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# abstract

The purpose of this study was to assess the prevalence of extradyadic activity in older adults in four European countries and investigate factors associated with extradyadic sex. Postal questionnaire data were collected in probability samples among populations aged 60–75 years in Norway (N = 1271), Denmark (N = 1045), Belgium (N = 991), and Portugal (N = 509). Across the different countries, 1-4% of participants reported having had their last sexual intercourse with someone other than their regular partner. The multivariate logistic regression analysis for men showed that extradyadic sex was 2.5 times higher for every unit increase in not sharing sexual likes and dislikes with their regular partner, and 1.5 times higher for every unit increase in relationship unhappiness. Extradyadic activity decreased by a factor of 0.71 for every unit increase in the regular partner (not) having had sexual difficulties. Compared to Norwegian men, Belgian men had a 70% lower likelihood of having had extradyadic sex. In women, only one significant association emerged: extradyadic sex was 2.5 times higher for every unit increase in (not) perceiving intimacy with their regular partner.
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# introduction

Since the 1940s, a liberalization of sexual attitudes and behavior has occurred in most Western countries (Hubert, Bajos, & Sandfort, 1998; Lewin, Fugl-Meyer, Helmius, Lalos, & Månsson, 2000). As two of the Nordic countries, Norway and Denmark are often perceived as representing sexually liberal cultures, with particularly accepting attitudes toward same-sex sexual behavior and adolescent sexuality (Jakobsson, Kotsadam, & Støre-Jakobsson, 2013; Widmer, Treas, & Newcomb, 1998). Regarding extradyadic sexual behavior, however, people in the Nordic countries often have negative attitudes. Using Norway as an example, in Widmer et al.’s study (1998), 95% of Norwegians surveyed considered extradyadic sex as wrong. In comparison, 62% of Russians and 94% of U.S. populations asserted that extradyadic sex was wrong. Restrictive attitudes toward extradyadic relationships in Norway have also been found in other studies (Træen, 1998), and may explain why extradyadic sexual activity is not particularly widespread in the married and cohabiting population. In 1992, 15% of the married or cohabiting Norwegian population between the ages of 18 and 60 reported that they had had an extradyadic sexual partner at some point during their present relationship (Træen & Stigum, 1998). In a more recent Norwegian couple study, 17% of men and 10% of women aged 40-67 years reported experience of extradyadic sexual activity during their present relationship, but there was no data collected on when in the relationship this occurred (Træen & Martinussen, 2008). That men have more extradyadic experience than women is a common finding, and likewise a higher level of education may give a greater opportunity to have extradyadic partners; for instance, when travelling (Allen *et al*., 2005; Træen & Stigum, 1998; Træen *et al*., 2007).

Comparing the prevalence of extradyadic sex across studies is difficult due to differences in type of sample, sample size, nationality, gender and ethnicity distribution of the sample, mean or range of participant age, and relationship status. Furthermore, the deﬁnition of extradyadic sex and the timeframe during which extradyadic sex is considered represent factors, making comparison between studies difficult (Lou et al., 2010). In most studies the measure of extradyadic sexual activity has been any lifetime experience, occurring during the current marriage/cohabitation, or occurring in the past 30 days. Lou et al. (2010) reported that in nationally representative, random samples, the overall rate of extradyadic sex ranged from 1.2% in the past 30 days to 37.5% for any lifetime experience. In convenience samples, the prevalence rate was much higher (16.5% to 85.5%, respectively). Measuring extradyadic sexual activity in an individual’s current relationship is also complicated, as we seldom have any information about when in the course of the relationship the activity took place. This is particularly complex in samples of older adults who perhaps have been living together for 40 years or more. To increase our understanding of extradyadic sexual activity in older adults it may therefore be more accurate to study whether the most recent sexual intercourse was with the regular partner or not, and what may predict extradyadic activity. To date, we have little knowledge of how prevalent extradyadic sexual activity is among older adults across Europe, and what predicts extradyadic activity in later life. This is despite the fact that the majority of older adults in Western societies are sexually active (DeLamater, 2010; Træen et al., 2017, 2018). The present study aimed to fill this gap in the literature.

