

Specification of Random Slopes for Each Model

When conducting linear mixed-effects models, it is important to specify a random-effect structure that (a) minimizes Type I error, (b) maximizes power, and (c) is supported by the data (Barr, Levy, Scheepers, & Tily, 2013; Matuschek, Kliegl, Vasishth, Baayen, & Bates, 2017). Thus, for each of our models, we followed Matuschek et al.'s (2017) recommendations for selecting the most parsimonious model: we started with the maximal model (i.e., a model that estimates variance and covariance parameters for all time-varying fixed effects) and used a backward-selection heuristic to reduce the model complexity until we detected a significant loss in the goodness-of-fit. Given that we estimated husbands' and wives' effects separately but simultaneously, each backward step involved removing husbands' and wives' corresponding parameters (followed by testing the influence of each spouse's random parameters separately). At each step, we specified a maximum likelihood method and compared the likelihood ratio of the simpler model to the likelihood ratio of the more complex model. As Matuschek et al. (2017) argue, using an $\alpha = .05$ criterion is overly conservative and thus we used their recommended $\alpha = .20$ to determine loss in the goodness-of-fit.

When modeling intimates' trajectories of marital satisfaction, the maximal model was unable to converge and thus we removed husbands' and wives' random Time² effects. This model (i.e., a model that allowed husbands' and wives' intercept and linear time estimates to vary randomly) reached convergence. Removing husbands' and wives' random time estimates resulted in a significant loss in the goodness-of-fit, $\chi^2(7) = 57.80, p < .001$,¹ and thus we retained these random effects in our model estimating intimates' trajectories of marital satisfaction.

¹ Although we removed only two random effects from the model (i.e., husbands' and wives' linear time estimates), the model was reduced by seven parameters: the two random time effects, the four correlations between each time effect and each intercept effect, and the correlation between the time effects.

When modeling the association between actors' and partners' sociosexuality and actors' trajectories of marital satisfaction, we again began by estimating the maximal model. The most complex model that reached convergence again allowed only husbands' and wives' intercept and linear time estimates to vary randomly. Removing husbands' and wives' random time estimates again resulted in a significant loss in the goodness-of-fit, $\chi^2(7) = 63.41, p < .001$, and thus we retained these random effects in our primary model.

Systematic Robustness Analyses

In the main paper, we present what we believe are the most theoretically and statistically appropriate models. Nevertheless, we made a number of analytic decisions when selecting these models (in addition to specifying our random slopes; see above). Specifically, we opted to (a) include Time² to properly model intimates' quadratic changes in marital satisfaction over time, (b) control for study to account for idiosyncratic differences across studies, (c) control for attrition to account for idiosyncratic differences between intimates who completed more versus fewer follow-up assessments, (d) use a composite marital satisfaction index (that averaged across intimates' scores on our three marital satisfaction measures) to minimize the likelihood that results were specific to one measure, and (e) simultaneously include all covariates in supplemental analyses. To examine the extent to which each of our reported effects are robust to variations in such analytic decisions, we conducted supplemental analyses for each of our effects using numerous alternative decisions. Specifically, we examined the extent to which each effect emerged in at least 19 different variations. The results of these analyses are presented in Supplemental Table 1. As can be seen, the association between actor sociosexuality and initial marital satisfaction was robust to 100% of the analytic variants we examined; the association between partner sociosexuality and linear changes in marital satisfaction over time was robust to

84% of the analytic variants we examined; and, the association between intimates' marital satisfaction trajectories and dissolution was robust to 100% of the analytic variants we examined. As can also be seen, the exploratory moderator analyses were somewhat less robust (though there was variability across these models): the extent to which frequency of sex moderated the association between actor sociosexuality and initial marital satisfaction was robust to 71% of the analytic variants we examined; the extent to which sexual satisfaction moderated the association between partner sociosexuality and linear changes in marital satisfaction over time was robust to 84% of the analytic variants we examined; and, the extent to which stress moderated the association between actor sociosexuality and initial marital satisfaction was robust to 16% of the analytic variants we examined. It is worth noting that there are over 1,500 analytic variants that we could have tested; thus, for the sake of simplicity and brevity, we chose what seemed to us the most obvious variants.

