

Ramifications Of Infidelity In Mauritius

Nandan Seeboruth

University of Technology Mauritius

Abstract: This study is based upon Infidelity prevailing in the Mauritian Society. It attempts to demonstrate the various factors related to infidelity. Moreover, the study has been carried out with a sample size of 350 to represent the whole population and to provide a rough estimate of the infidelity prevailing here. Thus, it has revealed that there is approximately 40% of unfaithfulness among all couples including those who are married religiously, legally or cohabiting. Likewise, it has been found that infidelity is linked to many secondary factors which contribute towards being treacherous. The main hypothesis revealed that sexual orientation is completely independent of unfaithfulness while religious segregation also does not assume a part in treachery. Although the causes of infidelity are varied and complex some of the causes have been identified. Furthermore, the impacts of infidelity may completely destroy a relationship, but the research has also revealed that some deceived mates chose to suffer in silence rather than remedy the situation. Nevertheless, while sometimes the betraying spouse may not be getting enough from the relationship and at other times the betrayed spouse may not be giving enough which results in treachery. As a result, this leaves the committed partner to feeling devastated, depressed, aggrieved and alone.

Keywords: infidelity, Mauritian, religious segregation, sexual orientation

Introduction

Over the last decades, infidelity has become a subject of major concern whereby partners no longer remain committed to each-other in their relationship as initiated by Feeney (2004). Conversely, infidelity is not a contemporary issue, but it has existed since the beginning of the 19th century as unveiled by Glass and Wright, (1985). Nevertheless, infidelity can be rated as not only having sexual intercourse with another partner as per Blow and Hartnett, (2005), therefore a broad definition of the type of infidelity that will be discussed in this study; infidelity is any action that violates an implicit or explicit agreement between two partners as defined by Buunk (1980). Furthermore, with the advent of online dating sites, many partners go for online dating because it is all virtual as defined by Young (1999). Even Facebook chats, email conversation, Viber, WhatsApp, Skype and Twitter among others are all used by cheating partners. Hence, when they get caught, they may get a guilt-free pass because there was no physical contact. But what happens to the other partner? He/She may be subjected to the worst trauma resulting in depression/stress as affirmed by Young (1998).

Problem Statement

Ramgoolam (2015) indicate that infidelity and extramarital issues in Mauritius are nothing but the same old thing new yet they are all the more in the open. Moreover, Sparking Dawn Editors (2012) connote that infidelity is maybe as old as the organization of marriage itself. Besides this, an unpublished data from the Ministry of Gender Equality, Child Development and Family Welfare states that there is 40% of infidelity in Mauritius. Anyhow with the progression of time, the tribe of betrayal has continued developing as per Trobst, Wiggins, Costa, Herbst, McCrae, and Masters, (2000). So much that unfaithfulness can be termed as the new social ailment. Why do individuals undermine their spouse/wife? Is it worth it? There are hitched individuals who satisfy all their obligations at home, as an obedient mate would do. They may go over to others as a flawless couple. By and by, one of them may be passing up a major opportunity for something in their relationship as initiated by Buss and Shackelford, (1997)

SIGNIFICANCE OF STUDY

The research is intended to detect cheating but also the different types of infidelity which be revealed by our survey. Likewise, the impacts of infidelity on others will also be dealt. In the same line, this study is based on all types of couples, that is Heterosexual and LGB whether they are married legally or religiously as well as cohabitation (Live-in Relationships) of all ages(18-80 Years) in Mauritius.

METHODS AND PROCEDURES

AIM: The aim of this research is to assess the different causes of infidelity in Mauritius.

Likewise, the research objectives were:

1. To examines and reports how couples react towards infidelity that is the consequences are borne by both partners.
2. To describe constituents of infidelity that is whether infidelity is related to a particular type of sexual orientation or to other secondary variables.

