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ABSTRACT

The current paper reviews researches on sexual and online infidelity from personality perspectives. This is done through looking from Dark Triad Traits, The Big Five Factors and HEXACO. 51 studies from various journals were reviewed and showed supportive findings between personality and infidelity. Individuals high in the Dark Triads: psychopathy, narcissism, and Machiavellianism were associated with committing infidelity. For the Big Five Factors, conscientiousness was linked to lower infidelity; extraversion and agreeableness were associated with higher infidelity while neuroticism and openness showed mixed results. For HEXACO, individuals scoring low on honesty-humility scale had stronger relationship with infidelity. Future studies should do more studies on neuroticism and openness on infidelity. Environment factors should also be considered in explaining individuals’ act in committing infidelity.
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INTRODUCTION

Love and treachery are theatrical themes in affairs provoking powerful emotions in people. Ardent passions and obscure secrets in infidelity have been depicted in history, literature, and art, regardless of whether it is portrayed in words, pigments, or tales. The intense drama associated with infidelity has enabled it to capture people’s interest for centuries.

Infidelity, or even the mere suspicion of it, is bound to produce destructive consequences, such as eliciting feelings of jealousy in men and women (Shackelford & Buss, 1997). There are 3 types of infidelity: sexual, emotional, and online. Sexual infidelity refers to committing physical sexual activities with individuals other than one’s partner. Emotional infidelity refers to the directing of emotional resources (love, time, attention) to persons other than one’s long-term partner (Buss & Shackelford, 1997). Online infidelity consists of elements of both emotional intimacy and sexual virtual contact (Aviram & Amichai-Hamburger, 2005). The evolutionary theory, which is used by most researches discussed in this article, explains infidelity amongst heterosexuals, stating that women are more likely to be distressed by emotional infidelity, whereas men are more likely to be distressed by sexual infidelity (Abraham, Cramer, Fernandez, & Mahler, 2001).

Studies have found personality to play an important factor in determining the likelihood to engage in infidelity. The three major personality factors are the Dark Triads, the Big Five and HEXACO. The Dark Triad consists of three traits: psychopathy, narcissism, and Machiavellianism. Rauthmann and Kolar (2012) describe psychopaths as being spontaneous, irresponsible, manipulative, and antisocial. As a result, psychopaths are usually damaging to both themselves and others because of their tendency to engage in thrill-seeking activities involving violence and delinquency. Alternatively, narcissism is characterized by an excessive enhancement of the self while belittling others. It is often accompanied by vanity, egocentricity, and overconfidence (Rauthmann & Kolar, 2012). Although narcissists occasionally encounter positive life events such as success in short-term mating, they also tend to encounter negative events such as vulnerability and misdemeanour in relationships. On the other hand, Machiavellians are portrayed as callous, pessimistic, fraudulent, exploitative and power-oriented – traits that are usually socially disadvantageous, yet is often judged as belonging to good leaders (Rauthmann & Kolar, 2012). Together, individuals with high levels of Dark Triad traits are more likely to utilize deceit and exploitation techniques and exhibit lower commitment in relationships (Ali & Chamorro-
The Big Five personality factors consist of five traits: openness to experience, conscientiousness, extraversion, agreeableness and neuroticism. Rothmann & Coetzer (2003) describe openness to experience as active imagination, flexibility of thoughts, and intellectual curiosity. Conscientiousness refers to self-control, perseverance and sense of duty. Extraversion is characterized according to talkativeness, sociability and assertiveness. An agreeable individual is described as being altruistic, eager to help others, and also believes that others are equally helpful. Neuroticism is the tendency to experience negative emotions such as sadness, fear, disgust, embarrassment, guilt and anger. One of the HEXACO factors is Honesty-humility, which is defined as the degree to which individuals are sincere, greed-avoidant and modest, as opposed to pretentious, greedy and sly. Infidelity is correlated more strongly with both honesty–humility and the dark triads than dimensions of the big five (Lee, Ashton, Wiltshire, Bourdage, Visser, & Galucci, 2013). Mutual elements across the 3 domains are low honesty-humility because it represents the willingness to gain at others’ expense and the motivation to seek short-term partners. Psychopathy was associated with low HEXACO emotionality and conscientiousness. Machiavellianism is negatively associated with agreeableness and extraversion.

