



Men's mate retention varies with men's personality and their partner's personality



William F. McKibbin^{a,*}, Emily J. Miner^b, Todd K. Shackelford^c, Alyse D. Ehrke^c, Viviana A. Weekes-Shackelford^c

^aUniversity of Michigan – Flint, USA

^bUniversity of California – Santa Barbara, USA

^cOakland University, USA

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received 27 April 2013

Received in revised form 2 August 2013

Accepted 17 August 2013

Available online 13 September 2013

Keywords:

Mate retention

Sexual infidelity

Personality

Big five

Evolutionary psychology

ABSTRACT

Mate retention is the recurrent adaptive problem of retaining a mate in a relationship. Humans may have evolved mechanisms which motivate behavior in response to this problem. We examined the relationship between men's mate retention and men's and their partner's personality in studies of 467 men and 565 women in committed relationships. Participants reported on their own or their partner's mate retention and both their own and their partner's personality. Results indicate a negative relationship between men's Emotional Stability and men's mate retention and a positive relationship between men's Agreeableness and men's benefit-provisioning mate retention. Discussion addresses limitations and directions for future research addressing the links between personality and mate retention.

© 2013 Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.

1. Introduction

Humans have recurrently faced over evolutionary history the adaptive problem of mate retention—that is, retaining a mate in a committed relationship (Buss, 1988; Buss & Shackelford, 1997a). Because mate retention has been a recurrent adaptive problem, humans are expected to have evolved psychological mechanisms motivating behavior in response.

Researchers have identified several correlates of mate retention behavior. For example, researchers have documented sex differences in the performance of certain types of mate retention (e.g., women more than men engage in appearance enhancement, whereas men more than women engage in resource display; Buss & Shackelford, 1997a). Several studies have investigated phenomena including physical violence (Kaighobadi, Starratt, Shackelford, & Popp, 2008; Shackelford, Goetz, Buss, Euler, & Hoier, 2005) and partner-directed insults (McKibbin et al., 2007), and the roles these behaviors play in mate retention. Other research has shown that men's mate retention varies with the risk of their partner's infidelity (Starratt, Shackelford, Goetz, & McKibbin, 2007).

Mate retention behavior is stable over time (Kaighobadi, Shackelford, & Buss, 2010). In addition, mate retention varies with stable characteristics of men (Goetz et al., 2005). This suggests that mate retention may be linked to other stable dimensions, such as personality. de Miguel and Buss (2011) found that two personality dimensions are associated with mate retention: Neuroticism and Agreeableness. They argued that because Neuroticism reflects sensitivity to social exclusion, those high in Neuroticism are particularly vigilant against the social danger of losing their mate. de Miguel and Buss argued that the relationships between Agreeableness and mate retention reflect the fact that Agreeableness signals cooperativeness rather than aggressiveness, motivating less frequent use of negative, cost-inflicting mate retention behaviors and more frequent use of positive, benefit-provisioning mate retention behaviors. In addition, de Miguel and Buss found that Conscientiousness is positively related to some types of mate retention, specifically resource display and appearance enhancement. They explained this by noting that Conscientiousness is associated with long-term resource acquisition and hierarchy negotiation, both of which are associated with an ability to successfully use benefit-provisioning mate retention behaviors.

Mate retention behavior is typically measured using the Mate Retention Inventory (MRI; Buss, 1988), which assesses mate retention behavior across five broad categories. Direct Guarding includes acts to keep one's partner under watch (e.g., "He insisted that she spend all her free time with him."). Intersexual Negative

* Corresponding author. Address: University of Michigan – Flint, Department of Psychology, 303 E. Kearsley Street, 411 MSB, Flint, MI 48502-1950, USA. Tel.: +1 8107623424.

E-mail address: wmckibbi@umflint.edu (W.F. McKibbin).

