

Northumbria Research Link

Citation: Molho, Catherine, Roberts, Sam G., de Vries, Reinout and Pollet, Thomas (2016) The six dimensions of personality (HEXACO) and their associations with network layer size and emotional closeness to network members. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 99. pp. 144-148. ISSN 0191-8869

Published by: Elsevier

URL: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2016.04.096>
<<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2016.04.096>>

This version was downloaded from Northumbria Research Link:
<http://nrl.northumbria.ac.uk/id/eprint/31931/>

Northumbria University has developed Northumbria Research Link (NRL) to enable users to access the University's research output. Copyright © and moral rights for items on NRL are retained by the individual author(s) and/or other copyright owners. Single copies of full items can be reproduced, displayed or performed, and given to third parties in any format or medium for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes without prior permission or charge, provided the authors, title and full bibliographic details are given, as well as a hyperlink and/or URL to the original metadata page. The content must not be changed in any way. Full items must not be sold commercially in any format or medium without formal permission of the copyright holder. The full policy is available online: <http://nrl.northumbria.ac.uk/policies.html>

This document may differ from the final, published version of the research and has been made available online in accordance with publisher policies. To read and/or cite from the published version of the research, please visit the publisher's website (a subscription may be required.)

1 The Six Dimensions of Personality (HEXACO) and their Associations with Network
2 Layer Size and Emotional Closeness to Network Members

3

4 Catherine Molho^{a*}

5 Sam G. B. Roberts^b

6 Reinout E. de Vries^{a,c}

7 Thomas V. Pollet^a

8

9 ^a VU Amsterdam

10 Department of Experimental and Applied Psychology

11 Van der Boechorststraat 1

12 1081 BT Amsterdam, Netherlands

13 ^b University of Chester

14 Department of Psychology

15 Parkgate Road

16 Chester, CH1 4BJ, UK

17 ^c University of Twente

18 Department of Educational Science

19 Postbus 217, 7500 AE Enschede, Netherlands

20

21 *Corresponding Author

22 c.molho@vu.nl

23

24

25

26

27

28 Abstract

29 Previous work has examined how specific personality dimensions are associated with
30 social network characteristics. However, it is unclear how the full range of personality
31 traits relates to the quantity and quality of relationships at different network layers.
32 This study (N = 525) investigates how the six HEXACO personality dimensions relate
33 to the size of support and sympathy groups, and to the level of emotional closeness to
34 network members. Extraversion was positively related to support group size, but did
35 not significantly relate to sympathy group size or emotional closeness. Openness to
36 Experience and Emotionality were positively related to support group size, but not to
37 the size of the sympathy group. Honesty-Humility, but not Agreeableness, was
38 positively related to emotional closeness to members of the sympathy group. Findings
39 suggest that personality effects vary across network layers and highlight the
40 importance of considering both emotional closeness and network size.

41

42 Keywords: individual differences, HEXACO, social networks, emotional closeness

1. Introduction

Personality is important for our understanding of individual patterns of cognition, motivation, emotion, and behavior—what has been described as “*a kind of thematic recurrence within the events of a life*” (Nettle, 2007, p. 12). Here, we focus on the effects of personality on characteristics of individuals’ innermost network layers, that is, on the number and emotional intimacy of close social relationships.

Individuals’ social networks are hierarchically structured in successive layers of increasing size and decreasing emotional intimacy (Dunbar, 1998; Hill & Dunbar, 2003; Sutcliffe et al., 2012). Recent work has examined the effects of personality on different network layers’ size and intimacy, but has been limited to specific dimensions, such as Extraversion and Neuroticism (Pollet et al., 2011; Roberts et al., 2008). Other studies, which examined a more exhaustive set of personality dimensions, did not differentiate between network layers, such as support and sympathy groups (Asendorpf & Wilpers, 1998; Selfhout et al., 2010). In this study, we attempt to address these limitations by investigating how the six HEXACO personality dimensions (Ashton & Lee, 2007; Lee & Ashton, 2004) relate both to the size and relationship intensity of individuals’ innermost network layers.

1.1. Social network characteristics

It is widely recognized that not all social relationships are of equal strength or emotional intensity (Bernard et al., 1990; Granovetter, 1973; Milardo, 1992; Wellman & Wortley, 1990). Focusing on emotionally close ties, many studies have identified two distinct groupings: a small number of emotionally close ties offering intense emotional support and a larger number of less emotionally close, but still significant, ties that provide more general support (Bernard et al. 1990; Binder et al., 2012; Boase et al., 2006; Milardo, 1992; Wellman & Wortley, 1990).

