[article in press, *European Journal of Psychological Assessment*, March 2017]

Confirmatory Factor Analysis of the Coalitional Mate Retention Inventory (CMRI) and Evidence for Two Superordinate Domains

Nicole Barbaro, Yael Sela, Guilherme S. Lopes, & Todd K. Shackelford

Oakland University

Department of Psychology

Correspondence: Nicole Barbaro, 654 Pioneer Drive, Oakland University, Rochester, MI 48309. Email: nmbarbar@oakland.edu

Acknowledgements: We thank Dr. Matthew J. W. McLarnon for helpful assistance with statistical analyses.

Abstract

The Coalitional Mate Retention Inventory (CMRI; Pham et al., 2015) assesses the frequency with which individuals solicit allies to assist with mate retention efforts. The current study subjected the CMRI to confirmatory factor analyses. A model comparison approach was employed using data from a large community sample of participants currently in a heterosexual romantic relationship (*n*=1,003, 54% male). The seven-factor structure of the CMRI demonstrates good model fit, and provides significantly better fit than an alternative single-factor structure. The results also demonstrate that the seven tactics of the CMRI are subsumed by two superordinate domains of Benefit-Provisioning and Cost-Inflicting coalitional mate retention. Correlational analyses with the superordinate domains of coalitional mate retention are presented, and highlight their predictive utility. We recommend the continued use of the CMRI in psychological research.

Keywords: Mate Retention; Coalitional Mate Retention; Confirmatory Factor Analysis; Evolutionary Psychology.

Confirmatory Factor Analysis of the Coalitional Mate Retention Inventory (CMRI) and Evidence for Two Superordinate Domains

Men and women may perform various *mate retention* behaviors designed to reduce the risk of partner infidelity and relationship dissolution (Barbaro, Pham, & Shackelford, 2015; Buss, 1988; Buss & Shackelford, 1997). Research on mate retention behaviors has historically focused on *individual mate retention*—behaviors that individuals perform alone (Buss, 1988). Allies, such as friends, also can assist with mate retention efforts (Canary & Stafford, 1992; Pham, Barbaro, & Shackelford, 2015). Recruiting an ally to perform mate retention (e.g., an individual asking their friend to keep an eye on their romantic partner at a social gathering) is referred to as *coalitional mate retention* (Pham et al., 2015). Across two studies, Pham and colleagues (2015) developed and validated the Coalitional Mate Retention Inventory (CMRI) to assess the frequency with which individuals solicit allies to assist with mate retention. Pham et al. (2015, Study 1) used an act nomination procedure (Buss & Craik, 1983) to generate a list of coalitional mate retention behaviors that individuals request that their friends perform. In an independent sample (Pham et al., 2015, Study 2) of participants (n = 387) indicated how frequently they requested that their friend perform each of the coalitional mate retention behaviors identified in the first study. Data-driven (i.e., principle component analyses) and theory-driven (e.g., comparisons with the Mate Retention Inventory (MRI); Buss, 1988) techniques were then used to construct the CMRI (Pham et al., 2015).

The CMRI includes 44 coalitional mate retention behaviors across seven factors—or "tactics" (Table 1, ESM; Pham et al., 2015). *Manipulation* includes behaviors in which an ally deceives the partner into demonstrating a propensity to commit infidelity. *Vigilance* includes behaviors in which an ally monitors the partner's behavior. *Monopolizing Time* includes behaviors in which an ally spends time with the partner. *Violence* tactic behaviors in which violence is directed against potential mate poachers. *Praise* includes behaviors in which an ally says positive things about the individual to the partner. *Therapy* includes behaviors in which an ally strengthens the romantic partnership by listening to relationship concerns, and advising on relationship problems. *Gifts* includes behaviors in which an ally solicits information regarding gifts desired by the partner.

The current study subjects the seven-factor structure of the CMRI to confirmatory factor analyses to validate the seven-factor structure of the CMRI obtained from Pham et al. (2015). The tactic structure of the CMRI (Pham et al. 2015) is similar to the tactic structure of the MRI (Buss, 1988; Buss et al. 2008)—a well-validated instrument that assesses performance frequencies of individual mate retention behaviors (Buss & Shackelford, 1997; Shackelford, Goetz, & Buss 2005). Tactics of individual mate retention can be organized into two superordinate domains of *Benefit-Provisioning* mate retention, characterized by behaviors that reduce the likelihood of partner infidelity by increasing relationship satisfaction (e.g., displaying love and affection toward the partner), and *Cost-Inflicting* mate retention, characterized by behaviors that reduce the likelihood of partner infidelity by inflicting costs on a partner (e.g., by lowering a partner's self-esteem; Miner, Shackelford, & Starratt, 2009). The two superordinate domains of individual mate retention have been replicated in several cultures[1] (Atari, Barbaro, Shackelford, & Chegeni, 2017; Lopes, Shackelford, Santos, Farias, & Segundo, 2016; Miner et al., 2009), and demonstrate unique predictive utility in several research areas (e.g., personality: McKibbin, Miner, Shackelford, Ehrke, & Weekes-Shackelford, 2014; sexual behavior: Sela, Shackelford, Pham, & Euler, 2015; relationship satisfaction: Salkicevic, Stanic, & Grabovac, 2014).

Both coalitional mate retention and individual mate retention strategies are designed to minimize the risk of a romantic partner's infidelity or relationship dissolution (Pham et al. 2015). Individuals who request more frequent coalitional mate retention also perform more frequent individual mate retention behaviors (Barbaro et al. 2015; Pham et al. 2015). Given the similarities between individual mate retention and coalitional mate retention, we suspect taxonomical similarities in the measurement of these two strategies. We therefore expect that the seven tactics of coalitional mate retention may be subsumed by two superordinate domains, similar to the superordinate domains of individual mate retention (Buss,

[1] The mate retention tactics that comprise superordinate mate retention domains slightly differ in Brazil (Lopes et al., 2016) and Iran (Atari et al., 2016), as compared to the United States (Miner et al., 2009). The tactics of Emotional Manipulation and Commitment Manipulation (four items) load highest on the Benefit-Provisioning domain in Iran and Brazil, rather than on the Cost-Inflicting domain as in United States samples. The tactic of Derogation of Competitors (two items) loads highest on the Benefit-Provisioning domain in Brazil, rather than on the Cost-Inflicting domain as in the United States and Iran.

1988; Buss, Shackelford, & McKibbin, 2008). We hypothesize that the CMRI tactics of Manipulation, Vigilance, Monopolizing Time, and Violence will be subsumed by the superordinate domain of Cost-Inflicting coalitional mate retention. CMRI items within each of these tactics are characterized by particularly deceitful behaviors (e.g., a friend "tricking" the partner into committing infidelity to assess the partner's loyalty). We hypothesize that the CMRI tactics of Praise, Therapy, and Gifts will be subsumed by the superordinate domain of Benefit-Provisioning coalitional mate retention. CMRI items within each of these tactics are characterized by behaviors that attempt to positively impact one's partner (e.g., soliciting a friend for relationship advice, or asking a friend to reassure the partner of the individual's romantic feelings) (see Table 1, ESM).

On the condition that statistical evidence is secured for superordinate domains of coalitional mate retention (via higher-order confirmatory factor analyses), the current study will explore the validity of the CMRI superordinate domains of Benefit-Provisioning and Cost-Inflicting coalitional mate retention by computing bivariate correlations between the CMRI domains and other target variables. Based on previous research with the MRI, it is expected that the coalitional mate retention domains will be negatively associated with age (i.e., self and partner) and relationship length (e.g., Atari, Barbaro, Sela, Shackelford, & Chegeni, 2017; Kaighobadi, Shackelford, & Buss, 2010).

Exploratory correlational analyses between coalitional mate retention domains with relationship satisfaction and relationship commitment will also be computed. Individuals who are more dishonest more frequently request coalitional mate retention (Pham et al., 2017), and also report lower relationship commitment (Farrell et al., 2015). Request frequencies for *both* Benefit-Provisioning and Cost-Inflicting coalitional mate retention, therefore, may be negatively associated with an individual's relationship satisfaction and relationship commitment. The association between dishonesty and request frequencies of coalitional mate retention, however, are particularly robust for the tactics of Manipulation and Violence (Pham et al. 2017). Request frequencies of Cost-Inflicting coalitional mate retention, in particular, may be more strongly (negatively) associated with an individual's relationship satisfaction and relationship commitment, than are request frequencies of Benefit-Provisioning coalitional mate retention. Differences in the magnitudes of the associations with the superordinate domains of coalitional mate retention will therefore also be explored in the current study.