Supplemental Table 1

P-values of Alternative Models That (a) Exclude Time², Study, Attrition, and all Theoretically Related Covariates, (b) Handle Attrition Differently, (c) Examine Each Satisfaction Measure Individually, (d) Handle Missing Scores of Frequency of Sex Differently, and (e) Include Each Covariate Individually

	Actor SOI and Initial MS	Partner SOI and Changes in MS	Changes in MS and Dissolution	FS × Actor SOI and Initial MS	SS × Partner SOI and Changes in MS	Stress × Actor SOI and Initial MS
Association Reported in Paper	<.001	.018	.003	.063	.169	.024
Excluding Time ²	<.001	.011	<.001	.057	.089 _a	.133 _a
Excluding Study	.012	.051	.002	.063	.063 _a	.112 _a
Handling Attrition Bias						
Excluding Attrition	<.001	.014	.002	.085	.068 _b	.108 _a
Natural log of Time	<.001 _c	.005 _c	<.001	.031 _d	.076 _e	.147 _a
Base-ten log of Time	<.001 _d	.006 _d	<.001	.059 _f	.127 _a	.130 _g
Satisfaction Measures						
SMD Only	.001 _d	.057 _d	<.001	.748 _h	.013 _a	.100 _a
QMI Only	.001 _d	.001 _d	.005	<.001 _d	.097 _a	.207 _a
KMS Only	.002	.169	.002	.037 _i	.643 _b	.082 _a
Covariates Included						
None	<.001	.008	<.001	.077	.235 _j	.133 _a
Time ²	<.001	.014	.001	.796 _k	.166 _j	.012
Study	<.001	.008	<.001	.077	.072 _e	.127 _a
Attrition	<.001	.011	<.001	.059	.085 _a	.134 _a
Anxious Attachment	<.001 _d	.003 _d	<.001	.061	.065 _e	.158 _a
Avoidant Attachment	.003 _d	.002 _d	<.001	.059 _f	.075 _a	.079 _a
Depression	<.001 _l	.011 _l	<.001	.260 _l	.027 _m	.013 _n
Relationship Length	<.001	.010	<.001	.079	.221 _j	.011

Children	<.001 _d	.008 _d	<.001	.025 _d	.063 _a	.202 _a
Neuroticism	<.001	.010	<.001	.092	.143 _j	.149 _b
All	.002 _l	.008 _l	.007	.157 _l	.047 _o	.103 _p
Missing FS Values						
Partner imputation	--	--	--	.195 _f	--	--
Listwise deletion	--	--	--	.164 _f	--	--
<hr/>						
<i>N</i> variants	19	19	19	21	19	19
<hr/>						
Percent <i>p</i> < .05	100%	84%	100%	19%	16%	16%
Percent robust to conclusion in paper	100%	84%	100%	71%	84%	16%

Note. MS = Marital Satisfaction. FS = Frequency of Sex. SS = Sexual Satisfaction. All references to Changes in MS (Marital Satisfaction) are linear changes over time. The *p*-values in bold are those presented in the main analyses (in the paper). For each model, we used a data-driven approach (see Matuschek et al., 2017) to determine which within-person effects should be allowed to vary randomly. Values without subscripts denote models that included the same random slopes as those presented in the main analyses [i.e., husbands' and wives' intercept and time (or variant of time) estimates]. Values with subscripts denote a different specification of random effects (but, in all models, husbands' and wives' intercept estimates varied) as follows: ^a wives' time (or variant of time) and husbands' moderator estimates varied; ^b husbands' time (or variant of time) and husbands' moderator estimates varied; ^c no additional estimates (other than husbands' and wives' intercepts) varied; ^d wives' time (or variant of time) estimates varied; ^e husbands' and wives' sexual satisfaction estimates varied; ^f wives' time (or variant of time) and wives' frequency of sex estimates varied; ^g husbands' stress estimates varied; ^h husbands' and wives' frequency of sex and wives' time estimates varied; ⁱ wives' frequency of sex estimates varied; ^j husbands' and wives' time and husbands' sexual satisfaction estimates varied; ^k husbands' and wives' frequency of sex and husbands' time estimates varied; ^l husbands' and wives' depression and wives' time estimates varied; ^m husbands' and wives' depression and wives' sexual satisfaction estimates varied; ⁿ husbands' and wives' depression estimates varied; ^o husbands' and wives' sexual satisfaction and wives' depression estimates varied; ^p husbands' stress and wives' depression estimates varied.