There are many theories of why people have extradyadic sexual relationships, ranging from individual explanations, such as permissive attitudes and personality traits (Finsham & May, 2017; Schmitt, 3004), the investment model that emphasize relationship satisfaction and commitment (Drigotas & Barta, 2001), to external precipitating factors such as stress or work environment (Allan et al., 2005, Finsham & May, 2017). All these theories explain extradyadic activity to some extent, but none of them gives us any direct insight into the motives of people for having extradyadic partners. Traditionally, researchers have identified four sets of motivations for extradyadic activity: "dissatisfied," "overlooked," "sex,", and "anger" (Barta & Kiene, 2005). According to Barta and Kiene, (2005) being dissatisfied is about knowing that one no longer loves one’s permanent partner and seeks to fulfill sexual needs with others. Feeling overlooked deals with the fact that the regular partner does not prioritize spending time and being together. "Sex" deals the variety of the sexual repertoire, how frequently one has sex, opportunities to have sex, fulfilling sexual preferences the partner cannot or will. “Anger" is about a desire to punish the permanent partner for something he or she has done or getting revenge.

Recent research involving mixed age groups has expanded these groups of motivations to include loss of love, low perceived intimacy with the regular partner, a desire for sexual variation, and situational factors such as being drunk or in a position where the risk for being ‘caught in the act’ is minimal e.g., on business trips or similar (Selterman, Garcia, & Tsapelas, 2019). However, having the opportunity to have extradyadic activity is rarely the motive alone. The extradyadic activity most likely occurs because of opportunity in combination with other problems within the relationship or strong desires for sexual practices that are not fulfilled within the relationship (Selterman et al., 2019). Beyond this, it has also been shown that sexual and emotional needs not being met by the partner, and falling in love with another person, are key motives for extradyadic activity (Omarzu, Miller, Schulz, & Timmerman, 2012).

Already in early childhood, the ability for attachment is established (Bowlby, 1982). A good childhood will often be followed by a secure attachment style, and a difficult childhood a less secure attachment style. Attachment style has been related to extradyadic activity as an adult (Allen & Baucom, 2004; Bogaert & Shaver, 2002; DeWall et al. 2011). Individuals with a secure attachment style are less likely to have extradyadic activity compared to those with an unsecure attachment style. It is likely that the anger, loss of love, and low perceived intimacy with a partner, associated with an insecure or avoidant attachment style, may motivate extradyadic sexual behaviour (Allen & Baucom, 2004; DeWall et al., 2011; Selterman et al., 2019). All these motives may apply to individuals of different ages. In older adults, sexual dysfunctions are relatively prevalent (Hald et al., 2019; Træen et al., 2017), and having a partner with a sexual dysfunction may play an important role as a predictor for extradyadic sexual activity in this age group.

The present study investigated if this is was the case among older adults across four European countries. Thus, the purpose of the study was to assess the prevalence of extradyadic activity during the most recent sexual intercourse in older adults in Norway, Denmark, Belgium and Portugal, and identify the factors associated with engagement in extradyadic activity. Furthermore, attitudes towards extradyadic activity will be described.

# Methods

## Participants

The Department of Psychology at the University of Oslo, in cooperation with the poll organization IPSOS (Institut de Publique Sondage d'Opinion Secteur), conducted a multinational survey on the sexual lives of 60–75-year-olds in probability samples of the non-institutionalized population in Norway, Denmark, Belgium, and Portugal. The sample size in Norway was *n* = 1271, in Denmark *n* = 1045, in Belgium *n* = 991, and in Portugal *n* = 509.

