



ARAŞTIRMA MAKALESİ

RESEARCH ARTICLE

The Investigation of the Relationship Between Borderline Personality Organization and the Reasons for the Tendency Towards Infidelity

Haydeh FARAJI¹ , Hazal TEZCAN² 

¹Assist. Prof., İstanbul Aydın University, Faculty of Science and Literature, Department of Psychology, İstanbul, Türkiye
²Psychologist, İstanbul, Türkiye

Abstract

Objective: Borderline personality organization is characterized by an individual's chronic sense of emptiness, fear of rejection and abandonment, intense anger, and impulsive behaviors in the face of rejection and abandonment experiences. Individuals with borderline personality traits may encounter various difficulties in romantic relationships, including infidelity. This study aims to determine the relationship between borderline personality organization and the tendency to infidelity.

Method: The research consisted of a total of 400 young adults, 251 (62.0%) of whom were female participants and 154 (38.0%) were male, who volunteered to participate. The Socio-Demographic Information Form, Borderline Personality Questionnaire (BPQ), and Causes of Infidelity Tendency Scale (SCIT) prepared by the researcher were used in the study. The data collected online were coded appropriately and transferred to SPSS 25 program for analysis. Prior to conducting the analysis, the assumption of normal distribution was checked, and it was found that all measurement tools were suitable for normal distribution.

Results: According to the research findings, a positive relationship was found between borderline personality traits and a tendency to infidelity. Subsequently, a regression model was established based on this relationship. According to the result of the regression model, impulsivity, abandonment, and psychosis-like situations were found to be significant predictors for the dependent variable of the tendency to infidelity.

Conclusion: It was observed that the effect of impulsivity, abandonment, and psychosis-like situations as independent variables on infidelity was positive. Impulsivity was found to be the best variable that explained the changes in the tendency to infidelity. These findings indicate that impulsivity is the best variable that explains the changes in the tendency to infidelity.

Keywords: Borderline Personality Traits, Tendency Towards Infidelity, Impulsiveness

Received: 11.04.2023; **Revised:** 24.05.2023; **Accepted:** 01.07.2023; **Publication:** 31.12.2023

Citation: Faraji, H., & Tezcan, H. (2023). The investigation of the relationship between borderline personality organization and the reasons for the tendency towards infidelity. *Current Research and Reviews in Psychology and Psychiatry*, 3(2), 1-14.

Corresponding Author: Haydeh FARAJI, Erenköy Mah. Fahrettin Kerim Gökay Cad. Mormin Apt. No:272 Kadıköy/İstanbul, haydehfarajil@gmail.com



Borderline Kişilik Organizasyonu ile Aldatma Eğilimi Nedenleri Arasındaki İlişkinin İncelenmesi

Öz

Amaç: Borderline kişilik organizasyonu bireyin kronik boşluk duygusu, reddedilme ve terk edilme korkusu, reddedilme ve terk edilme yaşantıları karşısında açığa çıkan yoğun öfke ve dürtüsel davranışları ile belirli bir bozukluktur. Borderline kişilik özelliklerine sahip olan bireyler romantik ilişkilerde çeşitli zorluklarla karşılaşabilmekte olup bunlardan biri aldatma davranışlarıdır. Bu çalışma, borderline kişilik organizasyonu ile aldatma eğilimi sebepleri arasındaki ilişkiyi belirlemeyi amaçlamaktadır.

Yöntem: Araştırma, 251 (%62) kadın katılımcı ve 154 erkek (%38) olmak üzere toplamda 400 genç yetişkinin gönüllü olarak katılımından oluşmaktadır. Çalışmada araştırmacı tarafından hazırlanan Sosyo-Demografik Bilgi Formu, Borderline Kişilik Ölçeği (BKÖ) ve Aldatma Eğilimi Sebepleri Ölçeği (AESÖ) kullanılmıştır. Çevrim içi olarak toplanan veriler SPSS 25 programına uygun şekilde kodlanarak aktarılmıştır. Analizlere başlamadan önce normal dağılım varsayımı kontrol edilmiş ve araştırmaya ilişkin tüm ölçüm araçlarının normal dağılıma uygun olduğu tespit edilmiştir.

Bulgular: Araştırma bulgularına göre, borderline kişilik özellikleri ile aldatma eğilimi arasında pozitif yönde bir ilişki tespit edilmiştir. Sonrasında tespit edilen bu ilişkiyi referans alarak regresyon modeli kurulmuştur. Kurulan regresyon modelinin sonucuna göre, dürtüsellik, terk edilme ve psikoz benzeri durumlar bağımsız değişkenleri aldatma eğilimi bağımlı değişkeni için anlamlı yordayıcı olduğu tespit edilmiştir.

Sonuç: Dürtüsellik, terk edilme ve psikoz benzeri durumlar bağımsız değişkenlerinin aldatma etkisinin pozitif olduğu gözlemlenmiştir. Aldatma eğilimindeki değişimi en iyi açıklayan değişkenin dürtüsellik olduğu saptanmıştır. Bu bulgular ışığında dürtüsellik aldatma eğilimindeki değişimi en iyi açıklayan değişken olduğunu göstermiştir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Borderline Kişilik Özellikleri, Aldatma Eğilimi, Dürtüsellik

Introduction

Borderline personality disorder (BPD) is a mental disorder characterized by instability and variability in cognition that manifests in a person's sense of self, identity, interpersonal relationships, emotions, behavior, and cognitive functions (Faraji, 2021). Borderline personality organization shares common traits with borderline personality disorder, but the level of these traits is lower in borderline personality organization, so people with borderline personality traits experience less functional impairment than those with borderline personality disorder (Rockland, 2016).

Infidelity, including within a romantic relationship, is understood as intimate physical contact with someone outside of the relationship (Skrzek, 2023). Wojciech Wypler (2016) pointed out that infidelity means "a violation of the trust principles that guide the relationship between two people." According to DSM-5, various forms of impulsivity, including

sexual impulsivity, are associated with borderline personality disorder (APA, 2013). Individuals with borderline personality disorder traits have more and shorter romantic relationships and exhibit higher levels of sexual impulsivity (Gómez et al., 2017). Individuals with high borderline personality disorder traits may engage in early sexual experiences, engage in random sexual encounters, engage in casual sexual relationships, have a greater number of different sexual partners, exhibit high-risk sexual behaviors, and engage in same-sex experiences (Sansone & Sansone, 2011). It is believed that these traits of borderline personality disorder may increase the tendency to engage in infidelity.