The Association Between Intimates' Marital Satisfaction Trajectories and Dissolution Emerged More Strongly in Study 1 Than in Study 2

The association between intimates' changes in marital satisfaction and the likelihood of marital dissolution was unexpectedly marginally moderated by study, $\beta = -0.41$, $CI_{95\%} [-0.89: 0.08]$, $t(197) = -1.69$, $p = .093$, effect-size $r = .12$, such that it was marginally stronger in Study 2, $\beta = -3.42$, $CI_{95\%} [-5.01: -1.83]$, $t(197) = -4.31$, $p < .001$, effect-size $r = .29$, than in Study 1, $\beta = -2.60$, $CI_{95\%} [-4.40: -0.80]$, $t(197) = -2.88$, $p = .004$, effect-size $r = .20$.

Analyses for Each Study Separately

Study 1. We first estimated intimates' marital satisfaction trajectories (using the mixed-model function in SPSS 23), controlling for attrition (and thus replicating the trajectory analysis presented in the main text). Direct tests confirmed that (a) both couple members' intercept and time estimates should vary randomly, (b) husbands' and wives' fixed effects did not significantly differ (all $ps \geq .205$) and thus we constrained the pooled estimates to be equal across sex, and (c) a constrained model that included a quadratic estimate fit the data no better than a constrained model that did not include this estimate, $\chi^2(1) = -2.21$, $p = .137$, and thus we removed the quadratic estimate of time. Results demonstrated that intimates on average reported relatively high levels of initial satisfaction, $\pi = 0.13$, $SE = 0.06$, that declined linearly across the first 3.5 years of marriage, $\pi = -0.12$, 95% Confidence Interval ($CI_{95\%}$) $[-0.18: -0.07]$, $t(30.22) = -4.50$, $p < .001$, effect-size $r = .63$.

To examine the extent to which each couple member's sociosexuality was associated with both trajectory components, we re-estimated our trajectory model but additionally included actor and partner sociosexuality (standardized) as well as their interactions with Time. This model would not converge with husbands' random time estimate and thus we removed it; direct

tests confirmed this model fit the data better than any alternative model. Again, no effects significantly differed across husband and wives (all $ps \geq .091$) and thus we constrained all estimates to be equal across sex. Results are presented in Supplemental Table 2. Consistent with the integrative data analysis presented in the main text, unrestricted (versus restricted) intimates began their marriages less satisfied, and intimates with unrestricted (versus restricted) partners experienced steeper declines in satisfaction across the first 3.5 years of marriage.

Supplemental Table 2

	β	CI _{95%}	<i>df</i>	Effect-size <i>r</i>
Intercept	0.116 [†]	[-0.004: 0.237]	139.81	--
Attrition	0.044	[-0.074: 0.162]	177.02	.06
Time	-0.134 ^{***}	[-0.181: -0.066]	439.30	.26
Actors' Sociosexuality	-0.172 ^{**}	[-0.269: -0.074]	202.02	.24
Partners' Sociosexuality	-0.066	[-0.156: 0.025]	144.50	.12
Time × Actors' Sociosexuality	-0.002	[-0.039: 0.035]	343.15	.01
Time × Partners' Sociosexuality	-0.054 [*]	[-0.010: -0.008]	186.45	.17

[†] $p < .10$. ^{*} $p < .05$. ^{**} $p < .01$. ^{***} $p < .001$.

We used HLM 7.03 (due to the dichotomous nature of marital dissolution) to examine the associations between intimates' trajectories of marital satisfaction and dissolution, controlling for actors' and partners' sociosexuality as well as attrition. Actors' initial satisfaction was negatively associated with dissolution, $\beta = -0.508$, CI_{95%} [-1.015: -0.001], $t(102) = -2.01$, $p = .048$, effect-size $r = .19$; moreover, changes in actors' satisfaction was negatively associated with dissolution, $\beta = -2.37$, CI_{95%} [-4.43: -0.30], $t(102) = -2.29$, $p = .024$, effect-size $r = .22$. That is, in Study 1, intimates who began their marriages relatively less (versus more) satisfied and intimates who experienced steeper (versus less steep) declines in satisfaction across the first 3.5 years of marriage were more likely to dissolve their marriages by the end of the 3.5-year study—notably, only the latter effect replicated the integrative data analysis presented in the main text.