A number of studies have been conducted investigating how various personality factors are related to relationship infidelity, yet no review has been performed that examines all studies collectively. Hence, this article intends to have a general results finding for all the studies from 2000-2015. This study will cover sexual and online infidelity but not emotional infidelity as there has been a lack in researches that investigates the relationship between personality and emotional infidelity. Overall, this review aims to see how personality influences the likelihood of an individual to engage in different types of infidelity.

**METHODOLOGY**

Google Scholar and Lancaster OneSearch were used to obtain articles for this review as they contain a fairly comprehensive overview of psychology-related databases. The timeline of search was set from 2000 to 2015 to obtain studies of the most recent findings. While many studies are available when looking at the relationships between personality and infidelity, the two keywords results in 28200 articles and 326 articles for the duration of that period resulting in difficulties to review all of them. Hence, the current approach keyed in the following keywords simultaneously: personality, infidelity, relationship, the big five, dark triad traits, openness, conscientiousness, extraversion, agreeableness, neuroticism, Machiavellianism, psychopathy, narcissism, for the purpose of capturing the most relevant studies for this article. This resulted in forty-eight studies from Google Scholar and eleven studies from Lancaster OneSearch. Fifty relevant articles are used in this study. Exclusion criteria include overlapping articles from both search engines, articles without access, researches on emotional infidelity and researches based on homosexual participants, as most articles used are based on the evolutionary theory, which explains infidelity in heterosexual relationships. Thirty-six articles assessed general infidelity; seven measures online infidelity and seven evaluates sexual infidelity.

