner who is not involved in infidelity is more stressed during therapy but ultimately receives more therapeutic strides in treatment compared to the unfaithful partner.

Regardless to who discloses the distress, treatment suggestions offered by Baucom, Gordon, Snyder, Arkins, and Christensen (2006), suggested that one approach towards healthy disclosure and dealing with infidelity is to uncover the meanings and framework of infidelity. Thus, effective treatment is twofold in that it is not only important for individuals to know that they are not alone in their actions and experiences, but also to know that their actions and experiences possess meaning and are patterned as such (Stolorow, Brandshaft, Atwood, 1987). Literature suggests that occurrences of infidelity abound for many reasons. The effects of these occurrences are hurtful, traumatic, and often revolving. Utilizing an approach that explains and integrates the innate tendencies of the act with archetypal identification as well as meaning in life

responses is ideal. This approach lays a foundation for discussion regarding why the drive exists and how unconscious habits and tendencies can be actualized to bring about change.

The proceeding sections of this paper addressed infidelity and relational issues regarding young adults. The next section of this paper will provide a discussion on symbolism and archetypes.

### **Symbolism**

One way to give meaning to patterned behavior is through the use of universal symbols. In forethought of its effect on the psyche, a seminal study by Joseph Campbell (2001) suggests that a symbol is like everything else and demonstrates a dual aspect. As such, he noted that it is important to distinguish between the significance and the meaning of symbols. Campbell (2001) added that all symbolical systems of the past operated together on three levels. These levels include (a) the tangible elements of waking consciousness, (b) the spiritual level of dreams, and (c) the divinity of the absolutely unknowable.

Zimmer (1946) gave an overview of the relevance of symbols offering that symbols are concepts and words similar to ceremonial images and rituals. Symbols, he added, are much like the customs of daily life through which a sublime reality is reflected. Meehan (2011) added that symbols are patterns that are played out in life over and over again. Koberna (2012) suggested that symbols are metaphors that imply and reflect something that is indefinable, innate, and often ambiguous, yet used diversely. Zimmer (1946) further offered that symbols are not necessarily truths themselves, but they are held as truths within the minds of the individuals who identify with them.

Thus, symbols are complex methods of communication that have collective hierarchies of meaning. Burke (1966) noted that the quest by man for social belonging, identity, and

explanation of behaviors is infused with and played out through symbols. This complexity distinguishes symbols from signs, as signs have a universal meaning (i.e., arbitrary marks, or figures that depict significance) (Langer, 1942). Garrod, Fay, Rogers, Walker, and Swoboda (2010) have pioneered several studies that suggest that human culture uses symbols as a way to express specific social philosophies, ideologies, and to represent characteristics of self. The unique conceptualization of symbols serves as the framework from which individuals make judgments and decisions. As such, humans use symbols to make sense of the world around them as well as to identify and achieve a sense of commonality.

According to Koberna (2012), the evolution of symbols goes in hand with the evolution of human behavior and is described best as a complex paradox. He added that symbols provide an explanation to human behavior. Jung (1968) concluded that symbols stand for things that are obscure and are difficult to make explicit. Symbols help individuals to create a sense of who they are and how they fit into the world. Further, individuals not only seek symbolic differences, they also seek commonality. As such, symbols are complex and their meanings evolve as individuals or cultures evolve. This is particularly pertinent for young adults who are not yet certain who they are.

### **Archetypes**

In the vein of the evolution of meaning and symbols, Stevens (1983) theorized that archetypes are evolved interpersonal relations used to explain human interaction. Archetypes, according to Toynbee (1956) are primal patterns of inborn, imprinted, and instinctive thoughts in the subconscious mind of every human. Carl Jung, a psychotherapist and a colleague of Sigmund Freud, was the first person to propagate the theory of archetypes. He studied myths, legends, and dreams and concluded that humans are born with specific archetypes and an innate ability to

understand them (Zoja, 2010). In his works, Jung (1968) noted that individuals are preprogrammed to look for archetypes in everyday life because they serve as a framework for understanding the world.

He further postulated that a considerable amount of human behavior is inherent and dwells in the unconscious and because it is unconscious, its existence is inferred indirectly through the observation of behavior and recognition of symbols. White (1940), wrote that all human behavior can be traced to archetypal symbols as they are what separate man from other animals. According to White (1940), archetypes are visual and energetic symbols imprinted in the human psyche and consequently explain certain innate behaviors, such as infidelity. There have been numerous studies conducted regarding archetypes particularly in literature through the development of characters and plots (Batto, 2010). There have also been studies conducted on archetypes as they relate to human nature in business and environmental settings (Wallace, 2011). All of these studies uphold the notion that archetypes are inward perceptions and behaviors that evolve as individuals evolve, and can be used to account for personal choices, attitudes, and beliefs. Whereas archetypal studies are accessible across genres, this study will specifically add to the field of counseling by interjecting archetypal associations as they pertain to romantic relationships and understanding how different individuals perceive their relationships.

Jungian archetypes refer to fundamental root systems or the archetypes-as-such from which patterns and images emerge. It is culture, history, and personal framework that influence these displayed representations giving them their specific meaning (Jung, 1968). These patterns and images are accurately referred to as archetypal images. Of note, Jung (1968) added it is customary for the term archetype to be utilized to refer to both archetypal images and

archetypes-as-such. Balthazar (2007) wrote that archetypes offer a footing to humanity by which each human being shapes his life experiences, influencing them with his life events and personality. In this fashion, archetypes are understood as a limited number of innate ambiguous forms, from which arises innumerable patterns, images, and symbols of behavior.

Though innumerable, archetypes seek actualization within the framework of the environment of each individual (Hunt, 2012). Dunlap (2012) suggested that archetypes are inherited potentials realized when they enter consciousness as manifestations in behavior during interface with the outside world. Jung (1968) explained this process of actualization using the terms evocation and constellation. Evocation in this sense refers to the bringing forth of, and constellation means the overarching symbolic quality of not just a random image of emotional experience but of the experience itself (Stewart, 1987).

Further, Stewart (1987) explained that in response to a symbol, a stimulus unconscious innate idea; there ensues a rush of feelings of a specific quality, labeled as emotions. These emotions are then accompanied by a specific behavior pattern. One example referenced by Jung (1968) is when the mother archetype is actualized in the psyche of the child by arousing innate expectancy of the maternal archetype when the child is near a maternal figure who strongly resembles its archetypal template. This maternal archetype is assembled as a mother complex in the unconscious of the child. Complexes are operative aspects of the personal unconscious, just as archetypes are units for the collective unconscious.

Regarding the collective unconscious, Beebe (1997) summarized that while type preferences of humans lie in the ego, which is the conscious portion of the mind, the archetypes rest in the unconscious area, specifically in the portion that is collective, or shared by all people. According to Williams (1963), an example of the unconscious is something that has been

forgotten. It is something that is suppressed in the memory but can no longer be freely brought up consciously. It may arise on its own through abrupt flashes of memory under stress, dreams, or déjà-vu. In essence, these are personal forms of unconsciousness. Sandic (2006) noted there are other forms that are collective, which are not grounded on personal recall, but nevertheless influence portions of human life such as inherited images of good and evil, love and power, and male and female that are exemplified in all cultures. When individual experiences suit these specific collective frames of organization and form a pattern, they then enter the personal part of the unconscious, and become complexes. The archetype lies at the heart of the complex and forms a mold around the function. The function then becomes the working perspective or "world-view" of that complex (Saunders & Skar, 2001).

### **Personal Unconsciousness**

In considering the personal part of the unconscious, it is necessary to note that the personal unconscious is similar to the Id concept proposed by Freud (2012). Segrist (2009) wrote that the id contains forgotten or repressed information or experiences that were once conscious. Likewise, according to Sandic (2006), the personal unconscious of Jung includes any thought, behavior, or belief that is not presently conscious, but can be made conscious through awareness. In addition, the personal unconscious serves as storage for events, experiences, and behaviors that humans prefer to leave in the unconscious. Examples may include repressed memories or infidelity tendencies (Johnson, 2012). Further, she commented that whereas the conscious mind is limited in how much information it can consume and process, the unconscious mind draws from everything including body language, patterns of behavior, and the past.

## **Collective Unconscious**

By contrast, the collective unconscious is a psychological structure that is genetically common to all human beings and is not influenced by personal experience (Jung, 1968). In essence, it is a collection of memories and experiences of humanity as a race. Merchant (2009) noted that the experiences of mankind are evolutionized in men and women, creating a genetic archetype of the experiences. Jung (1968) posited that the collective unconscious contains innate motifs and predispositions to patterned behavior that manifest symbolically as images from the deepest layers of the unconscious. Further, these images speak to common, recognizable human experiences, archetypes. The next few paragraphs of the study will identify and define the 12 Jungian archetypes.

## **Character Archetypes**

As mentioned, there are various archetypes. Jung (1968), however; outlined 12 key types that symbolize basic human motivations. Each type possesses its own collection of values, meanings, and personality traits and are separated into three specific sets of four. The three sets, ego, soul, and self each have a common underpinning. For example, according to Fordham (1982), types contained in the ego set are motivated to fulfill ego-defined agendas and constitute basic human instinct. Jung (1968) observed that most, if not all, individuals have numerous archetypes at play in their personality construct. However, one archetype is inclined to govern the personality overall. Jung offered that it can be beneficial to know which archetypes are at play in oneself and others in effort to gain personal insight into behaviors, tendencies, and motivations.

## **The Ego Types**

Ego types are the outermost types along the journey to self-realization. The four archetypes specific to this set include: “the innocent”, “the orphan” (regular guy or gal), “the hero”, and “the caregiver” (Moore, 1983). According to Taylor (2011), the ego archetypes are interested in connecting with their inner-child or inner-parent. As such, she noted that these types are typically present in young adults who are employing new endeavors and entering new levels development, such as college students. These particular archetypes provide an inner “family” of comfort for those adjusting in this phase. When this reality is awakened, the individual is able to move into the next phase of archetypal development (Taylor, 2011). Understanding this phase of development is particularly important for clinicians working with young adults struggling with relationship issues such as infidelity and commitment inabilities.

### **The Innocent**

In writings by Mamchur (2000), the innocent archetype embodies faith, optimism, and trust. Many individuals in helping professions are innocents at the onset and have exceptionally high aspirations and ideals. Innocents believe hard work and doing things the right way enable them to help others and make significant contributions to the world. The idea of becoming a coach, guide, or therapist is especially attractive to those who resonate with the innocent character as they believe that such professions or positions have high ideals and good motives (Mamchur, 2000). According to Forstmann (2013), the innocents have a desire for transparency, goodness and straightforwardness, safety and security, a feeling of protection, and to experience unconditional acceptance and love. Jung (1968), described this as the child archetype which symbolizes a developing personality with potential. As such, he offered that innocents (child-archetypes) believe “I will get what I need-it will be provided to me”. Characters such as Mary

Poppins, Sound of Music, and Forrest Gump are common illustrations of the innocent archetype (Mamchur, 2000). The shadows, or vices, of the innocent archetype are episodes of repression and denial, blaming, childish behavior, irrational optimism, conformity, and risk taking habits such as the development of consumption addictions to things such as fun and food (Jung, 1968). Mamchur (2000) goes on to note that common stages of the innocent archetype include blind obedience, naivety, and dependence.

### **The Orphan/Regular Guy or Gal**

Orphan archetypes according to Jung (1968), are considered realists who are “down to earth”. They possess strong integrity with a lack of pretense. Further, individuals who identify with the orphan archetype tend to be egalitarians who value the worth of others and believe in the dignity of all (Kolbenschlag, 1988). Mamchur (2000), wrote that acceptance originates easily to orphan archetypes as they are typically friendly, impartial, welcoming, and indulgent. As noted by Raffa (1995), orphans identify with the motto "one for all and all for one." Typically, individuals who identify with this archetype learned independence at a young age and are adapt at facing facts due to experiences or feelings of abandonment.

In an article by Isaac (2008), the process of the orphan metaphorically rests within any individual who looks for the self-actualization of a life that is equally rich in solitude as well as in relationships. The presence of the orphan in one’s life beckons the need to question not only how to respond to aloneness, but how to practice obedience to all of creation. Identifying individuals adapt well and value camaraderie and networking (Mamchur, 2000). According a review of *Island of the Blue Dolphins* by Baecker (2006), this real life story ideally illustrated the orphan archetype in that the main character, a young girl, was left for 18 years to her own survival devices and acquired self-reliance, independence, and self-realization. Further, other

well-known fictional characters according Mamchur (2000) that identify with this archetype include “Mr. Goodbar” and Pinocchio. She noted that vices (shadows) for the orphan can include using prior misfortunes as excuses, victimization or persecution, and willingness to be abused rather than be alone.

### **The Hero**

The word hero is a derivative of the Greek root that means to protect and serve. The hero (warrior) archetype according to Mamchur (2000) represents an internal feeling of authority that enables individuals to deal pragmatically with other authority figures in the world. She noted that individuals who are not afraid to stand up for themselves and who can quickly set goals and limits typically identify with this archetype. Vogler, (2007) noted that the hero is associated with self-sacrifice. He or she is the individual who transcends the ego, but at first, the hero is all ego. Further, Volger (2007) noted that the job of the hero is to integrate all the individual aspects of himself to become a genuine self, which he then recognizes as part of the whole. In most references, individuals are usually incited to identify with the hero. Kolbensschlag (1988) noted that people tend to admire the qualities of the hero and desire to be like him, however; cautioning that the hero also has flaws. Heroes typically have inner conflict such as trust and suspicion, despair and hope, and love and duty. Character examples of the hero include Dorothy in the Wizard of Oz, Saving Private Ryan, and Batman (Mamchur, 2000). Individuals who identify with the hero archetype typically believe that where there is a will, there is a way. They desire to prove their worth and have a fear of personal weakness and vulnerability. Vices for the hero include always needing another fight to win and arrogance (Kolbensschlag, 1988).

## **The Caregiver**

Mamchur (2000) reported that the caregiver archetype is needed for emotional self-care when altered emotions such as fear, guilt, shame, or sadness are triggered. Individuals who identify with the internal caregiver look inside for acknowledgement and reassurance. These individuals care for themselves by acknowledging and experiencing the emotions of others, not judging them, denying them, or trying to make them go away. Kolbenschlag (1988) offered that caregivers have a desire to care for and protect others and believe in “love thy neighbors as yourself”. The greatest fear of a caregiver archetype is ingratitude and selfishness. Further, Mamchur (2000) offered that whereas caregiver types typically have compassion and generosity, they carry vices such as being exploited and martyrdom. Character examples include Mother Theresa and It’s A Wonderful Life. Kaplan (1994) offered that the caregiver is often referred to as the parent, altruist, saint, or helper.

## **The Soul Types**

According to Schellhammer (2012), soul types share a common driving force of a desire for spiritual humanity and inner guidance. Further he noted that driven by a call to fulfill divinity services, only through the process of individuation is this archetype truly achieved. Soul types are divided into three levels that include archetype of soul fulfillment, archetypes about the service of God, and the highest archetype- the soul (Kolbenschlag, 1988). During levels of soul fulfillment, ideals such as discovering and forming all inner forces, integration of spiritual principles, and balancing internal and external life are personified. Throughout levels regarding the service of God, ideals such as developing authentic teachings and practices, becoming an alliance with God, and fashioning positions such as religious leader or supreme teacher are sought after. While experiencing the highest archetype of the soul level, principles such as

becoming a prophet or spiritual king are idolized (Mamchur, 2000). According to Taylor (2011), archetypes within this level are actively on a journey of seeking new options and doing away with behaviors that no longer work. Further, she noted that individuals in this category are often seeking personal freedom and fulfillment. When all four types within this level are recognized in an individual, it is assumed that the individual is prepared for the next phase of archetypal development (Taylor, 2011).

### **The Explorer**

Mamchur (2000) reported that individuals who identify with the explorer or “seeker” archetype experience feelings of emptiness, alienation, and lack of fulfillment. Explorers typically look for things to be better than they are and prefer no boundaries. Kolbenschlag (1988) added that the explorer often has an inner voice that conveys that life could be different or better. As such, the seeking behavior of the explorer often has to do with a search for meaning. Explorers desire freedom to find themselves and fear conformity and being trapped. Their vices, according to Mamchur (2000), include frequent wandering and misfit behavior. As such, character examples include Indiana Jones, Huckleberry Fin, and Peter Pan.

### **The Rebel**

Individuals who identify with the rebel archetype generally have inner feelings of anger, mistreatment, and powerlessness (Kolbenschlag, 1988). As such, they often are cutting edge, live outside the law, and radical. Rebel archetypes identify themselves as flying in the face of convention and are often disruptive. According to Mamchur (2000), the core desires of rebel archetypes often include revenge, revolution, and destruction of what is not working. Vices for the rebel can include crossing into the dark side and criminal activity. Character examples include Malcolm X, Gandhi, and Robin Hood.

## **The Lover**

The lover archetype is often referred to as the intimate, partner, friend, or team builder. As such, lovers desire to be in relationships, work environments, and other surroundings with people whom they love (Kolbenschlag, 1988). According to research by Mamchur (2000), lovers strive to be physically and emotionally attractive and fear being unloved or unwanted. In addition, lovers have a strong sense of commitment, gratitude, and appreciation. Their vices include people pleasing behaviors, obsession, and the loss of identify due to satisfying others. Character examples include Romeo and Juliet, Titanic, and War of Roses.

## **The Creator**

Fisher (2011) noted that the creator archetype is seen as the writer, artist, entrepreneur, or innovator and that creators indulge in any endeavor that builds on or from the imagination. The goal of the creator is to realize a vision and believe that it can be done. To that extent, their fears include substandard vision and substandard execution of ideas (Kolbenschlag, 1988). Vices for this archetype may include oblivion to reality, destructive imagination, and lack of responsibility. Character examples include Georgia Okeefe and Leonardo de Vinci (Mamchur, 2000).

## **The Self Types**

Jung (1968), postulated that those who reverence the self type have an understanding that the self is not just 'me' but encompasses God. Further, self types possess a belief in a spirit of the universe that serves to connect both consciousness and unconsciousness. Principles such as nirvana and ecstatic harmony are embodied in this type. When the archetypes within this level are activated into the consciousness of individuals, they are enter a new level of understanding They are typically motivated by ways to utilize their gifts in unique perspectives to make a difference in the world (Taylor, 2011). Individuals who have awareness at this level are believed

to no longer yearn to be taken care of (ego types) and no longer blame others or make excuses for poor behaviors and choices (soul types) (Taylor, 2011).