We used the RMediation package available in R (Tofighi & MacKinnon, 2011) to estimate the indirect associations between (a) actors' sociosexuality and dissolution, as well as (b) partners' sociosexuality and dissolution. To test the former association, we multiplied the association between actors' sociosexuality and initial satisfaction and the association between actors' initial satisfaction and dissolution; it emerged as significant, $\beta = 0.087$, $SE = 0.052$, $CI_{95\%} [0.001: 0.203]$. That is, in Study 1, actors' sociosexuality was indirectly associated with marital dissolution through their initial marital satisfaction. To test the latter association, we multiplied the association between partners' sociosexuality and actors' changes in satisfaction and the association between actors' changes in satisfaction and dissolution; it also emerged as significant, $\beta = 0.128$, $SE = 0.082$, $CI_{95\%} [0.003: 0.317]$. That is, in Study 1, partners' sociosexuality was indirectly associated with marital dissolution through actors' changes in marital satisfaction over time.

Study 2. We first estimated intimates' marital satisfaction trajectories (using the mixed-model function in SPSS 23). Direct tests confirmed that (a) husbands' and wives' intercept (but not time) estimates should vary randomly, (b) husbands' and wives' estimates did not significantly differ (all $ps \geq .113$) and thus we constrained the pooled estimates to be equal across sex, and (c) this constrained model fit the data significantly better than a constrained model that did not include a quadratic estimate of time, $\chi^2(1) = 13.42$, $p < .001$. Results demonstrated that, controlling for attrition, intimates on average reported relatively high levels of initial marital satisfaction, $\pi = 0.18$, $SE = 0.08$, that declined initially, $\pi = -1.09$, $CI_{95\%} [-1.54: -0.64]$, $t(243.09) = -4.79$, $p < .001$, effect-size $r = .29$, before leveling off over time, $\pi = 0.83$, $CI_{95\%} [0.39: 1.27]$, $t(243.58) = 3.70$, $p < .001$, effect-size $r = .23$.

To examine the extent to which each couple members' sociosexuality was associated

with each trajectory component, we re-estimated our trajectory model but additionally included actor and partner sociosexuality main effects as well as all interactions with Time and Time². No effects significantly differed across sex (all p s $\geq .341$) and thus we constrained the pooled estimates to be equal across sex. In this model, the highest-order interactions involving Time² emerged as non-significant (p s $\geq .352$); thus, we removed them. The results of this modified analysis are presented in Supplemental Table 3. Consistent with the integrative data analysis presented in the main text, unrestricted (versus restricted) intimates began their marriages (marginally) less satisfied. Inconsistent with the integrative data analysis presented in the main text, however, intimates with unrestricted (versus restricted) partners did not experience steeper declines in satisfaction over time. We believe that the shorter duration of Study 2 (1 year versus 3.5 years in Study 1) prevented us from being able to detect this association over time. Of course, future research would benefit from further examining this possibility.

We used HLM 7.03 to examine the associations between intimates' trajectories of marital satisfaction and dissolution, controlling for actors' and partners' sociosexuality as well as attrition. Initial satisfaction was not significantly associated with dissolution ($p = .946$). Given that our data did not meet the second criterion necessary for establishing mediation (i.e., the putative mediator—actors' initial satisfaction—was not significantly associated with the outcome variable—dissolution), we did not test whether actors' sociosexuality was indirectly associated with dissolution through their initial satisfaction. Moreover, although changes in satisfaction was negatively associated with dissolution ($p < .001$), partners' sociosexuality was unassociated with actors' changes in satisfaction and thus we did not test whether partners' sociosexuality was indirectly associated with dissolution through actors' changes in satisfaction.