Consistently, research suggests that social networks are organized in a series of hierarchically inclusive layers (Hill & Dunbar, 2003; Sutcliffe et al., 2012; Zhou et al., 2005). The innermost layers, corresponding to the two groupings identified above, have been termed ‘support groups’ and ‘sympathy groups’. Support groups consist of individuals from whom one would seek support in times of severe emotional or financial distress: they have an average size of 5 members (Binder et al., 2012; Dunbar & Spoors, 1995). Sympathy groups consist of individuals whose sudden death would be greatly upsetting (Buys & Larson, 1979): they have an average size of 12-15 members, including support group members (Binder et al., 2012; Dunbar & Spoors, 1995; Stiller & Dunbar, 2007).

Previous work has noted the importance of examining both the quantity and quality of relationships within different network layers (Pollet et al., 2011), as there is evidence of a trade-off between relationship quantity and quality (Roberts et al., 2009; Binder et al., 2011). As the size of each network layer increases, relationship intensity tends to decrease (Dunbar, 1998; Hill & Dunbar, 2003). Arguably, this is due to constraints—related to time and cognitive effort—on the number of relationships one can maintain at a certain level of emotional intensity (Roberts & Dunbar, 2011a; Stiller & Dunbar, 2007; Sutcliffe et al., 2012; Zhou et al., 2005).

While upper bounds seem to exist in different network layers’ size, previous work has also documented substantial inter-individual variation in both their size and composition. Such variation can be partly explained by demographic characteristics such as sex, socioeconomic status, age, and relationship status (McPherson et al., 2006; Roberts et al., 2009), but another important factor is personality (Nettle, 2007).

1.2. Personality and social networks

Research has examined how the Big Five or Five-Factor model personality traits (McCrae & Costa, 1999) relate to network characteristics. Among adolescents and young adults, Extraversion relates to larger networks and faster network growth, whereas Agreeableness is associated with higher peer acceptance and less conflict (Asendorpf & Wilpers, 1998; Jensen-Campbell et al., 2002; Selfhout et al., 2010). Although some studies have found no relation between Neuroticism and network size (Asendorpf & Wilpers, 1998; Roberts et al., 2008), higher Neuroticism is linked to less perceived social support and more loneliness (Russell et al., 1997; Stokes, 1985). Finally, Openness to Experience is linked to a larger number of new network contacts (Zhu et al., 2013; cf. Jensen-Campbell et al., 2002).

Research explicitly differentiating the hierarchical structure within social networks has focused on Extraversion. However, evidence on its relation with network characteristics is mixed. Specifically, Roberts and colleagues (2008) showed that Extraversion positively correlates with support group, but not sympathy group, size. However, this relation was no longer significant after controlling for participant age. Another study by Pollet and colleagues (2011) examined the relation of Extraversion with both network quantity and quality: extraverts reported having larger network layers (support group, sympathy group, outer layer), but did not feel emotionally closer to members of any layer.

1.3. HEXACO personality and network characteristics

Recent theoretical and empirical work in personality psychology has supported a six-dimensional framework of personality structure—the HEXACO—as a viable alternative to the Big Five and Five-Factor models. Lexical studies of personality structure in diverse languages consistently demonstrate the emergence of six (rather than five) personality factors (Ashton & Lee, 2007): Honesty-Humility (H),

117 Emotionality (E), Extraversion (X), Agreeableness (A), Conscientiousness (C), and
118 Openness to Experience (O).

119 An important difference between the HEXACO model and five-factor models
120 is the addition of Honesty-Humility, which is defined by honesty, fairness, sincerity,
121 modesty, and lack of greed. Further, in the HEXACO framework, the Emotionality
122 and Agreeableness factors result from a re-rotation of the Big Five factors of
123 Emotional Stability and Agreeableness. As a result, HEXACO Emotionality excludes
124 the anger facet that defines low Emotional Stability but includes the sentimentality
125 facet that defines Agreeableness. Conversely, HEXACO Agreeableness excludes
126 sentimentality and includes lack of anger¹.

127 For our research, the use of the HEXACO has two important advantages. First,
128 it allows us to examine the relations of both Agreeableness—i.e., the tendency to be
129 flexible, forgiving, and tolerant—and Honesty-Humility—i.e., the tendency to
130 approach others with sincerity and fairness—with emotional closeness toward support
131 and sympathy group members. While we start from the explorative hypothesis that
132 both Honesty-Humility and Agreeableness positively relate to emotional closeness,
133 we also consider the possibility that one characteristic is more important than the
134 other for building and maintaining close social relationships. Second, using the
135 HEXACO could clarify if Emotionality—including sentimentality, but excluding
136 anger content—relates to network layer size (Asendorpf & Wilpers, 1998; Roberts et
137 al., 2008) and, in particular, whether it is indeed associated with less social support
138 (Russell et al., 1997; Stokes, 1985).

