

[in press, *Personal Relationships*, June 2016]

**Dishonest Individuals Request More Frequent Mate Retention from Friends**

Michael N. Pham<sup>1</sup>, Nicole Barbaro<sup>2</sup>, Amy E. Noser<sup>3</sup>, Yael Sela<sup>1</sup>, Todd K. Shackelford<sup>1</sup>,  
Virgil Zeigler Hill<sup>1</sup>, Bettina Weege<sup>4</sup>, & Bernhard Fink<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Oakland University, United States

<sup>2</sup>University of Pittsburgh, United States

<sup>3</sup>University of Kansas, United States

<sup>4</sup>University of Göttingen, Germany

**CORRESPONDING AUTHOR:**

Michael N. Pham  
Oakland University  
Department of Psychology  
130 Pryale Hall  
Rochester, MI 48309  
(248) 370-2300  
(248) 370-4612 (fax)

## **Abstract**

Coalitional mate retention (CMR) occurs when individuals request assistance from a friend to minimize the risk of partner infidelity. We secured reports from men and women in a committed, heterosexual relationship to investigate associations between CMR requests and the sex and personality traits of individuals who request CMR, and the sex of their friends. Consistent with our Hypothesis, individuals scoring higher in Honesty-Humility requested CMR less frequently. We also documented that individuals higher in Extraversion and lower in Conscientiousness requested CMR more frequently. We address limitations of the research and future research directions, including tests of the hypothesis that CMR involves duplicitous behaviors that are less typical of individual mate retention.

*Keywords:* mate retention, coalitional mate retention, personality, sex differences, friendship

### **Dishonest Individuals Request More Frequent Mate Retention from Friends**

Mate retention behaviors are designed to minimize the risk of partner infidelity (Buss, 1988; Buss & Shackelford, 1997). The Mate Retention Inventory assesses performance of mate retention behaviors along 19 tactics, ranging from vigilance about a partner's whereabouts (e.g., "called my partner at unexpected times to see who my partner was with") to violence against rivals (e.g., "hit someone who made a pass at my partner"; Buss, 1988). Miner, Shackelford, and Starratt (2009) organized these 19 tactics into two domains: "benefit-provisioning" mate retention (i.e., positive behaviors designed to increase a partner's relationship satisfaction and thereby reduce the risk of infidelity) and "cost-inflicting" mate retention (i.e., negative behaviors that threaten costs on the partner for infidelity).

Men and women perform different mate retention tactics. Men (more than women) perform mate retention involving violence against rivals (e.g., "picked a fight with the guy who was interested in my partner"), whereas women (more than men) perform mate retention involving appearance enhancement (e.g., "dressed nicely to maintain my partner's interest"; Buss, 1988; Buss & Shackelford, 1997).

Personality traits correlate with the performance of mate retention tactics. For example, individuals higher in Neuroticism perform more frequent overall mate retention, in part because they are more sensitive to social threats (e.g., infidelity threats; de Miguel & Buss, 2011), and individuals higher in Agreeableness perform more frequent benefit-provisioning mate retention, in part because they are more cooperative (McKibbin, Miner, Shackelford, Ehrke, & Weekes-Shackelford, 2014; de Miguel & Buss, 2011). Individuals higher in Honesty-Humility are less likely to perform overall mate retention (Holden, Zeigler-Hill, Pham, & Shackelford, 2014).

Individuals do not always perform mate retention on their own or without assistance. Two items in the Mate Retention Inventory (MRI; Buss, 1988): "had my friends check up on my partner", and "got my friends to beat up someone who was interested in my partner", indicate that individuals sometimes perform coalitional mate retention (CMR)—mate retention with assistance from allies, such as friends. Friends are a ubiquitous feature of human life: Friends provide protection, companionship, guidance, resources, and assistance (Lewis et al., 2011)—including assistance with romantic relationships (Pham,

Barbaro, & Shackelford, 2015). Pham et al. (2015) developed the CMR Inventory—an inventory of 44 CMR behaviors, organized into seven tactics: *Manipulation* (i.e., an ally deceives the partner into admitting or demonstrating an interest in infidelity), *Praise* (i.e., an ally says positive things to the partner and to others, thereby increasing the romantic relationship’s desirability), *Vigilance* (i.e., an ally monitors the partner’s behavior), *Therapy* (i.e., an ally strengthens the romantic relationship by repairing relationship problems and listening to relationship concerns), *Gifts* (i.e., an ally secures information about desired gifts for the partner), *Monopolizing Time* (i.e., an ally spends time with the partner), and *Violence* (i.e., an ally inflicts violence against potential rivals).