Supplemental Table 3

	β	CI _{95%}	<i>df</i>	Effect-size <i>r</i>
Intercept	0.188 [*]	[0.034: 0.342]	154.97	--
Attrition	0.260 ^{***}	[0.124: 0.396]	173.67	.28
Time	-1.094 ^{***}	[-1.544: -0.644]	242.27	.29
Time × Time	0.824 ^{***}	[0.382: 1.265]	242.24	.23
Actors' Sociosexuality	-0.099 [†]	[-0.217: 0.019]	255.71	.10
Partners' Sociosexuality	-0.001	[-0.121: 0.120]	275.84	.00
Time × Actors' Sociosexuality	0.030	[-0.091: 0.152]	404.11	.02
Time × Partners' Sociosexuality	-0.045	[-0.170: 0.081]	452.21	.02

[†] $p < .10$. ^{*} $p < .05$. ^{**} $p < .01$. ^{***} $p < .001$.

Effect Sizes in the Present Research Versus Past Research

Readers may be interested in examining the extent to which the effect sizes in the current research compare to previously reported effect sizes of the association between sociosexuality and relationship satisfaction (i.e., Rodrigues, Lopes, & Smith, 2017; Webster et al., 2015). To facilitate such comparisons, we provide direct comparisons using *Fisher r-to-z transformations* in Supplemental Table 4. As can be seen, the effect sizes in the current research tend to be largely similar to those reported in previous research.

Supplemental Table 4

	Effect-size		Comparison to	Comparison to
	<i>r</i>	<i>N</i>	French et al. (1)	French et al. (2)
			(<i>Fisher r-to-z</i>)	(<i>Fisher r-to-z</i>)
French et al. (current research)				
1. Initial Satisfaction (Actor; Table 2)	.18	408	--	--
2. Changes in Satisfaction (Partner; Table 2)	.27	408	--	--
Rodrigues et al. (2017)				
Satisfaction (all couple types)	.15	270	-0.39	1.59
Satisfaction (consensually monogamous)	.30	107	1.16	-0.30
Satisfaction (consensually non-monogamous)	.09	81	0.74	1.51
Webster et al. (2015)				
Men's Satisfaction (Actor; Table 2)	.24	564	0.96	-0.49
Men's Satisfaction (Partner; Table 2)	.10	564	-1.25	-2.71**
Men's Satisfaction (Actor; Table 4)	.22	564	0.64	-0.82
Men's Satisfaction (Partner; Table 4)	.11	564	-1.10	-2.55*
Men's Satisfaction (Actor; Table 7)	.36	564	2.99**	1.53
Men's Satisfaction (Partner; Table 7)	.16	564	-0.32	-1.77 [†]
Women's Satisfaction (Partner; Table 7)	.20	564	0.32	-1.14

Note. Negative *Fisher r-to-z* values represent comparatively smaller effect sizes in previously reported research relative to the current research.

[†] $p < .10$. * $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$.

Is the Association Between Unrestricted Partner Sociosexuality and Declines in Satisfaction Due, at Least in Part, to Partners' Increased Attention to Alternatives?

Why do intimates with relatively unrestricted (versus restricted) partners experience steeper declines in satisfaction across the first several years of marriage? Drawing from an investment model perspective (Rusbult, Martz, & Agnew, 1998) as well as prior research demonstrating an increased tendency for relatively unrestricted individuals to attend to and pursue alternative relationship partners (e.g., Miller, 1997; Seal, Agostinelli, & Hannett, 1994), we reasoned that unrestricted people—given their stronger motivations to pursue uncommitted sex, relative to restricted people—may attend more to extra-pair alternatives, which may

negatively impact their partner's satisfaction.

Across both studies, we had five different operationalizations of extra-pair attention available for analysis. Specifically, we had three self-report measures including the 6-item Alternative Monitoring subscale of the Commitment Inventory (Stanley & Markman, 1992; assessed at baseline in both studies; in Study 1: $\alpha = .76$, in Study 2: $\alpha = .85$), the 5-item Quality of Alternatives subscale of the Investment Model Scale (Rusbult et al., 1998; assessed at baseline in both studies; in Study 1: $\alpha = .85$, in Study 2: $\alpha = .78$), and the Attention to Alternatives Scale (Miller, 1997, 2008; assessed at the final four assessments of Study 1 using the original 6-item scale, all $\alpha s \geq .55$; assessed at all assessments of Study 2 using the new 9-item scale, $\alpha s \geq .83$). We also had one implicit measure of disengagement from alternatives (Maner, Gailliot, Rouby, & Miller, 2007) assessed at baseline in both studies. Finally, we had one self-report measure of alternative-partner derogation (see McNulty, Meltzer, Makhanova, & Maner, 2018) assessed at baseline in both studies. We explored the extent to which each of these operationalizations of extra-pair attention mediated the associations between (a) actors' sociosexuality and initial marital satisfaction and (b) partners' sociosexuality and actors' changes in marital satisfaction.