Inducements includes behaviors which manipulate or threaten one's partner into remaining faithful (e.g., "She became jealous when he went out without her."). Intrasexual Negative Inducements includes conceptually similar acts of threat or manipulation, but directed toward potential rivals (e.g., "He yelled at the other guys who looked at her."). Positive Inducements includes acts such as providing sexual favors, material gifts, and displaying signs of affection (e.g., "He went out of his way to be kind, nice, and caring."). Public Signals of Possession includes behaviors intended to signal of "possession" of a partner (e.g., "She bragged about him to other guys."). These categories of mate retention can be characterized as *cost-inflicting* (Intrasexual Negative Inducements, Intersexual Negative Inducements, and Direct Guarding) or *benefit-provisioning* (Positive Inducements and Public Signals of Possession; Miner, Starratt, & Shackelford, 2009).

We build upon the research of de Miguel and Buss (2011), using the MRI. We examined the relationship between personality and mate retention behaviors. We extend their research by collecting information about the personality of both partners, rather than only the participant. We also contrast the links of personality dimensions with cost-inflicting versus benefit-provisioning mate retention behavior. In two independent studies of men and women, respectively, we tested the following hypotheses, derived in part from de Miguel and Buss:

Hypothesis 1. Men and women's Emotional Stability will be negatively related to men's cost-inflicting mate retention behaviors and men's benefit-provisioning mate retention behaviors.

Hypothesis 2. Men and women's Conscientiousness will be negatively related to men's cost-inflicting mate retention behaviors and positively related to men's benefit-provisioning mate retention behaviors.

Hypothesis 3. Men and women's Agreeableness will be negatively related to men's cost-inflicting mate retention behaviors and positively related to men's benefit-provisioning mate retention behaviors.

We did not predict relationships between men's or women's Surgency or Openness and men's mate retention behaviors.

2. Study 1: Methods

2.1. Participants

467 men in a committed, sexual relationship with a woman participated. The mean age of the participants was 24.2 years ($SD = 7.9$), the mean age of the participants' partners was 23.0 years ($SD = 7.3$), and the mean relationship length was 37.1 months ($SD = 59.7$). Participants were drawn from several US universities. Because of the sensitive nature of some of the questions, no further demographic data were secured.

2.2. Materials and procedure

Men completed an online questionnaire that solicited information on their age, their partner's age, and the duration of their relationship. After completing the demographic questions, participants completed the MRI to assess performance of their own mate retention. Following Buss (1988; and see Shackelford et al., 2005), we grouped responses into five categories of mate retention behaviors (see Section 1 for categories and sample acts). For each item, participants indicated how often they performed the behavior in the past month, ranging from 0 = *Never* to 3 = *Often*. Following Miner et al. (2009), mate retention categories were further organized into groups of cost-inflicting behaviors and benefit-provisioning behaviors. Previous research has established the reliability, validity, and utility of the MRI as an assessment of mate retention behaviors

(Buss & Shackelford, 1997a; Shackelford et al., 2005; Shackelford, Goetz, Buss, Euler et al., 2005).

Participants also completed assessments of their own and their partner's standings on five major dimensions of personality using a 40-item instrument (Botwin, Buss, & Shackelford, 1997). For each item, participants were given an adjective pair with the numbers 1 through 7 displayed between the two anchors (e.g., independent-conforming). Participants indicated the number that best describes them along each adjective pair and the number that best described their partner along each adjective pair. Following Botwin et al., we grouped responses to capture the five major dimensions of personality: Surgency (e.g., "independent", "talkative"), Agreeableness (e.g., "warm", "flexible"), Conscientiousness (e.g., "reliable", "hardworking"), Emotional Stability (e.g., "relaxed", "even-tempered"), and Openness (e.g., "knowledgeable", "curious"). Previous research has established the reliability, validity, and utility of this measure as an assessment of standings on the five major dimensions of personality (Botwin et al., 1997; Buss & Shackelford, 1997b; Goetz et al., 2005).

