<u>**Supplementary Materials**</u>

Prior Studies That Have Used These Data

Portions of the longitudinal studies described in this manuscript have been used in other published reports (e.g., French, Meltzer, & Maner, 2017; Hicks, McNulty, Meltzer, & Olson, 2016; Maner, Dittman, Meltzer, & McNulty, 2017; McNulty & Russell, 2016; Meltzer, 2017; Meltzer, Makhanova, Hicks, French, McNulty, & Bradbury, 2017; Meltzer & McNulty, 2016; Meltzer, McNulty, & Maner, 2017; Meltzer, McNulty, Miller, & Baker, 2015; Overall, Hammond, McNulty, & Finkel, 2016; Reynolds & Meltzer, 2017; Russell, McNulty, Baker, & Meltzer, 2014). It is worth noting, however, none of those articles reported the associations described in this manuscript—own and partner personality traits and the likelihood of engaging in infidelity.

Sample Characteristics

Participants in Study 1 were 216 members of 108 couples participating in a broader longitudinal study of 113 heterosexual couples in North Texas [we excluded participants who failed to complete the personality measures ($n = 5$) and participants who lacked partner information ($n = 5$)]. Participants in Study 2 were 238 members of 119 couples participating in a broader longitudinal study of 120 couples ($n = 119$ heterosexual, $n = 1$ lesbian) in North Florida [we excluded participants who failed to complete the personality measures ($n = 1$) and participants who lacked partner information ($n = 1$)]. In each study, data collection was initially planned for 12 months but was extended one additional month to increase sample size.

On average, husbands and wives at baseline were 30.33 ($SD = 8.29$) and 28.61 ($SD = 6.88$) years of age, respectively, and had completed 15.59 ($SD = 2.65$) and 16.10 ($SD = 2.66$) years of education, respectively. Seventy-one percent of husbands and 58% of wives were

employed full time; 17% of husbands and wives were full-time students. Husbands' and wives' reported mean income was \$38,992 (*SD* = \$36,837, *Mdn* = \$33,000) and \$33,442 (*SD* = \$43,799, *Mdn* = \$27,000) per year, respectively. The samples were relatively diverse; 63% of husbands and wives self-identified as Caucasian, 21% of husbands and 19% of wives self-identified as African American, 8% of husbands and 9% of wives self-identified as Latino/a, 2% of husbands and 3% of wives self-identified as Asian, and 5% of husbands and wives self-identified as another race/ethnicity (one husband and wife did not provide their race/ethnicity). Couples had been together an average of 41.55 (*SD* = 32.63) months prior to marriage and 25% of the spouses had children.

Sample Recruitment Strategies

We recruited participants in both studies via letters sent to couples who had recently applied for marriage licenses in the counties where each study took place. In Study 1, a large number of couples registered for marriage licenses each month, so we sent letters to 700 randomly selected couples. In Study 2, we were only able to receive names (not addresses) through the County Clerk, so we sent letters only to those couples for whom we could find local addresses online. Due to this constraint, we additionally recruited couples for Study 2 using fliers and Facebook advertising. Of the 82 couples for whom recruitment data were available, 40% were recruited via letters, 45% via Facebook advertising, 12% via fliers, and 23% via word of mouth. These percentages do not sum to 100% because these categories are not mutually exclusive (i.e., some couples learned about the study in multiple ways).

Do Previous Findings Replicate When Employing Data-Analytic Strategies Similar to Prior Research?

It is notable that most of the associations between own personality and infidelity

demonstrated in previous research did not emerge in the current study. To examine whether this was the result of our data-analytic strategy, we conducted three additional sets of supplemental analyses. The first set of analyses examined the individual correlations between each personality trait (own and partner) and infidelity—similar to the correlational analyses employed in prior research (Buss & Shackelford, 1997; Schmitt & Buss, 2001; Schmitt, 2004; Schmitt & Shackelford, 2008). Specifically, we estimated a series of 2-level models that regressed concurrent and prospective infidelity onto a single personality trait (standardized and entered uncentered) at a time. We repeated this model for each personality trait (12 traits in total). In all analyses, we controlled for a dummy code of study at the level-2 intercept, allowed the level-2 intercept to vary randomly across couples, and specified a Bernoulli sampling distribution due to the dichotomous nature of infidelity. We estimated each model three times: once allowing the predictor to interact with a dummy variable with husbands coded 0 to obtain husbands' simple effect, once allowing the predictor to interact with a dummy variable with wives coded 0 to obtain wives' simple effect, and once collapsing across husbands and wives for the effect not moderated by participant sex.