Using the three self-report measures. To explore the extent to which the three self-report measures of extra-pair attention mediated these associations, we first examined whether intimates' sociosexuality was associated with their extra-pair attention. To test the associations between intimates' sociosexuality and the two measures assessed at baseline [i.e., the Alternative Monitoring subscale of the Commitment Inventory (Stanley & Markman, 1992) and the Quality of Alternatives subscale of the Investment Model Scale (Rusbult et al., 1998)], we conducted two mixed-effects models in SPSS 23, where intimates were nested within couples. To test the association between intimates' sociosexuality and the time-varying measure [i.e., the Attention to

Alternatives Scale (Miller, 1997, 2008)], we conducted a mixed-effects cross model in SPSS 23, where repeated observations were nested within intimates and husbands and wives were estimated separately but simultaneously. Results demonstrated that sociosexuality was indeed positively associated with extra-pair attention across all three measures (all $ps < .001$). That is, relatively unrestricted (versus restricted) intimates attended more to alternative partners.

We next examined whether actors' and/or partners' extra-pair attention was associated with actors' trajectories of marital satisfaction, controlling for actors' and partners' sociosexuality as well as their interactions with Time. Results demonstrated that actors' extra-pair attention was negatively associated with their initial marital satisfaction across all three measures (all $ps \leq .009$); partners' attention to alternatives was negatively associated with actors' changes in marital satisfaction over time using only the time-varying Attention to Alternatives Scale (Miller, 1997, 2008; $p < .001$).

Finally, we used RMediation to estimate the indirect associations between (a) actors' sociosexuality and initial marital satisfaction through actors' extra-pair attention and (b) partners' sociosexuality and actors' changes in marital satisfaction over time through partners' extra-pair attention. Across all three measures, actors' extra-pair attention indeed mediated the association between actors' sociosexuality and initial satisfaction (for the Alternative Monitoring subscale: $\beta = -0.08$, $SE = 0.02$, $CI_{95\%} [-0.12: -0.04]$; for the Quality of Alternatives subscale: $\beta = -0.09$, $SE = 0.02$, $CI_{95\%} [-0.14: -0.05]$; for the Attention to Alternatives Scale: $\beta = -0.04$, $SE = 0.02$, $CI_{95\%} [-0.08: -0.01]$). Using the Attention to Alternatives Scale only, partners' extra-pair attention mediated the association between partners' sociosexuality and actors' changes in marital satisfaction over time, $\beta = -0.03$, $SE = 0.01$, $CI_{95\%} [-0.05: -0.02]$.

Using the implicit measure of disengagement from attractive alternatives. We

assessed intimates' disengagement from attractive alternatives using a dot probe visual cuing task (Maner et al., 2007; for more information, see McNulty et al., 2018). Consistent with other research, we (a) excluded trials that participants miscategorized the target shape, (b) excluded participants whose average response latency on the index of extra-pair attention (i.e., attractive opposite-sexed faces) was more than 3 *SD* above the mean, (c) capped response latencies for the additional three indices (attention to average alternatives, attention to attractive same-sex targets, attention to average same-sex targets) at 3 *SD* above the mean, and (d) controlled for these additional indices in all analyses.

To test the association between intimates' sociosexuality and their disengagement from attractive alternatives, we conducted a mixed-effects model in SPSS 23, where intimates were nested within couples. According to this analysis, sociosexuality was not significantly associated with disengagement from attractive alternatives ($p = .832$). Given that our data did not meet the first criterion necessary for establishing mediation (i.e., sociosexuality was not significantly associated with disengagement from attractive alternatives), we did not further explore whether the disengagement from attractive alternatives was associated with intimates' trajectories of marital satisfaction.