A model comparison approach is used to confirm the factor structure of the CMRI, and to secure evidence for two superordinate domains of coalitional mate retention. Three models are tested and compared. Model A, one-factor lower-order model, is the most numerically parsimonious of the models, such that the covariation among the 44-items of the CMRI are explained by a single latent factor. Model B (Figure 1) depicts a seven-factor lower-order model that is tested to confirm the tactic structure of the CMRI (Pham et al., 2015). Model C (Figure 2) depicts a two-factor higher-order model that is tested to investigate the structure of the hypothesized superordinate domains of Benefit-Provisioning and Cost-Inflicting coalitional mate retention. Tests of configural, metric, and scalar invariance are conducted to evaluate structural similarities and differences of the best fitting model between the four groups present in the sample (men rating men, men rating women, women rating men, and women rating women.) Bivariate correlational analyses with the coalitional mate retention domains are conducted to assess the validity of the two higher-order factors of Model C. Data from a large community sample are used to address the aims of the current research.

Method

Participants

Participants[2] (*n* = 1,003; 54% male) were recruited via Amazon's Mechanical Turk (MTurk). Participants were eligible to participate if they were currently in a committed, heterosexual relationship, at least 18 years of age, and resided in the United States. Participants ranged from 19 to 74 years of age (*M* = 30.66, *SD* = 8.45). Participant's romantic partners ranged from 18 to 74 years of age (*M* = 30.44, *SD* = 8.44). The mean relationship length was 47.65 months (*SD* = 68.21). MTurk filters (Peer, Vosgerau, & Acquisti 2013) were implemented such that prospective participants could access and participate in the

[2] Data used in the current study were part of a larger project to test different hypotheses as reported in Barbaro, Shackelford, and Weekes-Shackelford (2016).

study if they had (1) successfully completed at least 95% of all their accessed MTurk jobs and (2) successfully completed at least 500 accessed MTurk jobs.

Procedure

Prospective participants viewed an advertisement for the study on MTurk's job listings. Interested and eligible participants were provided with a link to an information sheet. Those who agreed to participate could access and complete the survey, and those who did not agree to participate were exited from the study. Participants reported demographic information and completed two measures of mate retention behaviors, and a measure of relationship satisfaction and relationship commitment. Participants received $0.50 compensation.

Measures

Participants completed a measure of relationship satisfaction and relationship commitment (Gagné & Lydon, 2003; Lydon, Menzies-Toman, Burton, & Bell 2008) by reporting the extent to which each statement described their relationship on a 7-point scale (1 = *not at all*, 7 = *completely*). Composite scores were constructed for *relationship satisfaction* (3 items; α = .86; e.g., "To what extent do you feel that you really enjoy your relationship right now?") and *relationship commitment* (6 items; α = .91; e.g., "To what extent to you feel devoted to your relationship right now?").

Participants completed the Mate Retention Inventory-Short Form (MRI-SF; Buss et al. 2008) to assess performance frequency of individual mate retention behaviors. Participants reported how often they performed each mate retention behavior on a 4-point scale (0 = *never*, 1 = *rarely*, 2 = *sometimes*, 3 = *often*). Following Miner et al. (2009), we constructed composite (i.e., mean averages) scores for Benefit-Provisioning individual mate retention behaviors (16 items; α = .79), and for Cost-Inflicting individual mate retention behaviors (22 items; α = .96).

Participants completed the 44-item Coalitional Mate Retention Inventory[3] (CMRI; Pham et al. 2015) twice—once for a male friend and once for a female friend. Participants were instructed to identify

[3] The CMRI can also be used to assess an ally's "performance" of coalitional mate retention—the frequency with which individuals estimate that their ally performs coalitional mate retention behaviors, but that the individual did

one man and one woman, each of whom they considered a good friend, and report on a 4-point scale (0 = *never*, 1 = *rarely*, 2 = *sometimes*, 3 = *often*) how often they asked their friend to perform each mate retention behavior. Composite scores (i.e., mean averages) were calculated for overall request frequency of coalitional mate retention behaviors from participant's male friend (44 items; α = .98) and female friend (44 items; α = .98).

Results

Preliminary Analyses

All correlation and reliability analyses were performed with SPSS 19.0. All confirmatory factor analyses (CFAs) were performed with AMOS 19.0. Maximum Likelihood estimation was used for all CFAs reported throughout. Univariate normality of the 44 CMRI items was investigated in terms of skewness (.44 to 1.08, $|M|$ = .81) and kurtosis (-1.12 to -.20, $|M|$ = -.66), and these values were within the ranges recommended for CFA with maximum likelihood (skew < 2 and kurtosis < 7; West, Finch, & Curran, 1995). Marker-variable method was used for primary CFA analyses. Because participants completed the CMRI twice, however (i.e., once for a male friend and once for a female friend), two sets of the three models were tested and compared (i.e., one set of three models for participants' male friend, and one set of three models for participants' female friend).

Model fit for each model was assessed with multiple fit indices (Jackson, Gillaspy, & Purc-Stephenson, 2009). Chi-square goodness of fit was evaluated (non-significant *p*-value at the .05 level indicating acceptable model fit; Barrettt, 2007). Because the chi-square statistic is sensitive to sample size ($n > 400$, as in the current study) often yielding significant chi-square values (Bentler & Bonnet, 1980) despite adequate model fit, model fit in the current study also included the relative/normed chi-square (χ^2/df *between 2-3*; Kline, 2005; Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007; Wheaton, Muthen, Alwin, & Summers,

---

not explicitly request from the ally (see Pham et al., 2015). CFA of the performance version of the CMRI are not reported here (1) to reduce the number of analyses, (2) because the performance version of the CMRI is not as often used in research on coalitional mate retention (but see Pham, Barbaro, Mogilski, and Shackelford, 2015 for an example of its use), and (3) because the request, rather than the performance, version of the CMRI affords greater insight into the psychological mechanisms governing the use mate retention strategies.

1977). Root-mean-square error of approximation (RMSEA) of less than .06 (Hu & Bentler, 1999), and a 90% confidence interval with a lower limit close to 0 and an upper limit of less than .08 (MacCallum et al., 1996) indicates good model fit. Tucker-Lewis index (TLI) and Comparative Fit index (CFI) with values of .95 or greater indicates good model fit (Hu & Bentler, 1999). Model comparisons—Model B to Model A, and Model C to Model B—were evaluated by chi-square difference tests (significant *p*-values at the .05 level indicate substantial differences in model fit).

Confirmatory Factor Analyses

A summary of fit statistics for all models is reported in Table 2. CFA results discussed in the text refer to the CMRI for both male and female friend versions, unless otherwise stated. For Model A, the χ^2 value was significant at $p < .001$. The χ^2/df ratio fell outside the pre-specified cutoff range for Model A (for participant's female friend), indicating poor fit of the single-factor lower-order model. Values for the TLI and CFI failed to reach the .95 cutoff.

Model B (Figure 1) showed significant improvement in fit compared to Model A. Significant χ^2 difference tests (*p*s < .001) indicated that the seven-factor model was a better fit than the alternative single-factor model. The χ^2 remained significant at $p < .001$. Model B demonstrated acceptable χ^2/df ratio statistics, with a ratio of less than 3 for the male friend CMRI, and a ratio just above 3 for the female friend CMRI. Inspection of fit indices for Model B indicated good fit in terms of RMSEA, CFI, and TLI (for the male friend CMRI), with the TLI for the female friend CMRI (.94) just below the cutoff value of .95. Path estimates of Model B (see Tables 3 and 4, ESM) were strong (βs > .63, *p*s < .001), and explained 44-67% of the variance in the indicator variables (see Table 5, ESM). Model B demonstrated substantial covariance estimates among the seven factors (see Table 6, ESM).

Model C (Figure 2) showed significant reduction in fit compared to Model B. χ^2 difference tests (*p*s < .001) indicated that the seven-factor model is a better fit than the two-factor higher-order model. The χ^2 remained significant at $p < .001$. Independent analysis of fit indices for Model C, however, would be deemed acceptable (e.g., Hu & Bentler, 1999; Wheaton et al., 1977). Model C demonstrated acceptable χ^2/df ratio statistics, with a ratio of less than 3 for the male friend CMRI, and a ratio just above 3 for the female friend CMRI. Inspection of fit indices for Model C indicated good fit in terms of RMSEA, CFI, and TLI (for male friend CMRI), whereas the CFI and TLI for the female friend CMRI (.94) were just below the cutoff value of .95. Path estimates for Model C (see Tables 3 and 4, ESM) were strong (βs > .92, *p*s < .001). Model C reproduced path estimates from the lower-order factors to the indicator variables (βs > .63, *p*s < .001), and explained 43-67% of the variance in the indicator variables (see Table 5, ESM)—indicating the ability of the two higher-order factors to reproduce the estimates between the lower-order factors and the observed variables demonstrated in Model B. The two-factor higher-order model (Model C), therefore, demonstrated overall acceptable model fit.