The second and third sets of analyses examined the associations between (a) own personality traits and infidelity and (b) partner personality traits and infidelity, respectively. Both sets of analyses employed a similar data-analytic strategy that we used in the full manuscript. Specifically, we estimated a series of 2-level models that regressed concurrent and prospective infidelity onto participants' own Big Five personality traits and narcissism (standardized and entered uncentered) simultaneously at Level 1 in the second set of analyses or partners' Big Five personality traits and narcissism (standardized and entered uncentered) simultaneously at Level 1 in the third set of analyses. In all analyses, we controlled for a dummy code of study at the level-

2 intercept. In each model, we allowed the level-2 intercept to vary randomly across couples and again specified a Bernoulli sampling distribution. We estimated this model three times: once allowing each predictor to interact with a dummy variable with husbands coded 0 to obtain husbands' simple effects, once allowing each predictor to interact with a dummy variable with wives coded 0 to obtain wives' simple effects, and once collapsing across husbands and wives for effects not moderated by participant sex. Lastly, given that we are not aware of any prior research that has examined the associations between infidelity and the Big Five personality traits and narcissism simultaneously, we further examined whether the inclusion of narcissism affected the extent to which previous findings replicated by repeating the second and third sets of analyses but excluding narcissism at Level 1.

Individual correlations between both couple members' personality traits and infidelity. The results from the first set of analyses examining the individual correlations between each couple members' personality trait and infidelity are presented in Table 1. As can be seen, the associations between extraversion and infidelity and neuroticism and infidelity differed across spouses' sex. Wives high (versus low) in extraversion and wives low (versus high) in neuroticism were more likely to engage in infidelity during the first three years of marriage, although the effect of neuroticism only reached marginal significance; husbands' extraversion and neuroticism were unassociated with infidelity. Collapsing across participant sex, spouses low (versus high) in agreeableness and spouses high (versus low) in narcissism were more likely to engage in infidelity, although the effect of narcissism only reached marginal significance. Spouses with partners high (versus low) in neuroticism were more likely to engage in infidelity.

Associations between own personality traits, entered simultaneously, and infidelity.

The results from the second set of analyses examining the associations between own personality traits and infidelity are presented in Table 2. As can be seen, the association between extraversion and infidelity differed across spouses' sex, such that wives high (versus low) in extraversion were more likely to engage in infidelity during the first three years of marriage; husbands' extraversion was unassociated with infidelity. When we excluded narcissism from this model, this association remained significant.

Associations between partner personality traits, entered simultaneously, and infidelity. The results from the third set of analyses examining the associations between partner personality and infidelity are presented in Table 3. As can be seen, the association between partner conscientiousness and infidelity differed across spouses' sex, such that wives married to more (versus less) conscientious partners were more likely to engage in infidelity during the first three years of marriage; partner conscientiousness was unassociated with husbands' infidelity. When we excluded narcissism from this model, the association between partner conscientiousness and infidelity no longer differed across spouses' sex. Collapsing across participant sex, spouses married to partners high (versus low) in neuroticism were more likely to engage in infidelity during the first three years of marriage. Additionally, when we excluded partner narcissism from this model, spouses married to partners high (versus low) in extraversion were more likely to engage in infidelity during the first three years of marriage.

Discussion. Ultimately, by emulating the correlational analyses employed in previous research (that is, by examining the associations between each personality trait and infidelity individually), we were able to replicate many previously reported findings. Notably, consistent with prior research, we found a negative association between agreeableness and infidelity and a positive association between narcissism and infidelity (Atkins, Yi, Baucom, & Christensen,

2005; Barta & Kiene, 2005; Buss & Shackelford, 1997; Campbell, Foster, & Finkel, 2002; Hunyady, Josephs, & Jost, 2008; Orzeck & Lung, 2005; Schmitt, 2004; Schmitt & Buss, 2001). These sets of supplemental analyses suggest that our decision to examine the associations between both couple members' personality traits and infidelity simultaneously may, in part, explain our inability to replicate previously reported findings. In contrast to prior studies, however, the current study demonstrates the unique influence of each partners' personality trait on infidelity.

Does a Similar Pattern of Effects Emerge When Analyzing Studies 1 and 2 Separately?