3. Study 1: Results

Following Shackelford, Goetz, and Buss (2005), we standardized mate retention scores and averaged the standardized scores to calculate values for the five categories of mate retention. Cronbach's alpha reliabilities for the five categories—Direct Guarding, Intersexual Negative Inducements, Positive Inducements, Public Signals of Possession, and Intrasexual Negative Inducements—were .83, .84, .81, .73, and .74, respectively. We calculated scores for the two major dimensions of mate retention by summing the category values for the constituent mate retention categories following Miner et al. (2009). Alpha reliabilities for the two dimensions—cost-inflicting and benefit-provisioning—were .87 and .85, respectively. Following Botwin et al. (1997), we calculated scores for men's reports of their own personality and their partner's personality by first reverse-scoring relevant items and then averaging responses for each of the five dimensions of personality. Alpha reliabilities for the five personality dimensions—Surgency, Agreeableness, Conscientiousness, Emotional Stability, and Openness—were .61, .65, .64, .52, and .52, respectively, for men's personality and .57, .64, .60, .53, and .60, for women's personality. The reliabilities are moderate in size, and may reflect the small number of items used to construct each personality dimension score.

3.1. Correlational analyses

Because of the potential for alpha inflation, we set a more stringent criterion of $\alpha = .01$ for interpretation of analyses. We calculated correlations using men's reports of their own personality and their partner's personality and men's reports of their own mate retention behaviors (see Table 1). Men's reports of their own use of cost-inflicting mate retention behaviors correlated negatively with their reports of their own Agreeableness, their own Emotional Stability, and their partner's Openness. Men's reports of their own use of benefit-provisioning mate retention behaviors correlated positively with their own Agreeableness and their own Openness, and positively with their partner's Conscientiousness.

3.2. Multiple regression analyses

Across-sex correlations between men's self-reported personality scores and men's reports of their partner's personality scores for the five personality dimensions averaged $r = .26$ (all $ps < .001$, see Table 2). Correlations among men's ratings of their own personality dimensions averaged .20, with correlations among men's

Table 1
Study 1: Correlations between men's reports of their own and their partner's personality and their own mate retention behaviors.

Men's mate retention	Men's personality (Women's personality)				
	Surgency	Agreeableness	Conscientiousness	Emotional Stability	Openness
Cost-inflicting	.02 (-.05)	-.14* (-.07)	-.06 (-.03)	-.20** (-.11)	-.03 (-.15*)
Direct Guarding	.02 (-.04)	-.11 (-.05)	-.01 (-.01)	-.17* (-.10)	-.01 (-.14*)
Intersexual Negative Inducements	.01 (-.02)	-.12 (-.06)	-.06 (.01)	-.24** (-.11)	.01 (.12)
Intrasexual Negative Inducements	.04 (-.08)	-.15* (-.10)	-.10 (-.08)	-.15* (-.11)	-.07 (-.17*)
Benefit-provisioning	.10 (.09)	.14* (.13)	.07 (.21**)	-.12 (-.01)	.14* (.12)
Positive Inducements	.07 (.10)	.16* (.09)	.09 (.19**)	-.11 (-.03)	.11 (.11)
Public Signals of Possession	.11 (.07)	.11 (.14*)	.04 (.21**)	-.10 (.02)	.15* (.12)

* $p < .01$.
** $p < .001$.

Table 2
Study 1: Within-sex and across-sex correlations between dimensions of personality according to men's reports.

Personality	1	2	3	4	5
1. Surgency	.21***	.11*	.12*	.22***	.38***
2. Agreeableness	.10*	.25***	.35***	.40**	.32***
3. Conscientiousness	.12*	.35***	.27***	.14*	.37***
4. Emotional Stability	.15**	.28***	.21***	.20***	.23***
5. Openness	.31***	.18***	.18***	.10*	.37***

Correlations below the diagonal are within-sex correlations of men's personality dimensions. Correlations above the diagonal are within-sex correlations of women's personality dimensions. Correlations along the diagonal are across-sex correlations of men's personality dimensions and women's personality dimensions.