Invariance Tests

Invariance tests across groups were performed on the best-fitting model (Model B). Three levels of invariance were tested using multi-group CFA: Configural invariance, metric, and scalar invariance (Milsap, 2012). The seven-factor model demonstrates adequate configural and metric invariance based on acceptable χ^2/df ratio statistics (less than 3), and a non-significant χ^2 difference test between configural and metric models (p = .29). Although model fit for the scalar model was significantly worse than the metric model, the CFI change was less than .01, suggesting adequate scalar invariance across groups. Overall, Model B demonstrates acceptable invariance across groups (see Table 7).

Correlational Analyses

Because the two-factor higher-order model (Model C) demonstrated acceptable fit to the data, we examined of the associations between request frequencies on the superordinate domains of coalitional mate retention—Benefit-Provisioning and Cost-Inflicting—and demographic variables (i.e., age, partner age, relationship length), relationship commitment, relationship satisfaction, and performance frequencies on the domains of Benefit-Provisioning and Cost-Inflicting *individual* mate retention. Results are displayed in Table 8 (all *p*s < .001).

Request frequencies for both Benefit-Provisioning and Cost-Inflicting coalitional mate retention (male friend and female friend) showed negative correlations with participant age, partner age, and relationship length. Request frequencies for both Benefit-Provisioning and Cost-Inflicting coalitional mate retention were negatively associated with relationship commitment and relationship satisfaction. Request frequencies for Cost-Inflicting coalitional mate retention, however, were more strongly (negatively) associated with both relationship commitment (male friend: $z = -5.01$, $p < .001$; female friend: $z = -4.97$, $p < .001$) and relationship satisfaction (male friend: $z = -4.05$, $p < .001$; female friend: $z = -5.66$, $p < .001$), than were request frequencies for Benefit-Previsioning coalitional mate retention (Fisher's *r*-to-*z* for dependent samples; Steiger, 1980). Finally, request frequencies for both Benefit-Provisioning and Cost-Inflicting coalitional mate retention were positively associated with performance frequencies for both Benefit-Provisioning and Cost-Inflicting individual mate retention. Performance frequencies for Cost-Inflicting *individual* mate retention, however, were more strongly associated with request frequencies for both Benefit-Provisioning (male friend: $z = 13.68$, $p < .001$; female friend: $z = 11.79$, $p < .001$) and Cost-Inflicting (male friend: $z = 18.30$, $p < .001$; female friend: $z = 17.12$, $p < .001$) *coalitional* mate retention, than with performance frequencies for Benefit-Previsioning individual mate retention (using Fisher's *r*-to-*z* for dependent samples; Steiger, 1980).

Discussion

The current study aimed to confirm the factor structure of the Coalitional Mate Retention Inventory (CMRI; Pham et al. 2015). Results of confirmatory factor analyses (CFAs) demonstrate good fit of the seven-factor CMRI (Figure 1), and better fit than an alternative single-factor model. The current study also showed acceptable model fit for a two-factor higher-order model of the CMRI. Although the seven-factor lower-order model showed slightly better fit to the data, differences in global fit indices were minimal. Importantly, the two superordinate domains successfully reproduce the path estimates of the seven lower-order factors on their indicator variables.

Correlational analyses further attest to the psychometric soundness and utility of the superordinate domains of coalitional mate retention. Request frequencies of Benefit-Provisioning and Cost-Inflicting coalitional mate retention are positively associated with the analogous superordinate domains of individual mate retention—further evidence that mate retention strategies are employed concurrently (Barbaro et al. 2015). Coalitional mate retention domains were negatively associated with participant age, partner's age, and relationship length—paralleling results documented with the MRI (e.g., Atari et al. 2017).

The correlational analyses also suggest that the domains of coalitional mate retention and of individual mate retention are differently associated with relationship outcomes. Benefit-Provisioning individual mate retention is positively associated, and Cost-Inflicting individual mate retention is negatively associated, with relationship satisfaction and relationship commitment (see also, Salkicevic et al., 2014). Conversely, both Benefit-Provisioning and Cost-Inflicting coalitional mate retention are negatively associated with relationship satisfaction and relationship commitment. These associations are weaker for Benefit-Provisioning coalitional mate retention, relative to the associations with Cost-Inflicting coalitional mate retention—indicating a degree of differential predictive utility of the domains.

Pham et al. (2017) suggested that coalitional mate retention may be more duplicitous than individual mate retention, which may even be the case for "positive" coalitional mate retention behaviors (e.g., tactics of Therapy, Praise, and Gifts). In accord with this suggestion, the associations between domains of coalitional mate retention are more strongly associated with Cost-Inflicting, relative to Benefit-Provisioning, *individual* mate retention. Benefit-Provisioning *coalitional* mate retention behavior may have unintended consequences, however. Benefit-Provisioning behavior may be perceived by a partner as deceitful or untrustworthy because of the indirect method (via a friend) and the disclosure to the friend required for solicitation of coalitional mate retention. Future research could examine coalitional mate the effectiveness of coalitional behaviors, or how these behaviors are perceived within romantic relationships.

We suggest that the two superordinate domains of Benefit-Provisioning and Cost-Inflicting coalitional mate retention can be profitably employed in future research using the CMRI. The two superordinate domains therefore afford researchers a reduction in the number of variables (two instead of seven) used in hypothesis testing involving the CMRI. Fewer variables afford the benefits of reducing Type 1 error (e.g., coalitional mate retention as an dependent variable), and can potentially reduce issues related to multicollinearity (e.g., domains, rather than tactics, of coalitional mate retention as independent variables) in regression-based analyses.

Future research may find that differential associations with domains of Benefit-Provisioning and Cost-Inflicting coalitional mate retention are more complex than the parallel associations with domains of individual mate retention. A key difference between associations with individual mate retention and associations with coalitional mate retention is that coalitional mate retention involves a third individual, in addition to the romantic dyad. Future research efforts, therefore, should take into account the relationship between the partner and the ally (e.g., friendship quality, kinship relatedness), and the individual characteristics (e.g., personality dimensions) of the partner and the ally, in addition to aspects of the romantic partnership. Nuanced investigations of coalitional mate retention have the potential to elucidate important aspects of romantic relationships within a broader (more evolutionarily relevant) social context.

Because the current study and Pham et al. (2015) used MTurk samples to validate and confirm the CMRI, future research may benefit from different participant recruitment strategies to confirm that the seven-factor lower-order structure, and the two-factor higher-order structure, replicate across populations and cultures.

Conclusions

The current study confirmed the tactic structure of the Coalitional Mate Retention Inventory (CMRI; Pham et al., 2015). The results demonstrate that the seven-factor structure of the CMRI fits the data better than does an alternative single-factor structure, and we also provide initial evidence for two superordinate domains of Benefit-Provisioning and Cost-Inflicting coalitional mate retention. Evidentiary support for conceptual similarities between coalitional mate retention and individual mate retention are provided, and we also document differential associations between domains of coalitional mate retention and domains individual mate retention with relationship satisfaction and relationship commitment. The results provide psychometric evidence for the tactic structure of the CMRI, and highlight the empirical and theoretical benefits afforded by investigating superordinate domains of coalitional mate retention.

References

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.

Atari, M., Barbaro, N., Sela, Y., Shackelford, T. K., & Chegeni, R. (2017). The Big Five personality dimensions and mate retention behaviors in Iran. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *104*, 286-290.

Atari, M., Barbaro, N., Shackelford, T. K., & Chegeni, R. (2016). Psychometric evaluation and cultural correlates of the Mate Retention Inventory-Short Form (MRI-SF) in Iran. Manuscript submitted for publication.

Barbaro, N., Pham, M. N., & Shackelford, T. K. (2015). Solving the problem of partner infidelity: Individual mate retention, coalitional mate retention, and in-pair copulation frequency. *Personality and Individual Differences, 82*, 67-71.

Barbaro, N., Shackelford, T. K., & Weekes-Shackelford, V. A. (2016). Mothers and fathers perform more mate retention behaviors than individuals without children. *Human Nature, 27*, 316-333.

Barrett, P. (2007). Structural equation modelling: Adjudging model fit. *Personality and Individual Differences, 42*, 815-824.