To examine whether Studies 1 and 2 produce a similar pattern of effects (compared to the combined analyses), we conducted two sets of supplemental analyses. The first set of analyses examined the associations between own and partner personality and infidelity using participants from Study 1 only. The second set of analyses examined the associations between own and partner personality and infidelity using participants from Study 2 only. Both sets of analyses employed a similar data-analytic strategy that we used in the full manuscript. Specifically, we estimated a series of 2-level models that regressed concurrent and prospective infidelity onto participants' own Big Five personality traits and narcissism (standardized and entered uncentered) and their partners' Big Five personality traits and narcissism (standardized and entered uncentered) simultaneously (12 traits in total) at Level 1. In each model, we allowed the level-2 intercept to vary randomly across couples and specified a Bernoulli sampling distribution due to the dichotomous nature of infidelity. We estimated each model three times: once allowing each predictor to interact with a dummy variable with husbands coded 0 to obtain husbands' simple effects, once allowing each predictor to interact with a dummy variable with wives coded 0 to obtain wives' simple effects, and once collapsing across husbands and wives for effects not

moderated by participant sex. To isolate the effects of each study while maximizing power, we additionally regressed all level-2 estimates onto a dummy code of study, coded such that 0 represents the study of interest.

Associations between personality traits and infidelity in Study 1. The results from the set of analyses examining the associations between both couple members' personality traits and infidelity in Study 1 are presented in Table 4. As can be seen, the associations between infidelity and all own Big Five personality traits differed across spouses' sex. Wives high (versus low) in extraversion, openness, or neuroticism and wives low (versus high) in agreeableness or conscientiousness were more likely to engage in infidelity during the first three years of marriage; husbands' Big Five personality traits were not significantly associated with their infidelity. Additionally, the associations between infidelity and partner extraversion, agreeableness, conscientiousness, and narcissism differed across spouses' sex. Wives with spouses high (versus low) in extraversion, agreeableness, or conscientiousness, or wives with spouses low (versus high) in narcissism were more likely to engage in infidelity during the first three years of marriage; partner extraversion, agreeableness, conscientiousness, and narcissism were not significantly associated with husbands' infidelity. Collapsing across spouses' sex, own and partner personality traits were unassociated with their infidelity.

Many of the effects that emerged in Study 1 differed from those that emerged in the set of analyses that collapsed across Studies 1 and 2. We believe this is due in part to the fact that only four wives in Study 1 engaged in infidelity. Indeed, all associations that emerged in Study 1 involved wives' infidelity, suggesting that at least one wife with extreme personality traits who engaged in infidelity may have inaccurately driven the effects (that is, they may reflect a Type I

error). For this reason, we believe that the results from the analyses that collapsed across both studies is more trustworthy (due to its higher power).

Associations between personality traits and infidelity in Study 2. The results from the set of analyses examining the associations between both couple members' personality traits and infidelity in Study 2 are presented in Table 5. As can be seen, no associations between own and partner personality and infidelity significantly differed across spouses' sex. Collapsing across spouses' sex, intimates high (versus low) in narcissism were marginally more likely to engage in infidelity during the first three years of marriage. Moreover, intimates married to partners high (versus low) in neuroticism were more likely to engage in infidelity during the first three years of marriage.

Does a Similar Pattern of Effects Emerge When Analyzing Self- and Partner-Reported Infidelity Separately?

To examine whether analyses predicting only self-reported infidelity and analyses predicting only partner-reported infidelity produce a similar pattern of effects (compared to analyses that collapse across self- and partner-reported infidelity), we conducted two additional sets of supplemental analyses. The first set of analyses examined the associations between both couple members' personality traits and self-reported infidelity. To do this, we excluded cases of non-self-reported infidelity (i.e., partner-reported infidelities that were not corroborated by the participant; $n = 15$). The second set of analyses examined the associations between both couple members' personality traits and partner-reported infidelity. To do this, we excluded cases of non-partner-reported infidelity (i.e., self-reported infidelities that were not corroborated by the partner; $n = 11$). Both sets of analyses employed a similar data-analytic strategy that we used in the full manuscript. Specifically, we estimated a series of 2-level models that regressed

concurrent and prospective infidelity onto participants' own Big Five personality traits and narcissism (standardized and entered uncentered) and their partners' Big Five personality traits and narcissism (standardized and entered uncentered) simultaneously (12 traits in total) at Level 1, controlling for a dummy code of study at the level-2 intercept. In each model, we allowed the level-2 intercept to vary randomly across couples and specified a Bernoulli sampling distribution due to the dichotomous nature of infidelity. We estimated this model three times: once allowing each predictor to interact with a dummy variable with husbands coded 0 to obtain husbands' simple effects, once allowing each predictor to interact with a dummy variable with wives coded 0 to obtain wives' simple effects, and once collapsing across husbands and wives for effects not moderated by participant sex.