**RESULTS**

Table 1 illustrates personality measures and sample descriptions for individual studies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Sample Description</th>
<th>Mean Age</th>
<th>Personality Measure</th>
<th>Journal Type of Infidelity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adams et al. (2014)</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>American adolescents and adults recruited through</td>
<td>33.5</td>
<td>SRP-III; NPI-40; MACH IV</td>
<td>Personality and Individual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study Authors</td>
<td>Sample Size</td>
<td>Sample Description</td>
<td>Scale/Scales Used</td>
<td>Journal Title</td>
<td>Section</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ali &amp; Chamorro-Premuzic (2010)</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>Adolescents and adults with internet access</td>
<td>LSRP; MACH IV</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>Sexual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arnold et al. (2010)</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>Heterosexual students from a Manchester technical further education college</td>
<td>Kallichman and Rompa’s three scales of sensation seeking</td>
<td>Sexual and Relationship Therapy</td>
<td>General</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Back et al. (2013)</td>
<td>854</td>
<td>German-speaking internet user</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Journal of personality and Social Psychology</td>
<td>General</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bourdage et al. (2007)</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>Canadian undergraduates</td>
<td>HEXACO; NEO-FFI</td>
<td>Personality and Individual Differences</td>
<td>Sexual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brewer &amp; Abell (2015)</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>Adolescents and adults with internet access</td>
<td>MACH IV</td>
<td>Personality and Individual Differences</td>
<td>General</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brewer et al. (2015)</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>Heterosexual women from a British University in a romantic Relationship</td>
<td>LSRP; NPI-16; MACH IV</td>
<td>Personality and Individual Differences</td>
<td>General</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpenter et al. (2008)</td>
<td>2045</td>
<td>Indiana University psychology Undergraduates</td>
<td>SIS/SES</td>
<td>Journal of Sex Research</td>
<td>Sexual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carmody (2010)</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>Undergraduates from south-eastern Tennessee</td>
<td>HEXACO</td>
<td>Personality and Individual Differences</td>
<td>General</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study</td>
<td>Sample Description</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Measure(s)</td>
<td>Journal</td>
<td>Study Type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egan &amp; Angus (2004)</td>
<td>Workers in a large non-academic office</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>NEO-FFI; LSRP</td>
<td>Personality and Individual Differences</td>
<td>General</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giudice et al. (2012)</td>
<td>White Americans</td>
<td>10261</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>16PF</td>
<td>PLoS ONE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hall et al. (2010)</td>
<td>Users of a large online dating site</td>
<td>5020</td>
<td>BFI</td>
<td>Journal of Social and Personal Relationships</td>
<td>Online</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jakobwitz &amp; Egan (2006)</td>
<td>30 men and 52 women recruited through a ‘snowball’ system</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>NEO-FFI-R; LSRP; NPI; MACH-IV</td>
<td>Personality and Individual Differences</td>
<td>General</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jonason et al. (2009)</td>
<td>Psychology undergraduate students at New Mexico State University</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>NPI; MACH IV; SRP</td>
<td>European Journal of Personality</td>
<td>General</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jonason et al. (2009)</td>
<td>Online survey</td>
<td>336</td>
<td>NPI; MACH IV; SRP</td>
<td>Personality and Individual Difference</td>
<td>General</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jonason &amp; Kavanagh (2010)</td>
<td>Users from unique IP addresses</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>NPI; MACH IV; SRP</td>
<td>Personality and Individual Difference</td>
<td>General</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jonason et al. (2011)</td>
<td>College student</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>TIPI</td>
<td>Individual Differences Research</td>
<td>General</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jonason et al. (2012)</td>
<td>Participants recruited through Amazon’s MTurk</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>NPI; MACH IV; SRP</td>
<td>Personality and Individual Differences</td>
<td>General</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jones &amp; Weiser (2014)</td>
<td>Adolescents and adults recruited through MTurk</td>
<td>884</td>
<td>SRP; MACH-IV; NPI-16</td>
<td>Personality and Individual Differences</td>
<td>General</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lalasz</td>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>BSSS-4</td>
<td>Personality</td>
<td>Sexual</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: N/A indicates that the number of participants is not available.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author(s)</th>
<th>Sample Description</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Measure(s)</th>
<th>Journal Title</th>
<th>General Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Weigel (2011)</td>
<td>Sociology students at a Western university</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lee et al. (2013)</td>
<td>Pairs of closely acquainted undergraduate</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>HEXACO-PI-R</td>
<td>Personality and Individual Differences</td>
<td>General</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McKibbin et al. (2014)</td>
<td>Several US universities</td>
<td>1032</td>
<td>HEXACO</td>
<td>European Journal of Personality</td>
<td>General</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McNulty &amp; Widman (2014)</td>
<td>Newlywed couples from Ohio and Tennessee</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>SNS</td>
<td>Archives of Sexual Behaviour</td>
<td>General</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orzech &amp; Lung (2005)</td>
<td>Unmarried university students with previous relationships for at least 3 months</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>Trait Rating Adjectives Questionnaire</td>
<td>Current Psychology</td>
<td>General</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O'Sullivan &amp; Ronis (2013)</td>
<td>Students from 8 Eastern Canada high schools</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>CCYS</td>
<td>Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science</td>
<td>Online</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paulhus &amp; Williams (2002)</td>
<td>Undergraduate psychology students</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>BFI; SRP III; NPI; MACH IV</td>
<td>Journal of Research in Personality</td>
<td>General</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shackelford et al. (2008)</td>
<td>Married couples legally married for less than a year</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>BFI</td>
<td>Individual Differences Research</td>
<td>General</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schmitt &amp; Shackelford (2008)</td>
<td>College students and community members from 46 nations</td>
<td>13243</td>
<td>BFI</td>
<td>Evolutionary Psychology</td>
<td>General</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spitalnick et al. (2008)</td>
<td>Self-identified</td>
<td>715</td>
<td>SSSA</td>
<td>Journal of</td>
<td>Online</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study</td>
<td>Sample Description</td>
<td>Sample Size</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Journal</td>
<td>Type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turchik &amp; Garske (2009)</td>
<td>Undergraduates from a Midwestern university</td>
<td>613</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Archives of Sexual Behaviour</td>
<td>Online</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turchik et al. (2010)</td>
<td>Undergraduates from a Midwestern university</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Journal of Sex Research</td>
<td>Online</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visser et al. (2010)</td>
<td>University students in Ontario, Canada</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Personality and Individual Differences</td>
<td>General</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weiser &amp; Weigel (2015)</td>
<td>University students</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Personality and Individual Differences</td>
<td>General</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whisman et al. (2007)</td>
<td>Adolescents and adults married for more than a year</td>
<td>2291</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Journal of Family Psychology</td>
<td>General</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zuckerman &amp; Kuhlman (2010)</td>
<td>Students from an introductory psychology classes</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Personality and Individual Differences</td>
<td>Online</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Personality measures: SRP-III = Self-Report Psychopathy Scale-III; NPI-40 = 40-item Narcissistic Personality Inventory; MACH IV = Machiavellianism scale; SIS/SES = Sexual Inhibition Scale/Sexual Excitation Scale; LSRP = Levenson Self-Report Psychopathy scale; BSSS-4 = Brief Sensation Seeking Scale; BFI = Big Five Inventory; CCYS = Communities That Care Youth Survey; NPI-16 = 16-item Narcissistic Personality Inventory; NPI = Narcissistic Personality Inventory; NEO-FFI = NEO-Five Factor Inventory; NEO-FFI-R = NEO-Five Factor Inventory- Revised; ISSSS = Impulsive Sensation Seeking Scale; SNS = Sexual Narcissism Scale; MINI-IPIP = MINI-International Personality Item Pool; SD3 = Short Dark Triad; ZKPQ = Zuckerman-Kuhlman Personality Questionnaire.
General Infidelity