Hypothesis

- ❖ H₀: There is no association between Sexual Orientation and Infidelity
- ❖ H₁: Sexual Orientation has an effect upon infidelity
- ❖ H₀: There is no relationship between Religious Segregation and Infidelity
- ❖ H₁: Religious Segregation has an effect upon infidelity
- ❖ H₀: There is no link between Sociological factors v/s Infidelity
- ❖ H₁: Sociological factors have an effect upon infidelity
- ❖ H₀: There is no connection between Relational factors v/s Infidelity
- ❖ H₁: Relational factors have an effect upon infidelity

Sample

350 respondents were targeted as per Raosoft Sample Size Calculator [Margin of error; 5%, Confidence level; 95%, Population size; 148542 and Response distribution; 50%] which gave a sample size of 384. This number was stratified as per religions as follows; Hindu 48.5%, Roman Catholic 26.3%, Muslim 17.3%, other Christian 6.4%, other 0.6%, none 0.7%, unspecified 0.1%

Tools

The questionnaire has been adopted from Christopher (2009) and modified according to the literature review together with the different concepts stated in this study

Results and Discussion

With a total of 337 respondents, Table 1 demonstrates the demographic details of the respondents whereby the highest proportion of respondents fell under the category of 35-45 with a total percentage of 28.2%(n=95) followed by 19.3%(n=65) for the group 18-24. The next one is 25-34 which was at 16.9%(n=57) while the least percentages fell into the groups of 55-64(n=31), Under 18(n=22) and 65 or older(n=22). In addition, heterosexuals' had a top grossing of 90.8%(n=306) trailed by LGB community, with Gays at 2.7%(n=9), Bisexuals at 2.4%(n=8) and Lesbians 1.5%(n=5) being at lowest. Moreover, some unchecked fields led to a discrepancy in the Sexual Orientation variable. Likewise, the majority of the respondents affirmed that they were in an exclusive relationship with 31.5%(n=106) whilst only 24.6%(n=83) declared that they were in committed relationships(n=83) and surpasses those who are married(n=55) by a difference of 8.3%. Nevertheless, singles(n=31) are also dominating the sample as compared to engaged/committed(n=26) and those whose relationships have ended and lastly the smallest amount goes to widowed/partner demised(n=3). On the other hand, the education level in Mauritius among couples have been observed as follows; with SC being at top position with 23.1%(n=78) pursued by 22.8%(n=77) for Masters Degree whereas there is a slight difference of 0.9% between those having an HSC(n=53) and Diploma(n=50) and Doctoral Degree(n=33) and CPE(n=28) at lowest positions. Furthermore, the religion percentage replicated the secondary data from SM to some extent, with Hindu at 46.6%(n=157) followed by Catholic 25.8%(n=87), Muslim at 16.6%(n=56) and Christian at 6.2%(n=21) while the hidden populace consisted of Atheist(n=2), Rasta(n=1), Chinese(n=1) and Tamil(n=2)

Table 1 – Demographics

| | | | |
|------------------------|--------------------------------------|-----|------|
| Status | Single(never Married) | 31 | 9.2 |
| | In an Exclusive relationship | 106 | 31.5 |
| | Engaged/Committed | 26 | 7.7 |
| | Married/United | 55 | 16.3 |
| | Separated/Committed but living apart | 17 | 5 |
| | Divorced/Ended | 16 | 4.7 |
| | Committed Relationship | 83 | 24.6 |
| | Widowed/Committed Partner Died | 3 | 0.9 |
| Education_Level | CPE | 28 | 8.3 |
| | SC | 78 | 23.1 |
| | HSC | 53 | 15.7 |
| | Diploma | 50 | 14.8 |
| | Bachelor Degree | 18 | 5.3 |
| | Masters Degree | 77 | 22.8 |
| | Doctoral Degree | 33 | 9.8 |
| Religion | Hindu | 157 | 46.6 |
| | Muslim | 56 | 16.6 |
| | Christian | 21 | 6.2 |
| | Catholic | 87 | 25.8 |
| | Tamil | 2 | 0.6 |
| | Atheist | 2 | 0.6 |
| | Rasta | 1 | 0.3 |
| | Chinese | 1 | 0.3 |
| | Missing | 10 | 3.0 |

| Variables | | Frequency | Percentage of total (%) |
|---------------------------|--------------|-----------|-------------------------|
| Age_Range | under 18 | 22 | 6.5 |
| | 18-24 | 65 | 19.3 |
| | 25-34 | 57 | 16.9 |
| | 35-44 | 95 | 28.2 |
| | 45-54 | 45 | 13.4 |
| | 55-64 | 31 | 9.2 |
| | 65 or older | 22 | 6.5 |
| Sexual_Orientation | Heterosexual | 306 | 90.8 |
| | Bisexual | 8 | 2.4 |
| | Gay | 9 | 2.7 |
| | Lesbian | 5 | 1.5 |
| | Missing | 9 | 2.7 |