* $p < .05$.
** $p < .01$.
*** $p < .001$.

ratings of their partner's personality averaging .26 (see Table 2). Because of the across-sex and within-sex correlations among personality dimensions, we conducted regression analyses to identify unique predictive effects of men's own personality standings and men's partner's personality standings on men's self-reported mate retention.

We entered scores on each of the five personality dimensions for men and their partners into a set of seven regression equations

predicting men's use of the two major dimensions of mate retention and each of the five categories of mate retention (see Table 3). All seven overall models were significant. Investigation of the individual standardized regression coefficients indicated that men's Emotional Stability independently predicted men's reports of their own use of cost-inflicting mate retention behaviors. Men's own Emotional Stability and their partner's Conscientiousness independently predicted men's reports of their own use of benefit-provisioning mate retention behaviors.

3.3. Summary of results

According to the results of the correlational analyses, men who scored lower on Agreeableness or Emotional Stability, or whose partners scored lower on Openness, performed more cost-inflicting mate retention behaviors. Men who scored higher on Agreeableness or Openness, or whose partners scored higher on Conscientiousness, performed more benefit-provisioning mate retention behaviors.

After accounting for the within-sex and across-sex interrelatedness of personality dimensions by performing multiple regressions, many of the correlational relationships were no longer significant. Men who scored lower on Emotional Stability performed more cost-inflicting mate retention behaviors. Men who scored lower

Table 3
Study 1: Multiple regressions using men's reports of their own and their partner's personality to predict men's reports of their own mate retention behaviors.

Men's mate retention	Men's personality (Women's personality)					F	(df_b, df_w)	R^2
	S	A	C	ES	O			
Cost-inflicting	.06 (.02)	-.08 (.01)	-.01 (.08)	-.15* (-.05)	.03 (-.15)	2.67*	(10, 375)	.07
Direct Guarding	.04 (.02)	-.08 (.03)	.04 (.07)	-.14 (-.05)	.04 (-.15)	2.21	(10, 385)	.06
Intersexual Negative Inducements	.02 (.05)	-.08 (.01)	-.01 (.12)	-.21** (-.05)	.06 (-.14)	3.42**	(10, 385)	.08
Intrasexual Negative Inducements	.10 (-.01)	-.08 (-.01)	-.04 (.03)	-.08 (-.04)	-.01 (-.12)	2.16	(10, 385)	.05
Benefit-provisioning	.04 (.07)	.09 (.08)	-.01 (.17)	-.18* (-.06)	.07 (-.01)	4.14**	(10, 375)	.10
Positive Inducements	.03 (.07)	.13 (.05)	.03 (.14)	-.19** (-.09)	.05 (.00)	3.81**	(10, 385)	.09
Public Signals of Possession	.04 (.05)	.05 (.10)	-.04 (.18*)	-.15* (-.03)	.09 (-.02)	3.69**	(10, 385)	.09

S = Surgency, A = Agreeableness, C = Conscientiousness, ES = Emotional Stability, and O = Openness.
* $p < .01$.
** $p < .001$.

on Emotional Stability or whose partners scored higher on Conscientiousness also performed more benefit-provisioning behaviors.

4. Study 1: Discussion

Men who score lower on Emotional Stability report more cost-inflicting and more benefit-provisioning mate retention behaviors than do men who score higher on Emotional Stability. Buss (1991) documented that women whose husbands are low on Emotional Stability complain that their partners are jealous and moody. Thus, men who are more anxious and temperamental may be more suspicious of infidelities (see Buss, 1991) and, therefore, perform mate retention behaviors more frequently. In addition, men who report that their partner scores higher on Conscientiousness report performing benefit-provisioning mate retention behaviors more frequently than do men who report that their partner scores lower on Conscientiousness. One possible explanation for this is that women who score higher on Conscientiousness are more reliable (Botwin et al., 1997) and, therefore more likely to elicit their partner's 'positive' mate retention behaviors, such as spending time alone with other men.