Dark Triad Trait

Nineteen studies evaluated the relationship between the Dark Triad Traits and infidelity. Overall results supported the Dark Triad Traits to be associated with infidelity.

Seven studies assessed the influence of psychopathy on infidelity (see Adams, Luevano, & Jonason 2014; Ali & Chamorro-Premuzic, 2010; Brewer, Hunt, James & Abell, 2015; Egan & Angus, 2004; Jones & Weiser, 2014; Paulhus & Williams, 2002; Visser, Pozzebon, Bogaert, & Ashton, 2010). All seven studies found psychopathy to be linked to higher chances of committing infidelity.

Eight studies investigated how narcissism is related to infidelity. Seven studies (see Adams et al., 2014; Back, Kufner, Dufner, Gerlach, & Rauthmann, 2013; Brewer et al., 2015; Campbell, Foster, & Finkel, 2002; McNulty & Widman, 2014; Jakobwitz & Egan, 2006; Paulhus & Williams, 2002) uncovered a positive relationship between narcissism and infidelity. Only Jones and Weiser (2014) yielded insignificant results.

Eight studies examined how Machiavellianism is related to infidelity. Seven studies (see Ali & Chamorro-Premuzic, 2010; Brewer & Abell, 2015; Brewer et al., 2015; Jakobwitz & Egan, 2006; Jones & Weiser, 2014; Paulhus & Williams, 2002; Visser et al., 2010) observed Machiavellianism to be associated with infidelity conduct. Adams et al. (2014) was the only study to produce insignificant findings.

Seven studies supported overall Dark Triad and found other related variables (see O’Boyle, Forsyth, Story, & White, 2014; Jonason, Li & Buss, 2010; Jonason, Li, Webster, & Schmitt, 2009; Jonason & Kavanagh, 2010; Jonason, Luevano & Adams, 2012; Lee et al., 2013; Westhead & Egan, 2015).

The Big Five

Fourteen studies measured the relationship between the Big Five and infidelity. Overall results supported conscientiousness, extraversion and agreeableness being associated with infidelity.

All six articles found high conscientiousness negatively correlated with infidelity (see Barta & Kiene, 2005; Orzeck & Lung, 2005; Schmitt, 2004; Schmitt & Shackelford, 2008; Schmitt & Buss, 2001; Shackelford, Besser & Goetz, 2008).

All five articles showed high extraversion less likely to report infidelity (see Jonason, Teicher, & Schmitt, 2011; Orzeck & Lung, 2005; Schmitt & Buss, 2000; 2001; Schmitt & Shackelford, 2008). All six articles reported lower agreeableness associated with infidelity (see Barta & Kiene, 2005; Jonason et al., 2011; Schmitt, 2004; Schmitt & Buss, 2000; 2001; Schmitt & Shackelford, 2008).

Five studies examined the relationship between openness and infidelity. Three studies found individuals high in openness more likely to report infidelity (see Jonason et al., 2011; Orzeck & Lung, 2005; Schmitt & Buss, 2001). However, two studies found insignificant result (see Schmitt, 2004; Weiser & Weigel, 2015).

Five articles assessed the relationship between neuroticism and infidelity. Three reported neurotics to have higher chances to engage in infidelity behaviours (see Jonason et al., 2011; Shackelford et al., 2008; Whisman, Gordon & Chatav, 2007). However, two studies found insignificant result (see Schmitt, 2004; Schmitt & Shackelford, 2008).