139 The HEXACO Extraversion, Conscientiousness, and Openness to Experience
140 dimensions are largely equivalent to the corresponding traits in the Big Five.
141 However, HEXACO Openness excludes intellect content—i.e., intelligence and

mental ability—that is part of some Big Five measures (e.g., Goldberg’s IPIP scale, 1999).

Based on previous examinations of the relation between Extraversion and network characteristics (Asendorpf & Wilpers, 1998; Pollet et al., 2011), we expect Extraversion to positively relate to the size of both support and sympathy groups, but not to emotional closeness. Given previous inconsistencies regarding the relation between Openness and network size (Jensen-Campbell et al., 2002; Selfhout et al., 2010), and the lack of evidence for a relation between Conscientiousness and network characteristics, we do not make specific predictions for these dimensions.

2. Methods

2.1. Participants

525 participants (63.4% women, $M_{\text{age}} = 27$, $SD_{\text{age}} = 10.09$, range 18 to 83 years) completed an online survey in English or Dutch. Respondents were recruited via the personal networks of more than 20 international and Dutch students. The majority of respondents had a university degree (68.6%). Among participants, 29.3% reported Dutch as their native language, 20.4% reported English, and 50.3% another language. Finally, 52.8% of participants reported having a partner (married or in a relationship; 47.2% were single, divorced, or widowed; see also Supplementary Materials 1-2).

2.2. Procedure and measures

Participants were first asked to list all people with whom losing contact forever would be upsetting (*“We would like you to think of the people who are most important to you, and to imagine not being able to speak or to see these people ever again”*). Next, they indicated which of these people they would turn to *“in times of severe emotional or financial distress”*. We defined the support group as individuals

to whom participants would turn in times of severe distress, and the sympathy group as individuals with whom losing contact forever would be upsetting. These measures are commonly used to elicit individuals' inner network layers (e.g., Binder et al., 2012; Buys & Larson, 1979). Participants then reported how emotionally close they felt to each network member on a 0 to 100 scale. Emotional closeness is considered the most reliable indicator of tie strength (Marsden & Campbell, 1984) and is related to the frequency of both mobile phone and face-to-face contact (Roberts & Dunbar, 2011b; Saramäki et al., 2014).

Subsequently, participants completed the 60-item version of the HEXACO personality inventory (Ashton & Lee, 2009), using 5-point Likert scales (1 = strongly disagree, 5 = strongly agree). The HEXACO-60 consists of items representing a broad range of content from all facets of the six HEXACO dimensions (Ashton & Lee, 2009). Scales for all HEXACO dimensions showed adequate reliability: Honesty-Humility, $\alpha = .70$; Emotionality, $\alpha = .76$; Extraversion, $\alpha = .80$; Agreeableness, $\alpha = .73$; Conscientiousness, $\alpha = .77$; Openness to Experience, $\alpha = .76$.

2.3. Analytical Techniques

Here, our interest was in examining support and sympathy group properties. Following previous research (Roberts et al., 2008; Pollet et al., 2011), our sympathy group measure excluded support group members to avoid including the same individuals in two sets of analyses. Similarly, we calculated average emotional closeness to individuals belonging only to the support group, and individuals belonging only to the sympathy group, separately.

We report results from OLS regressions for support and sympathy group size, and for emotional closeness to support and sympathy group. For all regressions, we followed a hierarchical procedure. We first included all six HEXACO dimensions as

predictors in our model. We then kept only significant personality predictors and added control variables as follows: sex (0 = male, 1 = female), age, university degree (0 = no, 1 = yes), native language (two dummy coded variables; 0 = Dutch and English, 1 = other; 0 = Dutch and other, 1 = English), and relationship status (0 = no committed partner, 1 = with committed partner). For analyses on emotional closeness variables, we controlled for the corresponding layer size variables—given previous evidence of a trade-off between layer size and emotional closeness (Roberts et al., 2009). Finally, to test for the robustness of our results, we used a bootstrap procedure (Bias-Corrected and Accelerated (BcA); 1,000 samples). We report results based on parameter estimates and 95% confidence intervals from bootstrapped analyses.