Although CMR and individual mate retention are both strategies that individuals deploy in an attempt to minimize the risk of a partner’s infidelity, these mate retention strategies differ in several ways. For example, female friends (compared to male friends) are more likely to perform CMR involving violence (e.g., physically assaulting potential mate poachers; Pham, et al., 2015). In contrast, men are more likely than women to deploy individual mate retention involving violence—a robust finding that has been documented across many samples (Buss, 1988; Buss & Shackelford, 1997; Buss, Shackelford, & McKibbin, 2008).

Individuals also can avoid costs associated with individual mate retention by performing CMR. Individuals who perform excessive individual mate retention may appear overbearing, excessively jealous, and mistrustful to their partner (e.g., if an individual is constantly monitoring the partner). In contrast, individuals can surreptitiously monitor their partner while appearing trusting if they deploy CMR. For example, individuals can recruit an ally to accompany their partner to monitor them, while simultaneously appearing trusting to their partner because they are absent. CMR allows individuals to overcome time and geographic constraints of individual mate retention. For example, individuals in long-distance relationships, or who have restrictive work schedules, can recruit their ally to monitor their partner in their absence. Thus, individuals can receive benefits from deploying CMR that cannot be obtained from performing individual mate retention.

Sex (male, female) and personality traits predict individual mate retention performance (de Miguel & Buss, 2011; Holden et al., 2014; Jonason, Li, & Buss, 2010; McKibbin et al., 2014), but whether these correlates extend to CMR has not been investigated. Individual mate retention and CMR differ in several ways (Pham et al., 2015), and so the previously documented relationships between personality traits and individual mate retention may not extend to CMR. Furthermore, personality traits influence the extent to which individuals depend on their friends (i.e., the likelihood that they will request CMR; Selfhout et al., 2010).

However, there is compelling reason to expect that one particular personality trait—Honesty-Humility—will correlate positively with how frequently individuals request CMR. Individuals who perform more frequent individual mate retention, in general, and more frequent cost-inflicting mate retention, in particular, are lower in Honesty-Humility (Holden et al., 2014), and higher in antagonism, detachment, negative affect, narcissism, Machiavellianism, and psychopathy (Brewer & Abell, 2015; Jonason, Li, & Buss, 2010; Holden, Roof, McCabe, & Zeigler-Hill, 2015). That is, individuals possessing “negative” personality traits perform more frequent individual mate retention. CMR may be more manipulative and deceitful than individual mate retention because CMR behaviors include indirect methods (e.g., using one’s friends) to disguise attempts to minimize the risk of partner infidelity. Thus, we hypothesize that individuals higher in Honesty-Humility will request CMR less frequently.

McKibbin et al. (2014) found sex-differentiated relationships between personality traits and individual mate retention tactics. For reportorial completeness, and following McKibbin et al., we investigate whether CMR requester’s sex moderates the relationship between their personality traits and their CMR requests, separately for their male friends and for their female friends.

Because several individual mate retention tactics are deceitful (Brewer & Abell, 2015; de Miguel & Buss, 2011; Holden et al., 2014, 2015; Jonason et al., 2010), we assess personality traits using the HEXACO model of personality (see Ashton & Lee, 2009), which measures six personality traits: Honesty-Humility (e.g., sincerity, modesty), Openness (e.g., creativity, unconventionality), Conscientiousness (e.g., organization, diligence), Extraversion (e.g., sociability, social self-esteem),

Agreeableness (e.g., forgiveness, patience), and Emotionality (e.g., fearfulness, dependence). Unlike the five factor model of personality, the HEXACO includes an Honesty-Humility trait (Lee & Ashton, 2004), which is relevant to the current research because CMR involves indirect behaviors (i.e., using friends) that may be more “dishonest” than individual mate retention behaviors.

