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Romantic partnerships provide an opportunity for emotional and sexual fulfillment. However, having all needs fulfilled by one person can be challenging. Consensual non-monogamy (CNM) describes relationship structures where relational needs are dispersed among multiple partners, potentially decreasing pressures placed on a primary relationship. The current research investigated how self-determined sexual motives were differentially associated with sexual need satisfaction and relational outcomes in CNM and monogamous relationships. In Study One, 348 individuals from Amazon’s Mechanical Turk completed a cross-sectional survey. CNM and monogamous participants reported similar reasons for engaging in sex, though CNM participants were significantly more likely to have sex for personal intrinsic motives. No differences in mean levels of relationship and sexual satisfaction were found between CNM and monogamous individuals. Participants who engaged in sex for more self-determined reasons reported higher relational and sexual satisfaction and this relationship was mediated by sexual need fulfillment. In Study Two, 56 CNM dyads were recruited online to complete a survey on their sexual motives, need fulfillment, and relational outcomes for both a live-in partner and one additional partner. Overall, participants engaged in sex with both partners primarily for intrinsic reasons (e.g., pleasure), but reported higher mean scores with partner two for reasons such as physical intimacy and power dynamics. Structural equation modeling, guided by the actor-partner
interdependence model, indicated that when individuals engaged in sex with their first partner for self-determined reasons (e.g., valuing sex), the sexual interaction was associated with meeting their own psychological needs and was thus positively related to their own relational outcomes (i.e., an actor effect), and their first partner’s relational outcomes (i.e., a partner effect). Further, having sex for self-determined reasons with a second partner, and feeling more fulfilled with a second partner, was associated with lower sexual satisfaction of the first partner. This research extends theoretical understandings of motivation within CNM relationships and highlights the importance of sexual need fulfillment in relationship wellbeing.
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Chapter 1: Introduction

Romantic partnerships are central to psychological wellbeing and provide an opportunity for emotional intimacy, sexual fulfillment, and personal growth (Finkel, Hui, Carswell, & Larson, 2014; Patrick, Knee, Canevello, & Lonsberry, 2007). However, maintaining a satisfying sexual and romantic connection with a long-term partner is challenging, with couples reporting declines in relationship and sexual satisfaction over time (McNulty, Wenner, & Fisher, 2016). Throughout western history, people have structured their romantic and sexual relationships in a variety of ways to maximize social, economic, and relational benefits. Historically, monogamy has been considered normative in western narratives of romantic partnerships, and desired by many individuals and couples (Dindia & Emmers-Sommer, 2006; Impett, Muise, & Peragine, 2014; Finkel et al., 2014). Currently, individuals expect more from their partners than at any time in our recent past (e.g., love, sexual excitement, social, and financial support). These high expectations may place undue pressure and stress on romantic partnerships and make it difficult for each person to have their needs fulfilled (Finkel et al., 2014). Indeed, in Canada, approximately 40% of marriages end in divorce (Kelly, 2012), and high rates of infidelity among ostensibly monogamous relationships (e.g., 20%-40%, Tsapelas, Fisher, & Aron, 2010) indicate that many couples experience significant relational distress. Divorce is associated with poor health and well-being (Amato, 2000), and marital infidelity is linked with negative psychological outcomes, family break ups, and decreased emotional wellbeing for both partners (Lehmiller, 2009). It is therefore essential to examine ways in which romantic partners can create satisfying and fulfilling romantic and sexual relationships.
In response to these relational challenges, some individuals choose to seek additional relationships outside of a monogamous partnership, often referred to as consensual non-monogamy (CNM), to fulfill their diverse needs. Consensual non-monogamy is an umbrella term used to describe relationships in which all partners have agreed to engage in extra-dyadic (or multiple) sexual and/or romantic relationships (Barker & Landridge, 2010; Conley, Moors, Matsick, & Ziegler, 2012). Although individuals who participate in CNM indicate that their relationships include a broad range of structures, philosophies, boundaries, and identities, the most common forms of CNM described in the academic literature include open, swinging, and polyamorous relationships (Barker & Landridge, 2010; Conley, Zielger et al., 2013). Open relationships primarily involve agreements in which established partners have consented to some form of extra-dyadic sex (whether together or separately) (LaSala, 2004; Rubel & Bogaert, 2014). Polyamory is often described as the involvement (or potential involvement) in multiple romantic and/or sexual relationships, while swinging is frequently defined as retaining the emotional commitment to one’s primary partner but engaging in sexual behaviour with additional partners, often within the same social environment (e.g., at a swinging club/party) (Barker & Landridge, 2010; Conley, Zielger et al., 2013; Jenks, 1998; Rubel & Bogaert, 2014; Taormino, 2008). Often, both or all partners in a CNM relationship may engage in extra-dyadic relationships, though it is not necessary for both/all partners to have additional sexual and romantic activity for the relationship to be considered CNM. In the study of romantic relationships, monogamous partnerships are those in which individuals have articulated, or assumed, sexual and emotional fidelity. However, researchers often distinguish between monogamous relationships in which partners have engaged in nonconsensual sexual/emotional relationships outside of their partnership (i.e., “infidelity”) and those which have not (e.g., Tsapelas, Fisher, & Aron, 2010).
There has been rising popular and academic interest in CNM, with research indicating that approximately 3-7% of individuals in North America report currently participating in CNM (Conley, Ziegler, et al., 2013; Haupert, Moors, Gesselmen, & Garcia, 2017; Seguin, et al., 2017) and nationally representative samples suggest that approximately 21% of American singles have been involved in a CNM relationship at some point in their lives (Haupert et al., 2016). General interest in CNM has also been growing; Google search queries about open relationships and polyamory increased significantly between 2006 and 2015 (Moors, 2016). This rising interest is further reflected in the increasing number of self-help books on the topic of open relationships and television shows portraying the lives of individuals who engage in CNM (e.g., Married and Dating, 2012; Veaux, 2014,). Additionally, the academic study of CNM has flourished in the past 10 years to incorporate literature on CNM and the law (e.g., Calder, 2013), sexual health (e.g., Conley, Moors, Ziegler, & Karathanasis, 2012), and relationship therapy (e.g., Brandon, 2011), among others.

Despite increased attention to CNM, there continues to be frequent negative media portrayals of CNM relationships as psychologically damaging and inherently less healthy, stable, and satisfying than monogamous partnerships (Conley et al., 2012; Conley, Ziegler, et al., 2013). Research indicates that there is a stigmatizing effect on CNM relationships, where they are viewed as less satisfying, loving, respectful, and acceptable than monogamous partnerships (Conley et al., 2012; Séguin, 2017). Further, CNM partners may experience stigmatization within their social networks (e.g., withdraw of family support; Taormino, 2008). In addition to the increased risk mental health risks experienced by stigmatized groups (Major & O’Brien, 2005), those in CNM relationships face legal and structural barriers that may prevent some individuals from engaging in relationships in a way that feels authentic and fulfilling (e.g., being able to
legally marry more than one partner). Such factors may influence whether CNM persons are openly able to elicit social support for interpersonal and individual difficulties, potentially affecting their relational wellbeing. Nonetheless, growing evidence suggests that CNM partnerships possess positive qualities of happiness and stability, and are a viable and fulfilling alternative to monogamy for some individuals (Conley, Mastick, Moors, & Ziegler, 2017; de Visser, & McDonald, 2007; Mitchell, Bartholemew & Cobb, 2014; Moors, Conley, Edelstein, & Chopik, 2014; Wosick, 2012).

While many studies have examined how people in monogamous relationships fulfill needs and maintain commitment (e.g., LaGuardia & Patrick, 2008; Rusbult & Buunk, 1993), little research has addressed specific mechanisms that impact need fulfillment and relational outcomes, and how this may be similar or different depending upon one’s relationship structure (i.e., CNM versus monogamous relationships). CNM relationships provide a unique opportunity to examine need fulfillment and relational outcomes, as sexual and emotional needs are often met outside of a primary relationship (i.e., in contrast to relationships where sexual and emotional fidelity are cornerstones of the partnership). Need fulfillment that is dispersed among several partners may alleviate some of the pressures faced by individuals in modern committed relationships (Conley & Moors, 2014; Mitchell, Bartholomew, & Cobb, 2014; Moors, Matsick, & Schechinger, 2017). Studying the factors that impact need satisfaction and relational qualities among people in diverse relationship structures allows us to examine whether models of need fulfillment work similarly for people in CNM and monogamous relationships and determine the generalization of need fulfillment theories to different relational structures.

Researchers have identified several factors that impact relationship satisfaction among monogamous partnerships (Berscheid & Reis, 1998). One factor that has received increasing
attention in the romantic relationships and sexuality literature is sexual motivation (Hatfield, Luckhurst & Rapson, 2010; Impett, Strachman, Finkel & Gable, 2008; LaGuardia & Patrick, 2008; Muise, Impett, & Desmarais, 2013; Muise, Impett, Kogan, & Desmarais, 2012; Smith, 2007; Stephenson, Ahrold, & Meston, 2011; Vrangalova, 2014). Research suggests that one’s reasons for engaging in sex can impact both relationship satisfaction and sexual satisfaction (Brunell & Webster, 2013; Muise, Impett, & Desmarais, 2013; Smith, 2007; Stephenson, Ahrold, & Meston, 2011). Self Determination Theory (SDT), a theory that emphasizes the importance of innate psychological needs to relational wellbeing, and distinguishes between motivations that are autonomous and controlled (Deci & Ryan, 2000, 2012; Ryan & Deci, 2000b), may provide a useful perspective for how one’s motives for engaging in sexual activity with a partner(s) are linked to need fulfillment and relational outcomes for both CNM and monogamous individuals. In SDT, relational and sexual motives which reflect the fulfillment of basic psychological needs are proposed to result in greater feelings of individual and couple satisfaction (Brunell & Webster, 2013). Conversely, reasons that reflect pressured or non-autonomous situations would negatively impact couple relationships.

Despite scholars’ insistence on the importance of motivation and its role in enhancing relational wellbeing, these variables have rarely been examined outside of heterosexual, monogamous relationships (Barker, 2007; Conley et al., 2012). Additionally, the study of CNM has frequently been confined to gender and sexualities studies, with limited research conducted in psychology (Brewster et al., 2017). Social psychological researchers studying romantic relationships have often utilized samples of college-aged, heterosexual men and women, and subsequent theories of relationship satisfaction have been developed with this population as a reference point. To expand upon the voices represented within psychological research and
examine the utility of applying social psychological theories of romantic relationships (such as SDT) to additional relationship structures and experiences, it is important to study the relational wellbeing of individuals whose experiences are not solely heterosexual and monogamous. Therefore, the goal of the current research was to examine the association between sexual motivation, need fulfillment, and relationship and sexual satisfaction among CNM and monogamous individuals and a sample of CNM partners. The first chapter of this dissertation presents the guiding theoretical background for the research. Following this, I present a review of the sexual motivation literature as it pertains to monogamous and CNM relationships. Additional factors that have been identified as impacting relationship and sexual satisfaction are then examined and the theoretical model guiding the research is summarized. Chapter Two describes a detailed cross-sectional study examining the links between sexual motivation, need fulfillment, and relationship and sexual satisfaction among a sample of CNM and monogamous individuals. Chapter Three presents a second study examining these factors using dyadic reports from CNM partners. The dissertation concludes with an overall discussion that ties the two studies together and provides an empirical context for the findings.

Self-Determination Theory

Self Determination Theory (SDT) has been studied in a variety of contexts related to social relationships (Deci & Ryan, 2000, 2012; Knee, Hadden, Porter, & Rodriguez, 2013; Ryan & Deci, 2000a) and researchers have recently begun to apply this theoretical framework to the study of sexual motivation (Brunell & Webster, 2013; Vrangalova, 2014). SDT emphasizes the importance of innate psychological needs in the role of wellbeing and distinguishes between motivations that are autonomous and controlled (Deci & Ryan, 2000, 2012; Ryan & Deci, 2000a). According to SDT, individuals have an inherent tendency to develop a unified sense of
self by balancing three psychological needs: competence, autonomy, and relatedness (Deci & Ryan, 2000; Ryan & Deci, 2000a; 2002) (See Figure 1.1). Competence refers to the feelings of confidence and efficacy one has regarding their ability to perform, maintain, and enhance their skills (Ryan & Deci, 2002). It involves feeling a sense of mastery over one’s experiences and activities (Ryan & Deci, 2000a; White, 1959). Autonomy is the perception that one has agency over his/her/their own actions and authentically endorses his/her/their behaviours (La Guardia & Patrick, 2008; Deci & Ryan, 2012). Individuals perceive their behaviours as stemming from their “true self”, rather than being coerced or forced into behaviour due to external factors (Knee et al., 2013; Ryan & Deci, 2002; Smith, 2007). Finally, relatedness refers to the desire to connect and be close to, or understood by, other individuals and one’s community (Ryan & Deci, 2000a; 2002). SDT proposes that social context can act to enhance the satisfaction of these needs, and thus support psychological fulfillment and wellbeing. Social context can also be antagonistic toward need fulfillment (Ryan & Deci, 2000a). For example, partner behaviours that are considered supportive of psychological need fulfillment (such as actively attempting to understand a partner’s perspective/preferences, conveying that the partner/relationship is significant, providing clear expectations etc.), are related to positive personal and interpersonal relational outcomes (LaGuardia & Patrick, 2008). Conversely, the presence of excessively controlling behaviours and the unreasonable expectations of a relational partner are related to negative personal and interpersonal outcomes (Deci & Ryan, 2012; LaGuardia & Patrick, 2008;).
Researchers utilizing SDT have identified different types of motivations that represent the continuum of self-determination (see Figure 1.2) (Deci & Ryan, 2000; 2012; Knee et al., 2013; Vrangalova, 2014). At one end of the continuum are motivations that reflect self-determined goals that are often driven by a person’s own values or interests. This includes intrinsic motivations and two types of extrinsic motivations (integrated and identified). Intrinsically motivated behaviours are “the prototype of self-determined activities” (Deci & Ryan, 2000, pp.234). That is, they are the behaviours that people will engage in naturally and enjoy experiencing. An individual may engage in an activity because the activity itself is pleasurable or because they feel it is an important experience (Brunell & Webster, 2013; Deci & Ryan 2000; Jenkins, 2004). Regarding sexual motivation, a person may be intrinsically motivated to engage in sex at a personal or a relational level (Brunell & Webster, 2013). For example, they may have sex because they personally believe that sex itself is a pleasurable or interesting activity (personal intrinsic motivation) and/or because the intimacy of sex is fun and enjoyable (relational intrinsic motivation).
SDT proposes that individuals attempt to integrate their experiences and internalize external requests and social stimuli. That is, people “attempt to transform socially sanctioned mores or requests into personally endorsed values and self-regulations” (Deci & Ryan, 2000, pp. 236). The extent to which these requests are internalized (i.e., how integrated the social mores are with the person’s sense of self) will impact the level of perceived self-determined behaviour. Two levels of internalization are expected to result in more self-determined goals: 1) identified regulation, and 2) integrated regulation. Identified regulation involves intentionally examining the external regulation and accepting it as personally important or endorsing it. For example, a person with low sexual desire may still engage in sex with a partner because they believe that frequent sexual activity will bring them closer and is important to their relationship (Brunell & Webster, 2013; Jenkins 2004). Integrated regulation occurs when the external regulation fully aligns with one’s values and concept of the self (Deci & Ryan, 2000, Ryan & Deci, 2000b). For example, a person may engage in sex because they see sex as an important part of who they are, or as a part of their personal identity (Brunell & Webster, 2013). It is conceptually like intrinsic motivation in that it is both volitional and valued by the self (Ryan & Deci, 2000b). However, it is considered extrinsic, as the person is attempting to achieve specific important outcomes, rather than doing the activity for the inherent pleasure in the task or the process of the task.

At the other end of the self-determination spectrum are motivations that are less reflective of self-determined goals and are often driven by external rewards/punishments or to avoid feelings of guilt and shame (Ryan & Deci, 2002). Two types of regulations fall into this category: 1) external regulation, and 2) introjection. External regulation involves engaging in behaviour to receive tangible rewards (Deci & Ryan, 2000). It has been studied extensively in the motivation literature and is considered the least autonomous form of extrinsic motivation (Deci & Ryan
Introjection occurs when the stimuli or request is partially internalized but is not integrated with the self (Deci & Ryan, 2000; Ryan & Deci, 2002). Self-determination theorists describe these behaviours as stemming from a desire to control feelings of pride, guilt and/or shame (Deci & Ryan, 2000, 2012; Ryan & Deci, 2002). For example, a person motivated by introjected regulation may engage in sex because they feel guilty withholding sex from their partner, or to boost their self-confidence and make themselves feel more desirable.

In addition to a range of self-determined goals which are reflective of intentional behaviours, SDT proposes a state of amotivation. Amotivation refers to unintentional behaviours whereby a person is forced or coerced into performing a behaviour that they did not wish to engage in (e.g., being coerced into sexual interactions), or engages in a behaviour without self-involvement (e.g., going through the motions of sex with no idea of why; Knee, Hadden, Porter, & Rodriguez, 2013). This is relevant to the study of romantic relationships as amotivated sexual behaviours within relationships have been reported by individuals in the sexuality literature and are negatively associated with scores on measures of relationship satisfaction, and sexual functioning (Katz & Myhr, 2008).

**Basic Needs Theory**

SDT is comprised of five mini-theories that address various aspects of motivation, cognitive evaluation and outcomes related to wellbeing (Deci & Ryan, 2012). The theory most relevant to the current research, basic needs theory, posits that psychological and relational wellbeing requires the fulfillment or satisfaction of all three inherent needs (i.e., the need for autonomy, relatedness, competence) (see Figure 1.3). According to basic needs theory, it is not only the level of self-determined motivation that impacts psychological and relational outcomes, but also the extent to which the individual feels that their needs are satisfied that mediates this
relationship. These needs are thought to be universal; however, the way in which they are satisfied or thwarted will function as a means of the sociocultural context (Deci & Ryan, 2012; Ryan & Deci, 2000a). Research examining SDT supports this notion and has demonstrated a link between need fulfillment and relational outcomes (Brunell & Webster, 2013; Patrick, Knee, Canevello, & Lonsberry, 2007; Sheldon, Ryan & Reis, 1996; Smith, 2007). For example, higher levels of need satisfaction were related to increased sexual satisfaction among a sample of monogamous undergraduate students (Smith, 2007). More recent research identified that need satisfaction mediated the relationship between reported levels of self-determined sexual motivation and psychological well-being in heterosexual couples (Brunell & Webster, 2013).

Although SDT has been examined extensively in the realms of education, job performance and relationships, thus far, there are few studies have applied SDT to the analysis of sexual behaviour (Brunell & Webster, 2013; Jenkins, 2004; Smith, 2007; Vrangalova, 2014). Discussed in greater detail in the section below, these studies indicate that self-determined sexual motivations are associated with higher levels of relational well-being among people in romantic relationships (Brunell & Webster, 2013; Smith, 2007).
Figure 1.2. Motivation and self-determination (Deci & Ryan, 2000; 2012).
Research on sexual motivation has identified that people engage in sex for a variety of psychosocial and physiological reasons (Browning, Hatfield, Kessler, & Levine, 2000; Cooper, Barber, Zhaoyang, & Talley, 2011; Hatfield, Luckhurst, & Rapson, 2010; Hill & Preston, 1996; Meston & Buss, 2007; Meston, Hamilton, & Hart, 2009; Stephenson, Arhold, & Meston, 2011). Early work in this field emphasized pleasure, relief from sexual tension, and reproduction as the primary reasons for engaging in sex, with later research broadening its focus to include psychosocial reasons, such as having sex to please one’s partner, or to express love/commitment (Browning et al., 2000; Carroll, Volk, & Hyde, 1985; Hill & Preston, 1996; Impett, & Peplau, 2002; Kaplan, 1977; Leigh, 1989; Masters & Johnson, 1966). For example, in their study of 1549 undergraduate students, Meston and Buss (2007) identified 237 distinct reasons that individuals reported for engaging in sex. From this, they created the YSEX questionnaire, comprised of four factors and 13 subfactors: 1) physical reasons (stress reduction, pleasure, physical desirability, experience seeking), 2) goal attainment (resources, social status, revenge, utilitarian), 3)
emotional reasons (love & commitment, expression) and 4) insecurity (self-esteem boost, duty/pressure, mate guarding). The most frequently reported reasons for engaging in sex included reasons related to pleasure, attraction, feeling desired, seeking new experiences, and expressing love for their partner. The least frequently cited reasons for engaging in sex included harming another person, reasons related to revenge, attaining resources or improving social status, or because participants felt a sense of duty/pressure to engage in sex (Meston & Buss, 2007).

Subsequent research with the YSEX measure has found similar patterns of endorsement among older and more diverse samples, using a broader, more inclusive definition of sex (i.e., not solely sexual intercourse) (Meston et al., 2009; Wood, Milhausen, & Jeffrey, 2014). These results indicate that individuals report a variety of reasons for why they engage in sexual behaviour, ranging from pleasure and love, to desire and revenge.

Recently, researchers have begun examining the link between sexual motivation and relational outcomes, such as relationship satisfaction and sexual satisfaction (Brunell & Webster, 2013; Cooper et al., 2011; Muise, Impett, & Desmarais, 2013; Stephenson, Arhold, & Meston, 2011). Within social psychological theories of romantic relationships, relationship satisfaction (i.e., positive feelings about the relationship) is considered an important component of relationship stability (Berscheid & Reis, 1998; Rusbult & Buunk, 1993). Frequently, researchers have found an association between relationship and sexual satisfaction; however, the two variables have been identified as distinct concepts and experiences (Apt, Hurlbert, Pierce, & White, 1996; Byers, 2005; Byers & Rehman, 2014; Haavio-Mannila & Kontula, 1997; Lawrance & Byers, 1992; 1995; Schwartz & Young, 2009). Sexual satisfaction has been defined as “an affective response arising from one’s subjective evaluation of the positive and negative dimensions associated with one’s sexual relationship” (Lawrence & Byers, 1995, p. 268). It is
positively related to relationship satisfaction and is strongly predictive of relationship stability, quality of life and overall life satisfaction (Apt et al., 1996; Byers & Rehman, 2014; Christopher & Sprecher, 2000).

SDT proposes that motivations, which are autonomous and reflect the fulfillment of basic psychological needs, result in greater feelings of relational satisfaction (LaGuardia & Patrick, 2008). Studies examining sexual motivation and relationship satisfaction support this notion among monogamous individuals and couples (Brunell & Webster, 2013; Smith, 2007; Stephenson, Arhold, & Meston, 2011). Thus far, only two published studies have examined relationship or sexual satisfaction using concepts from SDT (Brunell & Webster, 2013; Smith, 2007). In the first, 164 psychology majors completed a three-week study examining the quality of their sexual interactions and levels of relational satisfaction (Smith, 2007). Although the link between sexual motives and relationship/sexual satisfaction was not explicitly tested, participants reported on how they felt both during and after the sexual interaction on several dimensions (e.g., capable, desirable, in control, competent, choiceful, pressured, loved, respected etc.). The researcher then created a composite measure that reflected the three basic psychological needs proposed in SDT (autonomy, competence and relatedness), and examined how these variables related to feelings of satisfaction, regret, guilt, contentment etc., following the sexual interaction. All three composites significantly predicted higher levels of relationship and sexual satisfaction, with each need uniquely related to these outcomes. Autonomy was the strongest predictor, followed by relatedness and competence- indicating that when a person feels they have control over their sexual interactions, feels connected during their sexual experience, and feels capable regarding their skill and ability, they are more likely to report the interaction and relationship as positive and satisfying.
Similar results were identified in a series of cross sectional and daily diary studies (Brunell & Webster, 2013). In contrast to Smith’s (2007) research, these studies directly tested the relationship between self-determined sexual motives, sexual need satisfaction (i.e., how well the needs for autonomy, competence, and relatedness are satisfied through sexual activity) and relational quality with samples of undergraduate students. In accordance with SDT propositions, more self-determined motivations (e.g., intrinsic motivations) were positively related to sexual need satisfaction, which was significantly associated with relational quality. These findings were replicated in subsequent daily diary studies with individuals and monogamous couples: in both studies, self-determined motivations were either positively directly linked to relational quality or mediated by sexual need fulfillment (Brunell & Webster, 2013). A partner effect of motivation on relational quality was also identified: men’s self-determined motivation was positively associated with women’s relational quality and women’s self-determined motivation was positively associated with men’s sexual need satisfaction. These results suggest that one’s sexual motives are important to both need fulfillment and to the enhancement of one’s romantic relationship. The findings highlight how one’s motivations can further impact relationship satisfaction through partner effects and demonstrates the utility of applying SDT to sexuality and relational variables.

Individual and partner effects of motivation on relational quality have also been articulated in the approach-avoidance motivational literature. Dyadic studies of sexual motivation indicate that when participants reported engaging in sex for approach motives (i.e., motives that direct a person toward positive outcomes such as intimacy or relationship growth), they experienced more relationship satisfaction, closeness with their partner and less conflict within their relationship (Impett, Peplau, & Gable, 2005). Conversely, when participants reported engaging in sex for avoidance goals (i.e., motives that direct a person away from negative
outcomes such as rejection or relationship conflict), they experienced less relational and sexual satisfaction. Daily diary studies have shown that on days when a participant engaged in sex for avoidance goals, their partner reported lower levels of satisfaction. One study described evidence of a cumulative impact of avoidance goals on heterosexual couples’ relational outcomes over the course of four months (Muise, Impett, & Desmarais, 2013). Though participants reported daily increases in their sexual satisfaction compared to when they did not engage in sex at all, having sex more frequently for avoidance-related goals predicted lower levels of sexual satisfaction and relationship commitment at a four month follow up.

An association between sexual motives and sexual satisfaction has also been identified using statistically driven measures of sexual motives (i.e., an atheoretical approach) (Stephenson, Arhold, & Meston, 2011). In one cross-sectional study, a sample of 544 undergraduate men and women completed a survey on sexual satisfaction and reasons for sex, as measured by the YSEX? questionnaire (Stephenson, Arhold, & Meston, 2011). Love and commitment motives positively predicted sexual satisfaction, whereas self-esteem and resources motives were negatively related to sexual satisfaction.

Motivation, Relationship Satisfaction and Sexual Satisfaction in CNM Relationships

Although research on sexual motivation is steadily growing, it has been limited primarily to samples of young, heterosexual individuals and monogamous couples (e.g., Brunell & Webster, 2013; Gable & Impett, 2012). A few studies have examined sexual motivation among samples of older monogamous men and women (e.g., Muise, Impett, & Desmarais, 2013) or have produced descriptive examinations of the sexual motivations of lesbian, bisexual, queer, and questioning women (Armstrong & Reissing, 2014; 2015; Ronson, Milhausen, & Wood, 2012; Wood, Milhausen, & Jeffrey, 2014). Additional research has examined motivations for oral sex
among young adults (Vannier & O’Sullivan, 2012), and the relationship between casual sex motives and psychological wellbeing (Vrangalova, 2014). However, no study to date has examined the association between sexual motivations and relationship and sexual satisfaction among individuals or partners in CNM relationships. While there are no studies directly addressing sexual motivations among CNM individuals, researchers have begun to investigate levels of relational quality among couples and individuals in open, swinging, and polyamorous relationships (e.g., Bergstrand & Williams, 2000; Parsons, Starks, Gamarel, & Grov, 2012; Séguin et al., 2016). Such research provides a contrast to narratives that position CNM individuals as less fulfilled or happy compared to their monogamous counterparts. Additionally, research emphasizing the motivations for engaging in various forms of CNM suggests that sexual motivation in CNM relationships may be considered from a SD theoretical perspective.

**Relationship and Sexual Satisfaction**

In contrast to ideas of CNM relationships as inherently unsatisfying, there is a growing body of research which indicates that CNM individuals report high levels of relational wellbeing. Early work examining relationship satisfaction among men and women in swinging partnerships identified high levels of reported relationship satisfaction and happiness (e.g., Gilmartin, 1974; Jenks, 1986, as cited in Jenks 1998; Levitt, 1988; Varni, 1974). Later research produced similar findings: for instance, a national online survey in the United States compared the political, sexual and social attitudes of self-identified swingers to a sample of married couples from the general population (Bergstrand & Williams, 2000). Swingers reported high levels of both marital satisfaction and marital happiness, and their levels of happiness and satisfaction were significantly higher than couples in the general population. In addition, 62.6% of swingers indicated that swinging had improved their relationship, 35.6% reported that their relationship
stayed the same and only 1.7% said their relationship became less happy after they began their swinging activities. High levels of sexual and relationship satisfaction have been noted in more recent studies with men and women in swinging relationships (e.g., Fernandes & Wood, 2014; Fernandes, Wood, & Schechinger, 2014).

Research on relationship satisfaction amongst men in same-gender open relationships indicates that men in CNM partnerships often rate their satisfaction similarly to male couples in monogamous relationships (LaSala, 2004; Parsons, et al., 2012; Wagner, Remien, & Carbello-Dieguez, 2000). For example, the relationship quality of monogamous and sexually non-monogamous gay couples was compared, using an online nation-wide American survey (LaSala, 2004). Relationship satisfaction was measured via the Dyadic Adjustment Scale, a validated measure of relationship quality that examines affectational expression (satisfaction with sex and affection), dyadic consensus (agreement on important relationship matters), dyadic cohesion (common interests), and dyadic satisfaction (tension, conflict etc.). No significant differences were found on any of these subscales when comparing men in open relationships to men in monogamous relationships, apart from dyadic satisfaction: Monogamous couples scored significantly lower on dyadic satisfaction compared to open couples. However, when monogamous couples who had broken their relationship agreements (i.e., those who had engaged in infidelity), were removed from the analysis, this difference was no longer significant. This suggests that gay men in monogamous relationships experience similar levels of satisfaction as men in open relationships, insofar as each member of the couple is adhering to the agreed upon boundaries of the relationship. Further research on men in same-gender partnerships supports this notion (Parsons et al., 2012). Relationship agreement was classified into one of four relationship categories: monogamous (if both members of the couple indicated this), open (having one or both
partners consensually engage in sex outside of the relationship), monogamish (one or both having sex outside of the relationship together, such as a having a threesome together with another person), and discrepant (each member of the couple indicating a different relational agreement).

A sample of 162 couples reported their levels of sexual satisfaction, sexual communication, sexual jealousy, and weekly sexual activity with their primary partner. Relationship agreement was not significantly associated with sexual satisfaction, communication or frequency of partnered sexual activity. That is, men in open, monogamish, discrepant, and monogamous relationships reported similar levels of sexual relational quality, except for monogamous couples who indicated higher levels of sexual jealousy compared with all other groups.

A recent study examined measures of relational adjustment among a sample of 1507 monogamous and 617 individuals in CNM relationships (i.e., polyamorous, swinging and open relationships; Conley et al., 2017). Overall, CNM and monogamous participants reported similar scores on measures of global satisfaction, commitment, and passionate love. However, CNM individuals reported greater levels of trust in their relationships and lower levels of jealousy than monogamists. Further, CNM participants reported more satisfaction, trust, commitment, and passionate love with their primary partners compared to a second partnership. Online studies comparing CNM and monogamous individuals have also demonstrated that people in monogamous relationships report slightly lower levels of sexual satisfaction and orgasm rates (Conley, Piemonte, Gusakova, & Rubin, 2018).

Few studies have directly examined indices of relational quality among polyamorous individuals, however those that have included polyamorous participants report high levels of relational satisfaction (Mitchell, Bartholomew, & Cobb, 2014; Morrison, Beaulieu, Brockman, & O’Beaglaoich, 2011; Séguin et al., 2016). One study of over 1000 polyamorous participants from
English-speaking Western countries indicated that scores on satisfaction for two partners were high, though satisfaction with a primary partnership was slightly higher than satisfaction for an additional partner (Mitchell, Bartholomew, & Cobb, 2014). In another study, 284 participants were asked to complete a measure of intimacy that focused on closeness with “others” (i.e., a general measure), and measures of trust and passionate love that focused on a single individual (i.e., a primary partner) (Morrison et al., 2013). Similar levels of passionate love and trust were identified amongst polyamorous and monoamorous women. However, polyamorous women reported significantly greater intimacy compared to the monoamorous participants. Comparable results were identified for men; polyamorous men reported significantly greater levels of intimacy compared to monoamorous men, and similar levels of trust and passionate love.

Similarly, a national survey of 3463 Canadians suggests that people in polyamorous and open relationships report high scores on measures of relational and sexual satisfaction, closeness, trust, commitment, and levels of satisfaction within their current relationships (Séguin et al., 2016). Further, no significant differences were found on these measures between participants who were polyamorous, in an open relationship or in a monogamous partnership.

Motivations for Engaging in CNM Relationships

Research examining participants’ motives for engaging in CNM highlight a range of reasons reflective of the continuum of SD motivations (i.e., intrinsic, externally regulated, etc.). A review of the early swinging literature notes that one of the primary reasons men and women reported for engaging in swinging involved sexual variety (26% of participants), followed by pleasure/excitement (19%), and to meet new people (13%) (i.e., personal and relational intrinsic motivations; Jenks, 1998). Further research on motivations for engaging in swinging parallel and extend these findings (Fernandes, Wood, & Schechinger, 2014). An online survey of 1650 self-
identified swingers demonstrated that the most frequently cited reasons for engaging in swinging were reflective of autonomous reasons: fulfilling sexual fantasies, fun/excitement, enhancing one’s emotional or sexual connection with their primary partner, personal growth, and meeting new people socially. Engaging in swinging for the fun, excitement or sheer enjoyment of sex reflects the personal intrinsic motivations described by SDT. Engaging in swinging to enhance the primary relationship reflects a relational intrinsic motivation. Additionally, reasons reflecting controlled motivations were also endorsed, including engaging in swinging because “my partner wants me to” or to “make my partner happy”—which can be considered an introjected motivation according to SDT. Very few participants endorsed such reasons; however, engaging in swinging to make a partner happy was associated with a decrease in satisfaction among participants. Although this is similar to research findings with monogamous couples (i.e., controlled motives are related to decreased levels of satisfaction), it is possible that this would look different among a broader sample of CNM couples. For example, some individuals in CNM relationships report feelings of “compersion” in relation to their partner’s extradyadic sexual experiences (Ritchie & Barker, 2006). Compersion refers to positive feelings associated with a partner’s interest in another person and is considered the opposite of jealousy. It is possible that when a person experiences compersion, motives to engage in sexual activities outside of the relationship, such as “to make my partner happy” may be considered as a relational intrinsic motive (e.g., enjoying partner’s happiness) rather than a controlled, introjected motivation (i.e., avoiding a conflict with a partner).

Similar results have been identified in qualitative research examining motivations for sexual relationship agreements among gay men (Hoff & Beougher, 2010). In their interviews, men reported a variety of reasons for engaging in open relationships, including several reasons
reflective of autonomy: trusting and loving each other, giving their relationships meaning, and sexual variety. Participants noted that engaging in these relationship agreements improved their relationships by bringing them closer sexually, increasing their sexual satisfaction and intimacy levels.

A recent cross-sectional, qualitative survey examining motivations for engaging in a CNM relationship determined that people engage in CNM for a range of reasons related to personal growth, philosophy and partner dynamics (DeSantis, Wood, Milhausen, & Desmarais, 2016). A sample of over 600 CNM individuals were asked to describe their reasons for engaging in their most recent CNM relationship and the following themes were identified: authenticity, growth and exploration, intimacy, sex, belief systems, identities, relationship maintenance, and pragmatic reasons. These findings map on to a SDT framework as they focus on reasons that are more autonomous (e.g., authenticity, independence) to less autonomous (e.g., because a partner wanted them to).