Conversely, a series of Chi square test was carried out to verify if infidelity is tied to certain variables and the following results were depicted; Infidelity and religion are two independent variables. Likewise, the above analysis is in line with (Amato and Rogers, 1997) who declared that people who pray regularly find it more difficult to cheat than those who participate less in religious practices. Similarly, Forste and Tanfer, (1996) were quite valid when they declared that religious segregation has no direct role to play in infidelity. Moreover, they also stated that not only infidelity is related to diverse conditions but also there is no direct evidence of linking infidelity to religion. There is a moderate association between infidelity in family and infidelity in children. Eventually, Bogaert and Sadava, (2002) also claim that infidelity is also linked to the attachment model which posits that kids develop an attachment with at least one primary caregiver and if ever, this does not happen then kids develop a low self-esteem and a fearful avoidant attachment style while as per Fraley (2000) this prevents the grown up child from being faithful to one partner only which can explain why some respondents were unfaithful despite their parents were faithful. There is a moderate connection between dominating partner and

infidelity. Adams (1963) argued that fairness is related to betrayal which Prins et al., (1993) took to another level and proved that unfairness in couples may trigger disloyalty in women perhaps due to the concept of unequal power at home which make sense in our results as demonstrated above. Nevertheless, Edwards and Booth, (1976) are against this view and critically affirm that women who win all the fights and disagreements were more likely to be unfaithful which explains why partners who had no dominating partners still chose to be unfaithful, while Buss. and Shackelford (1997) have demonstrated that couples who are miserable in their personal life tend to favour infidelity at some point in their life. There is a weak link between infidelity and Income difference. Furthermore, Treas et al., (2000) also exposed that partners who work whose spouses stay at home are more inclined to be unfaithful perhaps due to extra connections at work. Equally, Forste et al., (1996) found that women who were more skilled than their partners were more predisposed to take part in extra dyadic connections. There is a moderate relationship between Partner being trustworthy and infidelity. Hence Costa and McCrae, (1992) were right when they affirmed that betrayers are in short of trust thus they do not value that their partners are trustworthy therefore they chose to shatter this trust. Yarab, Sensibaugh, & Allgeier (1998) are also against being untrustworthy as by being such as jerk, one surely sets off for emotional infidelity. Likewise Corri (2014) in also in favour of being trustworthy because she initiated that lying is the beginning of betrayal. Therefore, there is a moderate connection between Partner being extrovert and infidelity. Hence, it can be said that Eysenck (1976) was precise by finding a link between extroverts having more sexual accomplices than did introverts. Hence respondents who chose to be still committed despite of their partners being extroverts are thus themselves introverts and have low level of sexual drive as revealed by Eysenck (1976) and thus remained committed. Therefore, John and Srivastava, (1999) refer to the Big Five personality traits in measuring infidelity. Another aspect put forward by Aron and Aron's (1986) states that person enter relationships to enhance their confidence and self-esteem as in the case of extroverts, hence when these seem to fade, the partners are inclined to indulge in extra connections to fulfill these needs. There is a weak relationship between Partner being talkative and infidelity. Thus, Whitty and Quigley, (2008) connoted that spending time with someone else is also labeled as emotional infidelity, hence talking may lead to romantic affiliations while Roscoe et al., (1988) further implied that romantic liaisons may cross limits in no time whereas Shackelford et al., (2002) added that emotional link is equally dangerous as a sexual one. There is a weak relationship between long Chats and infidelity. Nevertheless, long chats prove to be threat as unfolded by (Young 1998; Blow et al., 2005; Beatriz, 2007; Hertlein et al., 2005; Yarab et al., 1998) entailed that this kind of emotional infidelity brings the worst kind of depression to the deceived mates as affirmed by Young (1999). And Ramgoolam, (2015) discloses that infidelity is being made more open, that it is being on the rise as exposed by Trobst et al., (2000) in the case of long chats. Infidelity is completely independent of someone's Sexual Orientation. Therefore, comparison-wise, Tsapelas et al., (2009) were affirmative by deducing that Gays and lesbians are more treacherous than heteros and that gay men are seven times more likely to cheat than do hetero men as accentuated by Buss (2000) and reprehensibly the