## **Method**

### **Participants**

We used data secured as part of a larger project (Pham et al., 2015). We recruited from Amazon’s Mechanical Turk (MTurk) 387 participants (176 women) in a committed, heterosexual relationship lasting at least one year. Participants were at least 18 years of age. The mean participant age was 32.1 years ( $SD = 9.1$ ), and the mean relationship length was 66.0 months ( $SD = 88.5$ ). Participants reported on interactions with two heterosexual friends (one man and one woman), each of whom they considered a good friend, and each of whom they have known for at least one year. The mean length of the friendship was 88.7 months ( $SD = 90.2$ ) with the male friend, and 76.6 months ( $SD = 89.6$ ) with the female friend. We implemented MTurk filters recommended by Peer, Vosgerau, and Acquisti (2013): MTurk workers who could access had successfully completed at least (1) 500 MTurk jobs, and (2) 95% of their jobs.

### **Materials**

Participants completed the HEXACO-60, which secures scores on six personality traits: Extraversion, Emotionality, Openness, Conscientiousness, Agreeableness, and Honesty-humility (Ashton & Lee, 2009). Participants were instructed to think of one heterosexual man and one heterosexual woman, each of whom they considered to be good friend, and each of whom they have known for at least one year. Participants completed the 44-item CMR inventory twice (i.e., once for each friend) in which they reported on a 4-point scale (0 = *never*, 1 = *rarely*, 2 = *sometimes*, 3 = *often*) how often they requested their friend to perform each behavior during the past year. The CMR inventory includes behaviors organized into seven tactics: *Manipulation* (i.e., an ally deceives the partner into admitting or demonstrating an interest in infidelity), *Praise* (i.e., an ally says positive things to the partner and to others, thereby increasing the romantic relationship’s desirability), *Vigilance* (i.e., an ally monitors the

partner's behavior), *Therapy* (i.e., an ally strengthens the romantic relationship by repairing relationship problems and listening to relationship concerns), *Gifts* (i.e., an ally secures information about desired gifts for the partner), *Monopolizing Time* (i.e., an ally spends time with the partner), and *Violence* (i.e., an ally inflicts violence against potential rivals; See Pham et al., 2015). Two attention check questions were incorporated into the CMRI: One question asked participants to respond “never” and the other question asked participants to respond “often.”

## **Procedures**

Potential participants viewed an advertisement for this study on MTurk's job listings. Those interested in participating were provided a link to a consent form. Those who electronically signed the consent form could access the survey, and those who did not sign were exited from the study. Participants who correctly answered the attention check questions were compensated \$4.00.

## **Results**

We excluded 60 participants from analyses because of missing responses or because they failed the attention check questions, leaving a final sample of 150 women and 177 men. We conducted zero-order correlations between personality traits and CMR tactic request frequencies separately for male participants (Tables 1) and female participants (Table 2). The *Gifts* tactic produced relatively low reliabilities ( $\alpha = .31, .53, .54, .78$ ), likely because this tactic—unlike the other CMR tactics—was comprised of only two items, and scales with fewer items typically produce lower Cronbach's alphas (Nunnally, Bernstein, & Berge, 1976; Sijtsma, 2009). Therefore, results for this tactic should be interpreted with caution. The remaining six CMR tactics and all personality traits achieved adequate reliability ( $\alpha = .76$  to  $.95$ ). Men higher in Emotionality and lower in Conscientiousness, Honesty-Humility, and Openness requested more frequent CMR. Women lower in Conscientiousness and Honesty-Humility, and higher in Extraversion, requested more frequent CMR.

To identify unique relationships between participant sex, personality traits, and CMR tactics, we conducted a hierarchical multiple regression separately for male friends (Table 3) and female friends (Table 4). On Step 1, we regressed each CMR tactic (main effects) onto participant sex (0 = *female*, 1 =

*male*) and personality traits (standardized) . On Step 2, we entered into the model six interaction terms (participant sex  $\times$  each personality trait). Seven significant interactions emerged, all involving Emotionality or Openness. We conducted the simple slopes analyses recommended by Aiken and West (1991) to describe the interaction of continuous variables. These simple slopes tests were conducted using values that were one standard deviation above the mean (within-sex) to represent individuals who were higher on Emotionality and Openness, and one standard deviation below the mean (within-sex) to represent individuals who were lower on Emotionality and Openness (see Figures 1 and 2).