Aside from the first study of this dissertation which has now been published (see Wood, Desmarais, Burleigh, & Milhausen, 2018), only one other (unpublished) study has directly applied SD theoretical concepts to the examination of CNM relationships (Fernandes & Wood, 2014). As part of a larger survey, a sample of 3200 self-identified swingers were asked to complete a swinging satisfaction scale, comprised of three subscales (sexual freedom, emotional experience, and benefits to the relationship), and the Self Determination Scale, a measure that assesses the extent to which an individual functions in a self-determined way (comprised of two subscales: self-awareness and perceived choice) (Sheldon, Ryan & Reis, 1996). Levels of reported self-determination significantly predicted swinging satisfaction scores. That is, the extent to which participants were aware of their feelings and decisions, and felt they had a strong
sense of choice regarding their actions, positively related to how satisfied they were with their primary relationship and their swinging activities.

**Sexual Motivation and Relationship Structure**

Though research has begun to apply SDT to sexual relationships among monogamous individuals and couples (Brunell & Webster, 2013; Smith, 2007), little research has applied SDT principles to examine need fulfillment and relational outcomes among people who engage in CNM or compared these associations among individuals in CNM and monogamous relationships. There may be differences in the types of motives that people in CNM partnerships report, compared to monogamous individuals, that differentially impact relational outcomes. For example, monogamous individuals frequently report reasons for sex reflecting intrinsic values, such as to experience pleasure and increase intimacy (Muise, Impett, & Desmarais, 2013; Stephenson, Arhold & Meston, 2011; Wood, Milhausen, & Jeffrey, 2014). Given the role of sex and intimacy in CNM partnerships (e.g., Montenegro, 2010; Wosick-Corra, 2010) I would expect CNM individuals to also indicate these types of motives. However, sexual need fulfillment is particularly significant to CNM relationships as there is the opportunity for one’s sexual needs to be fulfilled across multiple partners, which may also impact relational outcomes (Conley, & Moors, 2014; Mitchell, Bartholomew, & Cobb, 2014; Moors, Matsick, & Schechinger, 2017). Research indicates that need fulfillment is a significant motivation to engage in CNM (DeSantis et al., 2016), and is recognized as a primary benefit to engaging in CNM relationships (Moors, Mastick, & Schechinger, 2017). Further, research has noted the importance of autonomy and personal growth in individuals’ reasons for engaging in CNM (DeSantis et al., 2016), and the perceived benefits of CNM (Moors, Mastick, & Schechinger, 2017). In such studies, participants expressed how having the choice to live their life authentically and in a way
that was congruent with their values, allowed them to grow as a person and be free from normative ideas about how relationships “should” be. Thus, one may expect mean level differences in the endorsement of self-determined motives related to these concepts (e.g., sex to express their own autonomy/values) between CNM individuals and monogamous individuals (with those in CNM relationships reporting higher levels than those in monogamous relationships).

The concept of autonomy and choice is central to need satisfaction in SDT (Deci & Ryan, 2000); a SDT perspective enables us to explore whether CNM and monogamous individuals report similar/different sexual motives, and whether motives affect sexual need fulfillment (i.e., autonomy, competence, relatedness) and relational outcomes differently depending on one’s relational orientation. It is possible that the links between sexual motives, sexual need fulfillment, and relational outcomes are stronger among CNM individuals, where need fulfillment is central to many types of relationship configurations (e.g., sexual need fulfillment in swinging and open partnerships, emotional and sexual need fulfillment in polyamory). However, SDT principles are proposed to operate similarly across a variety of social contexts, and relationships (Deci & Ryan, 2000; 2012). In all circumstances, more self-determined motives are thought to enhance need satisfaction, which, in turn, impacts relational outcomes positively. Thus, one might expect to see the primary tenets of SDT apply similarly to CNM relationships, especially in CNM relationships where there is a focus on a primary partnership (i.e., there is a significant commitment in emotions, time, energy, and resources with that specific partner).

A person in a CNM relationship may also report different motives for engaging in sex with a committed/primary partner versus an additional partner: intimacy motives may be more salient to sex with a long-term partner, whereas pleasure motives may be more relevant to an
additional or new partner. From an SDT perspective, these motives may impact need fulfillment (i.e., autonomy, competence, relatedness) differently. The context of these motives may also affect the relationship in different ways: if a person engages in sex with a primary partner to feel close to them, this may enhance their relationship; however, if they also engage in sex with another partner out of feelings of pressure or guilt (e.g., trying swinging because their partner wants them to), this may have a negative impact on their relationship(s).

Relatedly, differences in motivations may also be linked to differences in experiences of sexual and relationship satisfaction. Given stigma and popular culture’s reverence for monogamy, relationship and sexual satisfaction could be negatively impacted among CNM individuals. However, given the importance placed on need fulfillment in CNM relationships, it is possible that CNM individuals may experience high levels of relational satisfaction.

In summary, theory and research suggest that sexual motivations impact relationship and sexual satisfaction, and that these links may look similar among CNM and monogamous relationships. However, CNM relationships have differing norms regarding sexual fidelity, and individuals in these relationships may have different motives related to sexual activities with a variety of partners (LaSala, 2010; Montenegro, 2010; Wosick, 2012). Thus, research with a large sample of CNM and monogamous individuals could help bring some clarity to how people in different relational structures experience relationship and sexual satisfaction. Further, research examining these associations among a sample of CNM partners would provide a unique opportunity to test theory-driven hypotheses of how motivations are associated with need fulfillment and satisfaction when sexual and emotional needs are met outside of a primary romantic partnership (e.g., how sexual motives and need fulfillment in an additional partnership
impacts satisfaction in a primary partnership)—predictions that are simply not possible to test solely in monogamous relationships.

**Additional Factors Related to Sexual Motivation, Sexual Satisfaction and Relationship Satisfaction**

The following factors have been identified in the literature as relating to sexual motivation and/or impacting the sexual and relational dynamics of partnered relationships. Although there is variability in the research as to the importance placed on these factors and the reasons why they relate to sexual and relationship satisfaction, it is necessary to consider these variables when examining models and frameworks of sexual motivation and satisfaction (see Figure 1.4 for the proposed theoretical model).

**Gender**

Researchers have documented a variety of gender differences and similarities in the reported sexual motives of men and women (Hill & Preston, 1996; Meston & Buss, 2007; Stephenson, Ahrold, & Meston, 2011). Frequently, both men and women report engaging in sex to experience pleasure, express love, or because they were attracted to their partner (Hill & Preston, 1996; Meston & Buss 2007; Stephenson, Ahrold, & Meston, 2011; Wood, Milhausen, & Maitland, 2013). In their initial study of reasons for sex among undergraduate students, Meston and Buss (2007) identified great similarities in the most frequent reasons for engaging in sex: 20 out of the 25 most frequently endorsed reasons were identical for both men and women. However, men were more likely to endorse having sex for physical reasons, to improve their social status, to improve their sexual experience, and for utilitarian reasons. Women showed significantly greater endorsement for only three reasons: “I wanted to feel feminine”, “I wanted to express my love for the person”, and “I realized that I was in love.” Similar results have been
documented in other studies using the YSEX? and additional measures of sexual motivation (Browning et al., 2000; Hill & Preston, 1996; Wood, Milhausen, & Maitland, 2013). For example, Stephenson, Ahrold, and Meston (2011) examined which sexual motives were predictive of satisfaction for both men and women. Six categories of the YSEX? measure significantly predicted sexual satisfaction in women (love/commitment, self-esteem, resources, expression, pleasure, experience-seeking), but only three categories were predictive of sexual satisfaction in men (love/commitment, self-esteem, resources). They suggested that sexual motives might be more closely linked to sexual satisfaction for women than for men, perhaps due to the cultural scripts and gender roles that situate women as the “gate-keeper” in heterosexual relationships.

It has been noted that the gender differences reported in the literature are often small (Hatfield, Luckhurst, & Rapson, 2010) and may reflect a difference in the degree of importance of these reasons rather than entirely different sexual motivations (Wood, Milhausen, & Maitland, 2013). Further, gender differences are often inconsistent and are occasionally in the direction opposite to those proposed (Hatfield, Luckhurst, & Rapson, 2010). Thus, to predict a person’s sexual motivations we need to also understand the sociocultural norms and relational context in which they are currently conducting their sexual interactions. This is particularly relevant to CNM relationships, as individuals with these relationship structures adhere to different sexual and relationship norms and often have a critical view of gender and gender roles (Barker & Langdridge, 2010; Gould, 1999; Sheff, 2005; Wosick-Correa, 2010). For example, Sheff (2005) interviewed 20 polyamorous women, on CNM, sexual subjectivity, and power. Expanded roles was a key motivator for some women to embark upon a change in their relationship structure. Women expressed discontent in the maintenance and conformation of binary gender roles. They
discussed the importance of engaging in relational styles (e.g., polyamory) that allowed them greater latitude with their gender expression and sexual expression, and conveyed a sense of liberation in breaking free from the traditional gender and relationship roles they had observed in their family of origin. This relates to sexual motivation as some women may feel more comfortable expressing their desire for sexual variety within CNM relationships structures and feel that they are able to openly explore their sexuality – which in turn, may impact their relational and sexual satisfaction (Barker, 2005; Sheff, 2005).

**Relationship Duration, Sexual Frequency and Age**

Relationship duration is incorporated into many theories of love and sexual desire (e.g., Fisher, 2004; Hatfield & Walster, 1978; Sprecher & Regan, 1998; Sternberg, 1986). According to Hatfield and Walster (1978), passionate love is characterized as a state of intense longing and is associated with sexual desire and attraction, while companionate love is referred to as feelings of affection and attachment one has for a committed partner. The researchers suggested that romantic relationships shift from passionate to companionate love when a couple has been in the relationship between six and thirty months. Passionate love scores are positively associated with measures of desire for physical and/or sexual intimacy and tend to decrease over the course of a relationship (Sprecher & Regan 1998). In a study of 197 heterosexual dating and married couples, passionate love scores were significantly related to sexual excitation, while companionate love scores were significantly related to sexual intimacy. The authors suggested that the motivation to engage in sex may be different depending on the type of love that is most salient to the relationship: passionate love may reflect desire-related reasons while companionate love may reflect partner-intimacy reasons (e.g., closeness, warmth). In a study examining reasons for sex within heterosexual romantic relationships, men and women who were in relationships for
less than three years were more likely to engage in sex for physical reasons (e.g., physical desirability, experience seeking) than men and women who had been in a relationship for a longer duration (Wood, Milhausen, & Maitland, 2013). However, contrasting results were identified in research examining sexual motivation among lesbian, bisexual, queer, and questioning women (Wood, Milhausen, & Jeffrey, 2014). Women in earlier stages of their relationship were just as likely as women in later stages of their relationship to report engaging in sex to experience pleasure, express love, be close to their partner, or out of a physical desire for their partner.

Research also demonstrates an association between relationship duration and the decline of sexual desire, particularly among women in long-term relationships (Carralheira, Brotto, & Leal, 2010; Klusman, 2002; Murray & Milhausen, 2012). In one study, undergraduate women’s sexual desire was negatively predicted by relationship duration (after controlling for age, relationship/sexual satisfaction), but the same relationship was not significant among men (Murray & Milhausen, 2012). Other research has either found similar results or suggests that desire will decrease in long-term relationships, regardless of gender (Levine, 2002; Sprecher & Regan, 1998).

Research on the link between sexual frequency and relationship and sexual satisfaction has produced mixed results, with some studies suggesting that sexual frequency does not impact satisfaction (Loewenstein, Krishnamurti, Kopsich, & McDonald, 2015) and others suggesting a positive relationship between sexual frequency and sexual satisfaction (Sánchez-Fuentes, Santos-Iglesias, & Sierra, 2014). That is, decreased sexual frequency is associated with lower scores on sexual satisfaction. Recent longitudinal research has demonstrated that more frequent sex offsets
declines in sexual satisfaction that occurs because of relationship duration (McNulty, Wenner, & Fisher, 2016).

Finally, there is evidence that age also impacts the reasons that individuals engage in sex (Meston, Hamilton, & Harte, 2009). While women across age groups report similar reasons for engaging in sex (pleasure, love and commitment), women aged 31-45 indicate more motives for engaging in sex compared to women in younger age groups.

Taken together, the above research indicates that relationship duration, sexual frequency and age may impact relational outcomes. Therefore, these variables were treated as control variables in the theoretical model used in this research (see Figure 1.4).

Figure 1.4. Proposed Theoretical Model of Self Determination and Sexual Motivation - Study 1.
Limitations of Past Research

Psychologists have developed rich theoretical foundations to understand sexual motivations and how they relate to relational and interpersonal wellbeing (e.g., Gable & Impett, 2012; Ryan & Deci, 2002). However, the field remains limited in that the representation of sexual and romantic experiences has been quite narrow. Often, studies focus on how sexual motivation impacts individuals in heterosexual monogamous relationships, with little attention paid to the sexual motivations of people in the LGB community or of people involved in different relationship structures, such as CNM relationships. This is noteworthy, as Berscheid (1994) argues that most relationship scholars “hope their efforts ultimately will result in a body of knowledge about the causal dynamics of relationships that will transcend relationship type” (p. 80).

Further, despite negative portrayals of CNM relationships and the stigmatization attached to engaging in CNM, little research has been conducted that directly evaluates the factors that impact relational outcomes of CNM relationships (Conley et al., 2012; Rubel & Bogaert, 2014). While some research exists that examines the relational quality in CNM relationships (e.g., Conley et al., 2017; Parsons et al., 2012; Séguin et al., 2016), the study of relationship factors in CNM partnerships remains an under-researched area. Much of the research examining relational wellbeing among swingers is dated, and there are few studies investigating relational satisfaction among individuals in mixed-gender polyamorous relationships (Conley et al., 2013; Rubel & Bogaert, 2014). Although some recent studies have included larger sample sizes (e.g., Conley et al., 2017; Moors et al., 2014), much of the research in the field has been conducted with small samples of convenience (Barker & Langdridge, 2010). In-depth, qualitative research has been key to documenting the experiences of individuals who engage in CNM, however the samples often
represent homogenous subsets of CNM communities (Rubel & Bogaert, 2014) and have been criticized for not adequately addressing intersecting identities such as gender, or ethnicity (Haritaworn, Lin, & Klesse, 2006; Rambukkana, 2010; Sheff & Hammers, 2011). Additionally, very few studies of CNM partnerships have collected data from both members of a primary CNM couple (e.g., Cook, 2005; Kimberly & Hans, 2017) or more than one member of a polyamorous relationship, despite research that emphasizes the importance of partner dynamics when studying relational outcomes (Muise, Impett, & Desmarais, 2013).

A final limitation in the current study of CNM relationships is that, apart from a few recent studies (e.g., Moors et al., 2015; Muise, Laughton, Moors, & Impett, 2018), the examination of CNM has proceeded largely atheoretically. Additionally, when CNM relationships have been attended to in the literature, it is rarely from a psychological perspective, despite the discipline’s historical study and theorization of romantic relationships (Barker, 2007). Often, CNM relationships are considered from an anthropological or sociological perspective and much of the research is descriptive in nature. Examining social psychological theories of sexual motivation and relational wellbeing among CNM individuals and partners provides the opportunity to extend theoretical understandings of SD to relationships that fall outside of traditional monogamous pairings, and/or to determine the generalization of need fulfillment theories to different relational structures. Extending the theoretical basis of CNM relationships would allow researchers and clinicians working in this field to develop research and therapeutic programs based on nuanced understandings of CNM relationships rather than relying solely on data and assumptions derived from research on monogamous relationships, or research derived from descriptive studies on CNM individuals.
The Current Research

The current research aimed to address the gaps in the current literature by utilizing a social psychological theory of motivation to examine the relationship between sexual motivation, need fulfillment, and relationship and sexual satisfaction among people in CNM and monogamous relationships. Study 1 consisted of a cross-sectional survey of 348 individuals in CNM and monogamous relationships. Study 2 included a cross-sectional dyadic study of 56 CNM partners who reported on both a primary/committed relationship and one additional partner. The research examined how SDT applies to both CNM and monogamous relationships, with three general goals: 1) to examine the reported levels of relationship and sexual satisfaction in a sample of monogamous and consensually non-monogamous participants, 2) to examine the link between sexual motivation, and relationship/sexual satisfaction in a sample of CNM and monogamous individuals, and 3) to examine the relational dynamics of these variables by studying the association between sexual motivation, need fulfillment and relationship/sexual satisfaction in a sample of CNM partners.
Chapter 2: Study 1- A cross-sectional examination of sexual motivation, need satisfaction and relational outcomes in consensually non-monogamous and monogamous relationships

Research indicates that CNM relationships are viewed as more psychologically damaging, and less healthy, stable or satisfying compared to monogamous relationships (Conley et al., 2012). However, studies suggest that individuals in CNM relationships report similar (and occasionally higher) levels of relational satisfaction and sexual satisfaction compared to monogamous individuals (Bergstrand & Williams, 2000; LaSala, 2004; Morrison et al., 2013; Parsons et al., 2012; Rubel & Bogaert, 2014). SDT proposes that when people engage in sex for reasons that are reflective of autonomy or one’s values and interests (i.e., more self-determined), they are more likely to experience higher levels of sexual and relational satisfaction. In contrast, when individuals engage in sex for reasons that reflect controlled, external motives (i.e., less self-determined reasons), they report lower levels of relationship and sexual satisfaction. The first study extends past research by examining the relationship between sexual motives, need satisfaction, and relationship and sexual satisfaction in a large sample of CNM and monogamous individuals.

The current study incorporates exploratory research questions and specific hypotheses based on SDT to explore the relationship between sexual motivation and relational and sexual satisfaction among CNM and monogamous individuals.
Research Questions and Hypotheses Addressed in Study 1

Exploratory questions.

1. Do individuals in CNM and monogamous relationships report similar/different motives for engaging in sexual activity?

2. What are the similarities and differences in relational and sexual satisfaction for individuals in CNM and monogamous relationships?

3. Are the associations between self-determined sexual motives, sexual need fulfillment and relational and sexual satisfaction different for CNM versus monogamous individuals?
   That is, are the associations conditional upon whether participants are in a CNM or a monogamous relationship?

Hypotheses.

Based on self-determination theory and past research by Brunell and Webster (2013), I make the following hypotheses. In each model, I propose relationships will be significant while controlling for gender, relationship length, frequency of sexual activity, and age as research indicates that these variables impact sexual motives and/or relationship and sexual satisfaction (Meston, Hamilton, & Harte, 2009; Murray & Milhausen, 2012; Stephenson, Ahrold, & Meston, 2011). To maintain consistency between CNM and monogamous groups, I opted to select CNM participants who indicated they had a primary/committed partner. Although I recognize the complexity of CNM relationships as often involving more than one primary partner and not always including a primary partner (i.e., those approaches to CNM that are non-hierarchical), this approach allowed for symmetrical comparison between samples.
Hypothesis 1. More self-determined motives would be positively related to sexual need satisfaction (i.e., autonomy, competence, relatedness) and relationship/sexual satisfaction with a (primary) partner in both CNM and monogamous individuals.

Hypothesis 2. Sexual need satisfaction (i.e., how well the needs for autonomy, competence and relatedness are satisfied through sexual activity) would be positively related to relationship satisfaction and sexual satisfaction with a (primary) partner in both CNM and monogamous relationships.

Hypothesis 3. Sexual need satisfaction would mediate the relationship between self-determined sexual motivation and relationship/sexual satisfaction with a (primary) partner, in both CNM and monogamous relationships.

Methods

Screening and matching participants.

Participants were recruited on Amazon’s Mechanical Turk (MTurk). MTurk is an online labor market where requesters post jobs known as HITS (Human Intelligence Tasks) and workers can browse among the posted HITs and complete them for the fee determined by the requester. Samples recruited from this site for experimental and survey social psychological research are more demographically diverse than both standard Internet samples and samples of college students (Burmester, Kwang, & Gosling, 2011). Rates of participation are affected by payment, with compensation ranging from $0.05 for a five-minute task to $2 for a 20-minute survey.

An initial screening process occurred to find participants who were currently in CNM relationships. Two human intelligence tasks (HITS) were created on MTurk (see Appendix A). The first stated that the HIT was a screening questionnaire to determine participation in a separate
survey (the title was “Screening questionnaire for psychology relationships survey”). It included demographic items and questions on relationship structure/status (see Appendix A). The screening questionnaire took approximately two minutes to complete. Interested participants accepted the HIT and clicked a link that took them to the screening survey webpage (hosted on Qualtrics). Participants were asked to carefully read the document and told to verify their consent by clicking “Yes” or “No”. Participants were to download a copy of the consent form to keep for their records (see Appendix B). At the end of the screening survey, participants were thanked for their participation, told that they would be contacted if they qualified for the full survey, and were paid $0.25 for their time. Only MTurk workers who had an approval rating of 98% or higher and those workers who had completed more than 500 tasks were selected to complete the screening and/or full survey. These MTurk settings ensure that only those workers who have a history of submitting high quality work are selected. Participants who reported that they were 1) over the age of 18, 2) currently in a relationship (CNM or monogamous) and 3) that they have had sex at least once with their partner in the past month, were sent an invitation to the second HIT (i.e., the full survey) (see Appendix A).

CNM and monogamous participants were recruited separately. First, I recruited participants who met the selection criteria and identified as CNM. Of the 4919 participants who completed the screening questionnaire, 142 met the initial criteria (i.e., currently in a CNM relationship, have had sex with a partner at least once in the past month) and completed the full-length survey. I then examined the responses of the CNM participants on three demographic variables (gender, racial/ethnic identity, age). To facilitate comparisons between CNM and monogamous participants, and reduce some of the variation between the groups, I selected monogamous participants from the initial screening pool (i.e., the 4919 participants who
completed the screening questionnaire) who reported similar responses and invited them to complete the full-length survey. Though an exact one-to-one matching strategy was not utilized, I was able to randomly select a group of 206 monogamous participants whose demographic characteristics generally matched those of the CNM participants.

This process took several steps. For the first step, selection was totally random: I sent an invitation to 150 monogamous participants selected at random from the initial screening pool. Of these, 100 completed the follow-up survey. For subsequent steps, I performed a kind of corrective stratified sampling. I compared the CNM and monogamous follow-up samples on three demographic variables, separated into the following “bins”:

- **Gender.** Categorized as women, men and varied gender identities.
- **Age.** Categorized as 18-35, 36-50, and 51+ years old.
- **Ethnicity.** Categorized as white, black, Mexican, multi-racial and other identities.

I then oversampled monogamous participants from category bins that we observed to be underrepresented in the follow-up sample, relative to the follow-up sample of CNM participants. We did this by placing the remaining first-wave participants into bins and selecting participants at random from within the underrepresented bins at a higher rate than from the other bins. For example, after this initial follow-up recruitment, I discovered that the monogamous sample had 31% men (vs. 47% men in the CNM sample) and 91% white participants (vs. 71% white participants in the CNM sample). I aimed to recruit another 80 individuals, so I selected 68% men and 47% whites for the second round of recruitment – the rationale being that if all individuals participated, then I would have matched demographics between the groups (i.e., there were 47% men in the CNM sample, and \(((100 \times .31) + (80 \times .68))/180 = 47\%\) for the
monogamous sample). I repeated this process until the two samples were generally matched on the three key demographic variables.

Prior to recruitment for the follow-up survey (i.e., when examining the screening survey answers), I observed a slightly younger CNM cohort ($M_{\text{age(CNM)}} = 34.01, SD_{\text{age(CNM)}} = 9.28$; $M_{\text{age(M)}} = 35.44, SD_{\text{age(M)}} = 10.51$), a slightly higher percentage of gender queer/non-binary individuals (and corresponding lower percentage of women) in CNM vs. monogamy ($\text{Women}_{\text{CNM}} = 49\%$, $\text{Men}_{\text{CNM}} = 47\%$, Other-$\text{gender}_{\text{CNM}} = 3.5\%$; $\text{Women}_{\text{M}} = 54\%$, $\text{Men}_{\text{M}} = 45\%$, Other-$\text{gender}_{\text{M}} = 1\%$), slightly fewer white participants in CNM (CNM = 71%; Monogamous = 83%), more black participants (CNM = 12.7%; Monogamous = 7%), and similar proportions of other ethnicities (CNM = 10%; Monogamous = 12.5%).

**Procedure.**

Participants who reported that they were 1) over the age of 18, 2) currently in a monogamous or CNM relationship (with at least one primary or committed partner that they could report on), and 3) that they had engaged in sex at least once with their partner in the past month, were sent an invitation to complete the full survey. Interested participants clicked on the HIT, which brought them to the full survey webpage (in Qualtrics). After reading through the consent form (see Appendix B), participants were taken to the demographic portion of the survey (Appendix C), followed by questions assessing relationship agreements (Appendix D), sexual motives (Appendix E), need satisfaction (Appendix F), relationship satisfaction (Appendix F), and sexual satisfaction (Appendix F). The survey also included 3 attention checks to ensure that participants answering the questions thoughtfully, rather than clicking through the survey without examining the questions. The survey took approximately 20-30 minutes to complete. At the end of the survey, participants were thanked for their participation, given instructions to clear their
browser history and were provided with a specialized Qualtrics code that verified their participation in the survey. Each person was paid $2.50 to their AMT account.

**Measures.**

For all relational measures, participants were asked to report on their current partner. If CNM individuals had more than one partner, they were asked to report on a partner they spent more time with (and/or considered primary) to facilitate comparisons with monogamous couples.

**Demographic questions.** The demographic section included questions related to participants’ age, gender identity, ethnic and racial background, current geographical location, sexual orientation, relationship status, number of partners, relationship duration, and parental status. Age, gender, and relationship length were used in the models as control variables.

**Relationship type.** Participants were asked if they were currently in a sexual relationship. If they selected “yes”, they were asked to describe their current relationship with the following response options: 1) Single, 2) in a monogamous relationship, and 3) in consensually non-monogamous relationship(s) (i.e., in a sexual and/or intimate relationship with one or more partners wherein everyone is agreeing to it). Monogamous respondents were asked to state their current relationship status (casually dating one person, seriously dating one person, living with one partner but not married or engaged, engaged to one person, married to one person, other: please specify, or I choose not to answer). Participants in CNM relationships were asked to choose all that apply from the following: a) Casually dating more than one person, b) open relationship (one or both has sex outside of the relationship), c) polyamorous (one or both are in multiple loving and/or sexual relationships), d) swinging relationship (one or both go to parties/clubs/ etc., where partners may be exchanged for the night), e) living with one partner but not married or engaged, f) living with multiple partners but not married or engaged, g) engaged to
a partner, h) engaged to more than one partner, i) married to one partner, j) married to more than one partner, k) Other: please specify, l) I choose not to answer.

Frequency of sexual activity. As sexual frequency is related to relationship and sexual satisfaction (McNulty, Wenner, & Fisher, 2016; Sánchez-Fuentes, Santos-Iglesias, & Sierra, 2014), sexual frequency was used in the models as a control variable and assessed as follows: how many times in the past month have you engaged in sexual activity with your (primary/committed) partner?

Sexual motives. The Perceived Locus of Causality for Sex (PLOC-S) (Jenkins, 2003) assesses a variety of sexual motivations from a SD theoretical perspective. It asks participants to reflect on the most recent time they engaged in sex and rate several motives on a scale of 0-4 where 0 = not at all for this reason and 4 = very much for this reason. The stem for each question is “The last time I had sex, I engaged in sex…” and sample motives include: “Because I value sex as part of a full life”, “Because I thought sex would make me feel more secure” and “But I don’t know why.” The measure consists of 52-items and seven subscales including: 1) Personal Intrinsic Motivation: Sex is fun and enjoyable (8 items; a = .89), 2) Relational Intrinsic Motivation: The intimacy of sex is fun and enjoyable (10 items; a = .93), 3) Integrated-Identified Regulation: Sex is a valuable activity or part of a larger scheme of values (6 items; a = .88), 4) Introjected Regulation: Motivated by guilt, shame, anxiety, pride or grandiosity (11 items; a = .87), 5) Extrinsic Regulation: Motivated by desire for rewards or fear of punishment (7 items; a = .84), 6) Amotivation: No autonomy of sexual engagement (4 items; a = .80), and 7) Drive Motivation: Compelled by urges in the body (6 items; a = .86) (Jenkins, 2004; Brunell & Webster, 2013). Higher mean scores indicate higher levels of sex for each motivation subscale. For regression analyses, a composite measure for this scale was created (see page 45). To date,
only one published study has used this scale in sexual motivation research, with monogamous individuals. Brunell and Webster (2013) determined that the measure had good internal consistency when used with a sample of undergraduate students in a series of cross-sectional and daily diary studies, with Cronbach’s alpha scores ranging from .77-.80. For the current study, several items were modified slightly for the scale to apply to both monogamous and CNM participants (see Appendix E). For example, item 5 was changed from “Because I felt pressured by my partner” to “Because I felt pressured”. This was done to minimize confusion for CNM participants (e.g., if they have multiple partners they would have to be asked about whether they felt pressured by each partner), while keeping the measure the same for both groups and ensuring that each item was reflective of the subscale it falls under (e.g., feeling pressured to have sex is considered an extrinsic regulation, whether it is by a primary or a secondary partner).

**Sexual Need Satisfaction.** The degree to which participants experienced sexual need satisfaction (with their primary partner) was assessed using the 9-item Need Satisfaction Scale (LaGuardia, Ryan, Couchman, & Deci, 2000; \(a = .88\)). Items were altered slightly as per Brunell and Webster (2013); all items began with “When I engage in sexual activity with my current partner…” and included items such as “…I am free to be who I am”, and “…I feel loved and cared about.” Response choices ranged from 1 = not at all true to 7 = very true. (Appendix F).

**Relationship Satisfaction.** The shortened version of The Dyadic Adjustment Scale (Spanier, 1976), the DAS-4 (Sabourin, Valois, & Lussier, 2005), assessed couple satisfaction (\(a = .82\)). For three of the questions (which focus on commitment, relationship quality, and communication), individuals were asked to rate various aspects of their relationships on a 6-point Likert-type scale, where 0 = all the time and 5 = never. The fourth question is rated on a scale of
0-6, and participants are asked to report the degree of happiness, in their relationship, where $0 = \text{extremely unhappy}$ and $6 = \text{perfect}$. (Appendix F).

**Sexual Satisfaction.** The New Sexual Satisfaction Scale-Short (NCSSS-S) consists of 12 items and has been tested across cultures, gender, sexual orientation, and relationship status (Fisher, Davis, Yarber & Davis, 2010; Štulhofer, Busko, & Brouillard, 2010). Participants were asked to think about their sex life over the past 6 months and rate their sexual satisfaction with their primary partner on items such as “the quality of my orgasms” and “my partner’s sexual creativity” from $1 = \text{not at all satisfied}$ to $5 = \text{extremely satisfied}$ ($a = .93$). (Appendix F).

**Data analysis.**

Descriptive statistics were computed for demographic variables such as participants’ age, gender, ethnic/racial background, relationship status, and relationship duration. Mean scores identified the most and least frequently identified motives for engaging in sex. A Multivariate Analysis of Covariance was used to explore whether CNM and monogamous participants reported engaging in sex for similar or different motives. In this analysis, scores on the sexual motives (PLCS-s) subscales were compared after controlling for variables well known to have an impact on sexual motives including gender and age. Further, as CNM and monogamous participants differed significantly on sexual frequency (CNM participants reported more frequent sexual activity) and relationship length (monogamous individuals reported longer relationships), these variables were also included as covariates in the analyses.

To determine if individuals in CNM and monogamous relationships reported similar or different levels of relationship and sexual satisfaction, an Analysis of Covariance (ANCOVA) was conducted. After controlling for relationship length, sexual activity frequency, and age, individuals in CNM relationship and participants in monogamous relationships were compared
on their scores on the relationship satisfaction measure (DAS-4) and the sexual satisfaction measure (NSSS-S).

Based on prior research using a SDT motivational framework (Blais, Sabourin, Boucher, & Vallerand, 1990; Brunell & Webster, 2013; Vallerand, Pelletier & Koestner, 2008), I created a weighted composite measure of *self-determined motives* by assigning weights to each of the PLOC-S subscales (except for the drive scale, which has not been used in previous research using SDT when creating a weighted scale of self-determined motives¹). In the SDT literature, *personal intrinsic motives, relational intrinsic motives and integrated-identified motives* are considered self-determined motives (Deci & Ryan 2000; 2012), and these scales were given weights of +2, +2, and +1, respectively. In contrast, *introjected regulation, extrinsic regulation and amotivation* are considered less self-determined forms of motivation (i.e., controlling motives) and were assigned weights of -1, -2 and -2, respectively. To determine whether the associations between sexual motives, sexual need satisfaction and relational outcomes were conditional upon being in a CNM or monogamous relationship, I conducted two moderated-mediational analyses (one for relationship satisfaction and one for sexual satisfaction). In all models, I tested whether the effect

¹ The drive scale has not been included in the weighted scale. I followed previous research that recommends including only the personal intrinsic, relational intrinsic, integrated-identified, introjected, extrinsic and amotives subscales when creating a scale of self-determined motives (e.g., Blais, Sabourin, Boucher, & Vallerand, 1990; Brunell & Webster, 2013). It seems that “drive” has not been included as it focuses primarily on physiological responses rather than intentionality and social context (which SDT primarily focuses on), making it difficult to place on an SDT continuum (e.g., some research has found that drive is conceptually related to personal intrinsic motives, but acts similarly to extrinsic motives when examined in models). I believe this is debatable, however, as I wanted to directly relate my findings to previous research using SDT scales, I followed the same procedure. As I included the full measure (including the drive scale) in the study I felt it was important to report these findings regarding the similarities and differences of reported motives.
of sexual motives on sexual need fulfillment was moderated by relational structure (i.e., indirectly impacting relationship or sexual satisfaction; see Figures 2.1 and 2.2). These analyses were conducted using Hayes’s (2013; Model 7) PROCESS Macro on SPSS, which provides bias-corrected, bootstrapped confidence intervals (N = 10,000 random samples in the current study) for each indirect effect. Moderated mediation is considered significant if the confidence intervals of the Index of Moderated Mediation do not contain zero. Unstandardized coefficients are reported for all models. All models were run with and without the covariates. Though coefficients changed slightly, a similar pattern of results emerged in the models including the covariates (see Appendix G). As previous research suggests that each of these covariates impacts sexual motives and/or relational outcomes, I kept the covariates in the models presented here. All data was analyzed using SPSS v. 20 (IBM Corp., 2011).

Results

Data cleaning.

A total of 4919 MTurk workers completed the screening questionnaire. Of these, 225 CNM workers met the eligibility criteria and were invited to take the full survey. Two hundred and ten responded to the survey, and two did not complete the survey past the consent form. Participants who noted a different answer from their original screening questionnaire on key variables were removed. Three of the participants did not have sex in the past month and 53 people who originally reported a CNM relationship indicated that they were either single or in a monogamous relationship. Five participants noted that they were not currently in a relationship and five did not complete the survey past the demographic questions. This resulted in a total sample of 142 CNM participants. After examining the demographic characteristics of this sample, I attempted to match screened monogamous participants on three key demographic
variables: gender, ethnicity, and age. Three hundred and twenty-four monogamous workers were invited to take the full survey. A total of 220 people responded to the full survey. One person did not complete past the consent form, three noted that they were not currently in a relationship, three had not had sex in the past month and seven that had originally reported that they were in a monogamous relationship indicated that they were single. This resulted in a final sample of 206 monogamous participants. Cases with missing data were deleted listwise.