Borderline personality traits include chronic feelings of emptiness, and it causes a search for somebody to fulfill them and eliminate these feelings (Miller, 2020). Individuals with borderline personality traits make a lot of effort to avoid any actual or imaginary abandonment. They tend to be highly dependent on others.

Since their self-worth is dependent on the presence of others, they struggle to cope with situations such as separation, rejection, and loneliness and often cannot withstand them (Faraji & Tezcan, 2022). By explaining it as an attempt to restore relationship equity Munsch (2015) indicates that, for both men and women, economic dependency is associated with a higher likelihood of engaging in infidelity. Although people with borderline personality traits can be so independent about economic aspects, the study still gives some clues about the association between dependency and infidelity.

Due to problems in their relationships with their primary caregivers, they cannot develop emotion regulation skills and cannot regulate their negative emotions (Kuo et al., 2015). So, they need some romantic partner to make it for them. Individuals who have difficulty regulating their emotions and exhibit borderline traits experience severe problems in interpersonal relationships (Adrian et al., 2011). It may bring anxious thoughts like they are going to lose their relationship and creates some attitudes like taking precautions by stocking up on partners. Individuals with difficulty regulating their emotions resort to various actions to cope with symptoms (Faraji & Tezcan, 2022) and engage in self-sabotaging attitudes and behaviors (Faraji & Güler, 2021). Lack of mentalization makes them use actions instead words to explain themselves and their deep fears, so being angry can quickly turn to actions that cause harm to a relationship (Lo Monte & Englebert, 2022).

Close relationships are an area where individuals with high borderline personality traits often experience the most problems. Borderline personality traits can cause serious problems for the individual and their environment due to difficulties in regulating negative emotions. BPD also involves a heightened vulnerability to maladaptive impulsive behaviors in the context of perceived

rejection/abandonment and interpersonal stressors such as higher risk of sexual impulsivity. Besides, anger may cause infidelities that want to bring equality to relationships. Understanding the process leading to the emergence of the leading problem in close relationships, infidelity, may help prevent and resolve the problems individuals with high borderline personality traits face in close relationships. Therefore, the aim of this study is to explain the above points and examine the relationship between borderline personality traits and infidelity tendency. It is thought that the results of the study can be used in the psychotherapy processes of individuals with borderline personality traits, and in making their close relationships, which are their biggest stress areas, more satisfying and stable.

Method

Participants

The universe of research comprises young adult individuals over the age of 18. A simple random sample was used, consisting of 405 young adults. The survey link was shared through social media platforms and various email groups. Of the participants, 62.0% are women, 38.0% are men. In terms of marital status 10.1% of the participants are married, 89.6% are single, 0.2% are widowed. In terms of educational level, 5.4% of them completed secondary school, 26.9% completed high school, 50.1% completed undergraduate studies, and 17.5% completed graduate studies. Additionally, 27.4% are employed, while 72.6% are not working. In terms of annual income, 16.5% have a low income, 70.1% have a moderate income, and 13.3% have a high income.

Measurement Tools

Socio-Demographic Information Form (SDIF)

Age, gender, relationship status, level of education, and employment position of the

individuals who made up the sample are all included in the form that the researcher has created. Additionally, there are questions about their annual income level.

Borderline Personality Questionnaire (BPQ)

Borderline personality characteristics were developed by Poreh et al. (2006). Borderline personality characteristics of the participants and validation reliability studies were evaluated according to DSM-IV criteria. The scale consists of 80 items, with a separate subscale for each criterion in the DSM-IV. The validity and reliability survey of the scale was applied to a total of 763 university students (Poreh et al., 2006). The Borderline Personality Questionnaire (BPQ) was adapted to Turkish by Ceylan (2017), and it consists of a total of 9 subscales: impulsiveness, indecision in my emotions, abandonment, relationships, self-image, suicide/self-injuring behavior, feelings of emptiness, intense anger, and quasi psychotic states. The Cronbach's alpha coefficient, which measures the internal consistency of the scale, was .95 for the total score, .69 for impulsiveness, .76 for indecision in my mood, .78 for abandonment, .80 for relationships, .79 for self-image, .81 for suicidal self-injury behavior, .77 for a sense of emptiness, .87 for intense anger, and .73 for quasi psychotic states.

Causes of Infidelity Tendency Scale (SCIT)

The Causes of Infidelity Tendency Scale (SCIT) applied to participants consists of 7 subscales. These are reasons that create distance from the partner, problems related to sexuality, reasons that cause stress, different relationships, legitimizing risk, negative attitudes towards the partner, and cultural environmental influence. The Causes of Infidelity Tendency Scale (SCIT) consists of 57 items. Validity and reliability studies were conducted based on data obtained from a total of 938 people, 339 women and 599 men. Scoring is done by adding items for each sub-

scale. The total score is the sum of the subscales. (Er et al., 2020). To measure the reliability of the Causes of Infidelity Tendency Scale (SCIT), the Cronbach Alpha value, which shows internal consistency reliability, should be 0.60 or higher according to the literature (Gürbüz & Şahin, 2016). For this study, the Cronbach Alpha coefficient, which is the internal consistency coefficient, was determined as .98 for the Causes of Infidelity Tendency Scale, .97 for Reasons Creating Distance from the Partner, .93 for Problems Related to Sexuality, .95 for Reasons Causing Stress, .89 for Different Relationships, .90 for Legitimizing Risk, .89 for Negative Attitudes towards the Partner, and .90 for Cultural Environmental Influence.

Procedure

The data were obtained from March to June 2022 by taking the printout of the online survey form and the survey form prepared through the Google Form program. The implementation of the research was approved by the Aydin University Social and Human Sciences Ethics Board (decision no. 2022/08; date: 09.05.2022). Data were collected after receiving illuminated consent from young adults who participated in the study online and face-to-face. The prepared survey consists of three sections. In the first section, questions to determine socio-demographic information are used; in the second section, the Borderline Personality Questionnaire (BPQ); and in the third section, the Causes of Infidelity Tendency Scale (SCIT). Each question is mandatory, so no answer is left blank. Participants have the right to return to and change questions while completing the survey. Since all other questions except age and code questions are multiple-choice, participants were able to select a single option. After completing surveys of 220 young adults, online response acceptance was discontinued. There is no time limit for completing the survey, which took about 10 minutes to complete. By subtracting the three

values, 405 net participants were reached. Participant responses are limited to one response in Google Forms settings.