Consistent with our Hypothesis, individuals higher in Honesty-Humility requested CMR less frequently from their male friend (e.g., Monopolization of Time, Vigilance, Praise, Manipulation, Violence) and female friend (Gifts, Therapy, Monopolization of Time, Vigilance, Praise). Men were more likely than women to request CMR involving gifts from their female friend. Individuals higher in Extraversion and lower in Conscientiousness requested more frequently all seven CMR tactics from their friends. There were no significant relationships between Agreeableness and CMR requests.

Participant sex moderated the relationships between Emotionality and CMR requests: Men (but not women) higher in Emotionality requested CMR more frequently from their male friend (e.g., Therapy, Vigilance, Praise). Participant sex also moderated the relationships between Openness and CMR requests: Men (but not women) higher in Openness requested CMR less frequently from their male friend (e.g., Gifts, Manipulation) and their female friend (Monopolization of Time).

## **Discussion**

Consistent with our Hypothesis, individuals scoring higher in Honesty-Humility requested CMR less frequently. Because CMR and individual mate retention are conceptually similar (Pham et al., 2015), we compare the results of the current research to research documenting relationships between personality traits and the performance of individual mate retention (de Miguel & Buss, 2007; Holden et al., 2014; Jonason et al., 2009; McKibbin et al., 2014).

Individuals higher in Honesty-Humility and lower in Extraversion reported less frequent requests for CMR. Holden et al. (2014) argued that individuals higher in Honesty-Humility perform less individual

mate retention because many mate retention tactics are punitive (e.g., Punishing a Partner's Infidelity Threat; Buss, 1988), and individuals higher in Honesty-Humility are less likely to inflict costs on their romantic partners (Edwin Sheppard & Boon, 2012). de Miguel and Buss (2011) argued that individuals higher in Extraversion have a higher sex drive and, therefore, would perform more sex-related mate retention tactics (e.g., Sexual Inducements). The results concerning Honesty-Humility and Extraversion suggest that CMR may be, for some individuals, manipulative and deceitful, because these behaviors include indirect methods (e.g., using their friends) to disguise their attempts to minimize partner infidelity.

Agreeableness did not correlate with CMR. Individuals higher in Agreeableness perform more benefit-provision individual mate retention (de Miguel & Buss, 2011), suggesting important differences between individual mate retention and CMR. Specifically, CMR may be more duplicitous and deceitful than individual mate retention—and this may be the case even for the more “positive” CMR tactics (e.g., Therapy).

Men (but not women) higher in Emotionality requested CMR more frequently (Praise, Therapy, and Vigilance). This sex difference may be attributable to the way in which Neuroticism influences one's attractiveness (and consequent infidelity risk). Individuals high in Neuroticism are socially undesirable and unattractive (Francis, 1993). Men high in Neuroticism are less likely to achieve high social status, and having low status is more detrimental to men's attractiveness than to women's attractiveness (Buss, 1989). Indeed, McKibbin et al. (2014) found that men lower in Emotional Stability—which is similar to Emotionality (Lee & Ashton, 2004)—performed more individual mate retention behaviors, and de Miguel and Buss (2011) found that individuals higher in Neuroticism—which is similar to Emotionality—performed more overall individual mate retention tactics. However, McKibbin et al. and de Miguel and Buss did not assess the relationship between women's Emotionality and their mate retention behaviors—an avenue for future research.

Men (but not women) lower in Openness more frequently requested CMR (Monopolization, Manipulation, Praise). de Miguel and Buss (2011) suggest that Openness is associated with

communicative openness and expressiveness within romantic relationships. Thus, CMR may be employed more frequently by individuals who are less willing to communicate directly with their partner.

It is currently unclear how the relationship between the participant's ally and the participant's partner would influence CMR. If the ally and the partner are not friends, then the ally's one-sided loyalty to the requester might promote frequent CMR. However, if the ally and the partner are friends, then there might be a vested interest in maintaining the romantic connection between the ally's two good friends. Future research could profitably investigate how the relationship between the ally and the partner influences CMR.

Another limitation of the current research is that we did not secure data regarding participants' history of experiencing infidelity. Individuals might be reluctant to request CMR if they had previous success with mate poaching a friend's partner, or if their partner betrayed them with a friend. Future research would benefit from investigating the frequency with which individuals request CMR, depending on whether they have previously been a perpetrator or victim of mate poaching by friends.