## Procedure and Recruitment

Initially, IPSOS conducted recruitment interviews by telephone with a nationally representative sample of the population 60–75 years old in all four countries. Those who accepted participation received an anonymous postal questionnaire. Most of the included 66 questions and scales in the questionnaire were adapted from validated measures used in previous studies among the target group, for instance from NATSAL-3 (Mitchell et al., 2013). An overview of the questions and scales included is given elsewhere (Træen et al., 2018). The questionnaire was developed in English and subsequently translated into local languages translated by the principal investigators and persons employed by IPSOS in each country.

After the translation of the questionnaire into native languages was finalized, randomized telephone recruitment of participants started from October to December 2016. Trained interviewers at IPSOS made the phone calls after guidance from the researchers.  Using national phone registries (with the exception of Portugal), the sampling procedure produced probability samples of the target population. There were several problems with regard to drawing a telephone sample from the sample in Portugal, mainly because a complete and updated telephone register does not exist in in this country. For this reason, participants from Portugal were recruited as follows: 1) telephone numbers were first randomly selected from fixed phone directories and IPSOS’s own database of phone numbers; 2) to obtain a distribution representative of the population, participants were selected by age and gender; and 3) due to literacy problems, participants who had not completed primary school (ISCED 1) were excluded from the sample.

The ethics approval procedures followed the standards of ESOMAR (The European Society for Opinion and Market Research), and national and international rules and guidelines for what is recognized as professionally sound market analysis were followed. The rules include guidance on confidentiality, respondent anonymity, questionnaires and databases and methods for data collection etc. No compensation for participation was given.

The study was conducted as a postal survey among all who agreed and were eligible to participate in the telephone interview. Completed questionnaires were sent back in a freepost envelope provided to participants. Two postal reminders were sent starting one week after the questionnaire was received. After a discussion with IPSOS in Portugal, it was decided to send the reminders by phone. Unfortunately, 502 potential participants could not be reached by phone. Of the 1498 individuals contacted by phone, 561 refused to participate after having seen the questionnaire. Overall, the response rates were 68% in Norway, 52% in Denmark, 57% in Belgium, and 26% in Portugal. The mean age of men was 66.7 years in Norway, 67.8 in Denmark, 67.3 in Belgium, and 66.6 in Portugal. In women, the mean age was 66.9 years in Norway, 67.8 Denmark, 66.4 in Belgium, and 66.8 in Portugal.

Most participants in Norway and Denmark reported they were Protestants or Christians with no particular denomination. The majority of participants in Belgium and Portugal were Roman Catholics. The percentage with no religious affiliation was highest in Belgium (35%) and lowest in Denmark (14%). Participants who self-identified as Roman Catholics reported more frequent church attendance than Protestants. The proportion of participants with tertiary education (at least some University education) ranged from 17% in Portugal to 53% in Norway. It was most common for participants in Portugal to report primary education as their highest level of education (39%), and least common in Norway, where 10% reported primary education. Regarding place of residence, the majority of participants in all countries lived in rural areas or small towns. In Portugal, the percentage living in a large city was highest (34%). In Denmark and Portugal, most participants reported having a partner (84% and 82%, respectively), compared to 63% in Belgium and 76% in Norway. This article is based on data from participants who reported having a regular committed partner (including also married/cohabiting persons). Between 43–61% of men, and 52–70% of women reported that they had been in their relationship for 40 years or more, and nearly all of these participants reported that their partner was of the opposite sex (between 98% and 100%).

## Measures

### Outcome Variable

*Extradyadic sexual activity* was assessed by the question, ‘This question is about the person you had sex with most recently, whether this was quite recently or some while ago. Was the person you had sex with most recently your regular spouse or committed partner?’ The response categories sub questions were ‘Yes’, ‘No’, and ‘Don’t want to answer’. For the purpose of the multivariate analysis, this was recoded into 1 = ‘Regular partner’ and 2 = ‘Extradyadic partner’.

### Predictor Variables

*Age* was measured as a continuous variable in years.