Data Analysis

The data collected before starting the data analysis were formatted and transferred to the SPSS 25 program. The normal distribution hypothesis was examined with skewness and kurtosis coefficients, and it was observed that the skewness values of the scale items ranged between 0.056 and 1.401, and the kurtosis values ranged between -1.075 and 1.794, since skewness and kurtosis coefficients were within the range of ± 2 , the multivariate normality feature was achieved (Hahs Vaughn and Lomax, 2020). After this evaluation, parametric tests were used to continue the analyses.

Pearson correlation analysis, which is in the parametric test group and tests the relationship between variables, independent group t-test, and ANOVA was used to detect significant differences between groups. Multiple Linear Regression was used for predictive analysis. The value range for the correlation coefficient is defined as weak between 0.000-0.300, moderate between 0.301-0.700, and high between 0.701-1.000. Throughout the study, the reference confidence interval is 95%, and the p-value is 0.05.

Results

As seen in the Table 1 the average score for the Scale of Infidelity Tendency ($\bar{x}=82.43$, $SD=46.47$), the average score for Reasons For Distancing From The Partner ($\bar{x}=24.83$, $SD=14.80$), the average score for Sexual Problems ($\bar{x}=15.52$, $SD=8.88$), the average score for Causes that Create Stress ($\bar{x}=14.40$, $SD=9.30$), the average score for Different Relationships ($\bar{x}=9.51$, $SD=5.65$), the average score for Legitimizing the risk ($\bar{x}=5.74$, $SD=3.92$), the average score for Negative Attitudes towards Partners ($\bar{x}=6.92$, $SD=4.46$), the average score for Cultural Environment ($\bar{x}=5.52$, $SD=3.86$), the average score for

Borderline Personality Questionnaire ($\bar{x}=23.15$, $SD=15.89$), the average score for Impulsiveness ($\bar{x}=2.00$, $SD=1.93$), the average score for Affective Instability ($\bar{x}=3.76$, $SD=2.58$), the average score for Fear of Abandonment ($\bar{x}=2.73$, $SD=2.43$), the average score for Relationships ($\bar{x}=2.92$, $SD=2.48$), the average score for Self-Image ($\bar{x}=1.92$, $SD=2.20$), the average score for Suicidal and Self-Mutilation ($\bar{x}=1.35$, $SD=1.76$), the average score for Feelings of Emptiness ($\bar{x}=3.15$, $SD=2.55$), the average score for Intense Anger ($\bar{x}=3$, $SD=3,20$), The average of Quasi Psychotic States is ($\bar{x}=1.81$ $SS=1.86$).

As Table 2 shows, there is a moderate and positive correlation (PC) ($r=.353$, $p<0.01$) between the Borderline Personality Questionnaire and the Causes of Infidelity Tendency Scale, a moderate and PC ($r=.349$, $p<0.01$) between the Impulsiveness and the Causes of Infidelity Tendency Scale, a low and PC ($r=.290$, $p<0.01$) between the Affective Instability and the Causes of Infidelity Tendency Scale, a moderate and PC ($r=.308$, $p<0.01$) between the Abandonment and the Causes of Infidelity Tendency Scale, a low and PC ($r=.190$, $p<0.01$) between the Relationships and the Causes of Infidelity Tendency Scale, a low and PC ($r=.278$, $p<0.01$) between the Self-Image and the Causes of Infidelity Tendency Scale, a low and PC ($r=.199$, $p<0.01$) between the Suicide and Self-Mutilation and the Causes of Infidelity Tendency Scale, a low and PC ($r=.276$, $p<0.01$) between the Emptiness and the Causes of Infidelity Tendency Scale, a low and PC ($r=.271$, $p<0.01$) between the Intense Anger and the Causes of Infidelity Tendency Scale, and a low and PC ($r=.234$, $p<0.01$) between the Quasi-Psychotic States and the Causes of Infidelity Tendency Scale.

There is a moderate and positive relationship between the variables that form distancing from the partner in the reasons for Borderline Personality Questionnaire ($r=.322$, $p<0.01$), a low and positive relationship between the

Impulsiveness and reasons for distancing from the partner ($r=.295, p<0.01$), a low and positive relationship between the Affective Instability and reasons for distancing from the partner ($r=.268, p<0.01$), a low and positive relationship between Abandonment and reasons for distancing from the partner ($r=.284, p<0.01$), a low and positive relationship between Relationships and reasons for distancing from the partner ($r=.188, p<0.01$), a low and positive relationship between Self-Image and reasons for distancing from the partner ($r=.248, p<0.01$), a low and positive relationship between Suicide and Self-Mutilation and reasons for distancing from the partner ($r=.152, p<0.01$), a low and positive relationship between Emptiness and reasons for distancing from the partner ($r=.263, p<0.01$), a low and positive relationship between Intense Anger and reasons for distancing from the partner ($r=.250, p<0.01$), and a low and positive relationship between Quasi Psychotic States and reasons for distancing from the partner ($r=.230, p<0.01$).

There is a moderate and PC between Borderline Personality Questionnaire and Sexual Problems ($r=.361, p<0.01$) variables, a moderate and PC between Impulsiveness and Sexual Problems ($r=.374, p<0.01$) variables, a low and PC between Affective Instability and Sexual Problems ($r=.297, p<0.01$) variables, a moderate and PC between Abandonment and Sexual Problems ($r=.304, p<0.01$) variables, a low and PC between Relationships and Sexual Problems ($r=.207, p<0.01$) variables, a low and PC between Self-Image and Sexual Problems ($r=.298, p<0.01$) variables, a low and PC between Suicide and Self-Mutilation and Sexual Problems ($r=.237, p<0.01$) variables, a low and PC between Emptiness and Sexual Problems ($r=.269, p<0.01$) variables, a low and PC between Intense Anger and Sexual Problems ($r=.263, p<0.01$) variables, and a moderate and PC between Quasi Psychotic States and Sexual Problems ($r=.213, p<0.01$) variables

There is a moderate and PC between the Borderline Personality Questionnaire and

Causes that Create Stress ($r=.328, p<0.01$), a moderate and PC between Impulsiveness and Causes that Create Stress ($r=.335, p<0.01$), a low and PC between Affective Instability and Causes that Create Stress ($r=.256, p<0.01$), a low and PC between Abandonment and Causes that Create Stress ($r=.294, p<0.01$), a low and PC between Relationships and Causes that Create Stress ($r=.170, p<0.01$), a low and PC between Self-Image and Causes that Create Stress ($r=.275, p<0.01$), a low and PC between Suicide and Self-Mutilation and Causes that Create Stress ($r=.200, p<0.01$), a low and PC between Emptiness and Causes that Create Stress ($r=.263, p<0.01$), a low and PC between Intense Anger and Causes that Create Stress ($r=.247, p<0.01$), and a low and PC between Quasi Psychotic States and Causes that Create Stress ($r=.190, p<0.01$).