Bentler, P. M. & Bonnet, D. C. (1980). Significance tests and goodness of fit in the analysis of covariance structures. *Psychological Bulletin, 88*, 588-606.

Buss, D. M. (1988). From vigilance to violence: Tactics of mate retention in American undergraduates. *Ethology and Sociobiology, 9*, 291-317.

Buss, D. M., & Craik, K. H. (1983). The act frequency approach to personality. *Psychological Review, 90*, 105-126.

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.

Canary, D. J., & Stafford, L. (1992). Relational maintenance strategies and equity in marriage. *Communications Monographs, 59*, 243-267.

Farrell, J. E., Hook, J. N., Ramos, M., Davis, D. E., Van Tongeren, D. R., & Ruiz, J. M. (2015). Humility and relationship outcomes in couples: The mediating role of commitment. *Couple and Family Psychology: Research and Practice, 4*, 14-26.

Gagné, F. M., & Lydon, J. E. (2003). Identification and the commitment shift: Accounting for gender differences in relationship illusions. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 29*, 907-919.

Hu, L. T. & Bentler, P. M. (1999). Cutoff criteria for fit indexes in covariance structure analysis: Conventional criteria versus new alternatives. *Structural Equation Modeling, 6*, 1-55.

Jackson, D. L., Gillaspy Jr, J. A., & Purc-Stephenson, R. (2009). Reporting practices in confirmatory factor analysis: An overview and some recommendations. *Psychological Methods, 14*, 6-23.

Kaighobadi, F., Shackelford, T. K., & Buss, D. M. (2010). Spousal mate retention in the newlywed year and three years later. *Personality and Individual Differences, 48*, 414-418

Kline, R. B. (2005). *Principles and practice of structural equation modeling (2nd ed.).* New York: Guilford Press.

Lopes, G. S., Shackelford, T. K., Santos, W. S., Farias, M. G., & Segundo, D. S. A. (2016). Mate Retention Inventory—Short Form: Adaptation to the Brazilian context. *Personality and Individual Differences, 90*, 36-40

Lydon, J. E., Menzies-Toman, D., Burton, K., & Bell, C. (2008). If-then contingencies and the differential effects of the availability of an attractive alternative on relationship maintenance for men and women. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 95*, 50-65.

MacCallum, R. C., Browne, M. W., & Sugawara, H. M. (1996). Power analysis and determination of sample size for covariance structure modeling. *Psychological Methods, 1*, 130-149.

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.

Milsap, R. E. (2012). *Statistical approaches to measurement invariance.* New York: Routledge.

Miner, E. J., Starratt, V. G., & Shackelford, T. K. (2009). It's not all about her: Men's mate value and mate retention. *Personality and Individual Differences, 47*, 214-218.

Peer, E., Vosgerau, J., & Acquisti, A. (2013). Reputation as a sufficient condition for data quality on Amazon Mechanical Turk. *Behavior Research Methods, 46*, 1–9.

Pham, M. N., Barbaro, N., & Shackelford, T. K. (2015). Development and initial validation of the Coalitional Mate Retention Inventory. *Evolutionary Psychological Science, 1*, 4-12.

Pham, M. N., Barbaro, N., Mogilski, J. K., & Shackelford, T. K. (2015). Coalitional mate retention is correlated positively with friendship quality involving women, but negatively with male-male friendship quality. *Personality and Individual Differences, 79*, 87-90.

Pham, M. N., Barbaro, N., Noser, A. E., Sela, Y., Shackelford, T. K., Zeigler-Hill, V., Weege, B., & Fink, B. (in press). Dishonest individuals request more frequent mate retention from friends. *Personal Relationships*.

Salkicevic, S., Stanic, A. L., & Grabovac, M. T. (2014). Good mates retain us right: Investigating the relationship between mate retention strategies, mate value, and relationship satisfaction. *Evolutionary Psychology, 12*, 1038-1052.

Sela, Y., Shackelford, T. K., Pham, M. N., & Euler, H. A. (2015). Do women perform fellatio as a mate retention behavior? *Personality and Individual Differences, 73*, 61-66.

Shackelford, T. K., Goetz, A. T., & Buss, D. M. (2005). Mate retention in marriage: Further evidence of the reliability of the Mate Retention Inventory. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *39*, 415-425.

Steiger, J. H. (1980). Tests for comparing elements of a correlation matrix. *Psychological Bulletin*, *87*, 245-251.

Tabachnick, B. G. & Fidell, L. S. (2007). *Using multivariate statistics (5th ed.).* New York: Allyn & Bacon.

West, S. G., Finch, J. F., & Curran, P. J. (1995). Structural equation models with nonnormal variables: Problems and remedies. In Hoyle, R. H. (Ed.), *Structural equation modeling: Concepts, issues and applications* (pp. 56–75). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Wheaton, B., Muthen, B., Alwin, D., F., & Summers, G. (1977). Assessing reliability and stability in panel models. *Sociological Methodology*, *8*, 84-136.

Table 2. Summary of confirmatory factor analysis results.

CMR Female Friend											
Model	χ^2	*df*	χ^2/df	*p*	$\Delta\chi^2$	Δdf	*p*	RMSEA	90% CI	TLI	CFI
Model A	4017.48	902	4.45	< .001	—	—	—	.059	.057-.061	.91	.91
Model B	**2796.55**	**881**	**3.17**	**< .001**	**1220.93**	**21**	**< .000**	**.047**	**.045-.049**	**.94**	**.95**
Model C	3029.83	894	3.39	< .001	233.28	13	< .000	.049	.047-.051	.94	.94

CMR Male Friend											
Model	χ^2	*df*	χ^2/df	*p*	$\Delta\chi^2$	Δdf	*p*	RMSEA	90% CI	TLI	CFI
Model A	3397.14	902	3.77	< .001	—	—	—	.053	.051-.054	.92	.93
Model B	**2512.69**	**881**	**2.85**	**< .001**	**884.45**	**21**	**< .000**	**.043**	**.041-.045**	**.95**	**.95**
Model C	2630.67	894	2.94	< .001	117.98	13	< .000	.044	.042-.046	.95	.95

Note. Model A = one-factor lower-order model; Model B = seven-factor lower-order model; Model C = two-factor higher-order model. $\Delta\chi^2$ refers to model comparisons of Model B to Model A, and Model C to Model B. Best fitting model in bold.

Table 7. Summary of Invariance Tests for Model B (seven factor lower-order model).

					Model B Invariance Tests						
Model	χ^2	*df*	χ^2/df	*p*	$\Delta\ \chi^2$	Δ *df*	*p*	RMSEA	90% CI	CFI	Δ CFI
Configural	8790.89	3524	2.49	< .001	—	—	—	.027	.027-.028	.926	—
Metric	8909.51	3635	2.45	< .001	118.62	111	= .29	.027	.026-.028	.926	.000
Scalar	9105.53	3767	2.42	< .001	196.02	132	< .001	.027	.026-.027	.925	.001

Note. $\Delta\ \chi^2$ and Δ CFI refer to model comparisons of metric to configural models, and scalar to metric model.

Table 8. Bivariate correlations between CMR domains and other target variables.

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
1. Age	—										
2. Partner age	.87	—									
3. Relationship length	.60	.60	—								
4. Commitment	.18	.19	.21	—							
5. Satisfaction	.10	.11	.11	.81	—						
6. MR Cost	-.34	-.33	-.36	-.28	-.17	—					
7. MR Benefit	-.15	-.17	-.20	.19	.24	.62	—				
8. CMR Cost (male)	-.29	-.29	-.32	-.34	-.23	.76	.40	—			
9. CMR Benefit (male)	-.24	-.25	-.31	-.28	-.18	.69	.40	.92	—		
10. CMR Cost (female)	-.27	-.28	-.32	-.32	-.23	.75	.41	.91	.87	—	
11. CMR Benefit (female)	-.23	-.26	-.31	-.26	-.16	.68	.43	.84	.85	.92	—
M	30.66	30.44	47.65	5.98	5.87	1.20	1.77	0.81	0.90	0.81	0.90
SD	8.45	8.44	68.21	1.01	1.09	0.84	0.56	0.76	0.78	0.78	0.80

Note. All bivariate correlations significant at $p < .001$. MR = Individual Mate Retention (MRI-SF); CMR = Coalitional Mate Retention (CMRI); Cost = Cost-Inflicting; Benefit = Benefit-Provisioning. “Male” specifies male friend; “Female” specifies female friend.