### **The Jester**

According to Fisher (2011), individuals who identify with the jester archetype typically have traits that delve them into the role of the life of a party and they generally thrive in social settings such as celebrations and festivities. Jester figures are also able to thrive in stressful situations because fear is not an issue for them as they see everything as being fundamentally ridiculous and lighthearted. Forstmann (2013) noted that jesters can assume the fearless attitude of the warrior during an intense encounter or they can run away laughing as they do not fear humiliation that is often associated with running away from conflict. As such, jesters are hard to predict. Jestors are resourceful, capable, and out of the box thinkers. Vices for the jester include self-indulgence, mean spirited jokes, and lack of responsibility. Characters associated with the jester include Tom Sawyer and Spiderman (Mamchur, 2000).

### **The Sage**

According to Mamchur (2000), the sage is often referred to as the expert, the scholar, the advisor, or the philosopher. She added that the sage seeks to find truth and uses intelligence and analysis to understand the world. As reported by Fisher (2011), individuals who identify with the sage are self-reflective, have extensive thought processes, and believe in finding the truth. Sages fear being misled or duped and consequently have vices that include studying details and facts for extensive periods of time, often never acting on anything (Forstmann, 2013). Character examples of the sage include Dr. Spock, Oprah Winfrey, or Yoda (Mamchur, 2000).

## **The Magician**

For the magician, the attraction to magic is rooted in the idea of what having magic powers represents. The majesty of possessing secret knowledge and ability in effort to manipulate and control elements is what fuels those who identify with the magician archetype (Fisher, 2011). According to Kolbenschlag (1988), it is the ability to harness and possess power that energizes the Magician archetype. Magicians tend to hold hidden knowledge and are intellectually curious (Mamchur, 2000). Moore (1991) explained that the hidden knowledge of the magician is any knowledge that is not readily apparent or based on common sense. Further, Moore (1991) offered it is knowledge through mastery, diligence, and degrees that the average man does not obtain. The magician is often referred to as the leader, inventor, or visionary. Character examples include Dr. Martin Luther King and Merlin in Camelot. Vices may include dark magic, sick view of the world, and the fact that the magician may desire to heal when it is often he who needs healing (Mamchur, 2000).

## **The Ruler**

Those who identify with the ruler archetype do not like chaos. Rulers like procedures and creating common sense solution for difficult situations (Jung, 1946). Moreover, Moore (1991) noted that rulers are like caregivers and lovers in that each is concerned with status, however; rulers do not lower their status for appeal, rather continuously elevate themselves to higher statuses as they believe that people will listen to those in high position. Further, Kolbenschlag (1988) offered that rulers believe that power is “the only thing” and they constantly desire control. As such, rulers fear chaos and the possibility of being overthrown. Possible vices for the ruler are being unable to delegate and being authoritarian. Character examples include The President or Queen Elizabeth (Mamchur, 2000).

Diagram 1 below illustrates the levels of the 12 Jungian archetypes as they appear in stages.

*Diagram 1: Illustration of the 3 Stages of Jungian Archetypes*

<b>MOTIVATION</b> <i>Core Desire</i> Leadership Style	<b>STABILITY/STRUCTURE</b> <i>Desire to feel safe and in control</i> Administrator	<b>PEOPLE/BELONGING</b> <i>Desire to belong and feel valued</i> Manager	<b>RESULTS/MASTERY</b> <i>Desire to have a special impact on the world</i> Facilitator	<b>LEARNING/IDENTITY</b> <i>Desire to be yourself and find out about the world</i> Mentor
<b>Stage 1:</b> <b>Preparation</b> Socialization Archetypes (Locates power in the group and social systems)	Caregiver	Warrior (Hero)	Orphan (Regular Guy/Gal)	Innocent
<b>Stage 2:</b> <b>Journey</b> Change Archetypes (Takes back personal power and freedom)	Creator	Destroyer (Outlaw)	Lover	Seeker (Explorer)
<b>Stage 3:</b> <b>Return</b> Restabilization Archetypes (Exerts personal power in the world)	Ruler	Magician	Jester	Sage

### **The Four Cardinal Orientations**

The 12 archetypes separated into three distinct sets are further divided into cardinal orientations. The four cardinal orientations outline four groups, “*the quaternity*”. In the quaternity each group contains three types. Each group is driven by its corresponding orienting focus: ego-fulfillment, freedom, socialness and order. These groups are different than the three groups of types mentioned earlier because whereas all the types in the ego, soul, and self sets all share the same driving source, the types comprising the four orienting groups have different source drives but the same motivating orientation (Jung, 1968). Ouvry (2012) found that each group is important in ensuring an overall level of happiness and fulfillment in life. One example

offered by Ouvry (2012) suggested that the caregiver is motivated by the need to fulfill ego schemas through fulfilling the needs of others, which is a social orientation. Nonetheless, the Hero, who is also motivated by the need to satisfy ego agendas, does so through daring action that proves self-worth. Understanding the groupings is key in interpreting the motivational and self-perceptual dynamics of each type. Finally, Jung (1968) postulated that the unity of the quaternity is based on the underlying principle of the psyche, the self or soul, as the overall archetype of wholeness. It is by virtue of the self that each individual type unites to form any of the couplings, and in turn the four couplings, under the guidance of the self, point to the direction of undeveloped traits that form the compass of the soul, and together help individuals constantly strive for wholeness and a fuller life (Giannini, 2009).

### **Individuation**

Individuation is a method of self-realization in which an individual incorporates components of the psyche that have the capability of becoming conscious. O’hearn, Franconeri, Wright, Minshew, and Luna (2013) noted that individuation is the ability to see four elements simultaneously. Essentially, it is the process through which an individual becomes a totally integrated personality, a search for totality. Jung (1968) noted that it is an individualized experience that can be conveyed as the breakthrough of discovering the divine in oneself or the breakthrough of the totality of oneself. He further noted that individuation may be a painful actualizing process, but it is essential to begin to accept situations and things that one normally shies away from. Once a person recognizes the components of his unconsciousness and reaches the objective of the individuation process, he is conscious of his relationships with others as well as his behaviors. Further, Marshall (1994) offered that individuation is an inherent, natural

process in man and it is internally stimulated rather than externally. This process is fundamental in helping adults to recognize inner vices and deal with or prevent fidelity issues.

The individuation process starts with becoming conscious of the persona, the mask that is worn in everyday life. Once this occurs it is necessary to become conscious of the shadow, the repressed qualities of the ego. Then is the need to become conscious of the anima, the inner woman in each man, or the animus, the inner man in each woman. Next the experience of the self happens (Jung, 1968). Of note, these stages can run parallel to each other as well as overlap. A study by Tucker (2012) suggested that conceptualizing life through the process of individuation increases moral benefit and promotes the ability to extract in-between realms of understanding.

The second step of integration following individuation is the transcendental function (Jung, 1968). This function facilitates in integrating the opposing predispositions of the personality. The goal of transcendence is the awareness of originally concealed personality traits that were innately formed at the core of development. As such, transcendence is the process by which the unity of the archetype of self is realized.

The next sections of the paper will discuss archetype tendencies.

### **Archetype Identification**

Campbell (1988) wrote that archetypes contain the spiritual potential of transformation for healing whether within a story or real life. Archetypal therapy is considered an interactive visualization process where the therapist guides the client into his subconscious terrain to encounter the key aspects of the psyche. These aspects include growth, focus, strength, and balance as examples. Papadopoulo (2011) added that this therapeutic encounter is distinguishable from doing therapy in that client revelations are often intentional and not happened upon. In

addition, the client will be encouraged to encounter the polarities of each key aspect for the purpose of making the repressed energy conscious and bringing balance to their life by integrating them. For couples dealing with infidelity this approach will help to hone in cheating behaviors and make initial discussions and disclosures less intimidating.

Hunt (2012) described Jungian analysis is a depth psychology, or psychology of the unconscious. In this way, dream interpretation is integral to Jungian analysis. He wrote that unlike Freud, Jung believed that dreams were more than sexual wish fulfillments. Jung (1968) contended that dreams are compensations for attitudes of the ego and that the attitudes of the ego are consistently limiting and damaging, and in some extremes completely malfunctioning. He also asserted that through dreams, the unconscious gives the ego alternate vantage points that offset maladaptive or dysfunctional attitudes and behaviors. He offered that the unconscious challenges the ego to earnestly take into account these alternate perspectives. Further, he concluded that dreams provide advice, constructive criticism, and wisdom, to the ego.

If the ego is amenable rather than defensive, it can assess these alternate vantage points and make a decision whether to use or refuse them. In addition to this redeeming role, Jung (1968) believed that a portion of dreams have a predictive role. Specifically, Jung deemed that predictive dreams were “anticipations in the unconscious” of a plausible future result. He believed that predictive dreams occurred when the thoughts of the ego deviated completely from the norm. In such occurrences, according to Jung, the redeeming function of the unconscious becomes a predictive function that influences the conscious attitude in a different, more improved direction than the previous one. Discussions of dreams can be instrumental starting points in helping clinicians make conversations regarding unconscious thought and desires comfortable.

## **The Three Jungian Methods**

Jungian analysis uses three methods to interact with the thoughts that develop from the unconscious: explication, amplification, and active imagination (Hunt, 2012). Active imagination is a strategy for experiencing the unconscious. Explication and amplification are strategies for interpreting the unconscious. It is important to note that in some situations these methods require specified training, however; for clinicians working to integrate unconscious motives and fidelity behaviors through archetype identification, specialized training is not specifically required (Hunt, 2012).

### **Explication**

In contrast to Freud, Jung believed that images and *initial thoughts* mean nothing more than what they appear to be on the surface. He believed in exposing them based essentially on what they insinuate (Hunt, 2012). According to Jung (1968), the unconscious has the ability to choose an especially apt image or immediate thought from all those available to it in order to serve a specific purpose. The challenge is to uncover exactly what that purpose is because implicit in each image is a crux that requires clarification. In situations regarding relationship struggles in young adults, it will be important to unearth how and what impulsive visions and actions are present in their lives and how they impact their interactions with others.

### **Amplification**

Amplification is a correlative procedure that attempts to establish parallels (Hunt, 2012). Jung amplified images and correlated them to the same or comparable images in other sources (Jung, 1968). Further, Jung would amplify a key, battering ram, or stick in a dream by comparison to real-life functions of keys, battering rams, or sticks in myths, fairy tales, art, folktales, culture, and literature (Jung, 1968). Hunt (2012) noted that whereas explication

determines what is fundamental in an image, amplification determines what is conventional (or archetypal) about an image. The images in myths, fairy tales, art, folktales, culture, and literature are expressions of what Jung calls the archetypes of the collective unconscious.

### **Active Imagination**

Active imagination is a process by which an individual brings forth images from the unconscious and interacts with them through conversation (Jung, 1968). The method requires active interaction with the images rather than mere passive observation of them (Hunt, 2012). According to Laughlin and Tiberia (2012), the technique requires that the imagination is regarded as a reality just as things in external reality are regarded. In active imagination, the images develop from the unconscious as personifications, and the individual must relate with those images in internal reality as if they were real individuals. Jung (1968) noted that it is vital that the individual says what he has to say to the figure and listens to what the figure has to say. Further, he stated in this phase an individual must be prepared to pose a question to the figures and oblige the figures to give an answer. This active imagination according to Jung (1968) is a dialogue between the individual and unconscious figures. An example of implementing active imagination is writing a play based on characters from the imagination. Utilizing this technique in a session where fidelity is an issue would be instrumental in helping clients to introduce hidden desires or urges to partners.

Krasnow (2001), offered that Jungian analysis is a concentrated form of psychotherapy in which the counselor and client work mutually to increase the consciousness of the client in order to move toward psychological stability and wholeness, and to bring relief and meaning to overt behaviors and psychological suffering. Further, Krasnow (2001) offered the process can be used

to treat a wide range of emotional disorders such as depression, anxiety, and trauma, and it can also assist in pursuit of psychological growth and understanding.

Jung (1968) believed that individuals develop symptoms when they are stuck in old patterns of behaving and thinking. Examples of this may include innate unconscious drives that are not integrated into awareness. Failure to understand the deeper underlying symptoms and focusing merely on relief (by both clinician and client) can cause problems, such as infidelity, to escalate or go uncharted. Using archetypal identification to forge a connection between cheating tendencies and innate beliefs and desires can serve as a catalyst to explore alternative behaviors and lead to personal transformation.

The next section of this paper will discuss meaning in life.

### **Meaning in Life**

In addition to actuating archetypes, it may be necessary for individuals to establish and understand meaning in life. The concept, meaning in life, has been described in numerous ways. Reker (2000) theorized life meaning as the awareness of order, coherence, and purpose in the existence of an individual, the pursuit and fulfillment of meaningful goals, and an accompanying feeling of satisfaction. Yalom (1980) described meaning as retaining a sense of lucidity and purpose in life. While Frankl (1984) saw the search for meaning by an individual as the key inspiration in life, others have depicted meaning as making sense of individual existence and life purpose by selecting goals and relationships based on a sense of order (Reker, Peacock, & Wong, 1987; Yalom, 1980). Having social and emotional connections with others has been found to be strongly correlated with a sense of meaning in life, while interpersonal alienation and lack of relationships has been shown to be related to feelings of meaninglessness (Debats, 1995). Research has shown that a core component of trauma in young adults, such as the effects of

infidelity, is linked with a declined sense of meaning in life. Further, healthy emotional relationships reduce the effects of trauma on meaning, whereas negative inter-personal relationships intensify the destructive effects of trauma on meaning in life (Krause, 2005).

Having a sense of meaning in life has been shown to have many elements, including spiritual (Ryš, 2009; Waisberg & Porter, 1994), affective, behavioral, and cognitive domains (Debats, 1990; Maddi, 1967). Wong (1998) suggested that life meaning is established through endeavors such as pursuing goal achievement, accepting limitations, participating in self propelling activities, being social and well liked, and engaging in close, healthy interpersonal relationships. Specific areas of life that have been shown to be significant sources of life meaning are love, marriage, and committed relationships (Josselson, 2000). Research on meaning in life has shown that the concept is positively linked with fewer depressive symptoms, a sense of hope (Mascaro & Rosen, 2005), life satisfaction, higher self-esteem, (Halama, 2007), extraversion and conscientiousness (Halama, 2005), and happiness (Bhogle & Prakash, 1993).

Studies have also shown relationships between meaning in life and happiness (Debats, 1996; Park, Peterson, & Ruch, 2009; Scannell, Allen, & Burton, 2002), as well as spiritual well-being (Harris & Standard, 2001; Scannell et al., 2002) in samples of adult mixed dyads. Research has shown that meaning in life is linked with self-efficacy in a mixed gender adult population (Skrabski, Kopp, Rozsa, Rethelyi, & Rahe, 2005) and with overall positive mental health outcomes for college students (Lindeman & Verkasalo, 1996) and the elderly (Moore, 1997; Reker, 1997). Studies have indicated that a sense of meaning in life is negatively related to rejection, feelings of boredom, apathy, emptiness (Frankl, 1966), anxiety, depression (Debats, 1990), and hopelessness (Harris & Standard, 2001) in general adult populations, as well as depressive symptoms (Mascaro, 2007) and psychological distress in young adults (Debats, van

der Lubbe, & Wezeman, 1993; Hong, 2006). Meaning in life has been examined in a number of previous studies. Most of the research has focused on mixed gender samples, college students and achievement, and older adults in transition. No research has been completed regarding meaning in life and relationship fidelity. As such, it is anticipated that this study will aid in research by investigating a new area of focus.

Researchers have asserted that a sense of meaning has a unique causal effect on psychological health that exists across a variety of contexts, particularly gender and interpersonal relationships (Debats, 1996; Mascaro & Rosen, 2005). Similarly to navigating roles within infidelity, results from previous studies have suggested that men and women experience the construct of meaning in life in a varying ways. Kraus (2005) found that healthy relationships and emotional support reduce the effects of trauma on meaning, whereas negative interpersonal relationships tend to enhance the malevolent effects of trauma on meaning in life. Further, analyses broach that the relationships among trauma, emotional support, and negative interpersonal contacts (such as infidelity) appear mainly in adults (Ryff, 1989).

Infidelity in committed relationships has devastating consequences. Being a victim of cheating can result in depression, anguish, humiliation, and rage. Likewise, being a perpetrator of infidelity can result in similar consequences in addition to self-loathing and feelings of regret and failure (Daly & Wilson, 1988). Theories of evolutionary human sexual behaviors (Cherkas, 2004), parental investment (Bjorklund & Kipp, 1996), sexual strategy (Buss & Schmitt, 1993), and trauma (Bloom, 2010) offer a rich source of theorizing regarding innate explanations for the behavior. However, research studies have fallen short of integrating primal explanations of reproductive behavior with primal archetype classification and meaning in life outlooks. For clinicians challenged with sorting through the effects, this approach is ideal.

Initializing sessions with an understanding of innate tendencies and subconscious drives may help to lessen the impact and humility of disclosure. Further, understanding from which archetype an individual identifies will provide additional personality insight of the individual as well as other beliefs and tendencies. These elements give clinicians clues for ideal treatment approaches as well as help gauge willingness to amend. Uncovering these internal feelings help to shed light on negative aspects of self and encourage conscious change. In bringing about change, understanding feelings about meaning in life become essential (Lee, Park, Uhlemann, Patsult, 2000). It is plausible that individuals struggling with fidelity issues fall on a particular end of the meaning in life spectrum ranging from having absolute meaning to searching for meaning. Understanding these needs will further aid in curtailing failing relationships and help individuals uncover their true selves.

## CHAPTER 3

### RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This chapter describes the design and research methodology implemented in this study. This chapter also includes a description of the sample size, sample characteristics, research setting, recruitment procedures, data collection, and human rights protections. Finally, this chapter describes the instruments used as well as the data analysis procedures.

#### **Research Methodology and Design**

The principal purposes of this study were to examine if archetypal influences, meaning in life scores, and various demographics influence attitudes towards cheating and cheating propensity. According to Burns and Grove (2005), quantitative research uses statistical analysis and numerical data to obtain information about various phenomena through the use of structured tools. For this study, data will be collected through the use of electronic questionnaires. Through this method all respondents were asked the same questions with predetermined response choices, allowing for objective data throughout the study.

Non-experimental studies are very common in social sciences because, for natural and ethical reasons, many human characteristics cannot be manipulated experimentally (Burns & Grove, 2005). Therefore, the primary research design of this study was a non-experimental multinomial logistic regression. Frequency tables and graphs were used to interpret the findings.

#### **Sampling**

Sampling is a process of selecting a portion of the population for participation in a research study (Burns & Grove, 2005). The objective of sampling includes choosing a group of individuals who are able to represent the total population because the findings from the sample

are typically used to represent the general population (Polit & Beck, 2006). This study used a purposive sample of men and women.

In order to be included in the research sample, individuals must meet the following criteria:

(a) Participants must have been in a committed relationship at least one time for at least a two year period (per self-report)- The crux of the study regards experience in a committed relationship; this criterion is present to ensure that participants have the necessary familiarity with the topic as well as subjected experience.