Associations between personality traits and self-reported infidelity. The results from the sets of analyses examining the associations between both couple members' personality and self-reported infidelity are presented in Table 6. As can be seen, the associations between self-reported infidelity and own extraversion, own agreeableness, and own neuroticism differed across spouses' sex. Wives high (versus low) in extraversion and wives low (versus high) in agreeableness or neuroticism were more likely to engage in infidelity during the first three years of marriage; husbands' extraversion, agreeableness, and neuroticism were not significantly associated with self-reported infidelity. Collapsing across spouses' sex, intimates low (versus high) in conscientiousness and intimates high (versus low) in openness were more likely to engage in infidelity during the first three years of marriage. Additionally, intimates married to partners high (versus low) in conscientiousness or neuroticism were more likely to engage in infidelity during the first three years of marriage.

Associations between personality traits and partner-reported infidelity. The results

from the sets of analyses examining the associations between both couple members' personality and partner-reported infidelity are presented in Table 7. As can be seen, the association between partner conscientiousness and partner-reported infidelity differed across spouses' sex. Wives married to partners high (versus low) in conscientiousness were marginally more likely to engage in infidelity during the first three years of marriage; partner conscientiousness was not significantly associated with husbands' partner-reported infidelity. Collapsing across spouses' sex, intimates married to partners high (versus low) in neuroticism were more likely to engage in infidelity during the first three years of marriage.

  Discussion. The results of these two sets of analyses help us to rule out the possibilities that the associations between partner personality and the likelihood of engaging in infidelity during the first three years of marriage emerged due to highly neurotic or narcissistic partners (falsely) assuming their partners had engaged in infidelity. Indeed, the same partner personality traits were associated with both self-reported and partner-reported infidelity (although the association between partner conscientiousness and partner-reported infidelity differed between husbands and wives). We believe that these supplemental analyses bolster our decision to include both self-reported and partner-reported infidelity in our measure of infidelity.

Do Base Rates of Self-Reported Infidelities and Partner-Reported Infidelities Differ Between Men and Women?

  To examine whether men (versus women) are more likely to self-report infidelity, we regressed self-reported infidelity (dummy coded such that 0 = no infidelity and 1 = self-reported infidelity) onto gender (dummy coded such that 0 = husbands and 1 = wives) in Level 1 of a 2-level model and specified a Bernoulli sampling distribution. According to that analysis, although husbands were not significantly more likely to self-report infidelity than were wives, $\beta = -0.37$,

$t(231) = -1.41$, *ns*, the null effect emerged in the predicted direction. To examine whether women (compared to men) are more likely to partner-report infidelity, we regressed partner-reported infidelity (dummy coded such that 0 = no infidelity and 1 = partner-reported infidelity) onto gender (dummy coded such that 0 = husbands and 1 = wives) in Level 1 of a 2-level model and again specified a Bernoulli sampling distribution. According to that analysis, consistent with the gendered base rates of infidelity, men were more likely to have a partner-reported infidelity, $\beta = -0.82$, $t(231) = -3.32$, $p < .001$. In other words, wives (compared to husbands) were more likely to report that their partners had engaged in infidelity.

References

Atkins, D. C., Yi, J., Baucom, D. H., & Christensen, A. (2005). Infidelity in couples seeking marital therapy. *Journal of Family Psychology*, *19*, 470-473.

Barta, W. D., & Kiene, S. M. (2005). Motivations for infidelity in heterosexual dating couples: The roles of gender, personality differences, and sociosexual orientation. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, *22*, 339-360.

Buss, D. M., & Shackelford, T. K. (1997). Susceptibility to infidelity in the first year of marriage. *Journal of Research in Personality*, *31*, 193-221.

Campbell, W. K., Foster, C. A., & Finkel, E. J. (2002). Does self-love lead to love for others?: A story of narcissistic game playing. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *83*, 340-354.

French, J. E., Meltzer, A. L., & Maner, J. K. (2017). Perceived partner commitment and male mate guarding: The moderating role of partner's hormonal contraceptive use. *Evolutionary Behavioral Sciences, 11*, 173-186.

Hicks, L. L., McNulty, J. K., Meltzer, A. L., & Olson, M. A. (2016). Capturing the interpersonal implications of evolved preferences? Sex shapes implicit, but not explicit, partner evaluations. *Psychological Science, 27*, 836-847.

Hunyady, O., Josephs, L., & Jost, J. T. (2008). Priming the primal scene: Betrayal trauma, narcissism, and attitudes toward sexual infidelity. *Self and Identity*, *7*, 278-294.

Maner, J. K., Dittman, A., Meltzer, A. L., & McNulty, J. K. (2017). Life history strategies and dysregulated weight management: Implications for obesity. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*. OnlineFirst.