Figure 1. Hypothesized seven-factor lower-order model (Model B). Indicator variables and error terms omitted for presentation. See Table 1 (ESM) for complete list of indicator variables on each latent factor.



Figure 2. Hypothesized two-factor higher-order model (Model C). Indicator variables and error terms omitted for presentation. See Table 1 (ESM) for complete list of indicator variables on each latent factor.

Electronic Supplementary Material (ESM)

Table 1. Composition of latent factors and associated indicator variables

Higher-Order Latent Factor	Lower-Order Latent Factor	Indicator Items	Item Number
Cost-Inflicting	Manipulation	Talked to my partner to learn if my partner was interested in someone else	V1
		Told me if s/he saw my partner cheating on me	V2
		Told me if my partner was cheating on me	V3
		Asked my partner if my partner found other people attractive	V4
		Flirted with my partner to help me test my partner’s faithfulness to me	V5
		Got my partner drunk to see what my partner said	V6
		Got my partner drunk to see what my partner did	V7
		Seduced my partner to help me test my partner’s faithfulness to me	V8
		Wore revealing clothing around my partner	V9
		Said bad things about me to see how my partner would react	V10
		Tried to “hook up” my partner with someone else to see what my partner did	V11
		Said negative things about my romantic relationship to my partner to see if my partner would defend our romantic relationship	V12
	Vigilance	Observed if my partner was interested in someone else	V13
		Observed how my partner acted around people interested in my partner	V14
		Observed if my partner mentioned me during conversations with others	V15
		Mentioned a story to others that involved me and my partner to remind others that my partner was in a relationship	V16
		Observed if my partner was wearing gifts that I gave my partner	V17
		Followed my partner around	V18
	Monopolizing Time	Studied with my partner	V19
		Went out with my partner	V20
		Made plans with my partner for a get-together	V21
		Accompanied my partner to a party	V22
		Asked my partner for help with a task (e.g., home maintenance, yard work, school work)	V23
		Drove my partner home	V24
		Spent time with my partner when I wasn’t present	V25
	Violence	Hit someone who was flirting with my partner	V26
		Fought someone who was interested in my partner	V27
		Intimidated someone who was interested in my partner	V28
Benefit-Provisioning	Praise	Said nice things about me when my partner and other people were around	V29
		Said positive things about me to my partner	V30
		Mentioned me in conversation around my partner when I wasn’t around	V31
		Said positive things about me to my partner’s friends	V32
		Chatted with my partner	V33
		Reassured my partner that I liked my partner	V34
	Thera py	Told my partner that cheating was wrong	V35
		Kept my partner company	V36
		Listened to my partner’s relationship concerns	V37

		Asked my partner if my partner wanted to marry me	V38
		Asked my partner how serious my partner was about me	V39
		Asked my partner if my partner loved me	V40
		Told my partner how much I liked my partner	V41
		Included my partner in group activities	V42
	Gifts	Told me what gifts my partner wanted	V43
		Told me my partner's size (e.g., dress, ring) so I could buy my partner appropriately-sized gifts	V44

Note. Participants were instructed to "Please indicate how frequently you explicitly asked your male (female) friend to perform the following behaviors during with the intention of helping you strengthen your romantic relationship" using the 4-point scale described in the Measures section. Full administration instructions can be found in Pham et al. (2015).

Table 3. Path estimates for requests of coalitional mate retention from male friends.

Endogenous Variable	Model A			Model B			Model C		
	β	*b*	*SE*	*β*	*b*	*SE*	*β*	*b*	*SE*
Manipulation							0.97	1	
Vigilance							0.98	0.98	0.04
Monopolize							0.94	1.04	0.05
Violence							0.98	1.11	0.05
Praise							0.97	1	
Therapy							1.01	1.05	0.04
Gifts							0.92	0.98	0.04
V1	0.73	1		0.73	1		0.73	1	
V2	0.73	1.00	0.04	0.75	1.02	0.04	0.75	1.02	0.04
V3	0.74	1.04	0.04	0.76	1.06	0.04	0.76	1.06	0.04
V4	0.78	1.09	0.04	0.79	1.10	0.04	0.79	1.10	0.04
V5	0.78	1.10	0.04	0.79	1.12	0.04	0.79	1.12	0.04
V6	0.76	1.05	0.04	0.78	1.07	0.04	0.78	1.07	0.04
V7	0.77	1.08	0.04	0.80	1.12	0.04	0.80	1.12	0.04
V8	0.75	1.06	0.04	0.78	1.09	0.04	0.78	1.09	0.04
V9	0.78	1.07	0.04	0.80	1.10	0.04	0.80	1.09	0.04
V10	0.79	1.09	0.04	0.80	1.11	0.04	0.80	1.11	0.04
V11	0.78	1.06	0.04	0.80	1.09	0.04	0.80	1.09	0.04
V12	0.73	1.02	0.04	0.75	1.04	0.04	0.75	1.03	0.04
V13	0.71	0.94	0.04	0.73	1		0.73	1	
V14	0.71	0.90	0.04	0.72	0.95	0.04	0.72	0.95	0.04
V15	0.76	1.06	0.04	0.78	1.12	0.05	0.78	1.12	0.05
V16	0.78	1.08	0.04	0.79	1.14	0.05	0.79	1.14	0.05
V17	0.78	1.12	0.04	0.80	1.18	0.05	0.80	1.18	0.05
V18	0.78	1.06	0.04	0.79	1.11	0.04	0.79	1.11	0.04
V19	0.71	1.03	0.04	0.74	1		0.74	1	
V20	0.72	1.03	0.04	0.77	1.04	0.04	0.77	1.03	0.04
V21	0.69	0.98	0.04	0.74	0.99	0.04	0.74	0.99	0.04
V22	0.72	1.01	0.04	0.75	1.00	0.04	0.76	1	0.04
V23	0.71	1.04	0.05	0.74	1.02	0.04	0.73	1.01	0.04
V24	0.66	0.92	0.04	0.70	0.91	0.04	0.70	0.91	0.04
V25	0.73	1.03	0.04	0.75	0.99	0.04	0.75	0.99	0.04
V26	0.77	1.08	0.04	0.80	1		0.79	1	
V27	0.80	1.09	0.04	0.82	1.01	0.03	0.82	1.02	0.04
V28	0.77	1.08	0.04	0.79	0.99	0.04	0.79	1.00	0.04
V29	0.72	1.03	0.04	0.75	1		0.75	1	
V30	0.68	1.00	0.05	0.73	1.01	0.04	0.73	1.00	0.04
V31	0.76	1.07	0.04	0.78	1.02	0.04	0.78	1.03	0.04
V32	0.72	1.05	0.04	0.77	1.04	0.04	0.77	1.03	0.04
V33	0.62	0.90	0.05	0.66	0.89	0.04	0.65	0.88	0.04
V34	0.75	1.08	0.04	0.78	1.04	0.04	0.78	1.03	0.04
V35	0.75	1.08	0.04	0.75	1		0.75	1	
V36	0.63	0.88	0.04	0.63	0.82	0.04	0.63	0.82	0.04
V37	0.77	1.10	0.04	0.78	1.02	0.04	0.77	1.02	0.04
V38	0.77	1.08	0.04	0.77	0.99	0.04	0.78	0.99	0.04
V39	0.74	1.05	0.04	0.74	0.96	0.04	0.74	0.97	0.04
V40	0.79	1.14	0.04	0.80	1.05	0.04	0.80	1.06	0.04
V41	0.71	1.03	0.04	0.73	0.97	0.04	0.73	0.97	0.04
V42	0.64	0.94	0.05	0.66	0.89	0.04	0.65	0.88	0.04
V43	0.72	1.01	0.04	0.78	1		0.78	1	
V44	0.73	1.01	0.04	0.80	1.00	0.04	0.79	0.99	0.04

Note. All estimates significant at $p < .001$. “1” with no decimals indicates marker variable.

Table 4. Path estimates for requests of coalitional mate retention from female friends.