There is a moderate and positive relationship between Borderline Personality Questionnaire and Different Relationships ($r=.318, p<0.01$) variables, a moderate and positive relationship between Impulsiveness and Different Relationships ($r=.305, p<0.01$) variables, a low and positive relationship between Affective Instability and Different Relationships ($r=.285, p<0.01$) variables, a low and positive relationship between Abandonment and Different Relationships ($r=.261, p<0.01$) variables, a low and positive relationship between Relationships and Different Relationships ($r=.139, p<0.01$) variables, a low and positive relationship between Self-Image and Different Relationships ($r=.223, p<0.01$) variables, a low and positive relationship between Suicide and Self-Mutilation and Different Relationships ($r=.150, p<0.01$) variables, a low and positive relationship between Emptiness and Different Relationships ($r=.250, p<0.01$) variables, a low and positive relationship between Intense Anger and Different Relationships ($r=.269, p<0.01$) variables, and a low and positive relationship between Quasi Psychotic States and Different Relationships ($r=.265, p<0.01$) variables.

Table 1. Descriptive Values of the Scale of Causes of Infidelity Tendency and Borderline Personality Questionnaire

	n	Min.	Max.	\bar{x}	SD
Causes of Infidelity Tendency Scale	405	0	226	82.43	46.47
Reasons For Distancing from the Partner	405	0	64	24.83	14.80
Sexual Problems	405	0	44	15.52	8.88
Causes that Create Stress	405	0	44	14.40	9.30
Different Relationship	405	0	24	9.51	5.65
Legitimizing the risk	405	0	16	5.74	3.92
Negative Attitudes Towards the Partner	405	0	20	6.92	4.46
Impact of Cultural Environment	405	0	16	5.52	3.86
Borderline Personality Questionnaire	405	2	76	23.15	15.89
Impulsiveness	405	0	9	2.00	1.93
Affective Instability	405	0	10	3.76	2.58
Abandonment	405	0	10	2.73	2.43
Relationships	405	0	8	2.92	2.48
Self-Image	405	0	9	1.92	2.20
Suicide and Self-Mutilation	405	0	7	1.35	1.76
Emptiness	405	0	10	3.15	2.55
Intense Anger	405	0	10	3.52	3.20
Quasi-Psychotic States	405	0	7	1.81	1.86

There is a low level and PC between Borderline Personality Questionnaire and Legitimization of Risk ($r=.266$, $p<0.01$) variables, a low level and PC between Impulsiveness and Legitimization of Risk ($r=.268$, $p<0.01$) variables, a low level and PC between Affective Instability and Legitimization of Risk ($r=.216$, $p<0.01$) variables, a low level and PC between Abandonment and Legitimization of Risk ($r=.249$, $p<0.01$) variables, a low level and PC between Relationships and Legitimization of Risk ($r=.141$, $p<0.01$) variables, a low level and PC between Self-Image and Legitimization of Risk ($r=.192$, $p<0.01$) variables, a low level and PC between Suicide and Self-Mutilation and Legitimization of Risk ($r=.154$, $p<0.01$) variables, a low level and PC between Emptiness and Legitimization of Risk ($r=.193$, $p<0.01$) variables, a low level and PC between Intense Anger and Legitimization of Risk ($r=.207$, $p<0.01$) variables, and a low level and PC between Quasi Psychotic States and Legitimization of Risk ($r=.188$, $p<0.01$) variables.

There is a moderate and PC between Borderline Personality Questionnaire and Negative Attitudes towards Partner ($r=.347$, $p<0.01$), a moderate and PC between Impulsiveness and

Negative Attitudes towards Partner ($r=.327$, $p<0.01$), a low and PC between Affective Instability and Negative Attitudes towards Partner ($r=.267$, $p<0.01$), a low and PC between Abandonment and Negative Attitudes towards Partner ($r=.299$, $p<0.01$), a low and PC between Relationships and Negative Attitudes towards Partner ($r=.198$, $p<0.01$), a low and PC between Self-image and Negative Attitudes towards Partner ($r=.282$, $p<0.01$), a low and PC between Suicide and Self-Mutilation and Negative Attitudes towards Partner ($r=.235$, $p<0.01$), a low and PC between Emptiness and Negative Attitudes towards Partner ($r=.279$, $p<0.01$), a low and PC between Intense Anger and Negative Attitudes towards Partner ($r=.267$, $p<0.01$), and a low and PC between Quasi Psychotic States and Negative Attitudes towards Partner ($r=.204$, $p<0.01$).

There is a low level and positive relationship between Borderline Personality Questionnaire and Impact of Impact of Cultural Environment ($r=.257$, $p<0.01$) variables, a moderate level and positive relationship between Impulsiveness and Impact of Cultural Environment ($r=.306$, $p<0.01$) variables, a low level and positive relationship between Affective Instability and Impact of Cultural

Table 2. Relationship Between the Causes of Infidelity Tendency Scale and Borderline Personality Questionnaire

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18
1. Causes of Infidelity Tendency Scale	-																	
2. Reasons for Distancing from The Partner	.957**	-																
3.Problems Related to Sexuality	.916**	.833**	-															
4.Causes that Create Stress	.934**	.855**	.837**	-														
5.Different Relationship	.851**	.773**	.756**	.728**	-													
6.Legitimizing the Risk	.895**	.839**	.759**	.821**	.778**	-												
7.Negative Attitudes Towards the Partner	.869**	.831**	.798**	.816**	.658**	.697**	-											
8.Impact of Cultural Environment	.854**	.773**	.720**	.786**	.780**	.870**	.648**	-										
9.Borderline Personality Questionnaire	.353**	.322**	.361**	.328**	.318**	.266**	.347**	.257**	-									
10.Impulsiveness	.349**	.295**	.374**	.335**	.305**	.268**	.327**	.306**	.623**	-								
11.Affective Instability	.290**	.268**	.297**	.256**	.285**	.216**	.267**	.224**	.847**	.447**	-							
12.Abandonment	.308**	.284**	.304**	.294**	.261**	.249**	.299**	.231**	.825**	.466**	.639**	-						
13.Relationships	.190**	.188**	.207**	.170**	.139**	.141**	.198**	.104**	.783**	.426**	.631**	.641**	-					
14.Self-Image	.278**	.248**	.298**	.275**	.223**	.192**	.282**	.205**	.783**	.358**	.612**	.657**	.508**	-				
15.Suicide and Self-Mutilation	.199**	.152**	.237**	.200**	.150**	.154**	.235**	.144**	.645**	.423**	.451**	.507**	.397**	.519**	-			
16.Emptiness	.276**	.263**	.269**	.263**	.250**	.193**	.279**	.177**	.851**	.390**	.700**	.731**	.607**	.788**	.519**	-		
17.Intense Anger	.271**	.250**	.263**	.247**	.269**	.207**	.267**	.195**	.788**	.519**	.678**	.522**	.592**	.489**	.420**	.534**	-	
18.Quasi-Psychotic States	.234**	.230**	.213**	.190**	.265**	.188**	.204**	.169**	.546**	.237**	.433**	.361**	.378**	.342**	.267**	.423**	.351**	-