*Level of education* was assessed as the highest level of formal education. In three countries, the response categories were 1 = Primary school (6–8 years at school), 2 = Lower secondary school (9–10 years at school), 3 = Higher secondary school, high school (12–13 years at school), 4 = College, lower university level (bachelor’s degree level or similar), and 5 = Higher university level (master’s degree, PhD or similar). In Belgium, additional response alternatives were added to reflect the educational system in the country. To allow for cross-cultural comparisons, the variable was recoded into 1 = primary (1), 2 = secondary (2+3), and 3 = tertiary education (4+5).

*Sexual activity throughout life* was measured with the question ‘In your lifetime, how would you rate your sexual activity throughout most of your life (until the age of 60)?’ The response categories were 1= I was sexually very active, 2 = I was moderately sexually active, 3 = Neither active nor inactive, 4 = I was moderately sexually inactive, and 5 = I was very sexually inactive.

*Perceived emotional intimacy* was measured using a 5-item scale developed by Sinclair and Dowdy (2006). Respondents were asked to indicate their agreement with each of the presented items, whilst considering their regular partner or spouse. The mean scores were then calculated, with higher scores reflecting a lower perceived emotional intimacy with one’s partner. The Cronbach’s alpha for this scale was .90 for men and .91 for women.

*Partner’s sexual difficulties* was measured by the question (Mitchell et al., 2013), ‘Please indicate how much you agree with each of the following statements with your regular partner or spouse in mind.My partnerhas experienced sexual difficulties in the last year.’ The response categories ranged from 1 = ‘Strongly agree’, to 5 = ‘Strongly disagree’.

*Sexual compatibility* was measured by the question (Mitchell et al., 2013), ‘Please indicate how much you agree with each of the following statements with your regular partner or spouse in mind.My partner and I share the same sexual likes and dislikes.’The response categories ranged from 1 = ‘Strongly agree’, to 5 = ‘Strongly disagree’.

*Relationship happiness* was measured by the question ‘On a scale of 1 to 7, where 1 means 'very happy' and 7 means 'very unhappy': How happy or unhappy are you with your relationship with your partner, all things considered?’ The response categories ranged from 1 = ‘Very happy’, to 7 = ‘Very unhappy’.

## Statistical Analysis

Using SPSS 24.0, bivariate and multivariate logistic regression analyses were carried out on weighted data (DuMouchel & Duncan, 1983). Based on census data, weighting was used to adjust for the unequal probabilities of selection in terms of age and gender. All data analyses were performed separately for men and women to avoid intercorrelations due to inclusion of heterosexual couples. For each country, we used binary logistic regression to calculate age-adjusted odds ratios to investigate how reporting of the outcome variable varied by the predictors.

# results

Table 1 shows attitudes towards extradyadic activity in men and women in the four countries. The majority of participants in all countries agreed that a married person having sexual relations with someone other than their spouse was wrong. However, the acceptance for extradyadic activity was higher in Belgium and Portugal than in the Nordic countries for both genders.

Insert Table 1 about here

The participants were initially divided into two categories, one groups who currently were in a relationship, and another group who currently were single but had been in a committed relationship. Table 2 reports the percentage of the participants in the two groups who said they had their most recent sexual intercourse with an extradyadic partner by age, level of education, and country. As shown in the Table, a substantial proportion of singles had had their most recent intercourse with another than their regular partner. In those who currently were in a relationship, the prevalence of extradyadic activity was between 1-4 percent. More partnered women with tertiary (4.5%) than primary (0.6%) level of education had sex with an extradyadic partner (*p* < 0.01). No other statistically significant differences were found.

Insert Table 2 about here

Table 3 displays the mean scoring on the predictor variables among participants who had sex with their regular partner or an extradyadic partner at the time of their most recent sexual intercourse. In men, there was a statistically significant between-group difference on all selected predictor variables except sexual activity throughout life. Compared to men who had had sex with their regular partner, those who had had sex with an extradyadic partner were generally less happy with their relationship, perceived less intimacy with their regular partner, had a partner who had experienced sexual difficulties in the last year, and shared sexual likes and dislikes to a lesser degree with their regular partner. Compared to women who had had sex with their regular partner, those who had had sex with an extradyadic partner were generally less happy with their relationship, perceived less intimacy with their regular partner, and shared sexual likes and dislikes to a lesser degree with their regular partner.