MTurk samples are demographically different than standard internet samples or college samples (Buhrmester, Kwang, & Gosling, 2011). Future research should replicate these findings using different recruitment methods to determine whether the results of the current research are generalizable to broader populations.

We conducted several analyses to explore the relationships between personality traits and CMR tactics, and concluded that CMR often involves manipulative and deceitful behaviors. However, given the number of analyses we conducted, some of the results may be attributable to Type I errors—a limitation that is expected of exploratory research. Future research can test our *post hoc* explanations by assessing whether individuals who more frequently request CMR also score higher on measures of “Dark Triad” personality traits (i.e., narcissism, Machiavellianism, psychopathy; Paulhus & Williams, 2002). Because narcissism is linked with higher Extraversion and lower Honesty-Humility (Lee & Ashton, 2005), we hypothesize that individuals higher in narcissism will more frequently request CMR.

In conclusion, research on CMR—particularly within the context of personality—adds important information to the literature on mate retention. Several studies have attempted to classify individual mate retention behaviors on a spectrum from positive tactics to negative tactics (de Miguel & Buss, 2011; Holden et al., 2014; Jonason et al., 2010; McKibbin et al., 2013; Miner et al., 2009), but none have evaluated the contribution of an individual’s personality to CMR. The results of the current research suggest that CMR often involves manipulative and deceitful behaviors that are less typical of individual mate retention.

## References

- Aiken, L. S., & West, S. G. (1991). *Multiple regression*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Anderson, C., John, O. P., Keltner, D., & Kring, A. M. (2001). Who attains social status? Effects of personality and physical attractiveness in social groups. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 81*, 116-132.
- Ashton, M. C., & Lee, K. (2009). The HEXACO–60: A short measure of the major dimensions of personality. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 91*, 340-345.
- Brewer, G., & Abell, L. (2015). Machiavellianism in long-term relationships: Competition, mate retention and sexual coercion. *Scandinavian Journal of Psychology, 56*, 357-362.
- Buhrmester, M., Kwang, T., & Gosling, S. D. (2011). Amazon's Mechanical Turk a new source of inexpensive, yet high-quality, data? *Perspectives on Psychological Science, 6*, 3-5.
- Buss, D. M. (1988). From vigilance to violence: Tactics of mate retention in American undergraduates. *Ethology and Sociobiology, 9*, 291-317.
- Buss, D. M. (1989). Sex differences in human mate preferences: Evolutionary hypotheses tested in 37 cultures. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences, 12*, 1-14.
- Buss, D. M. (1991). Conflict in married couples: Personality predictors of anger and upset. *Journal of Personality, 59*, 663-688.
- Buss, D. M., & Shackelford, T. K. (1997). From vigilance to violence: Mate retention tactics in married couples. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 72*, 346-361.
- Buss, D.M., Shackelford, T.K., & McKibbin, W. F. (2008). The Mate Retention Inventory-Short Form (MRI-SF). *Personality and Individual Differences, 44*, 322-334.
- de Miguel, A., & Buss, D. M. (2011). Mate retention tactics in Spain: Personality, sex differences, and relationship status. *Journal of Personality, 79*, 563-586.
- Edwin Sheppard, K., & Boon, S. D. (2012). Predicting appraisals of romantic revenge: The roles of Honesty–Humility, Agreeableness, and vengefulness. *Personality and Individual Differences, 52*, 128-132.