Endogenous Variable	Model A			Model B			Model C		
	β	*b*	*SE*	*β*	*b*	*SE*	*β*	*b*	*SE*
Manipulation							0.97	1	
Vigilance							0.99	1.00	0.04
Monopolize							0.93	1.067	0.04
Violence							0.98	1.10	0.04
Praise							0.98	1	
Therapy							1.00	1.07	0.04
Gifts							0.93	0.98	0.04
V1	0.76	1		0.76	1		0.76	1	
V2	0.74	0.98	0.04	0.76	1.01	0.04	0.76	1.00	0.04
V3	0.73	0.94	0.04	0.75	0.98	0.04	0.75	0.97	0.04
V4	0.79	1.05	0.04	0.78	1.06	0.04	0.79	1.05	0.04
V5	0.79	1.09	0.04	0.82	1.13	0.04	0.82	1.13	0.04
V6	0.77	1.00	0.04	0.80	1.04	0.04	0.79	1.03	0.04
V7	0.78	1.06	0.04	0.81	1.10	0.04	0.80	1.10	0.04
V8	0.77	1.03	0.04	0.81	1.08	0.04	0.80	1.07	0.04
V9	0.80	1.08	0.04	0.82	1.11	0.04	0.82	1.11	0.04
V10	0.77	1.05	0.04	0.79	1.08	0.04	0.79	1.08	0.04
V11	0.77	0.99	0.04	0.81	1.04	0.04	0.80	1.03	0.04
V12	0.75	0.97	0.04	0.77	1.01	0.04	0.77	1.01	0.04
V13	0.74	0.95	0.04	0.76	1		0.76	1	
V14	0.75	0.99	0.04	0.77	1.04	0.04	0.77	1.04	0.04
V15	0.79	1.03	0.04	0.80	1.08	0.04	0.80	1.03	0.04
V16	0.77	1.03	0.04	0.77	1.07	0.04	0.77	1.07	0.04
V17	0.77	1.04	0.04	0.79	1.09	0.04	0.79	1.09	0.04
V18	0.77	1.06	0.04	0.78	1.11	0.04	0.78	1.11	0.04
V19	0.78	1.06	0.04	0.80	1		0.81	1	
V20	0.72	0.98	0.04	0.78	0.98	0.04	0.78	0.98	0.04
V21	0.71	0.96	0.04	0.78	0.95	0.04	0.77	0.95	0.03
V22	0.76	1.03	0.04	0.81	1.01	0.04	0.81	1.01	0.03
V23	0.74	1.03	0.04	0.76	0.97	0.04	0.76	0.96	0.04
V24	0.70	0.94	0.04	0.75	0.93	0.04	0.75	0.92	0.04
V25	0.72	0.96	0.04	0.76	0.94	0.04	0.76	0.93	0.03
V26	0.78	1.04	0.04	0.81	1		0.81	1	
V27	0.75	0.97	0.04	0.78	0.93	0.03	0.77	0.92	0.03
V28	0.79	1.06	0.04	0.80	0.99	0.03	0.81	1.00	0.03
V29	0.74	0.98	0.04	0.76	1		0.76	1	
V30	0.73	1.04	0.04	0.77	1.09	0.04	0.77	1.08	0.04
V31	0.73	0.96	0.04	0.74	0.97	0.04	0.75	0.97	0.04
V32	0.75	1.02	0.04	0.78	1.07	0.04	0.78	1.06	0.04
V33	0.68	0.94	0.04	0.71	0.99	0.04	0.71	0.98	0.04
V34	0.76	1.02	0.04	0.77	1.04	0.04	0.78	1.05	0.04
V35	0.77	1.06	0.04	0.77	1		0.77	1	
V36	0.68	0.94	0.04	0.70	0.92	0.04	0.69	0.91	0.04
V37	0.74	0.98	0.04	0.76	0.96	0.04	0.76	0.96	0.04
V38	0.75	1.02	0.04	0.75	0.98	0.04	0.76	0.98	0.04
V39	0.79	1.07	0.04	0.79	1.02	0.04	0.80	1.03	0.04
V40	0.77	1.05	0.04	0.78	1.01	0.04	0.78	1.01	0.04
V41	0.77	1.07	0.04	0.79	1.05	0.04	0.79	1.05	0.04
V42	0.69	0.97	0.04	0.71	0.96	0.04	0.70	0.95	0.04
V43	0.71	0.96	0.04	0.77	1		0.77	1	
V44	0.73	1.00	0.04	0.79	1.03	0.04	0.79	1.04	0.04

Note. All estimates significant at $p < .001$. “1” with no decimals indicates marker variable.

Table 5. Squared multiple correlations (R^2) for endogenous variables.

Endogenous Variable	Female Friend			Male Friend		
	Model A	Model B	Model C	Model A	Model B	Model C
Manipulation			0.93			0.94
Vigilance			0.98			0.97
Monopolize			0.86			0.90
Violence			0.95			0.95
Praise			0.96			0.94
Therapy			1.01			1.02
Gifts			0.87			0.85
V1	0.58	0.57	0.58	0.54	0.54	0.63
V2	0.55	0.58	0.58	0.53	0.56	0.61
V3	0.53	0.56	0.56	0.55	0.58	0.43
V4	0.62	0.62	0.62	0.61	0.62	0.53
V5	0.63	0.67	0.67	0.60	0.63	0.64
V6	0.59	0.63	0.63	0.58	0.61	0.55
V7	0.61	0.65	0.65	0.59	0.64	0.61
V8	0.60	0.65	0.65	0.57	0.60	0.60
V9	0.64	0.67	0.67	0.61	0.64	0.40
V10	0.59	0.62	0.62	0.62	0.65	0.57
V11	0.60	0.65	0.65	0.60	0.64	0.61
V12	0.56	0.60	0.60	0.54	0.56	0.43
V13	0.55	0.58	0.58	0.50	0.53	0.59
V14	0.57	0.59	0.59	0.50	0.52	0.61
V15	0.62	0.64	0.64	0.58	0.60	0.53
V16	0.59	0.60	0.60	0.61	0.62	0.57
V17	0.59	0.62	0.62	0.61	0.64	0.63
V18	0.60	0.61	0.61	0.61	0.63	0.67
V19	0.60	0.64	0.65	0.51	0.54	0.63
V20	0.51	0.61	0.61	0.52	0.60	0.56
V21	0.51	0.60	0.60	0.48	0.55	0.49
V22	0.58	0.66	0.66	0.51	0.57	0.54
V23	0.54	0.58	0.57	0.50	0.55	0.57
V24	0.49	0.56	0.56	0.44	0.49	0.55
V25	0.51	0.58	0.58	0.53	0.56	0.59
V26	0.61	0.65	0.65	0.60	0.64	0.56
V27	0.56	0.60	0.60	0.63	0.67	0.63
V28	0.62	0.64	0.65	0.60	0.62	0.64
V29	0.54	0.57	0.57	0.52	0.56	0.63
V30	0.54	0.59	0.59	0.46	0.54	0.60
V31	0.53	0.55	0.56	0.58	0.60	0.52
V32	0.56	0.61	0.61	0.52	0.60	0.53
V33	0.46	0.51	0.50	0.38	0.43	0.56
V34	0.57	0.60	0.61	0.57	0.60	0.64
V35	0.60	0.59	0.59	0.56	0.57	0.65
V36	0.46	0.49	0.47	0.39	0.40	0.64
V37	0.55	0.58	0.58	0.59	0.60	0.60
V38	0.56	0.57	0.57	0.60	0.60	0.64
V39	0.63	0.63	0.64	0.55	0.55	0.61
V40	0.59	0.60	0.61	0.63	0.64	0.63
V41	0.59	0.62	0.62	0.50	0.53	0.62
V42	0.47	0.51	0.50	0.41	0.44	0.58
V43	0.50	0.59	0.59	0.51	0.61	0.56
V44	0.54	0.62	0.63	0.54	0.63	0.54

Table 6. Covariance (correlation) between lower-order latent factors, Model B.

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1. Manipulation	—	.48 (.95)	.49 (.90)	.56 (.98)	.49 (.89)	.53 (.95)	.50 (.89)
2. Vigilance	.53 (.96)	—	.50 (.94)	.53 (.95)	.50 (.93)	.53 (.97)	.49 (.90)
3. Monopolize	.54 (.87)	.56 (.92)	—	.55 (.89)	.54 (.92)	.57 (.95)	.51 (.85)
4. Violence	.61 (.99)	.59 (.96)	.60 (.88)	—	.56 (.91)	.59 (.95)	.57 (.91)
5. Praise	.51 (.90)	.53 (.94)	.58 (.92)	.57 (.91)	—	.59 (.98)	.54 (.89)
6. Therapy	.56 (.94)	.57 (.97)	.62 (.95)	.60 (.92)	.60 (.99)	—	.57 (.92)
7. Gifts	.52 (.87)	.53 (.90)	.58 (.88)	.58 (.90)	.56 (.93)	.58 (.93)	—

Note. Requests of coalitional mate retention from female friend below diagonal. Request of coalitional mate retention from male friend above diagonal.

Table 9. Bivariate correlations between indicator variables (female friend data).