HEXACO

Three studies evaluated the relationship between HEXACO and infidelity. Individuals who are higher on extraversion but lower on honesty-humility, agreeableness and openness are more likely to involve in infidelity (Carmody, 2010). The finding of lower honesty-humility was also found in Lee et al. (2013) study. McKibbin, Miner, Shackelford, Ehrke and Weekes-Shackelford (2013) reported individuals who are low in emotional stability, conscientiousness and agreeableness to be more likely to engage in infidelity.

Sexual Infidelity

Seven studies focused on sexual infidelity and how it is influenced by personality in terms of the Sexy Seven, HEXACO, sexual
excitation/sexual inhibition, and sensation seeking.
One study measured the relationship between the Sexy Seven and HEXACO (see Bourdage, Lee, Ashton, & Perry, 2007). Results indicated that individuals high in relationship exclusivity, emotional investment and sexual restraint to be less likely to engage in sexual infidelity. In terms of HEXACO, Bourdage et al. (2007) found honesty-humility and agreeableness to have a negative correlation with sexual infidelity. Extraversion, on the other hand, is positively correlated with sexual infidelity.

Four studies identified links between sexual excitation/sexual inhibition and sexual infidelity (see Bancroft, Janssen, Carnes, Goodrich, Strong, & Long, 2004; Carpenter et al., 2008; Mark, Janssen, & Milhausen, 2011; Peterson, Janssen, & Heiman, 2010). It was indicated that individuals low in sexual inhibition due to threat of performance consequences are likely to commit sexual infidelity. However, those high in sexual inhibition due to threat of performance concerns reported more cases of sexual infidelity. Sexual excitation is related to sexual infidelity only in males.

Two studies examined the influence sensation seeking has on sexual infidelity conduct (see Arnold, Fletcher, & Farrow, 2002; Lalasz & Weigel, 2011). They found sensation seeking to be indicative of tendency for sexual infidelity, particularly in men.

Online Infidelity

Seven studies explored the relationship between online infidelity and personality in terms of the Big Five, Narcissism, and sensation seeking. Two studies assessed the connection between Big Five and online infidelity (see Hall, Park, Song, & Cody, 2010; Turchik, Garske, Probst, & Irvin, 2010). Among the Big Five, only Extraversion, agreeableness, openness and conscientiousness are found to be significantly related to online infidelity. Conversely, there was no significant relationship between neuroticism and online infidelity. Extraversion and openness are observed to be positively correlated to online infidelity whereas agreeableness and conscientiousness are negatively correlated to online infidelity.

One study investigated the association between Narcissism and online infidelity (Aviram & Amichai-Hamburger, 2005). Narcissists are found to have higher chances of reporting online infidelity, possibly due to their exhibitionism and manipulation.

Five studies evaluated sensation seeking and online infidelity (see O’Sullivan & Ronis, 2013; Spitalnick, DiClemente, Wingood, Crosby, Milhausen, Sales, McCarty, Rose, & Younge, 2007; Turchik et al., 2010; Turchik & Garske, 2009; Zuckerman & Kuhlman, 2000) and found it to have a significant positive relationship with online infidelity.

DISCUSSION

Dark Triad Traits: Psychopathy, narcissism, and Machiavellianism.

From the articles gathered, individuals high on Dark Triads are more likely to seek multiple new partners and engage in short-term relationships (Jonason et al., 2009; Jonason et al., 2010). However, their partners tend to be poached by others because of their lack of involvement in a long-term relationship, leading to lower relationship security.

Brewer, Hunt, James, and Abell (2015) highlighted narcissism and psychopathy being the most influential factors in infidelity. This was supported by other researches (Adams et al., 2014; Campbell et al., 2002; Egan & Angus, 2004; Jakobwitz & Egan, 2006; McNulty & Widman; 2014). Similarly, Back et al. (2013) found narcissists to be less comfortable in intimate relationships, and their partners are more likely to involve in infidelity due to rivalry.

According to Jonason and Kavanagh (2010), men score higher than women on the Dark Triads, especially in psychopathy. Gender differences in short-term mating are partly mediated by Dark Triads, which promote exploitative mating tactics in men. Men may engage in infidelity because they are rewarded with their desired excitement and sensation. Jonason et al. (2012) found a positive
correlation between Dark Triads and preferences for short-term relationships but negative correlation for long-term relationships. Narcissists prefer one-night stand and partners that reflect themselves well while psychopaths prefer impersonal sex.