**Participant characteristics.**

The sample included 348 participants, including 172 (49.4%) women (cisgender and transgender), 167 (48.0%) men (cisgender and transgender), and a small number of participants (n = 9, 2.6%) reporting multiple gender identities or a gender queer/non-binary identity. Approximately three quarters of the sample identified as heterosexual (N = 267, 76.7%). Participants ranged in age from 20 to 70 years old, with a mean age of 34.13 (SD = 9.50). Monogamous participants reported being in a relationship with their partner for a significantly longer period of time, on average, compared to the CNM participants (t(329) = -3.97, p < .001). For the participants in a CNM relationship, relationship duration with a primary (or more committed) partner ranged from one month to 28.75 years, with a mean of 4.76 years (57.13 months, SD = 5.34). For monogamous participants, relationship duration ranged from one month to 46.25 years, with a mean of 8.08 years (96.93 months, SD = 7.10). Further, CNM individuals reported engaging in sex with a partner significantly more often in the past month (M = 9.69, SD = 9.43) compared to monogamous participants (M = 7.54, SD = 5.99; p < .05). On average, those engaged in CNM had 2.06 (SE = .07) partners. Table 2.1 provides additional demographic details. See Table 2.2 and Table 2.3 for reliability coefficients, correlations and descriptive statistics of the key variables of the full sample and by relationship group.
**Table 2.1.** Demographic characteristics by relationship group.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>CNM participants</th>
<th>Monogamous participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong>a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women (cisgender and transgender)</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>49.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men (cisgender and transgender)</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>47.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender queer/non-binary</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sexual Orientation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asexual</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesbian</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gay</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bisexual</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>23.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pansexual</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queer</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertain or questioning</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heterosexual</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>55.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ethnicity</strong>b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian, Alaska Native</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian Indian</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black, African American</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominican</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filipino</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexican, Mexican American, Chicano</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple ethnic/racial identities</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puerto Rican</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnamese</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>71.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education</strong>b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school graduate</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some college/university</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>28.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College /university graduate</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>41.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some trade/technical/vocational training</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade/technical/vocational training degree or diploma</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some postgraduate work</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters degree</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional degree (e.g., MD)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral Degree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Residence</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>37.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburban</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>45.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>16.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Relationship Type/Status</strong>a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open relationship (one or both of us has sex outside of the relationship)</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>57.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polyamorous (one or both of us are in multiple loving and/or sexual relationships)</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>29.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship Type</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swinging relationship (one or both of you go to parties/clubs/etc. where partners may be exchanged for the night)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casual dating (dating more than one person)</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>25.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living with one partner, but not married or engaged</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living with multiple partners, but not married or engaged</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engaged to one partner</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engaged to more than one partner</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married to one partner</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>18.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married to more than one partner</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casually dating one person</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seriously dating one person</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>26.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living with one partner, but not married or engaged</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engaged to one partner</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married to one partner</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>49.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

aParticipants were asked to check all that apply
bAdditional ethnic identity categories and education categories were available but only those that were reported by participants are present in the table
Table 2.2. Cronbach alphas, descriptive statistics and correlations for key variables for the full sample.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>a</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Personal Intrinsic (+2)</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>5.79</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Relational Intrinsic (+2)</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>5.50</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>.59*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Integrated-Identified (+1)</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>.68*</td>
<td>.71*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Introjected (-1)</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>-0.96</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>-.12+</td>
<td>-.13+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Extrinsic (-2)</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>-1.27</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>.16'</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>.78*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Amotivation (-2)</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>-1.00</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>.57*</td>
<td>.60*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Need Satisfaction</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>52.15</td>
<td>9.27</td>
<td>.48**</td>
<td>.58*</td>
<td>.49*</td>
<td>.33*</td>
<td>.45*</td>
<td>.38*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Dyadic Adjustment Scale</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>15.97</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>.33*</td>
<td>.49*</td>
<td>.33*</td>
<td>.22*</td>
<td>.30*</td>
<td>.20*</td>
<td>.63*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. New Sexual Satisfaction Scale</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>45.55</td>
<td>9.51</td>
<td>.48*</td>
<td>.58*</td>
<td>.47*</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>.66*</td>
<td>.56*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Age</td>
<td>34.13</td>
<td>9.50</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>.20*</td>
<td>.19*</td>
<td>.17*</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Sexual Frequency</td>
<td>8.42</td>
<td>7.65</td>
<td>.21*</td>
<td>.18'</td>
<td>.18'</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>.21*</td>
<td>.18'</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>-.13+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Relationship Length (in months)</td>
<td>81.90</td>
<td>90.39</td>
<td>-.13+</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.13+</td>
<td>.16'</td>
<td>.16'</td>
<td>.14'</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.58*</td>
<td>.16'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. + p<.05, ' p<.01, * p<.001
### Table 2.3. Cronbach alphas, descriptive statistics and correlations for key variables for CNM and Monogamous Samples.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>CNM</th>
<th>Monogamous</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Personal Intrinsic (+2)</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>6.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Relational Intrinsic (+2)</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>5.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Integrated-Identified (+1)</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>2.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Introjected (-1)</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>-0.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Extrinsic (-2)</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>-1.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Amotivation (-2)</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>-0.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Sexual Need Satisfaction</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>52.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Dyadic Adjustment Scale</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>15.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. New Sexual Satisfaction Scale</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>46.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Age</td>
<td>34.01</td>
<td>9.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Sexual Frequency</td>
<td>9.69</td>
<td>9.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Relationship Length (in months)</td>
<td>57.13</td>
<td>59.69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. +p<.05, ’p<.01, *p<.001
Do individuals in CNM and monogamous relationships report similar or different motives for engaging in sexual activity with their (primary) partner?

A MANCOVA analysis indicated a significant difference in the motives reported by CNM and monogamous participants (see Table 2.4 for estimated means and 95% confidence intervals) \( F(7, 311) = 2.64, \) partial eta squared = .06, observed power = .90. Individuals in CNM relationships were significantly more likely to report motives related to the enjoyment of sex itself, (i.e., the personal intrinsic motives scale), their own values regarding sex and relationships (i.e., the integrated identified scale), and to satisfy their own sex drive (i.e., the drive scale), compared to monogamous participants. No differences were found between the relationship structure groups on any of the remaining subscales.
Table 2.4. MANCOVA assessing differences between CNM and monogamous samples.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Motivation</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>partial eta squared</th>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Estimated Means</th>
<th>Lower Bound</th>
<th>Upper Bound</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal Intrinsic (+2)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10.31</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>Mono</td>
<td>CNM</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>2.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relational Intrinsic (+2)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>Mono</td>
<td>CNM</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>2.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrated-Identified (+1)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>Mono</td>
<td>CNM</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>1.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introjected (-1)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>Mono</td>
<td>CNM</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extrinsic (-2)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>Mono</td>
<td>CNM</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amotivation (-2)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>Mono</td>
<td>CNM</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drive Motivation Scale</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10.27</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>Mono</td>
<td>CNM</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>1.81</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To further explore the first research question, the ten most frequent and the ten least frequent reasons for sex were examined in the PLOCS questionnaire (see Table 2.5 and Table 2.6). The most frequently cited reasons for engaging in sex reflected more self-determined reasons and included items from the *personal intrinsic* scale, the *relational intrinsic* scale, and
the integrated-identified scale. Six out of the ten most frequent reasons were the same for CNM and monogamous participants, and the top four reasons were identical. For CNM individuals, five items were drawn from the personal intrinsic scale, and two from the relational intrinsic scale, while monogamous participants endorsed three reasons from the personal intrinsic scale, and five from the relational intrinsic scale. CNM participants were significantly more likely to report engaging in sex for personal intrinsic reasons such as “because it’s stimulating and enjoyable”, “because I wanted to enjoy the physical sensations”, and “because I enjoy being sexual”. While many of the ten most frequent items were drawn from scales reflecting intrinsic motives, there were also reasons indicative of internalized values about sex, from the integrated-identified scale [e.g., viewing sex as a healthy aspect of one’s relationship(s)].

The least frequently cited reasons for engaging in sex were items drawn from the extrinsic regulation scale (five items), the amotivation scale (three items) and the introjected scale (two items). Across both groups, the most infrequent reason for engaging in sex was “Because I’d feel anxious or guilty if I don’t go along”, however, CNM participants reported significantly lower mean scores on this item compared to monogamous participants.
Table 2.5. Ten most frequent motives for sex by relationships structure.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>CNM</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Monogamous</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% Endorsed</td>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>% Endorsed</td>
<td>Rank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Because it feels good</td>
<td>98.6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>97.1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Because it's stimulating and enjoyable</td>
<td>98.6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>96.1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Because I wanted to enjoy the physical sensations</td>
<td>97.2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>96.6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Because it's exciting to be sexually intimate with my partner(s)</td>
<td>97.0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>95.1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**Because I wanted a fun experience</td>
<td>96.5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>91.7</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**Because I enjoy being sexual</td>
<td>96.5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>93.2</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Because I value sex as part of a full life</td>
<td>85.9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>82.5</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Because I wanted to share a mutually pleasurable activity</td>
<td>95.1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>94.7</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Because I think it is a healthy aspect of my relationship(s)</td>
<td>97.2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>95.1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Because I see sex as a healthy activity</td>
<td>95.8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>92.7</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Because sex is an important part of my relationship(s)</td>
<td>94.4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>96.6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For the pleasure of sharing a special and intimate activity</td>
<td>95.1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>94.7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Because I wanted to enjoy the closeness of being physically joined with my sexual partner(s)</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>95.6</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Because I think sex is an enjoyable way to share our feelings</td>
<td>93.7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>94.2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Response options ranging from 0 = not at all for this reason to 4 = very much for this reason (for sexual interactions within the past month); % Endorsed includes scores from 1-4

*p < .05, ** p < .001, as defined by t-tests
Table 2.6. Ten least frequent motives for sex by relationships structure.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>CNM</th>
<th>Monogamous</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*Because I feel anxious or guilty if I didn't go along</td>
<td>23.2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>31.6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Because alcohol makes me lose control</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>But I have no idea why I did</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>27.7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Because I was worried my partner(s) might leave or reject me if I didn't</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Because I think saying no will start a conflict with my partner(s)</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Because I worry I will be punished or neglected if I don't</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>But I did not feel like I was in control of my own behaviour</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Because I thought having sex would get me something I wanted later</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Because I felt pressured</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>31.1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Because I wanted another person to be under my control</td>
<td>29.6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Response options ranging from 0 = not at all for this reason to 4 = very much for this reason (for sexual interactions within the past month); % Endorsed includes scores from 1-4

*p < .05, **p < .001, as defined by t-tests
What are the similarities and differences in relational and sexual satisfaction for individuals in CNM and monogamous relationships?

Results of an Analysis of Covariance (ANCOVA), with controls for sexual frequency, gender, age, and relationship duration, found no significant differences between CNM and monogamous participants in reported levels of relationship satisfaction \[F(1, 319) = .47, p = .49; \] CNM estimated mean = 15.94, \(SE = .30, CI = 15.35, 16.54,\) Monogamous estimated mean = 16.21, \(SE = .23, CI = 15.75, 16.66\], or sexual satisfaction \[F(1, 319) = .05, p = .82; \] CNM estimated mean = 45.86, \(SE = .82, CI = 44.25, 47.47,\) Monogamous estimated mean = 45.62, \(SE = .63, CI = 44.38, 46.85\].

What are the associations between self-determined sexual motives, sexual need satisfaction and relational and sexual satisfaction among both CNM and monogamous participants?

After entering the control variables, there was no significant conditional indirect effect of relational structure on the association between self-determined motives, and relationship satisfaction, through sexual need fulfillment [Index of Moderated Mediation = .0033, \(SE = .03, \) CI (-.0648, .0726); CNM \(b = .26, CI (.19, .35),\) Monogamous \(b = .26, CI (.19, .35)\)] (see Figure 2.1 and Table 2.7). Similarly, relational structure was not significantly associated with the indirect link between sexual motives and sexual satisfaction, via sexual need fulfillment [Index of Moderated Mediation = .0107, \(SE = .12, CI (-.2019, .2532);\) CNM \(b = .85, CI (.61, 1.15),\) Monogamous \(b = .83, CI (.64, 1.06)\)] (see Figure 2.2 and Table 2.8).
Figure 2.1. Moderated-mediation model for sexual motives, need satisfaction and relationship satisfaction.
Table 2.7. Least squares regression results for moderated-mediation analysis, relationship satisfaction.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictors and Covariates</th>
<th>Need Satisfaction (M)</th>
<th>Relationship Satisfaction (Y)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$b$</td>
<td>$t$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Motives $a^1$</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>15.13***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship Structure $a^2$</td>
<td>-2.23</td>
<td>-1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship Structure $a^3$</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Motives x Need Satisfaction $a^4$</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>41.05</td>
<td>21.00***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>-1.98</td>
<td>-3.07**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship Length</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Frequency</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>2.61*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$R^2 = .54$  \hspace{1cm}  $R^2 = .40$

$F(7, 315) = 52.50***$  \hspace{1cm}  $F(6, 316) = 35.36$

*p < .05, **p < .01, ***p < .001
**Figure 2.2.** Moderated-mediation model for sexual motives, need satisfaction and sexual satisfaction.
### Table 2.8. Least squares regression results for moderated-mediation analysis, sexual satisfaction.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictors</th>
<th>Need Satisfaction (M)</th>
<th>Sexual Satisfaction (Y)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b</td>
<td>t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Motives</td>
<td>a^1</td>
<td>1.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship Structure</td>
<td>a^2</td>
<td>-2.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship Structure x Sexual Motives</td>
<td>a^3</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need Satisfaction</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>41.05</td>
<td>21.00***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covariates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>-1.99</td>
<td>-3.07**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship Length</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Frequency</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>2.61*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R^2 = .54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05, **p < .01, ***p < .001

**Mediational analyses of sexual motives, sexual need satisfaction and relational outcomes.**

As the associations between the key variables were not conditional upon participants’ relational structure, I followed Hayes’ (2013) recommendation to remove the non-significant interaction and examined two simple mediational models to test the link between sexual motives, sexual need satisfaction, and relational outcomes with the full sample (i.e., Model 4, Hayes, 2013). Self-determined sexual motives was significantly related to relationship satisfaction \( F(4, 310) = 25.28, p < .001, r^2 = .25; \text{path} c = .33, t(310) = 9.85, p < .001 \). However, self-determined motives indirectly influenced relationship satisfaction through its effect on sexual need satisfaction. As seen in Figure 2.3 participants who had more self-determined motives reported...
greater levels of sexual need satisfaction \(F(4, 310) = 80.00, p < .001, r^2 = .51; \ path a = 1.30, t(310) = 17.66, p < .001\), and those with higher levels of sexual need satisfaction reported higher levels of relationship satisfaction \(F(5, 309) = 38.94, p < .001, r^2 = .39 \ path b = 0.20, t(309) = 8.42, p = .001\). The bias-corrected bootstrap confidence interval for the indirect effect was above zero \((ab = .25; CI [.19, .32])\). The direct effect of self-determined sexual motives on relationship satisfaction was not significant \((path c^1 = .07, p = .08)\). The ratio of the indirect effect to the total effect was .77 \((CI = .5734, 1.01)\).

\[
AB = 0.25, 95\% \ CI [.19, .32]
\]

![Diagram](image)

Figure 2.3. Mediation model for sexual motives, need satisfaction and relationship satisfaction.

Further, sexual motives were linked to sexual satisfaction \(F(4, 310) = 22.97, p < .001, r^2 = .23; \ path c = .88, t(310) = 9.22, p < .001\), but this association was mediated by sexual need satisfaction (see Figure 2.4). Participants who had more self-determined motives reported greater levels of sexual need satisfaction \(F(4, 310) = 80.00, p < .001, r^2 = .51; \ path a = 1.30, t(310) = 17.66, p < .001\), and those with higher levels of sexual need satisfaction reported higher levels of
sexual satisfaction \([F(5, 309) = 48.37, p < .001, r^2 = .44, \text{path } b = 0.68, t(309) = 10.77, p < .001]\). The bias-corrected bootstrap confidence interval for the indirect effect was above zero (\(ab = .88\); CI [.69, 1.09]) and, here again, the direct effect of self-determined sexual motives on relationship satisfaction was not significant (\(\text{path } c = -0.006, p = .996\)). The ratio of the indirect effect to the total effect was 1.00 (CI = .7650, 1.35).

\[
AB = 0.88, 95\% \text{ CI (0.69, 1.09)}
\]

Figure 2.4. Mediation model for sexual motives, need satisfaction and sexual satisfaction.

**Ruling out alternative hypotheses.**

Although the theoretical model suggested that sexual motives are linked to relational outcomes through sexual need satisfaction, it is possible that these associations operate in an alternative direction. Sexual motives may act as a mediator between sexual need satisfaction and relational outcomes. That is, when individuals feel that they are fulfilled in their sexual relationship, they may engage in sex more frequently for self-determined reasons, and thus feel increased sexual and relational satisfaction. I tested this alternative association in a series of
moderated-mediational and simple mediational models. In both moderated-mediational models, I tested whether the effect of sexual need fulfillment on sexual motives was moderated by relational structure (i.e., indirectly associated with relationship or sexual satisfaction). All models tested included the covariates used in the previous models. There was no significant conditional indirect effect of relational structure on the association between sexual need fulfillment, and relationship satisfaction, through sexual motives [Index of Moderated Mediation = -.003, SE = .005, CI (-.0179, .0020); CNM b = .02, CI (-.0053, .0504), Monogamous b = .02, CI (-.0069, .0577)]. Similarly, there was no conditional indirect effect of relational structure on the link between sexual need fulfillment and sexual satisfaction, through sexual motives [Index of Moderated Mediation = .003, SE = .009, CI (-.0082, .0328); CNM b = -.02, CI (-.1107, .0651), Monogamous b = -.02, CI (-.1201, .0764)].

Simple mediation determined that there was no significant indirect effect of sexual need fulfillment on relationship satisfaction or sexual satisfaction (via sexual motives) (see Appendix H).

**Discussion**

Study One examined multiple aspects of SDT in a sample of 142 CNM and 208 monogamous individuals recruited from Amazon’s Mechanical Turk. The purpose of Study One was threefold: 1) to examine whether individuals in CNM and monogamous relationships reported similar or different motives for engaging in partnered sexual activity, 2) to determine whether CNM and monogamous participants reported similar or different levels of relational and sexual satisfaction, and 3) to investigate the associations between self-determined sexual motives, sexual need satisfaction and relational and sexual satisfaction among both CNM and monogamous participants.
Sexual motives.

CNM and monogamous participants in the current sample engaged in sex for similar reasons, often reporting reasons that were reflective of self-determination, with few individuals indicating reasons for sex that were that were less self-determined or controlling (e.g., feeling pressured or coerced). However, CNM participants were more likely to report motives related to the enjoyment of sex itself, their own values regarding sex and relationships, and to satisfy their own sex drive. It is possible that these small differences may be accounted for by differing attitudes towards sex. CNM individuals may have more positive views of sex compared to monogamous individuals, or place a higher value on sex as an integral part of their relationship(s); i.e., Morrison et al., (2013) found that polyamorous individuals had more permissive and positive attitudes toward casual sex when compared to monogamous participants. Research has also found that a greater endorsement of sexual sensation-seeking, sex-positivity, and need for sex positively predict attitudes towards polyamory (Johnson, Giuliano, Herselman, & Hutzler, 2015).

Relational outcomes.

In contrast to the perceptions of CNM relationships as less satisfying and healthy (Conley et al., 2013; 2017; Rubel & Bogaert, 2014), CNM and monogamous participants in the current study reported no significant difference in their level of relationship and sexual satisfaction. This finding is consistent with those of several other recent studies that have examined aspects of relational quality among gay male, CNM, polyamorous, and monogamous couples (Conley et al., 2017; Parsons, Starks, Gamarel, & Grov, 2012; Rubel & Bogaert, 2014; Séguin, et al., 2016). Taken together, these studies indicate that relational structure, in itself, is not a significant differentiator of relational outcomes.
Self-determination theory and relational outcomes.

Study One provides further evidence that SDT can be applied to sexual and relational outcomes (Brunell & Webster, 2013; Patrick et al., 2007; Smith, 2007). Consistent with SDT, I found support for predictions regarding the association between self-determined motives, sexual need fulfillment, and relational outcomes. Further, the results indicate that the link between these variables is similar for both CNM and monogamous individuals. That is, when both CNM and monogamous participants reported feeling more autonomous in their sexual interactions they indicated that their sexual needs had been met and, in turn, reported greater relationship and sexual satisfaction within their (primary) relationship. These findings are consistent with studies of monogamous participants wherein self-determined motives were associated with greater need satisfaction, and relational outcomes (Brunell & Webster, 2013; Smith, 2007). Study One extends previous work by examining these relationships among participants who are consensually engaging in sexual and/or romantic partnerships with more than one person.

The results of the mediation analyses indicated that for both CNM and monogamous participants, engaging in sex with a partner(s) may be a way to fulfill various relational and sexual needs. That is, sexual need fulfillment is one mechanism through which sexual motives may enhance or detract from relational wellbeing. Common stereotypes suggest that polyamorous people engage in additional partnerships because they are not fulfilled by their primary partner (Conley et al., 2013; Rubel & Bogaert, 2014). However, recent research refutes this inference by showing that polyamorous individuals report high need fulfillment across multiple partners (Mitchell, Bartholomew, & Cobb, 2014). Hence, perhaps this study’s most important finding is that a person’s motivations for engaging in sex were more central to relational wellbeing than was their relationship structure. When people feel in control of their sexual encounters and are
engaging in sex because they value sex or want to experience pleasure and closeness, they are likely to feel more psychologically fulfilled and happier in their relationships, regardless of whether they are in a monogamous or CNM partnership.

**Strengths and limitations.**

This study adds to the current literature on relational outcomes by providing a direct comparison of sexual and relational satisfaction between CNM and monogamous individuals. Except for a few recent studies (e.g., Conley et al., 2017; Morrison et al., 2013; Séguin et al., 2016), most have examined monogamous and CNM participants separately. However, the study is limited in several ways. First, sample size precluded examining the proposed theoretical model within CNM subgroups. Research indicates that there is significant heterogeneity within CNM relationships (Barker & Langdridge, 2010; Conley et al., 2017) and individuals in polyamorous, swinging, and open relationships endorse different relationship agreements (Barker & Langdridge, 2010; LaSala, 2004). However, the current study does provide a starting point from which to examine the interpersonal factors that impact relationship and sexual satisfaction among CNM partnerships. Additional research comparing CNM subgroups would provide important information as to how sexual motives impact need satisfaction and relational outcomes in partnerships that focus primarily on extradyadic sexual interactions (e.g., swinging), or relationships where additional romantic connections are central to the relationship agreements (e.g., polyamory).

Further, the current analyses impose a quasi-causal mediational framework onto correlational data. While I proposed that sexual motives were associated with relational outcomes through sexual need fulfillment, it may be the case that when individuals feel their needs are satisfied, they seek out partnered sexual activity for more self-determined reasons and this
impacts their relational and sexual satisfaction. However, in support of the proposed causal model, the alternative models tested did not provide evidence for this directional relationship. Future research should expand upon these findings to explore whether additional mediators (such as attitudes towards sex) impact the relationship between sexual motivation, need satisfaction and relational outcomes.

The study is further limited in its use of individual responses to evaluate the effects of motivation on dyadic outcomes (i.e., relationship and sexual satisfaction). Including information from both members of the (primary) relationship is critical to understand the relational dynamics of need fulfillment and how partners’ sexual motivations are related one another. Finally, CNM participants only reported on one partner that they either considered to be a primary partner or spent more time with and/or felt committed to. This limits our understanding of the unique dynamics of CNM partnerships where need fulfillment in one relationship might be associated with relational outcomes in another partnership. In Study Two I address these concerns by examining the relationship between sexual motives, need fulfillment, and relational outcomes among a sample of CNM partners.
Chapter 3: Study 2- A Dyadic Study of Sexual Motives, Need Satisfaction and Relational Outcomes Among Consensually Non-Monogamous Partners

In Study One, I investigated the similarities and differences in sexual motives and relational outcomes among a sample of CNM and monogamous individuals. I then tested the associations between self-determined sexual motives, sexual need satisfaction, and relational and sexual satisfaction among both CNM and monogamous participants. In accordance with SDT, I established that engaging in sex for motives that reflect autonomy (e.g., choosing to have sex in order to be close to a partner) were positively associated with relational outcomes and that this association was mediated by sexual need satisfaction. Further, the links between the tested variables were similar for both monogamous and CNM participants.

The purpose of Study Two was to extend the findings of Study One in two key ways: 1) by examining the dyadic associations between sexual motivations, need satisfaction, and relational outcomes among CNM partners who report having at least one “primary” (or committed live-in partner) relationship, and 2) by investigating how sexual motives and need fulfillment with a second partner are associated with relational outcomes in the primary relationship.

Despite the dyadic (or multiple) nature of romantic relationships, most psychological studies have focused on the perception of each individual. A dyadic analysis allows for the examination of interpersonal processes in a manner that recognizes the interdependence of data among romantic partners (Kenny, Kashy, & Cook, 2006). It also permits the examination of partner effects; that is, it is possible to study how a person’s sexual motivations are associated with not only their own levels of satisfaction, but also their partner’s levels of satisfaction. Research that incorporates dyadic data into the study of sexual motivations and satisfaction in
monogamous partnerships indicates that a person’s sexual motivation has a significant impact on their relationship quality (Brunell & Webster, 2013; Muise, Impett, & Desmarais, 2013). Motives that direct people toward positive outcomes or motives that reflect the fulfillment of basic psychological needs (e.g., engaging in a behavior because you want to be close to a partner), result in greater feelings of satisfaction for both the individual and their partner (Brunell & Webster, 2013; Impett et al., 2008; Muise, Impett, & Desmarais, 2013). In contrast, motives that direct a person away from negative outcomes or reasons that reflect pressured or non-autonomous situations (e.g., engaging in sex to avoid conflict) are associated with decreased relational wellbeing. Given previous research and the results of Study One, I expected that more self-determined sexual motives would positively impact sexual need satisfaction and relational outcomes for both the individual and their primary partner.

In addition to the benefits afforded by a dyadic analysis, exploring these associations among CNM partnerships allows for the examination of unique theoretical questions about how sexual motivations with a second partner are associated with relationship satisfaction in the primary relationship. SDT suggests that partner dynamics significantly impact psychological need fulfillment and relational outcomes (LaGuardia & Patrick, 2008; Ryan & Deci, 2012). For example, when a person is in a relationship where their autonomy is supported by their partner, they can authentically express themselves (LaGuardia, 2007). This outcome has also been described in the SDT literature as “growth motivation” (Knee et al., 2002). Research has noted the importance of autonomy, authenticity, and personal growth in individuals’ reasons for engaging in CNM (DeSantis et al., 2016), as well as some of the perceived benefits of CNM (Moors, Mastick, & Schechinger, 2017). It is possible that when individuals are able to engage authentically with additional sexual partners, they feel more sexually fulfilled and, in turn, more
appreciative of their primary relationship(s). Indeed, research on CNM indicates that having one’s sexual needs fulfilled outside of a primary partnership can enhance relational outcomes with a primary partner (Bergstrand & Williams, 2000; Cook, 2005; Fernandes, Wood, & Schechinger, 2014; Muise, Laughton, Moors & Impett, 2018). Such findings are supportive of what researchers refer to as an additive model of need fulfillment, where having sexual and emotional needs met by multiple partners can increase one’s overall wellbeing and, in turn, enhance both (or all) partnered relationships (Cook, 2005; LaGuardia et al., 2000; Mitchell, Bartholomew, & Cobb, 2014).

Though some research supports the idea that additional sexual relationships can enhance current partnerships (Balzarini et al., 2017; Bergstrand & Williams, 2000; Cook, 2005; Fernandes, Wood, & Schechinger, 2014; Muise et al., 2018), other findings indicate that individuals engage in additional partnerships to compensate for a lack of need fulfillment in a current relationship (i.e., a compensation model; Mitchell, Bartholomew, & Cobb, 2014; Muise et al., 2018; Sheff, 2011). For example, if one’s sexual needs are not being met in a primary partnership, engaging in sex with a new person may offer protective benefits to the primary relationship by ensuring that the person is still able to engage in sex in a way that makes them feel satisfied and fulfilled.

Alternatively, having needs met by a second partner could threaten and diminish satisfaction with the primary partnership (referred to in the literature as a contrast model of need fulfillment; Mitchell, Bartholomew, & Cobb, 2014). That is, additional partners may create instability within the primary partnership when a person becomes emotionally or sexually distant in response to their partner’s needs being met by another person (Mitchell, Bartholomew, & Cobb, 2014). Finally, research on polyamorous relationships suggests that having one’s needs
fulfilled in one partnership does not significantly impact the relational outcomes of another partnership (Mitchell, Bartholomew, & Cobb, 2014). That is, polyamorous relationships appear to be independent of one another. Testing models of sexual motives, need fulfillment and relational outcomes among CNM dyads with concurrent partners (i.e., a second partner) can illuminate whether need fulfillment in a second partnership has benefits for the partner in the first relationship (i.e., if it is additive or compensatory), or if it is detrimental to primary partner relational outcomes (i.e., if it is contrasting).

The limited research in this area has focused on how general need fulfillment in one relationship impacts another partnership. Only one study (Muise et al., 2018) has focused specifically on testing the links between sexual need fulfillment and satisfaction among multiple, concurrent partners. In two cross-sectional surveys, individuals in CNM relationships who reported greater sexual need fulfillment within a primary partnership also indicated higher relationship and sexual satisfaction with an additional partner (Muise et al., 2018). However, among women, greater sexual need fulfillment with a secondary partner was associated with lower satisfaction in the primary partnership. Given the scarcity of research and varied findings in this area, questions of how motives and need fulfilment in a second relationship are linked to the relational outcomes of the first partnership were treated as exploratory in the current study.

Study Two extends previous literature by dyadically examining the links between sexual motives, need fulfillment and relationship/sexual satisfaction among CNM committed/live-in partners, thus providing important information about how partner dynamics shape relational outcomes. Further, testing SDT models in relationships where primary partners have relationships that are external to the dyad (i.e., a second sexual partner) offers insight into
whether need fulfillment in one partnership has an additive, compensatory or contrasting effect on another, concurrent relationship.

**Research Questions and Hypotheses Addressed in Study 2**

For all hypotheses, statistical analyses and discussion, each participant in a dyad will be referred to as “dyad member 1” and dyad member 2”. All participants were asked to report on two partners. When referring to each partner that participants reported on, I have used the terms “first partner”, and “second partner”. I have also occasionally referred to the dyad as the “primary dyad”. Many members of CNM communities do not adhere to a hierarchical approach to relationships and the term “first partner” or “primary dyad” does not necessarily denote that this partner is “above” the second partner that the participants reported on. In all cases, the “first partner” refers to the person who completed the study with the participant (i.e., is a member of the dyad being analyzed) and “second partner” refers to a person who did not complete the study with the participant (i.e., is not a member of the dyad being analyzed). Based on self-determination theory, past research, and the results of Study One, I made the following hypotheses.

**Individual hypotheses for primary dyad analyses (i.e., first partner).**

The first three individual hypotheses replicate those found in Study 1.

*Hypothesis 1*. Higher scores on self-determined sexual motives would be positively related to sexual need satisfaction (i.e., autonomy, competence, relatedness) and relationship/sexual satisfaction with the first partner.
**Hypothesis 2.** Sexual need satisfaction (i.e., how well the needs for autonomy, competence and relatedness are satisfied through sexual activity) would be positively related to relationship satisfaction and sexual satisfaction with the first partner.

**Hypothesis 3.** Sexual need satisfaction would mediate the relationship between self-determined sexual motivation and relationship/sexual satisfaction with the first partner.

**Partner hypotheses for primary dyad analyses (i.e., first partner).**

**Hypothesis 4.** Consistent with dyadic research examining sexual motives and relational outcomes (e.g., Brunell & Webster, 2013), when individuals reported engaging in sex for more self-determined reasons, their first partner would report higher levels of sexual need satisfaction and relationship/sexual satisfaction.

**Hypothesis 5.** Participants’ sexual need satisfaction (i.e., how well the needs for autonomy, competence and relatedness are satisfied through sexual activity) would be positively related to their first partner’s relationship and sexual satisfaction.

**Hypothesis 6.** Sexual need satisfaction would mediate the relationship between self-determined sexual motivation of dyad member 1 and the relationship and sexual satisfaction of dyad member 2 (see Figures 3.1 and 3.2).

**Exploratory questions regarding concurrent partnerships (i.e., first and second partners).**

1. What sexual motives do CNM participants report for engaging in sex with their first and second partners?
2. How do sexual motives and need fulfillment with a second, concurrent partner impact one’s own relationship satisfaction (with a first partner) and the relationship satisfaction of one’s first partner? (see Figure 3.3 and 3.4).

3. How do sexual motives and need fulfillment with a second concurrent partner impact one’s own sexual satisfaction (with a first partner) and the sexual satisfaction of one’s first partner? (see Figure 3.3 and 3.4).

Figure 3.1. Proposed Theoretical Model of Self Determination and Sexual Motivation within the Primary Dyad-Actor Effects.

Figure 3.2. Proposed Theoretical Model of Self Determination and Sexual Motivation within the Primary Dyad-Partner Effects.
Figure 3.3. Proposed Theoretical Model of Self Determination and Sexual Motivation-Actor effects of sexual motives with second partner on first partner relational outcomes.

Figure 3.4. Proposed Theoretical Model of Self Determination and Sexual Motivation-Partner effects of sexual motives with second partner on first partner relational outcomes.
Methods

Recruitment.

Participants were recruited as part of a larger, dyadic daily diary and longitudinal study on the experiences of CNM relationships. Recruitment was completed online via social media (e.g., Facebook, Twitter; see Appendix I), engaging specifically with groups comprised of people in CNM relationships or people interested in CNM. Additionally, email advertisements (see Appendix I) were sent to relevant listservs (e.g., polyweekly.com), and messages were posted on reddit.com in appropriate subreddits (e.g., r/polyamory, r/nonmonogamy). Interested participants were asked to email the research team to receive a screening questionnaire.

Screening.

Participants who contacted the researchers were sent a brief Qualtrics (2005, www.qualtrics.com) screening questionnaire consisting of questions related to the study’s inclusion criteria and a request for a phone number where they could be contacted (see Appendix J). To be eligible for participation individuals had to meet the following criteria: 1) over the age of 18 and living in Canada or the United States, 2) fluent in English and have access to a computer, 3) currently in a CNM relationship with at least one primary/committed partner, 4) currently living with at least one primary/committed partner, 5) in order to test cross-partner effects of having multiple concurrent relationships, at least one of the two partners had to currently have at least one additional partner, 6) had sex with a partner at least once in the past month (to ensure that they could report on recent sexual events), 7) have one primary/committed partner who was willing to participate in the study, 8) have a private email account that only they (and not their partner) had access to. If eligible, researchers followed up with a phone call to
confirm the information reported in the screening questionnaire, discuss the details of the study, and answer any questions.