3. Results

3.1. Descriptives and bivariate correlations

Descriptive statistics for the HEXACO dimensions, network layer size, and emotional closeness can be found in Supplementary Materials 3. On average, the support group consisted of 5 individuals ($SD = 3$) and the sympathy group, including support group members, consisted of 11 individuals ($SD = 6$). The mean size of both layers is consistent with prior research (Binder et al., 2012; Dunbar & Spoor, 1995; Stiller & Dunbar, 2007). Results from bivariate Pearson's correlations, after performing BcA bootstrapping with 1,000 samples, between demographics, HEXACO dimensions, and all network layer size and emotional closeness variables are presented in Supplementary Materials 4.

3.2. Personality and network layer size

Table 1 shows results from bootstrapped hierarchical regressions for network layers' size. Consistent with predictions, higher Extraversion scores were associated with larger support group size. Openness was also positively and significantly related

to support group size. In contrast to the claim that Emotionality relates negatively to social support (Russell et al., 1997; Stokes, 1985), there was a marginally significant, positive relation between Emotionality and support group size. This model explained 4% of variance in support group size (adjusted $R^2 = .04$, $F(3, 513) = 7.60$, $p < .001$).

Contrary to predictions and previous evidence indicating a positive relation between Extraversion and sympathy group size (Pollet et al., 2011; cf. Roberts et al., 2008), none of the HEXACO dimensions significantly related to sympathy group size. Of the control variables, only native language was significantly associated with sympathy group size (adjusted $R^2 = .03$, $F(2, 514) = 10.19$, $p < .001$). Participants who reported Dutch or English as their language indicated having larger sympathy groups, compared to participants who reported another language.

3.3. Personality and emotional closeness

Table 2 shows results from bootstrapped hierarchical regressions for emotional closeness variables. Emotionality positively and significantly related to emotional closeness to support group members. However, this effect was no longer significant after controlling for participant sex: women felt emotionally closer to support group members, compared to men. Further, native language had a significant relation with emotional closeness to support group. Participants who indicated Dutch or English as their native language reported more closeness, compared to participants who indicated another language. Consistent with previous work (e.g., Roberts et al., 2009), there was a negative relation between support group size and emotional closeness to this layer's members, such that participants with larger support groups reported less closeness. This model accounted for 7% of variance in emotional closeness to support group (adjusted $R^2 = .07$, $F(5, 511) = 8.30$, $p < .001$).

In line with our prediction that Honesty-Humility is associated with higher emotional closeness, we found that this personality characteristic significantly and positively related to emotional closeness to sympathy group. Unexpectedly, there was also a marginally significant relation between Extraversion and emotional closeness to sympathy group members. Further, education level significantly related to emotional closeness to sympathy group: participants with a university degree reported less closeness than those without. Finally, native language also had a significant relation with emotional closeness to sympathy group. Respondents who indicated Dutch or another native language reported more closeness, compared to participants who indicated English as their language. This model accounted for 4% of the variance in emotional closeness to sympathy group (adjusted $R^2 = .04$, $F(5, 470) = 5.24$, $p < .001$).

4. Discussion

4.1. Summary of findings

This study examined the associations between the six HEXACO personality dimensions and the size and emotional closeness of individuals' innermost network layers. Regarding layer size, our findings suggest that extraverts have larger support groups, but not larger sympathy groups. Although previous studies have repeatedly demonstrated a relation between Extraversion and network size (Asendorpf & Wilpers, 1998; Pollet et al., 2011), further research is needed to clarify whether this relation can be observed at all network layers. For now, there is good evidence that Extraversion positively relates to support group size. With respect to emotional closeness to network members, our findings are in line with previous research (Pollet et al., 2011), suggesting that there is no significant relation between Extraversion and emotional closeness to either support or sympathy group members.

266 This result may seem counterintuitive given that Extraversion is linked to
267 behaviors that attract social attention (Ashton et al., 2002), and that extraverts are
268 more outgoing, energetic, and cheerful than introverts (Kalish & Robbins, 2006).
269 Thus, if extraverts have more frequent social interactions than introverts—and
270 frequency of contact between individuals is linked to emotional closeness (Roberts &
271 Dunbar, 2011b; Saramäki et al., 2014)—it may be expected that extraverts would
272 build relationships with higher emotional closeness. However, we found a negative
273 relation between support group size and emotional closeness, suggesting a trade-off
274 between maintaining a large network and having emotionally close relationships
275 (Roberts et al., 2009; Binder et al., 2012). Together, results suggest that extraverts
276 may focus on maintaining a larger number of ties, rather than developing the
277 emotional closeness of those ties.