However, Jones and Weiser (2014) found psychopathy to be the strongest predictor of infidelity in men whereas both psychopathy and Machiavellianism have equal influence on infidelity in women. This was supported by Ali and Chamorro-Premuzic (2010) and Visser et al. (2010), who found its presence in both gender. Additionally, contrasting Brewer et al.’s (2015) findings, Jones and Weiser (2014) detected no relationship between narcissism and infidelity because infidelity is usually perceived by the society as a negative conduct. Therefore, narcissists are less likely to engage in infidelity unless the relationship provides desirable incentives that prevails the negative associations linked to infidelity. Since this study has the largest sample size among the 7 studies, it may be because the researchers used The personality measure (NPI-16) which contains only 16 items whereas inventories used in other studies possess more items, which could be more descriptive of narcissistic traits.

Jones and Weiser (2014) explained the strong influence of psychopathy on infidelity that was observed in both genders as psychopaths’ antisocial and manipulative nature. Unlike psychopaths, relationships with Machiavellians are not ruined by infidelity because they are calculative and strategic. Machiavellians conceal their infidelity behaviours and successfully mend their relationships through manipulation, despite feeling no guilt. This result was supported by other researchers (Jakobwitz & Egan, 2006; Brewer & Abell, 2015), who further added that Machiavellians’ infidelity behaviour is facilitated by their lack of empathy, predilection for emotionally distant relationships, and confidence that their infidelity will not be discovered by their partners. Adams et al. (2014) however, found an insignificant relationship between Machiavellianism and infidelity, which they explained as their small sample of American subjects. This is possible, since other studies did not restrict their sample to only Americans, and most had a larger sample size.

Research indicates that higher scores in the Dark Triad Traits are linked to low agreeableness in The Big Five (Jakobwitz & Egan, 2006; O’Boyle et al. 2014). Agreeableness is the key predictor of the Dark Triad. Hence, they are more inclined to manipulate others because individuals with low agreeableness are less thoughtful and caring of others. Nevertheless, neuroticism in the Big Five is found unrelated to the Dark Triad.

Westhead and Egan (2015) found the Dark Triad and mating effort to be associated with antisocial behaviours. Psychopathy is the darkest among the Dark Triad constructs. When low agreeableness and psychopathy are taken into consideration, mating effort and narcissism are not associated with antisocial behaviours.

The Big Five Personality Factors
According to Schmitt and Buss (2001), individuals with lower agreeableness and conscientiousness are more likely to engage in infidelity. Also, individuals high on extraversion and openness are likely to receive more temptations because these traits correspond to high sensation-seeking, hence are more susceptible to infidelity. Similar results were obtained by other researchers (Barta & Kiene, 2005; Shackelford et al., 2008). Jonason et al. (2011) also found similar findings but only among men as their personalities may influence women’s mating decision.

High agreeableness and conscientiousness may imply lower motivation for infidelity because these individuals tend to have more perseverance in relationships regardless of conflicts and are also more capable of resisting seduction (Barta & Kiene, 2005; Jonason et al., 2011).

Shackelford et al. (2008) reasoned that individuals low on agreeableness and conscientiousness have lower satisfaction in their marriage, resulting in higher possibility of infidelity. Individuals higher in neuroticism are less likely to be happy and often feel neglected. This finding was replicated by
Jonason et al. (2011) and Whisman et al. (2007), who found neurotics to have higher chances to engage in infidelity behaviours because they are less concerned with the outcome of their action.

On the other hand, infidelity individuals have higher extraversion and openness to experience but lower conscientiousness (Orzech & Lung, 2005). Extraverted individuals are more sociable, indicating more opportunities of meeting alternative partners. Lower conscientiousness may be linked to the inability to consistently contribute to relationship demands. This study also found partners with similar level of the Big Five to be more faithful. Besides, infidelity individuals rated their partners lower in all big five components. This may be due to anticipated incompatibilities, leading to dissatisfaction in relationship. Additionally, cheaters view own agreeableness and neuroticism as being significantly higher than their partner’s (Orzech & Lung, 2005; Schmitt & Shackelford, 2008).