Using the measure of alternative-partner derogation. We assessed intimates' derogation of alternative partners using their explicit attractiveness ratings of the targets used in the dot probe task (on a 10-point scale, where 1 = "Not at all attractive" and 10 = "Extremely attractive;" for more information about this measure, see McNulty et al., 2018). We averaged across each participant's ratings within each target index (e.g., attractive opposite-sex targets, average opposite-sex targets, attractive same-sex targets, average same-sex targets). Similar to our previous analysis, we controlled for participants' perceived attractiveness of average

opposite-sex targets, attractive same-sex targets, and average same-sex targets in all analyses.

To test the association between intimates' sociosexuality and their alternative-partner derogation, we conducted a mixed-effects model in SPSS 23, where intimates were nested within couples. According to this analysis, sociosexuality was marginally negatively associated with their derogation of alternative partners ($p = .061$), such that unrestricted (versus restricted) intimates derogated alternative partners less (i.e., rated alternative partners as more attractive).

We next examined whether actors' and/or partners' derogation of alternatives was associated with actors' trajectories of marital satisfaction, controlling for actors' and partners' sociosexuality as well as their interactions with Time. Results demonstrated that actors' derogation was not significantly associated with their initial satisfaction ($p = .712$); similarly, partners' derogation was not significantly associated with actors' changes in satisfaction over time ($p < .940$). Given that our data did not meet the second criterion necessary for establishing mediation (i.e., alternative-partner derogation was not significantly associated with marital satisfaction trajectories), we did not further explore the indirect association.

References

- Barr, D. J., Levy R., Scheepers, C., & Tily, H., J. (2013). Random effects structure for confirmatory hypothesis testing: Keep it maximal. *Journal of Memory and Language*, *68*, 255–278.
- Maner, J. K., Gailliot, M. T., Rouby, D. A., & Miller, S. L. (2007). Can't take my eyes off you: Attentional adhesion to mates and rivals. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *93*, 389-401.
- Matuschek, H., Kliegl, R., Vasishth, S., Baayen, H., & Bates, D. (2017). Balancing Type I error and power in linear mixed models. *Journal of Memory and Language*, *94*, 305-315.
- McNulty, J. K., Meltzer, A. L., Makhanova, A., & Maner, J. K. (2018). Attentional and evaluative biases help people maintain relationships by avoiding infidelity. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *115*, 76-95.
- Miller, R. S. (1997). Inattentive and contented: Relationship commitment and attention to alternatives. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *73*, 758–766.
- Miller, R. S. (2008). Attending to temptation: The operation (and perils) of attention to alternatives in close relationships. In J. P. Forgas & J. Fitness (Eds.), *Social relationships: Cognitive, affective, and motivational processes* (pp. 321-337). New York: Psychology Press.
- Rodrigues, D., Lopes, D., & Smith, C. V. (2017). Caught in a “bad romance”? Reconsidering the negative association between sociosexuality and relationship functioning. *The Journal of Sex Research*, *54*, 1118-1127.
- Rusbult, C. E., Martz, J. M., & Agnew, C. R. (1998). The investment model scale: Measuring commitment level, satisfaction level, quality of alternatives, and investment size.

Personal Relationships, 5, 357-387.

Seal, D. W., Agostinelli, G., & Hannett, C. A. (1994). Extradyadic romantic involvement: Moderating effects of sociosexuality and gender. *Sex Roles*, 31, 1-22.

~~Simpson, J. A., & Gangestad, S. W. (1991). Individual differences in sociosexuality: Evidence for convergent and discriminant validity. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 60, 870-883.~~

Stanley, S. M., & Markman, H. J. (1992). Assessing commitment in personal relationships. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 54, 595-608.

Tofighi, D., & MacKinnon, D. P. (2011). RMediation: An R package for mediation analysis confidence intervals. *Behavior Research Methods*, 43, 692-700.

Webster, G. D., Laurenceau, J. P., Smith, C. V., Mahaffey, A. L., Bryan, A. D., & Brunell, A. B. (2015). An investment model of sociosexuality, relationship satisfaction, and commitment: Evidence from dating, engaged, and newlywed couples. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 55, 112-126.