- Holden, C. J., Roof, C. H., McCabe, G., & Zeigler-Hill, V. (2015). Detached and antagonistic: Pathological personality features and mate retention behaviors. *Personality and Individual Differences, 83*, 77-84.
- Holden, C. J., Zeigler-Hill, V., Pham, M. N., & Shackelford, T.K. (2014). Personality features and mate retention strategies: Honesty-Humility and the willingness to manipulate, deceive, and exploit romantic partners. *Personality and Individual Differences, 57*, 31-36.
- Jonason, P. K., Li, N. P., & Buss, D. M. (2010). The costs and benefits of the Dark Triad: Implications for mate poaching and mate retention tactics. *Personality and Individual Differences, 48*, 373-378.
- Lee, K., & Ashton, M. C. (2004). Psychometric properties of the HEXACO Personality Inventory. *Multivariate Behavioral Research, 39*, 329-358.
- Lee, K., & Ashton, M. C. (2005). Psychopathy, Machiavellianism, and narcissism in the Five-Factor Model and the HEXACO model of personality structure. *Personality and Individual Differences, 38*, 1571-1582.
- Lewis, D. M. G., Conroy-Beam, D., Al-Shawaf, L., Raja, A., DeKay, T., & Buss, D. M. (2011). Friends with benefits: The evolved psychology of same- and opposite-sex friendships. *Evolutionary Psychology, 9*, 543-563.
- McKibbin, W. F., Miner, E. J., Shackelford, T. K., Ehrke, A. D., & Weekes-Shackelford, V. A. (2014). Men's mate retention varies with men's personality and their partner's personality. *Personality and Individual Differences, 56*, 62-67.
- Miner, E. J., Shackelford, T. K., & Starratt, V. G. (2009). Mate value of romantic partners predicts men's partner-directed verbal insults. *Personality and Individual Differences, 46*, 135-139.
- Nowak, N., & Danel, D. (2014). Mate value asymmetry and relationship satisfaction in female opinion. *Journal of sex & marital therapy, 40*, 425-433.
- Nunnally, J. C., Bernstein, I. H., & Berge, J. M. T. (1967). *Psychometric theory* (Vol. 226). New York: McGraw-Hill.

- Paulhus, D. L., & Williams, K. M. (2002). The dark triad of personality: Narcissism, Machiavellianism, and psychopathy. *Journal of Research in Personality, 36*, 556-563.
- Peer, E., Vosgerau, J., & Acquisti, A. (2013). Reputation as a sufficient condition for data quality on Amazon Mechanical Turk. *Behavior Research Methods*. Advance online publication.
- Pham, M. N., Barbaro, N. M., & Shackelford, T.K. (2015). Development and initial validation of the Coalitional Mate Retention Inventory. *Evolutionary Psychological Science, 1*, 4-12.
- Selfhout, M., Burk, W., Branje, S., Denissen, J., Van Aken, M., & Meeus, W. (2010). Emerging late adolescent friendship networks and Big Five personality traits: A social network approach. *Journal of personality, 78*, 509-538.
- Sijtsma, K. (2009). On the use, the misuse, and the very limited usefulness of Cronbach's alpha. *Psychometrika, 74*, 107-120.

Table 1. Zero-order correlations between men's personality traits and the frequency with which they request CMR from their male friend and from their female friend.

		Honesty-Humility	Emotionality	Extraversion	Agreeableness	Conscientiousness	Openness
	$\alpha$	0.76	0.77	0.82	0.81	0.80	0.80
<u>Male friend</u>							
Gifts	0.53	-0.04	.18*	0.06	-0.01	-.21**	-.19*
Therapy	0.90	-0.12	.23**	0.02	-0.05	-.31**	-.18*
Monopolize time	0.89	-0.13	0.14	0.13	-0.03	-.23**	-0.09
Vigilance	0.88	-0.14	.22**	0.02	-0.06	-.31**	-.22**
Praise	0.84	-.20**	.28**	0.06	-0.04	-.33**	-.17*
Manipulation	0.95	-.16*	.19*	-0.03	-0.07	-.37**	-.29**
Violence	0.84	-.19*	.19*	-0.05	-0.10	-.39**	-.27**
<u>Female friend</u>							
Gifts	0.31	-.31**	0.09	0.03	-0.04	-.20**	-0.13
Therapy	0.87	-.19**	.21**	0.01	-0.07	-.33**	-.23**
Monopolize time	0.91	-.15*	0.11	.16*	-0.02	-.20**	-.19*
Vigilance	0.84	-.19*	.20**	0.02	-0.05	-.32**	-.20**
Praise	0.82	-.21**	.17*	0.06	-0.07	-.28**	-.17*
Manipulation	0.93	-.16*	.21**	-0.03	-0.05	-.42**	-.27**
Violence	0.84	-.15*	.17*	0.03	-0.06	-.38**	-.26**

$n = 177$ . \* $p < .05$ , \*\* $p < .01$

**Table 2.** Zero-order correlations between women’s personality traits and the frequency with which they request CMR from their male friend and from their female friend.