McNulty, J. K., & Russell V. M. (2016). Forgive and forget, or forgive and regret? Whether
  forgiveness leads to more or less offending depends on offender
  agreeableness. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 42*, 616-631.

Meltzer, A. L. (2017). Wives report higher satisfaction with masculine husbands near peak
  fertility. *Evolutionary Behavioral Sciences, 11*, 161-172.

Meltzer, A. L., Makhanova, S., Hicks, L. L., French, J. E., McNulty, J. K., & Bradbury, T. N.
  (2017). Quantifying the sexual afterglow: The lingering benefits of sex and their
  implications for pair-bonded relationships. *Psychological Science, 29*, 587-598.

Meltzer, A. L., & McNulty, J. K. (2016). Who is having more and better sex? The big five as
  predictors of daily sex during marriage. *Journal of Research in Personality, 62*, 62-66.

Meltzer, A. L., & McNulty, J. K. & Maner, J. K. (2017). Women like being valued for sex, as
  long as it is by a committed partner. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, *46*, 475-488.

Meltzer, A. L., McNulty, J. K., Miller, S. L., & Baker, L. R. (2015). A psychophysiological
  mechanism underlying women's weight goals: Women desire and strive for greater
  weight loss near peak fertility. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 41*, 930-942.

Orzeck, T., & Lung, E. (2005). Big-Five personality differences of cheaters and non-cheaters.
  Current Psychology, *24*, 274-286.

Overall, N. C., Hammond, M. T., McNulty, J. K., & Finkel, E. J. (2016). When power shapes
  interpersonal behavior: Low relationship power predicts men's aggressive responses to
  low situational power. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *111*, 195-217.

Reynolds, T., & Meltzer, A. L. (2017). Adopting a dyadic perspective to better understand the
  association between physical attractiveness and dieting motivations and behaviors. *Body
  Image, 22*, 48-52.

Russell, V. M., McNulty, J. K., Baker, L. R., & Meltzer, A. L. (2014). The association between

    discontinuing hormonal contraceptives and wives' marital satisfaction depends on

    husbands' facial attractiveness. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*,

    111, 17081-17086.

Schmitt, D. P. (2004). The Big Five related to risky sexual behaviour across 10 world regions:

    Differential personality associations of sexual promiscuity and relationship infidelity.

    European Journal of Personality, *18*, 301-319.

Schmitt, D. P., & Buss, D. M. (2001). Human mate poaching: Tactics and temptations for

    infiltrating existing mateships. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *80*, 894-

    917.

Schmitt, D. P., & Shackelford, T. K. (2008). Big Five traits related to short-term mating: From

    personality to promiscuity across 46 nations. *Evolutionary Psychology*, *6*, 246-282.

Table 1

Individual Associations Between Each Personality Trait and Infidelity, Controlling for Study

	Husbands' Infidelity			Wives' Infidelity			Sex Difference	Infidelity		
	b	*SE*	*r*	*b*	*SE*	*r*	*p*	*b*	*SE*	*r*
Own Extraversion	-0.23	0.16	.10	0.80***	0.20	.26	<.001***	--	--	--
Own Agreeableness	-0.27	0.20	.09	-0.22	0.26	.06	.874	-0.32*	0.14	.15
Own Conscientiousness	-0.19	0.18	.07	-0.02	0.20	.01	.518	-0.18	0.14	.08
Own Openness	0.01	0.16	.01	0.31*	0.15	.13	.185	0.11	0.11	.07
Own Neuroticism	0.22	0.16	.09	-0.25†	0.14	.12	.028*	--	--	--
Own Narcissism	0.04	0.15	.02	0.57*	0.24	.16	.071†	0.26†	0.13	.13
Partner Extraversion	0.23	0.19	.08	0.10	0.18	.04	.600	0.19	0.14	.09
Partner Agreeableness	-0.02	0.18	.01	0.14	0.31	.03	.656	0.13	0.14	.06
Partner Conscientiousness	-0.02	0.21	.01	0.44†	0.25	.11	.168	0.20	0.17	.08
Partner Openness	-0.16	0.16	.06	0.15	0.15	.07	.152	-0.05	0.12	.02
Partner Neuroticism	0.43*	0.17	.17	0.42†	0.25	.11	.984	0.48***	0.13	.24
Partner Narcissism	0.38*	0.17	.15	0.02	0.28	.00	.278	0.19	0.14	.09

Note. In the models examining simple effects for husbands and wives *df* = 224, and in the models examining main effects, collapsed across sex, *df* = 213. Sex differences represent tests of Variable × Sex interactions. Effect-size *r* is reported.
†*p* < .10. **p* < .05. ***p* < .01. ****p* < .001.