Although these analyses are consistent with previous research, the use of women's reports offers a different perspective. Although men may be more likely to be aware of their performance of some mate retention behaviors (e.g., "I checked my partner's mail..."), women may be more sensitive to their partner's performance of other mate retention behaviors. Men's use of mate retention behaviors, specifically the cost-inflicting behaviors, may be directly relevant to a woman's assessment of her health and safety. Thus, we extended our analyses of the relationships between men's mate retention and their own and their partner's personality standings by collecting independent reports from women who report on their partner's mate retention, their own personality, and their partner's personality.

5. Study 2: Methods

5.1. Participants

Five hundred and sixty five women in a committed, sexual relationship with a man participated. The mean age of the women was 21.5 years ($SD = 5.4$), the mean age of the participants' partners was 23.7 years ($SD = 6.6$), and the mean relationship length was 28.7 months ($SD = 38.4$). Participants were again drawn from several US universities. Because of the sensitive nature of some of the questions, no further demographic data were secured.

5.2. Materials and procedure

The materials and procedures for Study 2 paralleled the materials and procedures of Study 1, with sex-relevant revisions to survey items to account for the different sex of the participants in Study 2. Women reported on their partners' mate retention.

6. Study 2: Results

As in Study 1, we set a more stringent criterion of $\alpha = .01$ for interpretation of analyses. We calculated scores for the five categories of mate retention and for the five dimensions of personality as in Study 1 (see Study 1: Results). Cronbach's alpha reliabilities for the five categories of mate retention—Direct Guarding, Intersexual Negative Inducements, Positive Inducements, Public Signals of Possession, and Intrasectional Negative Inducements—were .82, .81, .81, .81, and .66, respectively. Cronbach's alpha reliabilities for the two dimensions of mate retention behaviors—cost-inflicting and benefit-provisioning—were .84 and .78, respectively. We also calculated scores for the five dimensions of personality in the same way as in Study 1. Alpha reliabilities for the five personality dimensions—Surgency, Agreeableness, Conscientiousness, Emotional Stability, and Openness—were .54, .76, .67, .55, and .62, respectively, for men's personality, and .65, .63, .62, .59, and .54, respectively, for women's personality.

6.1. Correlational analyses

We calculated correlations using women's reports of their own personality and their partner's personality and women's reports of their partner's mate retention (see Table 4). Women's reports of their partner's cost-inflicting mate retention behaviors correlated negatively with their reports of their partner's Agreeableness, Conscientiousness, Emotional Stability, and Openness, and negatively with their own Agreeableness and Emotional Stability. Women's reports of their partner's benefit-provisioning mate retention behaviors correlated positively with their reports of their partner's Agreeableness, and positively with their own Surgency.

6.2. Multiple regression analyses

Across-sex correlations between women's personality scores and women's reports of their partner's personality scores for the five personality dimensions averaged $r = .23$ (see Table 5). Within-sex correlations among scores on the five personality dimensions averaged .25 for women's reports of their own personality

Table 4

Study 2: Correlations between women's reports of their own and their partner's personality and women's reports of their partner's mate retention behaviors.

Men's mate retention	Men's personality (Women's personality)				
	Surgency	Agreeableness	Conscientiousness	Emotional Stability	Openness
Cost-inflicting	-.06 (.09)	-.29** (-.16*)	-.18** (-.07)	-.34** (-.13*)	-.19** (-.06)
Direct Guarding	-.09 (.10)	-.27** (-.14*)	-.16** (-.07)	-.31** (-.10)	-.17** (-.08)
Intersexual Negative Inducements	-.07 (.08)	-.26** (-.17*)	-.20** (-.07)	-.36** (-.16*)	-.18** (-.06)
Intrasectional Negative Inducements	.02 (.04)	-.24** (-.11)	-.12 (-.05)	-.24** (-.09)	-.16* (-.03)
Benefit-provisioning	.04 (.18*)	.17** (-.02)	.02 (.08)	-.10 (.07)	-.01 (.10)
Positive Inducements	.01 (.18**)	.18** (-.03)	.05 (.06)	-.09 (.06)	-.03 (.08)
Public Signals of Possession	.06 (.15*)	.15* (-.01)	.00 (.08)	-.09 (.07)	.00 (.11)

* $p < .01$.