p<0.01, *p<0.05, Name of the applied test: Pearson Correlation Test

Table 3. Findings Regarding the Prediction of Infidelity Tendency by Borderline Personality Traits

Model		R	R ²	R ² (Chanced)	B	SE	β	t	p	Tolerance	VIF
1	Impulsivity	.349	.122	.122	8.40	1.12	0.35	7.47	0.000*	1.00	1.00
2	Impulsivity	.386	.149	.027	6.32	1.25	0.26	5.04	0.000*	0.78	1.28
	Abandonment				3.56	1.00	0.19	3.57	0.000*	0.78	1.28
3	Impulsivity	.402	.161	.013	6.06	1.25	0.25	4.85	0.000*	0.78	1.29
	Abandonment				2.82	1.03	0.15	2.73	0.007*	0.72	1.40
	Quasi- psychotic states				3.02	1.23	0.12	2.46	0.014*	0.86	1.16

Note, CI: Confidence Interval

Environment ($r=.224$, $p<0.01$) variables, a low level and positive relationship between Abandonment and Cultural Environment ($r=.231$, $p<0.01$) variables, a low level and positive relationship between Relationships and Impact of Cultural Environment ($r=.104$, $p<0.05$) variables, a low level and positive relationship between Self-Image and Impact of Cultural Environment ($r=.205$, $p<0.01$) variables, a low level and positive relationship between Suicide and Self-Mutilation and Impact of Cultural Environment ($r=.144$, $p<0.01$) variables, a low level and positive relationship between Emptiness and Impact of Cultural Environment ($r=.177$, $p<0.01$) variables, a low level and positive relationship between Intense Anger and Impact of Cultural Environment ($r=.195$, $p<0.01$) variables, and a low level and positive relationship between Quasi Psychotic States and Impact of Cultural Environment ($r=.169$, $p<0.01$) variables.

When the **Table 3** is analyzed, it is seen that the independent variable of impulsivity ($\beta=.27$, $p<0.01$) predicts the tendency to cheat in the first model ($F_{(1-403)}=55.80$, $p<0.05$). The R² value was .12, indicating that the predictors explained 12.2% of the variance in the outcome variable.

In the second model, when the independent variable of abandonment was included in the regression model, the change in R² value was .027 and increased to .149. Impulsivity ($\beta=.26$,

$p<0.01$) and abandonment ($\beta=.19$, $p<0.01$) independent variables predicted the tendency to cheat ($F_{(2-402)}=35.11$, $p<0.05$).

In the third model, when the independent variable of psychosis-like conditions was included in the regression model, the change in R² value was .013 and increased to .161. Impulsivity ($\beta=.25$, $p<0.01$), abandonment ($\beta=.15$, $p<0.01$) and Quasi-psychotic states ($\beta=.12$, $p<0.05$) independent variables predicted the tendency to cheat ($F_{(3-401)}=25.72$, $p<0.05$).

Discussion

This research was conducted to determine the relationship between borderline personality traits and the tendency to infidelity. According to the research results, impulsivity, fear of abandonment, and psychosis-like symptoms were observed to have a positive relationship with the tendency to infidelity as independent variables. As there were no studies directly examining the relationship between borderline personality organization and the tendency to infidelity, findings from studies conducted on the sub-dimensions of borderline personality traits were obtained.

High levels of impulsivity represent a fundamental characteristic of borderline personality organization and play a significant clinical role (Kenézlői et al., 2020; Mungo et al., 2020). The distinguishing features of borderline personality organization are

maladaptive behaviors and impulsive emotional reactions (Rosu et al., 2022). Studies on borderline personality organization and impulsivity support this definition (Eskander et al., 2020; Euler et al., 2021; Kanwal & Kazmi, 2022; Linhartova et al., 2021; Martin et al., 2019). Pournaghash (2020) found a significant relationship between impulsivity and infidelity in marriage. Sevi et al. (2020) found that impulsive behavior between couples can lead to infidelity in marriage. Alavi et al. (2018) found a relationship between infidelity in marriage and impulsivity. Ignat (2018) found a relationship between sexual impulsivity and infidelity. Derrick et al. (2016) found that impulsivity is associated with infidelity. Schalkelford et al. (2008) found that low agreeableness and low self-control personality traits are intertwined with impulsivity and an inability to delay gratification, increasing the likelihood of infidelity. Schmitt (2004) found a universal relationship between infidelity and impulsivity. In our study, a significant and positive relationship was found between impulsivity, one of the borderline personality characteristics, and a tendency towards infidelity. High impulsivity increases the tendency towards infidelity. Studies on the relationship between impulsivity and infidelity are consistent with our research findings.

In the current study, a positive relationship was found between the fear of abandonment, which is one of the borderline personality traits, and the tendency to infidelity. The fear of abandonment is a fundamental feature of borderline personality organization (Palihawadana et al., 2018). Individuals with high levels of borderline personality traits tend to fear rejection, abandonment, and mistreatment in close relationships (Rao et al., 2018). Borderline personality organization is characterized by perceived rejection by others (Heekerens et al., 2022), and rejection sensitivity is one of its fundamental features (Cavicchioli & Maffei, 2020). Many studies

have shown a relationship between borderline personality organization and rejection sensitivity (Armenti & Babcock, 2021; Berenson et al., 2011; Lazarus et al., 2018; Pierro et al., 2022; Renneberg et al., 2012; Sommerfeld & Bitton, 2020; Stanley & Siever, 2010). Intense anxiety about being abandoned may increase the need to have a “backup plan” by establishing relationships with alternative partners, and individuals with high rejection sensitivity and fear of abandonment may have a higher tendency to infidelity (Birnbaum et al., 2019).