278 Interestingly, our results suggest that Openness to Experience positively
279 relates to support group size, but not necessarily sympathy group size. This result is
280 consistent with previous theoretical interpretations of Openness as reflecting
281 inquisitiveness and creativity, thus potentially yielding social benefits and social
282 attention (Ashton & Lee, 2007; Nettle, 2007). Future research could more closely
283 examine whether Openness to Experience is indeed related to a larger number of
284 relationships in the innermost network layers, or a larger number of new contacts, in
285 particular (Zhu et al., 2013).

286 In line with predictions, Honesty-Humility, which reflects a tendency to
287 approach others with sincerity and fairness (Lee & Ashton, 2004), positively related
288 to emotional closeness, albeit only for sympathy groups. Our results suggest that there
289 is no direct, significant, relationship between Honesty-Humility and emotional
290 closeness to support group members. Further, contrary to hypotheses, Agreeableness

does not seem to relate to emotional intimacy at any layer. Combined, these results suggest that the HEXACO is a useful alternative to Big-Five models, especially due to the inclusion of Honesty-Humility and, in particular, for examinations of emotional closeness in social network research.

Finally, our results are only partially consistent with previous work suggesting that Neuroticism does not relate to network size or other network characteristics (Asendorpf & Wilpers, 1998; Roberts et al., 2008). Using HEXACO Emotionality, which includes sentimentality but excludes anger content, we found that Emotionality is marginally but positively related with support group size. This finding points to the possibility that Emotionality is associated with increased, rather than decreased (Russell et al., 1997; Stokes, 1985), social support. Although Emotionality also correlates with emotional closeness to support group members, this relationship seems entirely attributable to gender differences in Emotionality (Lee & Ashton, 2004).

4.2. Strengths, limitations, and future directions

Our research contributes to the literature on individual differences and social networks in three ways. First, whereas previous work has focused on specific traits, such as Extraversion and Neuroticism (Pollet et al., 2011; Roberts et al., 2008), our study examined how all six HEXACO personality dimensions are related to network size and emotional closeness. Second, in investigating the effects of HEXACO traits on network characteristics, we differentiated between support and sympathy groups (Dunbar & Spoors, 1995; Stiller & Dunbar, 2007), rather than treating social networks as homogeneous (e.g., Asendorpf & Wilpers, 1998; Selfhout et al., 2010). Finally, we investigated both the quantity and quality of relationships within network layers, examining both the number and emotional closeness of participants' ties.

315 However, our study was cross-sectional and therefore cannot address
316 questions of causality—does personality influence the size and emotional closeness of
317 social networks, or do social network characteristics influence personality? Although
318 the former seems more likely—given that personality traits show a high degree of
319 stability over time—longitudinal work is needed to address this question directly.

320 Moreover, our findings point to rather weak associations between personality
321 and the number and emotional strength of close ties, in terms of proportion of
322 explained variance. One possibility is that the questionnaires we used are not valid
323 measures of the intended constructs. While this is unlikely for the HEXACO-60—
324 which has good levels of reliability and self-observer agreement (Ashton & Lee,
325 2009), less is known about the reliability of network size measures. Previous work
326 suggests that interviews as a method of eliciting personal networks have relatively
327 high levels of test-retest reliability (for a review, see Brewer et al., 2000). In terms of
328 questionnaire approaches, various research groups have used measures of group size
329 and emotional closeness that are similar to the ones used here and they have found
330 networks of similar size (Binder et al., 2012; Buys & Larson, 1979; Cummings et al.,
331 2006; Dunbar & Spoors, 1995; Jeon & Buss, 2007; Roberts et al. 2009).

332 However, these measures have two potential drawbacks. First, our measure of
333 support and sympathy groups allows participants to include all reported network
334 members in either one or the other group—and participants can be more or less
335 ‘inclusive’ in naming network members, irrespective of the objective size of these
336 groups. Second, our emotional closeness measure could be influenced by response
337 styles, whereby some respondents generally report more closeness, irrespective of the
338 actual closeness of their ties. However, an 18-month longitudinal study demonstrated
339 that self-reported emotional closeness is significantly related to the number of mobile

phone calls participants make to network members (Saramäki et al., 2014). This suggests that self-reported emotional closeness meaningfully relates to objective communication patterns. Further research could use the ‘digital trace’ left by electronic communication (Lazer et al., 1999) to examine in more detail how personality characteristics relate to individuals’ interaction patterns.