*** $p < .001$.

Table 5

Study 2: Within-sex and across-sex correlations between dimensions of personality according to women's reports.

Personality	1	2	3	4	5
1. Surgency	.10*	.06	.12**	.20***	.42***
2. Agreeableness	.03	.26***	.27***	.42***	.11*
3. Conscientious	.10*	.31***	.25***	.24***	.19***
4. Emotional Stability	.20***	.39***	.20***	.22***	.07
5. Openness	.40***	.23***	.31***	.20***	.35***

Correlations below the diagonal are within-sex correlations of men's personality dimensions. Correlations above the diagonal are within-sex correlations of women's personality dimensions. Correlations along the diagonal are across-sex correlations of men's personality dimensions and women's personality dimensions.

* $p < .05$.

** $p < .01$.

*** $p < .001$.

(see Table 5). Within-sex correlations among scores on the five personality dimensions averaged .26 for women's reports of their partner's personality (see Table 5). Because of the across-sex and within-sex correlations among personality dimensions, we conducted regression analyses to identify unique predictive effects of men's own personality and men's partner's personality on men's self-reported mate retention.

We entered scores on the five personality dimensions for women and their partners into a set of seven regression equations predicting men's use of the two major dimensions of mate retention and each of the five categories of mate retention (see Table 6). All seven overall models were significant. Investigation of the individual standardized regression coefficients indicated that women's partner's Agreeableness and Emotional Stability and their own Surgency independently predicted women's reports of their partner's use of cost-inflicting mate retention behaviors. Women's partner's Agreeableness and Emotional Stability independently predicted women's reports of their partner's use of benefit-provisioning mate retention behaviors.

6.3. Summary of results

According to the correlational analyses, women who scored lower on Agreeableness or Emotional Stability or whose partner scored lower on Agreeableness, Conscientiousness, Emotional Stability, or Openness indicated that their partners performed more cost-inflicting mate retention behaviors. Women who scored higher on Surgency or whose partner scored higher on Agreeableness

indicated that their partners performed more benefit-provisioning mate retention behaviors.

After accounting for the within-sex and across-sex interrelatedness of personality dimensions by performing regressions, many of the correlations were no longer significant. Women who scored higher on Surgency or whose partners scored lower on Agreeableness or Emotional Stability reported that their partners performed more cost-inflicting mate retention behaviors. Women whose partners scored higher on Agreeableness or lower on Emotional Stability reported that their partners performed more benefit-provisioning behaviors.

7. Study 2: Discussion

Women who rate their partner lower on Agreeableness report that their partner performs more cost-inflicting mate retention behaviors and fewer benefit-provisioning mate retention behaviors than men rated by their partner as higher on Agreeableness. Buss (1991) documented that women whose husbands are low on Agreeableness complain that their partner is condescending, inconsiderate, and insulting of the woman's appearance. Thus, men who score lower on Agreeableness may be more likely to perform cost-inflicting mate retention behaviors, such as publicly derogating their partner. Men who score higher on Agreeableness, and are therefore more considerate and likely to complement their partners (Buss, 1991), are more likely to perform benefit-provisioning behaviors, such as giving into their partner's wishes.

In addition, women who rate their partner lower on Emotional Stability report that their partner performs cost-inflicting mate retention behaviors more frequently than is reported by women who rate their partner higher on Emotional Stability. Men who are more anxious and emotionally unstable may be more likely to harbor suspicions of their partner's infidelity (Buss, 1991) and, therefore, perform cost-inflicting mate retention behaviors more frequently than men who are less emotionally unstable.