Individuals with high attachment anxiety chronically fear that their partners will not be able to reach them when they need them and that they will not respond, and they constantly worry about rejection and abandonment by their partners (Sakman et al., 2021). In both empirical and theoretical studies, insecure attachment styles bear a striking resemblance to borderline personality traits (Levy et al., 2015). There are studies in the relevant literature showing a relationship between borderline personality traits and insecure attachment styles (Antičević et al., 2019; Buchheim & Diamond, 2018). According to many studies, insecure attachment styles are associated with borderline personality traits (Agrawal et al., 2004; Beck et al., 2004; Lyons et al., 2005; Zanarini, 2008). Warach et al. (2018) have found that insecure attachment leads to sexual infidelity. Selterman et al. (2017) have found that infidelity is associated with insecure attachment. He and Tsang (2017) have found that an insecure attachment style is linked to infidelity. Allen and Baucom (2004) have also found that infidelity may be driven by the desire to compensate for feelings of insecurity in attachment. Swets and Cox (2023) have found that individuals with avoidant attachment style have a higher tendency and intention to infidelity. Fish et al. (2012) have found that avoidant attachment is significantly associated with infidelity. Mikulincer et al. (2016) have

found that individuals with avoidant attachment styles are more prone to infidelity. DeWall et al. (2011) have found that individuals with high levels of avoidant attachment have more permissive attitudes towards infidelity compared to those with low levels of avoidant attachment. Treger and Sprecher (2011) have found that an avoidant attachment style increases the likelihood of women choosing infidelity. Allen and Baucom (2004) have found that individuals with avoidant attachment styles may be inclined to infidelity due to feelings of insecurity in their relationships. Bogaert and Sadava (2002) have found that individuals with anxious attachment styles are more likely to infidelity. Weiser and Weigel (2015) have found that individuals with higher attachment anxiety are more likely to engage in infidelity with their partners. Russell et al. (2013) have found that when partners themselves or their partners have higher levels of attachment anxiety, the likelihood of infidelity increases.

Psychosis-like states that can be observed in borderline organizations exhibit high variability in cognitive processes. As this variability increases, it is believed to be parallel to the increase in the use of the splitting defense mechanism in the individual, and the increase in splitting is associated with a decrease in the sense of responsibility and impulsive behaviors (Faraji & Tezcan, 2022). Therefore, it is thought that it may increase the tendency for infidelity.

Among the study's main limitations, problems with the structure of the sample stand out. Firstly, it can be seen that individuals with high school, undergraduate, and graduate degrees are not equally distributed in the sample. The same problem has been found to apply to income level, marital status, and employment status demographic characteristics. The vast majority of participants are composed of individuals with middle-income levels, single and unemployed. In future studies, attention

should be paid to achieving a more balanced distribution of the sample in terms of demographic variables so that the data obtained will be more valid for generalizing to the population.

As a result of our study, a significant relationship was found between borderline personality traits and the causes of infidelity tendency scale. It was determined that impulsivity was the variable that best explained changes in infidelity tendency. Clients who exhibit borderline traits sometimes report infidelity as a complaint and sometimes indicate that it exacerbates the disruptive effects in their lives, which can increase the need for psychotherapy. The study's findings are important in showing that reducing impulsivity and increasing self-control may be a functional point in psychotherapeutic interventions for infidelity in individuals with borderline traits.

Author Contributions: F.H. idea/concept, design of the study, literature review, processing and interpretation of data, drafted manuscript, critical review. T.H. literature review, collection and interpretation of data, drafted manuscript.

Declaration of Conflicting Interests: Authors declared no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

Source(s) of Support: The authors did not receive support from any organization for the submitted work.

References

- Adrian, M., Zeman, J., Erdley, C., Lisa, L., & Sim, L. (2011). Emotional dysregulation and interpersonal difficulties as risk factors for nonsuicidal self-injury in adolescent girls. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology*, 39(3), 389-400. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10802-010-9465-3>
- Agrawal, H. R., Gunderson, J., Holmes, B. M., & Lyons-Ruth, K. (2004). Attachment studies with borderline patients: A review. *Harvard Review of*