V	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22
1	-																					
2	.57	-																				
3	.58	.60	-																			
4	.58	.61	.58	-																		
5	.60	.63	.58	.64	-																	
6	.61	.59	.64	.59	.67	-																
7	.57	.61	.61	.60	.68	.68	-															
8	.60	.60	.59	.62	.68	.64	.68	-														
9	.60	.59	.58	.63	.68	.67	.67	.65	-													
10	.59	.60	.57	.62	.66	.60	.61	.62	.68	-												
11	.61	.59	.59	.63	.67	.62	.65	.68	.68	.65	-											
12	.57	.59	.59	.60	.64	.60	.61	.64	.63	.64	.62	-										
13	.66	.54	.54	.60	.59	.55	.57	.58	.59	.57	.59	.56	-									
14	.63	.56	.56	.60	.61	.59	.61	.59	.61	.56	.57	.57	.65	-								
15	.60	.58	.59	.64	.61	.62	.61	.61	.62	.56	.59	.57	.62	.61	-							
16	.59	.56	.58	.55	.59	.56	.56	.59	.61	.60	.60	.60	.58	.58	.61	-						
17	.60	.59	.57	.60	.60	.58	.57	.62	.60	.57	.60	.60	.60	.59	.67	.59	-					
18	.59	.56	.57	.64	.59	.54	.61	.59	.58	.60	.58	.58	.57	.61	.62	.57	.62	-				
19	.82	.55	.54	.61	.59	.58	.59	.58	.59	.59	.59	.58	.59	.57	.62	.57	.62	.64	-			
20	.54	.49	.45	.54	.51	.54	.51	.51	.57	.54	.51	.51	.52	.53	.52	.52	.53	.57	.63	-		
21	.59	.49	.49	.55	.53	.54	.50	.49	.56	.49	.52	.45	.52	.51	.56	.52	.54	.58	.61	.61	-	
22	.59	.51	.54	.56	.57	.59	.55	.55	.56	.53	.53	.49	.54	.57	.61	.58	.60	.62	.64	.61	.69	-
23	.54	.52	.49	.57	.57	.54	.56	.54	.60	.57	.54	.52	.53	.55	.55	.53	.55	.58	.58	.60	.56	.61
24	.54	.48	.44	.53	.51	.49	.53	.52	.56	.56	.51	.49	.52	.52	.54	.51	.54	.55	.61	.65	.56	.60
25	.53	.50	.50	.51	.53	.55	.55	.52	.55	.53	.50	.49	.51	.54	.59	.52	.54	.60	.59	.62	.61	.61
26	.60	.61	.64	.60	.65	.63	.67	.63	.66	.61	.66	.60	.56	.61	.61	.61	.60	.62	.59	.52	.53	.58
27	.55	.55	.58	.58	.64	.62	.61	.62	.65	.63	.65	.61	.54	.56	.58	.59	.57	.60	.58	.52	.51	.54
28	.59	.62	58	.65	.64	.61	.66	.63	.64	.62	.61	.60	.60	.61	.61	.64	.61	.61	.61	.55	.52	.57
29	.56	.55	.51	.54	.55	.52	.54	.54	.58	.59	.58	.55	.51	.53	.58	.59	.28	.58	.55	.52	.54	.55
30	.52	.54	.45	.58	.54	.52	.52	.53	.56	.53	.52	.47	.53	.53	.59	.57	.57	.56	.59	.56	.55	.56
31	.59	.54	.56	.54	.52	.51	.55	.52	.55	.56	.58	.59	.55	.54	.59	.63	.55	.53	.54	.51	.51	.57
32	.55	.51	.52	.57	.56	.53	.55	.52	.55	.52	.54	.53	.56	.55	.59	.61	.55	.56	.61	.52	.54	.59
33	.48	.46	.44	.54	.51	.48	.47	.46	.52	.48	.44	.45	.47	.47	.50	.51	.50	.55	.53	.56	.51	.56
34	.59	.55	.51	.62	.59	.56	.58	.54	.57	.58	.57	.57	.54	.55	.61	.60	.57	.57	.56	.55	.54	.58
35	.62	.63	.58	.63	.67	.61	.62	.64	.61	.61	.59	.58	.62	.59	.62	.61	.60	.56	.60	.46	.51	.58
36	.55	.46	.44	.49	.47	.47	.47	.46	.53	.49	.48	.48	.54	.51	.52	.51	.51	.55	.58	.59	.59	.60
37	.53	.51	.50	.60	.56	.54	.58	.51	.59	.54	.54	.50	.53	.54	.57	.57	.56	.56	.55	.56	.54	.57
38	.57	.57	.54	.63	.59	.56	.56	.55	.62	.55	.57	.55	.58	.58	.61	.57	.61	.55	.58	.53	.52	.55
39	.59	.62	.58	.64	.62	.61	.62	.61	.62	.61	.61	.61	.57	.61	.61	.61	.60	.62	.59	.54	.54	.58
40	.59	.58	.56	.65	60	.56	.60	.58	.63	.57	.60	.60	.56	.557	.59	.58	.61	.59	.58	.54	.57	.59
41	.56	.53	.51	.58	.58	.54	.57	.56	.59	.56	.57	.54	.54	.56	.60	.57	.59	.61	.62	.59	.58	.58
42	.51	.47	.47	.52	.51	.54	.46	.49	.51	.51	.48	.47	.51	.48	.54	.52	.52	.49	.52	.58	.57	.57
43	.53	.51	.49	.53	.55	.51	.50	.52	.51	.54	.51	.53	.49	.50	.44	.60	.52	.52	.53	.53	.54	.57
44	.52	.53	.53	.59	.54	.55	.55	.54	.58	.58	.56	.57	.53	.53	.58	.60	.55	.56	.57	.52	.52	.55
M	.81	.78	.71	.83	.82	.73	.79	.77	.82	.78	.73	.73	.79	.84	.86	.84	.84	.83	.87	.91	.92	.92

Note. N = 1003; M = Mean

Table 9. Bivariate correlations between indicator variables (female friend data) continued.

V	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30	31	32	33	34	35	36	37	38	39	40	41	42	43	44
1																						
2																						
3																						
4																						
5																						
6																						
7																						
8																						
9																						
10																						
11																						
12																						
13																						
14																						
15																						
16																						
17																						
18																						
19																						
20																						
21																						
22																						
23	-																					
24	.54	-																				
25	.57	.57	-																			
26	.51	.53	.53	-																		
27	.52	.51	.52	.65	-																	
28	.56	.52	.54	.65	.60	-																
29	.56	.50	.54	.60	.58	.60	-															
30	.61	.54	.52	.54	.51	.55	.58	-														
31	.51	.51	.50	.56	.55	.61	.60	.54	-													
32	.57	.52	.55	.58	.52	.58	.63	.62	.56	-												
33	.57	.46	.55	.45	.46	.52	.52	.56	.52	.56	-											
34	.58	.49	.52	.58	.53	.56	.56	.58	.60	.59	.56	-										
35	.56	.52	.50	.58	.57	.62	.54	.57	.55	.60	.52	.57	-									
36	.56	.61	.57	.48	.43	.51	.52	.54	.46	.55	.53	.51	.48	-								
37	.59	.54	.56	.55	.52	.57	.53	.59	.54	.58	.58	.63	.59	.54	-							
38	.56	.52	.55	.57	.56	.57	.54	.56	.55	.56	.52	.58	.58	.47	.63	-						
39	.58	.53	.58	.61	.59	.66	.58	.58	.59	.61	.54	.60	.62	.52	.61	.61	-					
40	.55	.50	.55	.58	.53	.59	.53	.57	.55	.58	.51	.52	.58	.52	.63	.66	.66	-				
41	.64	.56	.56	.54	.55	.56	.60	.69	.56	.62	.59	.61	.60	.55	.60	.58	.61	.60	-			
42	.61	.53	.53	.48	.46	.49	.52	.58	.52	.54	.61	.57	.51	.54	.54	.50	.54	.52	.59	-		
43	.53	.54	.52	.55	.51	.56	.56	.51	.54	.60	.50	.57	.50	.54	.54	.52	.56	.52	.57	.55	-	
44	.52	.52	.50	.55	.54	.61	.56	.54	.56	.57	.46	.55	.57	.53	.59	.54	.59	.59	.57	.49	.61	-
M	.95	.88	.88	.76	.72	.81	.84	.98	.83	89	.96	.87	.83	.99	.85	.84	.86	.86	.95	1.02	.92	.88

Note. *N* = 1003; *M* = Mean

Table 10. Bivariate correlations between indicator variables (male friend data).