**Procedure.**

If eligible, participants were then emailed and asked to provide a time for the researcher to call and discuss the details of the study. Members of the research team organized phone calls with both dyad partners individually (or together at the request of the participants). Once both partners were enrolled, each member of the partnership was sent a link to an initial online survey via Qualtrics (2005, www.qualtrics.com). The full survey consisted of several demographic and relationship items, followed by questions related to sexual motives, sexual need satisfaction, relationship and sexual satisfaction, sexual desire, psychological wellbeing, interdependence, communication, communal strength, and overall motivations for engaging in CNM (see Appendix K for full survey). Each participant was asked to answer relational and sexual questions for both a primary/committed partnership (i.e., the partner who was also participating in the study) and one additional relationship. For each relationship, participants were asked to input the initials for the partner they were reporting on and the initials were then embedded into each relational question. The survey took approximately 45 minutes to complete and participants were paid $5.00. Following this, participants completed a brief online experience survey each day for 21 days and received $2.00 for every survey completed. An immediate follow-up survey was sent after the completion of the daily diary component, and participants were sent two-additional follow-up surveys at the three-month and six-month mark (paid $20 in total). The current analyses used data from the initial intake survey only.
Measures.

As the current analyses were part of a larger longitudinal and daily diary study on CNM partners, some of the measures in this study differed from Study One. The one most relevant to the current analyses was the measure of relationship satisfaction. A new measure of relationship satisfaction was selected for Study Two as it included a stem and items that could provide a general, overall appraisal of relationship satisfaction, and was also appropriate for a daily evaluation of the relationship (whereas the measure used in Study One was not appropriate for daily assessment). Further, to decrease participant burden, participants did not complete every measure for each partner that they reported on. For example, participants completed the same longer sexual satisfaction measure used in Study One (i.e., the NSSS) for their first partner only, as the focus of the study was on primary dyad outcomes. However, a single item measure of overall sexual satisfaction was also included to obtain a general understanding of satisfaction within both the first and second partnerships and to provide context for the results.

Demographic questions. The demographic section included questions related to participants’ age, gender identity, ethnic and racial background, current geographical location, sexual orientation, relationship status (i.e., type of CNM relationship), number of partners, and relationship duration.

Frequency of sexual activity. As in Study One, sexual frequency was used in the models as a control variable and was assessed as follows: how many times in the past month have you engaged in sexual activity with your (first/second) partner?

Sexual motives. Study Two also used the Perceived Locus of Causality for Sex (PLOC-S) (Jenkins, 2004) to assess sexual motivations. However, in the current study, participants were asked to report on their general motives for each partner, rather than the most recent time they
engaged in sexual activity. Participants rated their sexual motives on a scale of 0-4 where 0 = not at all for this reason and 4 = very much for this reason. The stem for each question was “In the last month, I engaged in sexual activity with _” (partner’s initials inserted) and sample motives included: “Because I value sex as part of a full life”, “Because I thought sex would make me feel more secure” and “But I don’t know why.” The measure consisted of 52-items and seven subscales: 1) Personal Intrinsic Motivation: Sex is fun and enjoyable (8 items), 2) Relational Intrinsic Motivation: The intimacy of sex is fun and enjoyable (10 items), 3) Integrated-Identified Regulation: Sex is a valuable activity or part of a larger scheme of values (6 items), 4) Introjected Regulation: Motivated by guilt, shame, anxiety, pride or grandiosity (11 items), 5) Extrinsic Regulation: Motivated by desire for rewards or fear of punishment (7 items), 6) Amotivation: No autonomy of sexual engagement (4 items), and 7) Drive Motivation: Compelled by urges in the body (6 items) (Jenkins, 2004; Brunell & Webster, 2013). Higher mean scores indicated higher levels of sex for each motivation subscale. As in Study One, a composite scale for this measure was created (see page 81).

**Sexual Need Satisfaction.** The degree to which participants experienced sexual need satisfaction with their first and second partners was assessed using the 9-item Need Satisfaction Scale (LaGuardia et al., 2000.). All items began with “When I engage in sexual activity with _” (partner’s initials embedded) and included items such as “…I am free to be who I am”, and “…I feel loved and cared about.” Response choices ranged from 1 = not at all true to 7 = very true.

**Relationship Satisfaction.** Partner satisfaction with the first and second relationship was assessed with an adapted, shortened version of the Quality of Marriage scale (Norton, 1983). This measure has been used in research examining relational satisfaction from an SDT perspective with high internal reliability (e.g., Knee, Lonsbary, Can Evello, & Patrick, 2005). Participants
rated their agreement with six items on a 7-point scale, where 1 = *very strong disagreement*, and 7 = *very strong agreement*. Sample items included “Right now my relationship with __ is strong” and “Right now I am unsure if my relationship with __ will last.” Items are averaged, with higher scores indicating greater relationship satisfaction (see Appendix L).

**Sexual Satisfaction.** As in Study One, The New Sexual Satisfaction Scale- Short (NSSS-S) measured sexual satisfaction in the first partnership. Participants were asked to think about their sex life with their (first) partner over the past 6 months and rate their sexual satisfaction on 12 items such as “the quality of my orgasms” and “my partner’s sexual creativity” from 1 = *not at all satisfied* to 5 = *extremely satisfied*. In addition to the NSSS-S, participants reported on the following question about overall sexual satisfaction with both the first relationship and their second partnership: “Overall, how satisfied are you with the sexual aspect of your relationship with __ (partner’s initials inserted)?”, with response options ranging from 1 = *not at all satisfied* to 5 = *extremely satisfied*.

**Analytic Strategy**

**Sexual motives index.**

A composite measure of self-determined sexual motives was created using the same approach as in Study One (see page 54). However, given the lack of variation in item questions and the poor reliability of the *amotivation* subscale (see page 99), this subscale was omitted from the composite measure. As in Study One, the drive motivation subscale was also not included in the composite measure (see page 54). Therefore, the sexual motives index included the following PLOC-S subscales and weights: personal intrinsic motives (+2), relational intrinsic motives (+2), integrated-identified motives (+1), introjected-identified motives (-1), and extrinsic motives (-2).
Examining sexual motives with first and second partners.

Each participant responded to different reasons for having sex (e.g., personal intrinsic, relational intrinsic, extrinsic, etc.) and all responses were measured on the same scale. Therefore, a repeated measures analysis of variance, using the unweighted subscale means, was conducted to determine whether there were any mean differences in the sexual motives subscales within partners (i.e., determining which motives were higher for the first partner and which motives were higher for the second partner; see Field, 2005). To examine differences in sexual motives between first and second partners, a series of paired t-tests were conducted. Participants who did not report on a second partner were excluded from the analyses.

The actor-partner interdependence model and structural equation modeling.

The Actor-Partner Interdependence Model (APIM) provides a framework for the organization of individual-level and dyad-level variables (Kenny, Kashy, & Cook, 2006; Parsons et al., 2014). It measures interdependence within close relationships and uses the dyad as the unit of analysis (Campbell & Kashy, 2002; Kashy & Kenny, 2000). The APIM considers the way in which a person’s own score (i.e., independent variable) affects their own outcome (called the actor effect), as well as the way a person’s own score affects their partner’s outcome (known as the partner effect). Study Two used this framework to examine whether a person’s own sexual motives and need satisfaction was associated with their own relational outcomes, in addition to how a person’s own sexual motives and need satisfaction was linked to their (first) partner’s relational outcomes. Additionally, the APIM approach was used to determine whether sexual motives and need satisfaction with a second partner was associated with the relational outcomes of the first relationship.
Several analytic strategies have been proposed to estimate actor and partner effects with the most dominant being Multilevel Modeling (MLM) and Structural Equation Modeling (SEM) (Campbell & Kashy, 2002; Cook & Kenny, 2005; Ledermann & Kenny, 2017). Though both strategies can assess a wide range of dyadic models, SEM is better equipped to handle more complex models, such as those with a mediating variable (Lederman & Kenny, 2017). As MLM is a single outcome analysis, variables are treated as either predictors or outcomes (Lederman & Kenny, 2017). However, with mediational analyses, the mediator is both a predictor and an outcome variable. Rather than conducting a number of separate analyses and putting the results together (as is the case with MLM), SEM provides all estimates of the model simultaneously. Further, SEM provides a direct evaluation of how well the model fits the data (Lederman & Kenny, 2017). Given these additional benefits, I chose to use SEM to evaluate a series of mediated actor-partner interdependence models (APIMcM; Lederman, Macho, & Kenny, 2011) that examined the dyadic relationships between sexual motives, sexual need satisfaction, and relationship/sexual satisfaction.

To determine whether the same covariates proposed in Study One should be included in the current models (to establish the most parsimonious model), I conducted two initial linear regression analyses. I entered the proposed covariates (i.e., sexual frequency with first partner, relationship length with first partner, age and gender) as the independent variables and relationship satisfaction and sexual satisfaction (with the first partner) as the outcome variables (see Appendix M). Sexual frequency with the first partner was the only variable significantly associated with first partner relational outcomes and was thus included in the SEM models as a covariate.
Dyadic analyses with romantic partners are often treated as distinguishable (i.e., there is a systematic or meaningful way to order the two scores; Kenny, Kashy, & Cook, 2006). When there is a meaningful factor that can be used to order the partners, researchers can then determine whether partners differentially impact one other (i.e., whether the dichotomous factor makes an empirical difference). For example, much of the previous dyadic research on sexual motives has been conducted with heterosexual couples, using gender as the distinguishing variable (e.g., Brunell & Webster, 2013). Researchers have reported that men’s motivations are significantly related to women’s relational outcomes, but that women’s motivations are not significantly associated with men’s outcomes (Brunell & Webster, 2013).

When there is not a systematic way to order the partners’ scores, the data is treated as indistinguishable (i.e., there is not a meaningful factor that defines dyad member 1 and dyad member 2). Participants in the current study indicated a broad range of gender identities and some reported multiple gender identities. Ethically, I did not want to omit the reports from participants whose gender did not fall into a binary category. Further, the initial regression analyses indicated that gender was not significantly associated with the outcome variables. Given these ethical and statistical considerations, I chose not to distinguish dyads according to a binary understanding of gender and instead treated the data as indistinguishable.

The parameters of the two SEM models for the primary dyad variables (i.e., one for relationship satisfaction and one for sexual satisfaction) are shown in Figure 3.5 and the parameters for the two models examining second partner motives and need satisfaction on relational outcomes for the first relationship are depicted in Figure 3.6. In each analysis, I followed Olsen and Kenny’s (2006) strategy for applying SEM to indistinguishable data by first structuring the data dyadically (Kenny, Kashy, & Cook, 2006). Then, I constrained all pairs of
parameters to be equal across Dyad Member 1 and Dyad Member 2. That is, both members of the dyad were assumed to have the same mean and variance on the predictor variables, the same actor and partner effects, the same intercept on the outcome variables and the same error variance (Olsen & Kenny, 2006; Sadler, Ethier, & Woody, 2011).

SEM provides direct indices of model fit, such as a chi-square statistic (a good model provides a non-significant result at the 0.05 level; Hooper, Coughlan, & Mullen, 2008), the Comparative Fit Index (CFI) and the Tucker-Lewis Index (TLI; both have a range of 0-1 with .90-.95 reflecting acceptable to excellent fit; Marsh, Ball, & Hau, 1996), the standardized root mean square residual (SRMR; values close to or below .08 indicative of good fit; Brown, 2006), and the Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA; values less than .05 or .07 are considered a good fit; Hooper, Coughlan, & Mullen, 2008). However, when data are indistinguishable, fit indices must be adjusted. This is due to the presumption that the imposed parameter constraints act as testable hypotheses rather than a structural necessity (Sadler, Ethier, & Woody, 2011). Therefore, additional steps were taken to adjust model fit. With indistinguishable data, adjusted model fit is determined by estimating three separate models: a null model, an analytic model, and a saturated model (called the interchangeable saturated model or I-SAT). The null model estimates only the means and variances, while constraining covariances to zero and is considered the worst possible model to fit the data (Olsen & Kenny, 2006; Sadler, Ethier, & Woody, 2011). The saturated model is considered the best-fitting model and freely estimates all variable means, variances and covariances (Sadler, Ethier, & Woody, 2011). These two models provide a range within which to evaluate the analytic model. To obtain a fit estimate for the analytic model, an adjusted chi-square (and an adjusted df) is obtained by examining the difference between the chi-square (and df) of the analytic model and the chi-square
(and $df$) of the saturated model (Olsen & Kenny, 2006; Sadler, Ethier, & Woody, 2011). Adjustment strategies and formulas for additional fit indices are discussed in Appendix N.

All SEM models were estimated using maximum likelihood, and the 95% bias-corrected confidence intervals for indirect effects were obtained via bootstrapping ($N = 1000$). All data structuring and initial analyses were conducted in SPSS v.25 (IBM Corp., 2017) and all SEM analyses were evaluated using R (R Core Team, 2013) with the lavaan program (Rosseel, 2012).

Figure 3.5. Model parameters for associations between sexual motives, sexual need satisfaction and relationship satisfaction with the first partner.
Power Analyses

Post-hoc power estimates were conducted for each APIMeM analysis. This was done using the online power analyses application APIMPowerR (Ackerman & Kenny, 2016). Given the mediational nature of the models, this was done in two steps. First, the effect sizes for the direct actor and partner effects were inputted, then the indirect actor and partner effects were calculated to obtain a general estimate of power for the mediational analyses.

Results

Participants.

The sample included 56 partners (112 individuals) who ranged in age from 19-65 years ($M = 36.22, SD = 8.88$). Most participants were informed of the study via social media, with 40% (n = 45) reporting that they saw it on Facebook (see Table 3.1). Forty percent (n = 45) identified
as women (cisgender and transgender), 38.5% (n = 43) identified as men (cisgender and transgender), 10.7% (n = 12) reported a genderqueer identity, and the remaining participants indicated additional gender identities (e.g., gender fluid) or multiple gender identities.

Approximately one-third of the sample were heterosexual (34.8%, n = 39), one-quarter (24.1%, n = 27) identified as queer, and the rest indicated several varied sexual orientations (see Table 3.2).

The majority of the sample (92.9%, n = 104) was white, with 4.5% (n = 5) identifying as multiracial, 0.9% (n = 1) as Chinese, 0.9% (n = 1) as Arab, and one person who chose not to answer.

Table 3.1. Recruitment avenues.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recruitment Avenue</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Facebook</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>40.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twitter</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email listserv</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reddit</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poly podcast or blog</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swinging website</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Google search</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Word of mouth</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From a partner</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>24.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Most participants were currently in a polyamorous relationship (40.2%, n = 45 individuals) or reported that their CNM relationship structure included multiple definitions or types (e.g., open and polyamorous, swinging and open). Length of relationship with the first partner (i.e., committed and/or primary partner) was collected from both dyad members and ranged from six months to 26.92 years with an average of 8.88 years ($SD = 6.91$). This was significantly longer than relationship length with the second partner [$t(96), = 4.32, p < .001$]
which ranged from one month to 16 years with an average of 2.51 years \((SD = 1.08)\). Participants reported a mean of 2.40 partners \((SD = 5.02)\) in addition to the first committed partnership.

Frequency of partnered sexual interactions in the past month was significantly higher \([t(101), = 8.70, p < .001]\) with first partners \(\bar{M} = 9.28, SD = 10.06\) compared to second partners \(\bar{M} = 4.33, SD = 5.60\). See Table 3.2 for additional demographic information, and Table 3.3 for correlations and descriptive statistics of the key variables for both the first and second partners that participants reported on.

*Table 3.2. Demographic characteristics.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women (cisgender and transgender)</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>40.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men (cisgender and transgender)</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>38.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender queer</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender fluid</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-binary</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple gender identities</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sexual Orientation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asexual</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesbian</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gay</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bisexual</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pansexual</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queer</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>24.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertain or questioning</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heterosexual</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>34.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple orientations</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional identities (e.g., heteroflexible, sapiosexual, demisexual)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some high school</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school graduate</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some college/university</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College/university graduate</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>33.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some trade/technical/vocational training</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade/technical/vocational training degree or diploma</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some postgraduate work</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree Type</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Masters degree</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional degree (e.g., MD)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral Degree</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Residence**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>58.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburban</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>29.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (e.g., small town)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Relationship Type/Status**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type/Status</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Open relationship</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polyamorous</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>40.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swinging relationship</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple types of CNM</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>35.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other type of CNM (not specified)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living with one partner</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living with multiple partners</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engaged to one partner</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engaged to more than one partner</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married to one partner</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>33.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married to more than one partner</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple types (e.g., married to one partner, casually dating another partner)</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Participants were asked to check all that apply

**Reliability.**

Cronbach's coefficient alphas were computed to examine the internal consistency of all scales and subscales (see Table 3.3). Adequate to high internal consistency was established for all scales used in the current analyses, with the exception of two sexual motives subscales. When all of the subscale items were included, the Cronbach’s alpha score for the *extrinsic motives* subscale was $a = .67$ for motives with the first partner and $a = .33$ for motives with the second partner. Item-total statistics indicated that item 16 (“Because it helped me relax or get to sleep”) was problematic and was removed from the subscale. Once this item was removed, reliability scores
changed to $a = .80$ for motives with the first partner and $a = .83$ for motives with the second partner. Further, reliability analysis indicated that the scores for the amotivation subscale was low for both the first ($a = .56$) and the second partner ($a = .61$). Further examination indicated little variation in the responses to these items. For the first partnership, between 70-95% of the sample responded “not at all for this reason” for all items in this subscale. For the second partnership, between 80-93% of the sample responded “not at all for this reason” for the four items. Given the low reliability, the amotivation subscale was excluded from the creation of the sexual motives index, and instead presented descriptively in Table 3.4, along with the drive subscale, which is also not included in the composite measure of self-determined sexual motives (please refer to page 54 for explanation as to the exclusion of the drive subscale).
**Table 3.3.** Cronbach alphas, descriptive statistics and correlations for key variables for Partner 1 and Partner 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>First Partner</th>
<th>Second Partner</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Personal Intrinsic (+2)</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>5.63</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>6.17+</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>-.61'</td>
<td>.68'</td>
<td>-0.15</td>
<td>.25'</td>
<td>.27'</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>.53'</td>
<td>.42'</td>
<td>.28'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Relational Intrinsic (+2)</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>5.84</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>.44'</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.65'</td>
<td>-0.90</td>
<td>.25'</td>
<td>.36'</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>.52'</td>
<td>.39'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Integrated-Identified (+1)</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>.63'</td>
<td>.69'</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-.23+</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>-0.15</td>
<td>.31'</td>
<td>.22+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Introjected (-1)</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>-0.70</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>-.82'</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-.33'</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.60'</td>
<td>.42'</td>
<td>.47'</td>
<td>0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Extrinsic (-2)</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>-0.37</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>-0.28</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>.49'</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.54'</td>
<td>.58'</td>
<td>.30'</td>
<td>.31'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Sexual Need Satisfaction</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>53.75</td>
<td>7.38</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>52.19</td>
<td>8.20</td>
<td>.24+</td>
<td>.58+</td>
<td>.34+</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>.31+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.55'</td>
<td>.61'</td>
<td>.49'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Relationship Satisfaction</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>6.33</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>5.69+</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>.49'</td>
<td>.26+</td>
<td>.27+</td>
<td>.29'</td>
<td>.62'</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.23+</td>
<td>.37'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. New Sexual Satisfaction Scale</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>47.34</td>
<td>7.68</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.61'</td>
<td>.35'</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Overall Sexual Satisfaction</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>.32'</td>
<td>.33'</td>
<td>.28'</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>.20+</td>
<td>.59'</td>
<td>.57'</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Sexual Frequency</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9.31</td>
<td>10.60</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>4.53</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.28'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. + p<.05, 3 p<.01, * p<.001 Correlations above the diagonal are for Partner 1 (i.e., the first partner reported on/primary partner) correlations below the diagonal are for Partner 2 (i.e., the second partner that participants reported on).
Table 3.4. Drive subscale and amotivation subscale descriptives.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>First Partner M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Second Partner M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Drive Motives</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>1.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amotivation</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Preliminary analyses.**

Descriptive statistics and bivariate correlations were calculated to provide an initial assessment of the data. Paired samples t-tests were conducted to determine any differences in sexual motives, sexual frequency and relational outcomes between participants’ first and second partners (see Table 3.3). Within the primary dyad, sexual frequency in the past month was highly correlated ($r = .94, p < .01$), suggesting a similar estimate of frequency among dyad members (Mean for DM1 = 9.34, SD = 10.80; Mean for DM2 = 9.29, SD = 10.72). However, as sexual frequency was used in subsequent models as a control variable, the mean of DM1 and DM2’s sexual frequency estimate was used in the SEMs.

Given the study’s focus on outcomes for the first relationship, actor-partner correlations were evaluated for the key outcome and predictor variables for the first partnership only (see Table 3.5). These intra-class correlations and their 95% confidence intervals acted as a means to determine interdependence (Alferes & Kenny, 2009; Kenny, Kashy, & Cook, 2006). Several significant correlations were identified. However, it is important to note that these correlations may not be reflective of the complex relationships between the variables. The subsequent SEM models consider the complexity of these associations and are likely to provide a better representation of the data.
Table 3.5. Actor-Partner bivariate correlations for key variables.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Intra-Class Correlation</th>
<th>95% Confidence Intervals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal Intrinsic Motives</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>- .19, .33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relational Intrinsic Motives</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>- .17, .37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrated-Identified</td>
<td>.24*</td>
<td>- .03, .48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introjected</td>
<td>.40**</td>
<td>.15, .60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extrinsic</td>
<td>.59***</td>
<td>.38, .74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Need Satisfaction</td>
<td>.50***</td>
<td>.28, .67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship Satisfaction</td>
<td>.58***</td>
<td>.37, .73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Sexual Satisfaction Scale</td>
<td>.29*</td>
<td>.03, .52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Sexual Satisfaction</td>
<td>.40**</td>
<td>.16, .60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Frequency</td>
<td>.94***</td>
<td>.91, .97</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p<.05, **p<.01, ***p<.001

Sexual motives.

The RMANOVA indicated that, overall, participants engaged in sex (with both their first and second partner) more often for self-determined reasons (e.g., personal intrinsic motives, relational intrinsic motives, integrated identified reasons) compared to less self-determined reasons (e.g., extrinsic motives, introjected motives; see Table 3.6). Paired t-tests examining differences between sexual motives scores with a first and second partner indicated that participants reported higher mean scores with their first partner on the amotivation subscale \([t(89), p = .013;\) Cohen’s \(d = .24\)], and significantly higher scores with the second partner on the personal intrinsic \([t(89), p = .014;\) Cohen’s \(d = .30\)] and introjected regulation subscales \([t(92), p = .006;\) Cohen’s \(d = .28\); see Table 3.2).
**Table 3.6.** RMANOVA for sexual motives subscales with first and second partners.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale</th>
<th>First Partner</th>
<th>Second Partner</th>
<th>95% Confidence Intervals</th>
<th>First Partner</th>
<th>Second Partner</th>
<th>95% Confidence Intervals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Estimated Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td></td>
<td>Estimated Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Intrinsic</td>
<td>***2.81</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>2.64, 2.99</td>
<td>***3.08</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>2.90, 3.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relational Intrinsic</td>
<td>***2.94</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>2.79, 3.09</td>
<td>***3.03</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>2.84, 3.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrated Identified</td>
<td>***2.86</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>2.67, 3.04</td>
<td>***2.81</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>2.59, 3.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introjected</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>0.58, 0.80</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>0.69, 0.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extrinsic</td>
<td>**1.16</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>0.66, 1.65</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>0.18, 0.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amotivation</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>0.14, 0.31</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>0.07, 0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drive</td>
<td>***1.68</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>1.57, 1.90</td>
<td>***1.67</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>1.43, 1.92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis conducted with unweighted subscale scores.

**First partner:** $F(6, 96) = 218.19, p<.001, R^2 = .93; ***p<.001$ Personal Intrinsic, Relational Intrinsic & Integrated Identified subscales significantly higher than all other subscales, Drive subscale significantly higher than the Introjected and Amotivation subscales **$p<.01$ Extrinsic motives significantly higher than Amotivation subscale.

**Second partner:** $F(6, 82) = 194.83, p<.001, R^2 = .93. ***p<.001$ Personal Intrinsic, Relational Intrinsic & Integrated Identified subscales significantly higher than all other subscales, Drive significantly higher than Introjected, Extrinsic and Amotivation subscales.

What are the dyadic associations between self-determined sexual motives, sexual need satisfaction and relationship satisfaction among CNM partners in a committed relationship?

**Relationship satisfaction.**

An APIMeM examining the associations between sexual motives, sexual need satisfaction and relationship satisfaction with the first partner is depicted in Figure 3.7. In support of Hypotheses 1-3, indirect actor effects indicated that individuals who engaged in sex for more self-determined reasons reported higher levels of relationship satisfaction with their first partner, and that this association was mediated by sexual need satisfaction (see Table 3.7). There was also
support for Hypotheses 4-6: when participants engaged in sex for more self-determined reasons, their *partner* reported higher levels of sexual need satisfaction and, in turn, greater relationship satisfaction. For Dyad member 1, the model accounted for 36% of the variance in relationship satisfaction and 29% of the variance in need satisfaction. For Dyad Member 2, 35% of the variance in relationship satisfaction and 28% of variance in need satisfaction was accounted for by the model. As seen in Table 3.8, the analytic model fit the data well. Post-hoc power analyses for the direct effects indicated a power of .05 to detect the actor effect and a power of .05 to detect the partner effect. There was a power of .20 to detect the indirect actor effect and a power of .06 to detect the indirect partner effect. The data indicate that engaging in sex for self-determined motives with one’s first partner is positively associated not only with a person’s own relationship satisfaction, but their first partner’s relationship satisfaction as well.
Figure 3.7. APIMeM for associations between sexual motives, sexual need satisfaction and relationship satisfaction with the first partner.
### Table 3.7. Summary of total effects, total indirect effects, indirect effects, and direct effects for primary dyad relationship satisfaction.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Estimate</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>BCLLCI</th>
<th>BCULCI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Actor Effect</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total effect</td>
<td>0.07*</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.017</td>
<td>0.147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total IE</td>
<td>0.08*</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.027</td>
<td>0.157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IE1 (actor-actor)</td>
<td>0.05*</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.018</td>
<td>0.106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IE2 (partner-partner)</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>-0.004</td>
<td>0.028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct effect</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>-0.030</td>
<td>0.009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Partner Effect</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total effect</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>-0.031</td>
<td>0.064</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total IE</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>-0.014</td>
<td>0.071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IE 3 (actor-partner)</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>-0.010</td>
<td>0.043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IE 4 (partner-actor)</td>
<td>0.03*</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>0.061</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct effect</td>
<td>-0.003</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>-0.055</td>
<td>0.035</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IE 1: SM with P1, DM1 → SNS with P1, DM1 → RS with P1, DM1
IE 2: SM with P1, DM1 → SNS with P1, DM2 → RS with P1, DM1
IE 3: SM with P1, DM1 → SNS with P1, DM1 → RS with P1, DM2
IE 4: SM with P1, DM1 → SNS with P1, DM2 → RS with P1, DM2

Note: IE = Indirect effect, SM = sexual motives, SNS = sexual need satisfaction, RS = relationship satisfaction, DM = dyad member (1 or 2), P = partner (1 or 2)

Note: Estimates are unstandardized; *95% BCCI does not include 0.
Table 3.8. Fit Indices for null, analysis and I-SAT models for primary dyad with relationship satisfaction as the outcome variable.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>TLI</th>
<th>TLI'</th>
<th>CFI</th>
<th>SRMR</th>
<th>$X^2$ (p value)</th>
<th>$X^2'$</th>
<th>df'</th>
<th>RMSEA (90% CI)</th>
<th>RMSEA'</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Null model</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>119.35 (p &lt; .001)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.29 (.24, .34)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis model</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>30.61 (p = .08)</td>
<td>4.48</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.09 (.00, .16)</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturated model</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>26.13 (p = .08)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.10 (.00, .17)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Sexual satisfaction.**

Figure 3.8 shows the associations between sexual motives, sexual need satisfaction and sexual satisfaction with the first partner. There were partially mediated actor effects (ratio of indirect effect to total effect = 0.45; Lederman & Macho, 2009) indicating that when participants reported engaging in sex for more self-determined motives, they reported higher levels of sexual need satisfaction and, in turn, greater relationship satisfaction with their first relationship (i.e., support for Hypotheses 1-3; see Table 3.9). No indirect partner effects were identified (i.e., Hypotheses 4-6). For both dyad members, the model accounted for 51% of the variance in sexual satisfaction and 26% of the variance in need satisfaction. The adjusted chi-square statistic, adjusted TLI and the CLI were within acceptable fit range. The SRMR and the RMSEA were both above acceptable cut off points (see Table 3.10). Post-hoc power analyses for the direct effects indicated a power of virtually 1 to detect the actor effect and a power of .71 to detect the partner effect. There was a power of virtually 1 to detect the indirect actor effect and a power of .39 to detect the indirect partner effect. The analyses indicate that having sex for self-determined motives is positively associated with a person’s own need fulfillment and sexual satisfaction but is not significantly associated with the sexual satisfaction of their first partner.
Figure 3.8. APIMeM for associations between sexual motives, sexual need satisfaction and sexual satisfaction with the first partner.
Table 3.9. Summary of total effects, total indirect effects, indirect effects, and direct effects for primary dyad sexual satisfaction.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actor Effect</th>
<th>Estimate</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>BCLLCI</th>
<th>BCULCI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total effect</td>
<td>1.34*</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>0.921</td>
<td>1.816</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total IE</td>
<td>0.57*</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>0.214</td>
<td>1.062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IE1 (actor-actor)</td>
<td>0.39*</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>0.162</td>
<td>0.697</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IE2 (partner-partner)</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-0.160</td>
<td>0.042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct effect</td>
<td>0.76*</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>0.441</td>
<td>1.047</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partner Effect</th>
<th>Estimate</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>BCLLCI</th>
<th>BCULCI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total effect</td>
<td>0.007</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>-0.338</td>
<td>0.327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total IE</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>-0.390</td>
<td>0.162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IE 3 (actor-partner)</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-0.240</td>
<td>0.122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IE 4 (partner-actor)</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>-0.010</td>
<td>0.419</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct effect</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>-0.218</td>
<td>0.391</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IE 1: SM with P1, DM1 → SNS with P1, DM1 → SS with P1, DM1
IE 2: SM with P1, DM1 → SNS with P1, DM2 → SS with P1, DM1
IE 3: SM with P1, DM1 → SNS with P1, DM1 → SS with P1, DM2
IE 4: SM with P1, DM1 → SNS with P1, DM2 → SS with P1, DM2

Note: IE = Indirect effect, SM = sexual motives, SNS = sexual need satisfaction, SS = sexual satisfaction, DM = dyad member (1 or 2), P = partner (1 or 2)
Note: Estimates are unstandardized; *95%BCCI does not include 0.
Table 3.10. Fit Indices for null, analysis and I-SAT models for primary dyad with sexual satisfaction as the outcome variable.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>TLI</th>
<th>TLI'</th>
<th>CFI</th>
<th>SRMR</th>
<th>( \chi^2 ) (p value)</th>
<th>( \chi'^2 )</th>
<th>df'</th>
<th>RMSEA (90% CI)</th>
<th>RMSEA'</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Null model</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>143.55 (0.000)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.30 (0.274, 0.374)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis model</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>33.37 (p = 0.04)</td>
<td>7.6 (p &gt; 0.05)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.10 (0.020, 0.165)</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturated model</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>25.77 (p = 0.08)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.10 (0.000, 0.167)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
How are sexual motives and need satisfaction with a second partner associated with the relationship and sexual satisfaction of the first partnership among CNM partners in a committed relationship? (Exploratory questions 2 and 3).

Relationship satisfaction.

An APIMeM exploring the associations between sexual motives with a second partner, sexual need satisfaction with a second partner and relationship satisfaction with the first partner is depicted in Figure 3.9. No indirect actor or indirect partner effects were found in this model (see Table 3.11), and only two model fit indices were within the acceptable range of fit (see Table 3.12). The model accounted for 7% of the variance in relationship satisfaction and 31% of the variance in need satisfaction. The current data indicate that sexual motives and need satisfaction with a second partner was not significantly associated with the relationship satisfaction of those in the primary dyad.
Figure 3.9. APIMeM for associations between sexual motives with second partner, sexual need satisfaction with second partner and relationship satisfaction with the first partner.
Table 3.11. Summary of total effects, total indirect effects, indirect effects, and direct effects for second partner predictors on first partner relationship satisfaction.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Estimate</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>BCLLCI</th>
<th>BCULCI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Actor Effect</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total effect</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>-0.003</td>
<td>0.082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total IE</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>-0.048</td>
<td>0.042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IE1 (actor-actor)</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>-0.041</td>
<td>0.035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IE2 (partner-partner)</td>
<td>-0.003</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>-0.015</td>
<td>0.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct effect</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>-0.023</td>
<td>0.099</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Partner Effect</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total effect</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>-0.046</td>
<td>0.053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total IE</td>
<td>-0.024</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>-0.065</td>
<td>0.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IE 3</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>-0.061</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IE 4</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>-0.006</td>
<td>0.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct effect</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>-0.016</td>
<td>0.110</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IE 1: SM with P2, DM1 $\rightarrow$ SNS with P2, DM1 $\rightarrow$ RS with P1, DM1
IE 2: SM with P2, DM1 $\rightarrow$ SNS with P2, DM2 $\rightarrow$ RS with P1, DM1
IE 3: SM with P1, DM1 $\rightarrow$ SNS with P1, DM1 $\rightarrow$ RS with P1, DM2
IE 4: SM with P1, DM1 $\rightarrow$ SNS with P1, DM2 $\rightarrow$ RS with P1, DM2

Note: IE = Indirect effect, SM = sexual motives, SNS = sexual need satisfaction, RS = relationship satisfaction, DM = dyad member (1 or 2), P = partner (1 or 2)
Note: Estimates are unstandardized; *95% BCCI does not include 0.
Table 3.12. Fit Indices for null, analysis and I-SAT models for primary dyad relationship satisfaction predicted by second partner sexual motives and second partner sexual need satisfaction.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>TLI</th>
<th>TLI'</th>
<th>CFI</th>
<th>SRMR</th>
<th>$\chi^2$ (p value)</th>
<th>$\chi^2'$</th>
<th>Df'</th>
<th>RMSEA (90% CI)</th>
<th>RMSEA'</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Null model</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>84.82 (p &lt; .001)</td>
<td>49.87 (p &lt; .001)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.23 (.18, .29)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis model</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>35.57 (p = .02)</td>
<td>0.62 (p &gt; .05)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.11 (.04, .17)</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturated model</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>34.95 (p = .01)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.14 (.07, .20)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Sexual satisfaction.**

Figure 3.10 shows the associations between second partner sexual motives, second partner sexual need satisfaction and sexual satisfaction with the first partner. No mediated actor effects were indicated in the model. However, a mediated partner effect was identified; when Dyad Member 1 reported more self-determined motives with a second partner, they indicated higher levels of sexual need satisfaction with that second partner, which in turn, negatively impacted Dyad Member 2’s sexual satisfaction. That is, when one person in the primary dyad had sex for self-determined reasons with a second partner, their sexual need satisfaction with that second partner was higher, and this was related to lower levels of sexual satisfaction reported by their first partner. For Dyad member 1, the model accounted for 11% of the variance in sexual satisfaction and 31% of the variance in need satisfaction. For Dyad Member 2, 10% of the variance in sexual satisfaction and 36% of variance in need satisfaction was accounted for by the model. See Table 3.13 for a summary of effects. Model fit indices were adequate, with the adjusted TLI and chi-square indicating good fit and the adjusted RMSEA and CLI falling below the cut off (Table 3.14). Post-hoc power analyses for the direct effects indicated a power of .93 to detect the actor effect and a power of virtually 1 to detect the partner effect. There was a power of .30 to detect the indirect actor effect and a power of virtually 1 to detect the indirect partner effect. The data indicate that sexual motives and need satisfaction with a second partner was not significantly associated with a person’s own levels of sexual satisfaction in their first relationship but were negatively linked to the reported levels of sexual satisfaction of their first partner.
Figure 3.10. APIMeM for associations between sexual motives with second partner, sexual need satisfaction with second partner and sexual satisfaction with the first partner.
Table 3.13. Summary of total effects, total indirect effects, indirect effects, and direct effects for second partner predictors on first partner sexual satisfaction.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Estimate</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>BCLLCI</th>
<th>BCULCI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Actor Effect</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total effect</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>-0.084</td>
<td>0.709</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total IE</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>-0.283</td>
<td>0.472</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IE1 (actor-actor)</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>-0.250</td>
<td>0.389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IE2 (partner-partner)</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>-0.287</td>
<td>0.054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct effect</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>-0.330</td>
<td>0.803</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Partner Effect</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total effect</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>-0.604</td>
<td>0.315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total IE</td>
<td>-0.48*</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>-0.937</td>
<td>-0.148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IE 3 (actor-partner)</td>
<td>-0.40*</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>-0.750</td>
<td>-0.135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IE 4 (partner-actor)</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>-0.065</td>
<td>0.097</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct effect</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>-0.156</td>
<td>0.858</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IE 1: SM with P2, DM1 → SNS with P2, DM1 → SS with P1, DM1
IE 2: SM with P2, DM1 → SNS with P2, DM2 → SS with P1, DM1
IE 3: SM with P2, DM1 → SNS with P2, DM1 → SS with P1, DM2
IE 4: SM with P2, DM1 → SNS with P2, DM2 → SS with P1, DM2

Note: IE = Indirect effect, SM = sexual motives, SNS = sexual need satisfaction, RS = relationship satisfaction, DM = dyad member (1 or 2), P = partner (1 or 2)
Note: Estimates are unstandardized; *95% BCCI does not include 0.
Table 3.14. Fit Indices for null, analysis and I-SAT models for primary dyad sexual satisfaction predicted by second partner sexual motives and second partner sexual need satisfaction.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>TLI</th>
<th>TLI’</th>
<th>CFI</th>
<th>SRMR</th>
<th>$X^2$ (p value)</th>
<th>$X'^2$</th>
<th>Df’</th>
<th>RMSEA (90% CI)</th>
<th>RMSEA’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Null model</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>69.76 (p &lt; .001)</td>
<td>0.20 (.15, .26)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis model</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>30.14 (p =.09)</td>
<td>7.65 (p &lt;.05)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.09 (.00, .15)</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturated model</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>22.49 (p =.17)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Ruling out alternative hypotheses.**

To strengthen confidence in the theoretical model, I conducted additional analyses to rule out alternative explanations. As in Study One, I conducted several APIMeM’s to test the directionality of the model. It is possible that sexual motives act as a mediator between sexual need satisfaction and relational outcomes. That is, when a person feels sexually fulfilled in their relationship, they are more likely to seek out partnered sexual interactions for self-determined reasons, thus positively impacting both their own relational outcomes and the relational outcomes of their first partner. In the alternative models with sexual motives as a mediator, support for one partially mediated actor effect was identified: in the primary dyad, higher levels of sexual need satisfaction were associated with more self-determined sexual motives, and this was linked to higher sexual satisfaction with one’s first partner (see Appendix O). This suggests that there is some degree of bidirectionality in the associations between sexual motives, sexual need satisfaction, and relationship/sexual satisfaction. No significant indirect partner or actor effects were identified for the cross-partner models [i.e., the mediational models testing whether sexual need satisfaction (with a second partner) and sexual motives (with a second partner) was associated with the relational outcomes of the first partner].