Table 2

Associations Between Own Personality Traits and Infidelity, Controlling for Study

	Husbands' Infidelity			Wives' Infidelity			Sex Difference	Infidelity		
	b	SE	r	b	SE	r	p	b	SE	r
With Narcissism										
Intercept	-2.26***	0.21	--	-3.06***	0.24	--	.007**	-2.73***	0.18	--
Study	0.66	0.42	.11	0.44	0.50	.06	.707	0.62	0.36	.11
Own Extraversion	-0.25	0.28	.06	0.68*	0.27	.17	.016*	--	--	--
Own Agreeableness	-0.15	0.21	.05	-0.36	0.38	.06	.620	-0.21	0.19	.08
Own Conscientiousness	-0.10	0.20	.03	-0.15	0.24	.04	.856	-0.14	0.16	.06
Own Openness	0.11	0.16	.05	0.24	0.28	.06	.687	0.14	0.14	.07
Own Neuroticism	0.10	0.18	.04	-0.26	0.20	.09	.165	-0.03	0.14	.01
Own Narcissism	0.16	0.20	.05	0.31	0.32	.07	.687	0.21	0.17	.09
Without Narcissism										
Intercept	-2.25***	0.21	--	-3.05***	0.23	--	.005**	-2.72***	0.17	--
Study	0.60	0.38	.11	0.34	0.43	.05	.614	0.54	0.32	.11
Own Extraversion	-0.16	0.23	.05	0.83***	0.23	.24	.002**	--	--	--
Own Agreeableness	-0.21	0.20	.07	-0.53	0.36	.10	.426	-0.30	0.18	.11
Own Conscientiousness	-0.06	0.19	.02	-0.10	0.25	.03	.903	-0.10	0.16	.04
Own Openness	0.11	0.16	.05	0.25	0.27	.06	.667	0.14	0.14	.07
Own Neuroticism	0.09	0.18	.04	-0.25	0.20	.09	.181	-0.04	0.14	.02

Note. Across both models, for Intercept and Study estimates, $df = 225$; with narcissism, for all other variables, $df = 213$ in the models examining simple effects for husbands and wives, and $df = 219$ in the model that collapses across sex; without narcissism, for all other variables, $df = 215$ in the models examining simple effects for husbands and wives, and $df = 220$ in the model that collapses across sex. Sex differences represent tests of Variable × Sex interactions. Effect-size r is reported.
†$p < .10$. *$p < .05$. **$p < .01$. ***$p < .001$.

Table 3

Associations Between Partner Personality Traits and Infidelity, Controlling for Study

	Husbands' Infidelity			Wives' Infidelity			Sex Difference	Infidelity		
	b	*SE*	*r*	*b*	*SE*	*r*	*p*	*b*	*SE*	*r*
With Narcissism										
Intercept	-2.52***	0.22	--	-2.84***	0.25	--	.326	-2.67***	0.16	--
Study	0.75	0.47	.11	0.76†	0.44	.11	.978	0.67†	0.34	.13
Partner Extraversion	0.30	0.22	.09	0.27	0.17	.11	.912	0.25	0.16	.10
Partner Agreeableness	0.22	0.22	.07	0.00	0.32	.00	.574	0.11	0.18	.04
Partner Conscientiousness	-0.01	0.24	.00	0.70**	0.24	.19	.038*	--	--	.02
Partner Openness	-0.32†	0.17	.13	0.10	0.21	.03	.124	-0.15	0.14	.07
Partner Neuroticism	0.55**	0.18	.21	0.79**	0.27	.20	.471	0.63***	0.15	.27
Partner Narcissism	0.40†	0.21	.13	-0.08	0.25	.02	.145	0.20	0.17	.08
Without Narcissism										
Intercept	-2.47***	0.21	--	-2.84***	0.25	--	.250	-2.51***	0.21	--
Study	0.50	0.41	.08	0.81†	0.43	.12	.580	0.52	0.31	.11
Partner Extraversion	0.45*	0.18	.17	0.21	0.23	.06	.387	0.35*	0.14	.17
Partner Agreeableness	0.04	0.20	.01	0.04	0.36	.01	.999	0.01	0.18	.01
Partner Conscientiousness	0.07	0.24	.02	0.67**	0.24	.19	.069†	0.28	0.19	.10
Partner Openness	-0.30†	0.16	.12	0.10	0.21	.03	.138	-0.14	0.13	.07
Partner Neuroticism	0.54**	0.17	.21	0.79**	0.27	.19	.455	0.61***	0.15	.27

Note. Across both models, for Intercept and Study estimates, $df = 225$; with narcissism, for all other variables, $df = 213$ in the models examining simple effects for husbands and wives, and $df = 219$ in the model that collapses across sex; without narcissism, for all other variables, $df = 215$ in the models examining simple effects for husbands and wives, and $df = 221$ in the model that collapses across sex. Sex differences represent tests of Variable × Sex interactions. Effect-size *r* is reported.
†$p < .10$. *$p < .05$. **$p < .01$. ***$p < .001$.

