

Original Article

Big Five Traits Related to Short-Term Mating: From Personality to Promiscuity across 46 Nations

David P. Schmitt, Bradley University, Department of Psychology, Peoria, IL 61625, USA. Email: dps@bradley.edu (Corresponding author)

Todd K. Shackelford, Department of Psychology, Florida Atlantic University, USA.¹

Abstract: As part of the International Sexuality Description Project, 13,243 participants from 46 nations responded to self-report measures of personality and mating behavior. Several traits showed consistent links with short-term mating. Extraversion positively correlated with interest in short-term mating, unrestricted sociosexuality, having engaged in short-term mate poaching attempts, having succumbed to short-term poaching attempts of others, and lacking relationship exclusivity. Low levels of agreeableness and conscientiousness also related to short-term mating, especially with extra-pair mating. Neuroticism and openness were associated with short-term mating as well, but these links were less consistent across sex and nation. Nation-level links between personality and sexuality replicated within-region findings, such as the strong association between national extraversion and national sociosexuality. Discussion focuses on the origins of personality-sexuality links and their implications across nations.

Keywords: Big Five; personality; cross-cultural psychology; evolutionary psychology; short-term mating; sexual behavior

Introduction

Short-term mating is likely to have been a recurrent feature of human evolutionary history, occasionally generating substantial reproductive benefits for ancestral members of both sexes (Kelly and Dunbar, 2001; Little, Cohen, Jones, and Belsky, 2007; Little, Jones, Penton-Voak, Burt, and Perrett, 2002; Scheib, 2001; Schmitt, 2005a; and see for review, Smith, 1984, and Buss, 2003). But there are reproductively-relevant costs to short-term mating as well, for ancestral humans as assuredly as for modern humans. For example, short-term mating

¹ All editorial decisions were handled by Associate Editor Dr. Steven Platek

behaviors—including variants such as promiscuity, infidelity, and the poaching of other people's long-term partners—represent significant health concerns to individuals, relationships, and societies throughout the world. Short-term mating can lead to relationship dissolution (Bringle and Buunk, 1991; Gottman, 1994), sexual jealousy and violent retribution by aggrieved partners (Buss, 2000; Malamuth, 1998), and the contraction of sexually-transmitted diseases and infections (Mashegoane, Moalusi, Ngoepe, and Peltzer, 2002; Pinkerton and Abramson, 1996). In sub-Saharan Africa alone, 23 million adults are currently infected with HIV, with most cases traceable to instances of short-term mating (Shelton et al., 2004).

An important task for personality psychologists is to identify those individual differences most closely associated with short-term mating. Doing so would give scientists a better framework for understanding the etiology of permissive sexual attitudes and risky sexual practices (Trost, Herbst, Masters, and Costa, 2002). Previous research suggests some of the traits from the Big Five model of personality (Digman, 1990; Goldberg, 1990) are associated with short-term mating (Hoyle, Fejfar, and Miller, 2000; Schenk and Pfrang, 1986; Shafer, 2001; Wright, 1999; Wright and Reise, 1997). In this article, the links among all five dimensions of the Big Five and multiple measures of short-term mating were examined across 46 nations representing 10 major regions of the world.

Personality Traits and Short-Term Mating

Perhaps the strongest personality predictor of short-term mating is impulsive sensation-seeking (Hoyle et al., 2000; Zuckerman and Kuhlman, 2000). Studies have consistently linked sensation-seeking to short-term mating (Franzini and Sidemen, 1994; Linton and Wiener, 2001; Mashegoane et al., 2002; Ripa, Hansen, Mortensen, Sanders, and Reinisch, 2001), including men's patronage of prostitutes (Wilson, Manual, and Lavelle, 1992). Impulsive sensation-seeking is closely associated with the Big Five dimensions of low agreeableness and low conscientiousness (Zuckerman, 1994; Zuckerman, Kuhlman, Joireman, Teta, and Kraft, 1994). Not surprisingly, low agreeableness and low conscientiousness have been linked directly to short-term sexual behavior across many studies (Barta and Kiene, 2005; Buss and Shackelford, 1997; Hoyle et al., 2000; Markey, Markey, and Tinsley, 2003; Schmitt, 2004; Trost et al., 2000; Wright and Reise, 1997).