- Psychiatry, 12(2), 94-104. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1067322049044721>
- Alavi, M., Mei, T. K., & Mehrinezhad, S. A., (2018). The dark triad of personality and infidelity intentions: The moderating role of relationship experience. *Personality and Individual Differences, 128*, 49-54. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2018.02.023>
- Allen, E. S., & Baucom, D. H. (2004). Adult attachment and patterns of extradyadic involvement. *Family Process, 43*, 467-488. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1545-5300.2004.00035.x>
- American Psychiatric Association. (2013). *Diagnostic and statistical manual mental disorders* (5th ed.). <https://doi.org/10.1176/appi.books.9780890425596>
- Antičević, V. S., & Britvić, D. (2019). Emotional competence and coping mechanisms in Croatian women with borderline personality disorder: the role of attachment. *Psychiatria Danubina, 31*(1), 88-94. <https://doi.org/10.2.4869/psyd.2019.88>
- Armenti, N. A., & Babcock, J. C., (2021). Borderline personality features, anger, and intimate partner violence: An experimental manipulation of rejection. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 36*(5-6), NP3104-NP3129. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260518771686>
- Beck, A. T., Freeman, A., & Davis, D. (2004). *Cognitive therapy for personality disorders*. The Guilford Press.
- Berenson, K. R., Downey, G., Rafaeli, E., Coifman, K. G., & Paquin, N. L. (2011). The rejection-rage contingency in borderline personality disorder. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 120*, 681-690. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0023335>
- Birnbaum, G. E., Mizrahi, M., Kovler, L., Stutzman, B., Aloni-Soroker, A., & Reis, H. T. (2019). Our fragile relationships: Relationship threat and its effect on the allure of alternative mates. *Arch Sex Behav, 48*(3), 703-713. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10508-018-1321-5>
- Bogaert, A. F., & Sadava, S. (2002). Adult attachment and sexual behavior. *Personal Relationships, 9*(2), 191-204. <https://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.1111/1475-6811.00012>
- Buchheim, A., & Diamond, D. (2018). Attachment and borderline personality disorder. *Psychiatric Clinics of North America, 41*(4), 651-668. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psc.2018.07.010>
- Cavicchioli, M., & Maffei, C. (2020). Rejection sensitivity in borderline personality disorder and the cognitive-affective personality system: A meta-analytic review. *Personality Disorders: Theory, Research, and Treatment, 11*(1), 1-12. <https://doi.org/10.1037/per0000359>
- Ceylan, V. (2017). *Borderline Kişilik Ölçeği (Türkçe BKÖ): Geçerlik, güvenirliği, faktör yapısı* [Yüksek lisans tezi]. Hasan Kalyoncu Üniversitesi.
- Derrick, J. L., Houston, R. J., Quigley, B. M., Testa, M., Kubiak, A., ... Leonard, K. E. (2016). (Dis) similarity in impulsivity and marital satisfaction: A comparison of volatility, compatibility, and incompatibility hypotheses. *Journal of Research in Personality, 61*(1), 35-49. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrp.2016.02.001>
- DeWall, C. N., Lambert, N. M., Slotter, E. B., Pond, R. S., Deckman, T., Finkel, E. J., et al. (2011). So far away from one's partner, yet so close to romantic alternatives: Avoidant attachment, interest in alternatives, and infidelity. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 101*(6), 1302-1316. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0025497>
- Er, K., Bal, F., & Faraji, H. (2020). Aldatma Eğilimi Sebepleri Ölçeği. *International Journal of Disciplines Economics & Administrative Sciences Studies, 6*(22), 596-608. <http://dx.doi.org/10.26728/ideas.314>
- Eskander, N., Emamy, M., Saad-Omer, S. M., Khan, F., & Jahan, N. (2020). The impact of impulsivity and emotional dysregulation on comorbid bipolar disorder and borderline personality disorder. *Cureus, 12*(8), e9581. <https://doi.org/10.7759%2Fcureus.9581>
- Euler, S., Nolte, T., Constantinou, M., Griem, J., Montague, P. R., & Fonagy, P. (2021). Interpersonal problems in borderline personality disorder: Associations with mentalizing, emotion regulation, and impulsiveness. *Journal of Personality Disorders, 35*, 177-193. <https://doi.org/10.1521/pedi.2019.33.427>
- Faraji, H. (2021). Borderline kişilik bozukluğunun ergenlik döneminde belirlenmesine dair bir değerlendirme. *OPUS Toplum Araştırmaları Dergisi, 18*(43), 7141-7166. <https://doi.org/10.26466/opus.898571>
- Faraji, H., & Güler, K. (2021). Borderline personality traits and self-handicapping. *International Journal of Current Research, 13*(6), 17683-17689. <http://doi.org/10.24941/ijcr.41401.06.2021>
- Faraji, H., & Tezcan, A. E. (2022). *Borderline kişilik bozukluğu*. Nobel Akademik Yayıncılık.
- Fish, J. N., Pavkov, T. W., Wetchler, J. L., & Bercik, J. (2012). Characteristics of those who participate in infidelity: The role of adult attachment and differentiation in extradyadic experiences. *American Journal of Family Therapy, 40*, 214-229. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01926187.2011.601192>
- Gómez, S. N., Frías, Á., & Carol, P. (2017). Romantic relationships of people with borderline personality: A narrative review. *Psychopathology, 50*(3), 175-187. <https://doi.org/10.1159/000474950>

- Gürbüz, S., & Şahin, F. (2016). *Sosyal bilimlerde araştırma yöntemleri: Felsefe yöntem analiz*. Seçkin Yayıncılık.
- Hahs-Vaughn, D. L., & Lomax, R. G. (2020). *İstatistiksel kavramlara giriş* (4. Baskı). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315624358>
- He, S., & Tsang, S. (2017). Perceived female infidelity and male sexual coercion concerning first sex in Chinese college students' dating relationships: The mediating role of male partners' attachment insecurity. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *11*(1), 146-152. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2017.02.016>
- Heckerens, J. B., Schulze, L., Enge, J., Renneberg, B., & Roepke, S. (2022). The temporal relation of arousal and perceived rejection in patients with borderline personality disorder and depressive disorders: An experience sampling approach. *Personality Disorders: Theory, Research, and Treatment*, *13*(6), 597-608. <https://doi.org/10.1037/per0000546>
- Ignat, R. (2018). 704 infidelity, impulsivity, attachment and distorted cognitions. *The Journal of Sexual Medicine*, *15*(3), 401. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsxm.2018.04.612>
- Kanwal, S., & Kazmi, S.F. (2022). Impulsivity, impulsive aggression, and borderline personality features among violent spouses. *Heliyon*, *8*(8), e10135. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2022.e10135>
- Kenézloi, E., Balogh, L., Fazekas, K., Bajzát, B., Kruck, E., Unoka, Z., & Réthelyi, J. (2020). Transdiagnostic study of impulsivity dimensions. Comparative analysis of impulsivity profiles in adult attention deficit hyperactivity disorder and borderline personality disorder. *Psychiatria Hungarica*, *35*(2), 136-145. <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/32191219/>
- Kuo, J. R., Khoury, J. E., Metcalfe, R., Fitzpatrick, S., & Goodwill, A. (2015). An examination of the relationship between childhood emotional abuse and borderline personality disorder features the role of difficulties with emotion regulation. *Child Abuse Neglect*, *39*(1), 147-155. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chiabu.2014.08.008>
- Lazarus, S. A., Scott, L. N., Beeney, J. E., Wright, A. G. C., Stepp, S. D., & Pilkonis, P. A. (2018). Borderline personality disorder symptoms and affective responses to perceptions of rejection and acceptance from romantic versus nonromantic partners. *Personality Disorders: Theory, Research, and Treatment*, *9*(3), 197-206. <https://doi.org/10.1037/per0000289>
- Levy, K. N., Johnson, B. N., Clouthier, T. L., Scala, J. W., & Temes, C. M. (2015). An attachment theoretical framework for personality disorders. *Canadian Psychology*, *56*(2), 197-207. <https://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.1037/cap0000025>
- Linhartova, P., Širůček, J., Ejova, A., Barteczek, R., Theiner, P., & Kašpárek, T. (2021). Dimensions of impulsivity in healthy people, patients with borderline personality disorder, and patients with attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder. *Journal of Attention Disorders*, *25*(4), 584-595. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1087054718822121>
- Lo Monte, F., & Englebort, J. (2022). Borderline personality disorder, lived space, and the Stimmung. *Psychopathology*, *55*(3-4), 179-189. <https://doi.org/10.1159/000521182>
- Lyons-Ruth, K., Yellin, C., Melnick, S. ve Atwood, G. (2005). Expanding the concept of unresolved mental states: Hostile/helpless states of mind in the adult attachment interview are associated with disrupted mother-infant communication and infant disorganization. *Development and Psychopathology*, *17*(1), 1-23. <https://doi.org/10.1017/s0954579405050017>
- Martin, S., Monte, J. D., & Graziani, P. (2019). Impulsivity issues in borderline personality disorder and its links with insight: the role of urgency. *Heliyon*, *4*;5(10), e02564. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2019.e02564>
- Mikulincer, M., & Shaver, P. (2016). *Attachment in adulthood*. Guilford Press.
- Miller, C. E., Townsend, M. L., Day, N. J., & Grenyer, B. F. (2020). Measuring the shadows: A systematic review of chronic emptiness in borderline personality disorder. *PLoS One*, *15*(7), e0233970. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0233970>
- Mungo, A., Hein, M., Hubain, P., Loas, G., & Fontaine, P. (2020). Impulsivity and its therapeutic management in borderline personality disorder: A systematic review. *Psychiatr Q*, *91*(4), 1333-1362. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11126-020-09845-z>
- Munsch, C. L. (2015). Her support, his support: Money, masculinity, and marital infidelity. *American Sociological Review*, *80*(3), 469-495. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0003122415579989>
- Palihawadana, V., Broadbear, J. H., & Rao, S. (2018). Reviewing the clinical significance of 'fear of abandonment' in borderline personality disorder. *Australasian Psychiatry*, *27*(1), 60-63. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1039856218810154>
- Pierro, Rs., Amelio, S., Macca, M., Madeddu, F., & Sarno, M. D. (2022). What if I feel rejected? Borderline personality, pathological narcissism,