Table 4

Associations Between Personality Traits and Infidelity in Study 1

	Husbands' Infidelity			Wives' Infidelity			Sex Difference	Infidelity		
	b	*SE*	*r*	*b*	*SE*	*r*	*p*	*b*	*SE*	*r*
Intercept	-2.84***	0.24	--	-9.03***	2.09	--	.297	-5.02***	0.45	--
Own Extraversion	-0.50[†]	0.29	.13	3.51**	1.19	.22	.003**	--	--	--
Own Agreeableness	0.16	0.25	.05	-2.61*	1.05	.18	.010*	--	--	--
Own Conscientiousness	0.26	0.25	.08	-2.11**	0.74	.21	.007**	--	--	--
Own Openness	-0.05	0.25	.01	3.20**	1.01	.23	.005**	--	--	--
Own Neuroticism	-0.02	0.19	.01	1.69*	0.72	.17	.034*	--	--	--
Own Narcissism	-0.67**	0.24	.21	-2.62	1.40	.14	.198	-0.05	0.28	.25
Partner Extraversion	0.30	0.29	.08	2.13***	0.57	.27	.005**	--	--	--
Partner Agreeableness	0.24	0.29	.06	4.24***	0.93	.32	<.001***	--	--	--
Partner Conscientiousness	-0.13	0.39	.02	1.57**	0.49	.23	.011*	--	--	--
Partner Openness	-0.66***	0.18	.26	-1.76*	0.84	.16	.178	-0.84	0.21	.28
Partner Neuroticism	-0.02	0.31	.00	1.01*	0.42	.18	.067[†]	0.17	0.27	.05
Partner Narcissism	0.98**	0.37	.20	-1.76***	0.57	.31	<.001***	--	--	--

Note. For Intercept and Study estimates, *df* = 225; for all other variables, *df* = 177 in the models examining simple effects for husbands and wives, and *df* = 183 in the model that collapses across sex. Sex differences represent tests of Variable × Sex interactions. Effect-size *r* is reported.
[†]*p* < .10. **p* < .05. ***p* < .01. ****p* < .001.

Table 5

Associations Between Personality Traits and Infidelity in Study 2

	Husbands' Infidelity			Wives' Infidelity			Sex Difference	Infidelity		
	b	*SE*	*r*	*b*	*SE*	*r*	*p*	*b*	*SE*	*r*
Intercept	-2.40***	0.33	--	-3.23***	0.47	--	.107	-2.59***	0.27	--
Own Extraversion	-0.37	0.55	.05	0.49	0.54	.07	.271	-0.25	0.33	.05
Own Agreeableness	-0.34	0.34	.08	-0.75	0.61	.09	.560	-0.34	0.37	.07
Own Conscientiousness	-0.19	0.31	.05	0.28	0.35	.06	.298	-0.09	0.23	.03
Own Openness	0.40	0.28	.11	0.11	0.67	.01	.711	0.32	0.23	.10
Own Neuroticism	0.16	0.38	.03	-0.21	0.38	.04	.463	-0.04	0.26	.01
Own Narcissism	0.26	0.32	.06	0.72	0.44	.12	.429	0.41†	0.23	.13
Partner Extraversion	0.50	0.40	.09	-0.48	0.41	.09	.103	0.36	0.29	.09
Partner Agreeableness	0.37	0.32	.09	-0.63	0.46	.10	.082†	-0.09	0.31	.02
Partner Conscientiousness	-0.17	0.24	.05	0.44	0.27	.12	.076†	0.06	0.21	.02
Partner Openness	-0.37	0.29	.10	0.91†	0.54	.12	.059†	0.01	0.23	.00
Partner Neuroticism	0.84***	0.19	.31	0.58	0.35	.12	.527	0.80***	0.17	.32
Partner Narcissism	0.51†	0.29	.13	0.12	0.25	.04	.380	0.28	0.18	.11

Note. For Intercept and Study estimates, *df* = 225; for all other variables, *df* = 177 in the models examining simple effects for husbands and wives, and *df* = 201 in the model that collapses across sex. Sex differences represent tests of Variable × Sex interactions. Effect-size *r* is reported.