**Discussion**

Study Two included three goals: 1) identify the types of sexual motives reported for both a first and a second partner, 2) investigate the dyadic associations between self-determined sexual motives, sexual need satisfaction and relational outcomes among CNM partners in a committed relationship, and 3) explore how sexual motives and need satisfaction with a second partner was linked to relational outcomes with a first partner. Fifty-six CNM dyads were recruited online to complete a survey on motivations and experiences in CNM partnerships. The findings both
replicate and extend the results of Study One by identifying a similar pattern of associations among the examined variables in a sample of CNM partners, and describing the associations of interpersonal dynamics with relationship and sexual satisfaction.

**Sexual motives.**

Overall, participants engaged in sex for self-determined reasons with both their first and their second partner. Intrinsic reasons, such as having sex for enjoyment, to be close to a partner, or because sex is considered a valuable activity, were reported more often than extrinsic reasons, such as having sex to manage feelings of shame or guilt, or to receive external rewards. Drive motives (i.e., having sex to relieve sexual tension) were reported less frequently than intrinsic reasons but more often than reasons related to loss of control (i.e., amotivated) or fear of partner withdrawal (i.e., extrinsic). People in monogamous relationships commonly report similar patterns of motives for partnered sexual activity (Armstrong & Reissing, 2015; Brunell & Webster, 2013; Muise, Impett, & Desmarais, 2013; Wood, Milhausen, & Jeffrey, 2014). Research also indicates that individuals are intrinsically motivated to engage in CNM generally, and in swinging interactions specifically (DeSantis et al., 2016; Fernandes, Wood, & Schechinger, 2014; Jenks, 1998; Kimberley & Hans, 2017). These studies suggest that intrinsic sexual motivation is high in romantic relationships, regardless of one’s relationship structure. However, participants in sexuality research tend to have more positive and liberal attitudes towards sex and have more sexual experience than those who do not participate (Dunne et al., 1997; Wiederman, 1999). It is possible that the participants in the current sample were more intrinsically motivated for sex prior to engaging in the research, compared to those who did not respond. Further, it is important to note that previous research on CNM, along with the current study, is likely based on individuals who are generally content with their partnerships and for
whom CNM has worked well, and not those who may have tried CNM and since disengaged from this relationship structure. It is possible that participants would indicate different sexual motives in relationships where there is notable conflict or where one person wishes to engage in CNM whereas another desires monogamy.

Though self-determined reasons were reported for both partners, participants engaged in sex more often, on average, with their second partner for reasons related to the physical enjoyment of sex (i.e., personal intrinsic) and reasons related to proving one’s capability, or feeling dominant (i.e., introjected). They were also more likely to engage in sex with their first partner because they did not feel in control of their own behaviour (i.e., amotivated). Higher personal intrinsic reasons with a second partner may be related to the desire for sexual variety, and novel experiences, both commonly cited motives for engaging in CNM (DeSantis et al., 2016; Hoff & Beougher, 2010). Moreover, it has been proposed that relationships shift from passionate love (i.e., state of longing, sexual desire) to companionate love (i.e., feeling of affection, attachment) when partners have been in a relationship between six and thirty months (Fisher 2004; 2006; Hatfield & Walster, 1978). Passionate love scores are positively associated with measures of desire for sexual intimacy and tend to decrease over the course of a relationship (Sprecher & Regan 1998). In the current research (i.e., Study Two), the relationship length with the first partner (M = 8.88 years) was significantly longer than the length of the relationship with the second partner (M = 2.51 years). Thus, it is possible that different relationship stages with each partner influenced participants’ reported sexual motives. Furthermore, research suggests that people in committed relationships will “go along with sex” when they are not feeling sexual desire, in order to maintain relationship harmony or because of an implicit understanding that sexual activity should sometimes occur even if one person is not interested (i.e., to keep their
partner happy; Ronson, Milhausen & Wood, 2012; Vannier & O’Sullivan, 2010). Possibly, the long-term primary dyad partners in Study Two engaged in sex more often for such maintenance reasons and sought an additional sex partner for reasons related to excitement and physical pleasure.

Higher introjected motives with a second partner may reflect different relational dynamics in the current sample versus those in previous research. For example, several participants noted that they were part of a BDSM (bondage, discipline, dominance, submission, sadism, masochism) or kink relationship. It may be that participants in this sample were more likely to have kink relationships with a second partner. Previous studies have found that engaging in expansive sexual behaviours, (such as BDSM) is a reason some couples open up a current relationship (Bauer, 2010; DeSantis et al., 2016). In these cases, engaging in sex because one wants to feel powerful (items about power and dominance are included on the introjected subscale) could indicate motives related to the kink aspect of the partnership. Engaging in BDSM activities can have positive impacts, such as a decrease in negative affect and psychological stress (Ambler et al., 2017). Thus, within the context of a kink relationship, power and dominance could be related to personally intrinsic motives (i.e., inherent positive feelings of dominance), rather than a negative internalization, or use of, power (i.e., introjected motives).

It is also important to note that the effect sizes for all differences between the first and second partner sexual motives were small (i.e., Cohen’s $d$ ranging from .24-.30). Further, the amotivation subscale items were rarely endorsed and the overall mean of the amotivation scale was quite low. Possibly, the few participants who endorsed these items had other relational challenges (e.g., lower levels of communication or trust) in their first partnership compared to the rest of the sample. Future research could explore the contexts in which CNM individuals
experience less control in their sexual lives, both from a beneficial perspective (such as in the case of consensual kink relationships) and when there is pressure or coercion within a partnership.

**Sexual motives and need fulfilment in the primary dyad.**

As in Study One, participants who engaged in more self-determined sexual motives reported higher levels of relational and sexual satisfaction, and this association was mediated by sexual need fulfillment (i.e., an indirect actor effect). The current research also identified indirect partner effects for relationship satisfaction: when a person engaged in sex more often for self-determined reasons, their partner also reported higher levels of need fulfillment, which was positively associated with their partner’s relational satisfaction. Similar actor and partner effects have been identified in research with monogamous participants. In a study with heterosexual undergraduate couples, the relationship between men’s daily self-determined sexual motivation and relational quality was mediated by sexual need satisfaction (Brunell & Webster, 2013). Further, men’s self-determined sexual motivation positively impacted women’s daily relationship satisfaction. Other daily diary studies with monogamous couples indicate that on days when one partner engaged in sex for reasons related to intimacy or pleasure, the other partner reported higher levels of relational satisfaction (Muise, Impett, & Desmarais, 2013). Together, these findings suggest that when individuals engage in sex because they want to experience pleasure or enhance intimacy, the sexual interaction is more likely to meet their psychological needs and positively impact not only how they view their sexual and romantic partnership, but also how their partner views the relationship. That is, it appears that the benefits of self-determined motives are not limited to one’s own relational wellbeing but extend to one’s partner as well.
Sexual motives and need fulfilment with a second partner: First partner relational outcomes.

Study Two tested how sexual motives and need fulfillment in a second relationship was associated with the relational outcomes of the first partnership. Research indicates that being sexually fulfilled in one partnership can enhance a current relationship (Moors, Mastick, & Schechinger, 2017, Muise et al., 2018). In contrast to such findings, the current study did not find support for an additive effect across partnerships. Though no actor or partner effects were identified for relationship satisfaction, having sex for self-determined reasons with a second partner, and feeling more fulfilled with a second partner, was negatively associated with the first partner’s sexual satisfaction. At first glance, this appears in line with contrast models of need fulfillment in CNM relationships where being fulfilled in one partnership negatively impacts how a person feels about a different relationship (see Mitchell, Bartholomew, & Cobb, 2014). Yet, no actor effects were identified in the sexual satisfaction model. That is, having sex with, and being fulfilled by, a second partner did not influence how the person felt about their first relationship. This suggests that participants view their relationships as separate, rather than mutually influential. However, it appears that feeling sexually fulfilled with a second partner is linked to the first relationship through the first partner’s decreased sexual satisfaction (i.e., a partner effect). In polyamorous relationships, individuals report spending a greater amount of time on sexual activity with a secondary partner, compared to a primary partner (Balzarini et al., 2017). It is possible that a discrepancy in how partners spend time with one another impacts how they feel about the partnership(s). For example, if one member of the primary dyad desires more time spent connecting through sexual activity with their first partner and is unable to, their satisfaction could be negatively impacted when they learn of their partner’s sexual time with another
individual. Yet, in the current study participants reported engaging in sex more frequently with their first partner (compared to their second partner), suggesting that frequency of sex (or time spent on sex) alone does not account for this finding.

The concept of new relationship energy (NRE) may contextualize the cross-partner results. NRE is described in the CNM literature as intense feelings of excitement at the beginning of a new partnership (Hardy & Easton, 2017; Wosick-Correa, 2010). NRE with a novel partner can enhance current relationships when a partner brings that additional energy into the primary relationship (Muise et al., 2018; Wosick-Correa, 2010). However, negative consequences of NRE have also been noted (Taormino, 2008). For example, established long-term partners can feel “left out” when their partner is intensely experiencing NRE, or find that their partner manages their time differently during this process. In such cases, it is possible that being aware of a partner’s sexual need fulfillment with another person could negatively impact how sexually satisfied that person feels in the primary dyad.

Alternatively, lower sexual satisfaction of the first partner could reflect the challenges associated with having a CNM relationship in a socio-cultural environment that is highly mononormative (i.e., the assumption that monogamy is natural or better than other relationship structures; Piper & Bauer, 2005). Assumptions of sexual fidelity are often incorporated into discourses of what makes a healthy, satisfying, and stable partnership (Finn, 2010; Jamieson, 2004; Moors & Schechinger, 2014; Wosick, 2012). Frequently, narratives of romantic partnerships present additional sexual partners as threatening and reinforce an idea of competition between partners (e.g., Rusbult & Buunk, 1993). With limited representations of CNM relationships, it would not be surprising if individuals struggled when directly faced with the task of deconstructing ideas about jealousy, NRE, and specialness (particularly ideas about sexual
specialness) in a CNM relationship. Research indicates that engaging with new ideas about monogamy and CNM takes considerable work and commitment from individuals and partners (Bergstrand & Sinski, 2010; Moors, Mastick, Schechinger, 2017; Wosick-Correa, 2010). It is possible that a partner’s lower sexual satisfaction in the primary dyad reflects participants’ attempt to work through some of their ideas of what it means to have specialness in a partnership or what it means for their partner to have their sexual needs fulfilled outside of their relationship (e.g., comparing their sexual relationship to their partner’s other sexual relationship).

Relatedly, the cross-partner associations may be temporary in nature and indicative of the processes involved in the transition from a monogamous to a CNM relationship. For example, jealousy is experienced more frequently, and more intensely, at the beginning stages of a swinging relationship and dissipates as partners become more comfortable with the lifestyle and are better able to communicate with one another (Bergstrand & Sinski, 2010; deVisser & McDonald, 2007; Gould, 1999). Polyamorous individuals report making a greater number of relational agreements when first opening up a partnership and then transitioning to fewer and more flexible arrangements over an extended period of time (Wosick, 2012). It is possible that some participants in the current study were experiencing common, temporary challenges associated this transition. However, relationship length with one’s first partner was an average of 8.88 years, suggesting that many partners had been together for an extended period of time. Thus, it is unlikely that a large number of them would be in an initial stage of transition. Nonetheless, there is no data on how long this transition takes in CNM partnerships and whether it is a linear process. Further, participants were not asked how long they had been engaging in CNM or whether they had opened up a previously monogamous partnership. Future research on the
processes that occur during the transition to a CNM relationship would be beneficial in identifying whether decreases in satisfaction are temporary or occur over a longer period of time.

Finally, it is important to note that participants in the current study were quite satisfied overall with their first partner (both relationally and sexually). A three-point difference in sexual satisfaction (in a scale where the mean was 47.34 out of a possible 60), does not necessarily indicate that participants are unhappy in their partnership (i.e., they are not moving from “very satisfied” to “very unsatisfied”), but that there is a slight change in an otherwise satisfied sexual relationship. Further, a drop in sexual satisfaction does not indicate that this challenge is detrimental to one’s first relationship or that there are not additional benefits of CNM that counter-act this experience.

**Strengths and limitations.**

This study is among the first to collect dyadic data from participants in a CNM relationship and to report on the sexual motives, need fulfillment, and relational outcomes in multiple relationships for the same person. It provides novel information about sexual motives across relationships and identifies how interpersonal dynamics are associated with relational outcomes in partnerships where need fulfillment is dispersed among multiple people. However, the study is limited in that participants only reported on two (rather than all) of their partners. Though including two partners may reflect the experiences of some people in the study, others may have been prevented from reporting on important partnerships (i.e., the mean number of partners, in addition to the first/primary relationship was 2.40). It is possible that additional relationships differentially influence relational outcomes of a primary dyad. For example, a second long-term partner may have a different relational dynamic with the primary dyad (such as family integration) compared to a new additional partner where NRE is present. Though
analytically challenging if done quantitatively, research that includes all members of the relationship could illuminate the specific contexts in which additional partnerships positively or negatively influence one another. Qualitative research in this area could also determine the nuanced circumstances that result in instances where NRE is beneficial or detrimental to an established partnership.

As in Study One, the current analyses impose a quasi-causal mediational model onto correlational data. Though additional analyses with sexual motives as a mediator of sexual need satisfaction and relational outcomes provided support for my proposed model, one of the actor effects in the alternative models was significant. This finding suggests that the associations between sexual motives, sexual need satisfaction and relationship/sexual satisfaction are bidirectional. That is, a person’s engagement in sex for self-determined motives is related to how fulfilled they are by the sexual interaction, and feeling more fulfilled is associated with engaging in sex more often for self-determined reasons. Longitudinal research examining these variables simultaneously over time could establish how partner dynamics shape relationships.

Lastly, in the primary dyad relational models, partner effects for relationship satisfaction were minimal, with confidence intervals close to zero. This is in line with previous findings where actor effects are moderate (or large) and partner effects are much smaller (e.g., Brunell & Webster, 2013). The sample size in the current study was small to medium by dyadic data standards (Kashy & Kenny, 2000). Though post-hoc power analyses suggested that there was strong power to detect actor effects, power for partner effects was limited. The small sample size might explain the current findings, and analyses with increased power could possibly strengthen the partner effects or identify additional partner effects. Future research with larger samples of CNM dyads would be beneficial to see if the current results are replicable and robust.
Alternatively, small partner effects could indicate how challenging it is for a person to accurately detect their partner’s sexual motives and/or whether their partner is sexually fulfilled (Muise, 2011). Further, the actor effects in the sexual satisfaction model were only partially mediated, suggesting that there are other variables- in addition to sexual motives and need fulfillment- that are important contributors of sexual satisfaction. Investigating how variables such as communication (noted as a critical component of engaging in CNM; Montenegro, 2010; Wosick-Correa, 2010), or NRE work separately, or in tandem with, sexual motives to influence satisfaction, could help identify concrete strategies that partners may use to enhance their relational outcomes.
Chapter 4: General Discussion of Research

Romantic partnerships provide individuals with the opportunity to experience personal fulfillment. Engaging in partnered sex is one way that people can fulfill their needs and enhance their relationships (Finkel et al., 2014; LaGuardia & Patrick, 2008; Patrick et al., 2007). A person’s sexual motives have a substantial impact on their relational quality: engaging in sex in order to be close to a partner or for the sheer pleasure of the activity promotes desire and need satisfaction, and thus amplifies sexual and relational satisfaction (Brunell & Webster, 2015; Muise, Impett, & Desmarais, 2013; Smith, 2007; Stephenson, Ahrold, & Meston, 2011). In contrast, engaging in sex out of pressure or to avoid negative consequences (e.g., partner conflict) is associated with decreased need satisfaction and the diminishment of sexual and relational wellbeing. The current research sought to understand how self-determined motives for engaging in partnered sex was differentially associated with sexual need satisfaction and relational outcomes in partnerships where sexual needs are met by one person (i.e., monogamous) and relationships where sexual needs are met by multiple people (i.e., CNM).

Summary of Major Findings

Across two studies, I demonstrated that intrinsic reasons for sex (e.g., pleasure, excitement, intimacy) were common in relationships where sexual fidelity is expected within the partnership (i.e., monogamy) and relationships where sexual needs are dispersed (i.e., CNM). Participants endorsed intrinsic motives as their primary reasons for engaging in sex, during both their most recent sexual interaction (Study One) and with their partners generally over the past month (Study Two). The least commonly cited reasons for partnered sexual activity included those related to pressure and loss of control (i.e., amotivated) or reasons linked to external rewards and punishments, such as fear of partner withdrawal (i.e., extrinsic). In Study One,
participants in CNM relationships were more likely to report motives related to the enjoyment of sex itself, their own values regarding sex and relationships, and to satisfy their own sex drive (compared to monogamous participants). In Study Two, I established that participants engaged in CNM reported similar reasons, overall, for sex with both a first and second partner. That is, both personally and relationally intrinsic reasons (e.g., pleasure, intimacy) were more commonly cited than extrinsic (e.g., fear of punishment) or controlling reasons (i.e., amotivated). However, CNM participants in Study Two did report engaging in sex more often, overall, with their second partner for the physical enjoyment of sex (i.e., personal intrinsic) and to prove one’s capability, or feel dominant (i.e., introjected).

Individual and dyadic mediational analyses indicated that sexual need satisfaction is an important mechanism through which self-determined sexual motives are associated with sexual and relationship satisfaction. In Study One, participants who reported engaging in sex for more self-determined motives also reported higher sexual need satisfaction and this was associated with higher sexual and relationship satisfaction. The links between these variables were similar for both monogamous and CNM participants, suggesting that a person’s reasons for sex are more central to their relational wellbeing than is their relationship structure. Study Two extended these findings to a sample of CNM dyads and determined that sexual motives and sexual need satisfaction appear to be important contributors to the relational and sexual wellbeing of the individual, and the relational wellbeing of their first partner (i.e., a committed partner that they lived with). Finally, sexual motives and need satisfaction in a second partnership was not significantly associated with the person’s perception of their first relationship. However, having sex for self-determined reasons with a second partner, and feeling more fulfilled with a second partner, was associated with lower sexual satisfaction of the first partner.
Methodological and Theoretical Contributions

The current research contributes to a growing body of work that demonstrates the unique benefits of applying a SDT perspective to understanding close relationships and sexual behaviour (Brunell & Webster, 2015; Gravel, Pelletier, & Reissing, 2015; Knee et al., 2005; 2013; La Guardia & Patrick, 2008; Smith, 2007; Vrangalova, 2015). In romantic relationships, self-determination refers to authentically endorsing one’s engagement in the partnership, without feeling pressured or coerced by internal or external forces (e.g., another person, feelings of guilt or shame; Knee, et al., 2013). Previous research established that behavioural pursuits that are more self-determined (i.e., more fully self-aware) are associated with several relational advantages, including increased relationship satisfaction for both partners (LaGuardia & Patrick, 2008; Knee et al., 2013; Patrick et al., 2007). SDT also explains aspects of sexual relationships through the identification of certain types of sexual motives that impact psychological needs. The incremental approach to SDT (i.e., motives that are less to more self-determined) provides a framework to begin understanding the contexts in which sexual needs are fulfilled and relational wellbeing occurs (La Guardia & Patrick, 2008). For example, engaging in sex because one feels that it is important to their personal or relational growth, is proposed to enhance psychological need fulfillment (i.e., autonomy, competence, relatedness) and thus increase relational and sexual satisfaction. In contrast, if a person were to engage in sex to avoid conflict with a partner, it is less likely that they would feel fulfilled by the sexual interaction, thus decreasing relational wellbeing. According to SDT, the first example reflects a behaviour that is regulated by the “true self” (i.e., the part that has been more fully internalized, adopted and endorsed by the person as their identity; Knee et al., 2013), and is characterized by choice, interest and growth. When a person acts in accordance with their true self, they are more likely to meet their psychological
needs, which can positively impact their relationship. The second example indicates a context in which there is pressure, or guilt that can create tension and anxiety regarding the behaviour, and thus decrease the likelihood that they will feel sexually fulfilled (Knee et al., 2013). Studies extending SDT to the domain of sexuality support these suppositions and have determined the importance of sexual motivation to both need fulfillment and relational outcomes (Brunell & Webster, 2013; Jenkins, 2004; Smith, 2007). The two studies presented here provide support for the notion that self-determination is important for the personal and interpersonal development of romantic partnerships. The findings also demonstrate that, for many individuals, sex in romantic partnerships is one avenue for personal need fulfillment.

The current research extends previous findings by testing theory-driven ideas of how sexual motives impact sexual need satisfaction and relational outcomes in both monogamous and CNM relationships. Though an SDT approach has been applied to sexual relationships that are monogamous (e.g., Brunell & Webster, 2013) or casual (e.g., Vrangralova, 2014), the present research is the first to examine this theoretical framework in relationships where sexual needs are consensually dispersed (i.e., CNM). The results of Study One indicated that sexual need fulfillment is one mechanism through which sexual motives may enhance or detract from relational well-being. Further, the pattern of associations between sexual motives, need satisfaction, and relational outcomes were the same for both CNM and monogamous participants, suggesting that SDT can be generalized to relational structures that fall outside of the monogamous norm. This is an important (and previously untested) contribution to the SDT literature as the associations between self-determined motives, need fulfillment, and relational outcomes are proposed to work similarly across relational and social contexts (Deci & Ryan, 2000; 2012).
A strength of the current research concerns the dyadic approach used in Study Two. Including the contributions of each partner are central for understanding the interpersonal dynamics of need fulfillment (LaGuardia & Patrick, 2008). As such, a dyadic analysis was an ideal framework for testing components of SDT. Applying API-MeM analyses made it possible to assess the dyadic associations between sexual motives, need satisfaction, and relational outcomes within the primary dyad. Results indicated that need satisfaction mediated the association between self-determined sexual motives and relationship satisfaction for both the individual and their first partner. That is, first partners reported greater need fulfillment (and thus greater relational satisfaction) when their partner engaged in sexual activity with them for self-determined reasons. This may suggest that, within a primary dyad, individuals are able to differentiate their partner’s sexual motives, which is associated with higher levels of need satisfaction. Previous research indicates that accurately perceiving a partner’s motives is positively associated with relationship quality (e.g., Impett, Peplau, & Gable, 2005). The partner effects in the current study could also suggest that engaging in sex for self-determined reasons is associated with specific behavioural changes that impact a significant other’s level of need fulfillment and enjoyment of the sexual interaction. For example, it may be that partners who have sex for self-determined reasons are more responsive during the sexual interaction. In previous research, perceiving a partner as more responsive was associated with sexual and relationship satisfaction among heterosexual monogamous married couples (Gadassi et al., 2015). However, in the current study, the partner effects for relational satisfaction were minimal and though the small sample size might account for this finding, it could also point to the difficulties that partners have in detecting the sexual motives, or the possible behavioural changes, of their significant other (Muise, 2011). Future research should incorporate measures on the perceived
sexual motives of one’s partner, and behaviour of one’s partner during sexual activity, to clarify how motives and sexual interactions are interpreted in primary relationships.

The multi-partner reports used in Study Two provide a unique contribution to the current literature on both SDT and CNM. To my knowledge, this is the first study to identify that self-determined sexual motives and need fulfillment in a concurrent sexual relationship is associated with relational outcomes in a primary dyad. In previous research on polyamorous individuals, general need fulfillment in one relationship was significantly linked to decreased relationship satisfaction with another partnership (though the authors concluded that the association was not large enough to be meaningful; Mitchell, Bartholomew, & Cobb, 2014). In another study on sexual need fulfillment in concurrent CNM relationships, Muise et al., (2018) demonstrated that higher sexual need fulfilment with a primary partner was significantly associated with higher levels of sexual satisfaction in a secondary relationship, but the reverse cross-partner association was negative. That is, feeling sexually fulfilled with a secondary partner was associated with lower levels of sexual satisfaction in the primary relationship. Muise et al., (2018) also determined that their cross-relationship findings were moderated by gender (their sample included a smaller number of gender-diverse individuals compared to the current research; 5% in their study compared to 17% in Study Two of the current research). CNM women who reported greater sexual need fulfillment in a secondary relationship also noted less sexual satisfaction in a primary partnership, but this association was not significant for men. The authors suggested that the women in their sample may have recognized that their sexual needs were not being met within the primary partnership and sought to fulfill these needs elsewhere (thus having a lower level of sexual fulfillment with the primary partner to begin with). In the current research (i.e., Study Two) participants’ overall sexual satisfaction was similar for both their first and second
partners (see Table 3.3). Possibly, partners were less satisfied in their first relationship to begin with, sought an additional new sexual partner to compensate for decreased need fulfillment, then felt more satisfied overall in both relationship(s) (i.e., suggesting an additive effect on sexual satisfaction). However, the cross-sectional data in Study Two does not address the temporal nature of this association and it is also possible that participants were equally satisfied overall with both partners for the duration of each partnership. Further, the person’s individual motives and need satisfaction with partner two was not associated with their own levels of sexual satisfaction with their first partner, suggesting that the participants in Study Two evaluated their first and second relationships separately (i.e., independent of one another). However, sexual motives and need satisfaction with a second partner was associated with lower sexual satisfaction for the first partner. As noted in the discussion in chapter three, additional variables related to CNM specifically (e.g., NRE, social narratives and expectations of monogamy) could account for this finding.

Relatedly, it is possible that factors specific to participants’ life stage influenced the cross-partner results. For example, research with monogamous couples and individuals demonstrates that having children affects partnered relationship dynamics (Ahlborg et al., 2008; Schwartz & Young, 2009; Twenge, Campbell, & Foster, 2003). Relationship and sexual satisfaction appears to increase during pregnancy for many monogamous individuals, but declines thereafter (De Judicibus & McCabe, 2002; Doss et al., 2009; Feeney, Hohaus, Noller, & Alexander, 200). Longitudinal studies indicate that decreases in satisfaction experienced during the transition to parenthood can last at least four years after the birth of a child (Doss et al., 2009). It is possible that participants in the current study were more likely to have children with their first (i.e., live-in partner) partner and experienced some of these relational changes (thus contributing to lower
levels of sexual satisfaction for the first partner). To begin examining this, I conducted a series of moderated-mediated analyses with parental status as the moderator (just under half of the sample indicated that they had children). There were no conditional indirect effects (of sexual motives and need fulfillment with a second partner) on sexual satisfaction (with a first partner), suggesting that parental status did not play a significant role in this particular sample. Future research could examine whether there are any protective effects (for relational outcomes) of having multiple relationships while engaged in parenting. For example, research on polyamorous families indicates that having multiple partners share childcare responsibilities has benefits for parents, including increased personal time and shared resources (Sheff, 2010). Thus, it could be that having multiple partners during the transition to parenthood (and thereafter) provides a buffer against declining satisfaction by providing parents with additional support and gives them increased opportunities to focus on fulfilling their relational needs.

SDT can also explain how contextual variables might negatively impact the sexual satisfaction of a first partner. The concept of need support in SDT speaks to the complexity of romantic relationships more generally and highlights the role of the partner in supporting the need fulfillment of their significant other(s). According to SDT, the way in which psychological needs are satisfied or thwarted will function as a means of the sociocultural context (Deci & Ryan, 2012; Ryan & Deci, 2000a). Romantic partners provide ongoing support to their significant other(s) to varying degrees, thus facilitating the self-determination of their partner(s) or obstructing it (Knee et al., 2013). Relational wellbeing is proposed to occur when “the relationship context supports the basic needs of both partners, promoting autonomous motivation for being in the relationship, which in turn facilitates how the couple approaches and manages disagreements and conflicts” (Knee et al., 2013, pg. 310; Patrick et al., 2007). Giving and
receiving autonomy support (e.g., actively attempting to understand the person’s interests and perspectives) is related to stronger need fulfillment, attachment, and relational quality among monogamous couples and those in close friendships (Deci et al., 2006; La Guardia & Patrick, 2008; Patrick et al., 2007). This suggests that within close relationships, a partner’s need support behaviour is a key component to one’s psychological need fulfillment. It may be that some of the challenges specific to CNM contribute to changes in how partners are indicating need support for one another. For example, conveying that one’s partner is significant and cared for unconditionally is one aspect of relatedness need support (LaGuardia & Patrick, 2008). Possibly, when partners experience NRE with a new partner, their ability to convey their relatedness support to their first partner (or how their relatedness support is perceived by their first partner) differs to some extent, depending on the level of communication and where partners are within the process of developing their relationships. To further clarify these findings, future research should examine how each person in a CNM relationship acts to support the need fulfillment of their partner(s).

Finally, the current research employed an established social psychological theory of motivation to explain and understand aspects of CNM relationships. This is a significant step forward because the study of CNM has been largely atheoretical (Barker & Landridge, 2010; Conley et al., 2017). Relatedly, with the exception of some recent research (e.g., Balzarini et al., 2017; Moors et al., 2014; Muise et al., 2018) the extant literature has been criticized for presenting CNM from one of two contrasting perspectives: 1) as a celebration of a potentially radical departure from heteronormative and mononormative relationship expectations that can greatly increase need fulfillment, or 2) one that is critical of nonmonogamies and presents them as “dangerous” alternatives to established relational norms (i.e., monogamy), where negative
relational outcomes are all but inevitable (Barker & Langdridge, 2010). This leaves little room for CNM individuals and partners to detail nuanced understandings of CNM where they may have experienced both positive psychological and relational outcomes, along with relational challenges associated with being in multiple partnerships. The current research provides an opportunity to discuss the complexities in multi-partnered relationships by identifying potential mechanisms (i.e., self-determined sexual motives and sexual need satisfaction) associated with relationship and sexual satisfaction. Further, the cross-partner analyses suggest that engaging in sex with multiple partners has both benefits and challenges (i.e., high levels of need fulfillment for the person but lower sexual satisfaction for their first partner). An important avenue for future research is establishing the contexts in which CNM partners feel their needs are supported by both/all of their partners and how additional relationships can differentially impact one another.

Limitations and Future Directions

Although this research advances knowledge of SDT and romantic relationships, several limitations warrant discussion. Both studies used measures adapted from previous research to assess sexual motives, need satisfaction and relational outcomes. Much of the quantitative research in the social psychological study of romantic partnerships has been conducted using samples of heterosexual, monogamous individuals and couples (Conley et al., 2013). Although some of these measures may be adapted for use among CNM partners, they are often not validated within this population. While this allows for direct comparison of monogamous and CNM individuals (as in Study One), it is possible that additional key variables may be missing when assessing some of these factors for CNM participants. For example, adherents to SDT propose that the theoretical concepts are universal (LaGuardia & Patrick, 2008), but it is possible that there are additional motives for sex among CNM individuals not included in the SDT
measure that may impact relational outcomes (for example, reconnecting with a live-in partner after they have been away with another person or motives related to authenticity and bringing one’s whole self to their relationships- key aspects of motivations for engaging in CNM generally; De Santis et al., 2016). In order to understand the complexity and nuanced experiences of CNM individuals, it is critical that future research on CNM establish measures specifically designed for people in CNM partnerships.

Surveys on sexuality tend to attract those participants who have more positive and liberal attitudes towards sex (Dunne et al., 1997; Wiederman, 1998). This is a limitation that pertains to the nature of conducting sexuality research generally and limits the findings to people with similar attitudes and dispositions. However, researchers have noted the difficulty in recruiting CNM participants as they are a heavily stigmatized group (Conley et al., 2017). Further, because CNM relationships are stigmatized, it is possible that individuals who are experiencing relational challenges are less likely to participate, to avoid further stigmatization. Conley and colleagues (2017) argue that the benefits of convenience sampling potentially outweigh the drawbacks when attempting to access large numbers of people who are members of stigmatized communities. That is, being able to access people and have them share their experiences in research is outweighed by the potential for social desirability and homogeneous sexual attitudes.