Based on his three-factor model of personality, Eysenck (1971, 1976) has argued that extraversion is central to explaining individual differences in sexuality, including many facets of short-term mating. For example, extraverts are more likely than introverts to endorse favorable attitudes about having multiple sex partners and to engage in sexual intercourse with more partners than introverts do (Eysenck, 1976; Eysenck and Eysenck, 1975). Similar associations between extraversion and short-term mating have been documented by others (Barnes, Malamuth, and Cheek, 1984; Cooper, Agocha, and Sheldon 2000; Costa et al., 1992; Snyder, Simpson, and Gangestad, 1986), including links with extra-pair mating and promiscuous sexual behavior (Buss and Shackelford, 1997; Pinkerton and Abramson, 1995; Schenk and Pfrang, 1986; Schmitt, 1996; Schmitt and Buss, 2001; Wright, 1999). Some investigators have found that neuroticism correlates with facets of short-term mating (Lameiras Fernandez and Rodriguez Castro, 2003; Zuckerman, 1993), including more sexual risk-taking (Ball and Schottenfeld, 1997; Cooper et al., 2000; McCown, 1992; Naff Johnson, 1997).

Personality Traits and Short-Term Mating across Nations

Most of the studies and findings reporting associations between personality traits and short-term mating have been based on responses from college students residing in the United States or the United Kingdom. We attempted to replicate and extend these findings in three ways. First, we examined the entire Big Five model in relation to short-term mating. We were particularly interested in whether some Big Five traits are more closely linked with short-term mating than others. Second, we examined a wide variety of short-term mating variables, including interest in short-term mating, short-term mating behavior, and both the infidelity and promiscuity facets of short-term mating (Schmitt and Buss, 2000). Third, we assessed these variables across multiple college student and community samples from 46 nations representing 10 major regions of the world, including North America (represented by 3 nations; see Table 1), South America (four nations), Western Europe (eight nations), Eastern Europe (ten nations), Southern Europe (five nations), the Middle East (three nations), Africa (five nations), Oceania (three nations), South/Southeast Asia (one nation), and East Asia (four nations).

Assessing personality and short-term mating across nations is important for several reasons. First, many psychologists have suggested that it is critical to conduct cross-cultural studies on correlates of personality instead of simply assuming their universality (Church and Lonner, 1998). Heine and his colleagues, for example, comment that most personality research has been “conducted by North American researchers at North American universities with North American participants using methodologies that were developed in North America” (Heine, Lehman, Markus, and Kitayama, 1999, p. 768). Such criticisms evoke concerns about the generalizability of the personality predictors of short-term mating previously described and attest to the necessity of replicating findings across diverse nations. Second, there is reason to believe that nations vary in their Big Five personality traits (McCrae, 2002), including how variable people are along these personality dimensions (Allik and McCrae, 2004; McCrae, 2001). Along with evidence that short-term mating behavior also varies across nations (Schmitt, 2005a; Schmitt et al., 2003), the present study helps to identify whether the same personality systems are universally active in the etiology of short-term mating attitudes and behaviors. Third, if nations do vary in the personality correlates of short-term mating, any application of individual difference findings, such as attempts to reduce the incidence of short-term mating, would need to take into account these cultural caveats.

Table 1. Sample sizes, sampling type, and language of survey across 46 nations and 10 world regions of the International Sexuality Description Project