†*p* < .10. **p* < .05. ***p* < .01. ****p* < .001.

Table 6

Associations Between Personality Traits and Self-Reported Infidelity, Controlling for Study

	Husbands' Infidelity			Wives' Infidelity			Sex Difference	Infidelity		
	b	*SE*	*r*	*b*	*SE*	*r*	*p*	*b*	*SE*	*r*
Intercept	-3.73***	0.25	--	-4.90***	0.32	--	.003**	-3.98***	0.18	--
Study	0.52	0.47	.07	0.61	0.70	.06	.897	0.67	0.43	.10
Own Extraversion	-0.17	0.32	.04	1.34**	0.46	.20	.008**	--	--	--
Own Agreeableness	-0.23	0.23	.07	-1.79**	0.64	.19	.033*	--	--	--
Own Conscientiousness	-0.37†	0.19	.13	-0.57***	0.17	.23	.452	-0.37**	0.14	.19
Own Openness	0.54**	0.17	.22	1.26***	0.37	.23	.083†	0.66***	0.17	.06
Own Neuroticism	0.09	0.16	.04	-0.82*	0.36	.16	.025*	--	--	--
Own Narcissism	-0.23	0.23	.07	0.02	0.46	.00	.638	-0.09	0.23	.03
Partner Extraversion	0.42**	0.16	.18	0.84***	0.23	.25	.154	0.37*	0.17	.15
Partner Agreeableness	-0.05	0.21	.02	-0.67	0.53	.09	.300	-0.20	0.21	.06
Partner Conscientiousness	0.98***	0.23	.29	0.42	0.35	.08	.183	0.73***	0.20	.25
Partner Openness	-0.37†	0.20	.13	-0.25	0.29	.06	.728	-0.26	0.19	.09
Partner Neuroticism	0.46*	0.19	.17	1.26***	0.35	.24	.064†	0.79***	0.20	.27
Partner Narcissism	0.69**	0.24	.20	-0.00	0.31	.00	.103	0.34†	0.20	.11

Note. For Intercept and Study estimates, *df* = 225; for all other variables, *df* = 201 in the models examining simple effects for husbands and wives, and *df* = 210 in the model that collapses across sex. Sex differences represent tests of Variable × Sex interactions. Effect-size *r* is reported.

†*p* < .10. **p* < .05. ***p* < .01. ****p* < .001.

Table 7

Associations Between Personality Traits and Partner-Reported Infidelity, Controlling for Study

	Husbands' Infidelity			Wives' Infidelity			Sex Difference	Infidelity		
	b	SE	r	b	SE	r	p	b	SE	r
Intercept	-2.75***	0.23	--	-3.98***	0.42	--	.007**	-3.07***	0.17	--
Study	0.92*	0.44	.14	1.24*	0.56	.15	.596	0.89*	0.40	.14
Own Extraversion	-0.43	0.32	.09	0.28	0.19	.10	.051†	-0.17	0.23	.05
Own Agreeableness	-0.07	0.28	.02	0.61	0.41	.10	.194	0.08	0.21	.03
Own Conscientiousness	0.05	0.21	.02	0.32	0.25	.09	.414	0.18	0.16	.08
Own Openness	0.10	0.17	.04	-0.07	0.24	.02	.569	0.06	0.14	.03
Own Neuroticism	-0.05	0.20	.02	0.36*	0.15	.17	.082†	0.15	0.14	.07
Own Narcissism	0.09	0.23	.03	0.30	0.37	.06	.609	0.21	0.18	.05
Partner Extraversion	0.23	0.26	.07	0.33†	0.17	.13	.704	0.07	0.19	.08
Partner Agreeableness	0.29	0.26	.06	-0.08	0.36	.02	.505	-0.24	0.20	.03
Partner Conscientiousness	-0.28	0.21	.09	0.46†	0.24	.14	.022*	--	--	--
Partner Openness	-0.11	0.13	.06	0.19	0.16	.08	.166	0.01	0.11	.01
Partner Neuroticism	0.35*	0.16	.16	0.31†	0.16	.13	.851	0.31*	0.12	.17
Partner Narcissism	0.44†	0.23	.13	-0.11	0.23	.04	.090	0.23	0.18	.09

Note. For Intercept and Study estimates, $df = 225$; for all other variables, $df = 201$ in the models examining simple effects for husbands and wives, and $df = 213$ in the model that collapses across sex. Sex differences represent tests of Variable $\times$ Sex interactions. Effect-size r is reported.
†$p < .10$. *$p < .05$. **$p < .01$. ***$p < .001$.