		Honesty-Humility	Emotionality	Extraversion	Agreeableness	Conscientiousness	Openness
	$\alpha$	0.81	0.77	0.85	0.83	0.80	0.83
<u>Male friend</u>							
Gifts	0.78	-0.13	-0.01	.18*	0.08	-0.04	0.11
Therapy	0.90	-.19*	-0.12	0.14	0.08	-.28**	-0.03
Monopolize time	0.91	-.17*	0.01	.19*	0.11	-.17*	-0.04
Vigilance	0.84	-.25**	-0.13	0.09	0.06	-.34**	-0.06
Praise	0.88	-.17*	-0.11	.24**	0.15	-.17*	-0.01
Manipulation	0.92	-.23**	-0.14	0.10	0.00	-.35**	-0.02
Violence	0.89	-.18*	-0.11	0.15	0.05	-.27**	-0.06
<u>Female friend</u>							
Gifts	0.54	-0.15	-0.10	0.15	0.06	-.24**	0.06
Therapy	0.87	-0.15	-0.09	.18*	0.11	-.25**	-0.01
Monopolize time	0.91	-0.14	-0.09	.17*	0.11	-.28**	0.02
Vigilance	0.83	-.21*	-0.02	0.12	0.08	-.25**	0.01
Praise	0.81	-0.13	-0.08	.23**	0.12	-.21*	0.05
Manipulation	0.92	-.19*	-0.16	0.11	0.03	-.34**	-0.05
Violence	0.77	-.16*	-0.13	.17*	0.11	-.27**	-0.08

$n = 150$ . \* $p < .05$ , \*\* $p < .01$

**Table 3.** Hierarchical multiple regressions of personality traits and participant sex predicting CMR tactics requested from male friends. Each column represents a model predicting one of the seven CMR tactics.

	Gifts		Therapy		Monopolize		Vigilance		Praise		Manipulation		Violence	
Step 1 (R <sup>2</sup> )	0.06		0.13		0.12		0.15		0.15		0.17		0.17	
Step 2 (R <sup>2</sup> )	0.09		0.16		0.13		0.19		0.19		0.2		0.19	
	<i>b</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>b</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>b</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>b</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>b</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>b</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>b</i>	<i>t</i>
Participant Sex <sup>1</sup>	0.05	0.58	-0.01	-0.14	0.03	0.44	0.05	0.80	0.03	0.32	0.04	0.79	0.05	0.86
Honesty-Humility <sup>1</sup>	-0.05	-1.20	-0.06	-1.88	-0.08	-2.27*	-0.07	-2.33*	-0.11	-2.90**	-0.05	-2.07*	-0.06	-2.08*
× Participant Sex <sup>2</sup>	0.13	1.54	0.10	1.51	0.08	1.11	0.09	1.59	0.08	1.01	0.05	0.91	0.04	0.65
Emotionality <sup>1</sup>	0.08	1.63	0.03	0.93	0.06	1.47	0.03	0.76	0.07	1.62	0.01	0.36	0.01	0.42
× Participant Sex <sup>2</sup>	0.14	1.42	0.19	2.53*	0.07	0.79	0.17	2.51*	0.26	3.03**	0.10	1.73	0.09	1.36
Extraversion <sup>1</sup>	0.14	3.09**	0.11	3.26**	0.16	4.28***	0.10	3.06**	0.17	4.26***	0.08	2.87**	0.09	3.12**
× Participant Sex <sup>2</sup>	0.02	0.18	0.01	0.19	0.04	0.52	0.05	0.87	0.00	0.04	0.02	0.29	-0.02	-0.35
Agreeableness <sup>1</sup>	0.01	0.19	0.00	0.09	0.01	0.29	0.00	-0.05	0.03	0.86	-0.02	-0.57	-0.01	-0.50
× Participant Sex <sup>2</sup>	-0.09	-0.98	-0.09	-1.36	-0.13	-1.66	-0.09	-1.44	-0.14	-1.82	-0.04	-0.68	-0.07	-1.12
Conscientiousness <sup>1</sup>	-0.10	-2.32*	-0.17	-5.20***	-0.14	-3.75***	-0.17	-5.55***	-0.18	-4.58***	-0.16	-6.13***	-0.17	-5.88***
× Participant Sex <sup>2</sup>	-0.04	-0.50	0.03	0.43	0.01	0.13	0.04	0.63	-0.01	-0.17	-0.01	-0.18	-0.03	-0.48
Openness <sup>1</sup>	-0.03	-0.66	-0.04	-1.11	-0.04	-1.01	-0.05	-1.58	-0.04	-1.10	-0.05	-1.97	-0.06	-2.06
× Participant Sex <sup>2</sup>	-0.12	-2.01	-0.06	-1.36	-0.04	-0.72	-0.09	-2.12	-0.07	-1.18	-0.11	-2.93**	-0.09	-2.21