LGB community are more retrained to live their sexual life which may be the reason for infidelity as concluded by (Heaphy et al., 2004a; Heaphy et al., 2004b) There is a moderate linkage between infidelity and partner being more educated. Hence the above deductions can be in line with Treas and Giesen, (2000) who unveiled that being more educated than the partner may lead to cheating but still depends upon secondary factors. Eventually, Forste et al., (1996) initiated that ladies with more qualifications may also cheat while conversely if the spouse is more educated then the chances of the wife being unfaithful is very minim. Therefore, in a couple, education with respect to one partner is more vital than the combined level of education. Consequently, a Kruskal Wallis Test unveiled that there is a link between duration of a relationship and infidelity. Therefore, Hansen (1987) was right when he affirmed that longer relationships are more prone to betrayals but however this result is in contrast with Liu (2000) who connoted that relationships are more exposed to betrayals after the eighteenth year of being together, nevertheless here, it is seen that infidelity had crept within only ten years. Therefore, Rusbult, (1980) was precise when he implied that the longer a relationship, the lesser partners tend to invest which gives rise to infidelity. Similarly, a One sample t test revealed that Education Level, Religious_Spiritual and Satisfaction in Sexual life, all have a strong positive impact on infidelity, however Educational level and Religious/Spiritual have a greater influence on infidelity as compared with Satisfaction in Sexual life. The results have also unfolded that a large fraction of deceived mates become depressed while some act normally to avoid further conflicts and others choose to vent out their anger upon their partners. Furthermore, this causes a lot of misbalances in the relation which further deteriorates the bond drastically which ultimately becomes the cause of separation for some duos. As a result, this obviously has a depressing impact upon children. Finally, as far as the cheating partner is concerned, a large amount of them do not even bother to regret their misconduct, which even reduces the chances of being pardoned

Conclusion

The study revealed that the main roots of infidelity are; low education prevailing among the couples. Additionally, Parent's infidelity also has a major effect upon children who often follow their steps. Extraversion, partner being more educated and being untrustworthy may also lead to infidelity. Likewise, being talkative and income difference and having long chats, satisfaction in sexual life do all have a minor effect on infidelity. But, duration of a relationship, spirituality/religious, educational level and age range have also been linked towards infidelity. Nonetheless, religious segregation and sexual orientation do not affect infidelity. Likewise, the results have also unfolded that a large fraction of deceived mates become depressed while some act normally to avoid further conflicts and others choose to vent out their anger upon their partners. Furthermore, this causes a lot of misbalances in the relation which further deteriorates the bond drastically which ultimately becomes the cause of separation for some duos. As a result, this obviously has a depressing impact upon children. Finally, as far as the cheating partner is concerned, a large amount of them do not even bother to regret their misconduct, which even reduces the chances of being pardoned.

Note:

- a) Sociological factors have been regrouped under Religious_Spiritual, Educational Level and Sex Life
- b) Relational Factors have been segregated into Infidelity in family, Partner Dominating, Income difference, Partner more educated, Partner trustworthy, Partner extravert, Partner Talkative, Long chats with others and duration of relationship