(b) Participants must be age 19 and older- The rationale for age criterion is to ensure that participants are of the legally recognized age of adulthood.

(c) Participants must be able to read English and answer questions independently

Respondents who are not willing to participate in the study or who do not meet the criteria will be excluded from the study.

### **Sample Size**

The research questions required regression analysis to explore potential predictors (archetypes identification, meaning in life responses, and demographics) of relationship fidelity.

According to Field (2005), there are various rules for determining sample size for regression.

One of the most common rules is there should be 10-15 cases for each predictor model. Based on this rule, to obtain statistical significance the sample size for this study with nine predictors could

be among 90-135 subjects. Field (2005) also discussed rules for calculating the minimum acceptable sample size for a regression model overall test. The minimum sample size is

calculated as  $50+8k$  (k=number of predictors). The second rule is based on an individual predictor test; the minimum sample size is  $104+k$  (k=number of predictors).

The sample size for this study, set at nine predictors, could be 113 or 122. Field (2005) recommended calculating the minimum sample size using both equations and then selecting the largest value, which would be a minimum of 122 subjects. A G-power analysis was also conducted to determine an *a-priori* calculation of sample size. Using input parameters of a two tail test that included a .05 type I error level of significance, a .95 type II error of test power, and a normal distribution, it was determined that based on a critical  $z$  of 1.95, an appropriate sample size for the study is approximately 143 respondents. This study was able to recruit the minimum requirement of 122 participants.

### **Setting**

Natural research settings according to Burns and Grove (2005), are real-life environments that have not undergone any changes for the purpose of study. This study was conducted in a natural setting, as it will be electronically distributed and there was no manipulation of the environment.

### **Human Rights Protection**

To ensure the ethical conduct of the study, approval was sought from the Institutional Review Board at The University of Mississippi. Privacy and confidentiality are based on the right of an individual to determine type of information to share or withhold from others (Burns & Grove, 2001). Removing specific identifiers from all questionnaires protected the privacy, respect, and confidentiality of the subjects. Disclosure forms were attached electronically to the questionnaires at the onset of the study. No consent forms were signed as declination of consent will electronically end the study for the participant and consent will allow participants to proceed to the questionnaires. The data was entered into the Statistical Package for Social Sciences statistical software, version 19, using only numeric identification codes assigned to collected

data. The data entry was performed by the principal investigator. After completion, the principal investigator maintained all completed questionnaires in an electronically secure file located in the home of the principle investigator. In addition to recognizing privacy and confidentiality, the principle investigator acknowledged the right to fair treatment. As such, respondent selection was not be based on racial, social, or cultural biases. In addition, the principle researcher maintained high awareness of any potential harm or discomfort experienced by respondents.

### **Benefits**

The respondents were informed of the impalpable benefits they will receive including making a contribution to the field of social science as well as providing viable data, insight, and a voice for individuals in need of understanding this phenomenon.

### **Sample Recruitment**

An introductory message attached to the link of the study contained information regarding the purpose of the study, criteria for participation, disclosure statements, statements of confidentiality, and contact information for the principle investigator. Any questions or concerns the participants had were to be addressed by the principle investigator. There were no questions or concerns noted during this study.

### **Data Collection Procedure**

Once appropriate consent was obtained from the Institutional Review Board the following questionnaires were electronically administered for the purpose of data collection: questionnaire created by principle investigator to capture demographic variables (age, gender, sexual orientation, race, longest length of time in any given committed relationship, experience cheating or being cheated on in a relationship including type (sexual/emotional), and current

relationship status), Archetype Self-Identification Questionnaire (Faber & Mayer, 2009), and the Meaning in Life Questionnaire (Steger, et al. 2006).

The principle investigator recruited participants via Access Insights Research Center, a research recruitment agency located in Memphis, TN. Founded in 2000, Access Insights specializes in recruiting and hosting a wide range of consumer research initiatives. The agency utilizes state-of-the-art technology via a secure database and does not attach any demographic identifiers to any participants. Further, the agency did not have access to any responses and all submissions were directly routed to Qualtrics, the database the principle investigator utilized to collect and store data. Further Access Insights Research Center ensured confidentiality of participants by sending links to studies randomly and not based on pre-assessment of participants meeting criteria.

## **Instrumentation**

### **Meaning in Life Questionnaire (MLQ)**

The Meaning in Life Questionnaire is a 10-item 7 point Likert scale that measures the presence of life meaning and search for meaning. The scale, recognized as multiculturally sensitive, has been translated into approximately 27 languages and takes about 3-5 minutes to complete. The calculation of presence of meaning and search for meaning is based on an algorithm for adding and subtracting various items on the scale.

Scoring for the instrument is as follows: 1) scores above 24 on presence and above 24 on search indicate that an individual's life has value and meaning, but the individual is still open to exploring deeper life purpose. 2) scores above 24 on presence and below 24 on search indicate that an individual believes his life has value and meaning and the individual is not actively exploring further enlightenment. 3) scores below 24 on presence and above 24 on search

indicates that an individual does not feel that his life has meaning but is actively searching for meaning. 4) scores below 24 on presence and below 24 on search, the individual does not feel that his life has meaning or value and is not actively exploring ways to give his life meaning and value.

The MLQ has been widely researched and cited for its strong reliability and validity. The Presence subscale assesses cognitive appraisals of whether life is meaningful (e.g., “I have a good sense of what makes my life meaningful”). The Search subscale assesses general tendencies to actively seek meaning and purpose in life (e.g., “I am seeking a purpose or mission for my life”). A multitrait-multimethod matrix study provided support for excellent convergent and discriminant validity from life satisfaction, optimism, and self-esteem, and evidence for reliability and stability has been strong (Steger & Kashdan, 2007). Respective alpha coefficients for the presence and search subscales were .82 and .88.

### **Archetype Self Identification Questionnaire**

The Archetype Self Identification Questionnaire (Faber & Mayer, 2009) is a 12-item 5 point likert scale measuring responses to particular archetypes. The items have each been demonstrated to represent one of the 12 archetypes, which tend to gather into four archetypal profiles (Faber & Mayer, 2009). Items are presented in randomized order. The questionnaire can be completed in 5-10 minutes. The questionnaire is considered to be culturally sensitive. There is no information to indicate that the instrument has been translated into other languages. Scores range from 1-5. High scores (4, 5) suggest archetypes that resonate most with respondents where as low scores (1, 2) suggest archetypes that resonate least with respondents. Participants for this study will be scored for resonance with each archetype (high score of 4 or 5 = 1, otherwise = 0).

The Archetype Self Identification Questionnaire (Faber & Mayer, 2009) is a self-reporting instrument that utilizes key terms and descriptions coined by Carl Jung as a means of identification. Thus, group consensus or reliability is superseded by individual experience and relativity. Jung (1968) cautioned that archetypes are innate and rest in the unconscious. As such, the archetype instruments are designed as tools to bring awareness to the unconscious portion of self. Nonetheless, to ensure that interpretation and reliability of the results found in previous applications of the instruments were in accordance with the archetype descriptions offered by Jung, the principle investigator communicated with both authors of the instrument. Each author confirmed the abstract reliability and validity of the instruments noting that it is used to bring awareness of hidden tendencies and therefore cannot be measured as accurate or inaccurate. In addition, each author offered that the descriptions and terminology used in the instruments were taken from actual work and descriptions coined by Carl Jung in his explanation for archetypes. The principle investigator also cross checked the information provided in the instrument (by the authors) with empirical literature to confirm accuracy.

### **Attitudes toward Infidelity Scale**

The Attitudes toward Infidelity scale is a 12-item 7 point Likert scale measuring thoughts and beliefs related to infidelity. The norm group for testing the instrument consisted of college students averaging in age from 18-23 years old. The lowest possible score is 12 and the highest possible score is 84. The lower an individual's total score, the less accepting he or she is of infidelity. The higher the individual's total score, the greater his or her acceptance of infidelity. A score of 48 places an individual at the midpoint between very disapproving of infidelity and very accepting of infidelity (Whatley, 2006).

## Factor Analysis

An exploratory factor analysis was conducted using SPSS version 15. The factor analysis used the maximum likelihood method of extraction and varimax rotation.

### *Factor Analysis Results*

The factor analysis indicated there were 15 factors with an eigenvalue greater than 1.0. After inspection of the scree plot, a single factor solution was deemed appropriate. A 12 item solution consisting of six positively worded and six negatively worded items was chosen to allow greater flexibility in research. The reliability (internal consistency) of the scale was .80.

### *Factor I*

Factor I was named “INFIDELITY” and accounted for 19.24% of the variance. Factor I had a mean value of 27.85 and a standard deviation of 12.02. The coefficient of variation was .43. This value indicated how much variability exists in the scale allowing the discrimination of high and low scoring individuals (Howell, 1992). The higher the value the better the discrimination properties of the measure.

### *Sex Differences*

A one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was conducted to determine whether there were sex differences in attitudes toward infidelity. There was a significant difference,  $F(1, 284) = 33.03, p < .01 (r = .32)$ . In general, male participants reported more positive attitudes toward infidelity ( $M = 31.53, SD = 11.86$ ) than did female participants ( $M = 23.78, SD = 10.86$ ).

### *Race Differences*

A one-way ANOVA was conducted to determine whether there were race differences in attitudes toward infidelity. Due to the distribution of races, a new variable was computed grouping NonWhites together. There was a significant difference,  $F(1, 284) = 20.26, p < .01 (r =$

.26). In general, Non-White participants reported more positive attitudes toward infidelity ( $M = 31.71, SD = 12.32$ ) than did White participants ( $M = 25.36, SD = 11.17$ ).

#### *Age Differences*

A one-way ANOVA was conducted to determine whether there were race differences in attitudes toward infidelity. A median split analysis was used to create younger and older groups. There was a significant difference,  $F(1, 284) = 3.75, p < .05 (r = .26)$ . In general, older participants reported more positive attitudes toward infidelity ( $M = 28.94, SD = 12.43$ ) than did younger participants ( $M = 26.13, SD = 11.18$ ).

#### *School Standing*

A one-way ANOVA was conducted to determine whether there were school standing differences in attitudes toward infidelity. Due to the distribution of participants, freshmen and sophomores were grouped together and juniors and seniors were grouped together. The analysis was not significant,  $F(1, 284) = 1.42, p > .05 (r = .07)$ . In general, freshman and sophomores ( $M = 26.95, SD = 11.36$ ) than did juniors and seniors ( $M = 28.90, SD = 12.67$ ).

#### *Initial Validity Check*

In order to examine the construct validity of the attitudes toward infidelity scale, a point-biserial correlation was calculated between attitude toward infidelity scores and participants' response to the true/false question "I have never been unfaithful to a partner." The analysis was significant,  $r(285) = .25, p < .01$ . The more positive students' attitudes toward infidelity score the more likely they have been unfaithful to one or more partners.

### **Data Analysis**

Each test instrument as well as demographic questionnaire was administered electronically through the Qualtrics Online Survey Software. Responses from each instrument

and questionnaire were entered into the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences, version 19 for data analysis. The following sections will discuss the data analysis procedures.

The distributions of age, length of time in committed relationships, and number of committed relationships were examined using cumulative frequencies. The variables were then recoded based on apparent clumps in the data and the number of individuals at different levels (in order to create categories that relevant to distributions in the sample and large enough for meaningful analysis). For the age variable, recoding was attempted to consider developmental levels (e.g., younger adult in Intimacy stage, older adult in Generativity stage) based on Erickson's (1968) developmental stages.

Percentages were presented for the categorical demographic variables: gender, race, sexual orientation, recoded age, recoded length of time in committed relationships, and recoded number of committed relationships. Frequencies were run to obtain means and standard deviations for continuous-level demographic variables (age, length of time in relationship, number of committed relationships).

Frequencies were run to obtain means and standard deviations for each individual archetype, the MLQ presence dimension, the MLQ search dimension, attitudes towards infidelity, the number of times participant has been cheated upon, and the number of times participant has cheated on a partner.

Possible multicollinearity of the MLQ presence and search dimensions were examined by correlating the variables with each other. If they correlated above .70 or have Cronbach's alpha of .70 or above, they were averaged into one scale. Possible multicollinearity of the archetype dimensions were examined by correlating the variables with each other. If two scales correlated above .70, they were averaged into one scale representing both archetypes. Cronbach's alpha was

be computed for each of the sets of archetypal variables posited as showing core desires/drives: e.g., Orphan, lover, jester archetypes for People/belonging core desire/drive. If alpha was .60 or higher for each set of archetypes, they were averaged into continuous-level variables representing core desires/drives. Otherwise, the archetype variables were recoded as binary variables (see below), summed within each core desire/drive group, and then recoded again (1 = any archetype scores high in the core desire/drive group; 0 = no archetype scores high in the core desire/drive group). Cronbach's alpha was computed for each of the sets of archetypal variables posited as showing developmental stages: e.g., ruler, jester, magician, sage archetypes for maturation archetypes. If alpha was .60 or higher for each set of archetypes, they were averaged into continuous-level variables representing developmental stage. Otherwise, the archetype variables were recoded as binary variables (see below), summed within each developmental group, and then recoded again (1 = any archetype scores high in the developmental group; 0 = no archetype scores high in the developmental group).

For each of the demographic variables listed, distribution of normality was examined using histograms, tests of normality, and identification of outliers. The EXPLORE command in SPSS was used. Based on that analysis, the following section will discuss cut-points to create categorical independent and dependent variables that were to be established.

### **Individual archetypes (independent variables)**

If these variables were normally distributed, they may be used as continuous variables. Otherwise, they were recoded. In cases where there was enough people who answered 4 or 5 on the Likert scale for each archetype variable, then these responses were scored 1, and otherwise scored 0. If the number of people who answered 4 or 5 was low for some variables, then all archetype variables were divided at the median, with responses below the median scored 0 and

responses at or above the median scored 1. It was assumed that people can score high on more than one archetype, so it was not a concern if people had tied scores for archetypes.

**Core desires/drives, Developmental stages (independent variables).** If these variables were to be used as scales (based on information collected regarding Cronbach's alpha) and were normally distributed, they may be used as continuous variables. Otherwise, they would have been used as categorical variables as described above (based on information collected regarding Cronbach's alpha). Due to the inability to obtain enough responses across each of the four categories of core desires, this investigator was unable to calculate this variable.

**MLQ Presence and Search dimensions (independent variables).** It was proposed that if these variables are so highly correlated that they can form one scale, they would be used as one scale. If that scale was normally distributed, it would possibly be used as a continuous variable. If the two scales were not multicollinear (i.e., correlate at or above  $r = .70$ ) but were normally distributed, they may be used as continuous-level variables in the analyses below. Otherwise, each variable would be divided at the median and a new categorical variable will be created (0 = Low search, low meaning, 1 = High search, low meaning; 2 = Low search, high meaning; 3 = High search, high meaning).

**Cheating propensity (dependent variable).** The Attitudes Toward Infidelity scale was recoded 1) very approving, 2) very disapproving, 3) indifferent. The responses were first be recoded according to their Likert-scale values to see whether there are enough people in each category for meaningful analysis. Respondents who on average have Likert-scale scores on all items ranging from 1 to 2.4 (disapprove or very much disapprove of infidelity)—or a sum score of 12-29—were scored as very disapproving of infidelity. Respondents who on average have Likert-scale scores on all items ranging from 5.5 to 7 (approve or very much approve of

infidelity)—or a sum score of 66-84—were scored as very approving of infidelity. The remaining participants were scored as having scores in the indifferent range. If there were not enough people in each category for meaningful analysis, then the Attitudes Toward Infidelity variable was to be divided in thirds (low, medium, high).

**Cheated upon (dependent variable).** The variable Number of times cheated upon was first recoded 1) never cheated upon, 2) cheated upon less than three times, 3) cheated upon three times or more. If there were only small numbers of people in the third category, the variable was recoded based on having been cheated upon two times or more, once, or never.

**Cheating (dependent variable).** The variable Number of times cheated was first recoded 1) never cheated, 2) cheated less than three times, 3) cheated three times or more. If there were only small numbers of people in the third category, the variable was recoded: cheated two times or more, once, or never.

Spearman's two-tailed correlations were run to assess multicollinearity among the recoded variables listed in #8 as well as among the demographic variables. If any variables correlated with each other at or above  $r = .70$ , one of these variables were recoded again to reduce multicollinearity.

Percentages were presented for any recoded categorical variables: that is, archetypes, core desires/drives, MLQ categories, cheating propensity, cheated upon, cheated.

Next, each research question was analyzed using a multinomial logistic regression. Multinomial logistic regression allows each category of an unordered response variable to be compared to a reference category, providing a number of logistic regression models. For example, to model which of three infidelity options (there are three categories in the unordered response variable) is likely to be chosen by a respondent, two logit models were computed. One

model comparing choice ‘A’ with the reference category, choice ‘C’, and one model comparing choice ‘B’ with the reference category, choice ‘C’. The model of choice behavior between three responses was represented using two (i.e.,  $j - 1$ ) logit models. Multinomial logistic regression does not make any assumptions of normality, homogeneity of variance, or linearity for the independent variables. As such, it is preferred to discriminant function analysis when the data does not necessarily satisfy these assumptions (Kelly, Beggs, McNeil, Eichelberger, & Lyon, 1969). Ideally, variables should not be multicollinear so it is possible to assess the role of each in the analysis. Multicollinearity of the variables was addressed above. According to Schwab (2002), multinomial logistic regressions should also have a minimum of 10 cases per independent variable. Based on the power analysis above, the sample size for this study was adequate for these analyses.

The formula for calculation for each question was as follows:

$$\frac{\log \Pr (Y=\text{choice A})}{\log \Pr (Y=\text{choice C})} = \alpha + \beta_1 X_1 + \beta_2 X_2 + \dots + \beta_k X_k$$

$$\frac{\log \Pr (Y=\text{choice B})}{\log \Pr (Y=\text{choice C})} = \alpha + \beta_1 X_1 + \beta_2 X_2 + \dots + \beta_k X_k$$

Regarding question 1:

*Do archetypal tendencies influence attitudes towards infidelity?*

**Dependent variable** (nominal): cheating attitudes, with three possible values:

- 1) very approving (choice A)
- 2) very disapproving (choice B)
- 3) indifferent (choice C)

**Independent variables** (see above): archetypal tendencies

This prediction model would generate the probability of a person falling into the first or second category of cheating attitudes compared to the third category (indifferent) based on values for the other predictors.