| World Regions | Sample Size | | Sample Type | Language |
|--------------------------|-------------|-------|-------------------|-----------------|
| | Men | Women | | |
| <u>North America</u> | 1,269 | 2,256 | | |
| Canada | 329 | 618 | College Students | English/French |
| Mexico | 90 | 100 | Community-Based | Spanish |
| United States of America | 850 | 1,538 | College Students | English |
| <u>South America</u> | 293 | 329 | | |
| Argentina | 107 | 136 | College Students | Spanish |
| Bolivia | 66 | 54 | College Students | Spanish |
| Brazil | 37 | 48 | College Students | Portuguese |
| Peru | 83 | 91 | College Students | Spanish |
| <u>Western Europe</u> | 852 | 1,471 | | |
| Austria | 167 | 223 | College/Community | German |
| Belgium (Flanders) | 129 | 284 | College Students | Dutch (Flemish) |
| Finland | 26 | 67 | Community-Based | Finnish |
| France | 46 | 53 | College Students | French |
| Germany | 218 | 372 | College/Community | German |
| Netherlands | 92 | 111 | College Students | Dutch |
| Switzerland | 57 | 94 | College Students | German |
| United Kingdom | 117 | 268 | College/Community | English |
| <u>Eastern Europe</u> | 841 | 1,082 | | |
| Croatia | 98 | 100 | College Students | Croatian |
| Czech Republic | 72 | 98 | College Students | Czech |
| Estonia | 60 | 84 | College Students | Estonian |
| Latvia | 75 | 78 | College Students | Latvian |
| Lithuania | 39 | 38 | College Students | Lithuanian |
| Poland | 210 | 379 | College Students | Polish |
| Romania | 97 | 103 | College Students | Romanian |
| Serbia | 91 | 94 | College Students | Serbian |
| Slovakia | 55 | 68 | College Students | Slovak |
| Slovenia | 44 | 40 | College Students | Slovenian |
| <u>Southern Europe</u> | 406 | 668 | | |
| Greece | 37 | 153 | College Students | Greek |
| Italy | 91 | 108 | College/Community | Italian |
| Malta | 103 | 119 | College Students | English |
| Portugal | 98 | 131 | College Students | Portuguese |
| Spain | 77 | 157 | College Students | Spanish |

Big Five and Sexuality across Nations

| | | | | |
|-----------------------------|-------|-------|-------------------|--------------|
| <u>Middle East</u> | 411 | 474 | | |
| Israel | 130 | 170 | College Students | Hebrew |
| Lebanon | 102 | 117 | College Students | English |
| Turkey | 179 | 187 | College/Community | Turkish |
| <u>Africa</u> | 421 | 379 | | |
| Botswana | 94 | 114 | College Students | English |
| Congo, Dem. Rep. of | 86 | 48 | College/Community | French |
| Ethiopia | 90 | 60 | College/Community | English |
| Morocco | 55 | 67 | College Students | English |
| Zimbabwe | 96 | 90 | College Students | English |
| <u>Oceania</u> | 341 | 463 | | |
| Australia | 176 | 261 | College Students | English |
| Fiji and Pacific Islands | 65 | 50 | College/Community | English |
| New Zealand | 100 | 152 | College Students | English |
| <u>South/Southeast Asia</u> | 93 | 118 | | |
| Philippines | 93 | 118 | College Students | English |
| <u>East Asia</u> | 518 | 557 | | |
| Hong Kong (China) | 90 | 94 | College Students | English |
| Japan | 125 | 86 | College Students | Japanese |
| Korea, Rep. of | 189 | 289 | College Students | Korean |
| Taiwan | 114 | 88 | College Students | Mandarin |
| <hr/> | | | | |
| Worldwide ISDP Sample: | 5,445 | 7,798 | College/Community | 24 Languages |

Note. All samples were convenience samples. Further details on sampling methods within each nation are available from the author. Additional samples from Chile, Ukraine, Cyprus, Jordan, South Africa, Tanzania, Bangladesh, India, Indonesia, and Malaysia were included in the International Sexuality Description Project, but participants in those samples did not complete all measures used in this study.

Method

Samples

The samples in this study are from the International Sexuality Description Project (ISDP; Schmitt et al., 2003, 2004). The ISDP included a total of 56 nations. However, some participants did not receive, or did not fully respond to, all measures relevant to the present study. Specifically, participants from Chile, Ukraine, Cyprus, Jordan, South Africa, Tanzania, India, Indonesia, Bangladesh, and Malaysia were not included in the present study due to substantial missing or incomplete data. As shown in Table 1, the present dataset included 46 nations from the world regions of North America ($n = 3,525$), South America ($n = 622$), Western Europe ($n = 2,323$), Eastern Europe ($n = 1,923$), Southern Europe ($n = 1,074$), Middle East ($n = 885$), Africa ($n = 800$), Oceania ($n = 804$), South/Southeast Asia ($n = 211$), and East Asia ($n = 1,075$). Following previous work (Schmitt et al., 2003), and in an effort to present the key results as

concisely as possible, we will focus most of the current analyses at the level of world region. All nation-level results are available from the first author.