V	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22
1	-																					
2	.55	-																				
3	.58	.66	-																			
4	.57	.58	.60	-																		
5	.59	.60	.59	.64	-																	
6	.55	.60	.60	.62	.63	-																
7	.55	.62	.61	.64	.64	.64	-															
8	.54	.60	.56	.58	.61	.62	.64	-														
9	.55	.56	.60	.60	.62	.62	.67	.66	-													
10	.57	.58	.60	.63	.63	.64	.62	.65	.67	-												
11	.59	.56	.59	.62	.63	.61	.66	.64	.67	.64	-											
12	.56	.55	.58	.59	.61	.57	.59	.58	.58	.59	.60	-										
13	.63	.54	.55	.55	.55	.54	.54	.54	.56	.55	.55	.52	-									
14	.60	.52	.53	.54	.56	.53	.56	.58	.56	.56	.57	.52	.62	-								
15	.59	.56	.60	.59	.59	.54	.56	.51	.58	.59	.55	.55	.58	.53	-							
16	.55	.56	.57	.58	.60	.56	.58	.58	.60	.62	.60	.57	.58	.55	.64	-						
17	.59	.58	.58	.59	.60	.61	.59	.57	.59	.61	.61	.57	.58	.57	.64	.62	-					
18	.60	.56	.58	.63	.59	.59	.60	.56	.60	.60	.59	.56	.56	.56	.61	.60	.65	-				
19	.55	.54	.51	.55	.56	.56	.55	.54	.55	.56	.55	.56	.48	.50	.53	.49	.57	.58	-			
20	.52	.49	.50	.54	.56	.52	51	.52	.54	.56	.54	.51	.52	.50	.53	.55	.57	.59	.58	-		
21	.53	.48	.49	.54	.52	.50	.51	.49	.52	.51	.53	.49	.50	.46	.52	.49	.57	.60	.57	.60	-	
22	.54	.49	.51	.54	.50	.56	.53	.53	.53	.55	.53	.51	.51	.50	.54	.54	.59	.62	.55	.59	.56	-
23	.50	.49	.52	.53	.54	.50	.52	.50	.53	.54	.52	.50	.47	.47	.51	.53	.54	.53	.55	.55	.54	.56
24	.49	.47	.48	.51	.50	.46	.45	.49	.50	.51	.47	.44	.52	.49	.50	.53	.51	.57	.48	.60	.56	.54
25	.55	.53	.55	.56	.55	.53	.54	.51	.58	.53	.53	.50	.51	.52	.60	.56	.60	.60	.54	.54	.57	.56
26	.57	.59	.61	.60	.63	.59	.64	.60	.64	.65	.61	.58	.54	.55	.58	.62	.58	.59	.53	.50	.49	.53
27	.60	.59	.55	.63	.62	.63	.63	.63	.66	.66	.66	.60	.58	.56	.60	.63	.63	.63	.55	.53	.53	.56
28	.54	.57	.57	.69	.60	.57	.60	.59	.63	.62	.63	.60	.55	.56	.56	.63	.59	.58	.54	.55	.50	.58
29	.49	.53	.53	.55	.51	.52	.53	.54	.55	.57	.54	.54	.52	.48	.57	.62	.56	.53	.50	.55	.47	.51
30	.57	.43	.43	.51	.48	.45	.48	.48	.48	.52	.50	.45	.43	.47	.54	.52	.53	.52	.46	.51	.48	.50
31	.55	.53	.53	.62	.58	.57	.56	.56	.59	.58	.57	.54	.53	.51	.57	.64	.56	.55	.53	.56	.51	.50
32	.51	.48	.52	.51	.51	.54	.48	.52	.54	.54	.56	.48	.45	.49	.55	.60	.58	.56	.52	.54	.51	.51
33	.40	.40	.43	.45	.46	.43	.44	.41	.45	.44	.45	.45	.39	.40	.46	.50	.48	.48	.44	.50	.48	.44
34	.54	.56	.53	.60	.56	.57	.56	.56	.56	.55	.57	.52	.50	.51	.58	.59	.59	.59	.51	.52	.51	.55
35	.55	.55	.56	.63	.57	.56	.57	.57	.58	.59	.56	.54	.50	.51	.59	.57	.57	.56	.51	.57	.49	.52
36	.49	.41	.41	.42	.51	.42	.43	.47	.47	.49	.45	.43	.47	.46	.48	.53	.47	.50	.45	.53	.51	.50
37	.51	.56	.57	.61	.63	.58	.59	.55	.61	.58	.57	.54	.50	.52	.60	.60	.62	.58	.54	.56	.52	.54
38	.58	.56	.57	.62	.63	.60	.56	.57	.59	.60	.60	.57	.54	.55	.61	.60	.59	.61	.55	.53	.49	.54
39	.54	.58	.57	.59	.58	.60	.57	.54	.59	.55	.52	.49	.53	.52	.59	.60	.58	.60	.50	.51	.51	.50
40	.60	.57	.58	.65	.62	.61	.58	.61	.62	.59	.61	.56	.56	.56	.61	.61	.62	.62	.57	.55	.53	.55
41	.49	.48	.50	.54	.52	.49	.51	.48	.52	.54	.50	.51	.46	.47	.55	.57	.56	.57	.50	.58	.55	.51
42	.43	.43	.43	.46	.51	.44	.45	.44	.47	.49	.47	.44	.41	.44	.48	.49	.50	.47	.44	.49	.51	.48
43	.50	.48	.50	.56	.56	.52	.52	.55	.51	.58	.54	.55	.49	.51	.53	.60	.55	.55	.49	.55	.49	.49
44	.52	.47	.53	.53	.57	.51	.58	.56	.62	.58	.62	.56	.50	.50	.55	.63	.55	.56	.50	.50	.49	.53
M	.78	.73	.74	.81	.77	.75	.74	.76	.74	.78	.72	.75	.74	.74	.85	.81	.86	.79	.83	.92	.96	.89

Note. *N* = 1003; *M* = Mean

Table 10. Bivariate correlations between indicator variables (male friend data) continued.

V	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30	31	32	33	34	35	36	37	38	39	40	41	42	43	44
1																						
2																						
3																						
4																						
5																						
6																						
7																						
8																						
9																						
10																						
11																						
12																						
13																						
14																						
15																						
16																						
17																						
18																						
19																						
20																						
21																						
22																						
23	-																					
24	.49	-																				
25	.56	.49	-																			
26	.53	.47	.54	-																		
27	.54	.53	.59	.66	-																	
28	.53	.53	.53	.63	.64	-																
29	.55	.49	.53	.56	.57	.56	-															
30	.58	.48	.50	.47	.52	.50	.57	-														
31	.57	.47	.57	.61	.59	.61	.62	.53	-													
32	.56	.47	.52	.52	.57	.54	.61	.63	.59	-												
33	.54	.45	.47	.45	.46	.44	.48	.51	.49	.51	-											
34	.57	.49	.53	.56	.59	.57	.55	.56	.58	.57	.52	-										
35	.52	.50	.51	.57	.61	.57	.54	.53	.61	.57	.49	.60	-									
36	.47	.52	.50	.45	.49	.47	.44	.46	.46	.47	.44	.49	.47	-								
37	.59	.49	.56	.58	.56	.59	.54	.55	.60	.57	.51	.62	.54	.46	-							
38	.52	.50	.57	.62	.61	.62	.56	.54	.58	.56	.45	.60	.57	.45	.61	-						
39	.51	.46	.53	.58	.56	.58	.54	.48	.58	.52	.43	.57	.56	.45	.60	.60	-					
40	.56	.51	.58	.61	.63	.62	.56	.54	.60	.60	.46	.64	.59	.50	.64	.68	.64	-				
41	.57	.49	.49	.51	.54	.53	.53	.63	.54	.60	.51	.56	.59	.47	.59	.52	.51	.56	-			
42	.54	.47	.52	.45	.46	.45	.49	.55	.54	.51	.59	.53	.50	.47	.51	.50	.45	.49	.48	-		
43	.49	.49	.51	.53	.55	.58	.53	.49	.57	.52	.44	.53	.53	.49	.57	.58	.54	.58	.54	.45	-	
44	.51	.44	.52	.61	.48	.59	.50	.50	.56	.57	.47	.54	.55	.47	.55	.58	.54	.57	.54	.44	.62	-
M	.94	.92	.94	.77	.77	.79	.88	1.02	.85	.93	1.00	.90	.83	.99	.88	.81	.84	.85	.93	1.10	.92	.80

Note. *N* = 1003; *M* = Mean