Regarding question 2:

*Do archetypal tendencies influence infidelity propensity?*

**Dependent variable** (nominal): tendencies with three possible values:

- 1) cheated three or more times (choice A)
- 2) cheated less than three time (choice B)
- 3) never cheated (choice C)

**Independent variables** (see above): archetypal tendencies

\*\*This prediction model would generate the probability of a person falling into the first or second category of cheating propensity compared to the third category (never cheated) based on values for the other predictors.

Regarding question 3:

*Does meaning in life influence attitudes towards infidelity?*

**Dependent variable** (nominal): cheating attitudes with three possible values:

- 1) very approving (choice A)
- 2) very disapproving (choice B)
- 3) indifferent (choice C)

**Independent variables** (see above): meaning in life score

\*\*This prediction model would generate the probability of a person falling into category the first or second category of cheating propensity compared to the third category (indifferent) based on values for the other predictors

Regarding question 4:

Does meaning in life influence cheating propensity?

**Dependent variable** (nominal): cheating habits with three possible values:

- 1) cheated 3 or more times (choice A)
- 2) cheated less than 3 times (choice B)
- 3) never treated (choice C)

\*\*This prediction model would generate the probability of a person falling into the first or second category of cheating propensity compared to the third category (never cheated) based on values for the other predictors

### **Hypotheses:**

H<sub>1</sub>: People who have low 'presence of meaning' and low 'search for meaning' will have high cheating propensity (more accepting of infidelity) compared to other groups categorized by low or high presence of meaning and search for meaning.

H<sub>2</sub>: People who have low 'presence of meaning' and low 'search for meaning' will have high cheating behavior compared to other groups categorized by low or high presence of meaning and search for meaning.

H<sub>3</sub>: People who have high 'presence of meaning' and either high 'search for meaning' or low 'search for meaning' will demonstrate low cheating victimization compared to other groups categorized by low or high presence of meaning and search for meaning.

1. To test Hypotheses 1-3 in bivariate analyses, multinomial logistic regressions was used to test the bivariate association of each of the three dependent variables with the meaning in life categorical variable. A criterion level of  $p < .05$  will be used to assess significance.
2. The research questions also ask about any significant association of the three dependent variables with any archetypal variables or demographic variables. Bivariate multinomial

3. logistic regressions were also be used to test the bivariate association of each of the three dependent variables with:
  - a) the categorical demographic variables,
  - b) the continuous demographic variables,
  - c) individual archetypes (measured as continuous or categorical variables), and
  - d) core desires/drives (measured as continuous or categorical variables)
  - e) archetypal developmental stages (measured as continuous or categorical variables).
4. Any variables above that are significantly associated with each of the three outcome measures at  $p < .05$  were tested together with the meaning of life variables in multivariate multinomial logistic regression analyses for that measure to address each of the three research questions. Other than the meaning in life variables, only variables that were significant at  $p < .05$  will be retained in the final models. Regression analyses were also conducted with individual archetypes, core desires/drives, and developmental stages entered in separate analyses. The model with the best goodness-of-fit index was the final model.
5. A secondary research question is whether core-desires/drives are related to gender, length of time in committed relationships, or number of committed relationships. Due to low number of responses across categories of core-desire/drives, cross-tabulations with chi-square statistics were not able to be run with core desires/drives as the independent variable and each recoded categorical variables as the dependent variable.

## **Conclusion**

Infidelity has been examined within a variety of viewpoints in literature. Like other widely researched topics, the phenomenon of infidelity leaves many unanswered questions. Due to the importance of the issue in regards to relationships satisfaction and clinical research, increased knowledge about the subject is necessary. Through this study the principle investigator has attempted to answer questions wagered by sociobiologists by exploring the genetics of psychology via archetypal tendencies in relation to fidelity choices.

## CHAPTER 4

### RESULTS

This chapter describes and summarizes the sample and statistical analyses used to evaluate the research questions established in the previous chapters.

#### **Participant Demographics**

The descriptive analyses completed determined the frequency and percentages of responses from participants regarding demographic variables (see Table 1). Respondents to the survey advertisement were 248 adult volunteers. Of these 248 original respondents, 86 (35%) failed to adequately complete the surveys and were removed from the study. Of the remaining 122 participants, over half (68%) were women and less than half (32%) were men. Age data was sorted by groups: 18-29, 30-39, and 40 and older. Regarding age, almost half (48%) of the participants were between the ages of 18 and 29. Participants between the ages of 30 and 39 comprised about 34% of the surveys, and participants aged 40 and over accounted for the remaining 18%.

The racial make-up of the sample was predominantly Caucasian, comprising about two thirds of the total participants. About one third of the participants identified themselves as African American. Other minority populations comprised about one-tenth of the sample ( $n= 2$ ; 1.6%). The majority of respondents denoted “married” as their current relationship status, comprising about two thirds of the total participants. The majority of participants noted heterosexuality as their sexual orientation. Finally, the majority of participants indicated that

based on the given definition of committed relationships, they had participated in at least five or more committed relationships.

Table 2 shows frequencies for archetypes and meaning variables. Percentages of people who strongly identified with the archetypes (i.e., scored 4 or 5 in their self-reports) are shown. About three quarters of participants identified with the caregiver archetype. About half of the participants identified with the sage, everyman, or creator archetype (i.e., scored 4 or 5 in their self-reports). Less than one quarter of the participants identified with the outlaw archetype (i.e., scored this archetype as a 4 or 5 in their self-reports).

Most participants also tended to strongly agree that life is meaningful and are not actively exploring that meaning or seeking additional meaning in their lives. The Life is meaningful variable correlated negatively with Seeking meaning at  $b(n = 122) = -0.38, p < .001$  (people who were more satisfied less likely to seek meaning). Next, the two meaning variables were each divided at the median to create four categories of individuals based on whether they had high or low scores on each variable. The largest groups were those identifying as having high meaning and low seeking (about 32%) and low meaning with high seeking (about 30%). Smaller representations included those of high meaning and high seeking (20%) and low meaning with low seeking (about 17%).

Table 3 also shows the means for reports of attitudes about infidelity and reports of sexually cheating or being cheated on. The mean for attitudes indicated individuals tended to disapprove of infidelity; percentages also indicated that the majority of respondents disapproved of it. The mean for cheating shows people reported cheating on average about one time. Percentages show that the majority of the respondents indicated they never cheated. The mean for items regarding being cheated on indicated people reported being cheated on an average of

one or two times. The percentages indicated that the majority reported they had been cheated on at least once. Due to the relatively small sample size within each category of cheating, each of the dependent variables was recoded into binary variables, with the top two categories being combined.

Next the analyses addressed the research questions. R1 asked: Does archetypal tendency influence infidelity? Table 4 shows results from cross-tabulations with chi-square statistics.

Results indicated that participants who said they identified with caregiver or innocent archetypes were less likely than their counterparts to report cheating. Participants who said they identified with the jester archetype were more likely than their counterparts to report cheating, as well as to report having been cheated on.

R2 asked: Does archetypal tendency influence cheating propensity? Table 4 shows results from cross-tabulations with chi-square statistics. Results indicate that participants who said they identified with the caregiver archetype were more likely to disapprove of infidelity, and thus were less likely to report a propensity toward cheating.

R3 asked: Does meaning in life influence infidelity? Table 4 shows results from cross-tabulations with chi-square statistics. Results indicated that participants in the group reporting low meaning and high seeking are especially likely to report cheating behavior as well as having been cheated on.

R4 asked: Does meaning in life influence infidelity propensity? Table 4 shows results from cross-tabulations with chi-square statistics. Results indicate that participants in both high meaning groups are especially likely to disapprove of infidelity. Essentially, both archetype and meaning variables thus were associated with each of the dependent variables.

Cross tabulations with chi-square statistics were also run between the demographic variables and dependent variables (Table 4). Only one variable, number of times in a committed relationship, was significantly associated with the dependent variables. People in five or more committed relationships were especially likely to cheat and be cheated upon. Cross-tabulations with chi-square statistics also showed that a greater percentage of women (83%) than men (64%) identified as caregivers,  $X^2(1, N = 122) = 5.43, p = .02$ , but demographic variables were not significantly associated with the jester or innocent archetypes or with the meaning pattern variable.

Next, multiple logistic regression analyses were run to determine whether archetype and meaning variables would both be significant when entered together to predict the dependent variables. First, a logistic regression was run predicting attitudes towards infidelity (Table 5). Both variables significantly predicted attitudes toward infidelity,  $X^2(4) = 12.97, p < .001$ , and the model had a strong goodness-of-fit,  $X^2(5) = .50, p = .99$ . The regression analysis was also run again with gender included as an independent variable, but gender was not significant, and the caregiver archetype remained significant.

Identifying with the caregiver archetype was significantly negatively correlated with having positive attitudes toward infidelity. The Low meaning/low seeking group was also especially likely to report positive attitudes about infidelity compared to the high meaning, low seeking group. In essence, both archetype and meaning predicted attitudes towards infidelity.

Next, a logistic regression was run predicting cheating behavior (Table 5), and was significant,  $X^2(7) = 28.71, p < .001$ , with a reasonably good goodness-of-fit,  $X^2(8) = 3.08, p = .93$ . People who identified with caregiver and innocent archetypes were less likely to report cheating behavior, and people who reported five or more committed relationships were more likely to report cheating behavior. The meaning variable was not significant. The regression analysis was also run again with gender included as an independent variable, but gender was not significant, and the caregiver archetype remained significant. A logistic regression was also run predicting having been cheated on but it was not possible to develop a model that had a reliable goodness-of-fit.

## CHAPTER 5

### DISCUSSION

As an aide to the reader, the final chapter of this dissertation provides a brief overview of the study and a summary of the research questions and hypotheses established in the previous chapters.

#### **Summary of the Study**

Although marital relationships can be the source of some of life's most enjoyable experiences, they are also the source of one of life's most painful experiences-infidelity. Estimates suggest that over 25% of married men and 20% of married women engage in extramarital sex over the course of their relationships (Atkins, Baucom, & Jacobson, 2001; Greeley, 1994; Laumann, Gagnon, Michael, & Michaels, 1994; Wideman, 1997). Such infidelities can have serious negative consequences for those involved. Not only may infidelity lead to relationship distress, and thus decreased relationship satisfaction in both partners (Sanchez Sosa, Hernandez Guzman, & Romero, 1997; Spanier & Margolis, 1983), it is also a strong predictor of divorce (Amato & Rogers, 1997; Betzig, 1989).

Further, the victims and perpetrators of infidelity also frequently experience negative intrapersonal outcomes, such as decreased self-esteem (Shackelford, 2001), increased risk of mental health problems (e.g., Allen et al., 2005; Cano & O'Leary, 2000), guilt (Spanier & Margolis, 1983), and depression (Beach, Jouriles, & O'Leary, 1985). Identifying inherited psychological characteristics (such as archetypal tendencies) that may be associated with a risk

of perpetrating infidelity may help to identify and charter interventions to better target and understand such behaviors.

As previously mentioned, Jung (1968) and other theorists (Gray, 1996; Stevens, 1982) proposed that archetypal tendencies are genetically determined. Expounding on the evolutionary theory of human sexual behavior, mating patterns such as promiscuity and fidelity are passed along genetically to ensure species perseverance. Whereas research regarding infidelity in this vein abounds, no studies have examined the convergence of infidelity practices and attitudes with archetypal tendencies. One way to better understand this relationship and the full picture of infidelity and infidel attitudes was through an investigation focusing on infidelity propensities, attitudes toward infidelity, and meaning in life status. Thus, this dissertation sought to achieve an initial understanding of potential relationships between those factors.

### **Review and Discussion of the Main Conclusions of the Study**

Four research questions were formulated to assess the hypotheses of the study and the principle assumption that there is a relationship between archetypal tendencies and infidelity. To aid in answering the four research questions, demographic variables including: gender, ethnicity, age, relationship status, sexual orientation, and number of committed relationships were considered in the findings of the study.

Demographic results indicated the majority of individuals completing the survey were Caucasian females between the ages of 18 and 29. Most reported being married as their current relationship status with heterosexuality as their preferred sexual orientation. In addition, most reported a history of having been in 5 or more committed relationships over time in their adulthood. Whereas this study yielded a healthy pool of respondents in terms of the suggested sample size of 90-135, as recommended by Fields (2005) for 9 predictors, it is important to note

that the responses and findings are based on the demographics of the individuals within this study and consequently may not be generalizable to all populations.

First, the dimensions of archetype identification were determined by calculating the frequency for each individual archetype. Examination of the frequencies of the items in each factor gave an overall view of what archetypal tendencies participants generally identified with the most and least. Approximately 77% of respondents believed that characteristics of the caregiver resonated with them. The caregiver archetype, according to Meehan (2011) has an ultimate goal of taking care of others through love and self-sacrifice. Further, caregivers generally see all the positive aspects of life and human nature. Individuals who identify with the caregiver archetype are often willing to risk their lives to help others and to ensure peace and stability (Meehan, 2011). In addition, recognized weaknesses of the caregiver archetype are that they often rely on guilt, such as “look at all I’ve done for you” to manipulate certain situations or individuals to do things they may not ordinarily do as well as deprive themselves of basic necessities for the sake of stability in their relationships with others (Faber & Mayer, 2009). These results suggest that most individuals migrate towards the described caregiver preferences for life goals and interactions. In terms of relationships and behaviors and or attitudes towards infidelity, research finding indicate highly committed individuals such as those identifying with the caregiver archetype, are more likely to consider the long-term consequences of their actions rather than the potential short-term benefits of the behavior (Drigotas, Safstrom, & Gentilia, 1999). As such, these individuals would be more likely to reframe from a potential infidelity situation by shifting their focus from the immediate benefits to the long-term ramifications (Drigotas, Safstrom, & Gentilia, 1999). Archetypal tendencies of the sage, everyman, and creator were also frequently selected by respondents. In terms of the selection of the sage (also

significant), the results indicated that many individuals within the study tend to view themselves as teachers or those with a responsibility to bring about awareness (Fisher, 2011). In addition, those individuals tend to seek the truth and ponder problems for optimum solutions (Mamchur, 2000). According to Mamchur (2000), sages are unswayed by their emotions as they seek the truth and can be rigid in their thinking and are often slow to react when needed. In addition, these individuals are often unbending in their decisions. In terms of romantic relationships, some studies have found that individuals who trusted their intuition regarding relationship fidelity (or lack of), such as sages, were often perceptive and accurate in their assumptions (Mamchur, 2000). In addition, study results have indicated that individuals who trust their intuition are generally more in tune with and accepting of signs and indications that relationships are healthy or unhealthy (Johnson, 2012). Further, intuitive individuals like sages are often less blindsided by betrayal and are more apt to make permanent decisions regarding the standing of their relationships. As such, findings in this study are congruent with the probability that sages are not likely to engage in extramarital behaviors and are least likely to be victims of infidelity due to their ability to recognize and accept situations as they are. The everyman archetype, as previously described Mamchur (2000), suggests that a large portion of individuals within this study identify with the commonality of life and tend to blend-in democratically amongst people without the need to stand out from the crowd. Descriptions also indicate that these individuals have a tendency to lose themselves in effort to maintain superficial relationships, but are often mistrustful of others based on their past experiences. Research studies have found that individuals who ruminate over past failures, such as those identifying with the everyman, are typically loners and experience extreme bouts of self-pity in terms of relationships and intimacy. Regarding the creator archetypal tendencies, results suggest a large portion of individuals

completing this study desire self-expression and change. By the same token, these individuals may ignore reality and responsibility.

Findings further indicate that individuals with these freelance behaviors tend to keep their eyes open in relationships and often strive for different or better relationship situations (Martin & Dowson, 2009). Of significance, the least identified archetypal tendency was that of the outlaw, accounting for approximately 16% of the responses. Generally, according to Fisher (2011), individuals who identify with the tendencies of the outlaw value freedom to the extent where they feel the need to function outside the realm of legal and social norms. Further, literature also suggests that these individuals are also often consumed with self-importance. In terms of romantic relationships, there have been studies conducted that found that rebellious behaviors (such as those described of the outlaw) thrive best in relationships where there is equality and reciprocity (Mamchur, 2000). In situations where there is a feeling of entrapment or too many rules, these individuals tend to flee or enter into additional relationships in which the desired freedom is offered (Fisher, 2011). Whereas the outlaw archetype is commonly admired and attractive to most individuals in fictional settings (Mamchur, 2000), findings in this study suggests that it is not typically selected as a key personality component.

### **Meaning in Life**

Second, meaning in life was assessed. Meaning in life has been identified as a potential mediator in issues regarding psychological health (Debats, 1996). Examining this component was an important element in this study because Debats (1996) suggests that meaning in life may be an effective conduit through which counselors and clients can discuss relationship matters. The second phase in this assessment was to determine the dominant presence and search dimensions regarding the meaning in life for respondents. Most participants (mean of 5.62)

strongly agreed that life is meaningful, indicating that the majority of respondents believe that their lives have meaning and they are not currently striving to establish or understand the purpose or significance in their lives (Steger, et al., 2006).

The life is meaningful variable correlated negatively with seeking meaning, suggesting that respondents who were more satisfied with their lives were less likely to seek meaning. This is congruent with assumptions of this study that posited that individuals who are more settled and established are less likely to engage in behaviors that serve the purpose of establishing meaning or satisfaction, such as acts of promiscuity or infidelity. When looking at meaning in life across four categories: low meaning/low seeking, low meaning/high seeking, high meaning/low seeking, high meaning/high seeking, the largest identifying groups were individuals having high meaning with low seeking and low meaning with high seeking. These findings also tend to be congruent with the posits of this study that individuals who cheat or do not cheat likely either identify with having relationship satisfaction (high meaning and low seeking) or are in pursuit of other relationships (low meaning high search).

Third, attitudes towards infidelity and reports of being cheated on were assessed. Results suggested that most respondents had disapproving attitudes towards infidelity. Specifically this indicates that these individuals expressed no interest in or liking for going outside of their romantic relationships to pursue separate romantic endeavors (Whatley, 2006). Regarding the population in this study, these findings are congruent with another aspect of the study, personal engagement in infidelity. Results indicated most respondents reported no personal instances of cheating on a partner.

According to Whatley (2006), the more disapproving individuals are towards infidelity, the lower their personal level of engagement in the activity. Further, when individuals are

satisfied with their relationships they express less accepting attitudes towards infidelity because they feel they have more to lose. This is congruent with meaning in life findings previously addressed. Thirdly, most respondents reported having been cheated on at least one or two times over the course of any given relationship. Given the statistically high reports of extramarital relationships found in other studies (Blow & Harnett, 2005; Charny & Parnass, 1995; Clanchy & Trotter, 1999), these findings are congruent with societal norms in which acts of infidelity, in some form, persist.