Most samples were comprised of college students; some included college students plus general members of the community; and two (Finland and Mexico) consisted solely of community members (see Table 1). All samples were convenience samples. Most samples were recruited as volunteers, some received course credit for participation, and some received a small monetary reward for their participation. All samples were administered an anonymous self-report survey, and most surveys were returned via sealed envelope or the usage of a drop-box. This form of assessment tends to minimize response biases involving sexual surveys (Alexander and Fisher, 2003; Andersen and Broffitt, 1988). Return rates for college student samples tended to be high (around 95%), although this number was lower in some nations. Return rates for community samples were around 50%. Further details on the sampling and assessment procedures within each nation are provided elsewhere (Schmitt et al., 2003, 2004) and are available from the first author.

Procedure

Participants were provided with a brief description of the study, including the following instructions: “This questionnaire is entirely voluntary. All your responses will be kept confidential and your personal identity will remain anonymous. No identifying information is requested on this survey, nor will any such information be added later to this survey. If any of the questions make you uncomfortable, feel free not to answer them. You are free to withdraw from this study at any time for any reason. This series of questionnaires should take about 20 minutes to complete. Thank you for your participation.” Details on incentives and cover stories used across samples are available from the first author.

Measures

Researchers from non-English-speaking nations were asked to use a translation/back-translation process and to administer the ISDP in their native language. This procedure involved the primary collaborator translating the measures into the native language of the participants, and then having a second person back-translate into English. Differences between the original English and the back-translation were discussed, and mutual agreements were made on the most appropriate translation. This procedure balances the needs of making the translation meaningful and naturally readable to the native participants, while preserving the original psychological constructs (Brislin, 1993; Church, 2001; van de Vijver and Leung, 2000). Samples from Morocco, Ethiopia, Fiji, the Philippines, and Hong Kong were administered the survey in English, with certain terms and phrases annotated to clarify what were thought to be confusing words for the participants. The translation of the ISDP survey into Flemish used only a translation procedure, as this involved mainly word variant changes from the original Dutch. Finally, pilot studies were conducted in several testing sites to clarify translation and comprehension concerns.

Demographic measure. Each sample was presented with a demographic measure including questions about sex (male or female), age, ethnicity, date of birth, sexual orientation, socioeconomic status, and current relationship status. Not all of these questions were included in all samples (e.g., date of birth was considered too invasive in some samples), and all

collaborators were asked to adapt the demographic questions appropriately for their sample (e.g., ethnic categories varied).

Short-term mating measures. Short-term mating is not a one-dimensional construct. Some individuals seek short-term sexual relationships in addition to their long-term relationships (i.e., infidelity; Wiederman, 1997). Others seek short-term partners as their primary mode of mating (i.e., promiscuity; Paul, McManus, and Hayes, 2000). Still others may possess high levels of interest in short-term mating, but are not able or willing to engage in short-term mating (Jackson and Kirkpatrick, 2007; Webster and Bryan, 2007). Each of these facets of short-term mating are likely interrelated, given that low levels of short-term sexual interest would lead to relatively little short-term mating behavior. However, because of the potential differences between sexual interests and behaviors, short-term mating was assessed in the present study using multiple measures.