Women who score higher on Surgency also report that their partner performs cost-inflicting mate retention behaviors more frequently than do women who score lower on Surgency. Women who score higher on Surgency are more talkative and sociable than women who score lower on Surgency (Botwin et al., 1997). These women may be more likely to engage socially with men other than their partner and, therefore, may be more likely to perform behaviors that elicit their partner's jealousy than women who are shy and quiet.

Table 6

Study 2: Multiple regressions using women's reports of their own and their partner's personality to predict women's reports of their partner's mate retention behaviors.

Men's mate retention	Men's personality (Women's personality)					F	(df_b, df_w)	R^2
	S	A	C	ES	O			
Cost-inflicting	.04 (.17)	-.16* (-.07)	-.10 (.02)	-.25** (.02)	-.10 (-.02)	10.06**	(10, 417)	.20
Direct Guarding	-.02 (.20**)	-.17* (-.06)	-.10 (.01)	-.23** (.04)	-.05 (-.06)	8.91**	(10, 417)	.18
Intersexual Negative Inducements	.03 (.17)	-.13 (-.08)	-.12 (.04)	-.28** (-.02)	-.07 (-.01)	10.52**	(10, 421)	.20
Intrasexual Negative Inducements	.11 (.09)	-.15* (-.04)	-.04 (.00)	-.17* (.02)	-.14 (.02)	5.25**	(10, 418)	.11
Benefit-provisioning	.06 (.12)	.22** (-.08)	-.04 (.05)	-.19** (.05)	-.08 (.05)	4.08**	(10, 418)	.09
Positive Inducements	.04 (.12)	.23** (-.09)	.01 (.03)	-.19** (.03)	-.09 (.04)	3.91**	(10, 418)	.09
Public Signals of Possession	.08 (.11)	.19* (-.06)	-.08 (.05)	-.17* (.06)	-.06 (.06)	3.52**	(10, 418)	.08

S = Surgency, A = Agreeableness, C = Conscientiousness, ES = Emotional Stability, and O = Openness.

* $p < .01$.

*** $p < .001$.

Based on the results from both studies, women may be more sensitive to men's cost-inflicting mate retention behaviors than are the men who inflict them. Because men's cost-inflicting behaviors may lead to more serious forms of violence (see Goetz, Shackelford, Schipper, & Stewart-Williams, 2006), women may pay more attention to signals of future cost-inflicting behaviors, such as their partner's personality. Thus, the results based on women's reports of their personality and their partner's personality may more accurately reflect the relationship between men's personality and men's mate retention behaviors, especially men's cost-inflicting mate retention behaviors.

8. General discussion

This research is the first to secure men's and women's reports about their personality and their partner's personality to address variation in men's mate retention behaviors as a function of men's and their partner's standings on major dimensions of personality. It also provides a replication of findings from de Miguel and Buss (2011). We focus here on the results of the regressions, which account for the within-sex and across-sex interrelatedness of personality dimensions.

We first hypothesized that men's and women's Emotional Stability would be negatively related to both men's cost-inflicting mate retention and men's benefit-provisioning mate retention. This hypothesis received mixed support. Emotional Stability was negatively correlated with cost-inflicting mate retention behaviors and with benefit-provisioning mate retention behaviors from both men's reports of their own Emotional Stability and women's perceptions of their partner's Emotional Stability. These results suggest that a man's Emotional Stability is linked with their use of mate retention behaviors of both types. Women's reports of their own Emotional Stability and men's perceptions of their partner's Emotional Stability were not related to mate retention of either type.

We next hypothesized that men and women's Conscientiousness would be negatively related to men's cost-inflicting mate retention and positively correlated with men's benefit-provisioning mate retention. This hypothesis received mixed support. There was no relationship between Conscientiousness and men's mate retention, based on men's and women's reports on men's personality. However, men's reports of their partner's Conscientiousness were positively related to benefit-provisioning mate retention.