Though Study One included a diverse sample of individuals who were matched generally on a number of demographic characteristics, Study Two was limited in that the participants were overwhelmingly white. Thus, the dyadic findings discussed in Study Two are reflective of a particular social context and do not address issues of intersectionality related to CNM and racial and ethnic identities. Methods of recruitment used in Study Two may have contributed to this lack of ethnic and racial diversity (i.e., online groups devoted to CNM that may be more racially
homogeneous). Studies with smaller, non-representative samples of CNM individuals have concluded that the practice of CNM is more common among white individuals (Haupert et al., 2017b). However, other research indicates that people of colour are equally likely to engage in CNM as white people (Haupert et al., 2017a; Rubin, Moors, Mastick, & Conley, 2014). Differences in the language used to identify oneself as a CNM community member (e.g., “polyamorous” is more often associated with whiteness) versus examining the specific behaviours individuals engage in and/or the relational agreements that people have made, may account for such discrepancies (Haupert et al., 2017b; Klesse, 2014). In Study Two of the current research, participants were asked to self-define their relationship type but did not report on their specific relational agreements. Future research should explore different avenues for recruiting CNM individuals (e.g., large scale studies on romantic relationships that include questions about CNM, rather than targeting CNM individuals specifically), discern how different recruitment terms impact the characteristics of the sample, and adjust these terms to ensure CNM people of colour are included.

Both of the studies in this dissertation relied on retrospective reports of sexual motives. In Study Two, participants were asked to report on their general sexual motives with each partner within the past month. Research demonstrates that recall fades with the passage of time, increasing the chance of error (e.g., Tourangeau, Rips, & Rasinski, 2000). Further, it is possible that relationship events which occurred after the last sexual interaction influenced their responses. This concern may be less apparent in Study One as participants were asked to report on their most recent sexual event, thus lessening the chance of error. However, the most recent sexual event could have been at any point in the previous month, therefore recall error is still of concern. Research using daily diary methods could help with this issue, as participants are asked to report
on their experience the same day that the sexual interaction occurred. Such work is forthcoming as daily reports were collected in the current research as part of a larger study on CNM partners (i.e., the current analyses focused only on the intake survey). A daily experience approach could aid our understanding of how each partner contributes to the relational exchanges on a daily basis and identify daily fluctuations in motivation and need fulfillment to better approximate couples’ daily lives.

A further limitation concerns the cross-sectional approach of both Study One and Study Two. Although the models tested in this research were based on SDT, the correlational nature of the data impedes definitive answers regarding the directionality of the associations between self-determined sexual motives, sexual need satisfaction, and relational outcomes. To strengthen support for my proposed models, I tested a number of alternative models in both studies. With one exception, there was no support for the alternative pathway. In Study Two, an actor effect was identified for the associations between sexual need satisfaction, sexual motives, and relationship/sexual satisfaction, suggesting that motives and need satisfaction mutually influence one another. That is, a person’s engagement in sex for self-determined motives was associated with how fulfilled they were by the sexual interaction and feeling more fulfilled was associated with engaging in sex more often for self-determined reasons. Longitudinal research in this area would play an important role in identifying the causal relations between these variables and modeling trajectories of motives and need fulfillment over time. A longitudinal approach could examine how partner dynamics shape relationships and whether there are long-term effects of sexual motives on need fulfillment and relational outcomes.

In addition to determining the directionality of the links between sexual motives, need fulfillment, and relational outcomes, it will be important for future research to examine whether
each specific type of need satisfaction (i.e., competence, relatedness, autonomy) contributes equally to relational outcomes. In the current studies, sexual need satisfaction was assessed generally, as opposed to three separate concepts. In previous research, overall need fulfillment was associated with increased psychological and relational wellbeing (Patrick et al., 2007). Further, each need appears to contribute uniquely to various psychological and relational variables (Patrick et al., 2007). For example, in a series of studies with individuals and couples in dating relationships, relatedness was the strongest unique predictor of several relational outcomes (e.g., relationship satisfaction, commitment, defense responses to conflict; Patrick et al., 2007). It is possible that relatedness is also uniquely important to relational outcomes among CNM partners, given the similarities identified in the current research among CNM and monogamous individuals. However, autonomy-need fulfillment could also play a significant and unique role in CNM partnerships as feeling authentic and having a sense of choice are critical components and benefits of engaging in CNM (DeSantis et al., 2016; Moors, Matsick, & Schechinger, 2017). Investigating which needs contribute uniquely to relational outcomes in CNM partnerships could provide important information for therapists. That is, if relatedness-need fulfillment is central to sexual and relationship satisfaction, specific relational strategies to support this need (e.g., showing interest in and directing energy towards the person; LaGuardia & Patrick, 2008) could be identified and implemented.

Future research that examines the nuanced processes involved in transitioning to a CNM relationship, and in working through mononormative ideas about jealousy and specialness in CNM partnerships, is needed to provide context for the cross-partner findings identified in Study Two (i.e., sexual motives and need satisfaction with one’s second partner is associated with lower sexual satisfaction of one’s first partner). Many of the popular books on CNM target couples who
are currently opening up a monogamous relationship (e.g., Taormino, 2008), and family therapists indicate that couples undergoing the transition to a CNM partnership may struggle to deal with jealously and boundary negotiations, particularly during the beginning of this transition (Girard & Brownlee, 2015). However, no research has examined the types of factors that determine whether this transition is viewed as a success or when it is particularly challenging for the individuals involved. Qualitative research would be particularly helpful in identifying the factors that impact this transition and the skills needed to promote positive outcomes. Longitudinal work with couples who are in the process of opening up their current relationship could determine whether the cross-partner associations established in the current research are temporary and identify the contexts in which couples are able to positively navigate this transition.

Finally, it is important to stress that the current research reflects a specific type of CNM relationship (i.e., at least one live-in/committed partner) and is not representative of the vast relationship configurations found under the CNM umbrella. Research on CNM has been criticized for focusing primarily on relational structures that are akin to monogamy, thus reproducing hierarchical and monormative understandings of romantic partnerships (Finn, 2010). Such reproductions reinforce the idea that the “the couple”, or in this case the “primary couple”, is the ultimate form of romantic stability and fulfillment (Finn & Malson, 2008). The current research may contribute to this concern, given its focus on primary partnership outcomes. Nonetheless, many relationships are categorized by one committed partner and additional sexual relationships. For example, in one study 74% of the 667 participants identified with the term “primary partner” (DeSantis et al., 2016). Further, SDT proposes that the associations between self-determination and relational outcomes will be similar across social contexts (Deci & Ryan,
2000; 2012). Given this proposition, and the results presented in the current research, it is likely that the links between sexual motives, need satisfaction, and relational outcomes would be similar for relationships where there are multiple committed partners (e.g., a polyamorous “quad”) or relationships that are non-hierarchical. However, cross-partner effects may look different in such relational structures. Individuals in polyamorous communities often discuss the term “compersion” to describe feelings that are the opposite of jealousy (i.e., a feeling of empathetic joy when a partner is interested in, or has experiences with, another partner; Ritchie & Barker, 2008; Taormino, 2008). It is possible that in polyamorous relationships (where there is a greater chance of having multiple committed/live-in partners) the cross-partner associations may look different. For example, sexual need satisfaction with one’s second partner may not be associated with lower sexual satisfaction of one’s first partner, and- with feelings of compersion- could be positively linked to the sexual satisfaction of one’s first partner (i.e., an additive effect on need fulfillment; Mitchell, Bartholomew, & Cobb, 2014). To begin addressing this issue I ran a series of APIMeMs with only the participants in Study Two who identified as polyamorous. A similar pattern of results emerged, including those in the cross-partner models. Thus, it appears that even amongst those participants who were most likely to have multiple committed/live-in partners (and less likely to have a hierarchical approach to relationships) engaging in sex for self-determined motives with a second partner, and being sexually fulfilled with a second partner, was associated with lower sexual satisfaction of one’s first (i.e., live-in) partner. Clearly more research is needed to determine if these effects are similar amongst CNM partners who explicitly state that they do not adhere to hierarchal understandings of relationships (compared to those with a primary emotional attachment such as in swinging partnerships), but the current research suggests that the cross-partner findings are comparable across several CNM relational structures.
Implications

The two studies presented in this dissertation demonstrate the usefulness of applying a SDT perspective to the study of sexual motives and need fulfillment in both CNM and monogamous relationships. The research provides support for the proposition that sexual motives and need fulfillment are not only related to sexual outcomes (e.g., sexual satisfaction) but are also associated with more general relational outcomes (i.e., relationship satisfaction). These findings have implications both for romantic partners wishing to enhance their relationship(s) and clinicians working with CNM and monogamous individuals/couples. Promoting self-determined reasons for engaging in sex could encourage partners to engage in sexual interactions that are more likely to fulfill their needs (e.g., having sex when they are excited about the activity, rather than to avoid conflict). Research indicates that sexual motives related to conflict avoidance have a more powerful, and more costly, relational impact, compared to motives that emphasize pleasure and closeness (Impett, Peplau, & Gable, 2005; Muise, Impett, & Desmarais, 2013). Thus, encouraging partners to explore why they may be having sex for less self-determined reasons, and how they may shift to having sex for more self-determined reasons, is one strategy clinicians can use to promote relational wellbeing.

Further, the small partner effects among those in the primary dyad suggest that boosting awareness of the sexual motives of one’s partner, or attending to how a partner responds in a sexual interaction that is motivated by self-determined reasons, could be another avenue for promoting need fulfillment and strengthening relational outcomes. Though this strategy may not work in cases where partners are less satisfied because of differential experiences in the relationship(s) (e.g., communication, conflict, sexual desire etc.), the APIMeM analyses indicated that when dyad member one engaged in sex with their first partner for self-determined reasons,
dyad member two reported higher levels of need fulfillment, and, in turn, higher relationship satisfaction. Thus, increasing awareness and communication about each person’s sexual motives, or attending to possible positive behavioural changes that occur during the sexual interaction, could foster understanding between partners and therefore increase the likelihood of accurately detecting a partner’s reasons for sex and enjoyment of the sexual interaction.

The current research also has implications for individuals in CNM communities. Popular assumptions of romantic relationships position CNM partnerships as less satisfying or less stable compared to monogamous relationships (Conley et al., 2013; Séguin, 2017). In contrast to these perceptions, CNM and monogamous participants in Study One scored no differently on their levels of relationship and sexual satisfaction. Furthermore, the CNM participants in both Study One and Study Two reported being relationally and sexually satisfied with their primary (or live-in) partner. CNM individuals in the second study noted high levels of satisfaction and sexual need fulfilment with both their first and second partners. Moreover, a concurrent sexual partnership was not associated with the relationship satisfaction in the first partnership, nor were any actor effects identified for sexual satisfaction in the cross-partner analyses (though partner effects were present). These findings verify what CNM researchers and advocates have previously emphasized: that for some, CNM relationships are a viable and fulfilling alternative to monogamy, and one of many approaches to encouraging personal growth and fulfillment (e.g., Mitchell & Bartholomew, 2014). These results may help to destigmatize CNM partnerships as they confirm that individuals can experience psychological need fulfillment and satisfying relationships with concurrent partners.

Even though participants in the current studies were satisfied and fulfilled, the results also indicate that there are challenges associated with having multiple partnerships. That is, the
first partner reported lower levels of sexual satisfaction with their significant other when their significant other described higher levels of sexual need satisfaction with a second partner. Thus, a key implication of this research is that need fulfillment in one relationship is associated with a simultaneous partnership. More research is needed to address the context in which lower levels of sexual satisfaction occur (e.g., in relationships where there is a new partner or NRE, the levels of communication partners have, processes involved in transitioning to a CNM relationship, working through ideas about jealousy and specialness) and those behaviours that support a partner’s psychological needs. However, the influence of additional relationships opens up novel avenues for future researchers to test the central tenets of SDT. For example, the level of need support that one receives from other close relationships (e.g., family) could impact a person’s motivations for being in a CNM partnership. In a recent study, polyamorous individuals reported higher levels of acceptance by family and friends for their relationship with a primary (versus a secondary) partner (Balzarini et al., 2017). Furthermore, romantic secrecy was higher with secondary partners in comparison to a primary partner. Possibly, when partnerships are not supported by close others in one’s life, it could influence the type and strength of one’s motivation to be in a CNM partnership, thus impacting the level of need fulfillment experienced and one’s level of relational wellbeing. SDT researchers can build on the current findings to elucidate how a variety of close relationships outside of the primary dyad influence relational outcomes.

Finally, research on sexual behaviour, and on CNM generally, has been criticized for lacking theoretical frameworks (Barker & Langridge, 2010; Brunell & Webster, 2013; Conley et al., 2017; Weis, 1998). As a field, social psychology has amassed a wealth of knowledge on romantic partnerships. However, the discipline has historically represented a narrow range of
sexual and romantic experiences (e.g., heterosexual, monogamous; Barker, 2007; Barker & Langdridge, 2010; Kleinplatz & Diamond, 2014; Rubin, 2011; Vaughn, 2011). The current studies contribute to a growing body of research that utilizes social psychological approaches to study of sexual behaviour and emphasizes the importance of sexuality to relational wellbeing (e.g., Brunell & Webster, 2014; Muise, Impett, & Desmarais, 2013; Smith, 2007; Vrangralova, 2014). The research provides a theoretical context within which to understand the associations between sexual motives, need fulfilment, and relational outcomes in relationships where sexual and emotional needs are met by multiple partners, thus expanding the voices and experiences represented in the social psychological literature.

Conclusion

Individuals in both CNM and monogamous relationships engaged in partnered sex primarily for intrinsic reasons (i.e., pleasure, intimacy, valuing sex) and reported comparable levels of relationship and sexual satisfaction. Participants in CNM relationships described similar reasons, overall, for sex with both a first and second partner (i.e., intrinsic reasons were more common than extrinsic or amotivated reasons) but engaged in sex more often with their second partner for the physical enjoyment of sex. Sexual need satisfaction was an important mechanism through which self-determined sexual motives was linked to sexual and relationship satisfaction, and these associations were similar across relationship structures (i.e., CNM or monogamous). Furthermore, sexual motives and sexual need satisfaction were important contributors to the relational and sexual wellbeing of the individual, and the relational wellbeing of their first partner. Finally, having sex for self-determined reasons with a second partner, and feeling more fulfilled with a second partner, was related to how satisfied a first partner was in the primary dyad; that is, lower levels of sexual satisfaction were reported by the first partner.
To my knowledge, these are the first studies to examine relational outcomes among CNM individuals using an established social psychological motivational perspective, extending the application of SDT to relationships that fall outside of traditional monogamous pairings. Researchers and clinicians working in this field can draw upon these findings to develop research and therapeutic programs based on nuanced understandings of CNM relationships rather than solely on data and assumptions derived from research on monogamous relationships, or findings from descriptive studies on CNM individuals. This research indicates that SDT is a useful framework for considering the associations between sexual motivation and relational outcomes among both monogamous and CNM individuals and highlights the importance of sexual need fulfillment in relationship functioning and wellbeing.
References


Barker, M. (2005). This is my partner, and this is my… partner's partner: Constructing a polyamorous identity in a monogamous world. *Journal of Constructivist Psychology, 18*(1), 75-88.


DeSantis, C., Wood, J., Milhausen, R., & Desmarais, S. (2016). “Just because we found our favourite dish, doesn’t mean we have to shut down the buffet”: Motivations for engaging in consensually non-monogamous relationships. Paper presented at the at the 41st Canadian Sex Research Forum Annual Meeting in Quebec, Canada, Sept 22-24.


Fernandes, E., Wood, J.R., & Schechinger, H. (2014). “You only go around this rock once and we want the most out of life”: Motives for engaging in swinging relationships and


Ritchie, A., & Barker, M. (2006). 'There aren't words for what we do or how we feel so we have to make them up': Constructing polyamorous languages in a culture of compulsory monogamy. Sexualities, 9, 584-601.


motives and sexual satisfaction: Gender differences and categorical comparisons.
*Archives of Sexual Behavior, 40*, 607-618.


Štulhofer, A., Buško, V., & Brouillard, P. (2010). Development and bicultural validation of the

Francisco, CA: Cleis Press.

Tourangeau, R., Rips, L., & Rasinski, K. (2000). *The psychology of survey response*. Cambridge,
England: Cambridge University Press.

Routledge.

1461-1515.

Twenge, J.M., Campbell, W.K., & Foster, C.A. (2003). Parenthood and marital satisfaction: A


Appendix A - Study 1 Screening and MTurk Hits

1. With what gender do you identify most?

A. ___Woman
B. ___Man
C. ___Transwoman
D. ___Transman
E. ___Gender queer/nonbinary
F. ___My gender identity is not listed above

2. What year were you born in? ____________

3. Are you currently in a romantic relationship?
   i. ___Yes
   ii. ___No

4. How would you describe your current relationship?
   i. ___Single (not dating anyone)
   ii. ___In a relationship where both of us have agreed to have a sexual and intimate relationship with each other only
   iii. ___In a sexual and/or intimate relationship with one or more partners and your partners know about it/agree to it

5. If they report a CNM relationship:
   Some people consider this type of relationship to be consensually non-monogamous. Please write a sentence or two telling us what a consensually non-monogamous relationship means to you:

   If they report a monogamous relationship:
   Some people consider this to be a monogamous relationship. Please write a sentence or two telling us what a monogamous relationship means to you:

   If they report that they are single:
   Please write a sentence or two telling us what you like about being single:

6. Have you had sex with your partner(s) in the past month?
   a. Yes
   b. No

7. Do you have any children living at home with you?
   a. Yes
b. No

8. Please think about your communication with your partner(s) in your current relationship. If you are not currently in a relationship, please think of your most recent relationship.

   My partner(s) and I communicate well when there is a conflict in our relationship
   a. Strongly disagree
   b. __________
   c. __________
   d. __________
   e. Strongly agree

9. My current geographical location is:

   1. Canada
   2. __ Maritimes and Newfoundland
      __ Eastern Canada (Quebec and Ontario)
      __ Central Canada (Manitoba and Saskatchewan)
      __ Western Canada (Alberta & British Columbia)
      __ Northern Canada (Yukon, Northwest Territories, Nunavut)
   3. United States
   4. __ North East.
   5. __ North West
   6. __ Southeast
   7. __ Southwest
   8. __ Mid-West
   9. __ California
   10. __ Other (specify)__________________

10. Sometimes people identify themselves by race and/or ethnicity. Please check the group(s) that with which you most identify (Check all that apply)
    a. American Indian or Alaska Native
    b. Black, African American
    c. White
    d. Asian Indian
    e. Chinese
    f. Filipino
    g. Japanese
    h. Korean
    i. Vietnamese
    j. Native Hawaiian
    k. Guamanian or Chamorro
    l. Samoan
    m. Mexican, Mexican American, Chicano
    n. Puerto Rican
    o. Cuban
p. Arab (e.g., Saudi Arabian, Iraqi)
q. West Asian (e.g., Iranian, Afgani)
r. Aboriginal/First Nations

Not listed, please specify: __________________________________________

Please enter your age in years (e.g., 42):

HIT for Study 1, Screening

Title: Screening questionnaire for psychology relationships survey

Description: Complete a brief demographic survey (approximately 5 minutes) to determine eligibility to participate in a longer survey on relationships, sexual motivation and wellbeing. Please open the following link IN A NEW WINDOW. You will need to return to this page to enter your unique HIT code once you are done with the survey.

Keywords: relationships, motivation, psychology, personality, survey, demographics, questionnaire

Rewards per assignment: $0.25
Number of Assignments per HIT: 2000
Time allotted per assignment: MAX 30 minutes
HIT expires in: 60 days
Results are automatically approved in: 2 days

HIT for Study 1, Survey

Title: Sexual motivation survey for people in romantic relationships where one or both partners may have sex outside of the relationship (e.g., open, polyamorous, swinging)

Description: Complete a survey (approximately 20-30 minutes) on relationships, sexual motivation and wellbeing. Must currently be in a partnered relationship where one or both partners can have sex outside of the relationship (e.g., open relationships, polyamorous relationships). Must have had sex at least once in the past month. Please open the following link IN A NEW WINDOW. You will need to return to this page to enter your unique HIT code once you are done with the survey.

Keywords: relationships, sexual experience, sexual motivation, psychology, personality, survey, demographics, questionnaire

Rewards per assignment: $2.50
Number of Assignments per HIT: 500
Time allotted per assignment: MAX 2 hours
HIT expires in: 60 days
Results are automatically approved in: 2 days

HIT for Study 2, Screening

Title: Screening questionnaire for psychology relationships survey
Description: Complete a brief demographic survey (approximately 5 minutes) to determine eligibility to participate in a longer survey on relationships, sexual motivation and wellbeing. Please open the following link IN A NEW WINDOW. You will need to return to this page to enter your unique HIT code once you are done with the survey.

Keywords: relationships, motivation, psychology, personality, survey, demographics, questionnaire

Rewards per assignment: $0.25
Number of Assignments per HIT: 1000
Time allotted per assignment: MAX 30 minutes
HIT expires in: 60 days
Results are automatically approved in: 2 days

HIT for Study 2, Survey

Title: Sexual motivation survey for people in romantic relationships

Description: Complete a survey (approximately 20-30 minutes) on relationships, sexual motivation and wellbeing. Must currently be in a partnered relationship and must have had sex at least once in the past month.

Please open the following link IN A NEW WINDOW. You will need to return to this page to enter your unique HIT code once you are done with the survey.

Keywords: relationships, sexual experience, sexual motivation, psychology, personality, survey, demographics, questionnaire

Rewards per assignment: $2.50
Number of Assignments per HIT: 500
Time allotted per assignment: MAX 2 hours
HIT expires in: 60 days
Results are automatically approved in: 2 days
Appendix B - Study 1 Consent Form for CNM and Monogamous Participants

CONSENT TO PARTICIPATE IN RESEARCH

Sexual Motivation, Satisfaction and Wellbeing in Consensually Non-Monogamous and Monogamous Relationships

You are invited to take part in a research study conducted by Dr. Serge Desmarais, Associate Professor, and Jessica Wood Phd Candidate, from the Department of Psychology, and Dr. Robin Milhausen, Associate Professor, from the Department of Family Relations and Applied Nutrition, at the University of Guelph. You have been invited to take part in this research because you completed a prior questionnaire and met the criteria for our survey.

If you have any questions or concerns about the research, please feel free to contact Dr. Desmarais at 1-(519) 824-4120 ext. 53880, s.desmarais@exec.uoguelph.ca or Jessica Wood at jwood03@uoguelph.ca

PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

To learn more about the reasons people engage in sexual activity within the context of romantic partnered relationships.

To participate in the study, you must:
1) Be over the age of 18
2) Currently be in a romantic relationship(s) where one or both partners may have sex outside of the relationship (e.g., open, polyamorous, swinging).
3) Have had sex at least once in the past month.

**PROCEDURES**

If you volunteer to participate in this study, you will be asked to complete an online survey that will take approximately 30 minutes to complete. The survey will ask you questions about your sexual motivations, relationship/sexual satisfaction wellbeing.

**POTENTIAL RISKS AND DISCOMFORTS**

Some participants may feel embarrassed answering questions related to sexuality, relationships and motivation. You do not have to answer any question that makes you uncomfortable and you may skip any questions that you do not wish to answer. You may stop the questionnaire at any time. You may also choose to withdraw from the study at any time by closing the window or hitting the withdraw button. Additionally, in order to decrease potential discomfort, we ask that you complete the survey in a private location.

**POTENTIAL BENEFITS TO PARTICIPANTS AND/OR TO SOCIETY**

While there is no direct benefit to you, your participation is important, as it will contribute to the growing body of literature on sexual motivation and the factors that impact relationship and sexual satisfaction.

**PAYMENT FOR PARTICIPATION**

- You will be paid $2.50 for your participation, through your Mechanical Turk account. At the end of the survey, you will be given a specialized code. Enter this code into your MTurk account. Once we verify that the codes match we will approve your payment. If you do not complete the survey or close your window browser early, you will not be able to receive the code, and will not be eligible for compensation.

**RESULTS**

The results of this study will be communicated, in aggregate form, through journal publications and conference presentations. If you would like us to send you a copy of the results of the study, please email to Jessica Wood at:

jwood03@uoguelph.ca

**CONFIDENTIALITY**

This is an anonymous survey. We will not be collecting IP addresses or any identifying information. Your Mechanical Turk account number will be kept completely separate from
your survey results. Results will only be published in aggregate (i.e., group) form-individual results will not be published.

All electronic data will be stored on a password-protected, encrypted computer, in a locked office. Please note that confidentiality cannot be guaranteed while data are in transit over the internet.

You can help to ensure confidentiality by taking the following precautions to clear all private data from the computer you are using to respond to the survey:

1. Clear the browsing history
2. Clear the cache
3. Clear the cookies
4. Clear the authenticated session
5. LOG OFF

If you are using Internet Explorer, the first 4 steps can be accomplished by going to Tools and selecting Delete Browsing History. Your application may have a similar system.

PARTICIPATION AND WITHDRAWAL

You can choose whether to be in this study or not. If you volunteer to be in this study, you may withdraw at any time without consequences of any kind. As the survey is anonymous, data cannot be removed if you chose to withdraw from the study after you have begun completing the survey. You may also refuse to answer any questions you don’t want to answer and still remain in the study. The investigator may withdraw you from this research if circumstances arise that warrant doing so.

RIGHTS OF RESEARCH PARTICIPANTS

This project has been reviewed by the Research Ethics Board for compliance with federal guidelines for research involving human participants. If you have questions regarding your rights and welfare as a research participant in this study (REB#15DC007), please contact: Director, Research Ethics; University of Guelph; reb@uoguelph.ca; 1-(519) 824-4120 (ext. 56606)

Do you consent to participate in this study?

YES

NO
CONSENT TO PARTICIPATE IN RESEARCH

Sexual Motivation, Satisfaction and Wellbeing in Consensually Non-Monogamous and Monogamous Relationships

You are invited to take part in a research study conducted by Dr. Serge Desmarais, Associate Professor, and Jessica Wood Phd Candidate, from the Department of Psychology, and Dr. Robin Milhausen, Associate Professor, from the Department of Family Relations and Applied Nutrition, at the University of Guelph. You have been invited to take part in this research because you completed a prior questionnaire and met the criteria for our survey.

If you have any questions or concerns about the research, please feel free to contact Dr. Desmarais at 1-(519) 824-4120 ext. 53880, s.desmarais@exec.uoguelph.ca or Jessica Wood at jwood03@uoguelph.ca

PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

To learn more about the reasons people engage in sexual activity within the context of romantic partnered relationships.

To participate in the study, you must:

1. Be over the age of 18
2. Currently be in a monogamous (i.e., one partner) romantic relationship.
3. Have had sex at least once in the past month.

PROCEDURES
If you volunteer to participate in this study, you will be asked to complete an online survey that will take approximately 30 minutes to complete. The survey will ask you questions about your sexual motivations, relationship/sexual satisfaction wellbeing.

POTENTIAL RISKS AND DISCOMFORTS

Some participants may feel embarrassed answering questions related to sexuality, relationships and motivation. You do not have to answer any question that makes you uncomfortable and you may skip any questions that you do not wish to answer. You may stop the questionnaire at any time. You may also choose to withdraw from the study at any time by closing the window or hitting the withdraw button. Additionally, in order to decrease potential discomfort, we ask that you complete the survey in a private location.

POTENTIAL BENEFITS TO PARTICIPANTS AND/OR TO SOCIETY

While there is no direct benefit to you, your participation is important, as it will contribute to the growing body of literature on sexual motivation and the factors that impact relationship and sexual satisfaction.

PAYMENT FOR PARTICIPATION

- You will be paid $2.50 for your participation, through your Mechanical Turk account. At the end of the survey, you will be given a specialized code. Enter this code into your MTurk account. Once we verify that the codes match we will approve your payment. If you do not complete the survey or close your window browser early, you will not be able to receive the code, and will not be eligible for compensation.

RESULTS

The results of this study will be communicated, in aggregate form, through journal publications and conference presentations. If you would like us to send you a copy of the results of the study, please email to Jessica Wood at:

jwood03@uoguelph.ca

CONFIDENTIALITY

This is an anonymous survey. We will not be collecting IP addresses or any identifying information. Your Mechanical Turk account number will be kept completely separate from your survey results. Results will only be published in aggregate (i.e., group) form-individual results will not be published.

All electronic data will be stored on a password-protected, encrypted computer, in a locked office. Please note that confidentiality cannot be guaranteed while data are in transit over the internet.
You can help to ensure confidentiality by taking the following precautions to clear all private data from the computer you are using to respond to the survey:

1. Clear the browsing history
2. Clear the cache
3. Clear the cookies
4. Clear the authenticated session
5. LOG OFF

If you are using Internet Explorer, the first 4 steps can be accomplished by going to Tools and selecting Delete Browsing History. Your application may have a similar system.

PARTICIPATION AND WITHDRAWAL

You can choose whether to be in this study or not. If you volunteer to be in this study, you may withdraw at any time without consequences of any kind. As the survey is anonymous, data cannot be removed if you chose to withdraw from the study after you have begun completing the survey. You may also refuse to answer any questions you don’t want to answer and still remain in the study. The investigator may withdraw you from this research if circumstances arise that warrant doing so.

RIGHTS OF RESEARCH PARTICIPANTS

This project has been reviewed by the Research Ethics Board for compliance with federal guidelines for research involving human participants. If you have questions regarding your rights and welfare as a research participant in this study (REB#15DC007), please contact: Director, Research Ethics; University of Guelph; reb@uoguelph.ca; 1-(519) 824-4120 (ext. 56606)

Do you consent to participate in this study?

YES  NO

PRINT THIS PAGE
Appendix C - Study 1 Demographic Questions

1. Are you currently in a romantic relationship?
   ___Yes
   ___No

2. Have you had sex with your partner(s) in the past month?
   a. Yes
   b. No

3. With what gender do you identify most? (check all that apply)
   ___Woman
   ___Man
   ___Transwoman
   ___Transman
   ___Gender queer/nonbinary
   ___My gender identity is not listed above

4. What year were you born in?___________

5. Sometimes people identify themselves by race and/or ethnicity. Please check the group(s) that with which you most identify (Check all that apply)
   a. American Indian or Alaska Native
   b. Black, African American
   c. White
   d. Asian Indian
   e. Chinese
   f. Filipino
   g. Japanese
   h. Korean
   i. Vietnamese
   j. Native Hawaiian
   k. Guamanian or Chamorro
   l. Samoan
   m. Mexican, Mexican American, Chicano
   n. Puerto Rican
   o. Cuban
   p. Arab (e.g., Saudi Arabian, Iraqi)
   q. West Asian (e.g., Iranian, Afgani)
   r. Aboriginal/First Nations
   s. Not listed, please specify:_______________________________________

6. Which of these commonly used terms would you use to describe your sexual orientation?
   _____Heterosexual
Gay
Lesbian
Bisexual
Queer
Pansexual
Uncertain or Questioning
Asexual
My sexual orientation is not listed above

i. If your sexual orientation is not listed above, please tell us how you identify: ___________________________________________________

7. How would you describe your current relationship?
   _______ Single (not dating anyone)
   _______ In a monogamous relationship (i.e., both partners have agreed to have a sexual
   and intimate relationship with each other only)
   _______ In consensually non-monogamous relationship(s) (i.e., in a sexual and/or
   intimate relationship with one or more partners and your partners know about it/agree to it)

8. (If Monogamous) My current relationship status is:
   _______ Casually dating one person
   _______ Seriously dating one person
   _______ Living with one partner, but not married or engaged
   _______ Engaged to one person
   _______ Married to one person
   _______ Other: please specify ________________________________
   _______ I choose not to answer

9. (If CNM-check all that apply) My current relationship status is:
   _______ Casual dating (dating more than one person)
   _______ Open Relationship (one or both of us has sex outside of the relationship)
   _______ Polyamorous (one or both of us are in multiple loving and/or sexual relationships)
   _______ Swinging relationship (one or both of you go to parties/clubs/etc., where
   partners may be exchanged for the night)
   _______ Living with one partner, but not married or engaged
   _______ Living with multiple partners, but not married or engaged
   _______ Engaged to a partner
   _______ Engaged to more than one partner
   _______ Married to one partner
   _______ Married to more than one partner
   _______ Other: please specify ________________________________
   _______ I choose not to answer
10. (For CNM participants): Do you consider any of your relationship partners to be a primary partner (e.g., spend more time with them, have a deeper level of commitment).
   ___Yes
   ___No

11. If No: How many relational partners do you currently have? ______

12. If Yes: How long have you been in a romantic relationship with your current primary partner? (e.g., 7 years, 2 months) ______________

13. (If yes from number 11). How many relational partners do you currently have?___
   *will be asked about relationship duration for each partner

14. (Monogamous participants): How long have you been in a relationship with your current partner? (e.g., 7 years, 2 months) ______________

15. With what gender does your partner/primary partner identify most?
   ___Woman
   ___Man
   ___Transwoman
   ___Transman
   ___Gender queer/non binary
   ___My partner’s gender identity is not listed above
   If your partner’s gender identity is not listed above, please tell us how your partner identifies:____________

16. (Monogamous participants) How many times in the past month have you engaged in sexual activity with your partner?_____ 

17. (CNM participants with a primary partner): How many times in the past month have you engaged in sexual activity with your primary partner?_____

18. (CNM participants with multiple relational partners): How many times in the past month have you engaged in sexual activity with your other relational partners?_____

19. My current geographical location is:
   
   Canada
   ___Maritimes and Newfoundland
   ___Eastern Canada (Quebec and Ontario)
   ___Central Canada (Manitoba and Saskatchewan)
   ___Western Canada (Alberta & British Columbia)
   ___Northern Canada (Yukon, Northwest Territories, Nunavut)

   United States
20. My area of residence can be best described as:

- [ ] Urban
- [ ] Suburban
- [ ] Rural
- [ ] Neither
- [ ] Other (specify)

21. What is the highest level of education that you have completed?

- [ ] No schooling completed
- [ ] Elementary school (grades 1-8)
- [ ] High school graduate
- [ ] Some college/university
- [ ] College/University graduate
- [ ] Some Trade/technical/vocational training
- [ ] Trade/technical/vocational training degree or diploma
- [ ] Some postgraduate work
- [ ] Master’s degree
- [ ] Professional school degree (e.g., MD)
- [ ] Doctoral degree (PhD)
Appendix D - Relationship Agreements

Please answer regarding your current relationship(s):

Response Options: Yes/No

You and/or your partner……

1. …are allowed to have sex with whomever you/they want, using protection, no strings attached, no questions asked.
2. …go together to swinger parties where partners are exchanged for the night.
3. …are allowed to form outside romantic relationships, but they must always be less important than the relationship between the two of you.
4. …are allowed to have sex with others, but never the same person more than once.
5. …are allowed to have sex and romantic relationships with whomever they want, but there must be no secrets between you.
6. …are allowed take on a third partner to join you in your relationship on equal terms.
7. …are allowed to engage in sex with others, as long as it is together (e.g., have threesomes).
8. …are in a committed relationship with another couple on equal terms.
9. …are in a sexual and emotional relationship with only each other. Neither of you has any other partners.
10. …have agreed on sexual and relational boundaries that include other people, but you have gone outside of those boundaries without telling them.
11. …are in a monogamous relationship, but I have had vaginal, anal, or oral sex with someone else without them knowing.
12. … are in a monogamous relationship, but I suspect they have had vaginal, anal, or oral sex with someone else.
13. … have an unspoken agreement that we will be sexual with other people but we haven’t talked about it.
14. Do you think your primary partner would respond the same way that you did to the above questions?
   - I am quite sure that they would give the same responses that I did
   - I think that they would give most of the same responses I did
   - I think that they would give some of the same responses that I did
   - I do not think that they would give the same responses that I did
15. To what degree have you and your primary partner discussed the boundaries or “rules” related to sexual or emotional connections with other people?
   - a great deal
   - somewhat
   - not very much
   - not at all
Appendix E - Perceived Locus of Control-Sex (PLCS)

People usually have many different reasons for engaging in sexual activity. Listed below are several statements that describe reasons you might have for engaging in sexual activity. For this task, we would like you to think about the most recent time you engaged in sexual activity with a partner(s). Use the scale below to indicate the extent to which each of the following statements reflects why you engaged in sexual activity with your partner(s). Please use the following scale:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not at all for this reason</td>
<td>A little for this reason</td>
<td>Somewhat for this reason</td>
<td>Quite a bit for this reason</td>
<td>Very much for this reason</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**The last time I had sex, I engaged in sexual activity with my sexual partner(s)...**

1. Because I expected it to be interesting and exciting.
2. For the pleasure of sharing a special and intimate experience.
3. Because I value sex as part of a full life.
4. Because my sex drive was high, and I felt like I needed to have sex.
5. Because I felt pressured*
6. Because I want sex to be a celebration of the feelings I share with a partner(s)*
7. Because I expect the pleasure of physical satisfaction.
8. Because I thought my partner(s) would like me better, or be happier with me.*
9. Because I wanted to feel more powerful or dominant.
10. Because it feels good.
11. Because it is exciting to be sexually intimate with my partner(s).*
12. But I did not feel like I was in control of my own behavior.
13. Because it is stimulating and enjoyable.
14. Because my body ached to have sex.
15. Because I would feel anxious or guilty if I didn’t go along.
16. Because it helped me relax or get to sleep.
17. Because sex is an important part of my relationship(s).*
18. Because I didn’t want to say no*
19. Because I expect a satisfyingly deep connection with my partner(s) during sex*
20. Because I needed to relieve myself of the tension and stress of the day.
21. Because I see sex as a healthy activity.
22. Because I wanted to enjoy the physical sensations.
23. Because I wanted to show that I am capable of performing.
24. Because I enjoy knowing my partner(s) this way.*
25. Because I see sex as an important part of who I am.
26. Because I worry I will be punished or neglected if I don’t.*
27. Because I felt driven to have sex.
28. Because the proposition made me feel more attractive.
29. Because I wanted a fun experience.
30. Because I thought having sex would get me something I wanted later.
31. But I don’t know why. It just happened.
Because I wanted to share a mutually pleasurable activity.*
Because I think it is a healthy aspect of my relationship(s).*
Because I want another person to be under my control.
Because I think sex is an enjoyable way to share our feelings.
Because I worried my partner(s) might reject me if I didn’t.*
Because I would feel bad to withhold sex*
Because I wanted to enjoy being close to my partner(s).*
Because I needed to orgasm.
Because I enjoy being sexual.
Because I value sex as an important part of maintaining a good relationship.*
Because I thought my partner(s) would treat me better afterward.*
Because I want to enjoy the closeness of being physically joined with my sexual partner(s).*
Because sex makes me feel better about myself.
Because I wanted to show how good I am in bed.
Because I think saying no will start a conflict*
Because alcohol makes me lose control.
Because I thought sex will make me feel more secure.
Because I value how sex can bring me closer to another person(s).
Because my sexual desire was high.
Because I needed to relieve myself of sexual tension.
But I have no idea why I did.