Recommendations

Notably, Young (1991) proposes premarital counseling program to alleviate the issue of infidelity, however, in our case; all couples should consider this program in order to prevent future infidelity. Likewise, Hansen (1987) developed a forgiveness based therapy for treachery. Besides this, Buunk (1980) emphasized that many couples who undergo infidelity may not always be present for the treatment because infidelity is a very personal and critical issue. In the same line, Feeney (2004) found that those that when the betraying spouses admitted their betrayal, this tended to be more fulfilling than those who kept it a secret; except that this resulted in the deceiving partner being distressed, yet both spouses showed rapid recovery. Forste & Tanfer, (1996), besides recommend that therapists should reframe the violated commitment to intimacy and hence strengthen their intimacy level to avoid any infidelity in the future. Colloquially, Liu. (2000) suggests betrayed mates to adopt a nonjudgmental attitude and scrutinize their own feelings and emotions to work towards biases which help to refrain from being too harsh on the betraying partner. This aids in accessing and sharing emotions, which urges the partners to avoid secrecy thus driving them to go a deeper level beneath the surface. Pins et al.,(1993) conversely, advised that couples should abstain from discussing this situation to families and friends which likely results in more damage and demonizing the betraying mate. Furthermore, Edwards & Booth (1976) recommended that the affair should be terminated before treatment is undergone, and that ending an affair does not mean only stopping sexual connections but also emotional ones and then undergoing a process of telling the story of the affair without defensiveness which would help in healing. Furthermore, the betrayed mate should practice empathetic listening so as to relieve the pressure from the latter. However, Young (1999) has established four rules for recovery prior an affair; firstly, never ever communicate with the outsider while working on temptations by promises of commitment for the present and future; to decide that infidelity was a stupidity and hence take better precautions for the future; both partners should re-discuss the relationship priorities as well as re-examine the personal reasons for straying because, it would not have happened if one partner had not let the opposite/same sex partner down; and lastly, the betrayed person should allocate a time table for resurrection but sometimes, the cheating spouse often are eager to let go of the past still one should always allow for buffer to honour the deceived partners timetable.

References

- [1] Amato, P. R., & Rogers, S. J. (1997). A longitudinal study of marital problems and subsequent divorce. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, Pp 59, 612-624.
- [2] Aron, A., & Aron, E. (1986). *Love and the expansion of the self: Understanding attraction and satisfaction*. New York: Hemispher.
- [3] Beatriz Lia Avila Mileham (2007): Online infidelity in Internet chat rooms: an ethnographic exploration Department of Counselor Education, University of Florida, 1215 Norman Hall, Gainesville
- [4] Blow, A. J. and Hartnett, K. (2005). Infidelity in committed relationships I: A methodological review. *Journal of Marital and Family Therapy*, Vol 31 No. 2, Pp 183-216
- [5] Bogaert, A. F., & Sadava, S. (2002). Adult attachment and sexual behavior. *Personal Relationships*, Pp 9, 191-204
- [6] Buss David M. and Shackelford Todd K. (1997), Susceptibility to Infidelity in the First Year of Marriage, *JOURNAL OF RESEARCH IN PERSONALITY* 31 The University of Texas at Austin Pp 194
- [7] Buss, D. M. (2000). *The dangerous passion: Why jealousy is as necessary as love and sex*. New York: The Free Press
- [8] Buunk, B. (1980). Extramarital sex in the Netherlands Motivations in social and marital context. *JOURNAL OF FAMILY AND ECONOMIC* Vol 1 ISSUES 3 Pp 28
- [9] Christopher Daniel Chuick, (2009), Gender and infidelity: a study of the relationship between conformity to masculine norms and extrarelatonal involvement, PhD (Doctor of Philosophy) thesis, University of Iowa, 162 pages.
- [10] Corri Fetman, (2014) *Telltale Signs of Cheaters* [Online] Available at; http://www.huffingtonpost.com/corri-d-fetman/telltale-signs-of-cheater_b_4676472.html (Accessed on 9 August 2015)
- [11] Costa, P. T., Jr., & McCrae, R. R. (1992). Revised NEO Personality Inventory (NEO-PI-R) and NEO Five-Factor Inventory (NEO-FFI) professional manual. Odessa, FL: Psychological Assessment Resources.
- [12] Edwards, J. N., & Booth, A. (1976). Sexual behavior in and out of marriage: An assessment of correlates. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, Pp 38, 73-81.
- [13] Eysenck, H. J. (1976). *Sex and personality*. London: Open Books
- [14] Feeney, J. A. (2004). Hurt feelings in couple relationships: Towards integrative models of the negative effects of hurtful events. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, Pp 21
- [15] Forste, R., & Tanfer, K. (1996). Sexual exclusivity among dating, cohabiting, and married women. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, Pp 58, 33-47
- [16] Forste, R., & Tanfer, K. (1996). Sexual exclusivity among dating, cohabiting, and married women. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, Pp 58, 33-47
- [17] Fraley, R. C., & Shaver, P. R. (2000). Adult romantic attachment: Theoretical developments, emerging controversies, and unanswered questions. *Review of General Psychology*, Pp 4, 132-154
- [18] Glass Shirley and Wright Thomas (1985). Sex differences in type of extramarital involvement and marital dissatisfaction Vol 12 Issue 9, *Sex Roles*: Pp 50
- [19] Hansen, G. L. (1987). Extra-dyadic relations during courtship. *Journal of Sex Research*, Pp 23, 382-390
- [20] Heaphy, B., Donovan, C., & Weeks, J. (2004a). A different affair? Openness and nonmonogamy in same