Research question one asked: Does archetypal tendency influence infidelity? Results indicated that participants who identified with the caregiver or innocent archetypes were less likely to report instances of cheating than others. This is congruent with literature descriptions of the caregiver archetypal tendencies which include having compassion and regard for others and fear of disappointing others (Mamchur, 2000). It is plausible that behaviors such as relationship infidelity would ignite the fear that caregivers frequently try to avoid. These findings are also congruent with the innocent archetypal tendencies which consist of an innate desire to nurture and foster relationships with others and disappointment when those relationships do not flourish (Mamchur, 2000).

Creating a negative rift in a romantic relationship would be less likely for these individuals. Participants who identified with jester archetypal tendencies were more likely to report personal instances of cheating as well as instances of being cheated on than other archetypes. This is congruent with descriptions of the jesters that suggest these individuals are often overly jovial and lack the seriousness required to engage in or sustain long term relationships (Mamchur, 2000). Overall the findings for question one are not surprising and are

relative to this study in that hypotheses regarding particular archetypes migrating towards particular cheating behaviors was supported.

Research question two asked if archetypal tendencies influence cheating propensity. Specifically, the goal of this question was to determine if individuals identifying with a particular archetype were more or less likely to demonstrate a tendency to cheat on a romantic partner. Findings were significant for those who identified with the archetypal tendency of the caregiver. These individuals tended to be more likely to disapprove of infidelity and less likely to confirm a propensity towards cheating. Again, these findings support hypotheses in this study that particular archetypes have a greater or lesser propensity towards cheating. Findings are also congruent with previous descriptions offered regarding caregiver archetypal tendencies. In analyzing the innocent archetypal preference, findings were similar. Individuals who identified with this archetype were less likely to cheat, however the percentage of those reporting having cheated at all was higher than that of those who selected the caregiver archetype. Research suggests that individuals who resonate with the innocent archetype are often in search of unconditional love and acceptance (Mamchur, 2000; Meehan, 2006). However, because their vices often include a tendency to frequently be in pursuit of these ideal relationships as well as to engage in risky and addictive behaviors to have these relationships (Mamchur, 2000; Meehan, 2006), it is conceivable that these characteristics explain the higher percentage of reports of cheating than the caregiver.

Individuals with the jester archetype confirmed a higher percentage overall of non-cheating behaviors. At a glance, these findings are surprising when considering the innate tendencies of the jesters to be non-serious and comedic in their relationships and interpersonal interactions (Meehan, 2006). However, when considering their conventional proclivity to

display cheating and untrusting behaviors (Meehan, 2006), it is plausible that the jesters, true to form, may not have been as truthful or forthcoming in their responses. Also, the jester reports of not being cheated on were not significantly different (50.6% not cheated on; 49.4% cheated on one or more times), suggesting again that those with the jester archetypal tendencies may have more difficulty in truthfully reporting situations or taking incidents (such as being cheated upon) seriously. In conclusion, the overall hypothesis- that the archetypal tendencies influence cheating propensity was supported based on the findings of this study.

Research question three examined if meaning in life influenced infidelity. Findings from this study indicate that individuals who have low meaning and high seeking are more likely to report cheating behavior as well as to report being cheated on. Researchers have found that adults who have low life meaning are typically struggling to find self-worth and purpose and consequently often engage in nomadic behaviors such as relationship exploration (Debats, 1996; Debats, Van Der Lubbe, Wezeman, 1993). In terms of this study, this provides support for the hypothesis that these individuals will more often be involved in multiple romantic relationships at one time and as their attention is dispersed due to personal exploration of self, they are also more likely to be cheated on. By incorporating meaning in life as a variable, this study confirms what previous research has found in terms of life satisfaction. That is, individuals who report greater meaning in their lives also report greater well-being holistically in other aspects of their lives including relationship satisfaction, mental health, and emotional stability, and are less likely to engage in behaviors (such as infidelity) that threaten to interrupt those aspects (Debats, 1990; Debats, 1996; Debats, Van Der Lubbe, Wezeman, 1993). Research question four asked if meaning in life influenced infidelity propensity. Findings from this study suggest that respondents indicating a higher meaning in life were more likely to disapprove of infidelity.

Again, this is congruent with the hypothesis that individuals who experience limited or low satisfaction with various aspects of their lives are more likely to engage in behaviors and endeavors that help them to further explore life and gain an understanding of who they are (Yul, Park, Uhlemann, & Patsult, 2000). Essentially, both the archetype and meaning in life variables were associated with each of the dependent variables examined. This suggests that overall, the hypotheses of this study were founded.

### **Limitations and Directions for Future Research**

The results of this dissertation provide additional information in the course of research on infidelity. By expanding beyond traditional studies that tend to focus on aspects of relationship satisfaction, levels of forgiveness, and gender differences (Dowd, 2012) this study was able to gain insight into how innate archetypal tendencies interface with relationship fidelity and general life meaning. In addition, this study is the first to ever converge the theories of evolutionary aspects of human sexuality with Jungian philosophies of inherent personality development. Whereas these contributions are noteworthy and significant, the research study did face several limitations.

First, the topic of this dissertation has fundamental constraints. Despite general interests in secrecy and information seeking, infidelity is frequently stigmatized in society. A great deal of studies on this topic have been met with instances of respondents who, despite the assurance of confidentiality, did not want to share, admit to, or reflect on their experiences (Fincham, 2006; Gordon, Baucom, Snyder, 2005). As a result, many participants often minimize experiences and or downplay feelings or attitudes associated with the topic.

Second, aspects of this dissertation relied on self-reports. While useful in examining the experiences of an individual, these reports are naturally limited by experiential bias and memory

accuracy. Therefore, the data are subjective interpretations, largely from past events, and should be interpreted as such.

Third, there is a scarcity of empirical research in the area of archetypes, particularly in regards to the counseling profession and interpersonal relationships. Whereas this dissertation serves as an attempt to bridge the gap, the lack of available data limited the scope of the analysis and proved to be an obstacle in terms of identifying trends and meaningful relationships for additional findings in the data.

Fourth, citing prior research studies helps lay a foundation for understanding and advancing research problems being investigated. In the case of this study, there is no prior information on the topic and consequently the principle investigator was charged with developing an entirely new research typology. This limitation speaks to the need for ongoing research in the area of innate drives and human relationships.

Despite efforts to recruit from a broad population using an online confidential survey format, the sample was limited in demographic diversity. The homogenous characteristics of the sample in this study may have caused responses to be over or underestimated in comparison to the general population.

## **Implications**

As identified by Whisman, Dixon, and Johnson (1997), therapists view relational infidelity as one of the most destructive and complicated issues to treat. The results of this study have implications for understanding how genetically predetermined copulation tendencies can be evaluated to assess attitudes and propensity towards relationship infidelity.

The correlation between archetypal tendencies and infidelity variables provide evidence for how some individuals may be predisposed to cheating behaviors. Further, the predictive

ability of archetype resonance and cheating behaviors supports the advantage of using therapeutic assessments of archetypes in sessions. These assessments can be used to address and help describe relationship unfaithfulness. Incorporating these assessments would help to validate experiences and behaviors as well as normalize drives and tendencies that may otherwise be feared as being abnormal. As a result, therapists can aid couples in comprehending the genetic behaviors and attitudes they display regarding relationship fidelity. This open communication can improve couples' understanding of cheating or non-cheating inclinations and begin to effectively communicate and address relationship needs and desires. Further, exploring these inclinations will help to reveal the role of each individual in relationship infidelity, resulting in an enhanced opportunity to produce change.

Although this dissertation was able to make initial strides towards conceptualizing infidelity within a larger system, this area of research still needs to pursue multiple voices and experiences in order to gain a true understanding. Unlike previous research concerning infidelity, the current study positions infidelity as a behavior that has inherent influences. This research provides the beginnings of an evolutionary model for extradyadic involvement. Future support for this research would be to also look at how archetypal preferences influence other relational aspects of human interaction. By enacting new aspects of inherited choices and behaviors, researchers would further the understanding of issues such as relationship infidelity and attitudes towards such behaviors. Specifically, by investigating the manner in which archetypal tendencies interplay in relationships, both perpetrators and victims would be provided with insight into how these norms promote or discourage infidelity. As such, this will allow them to work through these challenges in therapy.

## **Conclusion**

Infidelity or a violation of a contract regarding romantic relationship exclusivity is a relatively pervasive phenomenon in both dating and married relationships. For many couples, acts of infidelity spawn secrecy, deception, and withdrawal that subject them to life challenging issues ranging from personal insecurity and depression to relationship dissolution. This dissertation theorized acts and attitudes regarding infidelity as inherited manifestations. As such, this study was able to make initial strides towards conceptualizing infidelity within a larger system relying on genetic foundations to help explain and understand cheating attitudes and behaviors. Whereas this study does not propose an excuse for cheating behaviors, it is idealized that these findings will aid clinicians in helping couples find meaning and identification within the context of their infidelity issues, and consequently begin to work through those issues with an awareness of their inherent tendencies and likelihoods.

## LIST OF REFERENCES

## REFERENCES

- Adams, G.R., & Marshall, S.K. (1996). A developmental social psychology of identity: Understanding the person-in-context. *Journal of Adolescence, 19*, 429-442.
- Allen. E.S. (2005). The multidimensional and developmental nature of infidelity: Practical applications. *Journal of Clinical Psychology, 11*, 1371-1382.
- Allen, E., & Rhoades, G. (2008). Not all affairs are created equal: Emotional involvement with an extradyadic partner. *Journal of Sex & Marital Therapy, 34(1)*, 51-65.
- 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.
- Amato, P. R., & Rogers, S. J. (1997). A longitudinal study of marital problems and subsequent divorce. *Journal of Marriage & the Family, 59*, 612-624.
- American College Health Association. (2010). American college health association- national college assessment 2010 NYU Data. Hanover, MD: Author.
- Amos, W., & Acevedo-Whitehouse, K. (2009). A new test for genotype-fitness associations reveals a single microsatellite allele that strongly predicts the nature of tuberculosis infections in wild boar. *Molecular Ecology Resources, 9*, 110-111.
- Andersson, M. (1994). *Sexual Selection*. Princeton: University Press.
- Andrade, M.C.B., & Kasumovic, M.M. (2005). Terminal investment strategies and male mate choice: extreme tests of Bateman. *Integrated Biology, 45*, 838-847.
- Argyle, K., & Shields, R. (1996). *Cultures of internet: Virtual spaces, real histories, living bodies*. London: Sage.
- Astin, A.W. (1997). *What matters in college? Four critical years revisited*. San Francisco: Jossey-Boss.
- Atkins, D.C., Yi, J., Baucom, D.H., & Christensen, A. (2005). Infidelity in couples seeking

- marital therapy. *Journal of Family Psychology*, *19*, 470-473.
- Atkins, D.C., Jacobson, N.S., & Baucom, D.H. (2001). Understanding infidelity: correlates in a national random sample. *Journal of Family Psychology*, *15*, 735-749.
- Baecker, D.L. (2007). Surviving rescue: A feminist reading of scott o'dells island of the blue dolphins. *Children's Literature in Education*, *38*, 195-206.
- Balthazar, P. (2007). The mother-child relationship as an archetype for the relationship between the virgin mary and humanity in the gospels and the book of revelation. *Pastoral Psychology*, *55*, 537-542.
- Barkow, J., Cosmides, L., & Tooby, J. (1992). *The adapted mind: Evolutionary psychology and the generation of culture*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Bartholomew K. H. (1991). Attachment styles among young adults: A test of a four-category model. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *61*, 226-244.
- Batto, I. (2010). Sanziana-a midsummer's symbol in literature. *Scientific Journal of Humanistic Studies*, *2*(2), 26-33.
- Baucom, D.H., Gordon, K.C., Snyder, D.K., Atkins, S., & Christensen, A. (2006). Treating affair couples: Clinical considerations and initial findings. *Journal of Cognitive Psychology*, *20*, 375-292.
- Beatriz, K. (2007). *Infidelity and feminism*. Westport, CT: British Library Publications.
- Beebe, J. (1997). Attitudes toward the unconscious. *Journal of Analytical Psychology*, *42*, 3-30.
- Betzig, L. (1989). Causes of conjugal dissolution: A cross-cultural study. *Current Anthropology*, *30*(5), 654-676.
- Bhogle, S., & Prakash, I.J. (1993). Indicators of subjective well-being in a non-clinical adult sample. *Psychological Studies*, *38*, 135-141.
- Bjorklund, D.F., & Kipp, K. (1996). Parental investment theory and gender differences in the

- evolution of inhibition mechanisms. *Psychological Bulletin*, 120, 163-188.
- Bloom, S.L. (2010). Bridging the black hole of trauma: The evolutionary significance of the arts. *Psychotherapy Politics International*, 8(3), 198-212.
- Blow, A.J., & Hartnett, K. (2005). Infidelity in committed relationships II: A substantive review. *Journal of Marital and Family Therapy*, 31, 217-233.
- Bonduriansky, R., & Chenoweth, S.F. (2009). Intralocus sexual conflict. *Trends in Ecology and Evolution*, 24(5), 280-288.
- Brainerd, C.J. (1996). Piaget: A centennial celebration. *Psychological Science*, 7(4), 191-194.
- Brand, R.J., Markey, C.M., Mills, A., & Hodges, S.D. (2007). Sex differences in self-reported infidelity and its correlates. *Sex Roles*, 57, 101-109.
- Brink-Roby, A. (2009). Natural representation: Diagram and text in Darwin's on the origin of species. *Victorian Studies*, 51, 247-273.
- Burke, K. (1966). *Language as symbolic action*. Berkley: University of California Press.
- Buss, D.M. (1998). Sexual strategies theory: Historical origins and current status. *The Journal of Sex Research*, 35(1), 19-31.
- Buss, D.M., Larsen, R.R., Westen, D., and Semmelroth, J. (1992). Sex differences in jealousy: Evolution, physiology, and psychology. *Psychological Science*, 3, 251-255.
- Buss, D.M., & Schmitt, D.P. (1993). Sexual strategies theory: An evolutionary perspective on human mating. *Psychological Review*, 100, 204-232.
- Campbell, J. (1949). *The hero with a thousand faces*. New York: MJF Books.
- Campbell, J. (1988). *The power of myth*. New York: Doubleday.
- Campbell, J. (2001). *Thou art that: Transforming religious metaphor*. Sake Satar, Japan: Asian Journals Press.

- Campbell, N., & Reece, J. (2011). *Campbell Biology (Sixth edition)*. California: Benjamin Cummings Publications.
- Carpenter, C.J. (2012). Men and women are more similar than different. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, *36*(1), 25-37.
- Caporael, L.R., & Brewer, M.B. Hierarchical evolutionary theory: There is an alternative, and it's not creationism. *Psychological Inquiry*, *6*, 31-80.
- Cashdan, E. (1993). Attracting mates: Effects of paternal investment on mate attraction strategies. *Ethology and Sociobiology*, *14*, 1-23.
- Charny, I.W., & Parnass, S. (1995). The impact of extramarital relationships on the continuation of marriages. *Journal of Sex and Marital Therapy*, *21*, 1-15.
- Cherkas, L.F., Oelsner, E.C., Mak, Y.T., Valdes, A., & Spector, T. (2004). Genetic influences on female infidelity and the number of sexual partners in humans: A linkage and association study of the role of the vasopressin receptor gene. *Twin Research*, *7*, 649-658.
- Clanchy, M., & Trotter, C. (1999). Infidelity causes pain and suffering. Sometimes, it becomes a form of emotional violence. *The Age*, *23*, 18-22.
- Collins, P.H. (1999). Reflections of the outsider within. *Journal of Career Development*, *26*, 85-88.
- Cooper, A. Morahan-Martin, J., Mathy, R.M., & Maheu, M. (2002). Toward an increased understanding of user demographics in online sexual activities. *Journal of Sex & Marital Therapy*, *28*, 105-129.
- Cosmides, L., & Tooby, J. (1992). *Cognitive adaptations for social exchange*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Crawford, C., & Krebs, D.L. (1998). *Handbook of evolutionary psychology: Ideas, issues, and*

- applications*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Cox, R.M., & Calsbeek, R. (2009). Sexually antagonistic selection, sexual dimorphism, and the resolution of intralocus sexual conflict. *The American Naturalist*, *173*(2), 230-238.
- Crean, C.S., & Gilburn, A. (1998). Sexual Selection as a side effect of sexual conflict in the seaweed fly. *Animal Behavior*, *56*, 1405-1410.
- Crouch, G. (2013). Homo sapiens on vacation: What can we learn from Darwin? *Journal of Travel Research*, *52*, 575-590.
- Darwin, C. (1871). *The descent of man: And selection in relation to sex*. London: William Clowes and Sons.
- Davis, J.A., & Smith, T.W. (1994). *General social survey*. Newbury, CA: Sage.
- Debats, D.L. (1990). The life regard index: Reliability and validity. *Psychological Reports*, *67*, 27-34.
- Debats, D.L. (1996). Meaning in life: Clinical relevance and predictive power. *British Journal of Psychology*, *35*(4), 503-516.
- Debats, D.L., Van Der Lubbe, P.M., & Wezeman, F.R. (1993). On the psychometric properties of the life regard index (lri): A measure of meaningful life. *Personality and Individual Difference*, *14*, 337-345.
- Dominic, D.P. (2010). *Models of coexistence, conflict, and cooperation*. England: University of Oxford.
- Dowd, M.M. (2012). Comparing equity and self-expansion theory approaches to relational maintenance. *Personal Relationships*, *20*, 38-51.
- Drigotas, S.M., Safstrom, C.A., Gentilia, T. (1999). An investment model prediction of dating

- infidelity. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 77(3), 509-524.
- Dunlap, A. (2012). The seven paradoxes of heroism. *Society for Personality and Social Psychology*, 253, 530-535.
- Edward, D.A. (2010). Adaptations to sexual selection and sexual conflict: Insights from experimental evolution and artificial selection. *Biological Sciences*, 365, 2541-2548.
- Ellengerger, F.H. (1970). *The discovery of the unconscious: The history and evolution of dynamic psychiatry*. New York: Basic Books.
- Epstein, N.B. (2005). Extramarital involvement: A core relationship issue in need of a coherent model, comprehensive research, and empirically based intervention. *Clinical Psychology and Practice*, 12, 139-143.
- Estes, C.P. (1992). *Women who run with the wolves: myths and stories of the wild woman archetype*. New York: Ballantine Books.
- Faber, M.A., & Mayer, J.D. (2009). Resonance to archetypes in media; There's something accounting for taste. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 43, 307-322.
- Fay, N., Garrod, S., & Roberts, L. (2008). The fitness and functionality of culturally evolved communication systems. *Biological Science*, 363, 3553-3561.
- Fay, N., Garrod, S., Roberts, L., & Swoboda, N. (2010). The interactive evolution of human communication systems. *Cognitive Science*, 34, 351-386.
- Fedoraka, K.M., & Mousseau, T.A. (2004). Female mating bias results in conflicting sex-specific offspring fitness. *Nature*, 429, 65-67.
- Feldman, S.S., & Cauffman, E. (1999). Exual betrayal among late adolescents: perspectives of the perpetrator and the aggrieved. *Journal of Youth and Adolescents*, 28, 235-258.
- Fernandez, A.M., Vera-Villarroel, P., Sierra, J.C., & Zubeidat, I. (2007). Distress in response to