Insert Table 3 about here

Table 4 presents the results from multivariate logistic regression analyses on having had sex with an extradyadic partner. Results are stratified by age, level of education, relationship happiness, sexual activity throughout life, perceived intimacy with the regular partner, partner’s sexual difficulties, sexual compatibility, and country.

Insert Table 4 about here

The multivariate logistic regression analysis for men showed that sex with an extradyadic partner was 2.5 times more likely for every unit increase in not sharing sexual likes and dislikes with the regular partner, and 1.5 times more likely for every unit increase in relationship unhappiness (both *p* < 0.001). Having an extradyadic partner decreased by a factor of 0.71 for every unit increase in the regular partner (not) having had sexual difficulties. Compared to Norwegian men, Belgian men had a 70% lower likelihood of having had sex with an extradyadic partner (both *p* < 0.05). In women, only one statistically significant relationship was found in the multivariate model. Sex with an extradyadic partner was 2.5 times more likely for every unit increase in (not) perceiving intimacy with the regular partner (*p* < 0.05).

# Discussion

This study investigated the prevalence of extradyadic sexual activity during the most recent occasion of sexual intercourse in older adults in Norway, Denmark, Belgium and Portugal. The majority of participants expressed negative attitudes towards extradyadic activity, and participants in the Nordic region were more negative than participants in the south of Europe. Bivariate analyses showed that 1-3 percent of partnered men and 1-2 percent of women reported extradyadic sex, with no significant differences between the countries. In partnered women, however, the prevalence of extradyadic activity was higher in women with tertiary than primary level of education. A substantial proportion of single participants reported that their most recent intercourse had been with an extradyadic partner. The most likely explanation is that this happened with a partner after their previous committed relationship had ended, or it may have happened within the previous relationship and perhaps was the reason for why this committed relationship ended. The multivariate analyses revealed that important predictors for extradyadic activity in partnered men were not sharing the same sexual likes and dislikes with their regular partner, having a partner with sexual difficulties, and relationship unhappiness. The only significant predictor of extradyadic activity in partnered women was low perceived intimacy with their regular partner.

Compared to Lou et al.’s (2010) review of previous studies in mixed age groups, the proportion of partnered respondents who reported extradyadic sexual activity, defined as having had one’s most recent sexual intercourse with another person than the regular partner, was within the same range. Controlling for socio-demographic factors, we found a difference in reported extradyadic activity between men in the Nordic region and men in the south of Europe, and Nordic men had higher extradyadic activity than Portuguese men. This could be related to religious factors or because sexuality is more strictly controlled in the southern Catholic part of Europe than in the Protestant North.

## Extradyadic sexual activity in men

Although not statistically significant,we found that nearly twice as many men in the youngest age group than those in the oldest age group had sex with an extradyadic partner at their most recent sexual intercourse. This could first and foremost be associated with an increase in erectile difficulties in men with increasing age (Hald et al., 2019). With erection difficulties, the general interest in sex may be diminished making sex of lesser interest.