- sex relationships. Explorations in infidelity and commitment Pp. 167-186
- [21] Heaphy, B., Yip, A. and Thompson, D. (2004b) Ageing in a non-heterosexual context *Ageing and Society*, 24, pp.881-902
- [22] Hertlein, K.M., Wetchler, J.L., & Piercy, F.P. (2005). Infidelity. *Journal of Couple & Relationship Therapy: Innovations in Clinical and Educational Interventions*, Pp 4: 2-3, 5-16
- [23] John, O. P., & Srivastava, S. (1999). 2nd ed The Big Five trait taxonomy: History, measurement, and theoretical perspective. *Handbook of personality: Theory and research*. Pp. 102–138
- [24] Liu, C. (2000). A theory of marital sexual life. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, Pp 62, 363-374
- [25] Prins, K. S., Buunk, B. P. & Vanyperen, N. W. (1993). Equity, normative disapproval and extramarital relationships. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, Vol 10 Issue 1, Pp 39-53
- [26] Ramgoolam Anju, (2015), Des Mauriciens amoureux du divorce [Online], Available at; <http://www.lexpress.mu/article/266992/mauriciens-amoureux-divorce> (Accessed on 18/08/2015)
- [27] Roscoe, B., Cavanaugh, L., & Kennedy, D. (1988). Dating infidelity: Behaviors reasons, and consequences, *Adolescence*, Pp 23, 35-43
- [28] Rusbult, C. E. (1980). Commitment and satisfaction in romantic associations: A test of the investment model. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, Pp 60, 53-78.
- [29] Shackelford, T.K., Buss, D.M., & Bennett, K. (2002). Forgiveness or breakup: Sex difference in response to a partner's infidelity. *Cognition and Emotion*, Pp 16, 299-307
- [30] Treas, J., & Giesen, D. (2000). Sexual infidelity among married and cohabiting Americans. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, Pp 62, 48-60.
- [31] Trobst, K. K., Wiggins, J. S., Costa, P. T., Jr., Herbst, J. H., McCrae, R. R., & Masters, H. L., III. (2000). Personality psychology and problem behaviors: HIV risk and the Five-Factor Model. *Journal of Personality*, Pp 68
- [32] Tsapelas, I., Fisher, H. E., & Aron, A. (2009). Romantic love in the United States and Japan. Manuscript in preparation. *Science*, Vol 7 Issue 6, Pp 364-245
- [33] Whitty, M.T. & Quigley, L. (2008). Emotional and sexual infidelity offline and in cyberspace. *Journal of Marital and Family Therapy*, Vol 34 Issue 4, Pp 461-468
- [34] Yarab, P. E., Sensibaugh, C. C., & Allgeier, E. (1998). More than just sex: Gender differences in the incidence of self-defined unfaithful behavior in heterosexual dating relationships. *Journal of Psychology & Human Sexuality*, Vol 10 Issue 2, Pp45-57.
- [35] Young, K. S. (1998). *Caught in the Net: How to recognize the signs of Internet addiction and a winning strategy for recovery*. New York, NY: John Wiley & Sons, Inc
- [36] Young, K. S. (1999) *The Evaluation and treatment of Internet addiction A Source Book* (Vol. 17 Sarasota, FL: Professional Resource Press Pp. 1-13