Included first was a 7-item index designed to assess current interest in short-term mating, the *Short-Term Mating Interests* scale (see Schmitt, 2005b). The first three Short-Term Mating Interests items are from the Number of Partners measure (Buss and Schmitt, 1993; Fenigstein and Preston, 2007; Schmitt et al., 2003), which asks using open-ended scales for the number of sex partners desired across various future time periods. Three of the most commonly analyzed items include the time periods of “one month,” “one year,” and “five years” (Schmitt, Shackelford, Duntley, Tooke, and Buss, 2001; Schmitt et al., 2003). For Short-Term Mating Interests, all values on these three items that were above three were truncated down to three to control for extreme values (see Schmitt, in press). The next three Short-Term Mating Interests items are from the Time Known measure (Buss and Schmitt, 1993; Schmitt et al., 2003), which asks the likelihood of consenting to sex with someone who is desirable (using a scale of +3 = *definitely yes* to -3 = *definitely not*) after knowing that person for various time intervals. For Short-Term Mating Interests, the time periods of “one month,” “one year,” and “five years” were used. Also included in Short-Term Mating Interests was the Short-Term Seeking scale (Buss and Schmitt, 1993; Schmitt et al., 2003). This is a single-item 7-point rating scale ranging from 1 (*currently not at all seeking a short-term mate*) to 7 (*currently strongly seeking a short-term mate*). Responses to all seven items (three from the Number of Partners measure, three from the Time Known measure, and the Short-Term Seeking scale) were summed to form the Short-Term Mating Interests scale (see also Schmitt, 2005b). Cronbach’s alpha for Short-Term Mating Interests across the ISDP was .80 (see Table 2).

A 7-item measure of willingness to have sex without commitment, the Sociosexual Orientation Inventory (Simpson and Gangestad, 1991) also was administered to participants in the ISDP. The first three items of the Sociosexual Orientation Inventory are intended to capture behavioral expressions of short-term mating. Item one is: “With how many different partners have you had sex (sexual intercourse) within the past year?” Item two is: “How many different partners do you foresee yourself having sex with during the next five years? (Please give a specific, realistic estimate).” Item three is: “With how many different partners have you had sex on one and only one occasion?” Open-ended blanks are provided after each of the first three questions of the Sociosexual Orientation Inventory. The fourth item is designed to measure covert sociosexual behavior: “How often do (did) you fantasize about having sex with someone other than your current (most recent) dating partner?” This item is followed by an 8-point scale, ranging from 1 (never) to 8 (at least once a day). Items five, six, and seven are designed to measure sociosexual attitudes. Item five is: “Sex without love is OK.” Item six is: “I can imagine myself being comfortable and enjoying “casual” sex with different partners.” Item seven is: “I

would have to be closely attached to someone (both emotionally and psychologically) before I could feel comfortable and fully enjoy having sex with him or her.” All three attitudinal items are followed by 9-point scales ranging from 1 (I strongly disagree) to 9 (I strongly agree). Responses to item seven are reverse-coded so that higher scores indicate more unrestricted sociosexuality. According to Simpson and Gangestad (1991), items five, six, and seven are highly correlated and should be merged to form a single “attitudinal” score. This attitudinal score is then combined with the first four items to form the total Sociosexual Orientation Inventory composite measure. However, each item of the Sociosexual Orientation Inventory composite measure is first weighted using the following formula: $(5 * \text{Item One}) + (1 * \text{Item Two [with a cap on Item Two of 30]}) + (5 * \text{Item Three}) + (4 * \text{Item Four}) + (2 * \text{Mean of Items Five, Six, and Seven}) = \text{Total Sociosexuality}$ (Simpson and Gangestad, 1991). Using this formula produces a Sociosexual Orientation Inventory composite such that higher scores are associated with unrestricted sociosexuality (i.e., more short-term mating). In this study, Cronbach’s alpha for the Sociosexual Orientation Inventory was .80.