4.3 Conclusion

In summary, this study suggests that the personality traits of Extraversion, Openness to Experience, and Honesty-Humility, meaningfully relate to network layer size and emotional closeness to network members. However, current findings also indicate that a large proportion of variability in network characteristics is not accounted for by either personality or basic demographics. As such, future social network research could complement and extend this work by using more objective measures of interaction with network members and examining how other factors—for example, one’s childhood environment or current social setting (e.g., neighborhood, workplace)—influence the quantity and quality of close relationships.

Acknowledgments.

To be included.

References

- Asendorpf, J.B., Wilpers, S., 1998. Personality effects on social relationships. *J. Pers. Soc. Psychol.* 74, 1531–1544. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.74.6.1531
- Ashton, M.C., Lee, K., 2007. Empirical, Theoretical, and Practical Advantages of the HEXACO Model of Personality Structure. *Personal. Soc. Psychol. Rev.* 11, 150–166. doi:10.1177/1088868306294907
- Ashton, M.C., Lee, K., 2009. The HEXACO–60: A Short Measure of the Major Dimensions of Personality. *J. Pers. Assess.* 91, 340–345. doi:10.1080/00223890902935878
- Ashton, M.C., Lee, K., Paunonen, S.V., 2002. What is the central feature of extraversion? Social attention versus reward sensitivity. *J. Pers. Soc. Psychol.* 83, 245–252. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.83.1.245
- Bernard, H.R., Johnsen, E.C., Killworth, P.D., McCarty, C., Shelley, G.A., Robinson, S., 1990. Comparing four different methods for measuring personal social networks. *Soc. Networks* 12, 179–215. doi:10.1016/0378-8733(90)90005-T
- Binder, J.F., Roberts, S.G., Sutcliffe, A.G., 2012. Closeness, loneliness, support: Core ties and significant ties in personal communities. *Soc. Networks* 34, 206–214. doi:10.1016/j.socnet.2011.12.001
- Boase, J., Horrigan, J.B., Wellman, B., Rainie, L., 2006. The Strength of Internet Ties. Pew Internet & American Life Project, Washington, DC.
- Brewer, D. D. (2000). Forgetting in the recall-based elicitation of personal and social networks. *Social Networks*, 22, 29–43.
- Buys, C.J., Larson, K.L., 1979. Human Sympathy Groups. *Psychol. Rep.* 45, 547–553. doi:10.2466/pr0.1979.45.2.547

- 381 Cummings, J., Lee, J., Kraut, R. (2006). Communication technology and friendship
382 during the transition from high school to college. In Kraut, R., Brynin, M.,
383 Kiesler, S. (Eds.), *Computers, Phones, and the Internet: Domesticating*
384 *Information Technologies*. Oxford University Press, New York, pp. 265-278.
- 385 Dunbar, R.I.M., 1998. The social brain hypothesis. *Evol. Anthropol. Issues, News,*
386 *Rev. 6*, 178–190. doi:10.1002/(SICI)1520-6505(1998)6:5<178::AID-
387 EVAN5>3.0.CO;2-8
- 388 Dunbar, R.I.M., Spoors, M., 1995. Social Networks, support cliques and kinship.
389 *Hum. Nat. - An Interdiscip. Biosoc. Perspect. 6*, 273–290.
390 doi:10.1007/BF02734142
- 391 Granovetter, M. S., 1973. The strength of weak ties. *Am. J. Sociology* 78, 1360-1380.
- 392 Goldberg, L. R. (1999). A broad-bandwidth, public-domain, personality inventory
393 measuring the lower-level facets of several five-factor models. In I. Mervielde,
394 I. Deary, F. De Fruyt, & F. Ostendorf (Eds.), *Personality Psychology in*
395 *Europe*, Vol. 7. Tilburg University Press: The Netherlands, pp. 7-28.
- 396 Hill, R.A., Dunbar, R.I.M., 2003. Social network size in humans. *Hum. Nat.* 14, 53–
397 72. doi:10.1007/s12110-003-1016-y
- 398 Jensen-Campbell, L.A., Adams, R., Perry, D.G., Workman, K.A., Furdella, J.Q.,
399 Egan, S.K., 2002. Agreeableness, extraversion, and peer relations in early
400 adolescence: Winning friends and deflecting aggression. *J. Res. Pers.* 36, 224-
401 251. doi:10.1006/jrpe.2002.2348
- 402 Jeon, J., Buss, D.M., 2007. Altruism towards cousins. *Proc. Biol. Sci.* 274, 1181–7.
403 doi:10.1098/rspb.2006.0366