*Items modified from original measure. Most of the items from the original measure included the word “friend” or “friendship” as opposed to “partner” or “partnership”.
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Appendix F - Sexual Need Satisfaction, Relationship Satisfaction and Sexual Satisfaction

Need Satisfaction Scale

Please respond to each statement by indicating how true it is for you. Use the following scale.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Not at all true Somewhat True Very True

When I have sex with my primary partner......

1. I feel free to be who I am.
2. I feel like a competent person.
3. I feel loved and cared about.
4. I often feel inadequate or incompetent.
5. I have a say in what happens, and I can voice my opinion.
6. I often feel a lot of distance in our relationship.
7. I feel very capable and effective.
8. I feel a lot of closeness and intimacy.
9. I feel controlled and pressured to be certain ways.

Dyadic Adjustment Scale

Please answer the following questions while thinking of your current/primary partnership, using the following scale.

0 (all of the time) to 5 (never)

1. How often do you discuss or have you considered divorce, separation, or terminating your relationship?
2. In general, how often do you think that things between you and your partner are going well?
3. Do you confide in your partner?

The following represents different degrees of happiness in your relationship. Please select the choice which best describes the degree of happiness, all things considered, of your
Thinking about your sex life during the last six months, please rate your satisfaction with the following aspects:

Responses are anchored on the following scale: 1 = not at all satisfied, 2 = a little satisfied, 3 = moderately satisfied, 4 = very satisfied, 5 = extremely satisfied.

1. The quality of my orgasms
2. My “letting go” and surrender to sexual pleasure during sex
3. The way I sexually react to my partner
4. My body’s sexual functioning
5. My mood after sexual activity
6. The pleasure I provide to my partner
7. The balance between what I give and receive in sex
8. My partner’s emotional opening up during sex
9. My partner’s ability to orgasm
10. My partner’s sexual creativity
11. The variety of my sexual activities
12. The frequency of my sexual activity

Additional questions

Monogamous participants:
1) Overall, how satisfied are you with the sexual aspect of your relationship?
2) Overall, how satisfied are you with your sexual life?

CNM participants
1) Overall, how satisfied are you with the sexual aspect of your primary relationship?
2) Considering all of your sexual partners, how satisfied are you with your sexual relationships?
3) Overall, how satisfied are you with your sexual life?
Appendix G - Study1 Models Without Covariates

Table 1. Analysis of variance assessing differences between CNM and monogamous samples on relationship and sexual satisfaction, no covariates.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>partial eta squared</th>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Estimated Marginal Means</th>
<th>Lower Bound</th>
<th>Upper Bound</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relationship satisfaction</td>
<td>1, 344</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>Mono</td>
<td>16.17</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>16.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CNM</td>
<td>46.26</td>
<td>44.69</td>
<td>47.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual satisfaction</td>
<td>1, 343</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>Mono</td>
<td>45.06</td>
<td>43.75</td>
<td>46.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CNM</td>
<td>45.06</td>
<td>43.75</td>
<td>46.37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 1 - Moderated-mediation model for sexual motives, need satisfaction and relationship satisfaction, covariates not included
Figure 2. Moderated-mediation model for sexual motives, need satisfaction and sexual satisfaction, covariates not included
Figure 3. Mediation model for sexual motives, need satisfaction and relationship satisfaction, covariates not included

\[ AB = .26, 95\% \text{ CI (.20, .32)} \]

\[ a = 1.29^{***} \]
\[ b = .20^{***} \]
\[ c = .26^{***} \]
\[ c' = .07 \]
$AB = .86$, $95\% \text{ CI (.68, 1.05)}$

Figure 4. Mediation model for sexual motives, need satisfaction and sexual satisfaction, covariates not included

$\alpha = 1.29^{***}$

$\beta = .66^{***}$

$\gamma = .03$

$\gamma^1 = .03$

Self-determined sexual motives

Need Satisfaction

Sexual Satisfaction
Figure 1. Moderated-mediation model for need satisfaction, sexual motives, and relationship satisfaction, covariates included
Figure 2. Moderated-mediation model for need satisfaction, sexual motives, and sexual satisfaction, covariates included
Figure 3. Mediation model for need satisfaction, sexual motives and relationship satisfaction, covariates included
Figure 4 - Mediation model for need satisfaction, sexual motives and sexual satisfaction, covariates included

\[ A\beta = -.002, \text{ 95\% CI (-.1018, .0886)} \]

\[ a = .39^{***} \]

\[ b = -.001 \]

\[ c = .68^{**} \]

\[ i^1 = .68^{***} \]
Appendix I - Study 2 Recruitment Materials

Email Invitation & Poster

Email Subject Line: Participants needed for study on Multi-partnered relationships

Daily study of motivations and experiences in multi-partnered relationships.

Do you identify as having a primary partner, and do you live with your primary partner?

Would your primary partner also be interested in participating?

Do you have at least one additional partner?

Do you see any of your additional partner(s) at least once per month?

Have you had sex with any of your partners within the last month?

Are you over the age of 18?

If so we would like to invite you to participate in our study examining partners’ daily sexual motivations. If you participate, you and your primary partner will be asked to complete an initial, 45-60 min survey about your relationship, your wellbeing and your sexual motivations. You and your partner will also be asked to complete a short 10 minute daily survey every day for three weeks and finish a follow up survey immediately after the three weeks are complete (approximately 35 minutes). We will also ask you to complete two short 10-minute surveys 3 months and 6 months later. To thank you for your time, couples will receive up to $144 (up to $72 per person) in amazon gift cards to participate. Canadian participants will receive gift cards from amazon.ca and participants from the U.S. will receive gift cards from amazon.com. All genders and sexual orientations welcome.

If you are interested in taking part in the research, please email the address below relresea@uoguelph.ca

If you would like additional information about the study please contact Robin Milhausen, Associate Professor at rmilhaus@uoguelph.ca or Jessica Wood, PhD Candidate, at jwood03@uoguelph.ca. This study has been reviewed and received ethics clearance through the University of Guelph Research Ethics Board (REB#: 16OC017).
Motivations and Multi-partnered Relationships

• Are you currently in a multi-partnered relationship?
• Do you have a primary partner that you live with and at least one other sexual partner?
• Are you and your primary partner able to participate?

Participants are needed for a study examining daily relationship experiences in multi-partnered/consensually non-monogamous relationships (e.g., polyamorous, open, swinging)

Fill out daily surveys for 3 weeks and a few follow up surveys! Earn up to $144 per couple ($72 per person) in amazon gift cards, total participation time over 6 months = approx. 6 hours

All genders and sexual orientations welcome
To participate, please email us at:

relresea@uoguelph.ca

Twitter Recruitment

In a multi-partnered relationship? We’d like to learn more! Participate in our online study! Email for more info: relresea@uoguelph.ca
Appendix J - Study 2 Screening Questionnaire

Department of Psychology
Department of Family Relations and Applied Nutrition

Thank you for expressing an interest to participate in our research: Daily study of motivations and experiences in multi-partnered relationships.
This research is being conducted by Robin Milhausen, Associate Professor, Family Relations and Applied Nutrition, Jessica Wood Phd Candidate, from the Department of Psychology, and Dr. Serge Desmarais, Associate Professor, from the Department of Psychology, at the University of Guelph, ON, Canada.

To participate in the full study, you must:
1) Currently be in a multi-partnered/consensually non-monogamous relationship
2) Identify as having a primary partner
3) Live with your primary partner
4) Have a primary partner that is also willing to participate in the study
5) Have at least one secondary partner who you see at least once a month
6) Had sex with at least one of your partners in the past month
7) Be over the age of 18
8) Currently be living in Canada or the United States

This is a screening questionnaire to determine if you are eligible to take part in a longer survey. The screening survey should take approximately 3 minutes of your time, after which we will contact you to and let you know if you are eligible to participate. If you are eligible to participate in the research study, you will receive up to $72 per person (up to $144 per couple) in amazon gift cards. You will not be paid for completing the brief screening questionnaire.
You do not have to answer any question that makes you uncomfortable and you may skip any questions that you do not wish to answer. However, in order to participate in the study, we need to know the answers to key questions. In order to decrease potential discomfort, we ask that you complete the survey in a private location.
The answers to the screening will only be used to determine eligibility for participation in a longer survey. If you are not eligible to participate your data will be destroyed immediately. All electronic data will be stored on a password-protected, encrypted computer. Please note that confidentiality cannot be guaranteed while data are in transit over the internet.

If you have any questions or concerns about the research, please feel free to contact Dr. Milhausen at 1-(519) 824-4120 ext. 54397, rmilhaus@uoguelph.ca or Jessica Wood at jwood03@uoguelph.ca
This project has been reviewed by the University of Guelph Research Ethics Board for compliance with federal guidelines for research involving human participants. If you have any questions regarding your rights and welfare as a research participant in this study (REB #...),
please contact: Director, Research Ethics; University of Guelph; reb@uoguelph.ca; 519-824-4120 ext. 56606. You do not waive any legal rights by agreeing to take part in this study.

You can help to ensure confidentiality by taking the following precautions to clear all private data from the computer you are using to respond to the survey:

1. Clear the browsing history
2. Clear the cache
3. Clear the cookies
4. Clear the authenticated session
5. LOG OFF

If you are using Internet Explorer, the first 4 steps can be accomplished by going to Tools and selecting Delete Browsing History. Your application may have a similar system.

Please click “CONTINUE” to complete the screening survey.

[CONTINUE]

Screening Questions

1. Are you over the age of 18?
   a. Yes
   b. No

2. Are you currently in a romantic relationship?
   ___Yes
   ___No

3. Have you had sex at least once in the past month?
   ___Yes
   ___No

4. How would you describe your current relationship?
   i. ___Single (not dating anyone)
   ii. ___In a monogamous relationship (i.e., both partners have agreed to have a sexual and intimate relationship with each other only)
   iii. ___In consensually non-monogamous relationship(s) (i.e., in a sexual and/or intimate relationship with one or more partners and your partners know about it/agree to it)

5. Do you consider one of your relationship partners to be a primary partner (E
   ___Yes
   ___No

6. Do you currently live with your primary partner?
   ___Yes
___No

(if they have a primary partner), Are you AND your primary partner available to participate in this survey for 21 days in the near future?
___Yes
___No

7. Do you have at least one other sexual partner, other than your primary partner?
   a. Yes
   b. No

8. What country are you currently living in?
   a. Canada
   b. United States
   c. Other:____________

9. Do you have a personal email account that only you (i.e., not partner) has access to?
   ___Yes
   ___No

10. (If no) Please provide your personal email account so we can contact you:______________________

This study involves participation from both you and your partner (we will need to contact your partner separately). **Please tell your partner to email us with their unique email address in order for us to send them the screening questionnaire. Your partner must also give us your name so that we can ensure that we have the right person.**

The next step of this study is to follow-up with you via a brief telephone call (i.e., 10 minutes) to go over a few questions and the format of the study.

1. What is your phone number? (if you do not wish to give us your phone number, we can send you the number of the research assistant and you can call them at a set time):______________________

2. When is a good time to reach you for a short (i.e.,10 minutes) phone call (provide alternate times if possible)?________________________________________

3. What is your partner’s name? (we only ask this in order to ensure that we have the right person when they email us):______________________

Thank you very much for your input! We will be in contact with you soon.
Sincerely,

*Jessica Wood, PhD Candidate*
Appendix K - Study 2 Intake Survey

Department of Family Relations and Applied Nutrition
Department of Psychology

CONSENT TO PARTICIPATE IN RESEARCH
Daily study of motivations and experiences in multi-partnered relationships.
You are invited to take part in a research study conducted by Robin R. Milhausen, Associate Professor from the Department of Family Relations and Applied Human Nutrition, and Serge Desmarais, Associate Vice President, Department of Psychology, and Jessica Wood, PhD Candidate, from the Department of Psychology, at the University of Guelph. You are invited to take part in this research because you met the criteria for our study.
If you have any questions or concerns about the research, please feel free to contact Dr. Milhausen at 1-(519) 824-4120 ext. 54397, rmilhaus@uoguelph.ca or Jessica Wood at jwood03@uoguelph.ca

PURPOSE OF THE STUDY
We are interested in learning more about people’s daily experiences in their romantic relationships. We want to learn more about the reasons people/couples engage in sexual activity within the context of romantic partnerships, how people experience satisfaction/conflict within their relationship and how they communicate with their partners.

To participate in the study, you must:
1) Currently be in a multi-partnered/consensually non-monogamous relationship
2) Identify as having a primary partner (or use other terms that denote a similar concept related to time/energy spent with the person, commitment level etc.)
3) Do you live with (one of) your primary/committed partner(s)?
4) Have a primary partner that is also willing to participate in the study
5) Have at least one secondary partner who you see at least once a month
6) Had sex with at least one of your partners in the past month
7) Be over the age of 18
8) Currently be living in Canada or the United States

PROCEDURES

If you volunteer to participate in this study, you will be asked to participate in 5 parts of the study. In Part 1, you will complete an online background questionnaire about your general relationship experiences, your sexual motivations, and demographic information (approx. 45-60 min). In Part 2 you will complete a short daily online survey about various aspects of relationship experiences (e.g., sexual motives, satisfaction, wellbeing) for 21 days (approx. 10 minutes each survey). After the 21 days, you will complete a follow-up questionnaire consisting of similar
questions as the background survey (approx. 35 min). In Part 4 we will send you a brief follow-up survey 3 months after you have completed the study (approx. 10-15 min) and in Part 5 we will send you another brief follow-up survey 6 months after you have completed the study (approx. 10-15 min).

POTENTIAL RISKS AND DISCOMFORTS

Some participants may feel embarrassed answering questions related to intimacy, relationships and motivation. You do not have to answer any question that makes you uncomfortable and you may stop the questionnaire at any time. You may also choose to withdraw from the study at any time. Additionally, in order to decrease potential discomfort, we ask that you complete the survey in a private location. Participants may be worried that their partner will see their answers and there is the chance that if you discuss your answers with your partner that one or both of you may become upset. To decrease the chances of this occurring, we ask that you each complete the surveys in a private location. It is also possible that one partner will withdraw from the study without the agreement of the other partner. If this happens, there is the risk that partners will experience tension/conflict within their relationship as a result. If you or your partner feel any distress or anxiety while participating in this study, there are a number of agencies that offer confidential services. A list of helplines by town and state/province can be found at http://www.yourlifecounts.org/. You can also find qualified sex, marriage, relationship and family therapists via the following links:
American Association for Marriage and Family Therapy (AAMFT):
http://www.aamft.ab.ca/
American Association of Sexuality Educators, Counselors and Therapists (AASECT):
https://www.aasect.org/
Board of Examiners in Sex Therapy and Counseling Ontario
http://www.bestco.info/index.html
Canadian Counseling and Psychotherapy Association (CCPA):
https://www ccpa-acccp.ca/find-a-canadian-certified-counsellor/

POTENTIAL BENEFITS TO PARTICIPANTS AND/OR TO SOCIETY

While there is no direct benefit to you, your participation is important, as it will contribute to the growing body of literature on multi-partnered relationships and the understanding of intimate relationships more generally. In the study of romantic relationships, multi-partnered relationships are often not included when examining factors that impact relationship satisfaction. By broadening our understanding of different relationship structures, we may begin to destigmatize relationships that are outside of the traditional norm of heterosexual, monogamous partnerships.

PAYMENT FOR PARTICIPATION

You have the opportunity to receive up to $72 per person (up to $144 per couple) in amazon gift cards. For completing the initial background survey, you will receive $5. For each completed
daily survey you complete you will receive $2 (up to $42, $2 x 21 = $42). However, having a full set of information is very important for our analysis so we ask you to please try completing the survey each day. For completing the immediate follow up survey you will receive $5, $10 for completing the three-month follow-up survey and $10 for the six-month follow-up survey. Payment will occur at two time points: immediately after the completion of the first follow-up survey (up to $52) and immediately after completion of the final follow-up survey (up to $20). Canadian participants will receive gift cards from amazon.ca and participants from the U.S. will receive gift cards from amazon.com.

RESULTS
The results of this study will be communicated, in aggregate (i.e., group) form, through journal publications and conference presentations. If you would like us to send you a copy of the results of the study, please email to Jessica Wood at: jwood03@uoguelph.ca

CONFIDENTIALITY
Every effort will be made to maintain your confidentiality. You and your partner will be assigned unique ID codes that will be used throughout the study (e.g., you may have a unique ID code of 1001 and your partner may have 2001, in order for us to link you and your partner together). This will be the only information linking each of your surveys together – that is, the surveys will have no identifying information on them. The list that matches your unique ID code to your personal information (e.g., name, email) will be stored on a password-protected, encrypted computer that only the researchers will have access to. This will be permanently deleted after the study has been completed (i.e., after participants have completed and been paid for the entire study). The data from your surveys will be kept until 5 years after publication of the results. We collect data using a software called Qualtrics, which users servers with multiple layers of security to protect the privacy of the data. Once the data is downloaded from Qualtrics, it will be stored in a password-protected encrypted computer, in a locked office. Please note that confidentiality cannot be guaranteed while data are in transit over the internet.

Results will only be published in aggregate (i.e., group) form-individual results will not be published. However, as some of the survey questions are open-ended, we will use quotes in our publications. It is possible that direct quotations may be identifiable in a way unpredictable to the researchers. If you disclose any identifiers in your open-ended questions (e.g., names or geographical locations), these will be removed/changed prior to publication of the results, in order to protect identification. All electronic data will be stored on a password-protected, encrypted computer, in a locked office.

You can help to ensure confidentiality by taking the following precautions to clear all private data from the computer you are using to respond to the survey:

1. Clear the browsing history
2. Clear the cache
3. Clear the cookies
4. Clear the authenticated session
5. LOG OFF

If you are using Internet Explorer, the first 4 steps can be accomplished by going to Tools and selecting Delete Browsing History. Your application may have a similar system.
PARTICIPATION AND WITHDRAWAL

You can choose whether to be in this study or not. If you volunteer to be in this study, you may withdraw at any time. If you withdraw from the study at any time you will be compensated for any parts of the study that you have already completed. As one of the criteria for participating is that both you and your primary partner participate, if one partner chooses to withdraw from the study, the other partner will automatically be withdrawn. If you fail to respond to 5 consecutive daily diary surveys, you will automatically be removed from the study. If you wish for your data to be removed from the study, please email us and we will remove it. Data will be maintained unless you request that your data be withdrawn from the study. If you request that your data be removed, we can remove your data at any time, up until the point where we begin our analysis. You may also refuse to answer any questions you don’t want to answer and still remain in the study. The investigator may withdraw you from this research if circumstances arise that warrant doing so.

RIGHTS OF RESEARCH PARTICIPANTS

This project has been reviewed by the University of Guelph Research Ethics Board for compliance with federal guidelines for research involving human participants. If you have any questions regarding your rights and welfare as a research participant in this study (REB #...), please contact: Director, Research Ethics; University of Guelph; reb@uoguelph.ca; 519-824-4120 ext. 56606. You do not waive any legal rights by agreeing to take part in this study.

___ I have read the above consent form and understand the conditions of my participation.

Do you consent to participate in this study?
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NO
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Initial Background Survey
Q3 What year were you born?
- 1998 (82)
- 1997 (169)
- 1996 (158)
- 1995 (159)
- 1994 (160)
- 1993 (161)
- 1992 (162)
- 1991 (163)
- 1990 (170)
- 1989 (171)
- 1988 (172)
- 1987 (173)
- 1986 (174)
- 1985 (175)
- 1984 (176)
- 1983 (177)
- 1982 (178)
- 1981 (179)
- 1980 (180)
- 1979 (181)
- 1978 (182)
- 1977 (183)
- 1976 (184)
- 1975 (185)
- 1974 (186)
- 1973 (187)
- 1972 (188)
- 1971 (189)
- 1970 (190)
- 1969 (191)
- 1968 (192)
- 1967 (193)
- 1966 (194)
- 1965 (195)
- 1964 (196)
- 1963 (197)
- 1962 (198)
- 1961 (199)
- 1960 (200)
- 1959 (201)
Q4 Sometimes people identify themselves by race and/or ethnicity. Please check the group(s) with which you most identify (check all that apply).

- American Indian or Alaska Native (1)
- Black, African American (2)
- White (3)
- Asian Indian (4)
- Chinese (5)
- Filipino (6)
- Japanese (7)
- Korean (8)
- Vietnamese (9)
- Native Hawaiian (10)
- Guamanian or Chomorro (11)
- Samoan (12)
- Mexican, Mexican American, Chicano (13)
- Puerto Rican (14)
- Cuban (15)
- Arab (e.g., Saudi Arabian, Iraqi) (16)
- West Asian (e.g., Iranian, Afgani) (17)
- Aboriginal/First Nations (18)
- Not listed, please specify: (19) ____________________
- Choose not to respond (20)

Q5 My area of residence can be best described as:

- Urban (1)
- Suburban (2)
- Rural (3)
- Neither (4)
- Other (specify) (5) ____________________
- Choose not to respond (6)
Q6 What is the highest level of education that you have completed?
- No schooling completed (1)
- Elementary school (grades 1-8) (2)
- Some high school (13)
- High school graduate (3)
- Some college/university (4)
- College/university graduate (5)
- Some trade/technical/vocational training (6)
- Trade/technical/vocational training degree or diploma (7)
- Some postgraduate work (8)
- Master's degree (9)
- Professional school degree (e.g., MD) (10)
- Doctoral degree (11)
- Choose not to respond (12)

Q7 Do you have children?
- Yes (1)
- No (2)
- Choose not to respond (3)

Display This Question:
If Do you have children? Yes Is Selected
Q8 If yes, how many children do you have?

Display This Question:
If Do you have children? Yes Is Selected
Q9 If yes, do your children live with you at home?
- Yes, full time (1)
- Yes, part time (2)
- Some children live at home, some do not (5)
- No (3)
- Choose not to respond (4)
Q10 Which of these commonly used terms would you use to describe your sexual orientation?
- Heterosexual (1)
- Gay (2)
- Lesbian (3)
- Bisexual (4)
- Queer (5)
- Pansexual (6)
- Uncertain or questioning (7)
- Asexual (8)
- My sexual orientation is not listed above. If your sexual orientation is not listed here, please tell us how you identify: (9) ____________________
- Choose not to respond (10)

Q194 What sex were you assigned at birth?
- Female (1)
- Male (2)
- Intersex (3)
- Choose not to respond (4)

Q195 What is your current gender identity?
- Woman (cisgender, transgender) (1)
- Man (cisgender, transgender) (2)
- Gender queer (3)
- Non-binary (8)
- Agender (4)
- My gender identity is not listed above (6) ____________________
- Choose not to respond (5)

Q137 How did you hear about this survey?
- Facebook (1)
- Twitter (2)
- Email listserv (3)
- Reddit (4)
- Other social media: (5) ____________________
- Other, please specify: (6) ____________________

Q211 Below are five statements that you may agree or disagree with. Using the 1-7 scale below, indicate your agreement with each item by placing the appropriate number on the line preceding that item. Please be open and honest in your responding.
Q226 What is your agreement with the following items?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly disagree 1 (1)</th>
<th>Disagree 2 (2)</th>
<th>Slightly disagree 3 (3)</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree 4 (4)</th>
<th>Slightly agree 5 (5)</th>
<th>Agree 6 (6)</th>
<th>Strongly agree 7 (7)</th>
<th>Choose not to respond (8)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In most ways my life is close to my ideal 1 (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The conditions of my life are excellent 2 (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am satisfied with my life 3 (3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>So far I have gotten the important things I want in life 4 (4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If I could live my life over, I would change almost nothing 5 (5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q100 We will first ask you some questions about your relationship with your primary partner and once those are complete, we will ask you to report on your relationship with one additional partner if applicable.
Q12 My current relationship status is (check all that apply):
- Casually dating one or more people (1)
- Open relationship (one or both of us has sex outside of the relationship consensually) (2)
- Polyamorous (one or both of us are in multiple loving and/or sexual relationships consensually) (3)
- Swinging relationship (one or both of you go to parties/clubs/etc., where partners may be exchanged for the night consensually) (4)
- Living with one partner, but not married or engaged (5)
- Living with multiple partners, but not married or engaged (6)
- Engaged to a partner (7)
- Engaged to more than one partner (8)
- Married to one partner (9)
- Married to more than one partner (10)
- Other: please specify (11) ____________________
- Choose not to respond (12)

Q15 How long have you been in a romantic relationship with your current primary partner? (e.g., 7 years, 2 months)

Q357 What are the initials of your primary partner?

Q16 Other than your primary partner, how many additional relational and/or sexual partners do you currently have? Please respond with whole numbers (e.g., 4, 5, etc.) It is very important for us to have numerical data, not words like "four" or "five."

Display This Question:
If Other than your primary partner, how many additional relational and/or sexual partners do you cur... Text Response Is Greater Than or Equal to  1

Q21 We know that many people have more than two partners, but for the purpose of this study, we would like you to report on up to one additional partner. Please enter the initials of your additional partner - this will be inputted to the rest of the survey in order for you to identify which partner we are asking about.
- Partner 2 Initials (2) ____________________
- Choose not to respond (4)
Q200 What sex was your primary partner's (initials: $q://QID357/ChoiceTextEntryValue}) assigned at birth?
- Female (1)
- Male (2)
- Intersex (3)
- Choose not to respond (4)

Q136 What is your primary partner's (initials: $q://QID357/ChoiceTextEntryValue}) current gender identity?
- Woman (cisgender, transgender) (1)
- Man (cisgender, transgender) (2)
- Gender queer (3)
- Non-binary (8)
- Agender (4)
- My gender identity is not listed above (6) ____________________
- Choose not to respond (5)

Q27 How many times in the past month have you engaged in sexual activity with your primary partner (initials: $q://QID357/ChoiceTextEntryValue})?
Display This Question:
If How many additional relational and/or sexual partners do you currently have? You may have more than 2 additional partners, but we are only asking you to report on up to 2 additional partners.... Text Response Is Greater Than or Equal to 1

Q18 How long have you been in a romantic relationship with partner 2 (initials: ${q://QID21/ChoiceTextEntryValue/2})? (e.g., 7 years, 2 months)

Display This Question:
If Other than your primary partner, how many additional relational and/or sexual partners do you currently have? Text Response Is Greater Than or Equal to 1

Q198 What sex was partner 2 (initials: ${q://QID21/ChoiceTextEntryValue/2}) assigned at birth?
- Female (1)
- Male (2)
- Intersex (3)
- Choose not to respond (4)

Display This Question:
If Other than your primary partner, how many additional relational and/or sexual partners do you currently have? Text Response Is Greater Than or Equal to 1

Q199 What is partner 2's (initials: ${q://QID21/ChoiceTextEntryValue/2}) current gender identity?
- Woman (cisgender, transgender) (1)
- Man (cisgender, transgender) (2)
- Gender queer (3)
- Non-binary (8)
- Agender (4)
- If your partner's gender identity is not listed above, please specify (6)
- Choose not to respond (5)

Display This Question:
If We know that many people have more than two partners, but for the purpose of this study, we would like you to report on up to two additional partners. How many additional relational and/or sexual partners do you have currently? Text Response Is Greater Than or Equal to 1

Q28 How many times in the past month have you engaged in sexual activity with partner 2 (initials: ${q://QID21/ChoiceTextEntryValue/2})?
Q22 The last time you engaged in sexual activity with a partner, it was with...
ıntial: $q://QID357/ChoiceTextEntryValue}) (1)

If we know that many people have more than two partners, but for the purpose of this study, we would like you to report on up to two additional partners. How many additional relational and/or sexual partners have you engaged with since then? _Text Response Is Greater Than or Equal to 1_

- Partner 2 (initials: $q://QID21/ChoiceTextEntryValue/2}) (2)
- A partner that is not listed here (4)
- Choose not to respond (5)

Q366 Is there anything else you would like to tell us about your relationship(s)?

Q235 People usually have many different reasons for engaging in sexual activity. Listed below are several statements that describe reasons you might have for engaging in sexual activity. For this task, we would like you to think about times you engaged in sexual activity with a
partner(s). Use the scale below to indicate the extent to which each of the following statements reflects why you engaged in sexual activity with your partner(s).

Q361 In the past month, I engaged in sexual activity with my primary partner (initials: ${e://Field/PrimaryInitials})
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>0 (Not at all)</th>
<th>1 (A little)</th>
<th>2 (Somewhat)</th>
<th>3 (Quite a bit)</th>
<th>4 (Very much)</th>
<th>5 (Choose not to respond)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Because I expected it to be interesting and exciting. (1)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For the pleasure of sharing a special and intimate experience. (2)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Because I value sex as part of a full life. (3)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Because my sex drive was high, and I felt like I needed to have sex. (4)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Because I felt pressured. (5)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Because I wanted sex to be a celebration of the feelings I share with my partner. (6)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Because I expect the pleasure of my physical satisfaction. (7)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Because I thought my partner(s) would like me better, or be happier with me. (8)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Because I wanted to feel more powerful or dominant. (9)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Because it feels good. (10)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q362 In the past month, I engaged in sexual activity with my primary partner (initials: ${e://Field/PrimaryInitials})...
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not at all for this reason 0 (7)</th>
<th>A little for this reason 1 (2)</th>
<th>Somewhat for this reason 2 (3)</th>
<th>Quite a bit for this reason 3 (4)</th>
<th>Very much for this reason 4 (5)</th>
<th>Choose not to respond (6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Because it is exciting to be sexually</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>intimate with my partner(s)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>But I did not feel like I was in control</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of my own behavior</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(11)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Because it is stimulating and</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>enjoyable.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(12)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Because my body ached to have sex.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(13)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Because I would feel anxious or guilty</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if I didn't go along.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(14)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Because it helped me relax or get to</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sleep.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(15)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Because sex is an important part of my</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>relationship(s)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(16)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Because I didn't want to say no.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(17)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Because I expect a satisfyingly deep connection with my partner(s) during sex. (18)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Because I need to relieve myself of the tension and stress of the day. (19)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q363 In the past month, I engaged in sexual activity with my primary partner (initials:  ${e://Field/PrimaryInitials})...
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Not at all for this reason 0 (1)</th>
<th>A little for this reason 1 (2)</th>
<th>Somewhat for this reason 2 (3)</th>
<th>Quite a bit for this reason 3 (4)</th>
<th>Very much for this reason 4 (5)</th>
<th>Choose not to respond (6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Because I see sex as a healthy activity. (1)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Because I wanted to enjoy the physical sensations. (20)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Because I wanted to show that I am capable of performing. (21)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Because I enjoy knowing my partner(s) this way. (22)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Because I see sex as an important part of who I am. (23)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Because I worry I will be punished or neglected if I don't. (24)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Because I felt driven to have sex. (25)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Because the proposition made me feel more attractive. (26)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Because I wanted a fun experience. (27)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Because I thought sex would get my something I wanted later. (28)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q364 In the past month, I engaged in sexual activity with my primary partner (initials: ${e://Field/PrimaryInitials})...
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Not at all for this reason 0 (1)</th>
<th>A little for this reason 1 (2)</th>
<th>Somewhat for this reason 2 (3)</th>
<th>Quite a bit for this reason 3 (4)</th>
<th>Very much for this reason 4 (5)</th>
<th>Choose not to respond (6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>But I don't know why. It just happened.</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Because I wanted to share a mutually pleasurable activity. (29)</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Because I think it is a healthy aspect of my relationship(s). (30)</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Because I want another person to be under my control. (31)</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Because I think sex is an enjoyable way to share our feelings. (32)</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Because I worried my partner(s) might reject me if I didn't. (33)</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Because I would feel bad to withhold sex. (34)</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Because I wanted to enjoy being close to my friend. (35)</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Because I needed to orgasm. (36)</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Because I enjoy being sexual. (37)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q365 In the past month, I engaged in sexual activity with my primary partner (initials: ${e://Field/PrimaryInitials})...
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Not at all for this reason 0 (1)</th>
<th>A little for this reason 1 (2)</th>
<th>Somewhat for this reason 2 (3)</th>
<th>Quite a bit for this reason 3 (4)</th>
<th>Very much for this reason 4 (5)</th>
<th>Choose not to respond (6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Because I value sex as an important part of maintaining a good friendship. (1)</td>
<td>cellForRowAt</td>
<td>繇</td>
<td>繇</td>
<td>繇</td>
<td>繇</td>
<td>繇</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Because I thought my partner(s) would treat me better afterward. (38)</td>
<td>繇</td>
<td>繇</td>
<td>繇</td>
<td>繇</td>
<td>繇</td>
<td>繇</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Because I want to enjoy the closeness of being physically joined with my sexual partner(s). (39)</td>
<td>繇</td>
<td>繇</td>
<td>繇</td>
<td>繇</td>
<td>繇</td>
<td>繇</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Because sex makes me feel better about myself. (40)</td>
<td>繇</td>
<td>繇</td>
<td>繇</td>
<td>繇</td>
<td>繇</td>
<td>繇</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Because I wanted to show how good I am in bed. (41)</td>
<td>繇</td>
<td>繇</td>
<td>繇</td>
<td>繇</td>
<td>繇</td>
<td>繇</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Because I think saying no will start a conflict. (42)</td>
<td>繇</td>
<td>繇</td>
<td>繇</td>
<td>繇</td>
<td>繇</td>
<td>繇</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Because alcohol makes me lose control. (43)</td>
<td>繇</td>
<td>繇</td>
<td>繇</td>
<td>繇</td>
<td>繇</td>
<td>繇</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Because I thought sex will make me feel more secure. (44)
Because I value how sex can bring me closer to another person(s). (45)
Because my sexual desire was high. (46)
Because I needed to relieve myself of sexual tension. (47)
But I have no idea why I did. (48)

Q288 Is there anything else you would like us to know about the reasons you engage in sexual activity with a partner(s)?