All participants were presented with a questionnaire entitled “*Anonymous Romantic Attraction Survey*” (Schmitt and Buss, 2001). The Anonymous Romantic Attraction Survey asks a series of questions about personal experiences with romantic attraction and mate poaching (i.e., romantically attracting someone else’s partner). Each rating scale on the questionnaire asks participants to describe their experiences with a specific attraction behavior. For the frequency of attempting or succumbing to mate poaching behaviors, rating scale values range from 1 (*Never*) to 7 (*Always*). Intermediate values are labeled rarely, seldom, sometimes, frequently, and almost always. For the degree of success in mate poaching, rating scales range from 1 (*Not at all successful*) to 7 (*Very successful*). An intermediate value of 4 (*Moderately successful*) also is provided. These frequency and degree anchors tend to maximize the interval-level quality of rating scale data (Spector, 1992). Two items from the Anonymous Romantic Attraction Survey are relevant to the present study. The first question asks about the frequency with which participants have attempted to short-term mate poach, “Have you ever tried to attract someone who was *already in a romantic relationship with someone else* for a short-term sexual relationship with you?” The second question asks “While you were in a romantic relationship, if others attempted to obtain you as a short-term sexual partner, how *successful* have they been (if others have never tried, skip this question)?” Responses to this item are a direct indicator of previous infidelities.

Samples were then administered a measure of the “Sexy Seven” sexuality attributes (Schmitt and Buss, 2000). The Sexy Seven measure asks participants to rate themselves compared to others they know (using a nine-point scale from 1 = Extremely Inaccurate to 9 = Extremely Accurate) on a list of 67 sexually-connotative adjectives. The Sexy Seven includes one scale designed to capture variability in short-term mating, the Relationship Exclusivity scale. The Relationship Exclusivity scale contains the following adjectival items: “adulterous [reverse-scored],” “devoted,” “faithful,” “loose [reverse-scored],” “monogamous,” polygamous [reverse-scored],” “promiscuous [reverse-scored],” and “unfaithful [reverse-scored].” In this study, the Relationship Exclusivity scale had a Cronbach’s alpha of .78 (see Table 2). Further psychometrics on the Relationship Exclusivity scale can be found in Schmitt and Buss (2000). For the purposes of this study, we will refer to the Relationship Exclusivity scale as a “Lack of Relationship Exclusivity” such that it will correlate in the same direction as all other measures of short-term mating.

All measures of short-term mating were intercorrelated among both men and women. Among men, short-term mating interests correlated with sociosexuality, $r(4207) = +0.48$, $p < .001$, with having made short-term mate poaching attempts, $r(4144) = +0.33$, $p < .001$, with having succumbed to short-term mate poaching by others, $r(2841) = +0.29$, $p < .001$, and with a lack of self-described relationship exclusivity, $r(4105) = +0.37$, $p < .001$. Among women, short-term mating interests correlated with sociosexuality, $r(6155) = +0.49$, $p < .001$, with having made short-term mate poaching attempts, $r(6109) = +0.28$, $p < .001$, with having succumbed to short-term mate poaching by others, $r(4399) = +0.23$, $p < .001$, and with a lack of self-described relationship exclusivity, $r(6029) = +0.28$, $p < .001$. Further details concerning the intercorrelations among sexuality measures are available from the first author.

Personality trait measure. Participants completed the *Big Five Inventory* (BFI), a measure of the Big Five that has proven effective across nations and languages (Benet-Martinez and John, 1998). The first scale of the BFI is Extraversion, which includes individual differences in positive emotionality, sociability, energy levels, and talkativeness, among others (Costa and McCrae, 1992; Lucas et al., 2000; Watson and Clark, 1997). In this study, Cronbach's alpha for the Extraversion scale was .79. The second scale from the BFI is Agreeableness, which includes individual differences in kindness, empathy, interpersonal trust, and humility (see Graziano and Eisenberg, 1997). In this study, Cronbach's alpha for the Agreeableness scale was .71. The third scale from the BFI is Conscientiousness (i.e., tending to be organized, reliable, hardworking, and possessing high integrity; Hogan and Ones, 1997). In this study, Cronbach's alpha for the Conscientiousness scale was .79. The fourth scale of the BFI measures neuroticism. Neuroticism is related to several personality disorders (Costa and Widiger, 1994) and is conceptually anchored in high anxiety, depression, and vulnerability to stress. In this study, Cronbach's alpha for the Neuroticism scale was .80. The final scale from the BFI is Openness. People high in openness tend to be imaginative, creative, introspective, and cultured (McCrae and Costa, 1997). In this study, Cronbach's alpha for the Openness scale was .77.