The sexual function of the partner was also of relevance in predicting extradyadic sexual activity. This has also been reported in previous studies. When a sexual partner, most often female, lacks sexual interest and desire, the man may turn to an extradyadic partner for sexual gratification (Fisher et al., 2009). However, low frequency of sexual activity with the primary partner was not the only predictor of extradyadic activity. We found that not sharing the same sexual likes and dislikes predicted extradyadic sex in men. Sexual preferences can be stable over the life course, but new preferences may also appear as an individual accumulates experiences and learns new things with time. Over many years with the same partner sexual preferences may also change in one of the partners, but this may be difficult to communicate to the partner or the partner may reject the initiative for sexual experimentation (Mallory, Stanton, & Handy, 2019). With increasing age, it may be difficult to break up from a long-term relationship containing shared history and memories as well as shared economic affairs. Rather than breaking up from the relationship and suppressing sexual urges, the outcome may be that the man remains with this primary partner and seek sexual gratification with an extradyadic partner (Mallory et al., 2019). This may also be why feeling unhappy in the relationship predicted extradyadic sexual activity in this study, as well as in other studies (Barta & Kiene, 2005). However, the causal direction of this relationship is unclear. The lack of sexual activity and experimentation may cause men to feel unhappy in their relationship, but unhappy marriages may also be the reason why a couple’s sexual activity and experimentation diminishes. It could also be that the couple becomes intertwined in a vicious circle that is difficult to break. Previous studies have reported that extradyadic sexual activity is associated with relationship problems within the primary couple, as well as a higher androgen levels in men who have sex with extradyadic partners (Fisher et al., 2009). It is reasonable to believe that in men for whom sex is important, or who have high sexual desire, such a vicious circle might lead to extradyadic sexual activity.

## Extradyadic sexual activity in women

Previous research on extradyadic sexual activity has found that men seem more motivated by sexual desire, sexual variety and situational factors, while women’s extradyadic activity seems more motivated by feeling neglected and reporting less intimacy with the primary partner (Omarzu et al., 2012; Tsapelas, Aron, & Fisher, 2011; Selterman, 2019). In this study, the only significant predictor of extradyadic sexual activity in women was less perceived intimacy with the regular partner. This is consistent with Rosemary Basson’s theory of “responsive desire” that suggesting that motivation to move from sexual neutrality to sexual arousal and desire to continue the experience stems from the need to enhance emotional closeness to the partner, acceptance, bonding, toleration, commitment and love (Basson, 2002). According to Sand and Fisher (2007), this model better reflects sexual response in women with sexual dysfunctions than it does sexually functional women. It was therefore somewhat surprising that none of the other predictors were associated with extradyadic sexual activity in women.

## Strengths and Limitations

The strength of this study is population-based samples from four different countries, allowing for cross-country comparison. There were also some limitations of this study. It can reasonably be assumed that individuals with more liberal views about sexuality, and those who were sexually active were overrepresented in this study (Dunne, 2002). Furthermore, the measure of extradyadic activity was related to the most recent sexual intercourse and included the response category “Don’t want to answer”. Also, the number of participants who left this question unanswered was high and we have no information about why some participants did not want to answer the question. It could be that the question was perceived as too sensitive, or the participants may have been tired of answering questions by the time they got to this question.

Another limitation was that we asked if the most recent sex partner was a regular partner or not, and interpreted this as a sign of extradyadic sexual activity. This may not be the best way to capture extradyadic sexual activity in the current relationship. Extradyadic activity may have taken place before the most recent intercourse, but the individual would have been classified as not having had an extradyadic affair. In this sense, our estimates of extradyadic sexual activity may be very conservative estimates. Most previous studies on extradyadic sex have focused on lifetime experience or experience in the present marriage or cohabiting relationship, whereas we measured extradyadic activity only during the most recent intercourse increased the probability that the extradyadic activity actually took place as older.. However, this makes comparison with previous studies difficult.

# conclusions

Extradyadic activity in partnered older adults across Europe is not very prevalent, but extradyadic activity may have contributed to breaking up marriages among those who are currently single. The factors predicting extradyadic sexual activity appear different between men and women. Older women’s extradyadic sexual activity seem related to feeling less intimacy with their primary partner, whereas older men’s extradyadic activity was related to dissatisfaction with the sexual relationship with their primary partner and relationship unhappiness.
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**Table 1**