- emotional and sexual infidelity: Evidence of evolved gender differences in spanish students. *Journal of Psychology*, 141, 17-24.
- Fincham, F.D. (2006). Relationship dissolution following infidelity: The roles of attributions and forgiveness. *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology*, 25, 508-522.
- Fisher, T. (2011). *The popstars handbook: Your guide on the journey to pop stardom*. Lond: Ashley Lawrence Limited.
- Foerster, K.T., Coulson, B.C., Sheldon, J.M., Pemberton, T.H., Clutton, B., & Kruuk, L.B. (2007). Sexually antagonistic genetic variation for fitness in red deer. *Nature*, 447, 1107-1111.
- Fordham, M. (1982). Jungian Views of the Body-Mind Relationship. *Social Culture*, 4, 166-78.
- Forstmann, V. (2013). *Brands and their companies*. Cologne, Germany: Cologne University Press.
- Frankl, V.E. (1966). Self-transcendence as a human phenomenon. *Journal of Humanistic Psychology*, 6, 97-106.
- Frankl, V.E. (1991). *Man's search for meaning*. New York: Simon and Schuster.
- Freud, S. (2012). Critical introduction to neuropathology. *Psychoanalysis and History*, 14, 151-202.
- Friberg, U., Lew, T.A., Byrne, P.G., Rice, W.R. (2005). Assessing the potential for an ongoing arms race within and between sexes: Selection and heritable variation. *Evolution*, 59, 1540-1551.
- Gangestad, S.W., & Simpson, J.A. (2000). *The evolution of mind: Fundamental questions and controversies*. New York: Guilford Press.
- Garrod, S., Fay, N., Lee, J., Oberlander, J., & Macleod, T. (2007). Foundations of representation:

- Where might graphical symbol systems come from? *Cognitive Science*, 31, 961-987.
- Gay, L., Brown, E., Tregenza, T., Pincheira-Donoso, D., Eady, P.E., Vasudev, R., Hunt, J., & Hosken, D.J. (2011). The genetic architecture of sexual conflict: Male harm and female resistance in *callosobruchus maculatus*. *Journal of Evolutionary Biology*, 24, 449-456.
- Giannini, J.L., & Ross, F. (2009). Compass of the soul: Archetypal guides to a fuller life. *The Society of Analytical Psychology*, 54, 543-544.
- Gilding, M. (2009). Paternity uncertainty and evolutionary psychology: How a seemingly capricious occurrence fails to follow laws of greater generability. *Sociology*, 43, 140-157.
- Glass, S. P., & Wright, T. L. (1985). Sex differences in type of extramarital involvement and marital dissatisfaction. *Sex Roles*, 12, 1101-1120.
- Glass, S.P. (2002). *Not "just friends": Rebuilding your trust and recovering your sanity after infidelity*. New York: Free Press.
- Gordon, K.C., Baucom, D.H., & Snyder, D.K. (2005). Treating couples recovering from infidelity: An integrative approach. *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 61, 1393-1405.
- Gottman, J.M., & Clifford, I. (2002). Marital research in the 20<sup>th</sup> century and a research agenda for the 21<sup>st</sup> century. *Family Process*, 41(2), 159-189.
- Grice, J.W., & Seely, E. (2000). The evolution of sex differences in jealousy: Failure to replicate previous results. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 34, 348-356.
- Griffiths, P.E. (1996). The historical turn in the study of adaptation. *British Journal for the Philosophy of Science*, 47, 511-532.

- Gwynne, D.T., & Lorch, P.D. (2013). Mating failures as a consequence of sexual selection on females. *Entomologia Experimentalis et Applicata*, 146, 3-10.
- Hackathorn, J., & Harvey, R. (2011). Sexual double standards: Bias in perceptions of cyber-infidelity. *Sexuality and Culture*, 15, 100-113.
- Hall, J.H., & Fincham, F.D. (2006). *Relationship dissolution following infidelity*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Hamilton, W.D. (1964). The genetical evolution of social behavior. *Journal of Theoretical Biology*, 7, 1-52.
- Halama, P. (2005). Relationship between meaning in life and the big five personality traits in young adults and elderly. *Studia Psychologica*, 47, 167-178.
- Halama, P. (2007). Meaning in life and hope as predictors of positive mental health: Do they explain residual variance between predicted personality traits? *Studies in Psychology*, 49, 101-204.
- Hamrick, F.A., Evans, N.J., & Smith, J.H. (2002). *Foundations of student affairs practice*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Hansen, G.L. (1987). Extradyadic relations during courtship. *Journal of Sex Research*, 23, 382-391.
- Harris, A. H. S., & Standard, S. (2001). Psychometric properties of the Life Regard Index-Revised: A validation study of a measure of personal meaning. *Psychological Reports*, 89(3), 759-773.
- Henline, B.H., Lamke, L.K., & Howard, M.D. (2007). Exploring perceptions of online infidelity. *Personal Relationships*, 14, 113-128.
- Hertlein, K.M., & Piercy, F.P. (2006). Internet infidelity: A critical review of the literature.

- Family Journal*, 14, 366-371.
- Hillman, J. (1996). *The soul's code: in search of character and calling*. New York: Random House.
- Hoyle, A., & Gilburn, A.S. (2010). Sexually antagonistic co-evolution: A model and an empirical test. *Journal of Evolutionary Biology*, 23, 166-174.
- Hong, C.C. (2006). *The social psychology of culture*. New York: Psychology Press.
- Hunt, H.T. (2012). A collective unconscious reconsidered: Jung's archetypal imagination in the light of contemporary psychology and social science. *Journal of Analytical Psychology*, 57, 76-98.
- Isaac, J.L. (2008). Individuation and the orphan archetype: A phenomenological study. Ann Arbor, MI: ProQuest LLC.
- Janoff-Bulman, R. (1992). *Shattered assumptions: Towards a new psychology of trauma*. New York: Free Press.
- Johnson, S.H. (2012). *Breaking hope*. Houston, TX: Strategic Book Publishing and Rights Company.
- Jones, M.E. (2008). The emotional affair: How to recognize emotional infidelity and what to do about it. *Library Journal*, 133, 88-89.
- Josselson, R. (2000). *Relationship as a path to integrity, wisdom, and meaning*. London: Routledge.
- Jung, C.G. (1968). *The archetypes and the collective unconscious*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Kafeel, B. (2011). Emotional infidelity vs physical infidelity. *Only My Health*, 23, 12-13.
- Kaitala, A., & Mappes, J. (1997). Parental care and reproductive investment in shield bugs.

*Oikos*, 80, 3-7.

Kaplan, L.D. (1994). Woman as caretaker: An archetype that supports patriarchal militarism.

*Hypatia*, 9(2), 123-134.

Kashdan, T.B., & Steger, M.F. Curiosity and pathways to well-being and meaning in life: Traits, states, and everyday behaviors. *Motivation and Emotion*, 31, 159-173.

Kelly, F.J., Begga, D.L., McNeil, K.A., Eichelberger, T., & Lyon, J. *Multiple regression approach*. Southern Illinois University Press: Feffer and Simons, Incorporated.

Kirk-Kuwaye, M., & Nishida, D. (2001). Effect of low and high advisor involvement on the academic performance of probation students. *The NACADA Journal*, 21, 40-45.

Kitzinger, C., & Powell, D. (1995). Engendering infidelity: Essentialist and social constructionist readings of a story completion task. *Feminism and Psychology*, 5, 345-372.

Klug, H., & Bonsall, M.B. (2007). When to care for, abandon, or eat your offspring: The evolution of parental care and filial cannibalism. *American Naturalist*, 170, 886-901.

Koberna, C. (2012). *The evolution of symbols*. Portland, OR: SCAD Press.

Kolbenschlag, M. (1988). *Lost in the land of oz: The search for identity and community in American Life*. New York: Holt, Rinheart, and Winston Publishing.

Krasnow, M. (2001). Response to Sonu Shamdasani. *Journal of Jungian Theory and Practice*, 3, 120-125.

Krause, N. (2005). God-mediated control and psychological well-being in late life. *Research on Aging*, 27, 136-164.

Lancaster, L.T., Hipsley, C.A., Sinervo, B. (2009). Female choice for optimal combinations of multiple male display traits increases offspring survival. *Behavioral Ecology*, 20, 993-999.

- Langer, S. (1942). *Philosophy in a new key: A study in the symbolism of reason, rite, and art*. Boston: New American Library.
- Laughlin, C.D., & Tiberia, V.A (2012). Archetypes: toward a Jungian anthropology of consciousness. *Anthropology of Consciousness*, 23, 127-157.
- Laumann, E.O., Gagnon, J.H., Michael, R.T., & Michaels, S. (1994). The social organization of sexuality sexual practices in the united states. Danvers, MA: Copyright Clearance Center.
- Lee, D., Park, S., Uhlemann, M., & Patsult, P. (2000). What makes you happy? A comparison of self-reported criteria of happiness between two cultures. *Social Indicators Research*, 50(3), 351-362.
- Lessells, C.M. (2005). Why are males bad for females? Models for the evolution of damaging male mating behavior. *American Naturalist*, 165, 46-63.
- Lewandowski, G., & Ackerman, R. (2006). Something's missing: Need fulfillment and self expansion as predictors of susceptibility to infidelity. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 146(4), 389-403.
- Lindeman, M., & Verkasalo, M. (1996). Meaning in life. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 136, 657-658.
- Lloyd, E.A. (1999). Evolutionary psychology: The burdens of proof. *Biology and Philosophy*, 14, 211-233.
- Lounsbury, J.W., Fisher, L.A., Levy, J.J., & Welsh, D.P. An investigation of character strengths in relation to the academic success of college students. *Individual Differences Research*, 7(1), 52-69.
- Lusterman, D.D. (1998). *Infidelity: A survival guide*. Oakland, CA: Harbinger.
- Mackenzie, C.A. (2011). Declining sex ratio in a first nation community. *Environmental Health*

- Perspective*, 113, 1295-1298.
- Maddi, S.R. (1967). The pursuit of consistency and variety. *Cognitive Congruity*, 80, 146-149.
- Maheu, M., & Subotnik, R. (2001). *Infidelity on the internet*. CA: Sourcebook Trade.
- Mäkinen, T., Panova, M., & André, C. (2007). High levels of multiple paternity in littorina saxatilis: hedging the bets?. *Journal of Heredity*, 7, 705-716.
- Mamchur, C. (2000). Heart Beat. *Educational Leadership*, 40, 20-27.
- Marks, M. (2008). Infanticide. *Psychiatry*, 8(1), 10-12.
- Martin, A., Dowson, M. (2009). Interpersonal relationships, motivation, engagement, and achievement: Yields for theory, current issues, and practice. *Review of Educational Research*, 79, 327-365.
- Mascaro, N., & Rosen, D.H. (2005). Existential meaning's role in the enhancement of hope and prevention of depressive symptoms. *Journal of Personality*, 74, 985-1014.
- Mascaro, S. (2007). *Abortion, rape, and suicide: Evolutionary life investigations of ethically contentious behavior*. Monash: Monash University School of Information Technology.
- Meehan, J. (2011). Symbolism and archetypes. *Prez*, 6, 12-21.
- Merchant, J. (2009). A reappraisal of classical archetype theory and its implications for theory and practice. *Journal of Analytical Psychology*, 54, 339-358.
- Michaels, J.W., & Miethe, T.D. (1989). Applying theories of deviance to academic cheating. *Social Science Quarterly*, 70, 870-885.
- Miller-Roach, K.V., & Phipps, R.M. (2013). *College student mental health counseling; A developmental approach*. New York: Springer Publishing Company.
- Mineka, S., Watson, D., & Clark, L.A. (1998). Comorbidity of anxiety and unipolar mood disorders. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 49, 337-412.

- Moore, N. (1983). The archetype of the way: Part 2 the ego-self relationship. *Journal of Analytical Psychology*, 28, 227-256.
- Moore, R. (1991). *King, warrior, magician, lover: Rediscovering the archetypes of the mature masculine*. Chicago, IL: IS Productions.
- Moore, T. (1997). *The re-evaluation of everyday life*. New York: HarperCollins Books.
- Nakadera, Y., & Koene, J.M. (2013). Reproductive strategies in hermaphroditic gastropods: Conceptual and empirical approaches. *Journal of Zoology*, 91, 367-381.
- O'hearn, K., Franconeri, S., Wright, C., Minshew, N., & Luna, B. (2013). The development of individuation in autism. *American Psychological Association*, 39, 494-509.
- O'Leary, K.D. (2005). Commentary on intrapersonal, interpersonal, and contextual factors in extramarital involvement. *Clinical Psychology: Science and Practice*, 12, 131-133.
- Otto, S.P. (2009). The evolutionary enigma of sex. *American Naturalist*, 174(1), 1-14.
- Ouvry, T. (2012). Darkness emerging as light. *Integral Meditation*, 13, 296-297.
- Papadopoulos, R.K. (2011). The umwelt and networks of archetypal images: A Jungian approach to therapeutic encounters in humanitarian contexts. *Psychotherapy and Politics International*, 9, 212-231.
- Park, N., Peterson, C., & Ruch, W. (2009). Orientations to happiness and life satisfaction in twenty-seven nations. *The Journal of Positive Psychology*, 4(4), 273-279.
- Park, N., Peterson, C., & Seligman (2004). Strengths of character and well-being. *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology*. 23(5), 603-619.
- Pascarella, E.T., & Terenzini, P.T. (1991). *How college affects students: Findings and insight from twenty years of research*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Pennisi, E. (2012). Encode project writes eulogy for junk dna. *Science*, 337, 1159-1160.

- Pinker, S. (1994). *The language instinct*. London: Allen Lane.
- Pischedda, A., & Chippindale, A.K. (2006). Intralocus sexual conflict diminishes the benefits of sexual selection. *Plos Biology*, *4*, 356-357.
- Potter, N.P., & Potter, P. (2008). *Trauma, truth, and reconciliation*. Philadelphia, PA: Westminister Press.
- Raffa, J. (1995). *Dream theatres of the soul: Empowering the feminine through Jungian dream work*. Philadelphia, PA: Innisfree Press Incorporated.
- Reker, G.T. (1997). Personal meaning, optimism, and choice: Existential predictors of depression in community and institutional elderly. *The Gerontologist*, *37*, 709-716.
- Reker, G.T. (2000). *Theoretical perspective, dimensions, and measurement of existential meaning*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Reker, G.T., Peacock, E.J., & Wong, P.T. (1987). Meaning and purpose in life and well-being: A life span perspective. *Journal of Gerontology*, *42*, 44-49.
- Roscoe, B., Cavanaugh, L.E., & Kennedy, D.R. (1988). Dating infidelity: Behaviors, reasons and consequences. *Adolescence*, *23*, 35-43.
- Rubin, A.M., & Adams, J.R. (1986). Outcomes of sexually open marriages. *Journal of Sex Research*, *22*, 311-319.
- Ryff, C.D. (1989). Happiness is everything or is it? Explorations on the meaning of psychological well-being. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *57*, 1069-1081.
- Saad, G., & Gill, K. (2000). Applications of evolutionary psychology in marketing. *Psychology and Marketing*, *17(12)*, 1005-1034.
- Sacco, D.F., Young, S.G., Brown, C.M., Bernstein, M.J., and Hugenberg, K. Social exclusion

- and female mating behavior: Rejected women show strategic enhancement of short-term mating interest. *Evolutionary Psychology*, *10*(3), 573-587.
- Samuels, R. (1998). Evolutionary psychology and the massive modularity hypothesis. *British Journal for the Philosophy of Science*, *49*, 342-350.
- Sanders, P., & Skar, P. (2001). Archetypes, complexes, and self-organization. *Journal of Analytical Psychology*, *46*(2), 305-323.
- Sandic, M. (2006). The archetypes echoed in the collective unconscious of the people. *Group Analysis*, *39*, 411-420.
- Sato, A., & Karino, K. (2010). Female control of offspring sex ratios based on male attractiveness in the guppy. *Ethology*, *116*, 524-534.
- Scannel, E.D., Allen, F.C.C., & Burton, J. (2002). Meaning in life and positive and negative well-being. *North American Journal of Psychology*, *4*, 93-112.
- Schellhammer, E. (2012). *Decide*. Marbella University: Pioneering Education.
- Schmitt, D.P. (2004). The big five related to risky sexual behavior across 10 world regions: Differential personality associations of sexual promiscuity and relationship infidelity. (2004). *European Journal of Personality*, *18*, 301-319.
- Schmitt, D.P., & David, F. (2004). *Infidelity: A practitioner's guide to working with couples*. New York: Routledge.
- Schmitt, D.P., Shackelford, T.K., Duntley, J., Tooke, W., & Buss, D.M. (2001). The desire for sexual variety as a key to understanding basic human mating strategies. *Personal Relationships*, *8*, 425-455.
- Segrist, D.J. (2009). What's going on in your professor's head? Demonstrating the id, ego, and superego. *Teaching of Psychology*, *36*, 51-54.