- 404 Kalish, Y., Robins, G., 2006. Psychological predispositions and network structure:
405 The relationship between individual predispositions, structural holes and
406 network closure. *Soc. Networks* 28, 56–84. doi:10.1016/j.socnet.2005.04.004
- 407 Lazer, D., Pentland, A., Adamic, L., Aral, S., Barabasi, A. L., Brewer, D., . . . Van
408 Alstyne, M. (2009). Computational social science. *Science*, 323, 721-723.
409 doi:10.1126/science.1167742
- 410 Lee, K., Ashton, M.C., 2004. Psychometric Properties of the HEXACO Personality
411 Inventory. *Multivariate Behav. Res.* 39, 329–358.
412 doi:10.1207/s15327906mbr3902_8
- 413 Lee, K., & Ashton, M. C. (2013). Prediction of self-and observer report scores on
414 HEXACO-60 and NEO-FFI scales. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 47,
415 668-675.
- 416 Marsden, P.V., Campbell, K.E., 1984. Measuring tie strength. *Soc. Forces.* 63, 482-
417 501. doi: 10.1093/sf/63.2.482
- 418 McCrae, R.R., Costa Jr, P.T., 1999. The Five-Factor Theory of Personality. In Pervin,
419 L.A., John, O.P. (Eds.) *Handbook of Personality: Theory and Research*.
420 Guilford Press, New York, pp. 139-153.
- 421 McPherson, M., Smith-Lovin, L., Brashears, M.E., 2006. Social isolation in America:
422 Changes in core discussion networks over two decades. *Am. Sociol. Rev.* 71,
423 353–375.
- 424 Milardo, R.M., 1992. Comparative methods for delineating social networks. *J. Soc.*
425 *Pers. Relat.* 9, 447-461. doi:10.1177/0265407592093007
- 426 Nettle, D., 2007. *Personality: What makes you the way you are*. Oxford University
427 Press.

- 428 Pollet, T.V., Roberts, S.G.B., Dunbar, R.I.M., 2011. Extraverts Have Larger Social
429 Network Layers. *J. Individ. Differ.* 32, 161–169. doi:10.1027/1614-
430 0001/a000048
- 431 Roberts, S.G.B., Dunbar, R.I.M., Pollet, T.V., Kuppens, T., 2009. Exploring variation
432 in active network size: Constraints and ego characteristics. *Soc. Networks* 31,
433 138–146. doi:10.1016/j.socnet.2008.12.002
- 434 Roberts, S.G.B., Dunbar, R.I.M., 2011a. The costs of family and friends: an 18 month
435 longitudinal study of relationship maintenance and decay. *Evol Hum Behav.*
436 32, 186–197. doi:10.1016/j.evolhumbehav.2010.08.005
- 437 Roberts, S.G.B., Dunbar, R.I.M., 2011b. Communication in social networks: effects
438 of kinship, network size, and emotional closeness. *Pers Relationship*, 18, 439-
439 452. doi:10.1111/j.1475-6811.2010.01310.x
- 440 Roberts, S.G.B., Wilson, R., Fedurek, P., Dunbar, R.I.M., 2008. Individual
441 differences and personal social network size and structure. *Pers. Individ. Dif.*,
442 44, 954–964. doi:10.1007/s12110-003-1016-y
- 443 Russell, D.W., Booth, B., Reed, D., Laughlin, P.R., 1997. Personality, social
444 networks, and perceived social support among alcoholics: a structural equation
445 analysis. *J. Pers.* 65, 649–692. doi:10.1111/j.1467-6494.1997.tb00330.x
- 446 Saramäki, J., Leicht, E.A., López, E., Roberts, S.G.B., Reed-Tsochas, F., Dunbar,
447 R.I.M., 2014. Persistence of social signatures in human communication. *Proc.*
448 *Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.* 111, 942–7. doi:10.1073/pnas.1308540110
- 449 Selfhout, M., Burk, W., Branje, S., Denissen, J., Van Aken, M., Meeus, W., 2010.
450 Emerging late adolescent friendship networks and Big Five personality traits:
451 a social network approach. *J. Pers.* 78, 509–538. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-
452 6494.2010.00625.x