Distribution of the attitude “A married person having sexual relations with someone other than their spouse is wrong” in men and women from Norway, Denmark, Belgium and Portugal (percent, weighted data)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | **Men** | |  |  |  |  |  | **Women** | |  |  |  |
|  | Norway | Denmark | Belgium | Portugal | χ2 | *p* |  | Norway | Denmark | Belgium | Portugal | χ2 | *p* |
| Strongly agree | 33.2 | 32.2 | 37.6 | 39.2 | 107.76 | .000 |  | 45.1 | 42.0 | 37.7 | 49.0 | 196.01 | .000 |
| Agree | 39.4 | 29.5 | 25.8 | 13.1 |  |  |  | 34.7 | 26.9 | 20.9 | 10.6 |  |  |
| Neither agree nor disagree | 20.3 | 26.0 | 19.4 | 22.5 |  |  |  | 15.0 | 21.4 | 25.2 | 11.8 |  |  |
| Disagree | 5.4 | 8.2 | 9.3 | 14.4 |  |  |  | 3.3 | 5.7 | 8.9 | 8.7 |  |  |
| Strongly disagree | 1.6 | 4.1 | 7.9 | 10.8 |  |  |  | 1.9 | 3.9 | 7.3 | 19.8 |  |  |
|  | (n = 629) | (n = 515) | (n = 484) | (n = 222) |  |  |  | (n = 634) | (n = 509) | (n = 493) | (n = 263) |  |  |

**Table 2. Sociodemographic characteristics of participants who had their most recent sexual intercourse with another than their current or last regular spouse or committed partner (weighted data)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | Men | | | Men | | | Women | | | Women | | |
|  |  | Current relationship | | | Single – Last relationship | | | Current relationship | | | Single – Last relationship | | |
|  |  | *%* | X2 | *p* | *%* | X2 | *p* | *%* | X2 | *p* | *%* | X2 | *p* |
| **Age groups** | 60-64 yrs | 3.5 | 3.651 | 0.161 | 46.1 | 1.615 | 0.446 | 1.2 | 0.044 | 0.978 | 22.8 | 1.198 | 0.549 |
|  | 65-69 yrs | 2.8 |  |  | 41.3 |  |  | 1.1 |  |  | 23.6 |  |  |
|  | 70-75 yrs | 1.5 |  |  | 35.1 |  |  | 1.0 |  |  | 18.7 |  |  |
|  |  | (n=1366) |  |  | (n=208) |  |  | (n=1085) |  |  | (n=417) |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Level of education** | Primary | 2.6 | 2.678 | 0.349 | 41.4 | 0.035 | 0.983 | 0.6 | 10.661 | 0.005 | 20.0 | 1.105 | 0.575 |
|  | Secondary | 1.6 |  |  | 41.8 |  |  | 1.1 |  |  | 24.4 |  |  |
|  | Tertiary | 3.7 |  |  | 43.5 |  |  | 4.5 |  |  | 19.1 |  |  |
|  |  | (n=1362) |  |  | (n=206) |  |  | (n=1082) |  |  | (n=414) |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Country** | Norway | 3.3 | 4.190 | 0.242 | 40.5 | 1.404 | 0.705 | 1.0 | 1.577 | 0.665 | 17.8 | 2.366 | 0.500 |
|  | Denmark | 3.1 |  |  | 44.6 |  |  | 0.9 |  |  | 25.0 |  |  |
|  | Belgium | 1.4 |  |  | 37.5 |  |  | 1.9 |  |  | 23.8 |  |  |
|  | Portugal | 1.4 |  |  | 54.5 |  |  | 1.6 |  |  | 18.8 |  |  |
|  |  | (n=1366) |  |  | (n=207) |  |  | (n=1086) |  |  | (n=417) |  |  |

*Note.* Chi-square test of group differences.