- Shackelford, T.K., Weekes-Shackelford, V.A., LeBlanc, G.J., et. al. (2000). Female coital orgasm and male attractiveness. *Human Nature, 11*, 299-306.
- Shaver, P.R., Belsky, J., & Brennan, K.A. (2000). The adult attachment interview and self-reports of romantic attachment: Associations across domains and methods. *Personal Relationships, 7*, 25-43.
- Skinner, M.G. (1972). On the origin, evolution and phylogeny of giraffes giraffe camelopardalis. *Transactions of the Royal Society of South Africa, 58*, 51-73.
- Sponaugle, G.C. (1989). *Attitudes toward extramarital relations*. Westport, CT: Ablex.
- Sroufe, L.A., & Waters, E. (1977). Attachment as an organizational construct. *Child Development, 48*, 1184-1199.
- Stack, S., & Eshleman, J.R. (1998). Marital status and happiness: A 17-nation study. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 60*(2), 527-536.
- Steger, M.F., Frazier, P., Oishi, S., & Kaler, M. (2006). The meaning in life questionnaire: Assessing the presence of and search for meaning in life. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 53*, 80-93.
- Stevens, R., (1983) *Freud and Psychoanalysis: An Exposition and Appraisal*, Milton Keynes: Open University Press.
- Stewart, A.D., Morrow, E.H., & Rice, W.R. (2005). Assessing putative interlocus sexual conflict in drosophila melanogaster using experimental evolution. *Biological Science, 7*, 2029-2035.
- Stewart, O.C. (1987). Symbols of faith and belief. *Anthropologist, 19*, 21-26.
- Stolorow, R.D., Brandshaft, B., & Atwood, G.E. (1987). *Psychoanalytic treatment: An intersubjective approach*. Hillsdale, NJ: Analytic Press.
- Swami, V. (2011). *Evolutionary psychology: A critical introduction*. United Kingdom: British

- Psychological Society and Blackwell Publishing.
- Sweeney, M. & Horwitz, A. (2001) *Infidelity, Initiation, and the Emotional Climate of Divorce: Are There Implications for Mental Health?. Journal of Health and Social Behavior, 42(3), 125-129.*
- Symons, D. (1979). *The evolution of human sexuality. New York: Oxford University Press.*
- Taylor, S. (2011). Working with the archetypes in tarot: What, how, and why? *Psychodynamic Psychotherapy, 11, 12-22.*
- Thornhill, R., & Gangestad, S.W. (1996). The evolution of human sexuality. *Trends in Ecology and Evolution, 11(2), 98-102.*
- Thornton, A. (1989). The courtship process and adolescent sexuality. *Journal of Family Issues, 11, 239-273.*
- Tiddi, B. (2012). Social relationships between adult females and the alpha male in wild tufted capuchin monkeys. *American Journal of Primatology, 73, 812-820.*
- Tingbergen, N. (1963). On the aims and methods of ethology. *Zeitschrift fur Tierpsychologie, 20, 410-463.*
- Toplin, M.L. (2002). *The new family home.* Oakland, CA: Taunton Press Incorporated.
- Toynbee, A. (1956). The value of c.g. jung's work for historians. *Analytical Psychology, 1(2), 193-194.*
- Trivers, R. (1972). *Parental investment and sexual selection.* Chicago: Aldine.
- Tucker, I. (2012). Deleuze, sense, and life: Marking the parameters of a psychology of individuation. *Theory and Psychology, 22, 771-785.*
- Vangelisti, A.L., & Gerstenberger, M. (2004). *Communication and marital infidelity.* Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

- Veuille, M. (2010). Darwin and sexual selection: One hundred years of misunderstanding. *Comptes Rendus Biologies, 333*, 145-156.
- Vogler, C. (2007). *The writers journey: Mystic structure for writers*. New York: Michael Wiese Productions.
- Waisburg, J.L., & Porter, J.E. (1994). Purpose in life and outcome of treatment for alcohol dependence. *British Journal of Clinical Psychology, 33*, 49-62.
- Wallace, J.A. (2011). Come back to the ranks ag'in, huck honey! *English Studies in Canada, 37*, 17-20.
- Walters, A., & Berger, J. (2013). I love you, and I cheated: Investigating disclosures of infidelity to primary romantic partners. (2013). *Sexuality & Culture, 17*, 20-49.
- Weeks, G.R., Gambescia, N., & Jenkins, R.E. (2003). *Treating infidelity: Therapeutic dilemmas and effective strategies*. New York: W.W. Norton and Company.
- Westendorp, R.G., Van Dunne, F.M., Helmerhorst, F.M., & Huizinga, T.W. (2001). Optimizing human fertility and survival. *Nature Medicine, 7*, 873-874.
- Whatley, M. (2006). *Attitudes toward infidelity scale*. Department of Psychology, Valdosta State University, Valdosta, Georgia.
- Whisman, M.A., Dixon, A.E., & Johnson, B. (1997). Therapists' perspectives of couple problems and treatment issues in couple therapy. *Journal of Family Psychology, 11*, 361-366.
- White, L. (1940). *The origin and evolution of multiple sex-chromosome mechanisms*. London: University College Press.
- Whitty, M.T. (2005). The realness of cybercheating: Men's and women's representations of unfaithful internet relationships. *Social Science Computer Review, 23*, 57-67.

- Wiederman, M. W. (1997). The truth must be in here somewhere: Examining the gender discrepancy in self-reported lifetime number of sex partners. *Journal of Sex Research, 34*, 375-387.
- Wiederman, M.W., & Hurd, C. (1999). Extradyadic involvement during dating. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 16*, 265-274.
- Williams, Mary (1963). The indivisibility of the personal and collective unconscious. *Journal of Analytical Psychology, 8*, 45-51.
- Wong, P.T.P. (1998). *Spirituality, meaning, and successful aging*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Yalom, I. (1980). *Existential psychotherapy*. New York: Basic Books.
- Yul, D.L., Park, S.H., Uhlemann, M.R., & Patsult, P. (2000). What makes you happy? A comparison of self-reported criteria of happiness between two cultures. *Social Indicators Research, 50*, 351-362.
- Zimmer, H. (1946). *Myths and symbols in Indian art and civilization*. New York: Princeton University Press.
- Zoja, L. (2010). Carl gustav jung as a historical-cultural phenomenon. *Journal of Jungian Studies, 2*(2), 141-150.

## LIST OF APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

TABLE 1

Table 1

*Frequencies for Demographic Characteristics*

	<i>N</i>	%
<b>Gender</b>		
Female	83	68.0
Male	39	32.0
<b>Ethnicity</b>		
White	85	69.7
Black	35	28.7
Hispanic	1	0.8
Asian	1	0.8
<b>Age (recoded)</b>		
18-29	59	48.4
30-39	41	33.6
40 and up	22	18.0
<b>Relationship status</b>		
Married	85	69.7
Cohabiting/Partnership	11	9.0
Divorced	11	9.0
Separated	4	3.3
Single	11	9.0
<b>Sexual orientation</b>		
Heterosexual	118	96.7
Bisexual	1	0.8
Gay	1	0.8
Transgender	1	0.8
<b>Number of committed relationships</b>		
0	1	0.8
1	17	13.9
2	21	17.2
3	24	19.7
4	12	9.8
5 or more	47	38.5

APPENDIX B

TABLE 2

Table 2

*Frequencies for Archetypes and Meaning Variables*

	Total ( $N = 122$ )			
	$N$	%	$M$	$SD$
Archetypes	<u>Rated 4 or 5</u>			
Caregiver	94	77.0	4.09	1.16
Sage	69	56.6	3.35	1.35
Everyman	64	52.5	3.34	1.23
Creator	61	50.0	3.11	1.37
Lover	57	46.7	3.23	1.35
Jester	51	41.8	2.84	1.43
Explorer	45	36.9	2.81	1.31
Magician	44	36.1	2.79	1.40
Ruler	44	36.1	2.79	1.46
Innocent	42	34.4	2.68	1.39
Hero	40	32.8	2.73	1.39
Outlaw	20	16.4	1.87	1.31
Life is meaningful			5.62	1.15
Seeking meaning			4.23	1.65
Meaning groups (variables above divided at the median)				
Low meaning, Low seeking	21	17.2		
Low meaning, High seeking	37	30.3		
High meaning, Low seeking	40	32.8		
High meaning, High seeking	24	19.7		

*Note:* Archetypes coded: 1 = not at all like me, 5 = very much like me

Seeking meaning ( $\alpha = .88$ ) coded 1 = absolutely untrue, 7 = absolutely true

Life is meaningful ( $\alpha = .88$ ) coded 1 = absolutely untrue, 7 = absolutely true

APPENDIX C

TABLE 3

Table 3

*Frequencies for Infidelity Attitudes and Behavior Variables*

	Total ( $N = 122$ )			
	$N$	%	$M$	$SD$
Accept infidelity			2.15	0.93
Disapprove of infidelity (1-2.42)	85	69.7		
Neutral about infidelity (2.5-3.49)	20	16.4		
Accept infidelity (3.5-6)	17	13.9		
Most number of times cheated on a partner sexually			1.43	1.89
0 times	63	51.6		
1 or 2 times	28	23.0		
3 or more times	31	25.4		
Most number of times cheated on by a partner sexually			1.64	1.75
0 times	43	35.2		
1 or 2 times	47	38.5		
3 or more times	32	26.2		

*Note:* Infidelity attitudes ( $\alpha = .81$ ) coded: 1 = strongly agree, 7= strongly disagree

APPENDIX D

TABLE 4

Table 4

*Infidelity Attitudes and Cheating Variables, by Meaning Groups and Archetype Groups*

	<i>n</i> (%)	<i>n</i> (%)	<i>n</i> (%)	<i>n</i> (%)	$\chi^2$
	<u>Archetype (4 or 5)</u>				
	No	Yes			
<i>Caregiver archetype</i>					
Cheating behavior					5.53*
Didn't cheat	9 (32.1%)	54 (57.4%)			
Cheated 1+ times	19 (67.9%)	40 (42.6%)			
Infidelity attitudes					6.66**
Disapprove	14 (50.0%)	71 (75.5%)			
Neutral/approve	14 (50.0%)	23 (24.5%)			
<i>Innocent archetype</i>					
Cheating behavior					7.77**
Didn't cheat	34 (42.5%)	46 (69.0%)			
Cheated 1+ times	29 (57.5%)	13 (31.0%)			
<i>Jester archetype</i>					
Cheating behavior					3.84*
Didn't cheat	42 (59.2%)	21 (41.2%)			
Cheated 1+ times	29 (40.8%)	30 (58.8%)			
Cheated upon					5.27*
Not cheated on	31 (72.1%)	40 (50.6%)			
Cheated on 1+ times	12 (27.9%)	39 (49.4%)			
	Low meaning, low seeking	Low meaning, high seeking	High meaning, high seeking	High meaning, low seeking	
Cheating behavior					7.76*
Didn't cheat	11 (52.4%)	13 (35.1%)	17 (70.8%)	22 (55.0%)	
Cheated 1+ times	10 (47.6%)	24 (64.9%)	7 (29.2%)	18 (45.0%)	
Cheated upon behavior					8.11*
Not cheated on	10 (47.6%)	10 (27.0%)	13 (54.2%)	10 (25.0%)	
Cheated on 1+ times	11 (52.4%)	27 (73.0%)	11 (45.8%)	30 (75.0%)	
Infidelity attitudes					8.67*
Disapprove	10 (47.6%)	24 (64.9%)	18 (75.0%)	33 (82.5%)	
Neutral/approve	11 (52.4%)	13 (35.1%)	6 (25.0%)	7 (17.5%)	

Note: For analyses for meaning variables,  $df = 3$ , for archetype variables,  $df = 1$ .

\*  $p \leq .05$  \*  $p < .01$

APPENDIX E

TABLE 5

Table 5

*Results From Logistic Regressions Predicting Attitudes Towards Infidelity and Cheating**Behavior*

	<i>B</i>	<i>SE</i>	Wald <i>X</i> <sup>2</sup>	<i>df</i>	<i>p</i>	Exp( <i>B</i> )	95% <i>CI</i> - EXP( <i>B</i> ) Lower bound Upper bound	
<b><i>Predicting Attitudes towards infidelity</i></b>								
Caregiver archetype	-0.98	0.47	4.41	1	0.04	0.38	0.15	0.94
Meaning (High meaning, low seeking as referent)			6.43	3	0.09			
Low meaning, low seeking	1.52	0.62	6.07	1	0.01	4.56	1.36	15.26
Low meaning, high seeking	0.81	0.55	2.15	1	0.14	2.25	0.76	6.63
High meaning, high seeking	0.45	0.64	0.49	1	0.48	1.56	0.45	5.45
Constant	-0.76	0.55	1.89	1	0.17	0.47		
<b><i>Predicting Cheating behavior</i></b>								
Caregiver archetype	-1.18	0.51	5.43	1	0.02	0.31	.11	.83
Innocent archetype	-1.20	0.46	6.89	1	0.01	0.30	.12	.74
Meaning (High meaning, low seeking as referent)								
Low meaning, low seeking	-0.01	0.62	0.00	1	0.99	0.99	.29	3.34
Low meaning, high seeking	0.83	0.52	2.52	1	0.11	2.29	.82	6.36
High meaning, high seeking	-0.29	0.62	0.23	1	0.63	0.75	.23	2.50
Committed relationships (1-2 as referent)			7.86	2	0.02			
Three or four	0.21	0.64	0.10	1	0.75	1.23	.35	4.35
Five or more	1.36	0.66	4.26	1	0.04	3.90	1.07	14.18
Constant	0.42	0.80	0.28	1	0.60	1.53		

*Note:* *N* = 122.

APPENDIX F

INFORMED CONSENT FORM

## **INFORMED CONSENT FORM**

**\*Please Read Carefully\***

**PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR:** Kattrina Miller-Roach

**RESEARCH PURPOSE:** The study is designed to learn more about the influence of a particular population's perceptions and attitudes in a distinct domain. Specifically, the study will provide information regarding innate tendencies and choices that influence attitudes towards infidelity in adults.

**DESCRIPTION OF THE RESEARCH:** If you agree to participate in this study you will be required to complete electronic questionnaires regarding your personal attitudes to various situations, relationship history, and personality. Your participation will take approximately 20-30 minutes.

**POTENTIAL RISKS:** There are no known risks associated with this study. However, the questionnaires ask personal questions about you and your attitudes. As such, you will be able to ask questions about the study to help you understand it better and ensure your comfort. If any psychological events occur, you will be encouraged to make contact with a mental health professional for consultation.

**POTENTIAL BENEFITS:** This study will aid in your understanding of how knowledge is discovered in social science. It will also likely that it will aid in your realization of your own personal feelings and attitudes.

**COSTS/COMPENSATION:** There will be no monetary costs or compensation for participation in this study.

### **Additional Information**

**CONTACT PERSON:** If there are any questions, at any time, about this research, you may contact the principal investigator, Kattrina Miller-Roach, at [kvmille1@go.olemiss.edu](mailto:kvmille1@go.olemiss.edu) or 901-406-8725.

**CONFIDENTIALITY:** Confidentiality of research records will be strictly maintained by secure electronic storage. Identifying information will not be collected or required for completion of this study. The information obtained during this research (research records) will be kept confidential to the extent permitted by law. However, the research records may be reviewed by government agencies (such as the Department of Health and Human Services), the agency sponsoring this research, individuals who are authorized to monitor or audit the research, or the Institutional Review Board (the committee that oversees all research in human subjects at The University of Mississippi), if required by applicable laws or regulations. The data will be stored in a secure location owned by the principal investigator and be maintained for seven (7) years before being erased. The only individuals who will have access to the data will be the principal investigator and the doctoral advisors associated with this study. There is a limit to the confidentiality that can be guaranteed due to the technology itself. Specifically, although the risk is small, no guarantees can be made regarding the interception of data sent via the Internet by any third parties.

**VOLUNTARY PARTICIPATION:** Participation in this study is completely voluntary. You may withdraw from the study at any point during your participation without consequence. By completing the survey you are agreeing to participate in the research.

**CRITERIA FOR PARTICIPATION:** Criteria for participation in this study includes: being age 19 or older, experience in a committed relationship (at any given time) for a period of at least two years, ability to read English and complete questionnaires independently

Yes, I meet the criteria and I agree to participate in this study. Please direct me to the survey.

No, I do not wish to participate in the study at this time.

APPENDIX G

REQUIRED PERMISSION FOR INSTRUMENT USE

Browser address bar: <http://us-mg6.mail.yahoo.com/neo/launch> (1534 unread) - kroach49 - ... x (3) Facebook

File Edit View Favorites Tools Help

Home Mail News Sports Finance Weather Games Groups Answers Screen Flickr More v

YAHOO! MAIL  Search Mail Search Web

INBOX CONTACTS CALENDAR SEARCH: mlq RE: MLQ

Compose Delete Move Spam Actions Save

Inbox (999+) Drafts (47) Sent Spam (147) Trash FOLDERS + Notes Synced Messages MESSENGER Me: Offline Sign in to Messenger to see who's online. APPLICATIONS Photos Attachments Notepad

Hi Katrina, you have permission. Here is the document you requested.

Michael F. Steger, Ph.D.  
 Director of Clinical Training, Counseling Psychology  
 Director, Laboratory for the Study of Meaning and Quality of Life  
 Colorado State University  
[michaelfsteger.com](http://michaelfsteger.com)

Blog: [Meaning and the Mind](#)  
 View my TEDx talk: [What Makes Life Meaningful? \(Preview\)](#)  
 Check out our new Book, [Purpose and Meaning in the Workplace!](#)

---

**From:** Katrina Roach [mailto:kroach49@yahoo.com]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, September 24, 2013 2:55 PM  
**To:** Steger, Michael  
**Subject:** MLQ

Hello Dr. Steger,

My name is Katrina Roach and I am a doctoral candidate at The University of Mississippi. I am interested in determining if archetype identification, meaning in life, and attitudes towards infidelity have any commonalities. With your permission, I would love to use your MLQ instrument. I would also like the brief handout regarding scoring that is mentioned on your page.

Thank you for your consideration.  
 Katrina

APPENDIX H  
MEANING IN LIFE QUESTIONNAIRE

**Meaning in Life Questionnaire**  
(MLQ; Steger et al., 2006a)

Please take a moment to think about what makes your life feel important to you. Please respond to the following statements as truthfully and accurately as you can, and also please remember that these are very subjective questions and that there are no right or wrong answers. Please answer according to the scale below:

<b>Absolutely Untrue</b>	<b>Mostly Untrue</b>	<b>Somewhat Untrue</b>	<b>Can't Say True or False</b>	<b>Somewhat True</b>	<b>Mostly True</b>	<b>Absolutely True</b>
<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>7</b>

- \_\_\_ 1. I understand my life's meaning.
- \_\_\_ 2. I am looking for something that makes my life feel meaningful.
- \_\_\_ 3. I am always looking to find my life's purpose.
- \_\_\_ 4. My life has a clear sense of purpose.
- \_\_\_ 5. I have a good sense of what makes my life meaningful.
- \_\_\_ 6. I have discovered a satisfying life purpose.
- \_\_\_ 7. I am always searching for something that makes my life feel significant.
- \_\_\_ 8. I am seeking a purpose or mission for my life.
- \_\_\_ 9. My life has no clear purpose.
- \_\_\_ 10. I am searching for meaning in my life.

APPENDIX I

REQUIRED PERMISSION FOR INSTRUMENT USE

Browser window showing Yahoo! Mail interface. The address bar displays <http://us-mg6.mail.yahoo.com/neo/launch>. The search bar contains the text "faber". The email header shows "RE: contact info f...". The email body contains the following text:

Hi Katrina,

You're welcome. Here's Mike's web page, with his e-mail:  
<http://woodbury.edu/mcd/majors/psychology/faculty#top>

Best,

Jack

---

**From:** Kattrina Miller [kvmlle1@go.olemiss.edu]  
**Sent:** Thursday, September 12, 2013 3:09 PM  
**To:** Mayer, John  
**Subject:** contact info for Dr. Faber

Hello Dr. Mayer,

Thank you so much for speaking with me today about the archetype assessment. If you would, please provide me with contact information for Dr. Faber.