Note:  $n = 327$ . <sup>1</sup>Step 1 = main effects of participant sex and personality traits. <sup>2</sup>Step 2 = interaction effects of participant sex × personality traits.  $b =$

unstandardized beta,  $t = t$ -test associated with the beta coefficient. \* $p < .05$ , \*\* $p < .01$ , \*\*\* $p < .001$ .

**Table 4.** Hierarchical multiple regressions of personality traits and participant sex predicting CMR tactics requested from female friends. Each column represents a model predicting one of the seven CMR tactics.

	Gifts		Therapy		Monopolize		Vigilance		Praise		Manipulation		Violence	
Step 1 (R <sup>2</sup> )	0.18		0.14		0.17		0.14		0.13		0.19		0.18	
Step 2 (R <sup>2</sup> )	0.20		0.17		0.20		0.16		0.15		0.22		0.20	
	<i>b</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>b</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>b</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>b</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>b</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>b</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>b</i>	<i>t</i>
Participant Sex <sup>1</sup>	0.30	4.09***	0.00	0.07	0.25	3.13**	0.13	1.80	0.02	0.30	0.04	0.72	0.03	0.37
Honesty-Humility <sup>1</sup>	-0.13	-3.90***	-0.07	-2.27*	-0.07	-2.05*	-0.09	-2.67**	-0.08	-2.42*	-0.05	-1.81	-0.06	-1.84
× Participant Sex <sup>2</sup>	-0.12	-1.82	0.03	0.48	0.01	0.11	0.04	0.68	0.00	-0.03	0.05	1.03	0.07	0.99
Emotionality <sup>1</sup>	0.00	-0.07	0.03	0.95	0.02	0.45	0.06	1.58	0.03	0.89	0.01	0.31	0.01	0.21
× Participant Sex <sup>2</sup>	0.08	1.02	0.13	1.87	0.12	1.45	0.10	1.36	0.12	1.52	0.12	1.99*	0.13	1.69
Extraversion <sup>1</sup>	0.09	2.46*	0.12	3.49**	0.17	4.45***	0.10	2.98**	0.15	4.10***	0.08	3.04**	0.14	3.96***
× Participant Sex <sup>2</sup>	-0.01	-0.09	0.00	-0.08	0.13	1.66	0.05	0.65	0.00	-0.02	0.01	0.17	0.03	0.44
Agreeableness <sup>1</sup>	0.02	0.49	0.00	0.15	0.00	0.07	0.01	0.32	0.00	-0.01	-0.01	-0.27	0.00	0.05
× Participant Sex <sup>2</sup>	-0.02	-0.28	-0.09	-1.45	-0.11	-1.43	-0.08	-1.24	-0.11	-1.55	-0.04	-0.83	-0.11	-1.60
Conscientiousness <sup>1</sup>	-0.12	-3.58***	-0.16	-5.15***	-0.16	-4.32***	-0.16	-4.85***	-0.16	-4.67***	-0.18	-6.93***	-0.21	-5.98***
× Participant Sex <sup>2</sup>	0.06	0.87	0.02	0.31	0.07	0.99	-0.01	-0.08	0.02	0.24	-0.03	-0.55	-0.04	-0.59
Openness <sup>1</sup>	-0.01	-0.21	-0.05	-1.49	-0.06	-1.57	-0.03	-1.00	-0.02	-0.69	-0.05	-1.86	-0.09	-2.52
× Participant Sex <sup>2</sup>	-0.06	-1.20	-0.09	-2.00	-0.14	-2.77**	-0.09	-1.79	-0.07	-1.45	-0.09	-2.29	-0.12	-2.52

Note:  $n = 327$ . <sup>1</sup>Step 1 = main effects of participant sex and personality traits. <sup>2</sup>Step 2 = interaction effects of participant sex × personality traits.  $b =$

unstandardized beta,  $t = t$ -test associated with the beta coefficient. \* $p < .05$ , \*\* $p < .01$ , \*\*\* $p < .001$