**Table 3**

**Having had one’s last intercourse with a partner other than the regular spouse or committed partner or not, by selected predictors.**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Men** | | | | | |  |  | **Women** | | | | | |  |
|  | **Regular partner** | |  | **Extradyadic partner** | |  |  |  | **Regular partner** | |  | **Extradyadic partner** | |  |  |
|  | **M** | **SD** |  | **M** | **SD** | **Sign** |  |  | **M** | **SD** |  | **M** | **SD** | **Sign.** |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Sexual activity throughout life** | 1.85 | 0.65 |  | 1.97 | 0.83 | ns |  |  | 2.08 | 0.71 |  | 2.05 | 0.98 | ns |  |
|  | (n = 1329) |  |  | (n = 34) |  |  |  |  | (n = 1061) |  |  | (n = 12) |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Relationship happiness** | 2.05 | 1.25 |  | 3.59 | 1.84 | \*\*\* |  |  | 2.05 | 1.21 |  | 3.29 | 1.70 | \*\*\* |  |
|  | (n = 1304) |  |  | (n = 39) |  |  |  |  | (n = 1054) |  |  | (n = 18) |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Perceived intimacy** | 1.75 | 0.65 |  | 2.33 | 0.79 | \*\*\* |  |  | 1.73 | 0.72 |  | 2.51 | 0.84 | \*\*\* |  |
|  | (n = 1302) |  |  | (n = 39) |  |  |  |  | (n = 1049) |  |  | (n = 17) |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Partner’s sexual difficulties** | 3.24 | 1.22 |  | 2.24 | 1.33 | \*\*\* |  |  | 2.90 | 1.39 |  | 3.07 | 1.41 | ns |  |
|  | (n = 1284) |  |  | (n = 39) |  |  |  |  | (n = 1032) |  |  | (n = 16) |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Sexual compatibility** | 2.27 | 0.98 |  | 3.65 | 1.34 | \*\*\* |  |  | 2.19 | 0.93 |  | 2.74 | 1.31 | \* |  |
|  | (n = 1284) |  |  | (n = 36) |  |  |  |  | (n = 1024) |  |  | (n = 16) |  |  |  |

*Note.* \*\*\* *p* < .001; \*\* *p* < .01; \* *p* < .05; ns = not statistically significant.

**Table 4**

**Having had one’s last intercourse with a partner other than the regular spouse or committed partner, by selected predictors.**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Men**  **(n = 1228)** | | |  | **Women**  **(n = 1046)** | | |
|  |  | **AOR** | **95% CI** |  |  | **AOR** | **95% CI** |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Age***(in one year’s increase)* |  | 0.94 ns | 0.85-1.02 |  |  | 0.90ns | 0.78-1.03 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Level of education (in one unit’s increase) |  | 1.08 ns | 0.64-1.82 |  |  | 1.21ns | 0.51-2.88 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Sexual activity throughout life***(in one unit’s increase)* |  | 1.54 ns | 0.96-2.47 |  |  | 0.70ns | 0.34-1.46 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Relationship happiness** (in one unit’s increase) |  | 1.50 \*\*\* | 1.19-1.90 |  |  | 1.24ns | 0.79-1.95 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Perceived intimacy** (in one unit’s increase) |  | 0.71 ns | 0.42-1.21 |  |  | 2.49\* | 1.09-5.72 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Partner has sexual difficulties** *(in one unit’s increase)* |  | 0.71 \* | 0.51-0.99 |  |  | 1.14ns | 0.77-1.68 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Partners share the same sexual likes and dislikes** *(in one unit’s increase)* |  | 2.47 \*\*\* | 1.68-3.62 |  |  | 0.89ns | 0.48-1.64 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Country** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Norway different from Denmark |  | 1.00 ns | 0.42-2.39 |  |  | 1.04ns | 0.24-4.55 |
| Norway different from Belgium |  | 0.30ns | 0.10-0.90 |  |  | 3.22ns | 0.92-11.30 |
| Norway different from Portugal |  | 0.41 \* | 0.09-1.91 |  |  | 0.23 ns | 0.01-6.88 |

*Note.* The first column shows column shows the multivariate logistic regression analysis (adjusted odds ratios (AOR) with 95% confidence intervals (CI) for having a parallel partner, weighted data). \*\*\* *p* < .001; \*\* *p* < .01; \* *p* < .05; ns = not statistically significant.