Take care. Feel better.

Kattrina

APPENDIX J

ARCHETYPE SELF-IDENTIFICATION QUESTIONNAIRE

## Archetype Self-Identification Questionnaire (Faber & Mayer, 2009)

Read each of the descriptions of the following “heroes” or “archetypes” and rate your level of identification with each description on a scale of 1=Not like me at all, to 5=Very much like me.

Not at all like me	Mostly not like me	Neither like me nor dislike me	Somewhat like me	Very much like me
1	2	3	4	5
_____	<b>The Caregiver</b> – Caring, compassionate, protective, devoted, sacrificing, nurturing, and often parental. Usually very benevolent, friendly, helping, and trusting.			
_____	<b>The Creator</b> – Innovative, artistic, and inventive. Often non-social, possibly a dreamer, looking for novelty and beauty and an aesthetic standard. Prefers quality over quantity and highly internally driven.			
_____	<b>Everyman/Everywoman</b> – The “working-class” person; persevering, ordered, wholesome. Usually candid; self-deprecating, possibly cynical, careful, a realistic.			
_____	<b>The Explorer</b> – Independent, free-willed, adventurous; seeking discovery and fulfillment. Often solitary, spirited, an observer of the self and environment; a wanderer and constantly on the move.			
_____	<b>The Hero</b> – Courageous, impetuous; a noble rescuer and crusader. May feel the need to take on difficult tasks to “prove one’s worth,” and may see themselves as a “slayer of dragons” and become an inspiration to others.			
_____	<b>The Innocent</b> – Pure, faithful, somewhat naïve or childlike. Usually humble and tranquil; longs for happiness and simplicity; often traditional and may be seen as “saintly” by others.			
_____	<b>The Jester</b> – Lives for fun and amusement; playful and mischievous. Can be irresponsible or a prankster at times, enjoys good times and diversions.			
_____	<b>The Lover</b> – Intimate, romantic, sensual, and passionate. Desires finding and giving love and pleasure; seductive, delightful, but can be tempestuous and capricious at times.			
_____	<b>The Magician</b> – A visionary or alchemist who seeks to understand how things develop and how things work. A teacher, performer, or scientist; wants to understand natural forces, transformations, and metamorphoses			
_____	<b>The Outlaw</b> – Rebellious, a survivor, possibly a misfit. Can be disruptive, a rule-breaker, wild, destructive; may have experienced struggle or injury in their past.			
_____	<b>The Ruler</b> – Holds a strong sense of power and control; the leader, boss, or judge. May be highly influential, stubborn, dominates others in roles such as administrator, arbiter, or manager.			
_____	<b>The Sage</b> – Values enlightenment, knowledge, truth, understanding; viewed as the expert and the counselor. Possesses wisdom and acumen, and may be a bit pretentious; scholarly, philosophical, intelligent; a mystical and prestigious guide in the world.			

APPENDIX K  
PERMISSION FOR INSTRUMENT USE

Browser tabs: <http://us-mg6.mail.yahoo.com/neo/launch> (1534 unread) - kroach49 - ... (4) Facebook

File Edit View Favorites Tools Help

Home Mail News Sports Finance Weather Games Groups Answers Screen Flickr More

YAHOO! MAIL

attitudes towards infidelity Search Mail Search Web

INBOX CONTACTS CALENDAR SEARCH: attitudes to... RE: MLQ RE: Attitudes toward...

Compose Delete Move Spam Actions

Inbox (999+)  
 Drafts (47)  
 Sent  
 Spam (147)  
 Trash

FOLDERS  
 Notes  
 Synced Messages

MESSANGER  
 Me: Offline  
 Sign in to Messenger to see who's online.

APPLICATIONS  
 Photos  
 Attachments  
 Notepad

Infidelity Scale Writeup.do  
 Save

Hi Katrina.  
 You have permission and I've attached a document for you.  
 Regards,  
 Dr. Whatley

**From:** Katrina Roach [mailto:kroach49@yahoo.com]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, September 24, 2013 3:34 PM  
**To:** Mark A Whatley  
**Subject:** Attitudes towards infidelity scale

Hello Dr. Whatley,

I am a doctoral candidate at The University of Mississippi. I am studying archetypes and infidelity to determine if there is relationship. With your permission, I would love to incorporate your instrument in my study. I would also love to have any information you can offer regarding reliability and validity.

Thanks so much for your consideration.

Katrina Roach

APPENDIX L

ATTITUDES TOWARD INFIDELITY

### Attitudes Toward Infidelity Scale

Infidelity can be defined as a person being unfaithful in a committed monogamous relationship. The purpose of this scale is to gain a better understanding of what people think and feel about issues associated with infidelity. There are no right or wrong answers to any of these statements; we are interested in your honest reactions and opinions. Please read each statement carefully, and respond by using the following scale:

- |           | 1                    | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |                   |
|-----------|----------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|-------------------|
|           | Strongly<br>Disagree |   |   |   |   |   |   | Strongly<br>Agree |
| _____ 1.  |                      |   |   |   |   |   |   |                   |
| _____ 2.  |                      |   |   |   |   |   |   |                   |
| _____ 3.  |                      |   |   |   |   |   |   |                   |
| _____ 4.  |                      |   |   |   |   |   |   |                   |
| _____ 5.  |                      |   |   |   |   |   |   |                   |
| _____ 6.  |                      |   |   |   |   |   |   |                   |
| _____ 7.  |                      |   |   |   |   |   |   |                   |
| _____ 8.  |                      |   |   |   |   |   |   |                   |
| _____ 9.  |                      |   |   |   |   |   |   |                   |
| _____ 10. |                      |   |   |   |   |   |   |                   |
| _____ 11. |                      |   |   |   |   |   |   |                   |
| _____ 12. |                      |   |   |   |   |   |   |                   |

#### **Scoring**

---

Selecting a 1 reflects the least acceptance of infidelity; selecting a 7 reflects the greatest acceptance of infidelity. Before adding the numbers you selected, reverse score items #2, #5, #6, #7, #8, and #12 (i.e., 1 = 7; 2 = 6; 3 = 5; 4 = 4; 5 = 3; 6 = 2; 7 = 1). For example, if you responded to question #2 with a “6,” change this number to a “2.” If you responded to question #12 with a “7,” change this number “1.” After making these changes, add the numbers. The lower your total score (12 is the lowest possible score) the less accepting you are of infidelity; the higher your total score (84 is the highest possible score) the greater your acceptance of infidelity. A score of 48 places you at the midpoint between being very disapproving of infidelity and very accepting of infidelity.

APPENDIX M  
DEMOGRAPHIC QUESTIONNAIRE

## Demographic Questionnaire

1. What is your age?
2. What is your gender?
  - A. Female
  - B. Male
3. How would you classify yourself?
  - A. Arab
  - B. Asian/Pacific Islander
  - C. Black
  - D. Caucasian/White
  - E. Hispanic
  - F. Indigenous or Aboriginal
  - G. Latino
  - H. Multiracial
  - I. Other
4. What is your current relationship status?
  - A. Divorced
  - B. Living with another
  - C. Married
  - D. Separated
  - E. Single
  - F. Widowed
5. What is your sexual orientation?
  - A. Bisexual
  - B. Gay
  - C. Lesbian
  - D. Heterosexual
  - E. Transgender
6. For the purpose of this study a committed relationship is defined as a romantic relationship in which two individuals declare dating and courtship exclusivity to each other. Based on this definition, have you ever been in a committed relationship?
  - A. Yes
  - B. No

7. A committed romantic relationship is one in which you and a partner agree to be exclusive and not interact with anyone else in a romantic nature. It has often been referred to as “going steady”. Based on this definition, approximately how many committed relationships have you been in?
8. Infidelity can be sexual in nature. That is, it consists of voluntary intercourse and other physical sexual behaviors with someone other than your committed partner. Based on this definition:  
In any one relationship, what is the most number of times you have cheated on a partner sexually?  
In any one relationship, what is the most number of times you have been cheated on by a partner sexually?
9. Using the same definition, when you consider all committed relationships in which you have been involved, how many times have you engaged in sexual infidelity? How many times have you been the victim of sexual infidelity?
10. Infidelity can be emotional in nature. That is, it involves spending extra time with a person other than your committed partner (including cyber communication) romantic pleasure without intercourse or physical interaction. It is often called “affairs of the heart”. Based on this definition: in any one relationship, what is the most number of times you have cheated on a partner emotionally?
11. Using the same definition, when you consider all committed relationships in which you have been involved, how many times have you engaged in emotional infidelity?

VITA  
**Katrina Miller-Roach, PhD**

---

**EDUCATION**

- Ph.D. in Counselor Education** **May 2014**  
University of Mississippi  
University, MS CACREP Accredited
- M.Ed. in Community Counseling** **December 2000**  
Delta State University  
Cleveland, MS CACREP Accredited
- B.A. Sociology; Minor in History** **May 1998**  
Mississippi Valley State University  
Itta Bena, MS

**INSTRUCTIONAL EXPERIENCE**

- Instructor**  
**COUN 750 Abnormal Psychology** **Fall 2002**
- Developed and taught course curriculum topics adherent to abnormal psychology. Was responsible for grading, testing, and advising students in the courses as indicated according to university standards.
- Co-instructor of Record**  
**COUN 690 Counseling Skills** **Fall 2012**
- Led discussion and counseling skills training sessions for master's students in counselor education. In charge of assessing and providing feedback on counseling skills videos.
- Co-instructor of Record**  
**COUN 643 Group Counseling Techniques** **Fall 2012**
- Led discussions, groups, and group counseling skills training sessions for master's students in counselor education.

**Co-instructor of Record**

**COUN 690 Counseling Skills**

**Spring 2013**

Led discussion and counseling skills training sessions for master's students in counselor education. In charge of assessing and providing feedback on counseling skills videos.

**Co-instructor of Record**

**COUN 643 Group Counseling Techniques**

**Spring 2013**

Led discussions, groups, and group counseling skills training sessions for master's students in counselor education.

**Co-instructor of Record**

**COUN 601 Human Sexuality and Development**

**Summer 2013**

Led lectures and discussions regarding human sexuality; developed activities and mini workshops to support lessons. Recorded grades and participation.

**Co-instructor of Record**

**COUN 683 Theories of Counseling**

**Spring 2012**

Led lectures, discussions, and activities around counseling theories. Monitored and graded assignments pertaining to the course. Led activities and workshops to support lectures.

**Instructor**

**COUN 750 Abnormal Psychology**

**Spring 2003**

Developed and taught course curriculum topics adherent to abnormal psychology. Was responsible for grading, testing, and advising students in the courses as indicated according to university standards.

**CLINICAL AND SUPERVISION EXPERIENCE**

**Eureka Truevine Family Counseling Center, Memphis, TN**

**Coordinator of Counseling Services**

**September 2012-present**

- Responsible for church and local community counseling services
- Premarital counseling
- Adolescent counseling
- Group counseling
- Mental health referrals

- Coordination of social services such as family life assistance and linkage of municipal resources and services.

**The University of Mississippi, Desoto, MS**

**Director of Counseling Center**

**August 2011-present**

- Supervise and provide educational-track counseling to “at-risk” undergraduate students
- Manage counseling center for Desoto campus
- Grade weekly assignments and submit progress of students via Blackboard Learning System
- Provide personal and group counseling to all university as needed
- Complete projects assigned by the campus dean as needed
- Continuously work on CACREP accreditation assurance process to ensure clinical and school standards are being met by providing written quarterly updates and presentations to faculty and other leadership staff

**The University of Mississippi, Desoto, MS**

**EDHE Supervisor**

**August 2011-August 2013**

- Supervised 20+ Master’s level counselors in training
- Responsible for maintaining accurate supervision files
- Delivering and evaluating counseling skills assessments
- Responsible for tracking progress and grading skills
- Responsible for determining if clinical skills were satisfactory and pass/fail status of students

**The University of Mississippi, Desoto, MS**

**EDHE Facilitator**

**August 2011-present**

- Lead groups of students who were at risk of academic dismissal
- Provide individual counseling sessions
- Maintaining accurate files including tracking students’ progress
- Delivering and evaluating assessments
- Serve as liaison between clients and other departments on campus
- Contributed to enhancing student study and stress management skills

**Omni Visions, Incorporated, Memphis, TN**

**West Tennessee Regional Director**

**February 2008-August 2011**

- Provide oversight of administrative and clinical work
- Coordinate all aspects of service delivery for children placed in the Grand West Tennessee Region
- Supervise clinical team managers and clinical staff
- Provide oversight of adoptions and long-term placement arrangements
- Lead routine management meeting
- Contract negotiation and direct oversight of male residential treatment facility
- Contract negotiations and direct oversight of female residential treatment facility

- Develop operational policies and procedures to ensure compliance with state regulations
- Development, monitoring, and dissemination of regional budget (monthly operational gross of \$350,000+)
- Provide crisis intervention as needed
- Hire and terminate staff as necessary
- Lead team through national accreditation (COA)
- Provide quarterly trainings for staff and foster parents
- Oversee foster parent support groups
- Additional responsibilities as assigned

**Phoenix Homes, Memphis, TN**

**Regional Administrator**

**May 2005-February 2008**

- Supervise team of approximately 10-12 clinical and administrative staff
- Review and approve foster home licensure applications
- Review and offer feedback of treatment plans and case evaluations
- Provide youth and family assessments
- Hire and terminate staff as necessary
- Train and license foster parents as necessary
- Initiate and complete adoptions
- Attend home visits as needed
- Conduct PATH classes as needed
- Attend court hearings as needed
- Supervise sub contracted residential programs
- Worked to meet accreditation standards and acquire accreditation for company

**Youth Villages, Memphis, TN**

**Clinical Supervisor & Training and Recruitment Supervisor**

**February 2001-May 2005**

- Recruit, train, and retain state approved therapeutic foster homes
- Supervise individual and family therapy sessions
- Provide PATH certification for potential families
- Ensure JCAHO and F&A record compliance for clients
- Provide monthly specialized training on topics including behavior management, psychotropic medication awareness, and non-corporal consequencing
- Complete home studies and physical “walk-throughs” of home
- Secure community outreach efforts
- Supervise Master’s level counselors and Bachelor’s level treatment specialists
- Develop, maintain, and approve annual budget
- Facilitate monthly foster parent support groups
- Facilitate weekly discipline specific meetings for staff
- Provide statistical analysis of program and present to board of directors
- Conduct individual and family counseling for children in foster care
- Conduct case management activities and outside referrals
- Complete individualized educational plans for children (IEP’s)

- Served on accreditation review team

**Parkwood Behavioral Hospital, Olive Branch, MS**

**Served as Adolescent Therapist**

**September 2002-August 2006**

- Provide individual, group, and family counseling
- Negotiate insurance contracts and utilization reviews
- Provide case management and follow up recommendations
- Facilitate daily treatment groups
- Complete psychosocial assessments at initial intake

**RESEARCH EXPERIENCE**

- Post residential treatment recidivism and retention study for West Tennessee Foster Care Commission, August 2009
- West Tennessee Asset Mapping Project, January 2011-September 2012 SAMHSA funded study
- Smithville, MS tornado impact research project, (in progress)
- 1<sup>st</sup> Author of book chapter: Degges-White, S., Borzumato-Gainey, C. (2013). *College student mental health counseling: A developmental approach*. New York: Springer Publishing. (Chapter 17, Obsessive Compulsive Disorder and Treatment Strategies for College Students)
- Article in Progress: Archetypes of College Students and Career Decisions (anticipated submission date: June 2014)
- Brown, K., & Roach, K. (2013). Tales of a convalescent visit. *Association for Adult Development and Aging Newsletter*. November, 2013 Fall Edition.
- Brown, K., & Roach, K. (2012). Students' contribution to the association. *Association for Adult Development and Aging Newsletter*. July 2012 Summer Edition.

**PROFESSIONAL AFFILIATIONS**

- Chi Sigma Iota
- Doctoral Student Chair for AADA (appointed August, 2013)
- Foster Care Review Board member (state appointed position)
- Certified in Crisis Intervention and De-escalation techniques
- Trained trainer in Love and Logic (therapeutic intervention specifically developed for parents of unruly children)
- Mississippi Counseling Association
- American Counseling Association
- Memphis Play Therapy Specialists

**PROFESSIONAL PRESENTATIONS**

- Creativity in Counseling, Mississippi Counseling Association Biloxi, MS (Fall 2012)
- A Discussion on Smithville, MS tornado research proposal and IRB setbacks, Mississippi Counseling Association Biloxi, MS (Fall 2012)
- Trauma Informed Care workshop, The University of Mississippi, (Summer 2012)
- Trauma Informed Care clinical presentation, West Tennessee provider conference, Memphis, TN (Summer 2012)
- Supervision in Counseling presentation, Association for Creativity in Counseling conference Memphis, TN (Summer 2012)
- Children’s Studies poster board presentation, SAMHSA Annual Conference, Orlando, FL (Summer 2012)
- Counselor Techniques in Elementary Schools presentation, CREATE conference, Atlanta, GA (Summer 2013)
- Technology in the Classroom presentation, Association for Counselor Education and Supervision conference Denver, CO (Fall 2013)
- Questions in Doctoral Education presentation, Mississippi Counseling Association conference Jackson, MS (Fall 2013)
- Supervision Techniques in Counseling, Mississippi Counseling Association conference Jackson, MS (Fall 2013)
- Creative Techniques in Counseling, Mississippi Counseling Association conference Jackson, MS (Fall 2013)
- Discussion regarding Doctoral Studies, Mississippi Counseling Association conference Jackson, MS (Fall 2013)
- Foster care awareness panel discussion, Memphis Foster Care Association Conference, Memphis, TN (Spring 2012)

## **SERVICE**

### **Committee Membership**

Foster care retention member	2011-2012
Strategic planning and public service grant retention member	2011-2012
Foster care review board member	2008-2010

### **Leadership**

Student chair-Association for Adult Development and Aging (appointed position)	2011-present
Volunteer coordinator for regional VI mental health group	2005-2010

## **AWARDS**

- Fellowship for Doctoral Research (Summer 2013)

- Research presentation scholarship from department dean, school of education, and vice chancellor of student affairs (2013)
- Celebration of Achievement Award from dean of students (2013-2014)
- Doctoral student achievement award (2013-2014)

### **RESEARCH INTERESTS**

- Mental Health Counseling
- Human Growth and Development
- Human Relationships and Interactions
- Child and Family Life
- Marriage and Family
- Human Sexuality
- Play Therapy
- Adolescent and At-Risk Youth (including delinquents)
- Attachment Issues
- Archetypes
- Humanistic Perspectives in Counseling

### **REFERENCES**

References are readily available upon request