Schmitt (2004) investigated the relationship between the Big Five and infidelity across 52 nations. Results indicated that low agreeableness and conscientiousness is universally associated to higher infidelity. However, neuroticism and openness are not related to infidelity. Women in South America with low agreeableness reported themselves as less likely to be unfaithful, despite the universal trend that was detected. This is likely to be due to cultural differences, incorrect translations or different response styles across cultures. This finding was also present in Weiser and Weigel’s (2015) study; however, they were the only research to observe individuals lower in openness to have higher chances of infidelity, which they explained as reward obtained in infidelity conducts. Also, the study used the Mini-IPIP scale, which contains 20 items only while inventories used in other studies have more items.

Giudice et al. (2011) found that men are less committed in marriage in female-biased (where females outnumbered males) populations and thus involved more in infidelity because of the availability of mating opportunity. As personality traits affect mating behaviour, changes in sex ratio may cause variable selection on personality.

**HEXACO**

All three studies found individuals who are low in honesty-humility to tend to commit infidelity because they are willing to defy rules to fulfil their personal desires, acting as a motivator (Carmody, 2010; McKibbin et al., 2013; Lee et al., 2013). Also, infidelity is associated with lower agreeableness, emotional stability, conscientiousness and higher extraversion, which is consistent with the findings of the Big Five, except openness.

**Online Infidelity**

The internet has largely reduced the prerequisite for communication to depend on physical distance, an aspect required in real-life relationships. During early stages of a relationship, individuals have greater use of strategic misrepresentation for the sake of impression management (Hall et al., 2010), which is easier done online, as it allows information to be manipulated in a more positive light. Extraverts are more likely to manipulate information regarding past relationships (Hall et al., 2010; Turchik et al., 2010) because they tend to have more partners throughout a lifetime (Nettle, 2005) -- an information that may not be received favourably. Additionally, extraverts are less likely to misrepresent their personal interests (Hall et al., 2010) because they discern their sociability as an appealing trait. Using this strategy, extraverts project their ideal selves onto the internet to attract extra- dyadic partners.

Conscientious individuals are less likely to misrepresent personal information (Hall et al., 2010) because they are highly aware of the consequences of strategic misrepresentation, hence lowering chances of infidelity (Nettle & Clegg, 2008). Agreeable individuals are only likely to misrepresent information involving their weight (Hall et al., 2010). Similar to extraverts, those high in openness to experience are more likely to manipulate personal information to appear more interesting and fun (Hall et al., 2010), enabling them to initiate more potential relationships, increasing chances of online infidelity. However, neuroticism was not related to
strategic misrepresentation (Hall et al., 2010). Similarly, Turchik et al. (2010) found high extraversion and low agreeableness to be related to characteristics of narcissistic personality disorder.

Aviram and Amichai-Hamburger (2005) focused on how narcissism is related to online infidelity. Exhibitionist and manipulation components of narcissism contribute to the likelihood to engage in online extradyadic affairs. Narcissists are likely to manipulate a person into fulfilling a fantasy. This manipulativeness may prompt them to provide information online that is deceiving yet attractive in order to gain access to potential extradyadic partners; the exhibitionist component draws them towards the security provided online, where they could express their needs and desires with less fear of legal trouble or social sanction. For example, use of webcams permit exhibitionists to express themselves fully without risking prosecution for exhibitionist conduct. Although Jones and Weiser (2014) found narcissism to be unrelated to general infidelity, it could be related to online infidelity because it promises anonymity, hence narcissists are less likely to be judged for their infidelity if society members do not see it.

O’Sullivan and Ronis (2013) investigated how sensation seeking is associated with online extradyadic interactions. Adolescents with greater need for sensation seeking reported more extradyadic affairs. Yeniceri and Kokdemir’s (2006) study found sensation seeking to be linked to online infidelity because it consists of components such as ‘boredom with routine’, and ‘seeking enjoyment’. This result was replicated by other studies (Spitalnick et al., 2007; Turchik & Garske, 2009; Turchik et al., 2010; Zuckerman & Kuhlman, 2000). It is worth noting that sensation seeking is also a facet of extraversion, hence it might be one of the many factors that drive an extravert towards online infidelity. Hence for an extravert, online extradyadic affairs might provide the excitement they crave that is not provided in reality due to the anonymity that online relationships provide. In other words, they can be whoever they want to be and is able to meet countless partners.