Results

Table 2 includes the means and standard deviations of men and women across all measures of personality and short-term mating. Men and women were significantly different on all measures of personality. Women scored higher on extraversion, agreeableness, conscientiousness, and neuroticism. Men scored higher on openness. In terms of the magnitude of the sex differences, Cohen (1988) suggests that an effect size (d) of ± 0.20 be considered small, ± 0.50 be considered medium, and ± 0.80 be considered large. Although women scored significantly higher on many personality traits, most of these differences were less than small in magnitude. The one exception involved neuroticism, in which women scored moderately higher than men ($d = -0.46$). Men scored significantly higher on all measure of short-term mating, with small to medium effect sizes in short-term mating interests ($d = 0.68$), sociosexuality ($d = 0.74$), levels of short-term mate poaching attempts ($d = 0.42$), levels of having succumbed to short-term mate poaching ($d = 0.31$), and in having a lack of relationship exclusivity ($d = 0.53$).

Table 2. Descriptive Statistics and Sex Differences for Personality and Short-Term Mating Scales in the International Sexuality Description Project

| | Men | | Women | | Sex Differences | |
|--|----------|-----------|----------|-----------|-----------------|----------|
| | <i>M</i> | <i>SD</i> | <i>M</i> | <i>SD</i> | <i>t</i> | <i>d</i> |
| BFI: Extraversion ($\alpha = .79$) | 3.32 | 0.68 | 3.43 | 0.73 | -8.00*** | -0.14 |
| BFI: Agreeableness ($\alpha = .71$) | 3.57 | 0.59 | 3.68 | 0.60 | -10.16*** | -0.18 |
| BFI: Conscientiousness ($\alpha = .79$) | 3.39 | 0.66 | 3.50 | 0.66 | -9.89*** | -0.18 |
| BFI: Neuroticism ($\alpha = .80$) | 2.79 | 0.72 | 3.14 | 0.75 | -26.53*** | -0.46 |
| BFI: Openness ($\alpha = .77$) | 3.71 | 0.60 | 3.68 | 0.60 | 2.68** | 0.05 |
| Short-Term Mating Interests ($\alpha = .80$) | 11.64 | 7.16 | 6.77 | 6.37 | 36.36*** | 0.68 |
| Sociosexual Orientation Inventory ($\alpha = .80$) | 46.85 | 29.74 | 27.59 | 19.66 | 44.85*** | 0.74 |
| Mate Poaching Attempts (one item scale) | 2.33 | 1.43 | 1.78 | 1.15 | 24.31*** | 0.42 |
| Succumbed to Poaching (one item scale) | 2.85 | 1.87 | 2.30 | 1.70 | 14.62*** | 0.31 |
| Relationship Exclusivity ($\alpha = .78$) | 6.66 | 1.43 | 7.39 | 1.25 | -30.49*** | -0.53 |

Note: ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$. In general, d values of $\pm .20$ are considered small, $\pm .50$ are moderate, and $\pm .80$ are large (Cohen, 1988).

Extraversion and Short-Term Mating across Nations

As expected from previous research (e.g., Eysenck, 1976; Costa et al., 1992; Hoyle et al., 2000; Wright, 1999), extraversion correlated positively with several measures of short-term mating. Moreover, these correlations were pervasive across sex, and across most major regions of the world (see Table 3).

North and South America. Among North American men, higher extraversion was associated significantly with interest in short-term mating, unrestricted sociosexuality, short-term mate poaching attempts, and lower relationship exclusivity (i.e., greater infidelity). Among North American women, higher extraversion was associated significantly with interest in short-term mating, unrestricted sociosexuality, short-term mate poaching attempts, and acquiescence to short-term poaching attempts. In South America, all of the correlations between extraversion and short-term mating were positive, although only four reached statistical significance (see Table 3). Among South American men, higher extraversion was associated significantly with higher sociosexuality (i.e., more short-term mating), short-term mate poaching attempts, and lower relationship exclusivity. Among South American women, higher extraversion was associated significantly with higher sociosexuality.