Finally, we hypothesized that men and women's Agreeableness would be negatively related to men's cost-inflicting mate retention behaviors and positively correlated with men's benefit-provisioning mate retention. This hypothesis also received mixed support. It was supported by women's perceptions of their partner's Agreeableness (but not their own Agreeableness) being negatively correlated to men's cost-inflicting and benefit provisioning mate retention. There was no support for this hypothesis with respect to men's self-reported Agreeableness or perceptions of their partner's Agreeableness.

There are some differences in the results of the two studies. For example, men's use of cost-inflicting and benefit-provisioning mate retention behaviors is predicted by women's reports of their partner's Agreeableness but not by men's reports of their own Agreeableness. We did not generate specific hypotheses about differences between men's and women's reports, nor about differences in reports based on self-reports or partner-reports of

personality. Nonetheless, these findings suggest that men and women differ in their perceptions of their own and their partner's personality, and that these perceptions may differentially impact the performance of men's mate retention behaviors.

We secured self-reports and partner-reports. However, we did not collect data from both members of couples. Therefore, we are unable to provide cross-partner validation of the performance of mate retention behaviors or reports of personality. In addition, important personality dynamics may result from the interaction between partners' personalities and perceptions of each others' personalities. Future research might test these hypotheses in couples from whom such data is obtained. We did not assess relationship variables such as relationship satisfaction and commitment, which might moderate or otherwise affect the results. In addition, little demographic data was collected from either of the current samples. Therefore, it is difficult to assess the generalizability of these findings. Future research might collect additional and more varied demographic information.

In conclusion, the current research is the first to investigate the relationships between men's and women's self-reports and partner-reports of personality and men's mate retention behaviors. The results suggest that men and women's standings on five major dimensions of personality are related to men's mate retention behaviors.

References

- Botwin, M. D., Buss, D. M., & Shackelford, T. K. (1997). Personality and mate preferences: Five factors in mate selection and marital satisfaction. *Journal of Personality*, 65, 107–136.
- Buss, D. M. (1988). From vigilance to violence: Tactics of mate retention in American undergraduates. *Ethology and Sociobiology*, 9, 291–317.
- 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. (1997a). 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. (1997b). Susceptibility to infidelity in the first year of marriage. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 31, 193–221.
- de Miguel, A., & Buss, D. M. (2011). Mate retention tactics in Spain: Personality, sex differences and relationship status. *Journal of Personality*, 79, 563–586.
- Goetz, A. T., Shackelford, T. K., Schipper, L. D., & Stewart-Williams, S. (2006). Adding insult to injury: Development and initial validation of the Partner-Directed Insults Scale. *Violence and Victims*, 21, 691–706.
- Goetz, A. T., Shackelford, T. K., Weekes-Shackelford, V. A., Euler, H. A., Hoier, S., Schmitt, D. P., et al. (2005). Mate retention, semen displacement, and human sperm competition: A preliminary investigation of tactics to prevent and correct female infidelity. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 38, 749–763.
- 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.
- Kaighobadi, F., Starratt, V. G., Shackelford, T. K., & Popp, D. (2008). Male mate retention mediates the relationship between female sexual infidelity and female-directed violence. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 44, 1422–1431.
- McKibbin, W. F., Goetz, A. T., Shackelford, T. K., Schipper, L. D., Starratt, V. G., & Stewart-Williams, S. (2007). Why do men insult their intimate partners? *Personality and Individual Differences*, 43, 231–241.
- 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.
- Shackelford, T. K., Goetz, A. T., & Buss, D. M. (2005a). Mate retention in marriage: Further evidence of the reliability of the Mate Retention Inventory. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 39, 415–425.
- Shackelford, T. K., Goetz, A. T., Buss, D. M., Euler, H. A., & Hoier, S. (2005b). When we hurt the ones we love: Predicting violence against women from men's mate retention tactics. *Personal Relationships*, 12, 447–463.
- Starratt, V. G., Shackelford, T. K., Goetz, A. T., & McKibbin, W. F. (2007). Male mate retention behaviors vary with risk of female infidelity and sperm competition. *Acta Psychologica Sinica*, 39, 523–527.