**Sexual Infidelity**

To describe human sexuality, Schmitt and Buss (2000) identified the “Sexy Seven”: Sexual Attractiveness, Relationship Exclusivity, Gender Orientation, Sexual Restraint, Erotophilic disposition, Emotional Investment and Sexual Orientation. Sexual Attractiveness is associated with seduction and sexiness; Relationship Exclusivity is linked to loyalty and monogamy; Gender Orientation refers to how masculine or feminine a person is; Sexual Restraint is linked to chastity and celibacy; Erotophilic Disposition is related to vulgarity and lust; Emotional Investment is associated with affection and love; Sexual Orientation refers to heterosexuality or homosexuality.

Bourdage et al. (2007) found Honesty-Humility and Relationship Exclusivity to be negatively correlated with sexual infidelity. Individuals who are modest, loyal, agreeable and emotionally invested are less likely to commit sexual infidelity. Greater Emotional Investment and Agreeableness symbolize less susceptibility toward sexual infidelity (Bourdage et al., 2007). The more individuals devote time and energy in cultivating a relationship, and the more agreeable they are, the less vulnerable they are towards external allures. Highly agreeable individuals enter a relationship with love and affection hence experience greater marital satisfaction. Furthermore, Extraversion is negatively correlated with Sexual Restraint. Extraverts’ tendency for sensation seeking and impulsiveness may prompt them to easily succumb to their desires (Bourdage et al., 2007). Extraversion appears to be linked across all types of infidelity consistently, and sensation seeking appears to be the key facet of extraversion in predicting likelihood of infidelity.

Mark et al. (2011) discovered that individuals lower in sexual inhibition due to threat of performance consequences are prone to commit sexual infidelity. This is supported by Bancroft et al. (2004), who found these individuals to use less condoms and have more one-night stands. In addition, women with this trait reported more experiences in casual sex (Carpenter, Janssen, Graham, Vorst, & Wicherts, 2008). Contrastingly, those higher in
sexual inhibition due to threat of performance concerns reported more instances of sexual aggressiveness and sexual infidelity (Peterson et al., 2010; Mark et al., 2011). Therefore, individuals concerned with own sexual performance may have the misconception that risky sexual behaviour is associated with increased sexual performance. Together, this indicates that individuals with problems in sexual arousal may engage in risky sexual behaviours to overcome their concerns. They may be able to perform better when they are with strangers because there is less pressure. Sexual excitation is related to sexual infidelity only in males due to their higher inclination towards sexual risk-taking and higher sexual desire (Mark et al., 2011).

Previous research has shown that individuals high in general sensation seeking are more likely to commit sexual extra dyadic relationships (Lalasz & Weigel, 2011). Men are generally higher in sensation seeking than women, accounting for the gender difference in infidelity. Hence, men are more likely to engage in sexual extradyadic affairs to satisfy their need for the desired experience (Arnold et al., 2002).

Future Recommendations

Future studies interested in investigating the Dark Triad Traits and infidelity could consider situational influences. Conditions tempting to narcissists might not be so for those high in Machiavellianism or psychopathy. For example, narcissists may be drawn to relationships that provide entitlement, but Machiavellians and psychopaths may not. Since the investment model emphasizes the influence of commitment in infidelity, future research could examine whether those high in Dark Triad Traits are less likely to commit infidelity if they are married. As for the Big Five, since results for personality traits such as openness and neuroticism are inconsistent across culture and gender, future research could investigate the moderating effect of culture on personality traits and its relationship with infidelity.

Emotional Infidelity is the only type of infidelity that is not discussed in this review due to lack of researches focused solely on this aspect. General infidelity has been researched extensively throughout the years and has produced numerous studies. However, studies regarding personality and its relation to online infidelity, sexual infidelity and emotional infidelity are lacking. Hence, future research could investigate how personality traits such as the dark triads is related to different types of infidelity. Also, since there are so many types of infidelity, researches should define which behaviours constitutes which type of infidelity as different interpretations are found across studies regarding the same type of infidelity. Additionally, studies in this review rely on predicted scenario, hence their predictive validity is questionable. Future studies could recruit participants with experience in infidelity and administer personality tests to these individuals.
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