Q31 Now we will ask you about how you feel when you have sex with your primary relationship (initials: $\{e://Field/PrimaryInitials\}$). Please respond to each statement by indicating how true it is for you.
Q367 When I have sex with my primary relationship (initials: $\{e://Field/PrimaryInitials\})...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not at all true 1 (1)</th>
<th>2 (2)</th>
<th>3 (3)</th>
<th>Somewhat True 4 (4)</th>
<th>5 (5)</th>
<th>6 (6)</th>
<th>Very True 7 (7)</th>
<th>Choose not to respond (8)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I feel free to be who I am. (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel like a competent person. (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel loved and cared about. (3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I often feel inadequate or incompetent. (4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have a say in what happens, and I can voice my opinion. (5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I often feel a lot of distance in our relationship. (6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel very capable and effective. (7)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel a lot of closeness and intimacy. (8)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel controlled and pressured to be certain ways. (9)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q193 Please answer the following questions while thinking of your primary relationship (initials: `{e://Field/PrimaryInitials}`), using the following scale.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Never 0 (1)</th>
<th>1 (2)</th>
<th>2 (3)</th>
<th>3 (4)</th>
<th>4 (5)</th>
<th>All the time 5 (6)</th>
<th>Choose not to respond (7)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How often do you discuss or have you considered divorce, separation, or terminating your relationship? (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In general, how often do you think that things between you and your partner are going well? (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you confide in your partner? (3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q144 The following represents different degrees of happiness in your relationship. Please select the choice which best describes the degree of happiness, all things considered, of your relationship.

- 0 Extremely unhappy (1)
- 1 Fairly unhappy (2)
- 2 A little unhappy (3)
- 3 Happy (4)
- 4 Very happy (5)
- 5 Extremely happy (6)
- 6 Perfect (7)
- Choose not to respond (8)
Q178 Please complete the following questions about your primary relationship (initials: ${e://Field/PrimaryInitials}).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very strong disagreement 1 (1)</th>
<th>2 (2)</th>
<th>3 (3)</th>
<th>4 (4)</th>
<th>5 (5)</th>
<th>6 (6)</th>
<th>Very strong agreement 7 (7)</th>
<th>Choose not to respond (8)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Right now my relationship with my primary partner is stable. (1)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right now my primary relationship is strong. (2)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right now my relationship with my primary partner makes me happy. (3)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right now I am experiencing conflict with my primary partner. (4)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right now I am unsure if my relationship with my primary partner will last. (5)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right now my primary partner and I are getting on each other's nerves. (6)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q206 Overall, how satisfied are you with the sexual aspect of your primary relationship (initials: $\{e://Field/PrimaryInitials\}$) relationship?
- Not at all satisfied (1)
- A little satisfied (2)
- Moderately satisfied (3)
- Very satisfied (4)
- Extremely satisfied (5)
- Choose not to respond (6)

Q129 Is there anything else you would like to tell us about sexual satisfaction within this relationship?
Q189 Thinking about your sex life with your primary relationship (initials: %{e://Field/PrimaryInitials}) during the last six months, please rate your satisfaction with the following aspects:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not at all satisfied 1 (1)</th>
<th>A little satisfied 2 (2)</th>
<th>Moderately satisfied 3 (3)</th>
<th>Very satisfied 4 (4)</th>
<th>Extremely satisfied 5 (5)</th>
<th>Choose not to respond (6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The quality of my orgasms (1)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My &quot;letting go&quot; and surrender to sexual pleasure during sex (2)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The way I sexually react to my partner (3)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My body's sexual functioning (4)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My mood after sexual activity (5)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The pleasure I provide to my partner (6)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The balance between what I give and receive in sex (7)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My partner's emotional opening up during sex (8)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My partner's ability to orgasm (9)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My partner's sexual creativity (10)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The variety of my sexual activities (11)  
The frequency of my sexual activity (12)

Q398 Please rate the following items about your primary relationship (initials: ${e://Field/PrimaryInitials})

<p>| How far would you be willing to go to meet your primary partner's (initials: ${q://QID357/ChoiceTextEntryValue}) sexual needs? (1) |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all 0 (1)</th>
<th>1 (2)</th>
<th>2 (3)</th>
<th>3 (4)</th>
<th>Extremely 4 (5)</th>
<th>Choose not to respond (6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| How readily can you put the sexual needs of your primary partner's (initials: ${q://QID357/ChoiceTextEntryValue}) out of your thoughts? (2) |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all 0 (1)</th>
<th>1 (2)</th>
<th>2 (3)</th>
<th>3 (4)</th>
<th>Extremely 4 (5)</th>
<th>Choose not to respond (6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| How high a priority for you is meeting the sexual needs of your primary partner (initials: ${q://QID357/ChoiceTextEntryValue})? (3) |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all 0 (1)</th>
<th>1 (2)</th>
<th>2 (3)</th>
<th>3 (4)</th>
<th>Extremely 4 (5)</th>
<th>Choose not to respond (6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| How easily could you accept not meeting your primary partner's (initials: ${q://QID357/ChoiceTextEntryValue}) sexual needs? (4) |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all 0 (1)</th>
<th>1 (2)</th>
<th>2 (3)</th>
<th>3 (4)</th>
<th>Extremely 4 (5)</th>
<th>Choose not to respond (6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| How likely are you to sacrifice your own needs to meet the sexual needs of your primary partner (initials: ${q://QID357/ChoiceTextEntryValue})? (5) |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all 0 (1)</th>
<th>1 (2)</th>
<th>2 (3)</th>
<th>3 (4)</th>
<th>Extremely 4 (5)</th>
<th>Choose not to respond (6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please select response option 4 (Extremely) (7)

<p>| How happy do you feel when satisfying your primary partner's (initials: ${q://QID357/ChoiceTextEntryValue}) sexual needs? (6) |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all 0 (1)</th>
<th>1 (2)</th>
<th>2 (3)</th>
<th>3 (4)</th>
<th>Extremely 4 (5)</th>
<th>Choose not to respond (6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q358  Please choose which picture best describes your relationship with your primary relationship (initials: ${e://Field/PrimaryInitials} )

- a (1)
- b (2)
- c (3)
- d (4)
- e (5)
- f (6)
- g (7)
- Choose not to respond (8)
Q403 Thinking about your primary relationship (initials: $e://Field/PrimaryInitials$), please indicate how strongly you disagree or agree with each of these items.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Disagree strongly 1 (1)</th>
<th>2 (2)</th>
<th>3 (3)</th>
<th>4 (4)</th>
<th>5 (5)</th>
<th>Agree strongly 6 (6)</th>
<th>Choose not to respond (7)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I find some sexual matters are too upsetting to talk about with my primary partner. (1)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think it is difficult for my primary partner to tell me what he/she/they like(s) to do sexually. (2)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is easy for me to tell my primary partner what I do or don't like to do during sex. (3)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My primary partner hardly ever talks to me when I want to talk about our sex life. (4)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My primary partner really cares about what I think about sex. (5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talking about sex with my primary partner is usually fun for both of us. (6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q351 Please think about your communication with your primary relationship (initials: $\{e://Field/PrimaryInitials\})

Q353 I find it easy to talk to my primary partner about problems or concerns within our relationship

- 1 Strongly disagree (1)
- 2 (2)
- 3 (3)
- 4 (4)
- 5 Strongly agree (5)
- Choose not to respond (6)

Q354 To what degree have you and your primary partner discussed the boundaries or "rules" related to sexual and/or emotional connections with other people?

- A great deal (1)
- Somewhat (2)
- Not very much (3)
- Not at all (4)
- Choose not to respond (5)
Q355 Compared to most people you know, do you feel the QUALITY of the communication between you and your primary partner is generally…
- 1 Well below average (1)
- 2 Below average (2)
- 3 About average (3)
- 4 Above average (4)
- 5 Well above average (5)
- Choose not to respond (6)

Q356 Is there anything else you would like us to know about communication with your relationship?

Q69 People look for different qualities in romantic relationships. Think about your current romantic relationship with your primary relationship (initials: ${e://Field/PrimaryInitials}) below is a list of relationship qualities.
Q370 Please use the following scale to indicate how true each quality is in your current relationship with your primary relationship (initials: ${e://Field/PrimaryInitials}).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quality</th>
<th>Never true 1 (1)</th>
<th>2 (2)</th>
<th>3 (3)</th>
<th>4 (4)</th>
<th>5 (5)</th>
<th>6 (6)</th>
<th>Always True 7 (7)</th>
<th>Choose not to respond (8)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I feel closeness and intimacy with my primary partner (initials: ${e://Field/PrimaryInitials}$)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can honestly express my thoughts and feelings to my primary partner (initials: ${e://Field/PrimaryInitials}$)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My primary partner (initials: ${e://Field/PrimaryInitials}$) really understands me</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My primary partner (initials: ${e://Field/PrimaryInitials}$) and I enjoy spending time together</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My primary partner (initials: ${e://Field/PrimaryInitials}$) and I laugh and have a good time together</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My primary partner (initials: ${e://Field/PrimaryInitials}$) and I share our beliefs and values</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q371 Please use the following scale to indicate how true each quality is in your current relationship with your primary relationship (initials: $\{e://Field/PrimaryInitials\})..

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Never true 1 (1)</th>
<th>2 (2)</th>
<th>3 (3)</th>
<th>4 (4)</th>
<th>5 (5)</th>
<th>6 (6)</th>
<th>Always True 7 (7)</th>
<th>Choose not to respond (8)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I feel good about myself with my primary partner (initials: ${e://Field/PrimaryInitials}$) (1)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My primary partner (initials: ${e://Field/PrimaryInitials}$) brings out the best in me (7)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My primary partner (initials: ${e://Field/PrimaryInitials}$) makes me feel cherished and special (8)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I like the way my primary partner (initials: ${e://Field/PrimaryInitials}$) makes me feel about myself (9)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q372 Please use the following scale to indicate how true each quality is in your current relationship with your primary relationship (initials: ${e://Field/PrimaryInitials}).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quality</th>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Choose not to respond</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I feel free to be who I am with my primary partner (initials: ${e://Field/PrimaryInitials})</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My primary partner respects my choices and decisions (7)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My primary partner respects me (10)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My primary partner supports that I do things on my own (11)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My primary partner respects my independence (12)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q373 Please use the following scale to indicate how true each quality is in your current relationship with your primary relationship (initials: $\{e://Field/PrimaryInitials\}$).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quality</th>
<th>Never true 1 (1)</th>
<th>2 (2)</th>
<th>3 (3)</th>
<th>4 (4)</th>
<th>5 (5)</th>
<th>6 (6)</th>
<th>Always True 7 (7)</th>
<th>Choose not to respond (8)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I have exciting experiences with my primary partner (initials: ${e://Field/PrimaryInitials}$)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have a variety of new experiences with my primary partner (initials: ${e://Field/PrimaryInitials}$)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I learn new things from my primary partner (initials: ${e://Field/PrimaryInitials}$)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am spontaneous with my primary partner (initials: ${e://Field/PrimaryInitials}$)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My relationship with my primary partner (initials: ${e://Field/PrimaryInitials}$) allows me to see the world in new ways</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q374 Please use the following scale to indicate how true each quality is in your current relationship with your primary relationship (initials: $\{\text{e://Field/PrimaryInitials}\}$).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Never true 1 (1)</th>
<th>2 (2)</th>
<th>3 (3)</th>
<th>4 (4)</th>
<th>5 (5)</th>
<th>6 (6)</th>
<th>Always True 7 (7)</th>
<th>Choose not to respond (8)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>My sex life with my primary partner (initials: ${\text{e://Field/PrimaryInitials}}$) is exciting (1)</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I engage in desired sexual activities with my primary partner (initials: ${\text{e://Field/PrimaryInitials}}$) (13)</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My primary partner (initials: ${\text{e://Field/PrimaryInitials}}$) and I try new things sexually (14)</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I share my sexual fantasies with my primary partner (initials: ${\text{e://Field/PrimaryInitials}}$) (15)</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My primary partner (initials: ${\text{e://Field/PrimaryInitials}}$) understands my sexual needs (7)</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q375 Please use the following scale to indicate how true each quality is in your current relationship with your primary relationship (initials: `{e://Field/PrimaryInitials}`).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Never true 1 (1)</th>
<th>2 (2)</th>
<th>3 (3)</th>
<th>4 (4)</th>
<th>5 (5)</th>
<th>6 (6)</th>
<th>Always True 7 (7)</th>
<th>Choose not to respond (8)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I feel secure in my relationship with my primary partner (initials: <code>{e://Field/PrimaryInitials}</code>). (1)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My relationship with my primary partner (initials: <code>{e://Field/PrimaryInitials}</code>). is stable (17)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can count on my primary partner (initials: <code>{e://Field/PrimaryInitials}</code>). (18)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My primary partner (initials: <code>{e://Field/PrimaryInitials}</code>). will always be there for me (19)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I trust my primary partner (initials: <code>{e://Field/PrimaryInitials}</code>). (20)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q376 Please use the following scale to indicate how true each quality is in your current relationship with your primary relationship (initials: $\{e://Field/PrimaryInitials\}$).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quality</th>
<th>Never true 1 (1)</th>
<th>2 (2)</th>
<th>3 (3)</th>
<th>4 (4)</th>
<th>5 (5)</th>
<th>6 (6)</th>
<th>Always True 7 (7)</th>
<th>Choose not to respond (8)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>My primary partner (initials: ${e://Field/PrimaryInitials}$) is there for me when I need comfort (1)</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can talk to my primary partner (initials: ${e://Field/PrimaryInitials}$) when I'm worried about something (21)</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My primary partner (initials: ${e://Field/PrimaryInitials}$) is understanding when I'm upset (22)</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My primary partner (initials: ${e://Field/PrimaryInitials}$) supports me emotionally (23)</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My primary partner (initials: ${e://Field/PrimaryInitials}$) comforts and supports me when I am stressed (24)</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q104 Is there anything else you would like to tell us about need fulfillment within your relationship?
Q397 In my relationship with my primary partner (initials: $\{e://Field/PrimaryInitials\})...
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>2 (2)</th>
<th>3 (3)</th>
<th>4 (4)</th>
<th>5 (5)</th>
<th>6 (6)</th>
<th>Strongly agree 7 (7)</th>
<th>Choose not to respond (8)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I am trying to avoid getting embarrassed, betrayed, or hurt by my romantic partner (1)</td>
<td>⬜</td>
<td>⬜</td>
<td>⬜</td>
<td>⬜</td>
<td>⬜</td>
<td>⬜</td>
<td>⬜</td>
<td>⬜</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am trying to enhance the bonding and intimacy in my romantic relationship (2)</td>
<td>⬜</td>
<td>⬜</td>
<td>⬜</td>
<td>⬜</td>
<td>⬜</td>
<td>⬜</td>
<td>⬜</td>
<td>⬜</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am trying to avoid disagreements and conflicts with my romantic partner (3)</td>
<td>⬜</td>
<td>⬜</td>
<td>⬜</td>
<td>⬜</td>
<td>⬜</td>
<td>⬜</td>
<td>⬜</td>
<td>⬜</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am trying to deepen my relationships with my romantic partner (4)</td>
<td>⬜</td>
<td>⬜</td>
<td>⬜</td>
<td>⬜</td>
<td>⬜</td>
<td>⬜</td>
<td>⬜</td>
<td>⬜</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am trying to make sure that nothing bad happens in my romantic relationship (5)</td>
<td>⬜</td>
<td>⬜</td>
<td>⬜</td>
<td>⬜</td>
<td>⬜</td>
<td>⬜</td>
<td>⬜</td>
<td>⬜</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am trying to share many fun and meaningful experiences with my romantic partner (6)</td>
<td>⬜</td>
<td>⬜</td>
<td>⬜</td>
<td>⬜</td>
<td>⬜</td>
<td>⬜</td>
<td>⬜</td>
<td>⬜</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q300 Sometimes people in the polyamorous community report feeling something that is the opposite of jealousy. Compersion is described as having positive feelings when a partner experiences pleasure with other people. How often do you experience compersion within your relationship(s)?
- Never (1)
- A few times a year (2)
- Once a month (3)
- Two or three times a month (4)
- Once a week (5)
- Two or three times a week (6)
- Four or more times a week (7)
- Choose not to respond (8)

Q302 Now we are going to ask about a number of things that can occur in relationships. Listed below are a number of emotions that typically represent how people may feel. If you have experienced any of these, answer with those experiences in mind. If you have never experienced the specific thing asked about, imagine instead what you think it would feel like. For each item, use the scale to signify how much of each of the emotions you felt or think you would feel.
Q206 If my primary partner (initials: $e://Field/PrimaryInitials$) fell in love with another person, I would feel…

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not at all 1 (1)</th>
<th>2 (2)</th>
<th>3 (3)</th>
<th>Neutral 4 (4)</th>
<th>5 (5)</th>
<th>6 (6)</th>
<th>Very much 7 (7)</th>
<th>Choose not to respond (8)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Happy (1)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sad (2)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Love for my partner (3)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angry (4)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enthusiastic (5)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jealous (6)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joyful (7)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loved by my partner (8)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scared (9)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excited for my partner (10)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q314 Has this ever happened to you with your primary partner (initials: $e://Field/PrimaryInitials$)?
○ Yes (1)
○ No (2)
○ Choose not to respond (3)
○ Other (4) ________________
Q208 If I watched my primary partner (initials: $\{e://Field/PrimaryInitials\}$) expressing intense sexual desire for another person, I would feel…

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not at all 1 (1)</th>
<th>2 (2)</th>
<th>3 (3)</th>
<th>Neutral 4 (4)</th>
<th>5 (5)</th>
<th>6 (6)</th>
<th>Very much 7 (7)</th>
<th>Choose not to respond (8)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Happy (1)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sad (2)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Love for my partner (3)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angry (4)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enthusiastic (5)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jealous (6)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joyful (7)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loved by my partner (8)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scared (9)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excited for my partner (10)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q209 Has this ever happened to you with your primary partner (initials: $\{e://Field/PrimaryInitials\}$)?
○ Yes (1)
○ No (2)
○ Choose not to respond (3)
○ Other (4) ________________

Q458 Now we will ask many of the same questions about partner 2 (initials: $\{e://Field/SecondaryInitials\}$). People usually have many different reasons for engaging in sexual activity. Listed below are several statements that describe reasons you might have for engaging in sexual activity. For this task, we would like you to think about times you engaged in sexual activity with a partner(s). Use the scale below to indicate the extent to which each of the following statements reflects why you engaged in sexual activity with your partner(s).
Q459 In the past month, I engaged in sexual activity with partner 2 (initials: ${e://Field/SecondaryInitials})...
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Not at all for this reason 0 (1)</th>
<th>A little for this reason 1 (2)</th>
<th>Somewhat for this reason 2 (3)</th>
<th>Quite a bit for this reason 3 (4)</th>
<th>Very much for this reason 4 (5)</th>
<th>Choose not to respond (6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Because I expected it to be interesting and exciting. (1)</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For the pleasure of sharing a special and intimate experience. (2)</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Because I value sex as part of a full life. (3)</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Because my sex drive was high, and I felt like I needed to have sex. (4)</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Because I felt pressured. (5)</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Because I wanted sex to be a celebration of the feelings I share with my partner. (6)</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Because I expect the pleasure of my physical satisfaction. (7)</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Because I thought my partner (s) would like me better, or be happier with me. (8)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Because I wanted to feel more powerful or dominant. (9)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Because it feels good. (10)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q460 In the past month, I engaged in sexual activity with partner 2 (initials: ${e://Field/SecondaryInitials})...
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Not at all for this reason 0 (7)</th>
<th>A little for this reason 1 (2)</th>
<th>Somewhat for this reason 2 (3)</th>
<th>Quite a bit for this reason 3 (4)</th>
<th>Very much for this reason 4 (5)</th>
<th>Choose not to respond (6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Because it is exciting to be sexually intimate with my partner(s).</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>But I did not feel like I was in control of my own behavior.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Because it is stimulating and enjoyable.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Because my body ached to have sex.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Because I would feel anxious or guilty if I didn't go along.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Because it helped me relax or get to sleep.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Because sex is an important part of my relationship(s).</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Because I didn't want to say no.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement</td>
<td>Option 1</td>
<td>Option 2</td>
<td>Option 3</td>
<td>Option 4</td>
<td>Option 5</td>
<td>Option 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Because I expect a satisfyingly deep connection with my partner(s) during sex. (18)</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>❌</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Because I need to relieve myself of the tension and stress of the day. (19)</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>❌</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q461 In the past month, I engaged in sexual activity with partner 2 (initials: \$\{e://Field/SecondaryInitials\}...
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Not at all for this reason 0 (1)</th>
<th>A little for this reason 1 (2)</th>
<th>Somewhat for this reason 2 (3)</th>
<th>Quite a bit for this reason 3 (4)</th>
<th>Very much for this reason 4 (5)</th>
<th>Choose not to respond (6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Because I see sex as a healthy activity. (1)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Because I wanted to enjoy the physical sensations. (20)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Because I wanted to show that I am capable of performing. (21)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Because I enjoy knowing my partner(s) this way. (22)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Because I see sex as an important part of who I am. (23)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Because I worry I will be punished or neglected if I don't. (24)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Because I felt driven to have sex. (25)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Because the proposition made me feel more attractive. (26)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Because I wanted a fun experience. (27)
Because I thought sex would get my something I wanted later. (28)
Q462 In the past month, I engaged in sexual activity with partner 2 (initials: ${e://Field/SecondaryInitials})...
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Not at all for this reason 0</th>
<th>A little for this reason 1</th>
<th>Somewhat for this reason 2</th>
<th>Quite a bit for this reason 3</th>
<th>Very much for this reason 4</th>
<th>Choose not to respond 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>But I don't know why. It just happened. (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Because I wanted to share a mutually pleasurable activity. (29)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Because I think it is a healthy aspect of my relationship(s). (30)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Because I want another person to be under my control. (31)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Because I think sex is an enjoyable way to share our feelings. (32)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Because I worried my partner(s) might reject me if I didn't. (33)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Because I would feel bad to withhold sex. (34)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Because I wanted to enjoy being close to my friend. (35)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Because I needed to orgasm. (36)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Because I enjoy being sexual. (37)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q463 In the past month, I engaged in sexual activity with partner 2 (initials: ${e://Field/SecondaryInitials})...
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Not at all for this reason 0 (1)</th>
<th>A little for this reason 1 (2)</th>
<th>Somewhat for this reason 2 (3)</th>
<th>Quite a bit for this reason 3 (4)</th>
<th>Very much for this reason 4 (5)</th>
<th>Choose not to respond (6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Because I value sex as an important part of maintaining a good friendship. (1)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Because I thought my partner(s) would treat me better afterward. (38)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Because I want to enjoy the closeness of being physically joined with my sexual partner(s). (39)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Because sex makes me feel better about myself. (40)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Because I wanted to show how good I am in bed. (41)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Because I think saying no will start a conflict. (42)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Because alcohol makes me lose control. (43)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reason</td>
<td>Q417</td>
<td>Q427</td>
<td>Q437</td>
<td>Q447</td>
<td>Q457</td>
<td>Q467</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Because I thought sex will make me feel more secure. (44)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Because I value how sex can bring me closer to another person(s). (45)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Because my sexual desire was high. (46)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Because I needed to relieve myself of sexual tension. (47)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>But I have no idea why I did. (48)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q464 Is there anything else you would like us to know about the reasons you engage in sexual activity with a partner(s)?

Q417 Please respond to each statement by indicating how true it is for you.
Q419 When I have sex with partner 2 (initials: ${e://Field/SecondaryInitials})...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not at all true</th>
<th>2 (2)</th>
<th>3 (3)</th>
<th>Somewhat True 4 (4)</th>
<th>5 (5)</th>
<th>6 (6)</th>
<th>Very True 7 (7)</th>
<th>Choose not to respond (8)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I feel free to be who I am.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel like a competent</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>person.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel loved and cared</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>about.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I often feel inadequate</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or incompetent.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have a say in what</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>happens, and I can voice my</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>opinion.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I often feel a lot of</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>distance in our relationship.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel very capable and</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>effective.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel a lot of closeness</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and intimacy.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel controlled and</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pressured to be certain ways.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

235
Q427 Please rate how strongly you agree or disagree with the following items while thinking about partner 2 (initials: $\{e://Field/SecondaryInitials\}$).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Very strong disagreement 1 (1)</th>
<th>2 (2)</th>
<th>3 (3)</th>
<th>4 (4)</th>
<th>5 (5)</th>
<th>6 (6)</th>
<th>Very strong agreement 7 (7)</th>
<th>Choose not to respond (8)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Right now my relationship with partner 2 (initials: ${e://Field/SecondaryInitials}$) is stable. (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right now my relationship with partner 2 (initials: ${e://Field/SecondaryInitials}$) is strong. (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right now my relationship with partner 2 (initials: ${e://Field/SecondaryInitials}$) makes me happy. (3)</td>
<td></td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right now I am experiencing conflict with partner 2 (initials: ${e://Field/SecondaryInitials}$). (4)</td>
<td></td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right now I am unsure if my relationship with partner 2 (initials: ${e://Field/SecondaryInitials}$) will last. (5)</td>
<td></td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right now partner 2 (initials: ${e://Field/SecondaryInitials}$) and I are getting on each other's nerves. (6)</td>
<td></td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q440 Please rate the following items about partner 2 (initials: $\{e://Field/SecondaryInitials\}$)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not at all 0 (1)</th>
<th>1 (2)</th>
<th>2 (3)</th>
<th>3 (4)</th>
<th>Extremely 4 (5)</th>
<th>Choose not to respond (6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How far would you be willing to go to meet partner 2 (initials: ${e://Field/SecondaryInitials}$) sexual needs? (1)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How readily can you put the sexual needs of partner 2 (initials: ${e://Field/SecondaryInitials}$) out of your thoughts? (2)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How high a priority for you is meeting the sexual needs of partner 2 (initials: ${e://Field/SecondaryInitials}$)? (3)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How easily could you accept not meeting partner 2 (initials: ${e://Field/SecondaryInitials}$) sexual needs? (4)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How likely are you to sacrifice your own needs to meet the sexual needs of partner 2 (initials: ${e://Field/SecondaryInitials}$)? (5)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How happy do you feel when satisfying partner 2 (initials: ${e://Field/SecondaryInitials}$) sexual needs? (6)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q208 Overall how satisfied are you with the sexual aspect of your relationship with partner 2 (initials: ${e://Field/SecondaryInitials})?
- Not at all satisfied (1)
- A little satisfied (2)
- Moderately satisfied (3)
- Very satisfied (4)
- Extremely satisfied (5)
- Choose not to respond (6)

Q128 Is there anything else you would like to tell us about sexual satisfaction within this relationship?

Q359 Please choose which picture best describes your relationship with your partner 2 (initials: ${e://Field/SecondaryInitials})
- a (1)
- b (2)
- c (3)
- d (4)
- e (5)
- f (6)
- g (7)
- Choose not to respond (8)

Q466 The following represents different degrees of happiness in your relationship with partner 2 (initials: ${e://Field/SecondaryInitials}). Please select the choice which best describes the degree of happiness, all things considered, of your relationship with partner 2 (initials: ${e://Field/SecondaryInitials}):
- 0 Extremely unhappy (1)
- 1 Fairly unhappy (2)
- 2 A little unhappy (3)
- 3 Happy (4)
- 4 Very happy (5)
- 5 Extremely happy (6)
- 6 Perfect (7)
- Choose not to respond (8)

Q106 We're just about done! Now that we've asked you about your specific relationships, we want to ask you a few questions about why you chose to engage in a CNM relationship. Below are some reasons that people report for engaging in consensually non-monogamous/multipartnered relationships. We would like you to think about your relationship(s) and indicate the extent to which the following statements reflect the reasons why you are engaging in a CNM/multipartnered relationship.
Q107 Reflect on the following statements about the reasons you are engaging in a CNM/multipartnered relationship and indicate the degree to which you engage in a CNM/multipartnered relationship for each reason.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Not at all for this reason 0 (1)</th>
<th>A little for this reason 1 (2)</th>
<th>Somewhat for this reason 2 (3)</th>
<th>Quite a bit for this reason 3 (4)</th>
<th>Very much for this reason 4 (5)</th>
<th>Choose not to respond (6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Because it feels natural for me. (1)</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Because this type of relationship is reflective of my beliefs. (6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Because it allows me to grow as a person. (7)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Because it allows me and my partner(s) to grow together. (8)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Because I feel that I have the capacity to love more than one person. (9)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Because I feel that I have the capacity to romantically connect with many people at one time. (10)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Because I value the support that I receive in this community. (11)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Because it fits with my lifestyle. (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Because my partner and I spend a lot of time apart from one another. (3)
Because it allows me to explore my sexual desires. (4)
Q395 Reflect on the following statements about the reasons you are engaging in a CNM/multipartnered relationship.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not at all for this reason 0 (1)</th>
<th>A little for this reason 1 (2)</th>
<th>Somewhat for this reason 2 (3)</th>
<th>Quite a bit for this reason 3 (4)</th>
<th>Very much for this reason 4 (5)</th>
<th>Choose not to respond (6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Because it allows me to explore my sexual orientation. (1)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Because I like having sexual variety. (15)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Because it is pleasurable. (16)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Because this relational style suits me. (17)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Because I wanted to revive the passion in my primary relationship. (18)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Because I enjoy seeing my partner happy in other relationships. (19)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Because my partner wanted to. (20)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Because I find monogamous relationships to be too constrained. (21)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Because it allows me to meet my sexual needs. (6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Because it allows me to meet my emotional needs. (7)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q396 Reflect on the following statements about the reasons you are engaging in a CNM/multipartnered relationship.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Not at all for this reason 0 (1)</th>
<th>A little for this reason 1 (2)</th>
<th>Somewhat for this reason 2 (3)</th>
<th>Quite a bit for this reason 3 (4)</th>
<th>Very much for this reason 4 (5)</th>
<th>Choose not to respond (6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Because it allows my partner to meet their needs. (1)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Because I value sexual autonomy. (15)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Because it is exciting. (16)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Because it allows me to be myself. (17)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Because I do not feel that I could have my needs met in a monogamous relationship. (18)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Because I want to meet new people. (19)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Because I want to avoid conflict with a partner. (20)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Because I want to help fulfill my partner's fantasies. (21)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Because I wanted to enhance my relationship with my primary partner. (6)

Q136 Other:

Q329 These are the last questions! This questionnaire asks about your level of sexual desire. By desire, we mean interest in or wish for sexual activity.

Q130 Over the past 4 weeks, how often did you feel sexual desire or interest?
- Almost always or always (1)
- Most times (2)
- Sometimes (3)
- A few times (4)
- Almost never or never (5)

Q131 Over the past 4 weeks, how would you rate your level (degree) or sexual desire or interest?
- Very high (1)
- High (2)
- Moderate (3)
- Low (4)
- Very low or none at all (5)

Q344 Is there anything else you would like to tell us about sexual desire?
Appendix L - Relationship Satisfaction, Quality of Marriage Scale

Please complete the following questions about your primary relationship(s) today:

1 (very strong disagreement) to 7 (very strong agreement)

1. Right now my relationship with my primary partner is stable
2. Right now my primary relationship is strong
3. Right now my relationship with my primary partner makes me happy
4. Right now I am experiencing conflict with my primary partner.
5. Right now I am unsure if my relationship with my primary partner will last.
6. Right now my primary partner and I are getting on each other’s nerves.
### Appendix M - Study 2 Initial Regression Analyses and RMANOVA Analyses

Table 1. *Initial linear regression analyses for potential covariates.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Model 1: Relationship Satisfaction</th>
<th>Model 2: Sexual Satisfaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>SE B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Frequency</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship Length</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**p < .01
R² model 1 = .03, R² model 2 = .16
Appendix N - Adjusted Fit Indices for SEM models in Study 2

To determine adjusted fit indices, I ran both a null model and an I-SAT model. Below are instructions and formulas for each of the adjusted fit indices (see Olsen & Kenny, 2006).

Corrected Chi-square:

\[(\text{Analytic Chi-square}) - (\text{I-SAT Chi-square}) = \chi^2\]
\[(\text{Analytic } df) - (\text{I-SAT } df) = df\]

Corrected RMSEA, using the adjusted chi-square:

\[
\text{RMSEA} = \sqrt{\frac{\chi^2'}{df' - 1}}
\]

Corrected TLI:

- First, adjust the chi-square form the null model:

\[(\text{Null Chi-square}) - (\text{I-SAT}) = \chi^2_b\]
\[(\text{Null } df) - (\text{I-SAT } df) = df_b\]

\[
\text{TLI} = \frac{\chi^2_b \chi^2}{\frac{\chi^2_b}{df_b} - 1}
\]
Appendix O - Study 2 Alternative Models

Figure 1. APIMeM for associations between sexual need satisfaction, sexual motives and sexual satisfaction with the first partner.

Table 1. Summary of total effects, total indirect effects, indirect effects, and direct effects for primary dyad sexual satisfaction, alternative direction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Estimate</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>BCLLCI</th>
<th>BCULCI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Actor Effect</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total effect</td>
<td>5.76*</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>4.059</td>
<td>7.777</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total IE</td>
<td>1.46*</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>0.608</td>
<td>2.464</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IE1 (actor-actor)</td>
<td>1.48*</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>0.535</td>
<td>2.723</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IE2 (partner-partner)</td>
<td>-0.001</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-0.143</td>
<td>0.231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct effect</td>
<td>4.30*</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>2.662</td>
<td>6.389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner Effect</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total effect</td>
<td>-0.59</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>-2.446</td>
<td>1.181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total IE</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>-0.595</td>
<td>0.782</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IE 3 (actor-partner)</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>-0.685</td>
<td>0.731</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IE 4 (partner-actor)</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>-0.790</td>
<td>0.683</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct effect</td>
<td>-0.68</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>-2.491</td>
<td>1.231</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
IE 1: SNS with P1, DM1 \rightarrow SM with P1, DM1 \rightarrow SS with P1, DM1
IE 2: SNS with P1, DM1 \rightarrow SM with P1, DM2 \rightarrow SS with P1, DM1
IE 3: SNS with P1, DM1 \rightarrow SM with P1, DM1 \rightarrow SS with P1, DM2
IE 4: SNS with P1, DM1 \rightarrow SM with P1, DM2 \rightarrow SS with P1, DM2

Note: IE = Indirect effect, SM = sexual motives, SNS= sexual need satisfaction, SS = sexual satisfaction, DM = dyad member (1 or 2), P = partner (1 or 2)

Note: Estimates are unstandardized; *95% BCCI does not include 0.