- 453 Stiller, J., Dunbar, R.I.M., 2007. Perspective-taking and memory capacity predict
454 social network size. *Soc. Networks* 29, 93–104.
455 doi:10.1016/j.socnet.2006.04.001
- 456 Stokes, J.P., 1985. The relation of social network and individual difference variables
457 to loneliness. *J. Pers. Soc. Psychol.* 48, 981–990. doi:10.1037/0022-
458 3514.48.4.981
- 459 Sutcliffe, A., Dunbar, R., Binder, J., Arrow, H., 2012. Relationships and the social
460 brain: integrating psychological and evolutionary perspectives. *Br. J. Psychol.*
461 103, 149–68. doi:10.1111/j.2044-8295.2011.02061.x
- 462 Wellman, B., Wortley, S., 1990. Different strokes from different folks: Community
463 ties and social support. *Am. J. Sociology* 96, 558-588.
- 464 Zhou, W.-X., Sornette, D., Hill, R.A., Dunbar, R.I.M., 2005. Discrete hierarchical
465 organization of social group sizes. *Proc. R. Soc. B Biol. Sci.* 272, 439–444.
466 doi:10.1098/rspb.2004.2970
- 467 Zhu, X., Woo, S. E., Porter, C., Brzezinski, M., 2013. Pathways to happiness: from
468 personality to social networks and perceived support. *Soc. Networks* 35, 382-
469 393. doi:10.1016/j.socnet.2013.04.005
- 470

Appendix

Table 1. Hierarchical regressions for network layer size (BcA bootstrapping; 1,000 samples).

Dependent variable	Model	Predictors	B	b (bootstrap)	p (bootstrap)	Lower	Upper
Support group size	Model 1 ($R^2 = 0.04$)	Emotionality	0.101	0.552	.060	-0.077	1.072
		Extraversion	0.131	0.751	.004	0.267	1.260
		Openness to Experience	0.131	0.737	.002	0.292	1.170
Sympathy group size	Model 1 ($R^2 = 0.03$)	Language	-0.204	-1.870	.001	-2.780	-0.972
		(Dutch/English vs. Other)					
		Language	-0.018	-0.203	.756	-1.426	1.050
		(Dutch/Other vs. English)					

Notes. Sympathy group size is excluding support group members. Lower and upper represent lower and upper 95% CI for bootstrapped estimates.

Table 2. Hierarchical regressions for emotional closeness (EC) (BcA bootstrapping; 1,000 samples).

Dependent variable	Model	Predictors	β	b (bootstrap)	p (bootstrap)	Lower	Upper
EC support group	Model 1 ($R^2 = 0.01$)	Emotionality	0.091	1.811	.039	0.077	3.760
	Model 2 ($R^2 = 0.04$)	Emotionality	0.012	0.229	.806	-1.695	2.190
		Gender	0.182	4.816	.002	2.292	7.765
	Model 3 ($R^2 = 0.05$)	Emotionality	0.028	0.557	.571	-1.448	2.624
		Gender	0.163	4.311	.003	1.746	7.125
		Language	-0.141	-3.591	.003	-5.637	-1.409
		(Dutch/English vs. Other)					
		Language	-0.125	-3.959	.006	-6.523	-1.344
		(Dutch/Other vs. English)					
	Model 4 ($R^2 = 0.07$)	Emotionality	0.037	0.738	.430	-1.215	2.864
		Gender	0.164	4.325	.002	1.851	7.001
		Language	-0.134	-3.399	.004	-5.439	-1.267
		(Dutch/English vs. Other)					
		Language	-0.111	-3.533	.011	-6.157	-0.982
		(Dutch/Other vs. English)					
		Support group size	-0.151	-0.551	.002	-0.897	-0.222

Table 2 continued.

EC sympathy group	Model 1 ($R^2 = 0.02$)	Honesty-Humility	0.124	3.751	.008	0.960	6.237
		Extraversion	0.083	2.406	.068	-0.241	5.148
	Model 2 ($R^2 = 0.03$)	Honesty-Humility	0.134	4.050	.004	1.297	6.434
		Extraversion	0.085	2.472	.057	-0.142	5.165
		Degree	-0.139	-5.419	.003	-8.896	-1.922
	Model 3 ($R^2 = 0.04$)	Honesty-Humility	0.128	3.858	.006	1.073	6.373
		Extraversion	0.077	2.241	.089	-0.349	4.865
		Degree	-0.118	-4.585	.009	-7.996	-1.060
		Language	-0.088	-3.156	.068	-6.393	0.467
		(Dutch/English vs. Other)					
		Language	-0.128	-5.700	.011	-9.879	-1.517
		(Dutch/Other vs. English)					

Notes. EC sympathy group is excluding support group members. Lower and upper represent lower and upper 95% CI for bootstrapped estimates.

476

477

478

479

Footnotes

¹ Empirically, Honesty-Humility and Emotionality are less well covered by the five factors of the NEO-FFI than the other HEXACO factors, suggesting that these two traits—and somewhat Agreeableness—include content that is not well-represented in the Big Five (Lee & Ashton, 2013).