- and social rejection in daily life. *Journal of Personality Disorders*, 36(5), 559-582. <https://doi.org/10.1521/pedi.2022.36.5.559>
- Poreh, A. M., Rawlings, D., Claridge, G., Freeman, J. L., Faulkner, C., & Shelton, C. (2006). The BPQ: A scale for the assessment of borderline personality based on DSM-IV criteria. *Journal of Personality Disorders*, 20(3), 247-260. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1521/pedi.2006.20.3.247>
- Poumaghash, S. (2019). Infidelity, impulsivity, and marital adjustment. *Journal of Psychiatry Depression & Anxiety*, 5, 20. <http://dx.doi.org/10.24966/PDA-0150/100020>
- Renneberg, B., Herm, K., Hahn, A., Staebler, K., Lammers, C. H., & Roepke, S. (2012). Perception of social participation in borderline personality disorder. *Clinical Psychology & Psychotherapy*, 19, 473-480. <https://doi.org/10.1002/cpp.772>
- Rockland, L. H. (2016). *Borderline hastalar için destekleyici terapi psikodinamik bir yaklaşım*. Psikoterapi Enstitüsü Eğitim Yayınları.
- Rosu, A., Tót, K., Godó, G., Keri, S., Nagby, A., & Eördegh, G. (2022). Visually guided equivalence learning in borderline personality disorder. *Heliyon*, 8(10), e10823. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2022.e10823>
- Russell, V. M., Baker, L. R., & McNulty, J. K. (2013). Attachment insecurity and infidelity in marriage: Do studies of dating relationships really inform us about marriage? *Journal of Family Psychology*, 27(2), 242-251. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0032118>
- Sansone, A. R., & Sansone, A. L. (2011). Sexual behavior in borderline personality. *Innovations in Clinical Neuroscience*, 8(2), 14-18. <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/21468292>
- 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. *Personality*, 18(4), 301-319. <https://doi.org/10.1002/per.520>
- Selterman, D., Garcia, J. R., & Tsapelas, I. (2017). Motivations for extradyadic infidelity revisited. *J Sex Res*, 56(3), 273-286. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00224499.2017.1393494>
- Sevi, B., Urganci, B., & Sakman, E. (2020). Who cheats? An examination of light and dark personality traits as predictors of infidelity. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 164, 110126. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2020.110126>
- Shackelford, T. K., Besser, A., & Goetz, A. T. (2008). Personality, marital satisfaction, and probability of marital infidelity. *Individual Differences Research*, 6(1), 13-25.
- Shaver, P. R., Mikulincer, M., Gross, J. T., Stern, J. A., & Cassidy, J. A. (2016). A lifespan perspective on attachment and care for others: Empathy, altruism, and prosocial behavior. In J. Cassidy & P. R. Shaver (Eds.), *Handbook of attachment: Theory, research, and clinical applications* (3rd Ed., pp. 878-916). <http://hdl.handle.net/2066/162472>
- Skrzek, J. W. (2023). Perceptions of love and infidelity by Polish youth. *Sexuality & Culture*, 27, 148-160. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12119-022-10007-5>
- Sommerfeld, E., & Bitton, M. S. (2020). Rejection sensitivity, self-compassion, and aggressive behavior: The role of borderline features as a mediator. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 24(11), 44. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2020.00044>
- Stanley, B., & Siever, L. J. (2010). The interpersonal dimension of borderline personality disorder: Toward a neuropeptide model. *American Journal of Psychiatry*, 167, 24-39. <https://doi.org/10.1176/appi.ajp.2009.09050744>
- Swets, J. A., & Cox, C. R. (2023). Insecure attachment and lower preference for romantic relationship nostalgia predict higher acceptance of infidelity. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 43, 112006. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2022.112006>
- Treger, S., & Sprecher, S. (2011). The influences of sociosexuality and attachment style on reactions to emotional versus sexual infidelity. *The Journal of Sex Research*, 48(5), 413-22. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00224499.2010.516845>
- Warach, B., Lawrence, J., & Gorman, B. S. (2018). Pathways to infidelity: The roles of self-serving bias and betrayal trauma. *J Sex Marital Ther*, 44(5), 497-512. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0092623x.2017.1416434>
- Weiser, D. A., & Weigel, D. J. (2015). Investigating experiences of the infidelity partner: Who is the "Other Man/Woman?" *Personality and Individual Differences*, 85, 176-181. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2015.05.014>
- Wypler, W. (2016). *Anatomy of infidelity*. Muza SA.
- Zanarini, M. C. (2008). Reasons for change in borderline personality disorder (and other axis II disorders). *Psychiatric Clinics of North America*, 31(3), 505-515. <https://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.1016/j.psc.2008.03.006>