Europe. In Western Europe, most correlations between extraversion and short-term mating were positive and several reached statistical significance. Among Western European men, higher extraversion was associated significantly with higher sociosexuality and more frequent short-term mate poaching attempts. Among Western European women, higher extraversion was associated significantly with higher sociosexuality, more frequent short-term mate poaching attempts, and lower relationship exclusivity. In Eastern Europe, all associations between extraversion and short-term mating were positive and significant, demonstrating the most consistent links between extraversion and short-term mating for any world region. In Southern Europe, the same pattern found in Western Europe was evident. Namely, higher extraversion was associated significantly with higher sociosexuality and short-term mate poaching among men and women, and lower relationship exclusivity for women.

Middle East and Africa. In the Middle East, extraversion was associated significantly with unrestricted sociosexuality, short-term mate poaching attempts, and lower relationship exclusivity among men. Among Middle Eastern women, higher extraversion was associated significantly only with lower relationship exclusivity. Among African men, higher extraversion was associated significantly with more short-term mating interest and more short-term mate poaching attempts. For women in Africa, higher extraversion was associated significantly with more short-term mating interest and more unrestricted sociosexuality.

Oceania, South/Southeast Asia, and East Asia. Among Oceanic men, higher extraversion was associated significantly with interest in short-term mating, unrestricted sociosexuality, and lower relationship exclusivity. Among Oceanic women, higher extraversion was associated significantly only with short-term mate poaching attempts. In South/Southeast Asia, higher extraversion was associated significantly with a more unrestricted sociosexual orientation and more frequent short-term mate poaching attempts. For women in South/Southeast Asia, higher extraversion was only associated significantly with a more unrestricted sociosexuality. In East Asia, higher extraversion was associated significantly with more short-term mating interest, more unrestricted sociosexuality, and more short-term mate poaching attempts among both men and women.

Table 3. Big Five Personality Traits Related to Short-Term Mating among Men and Women across 10 World Regions of the International Sexuality Description Project

| World Region | Personality Traits | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|--------------------|----------|---------------|----------|-------------------|----------|-------------|----------|----------|----------|
| | Extraversion | | Agreeableness | | Conscientiousness | | Neuroticism | | Openness | |
| | <u>M</u> | <u>W</u> | <u>M</u> | <u>W</u> | <u>M</u> | <u>W</u> | <u>M</u> | <u>W</u> | <u>M</u> | <u>W</u> |
| <u>North America</u> | | | | | | | | | | |
| Short-Term Mating Interests | .11*** | .06** | -.16*** | -.13*** | -.17*** | -.13*** | .00 | .05* | -.02 | .11*** |
| Unrestricted Sociosexual Orientation | .13*** | .13*** | -.14*** | -.17*** | -.07* | -.11*** | .00 | .04* | -.03 | .11*** |
| Mate Poaching Attempts | .15*** | .08*** | -.12*** | -.16*** | -.06* | -.09*** | .03 | .06** | -.01 | .01 |
| Succumbed to Poaching | .05 | .05* | -.07* | -.11*** | -.11*** | -.12*** | .02 | .08*** | -.07* | .02 |
| Lack of Relationship Exclusivity | .13*** | .04 | -.18*** | -.20*** | -.19*** | -.25*** | -.01 | .06** | -.10*** | -.01 |
| <u>South America</u> | | | | | | | | | | |
| Short-Term Mating Interests | .09 | .09 | .00 | -.07 | -.04 | -.09 | -.12 | -.01 | .03 | .05 |
| Unrestricted Sociosexual Orientation | .12* | .16** | -.07 | -.07 | -.11 | .05 | -.11 | -.03 | .12* | .10 |
| Mate Poaching Attempts | .13* | .06 | -.11 | -.11 | .00 | -.05 | -.08 | .06 | .13* | -.09 |
| Succumbed to Poaching | .02 | .08 | -.15* | .05 | -.01 | .03 | .01 | .03 | .13* | .12 |
| Lack of Relationship Exclusivity | .23*** | .06 | -.11 | .08 | -.13* | -.11 | -.09 | -.09 | .12* | .06 |
| <u>Western Europe</u> | | | | | | | | | | |
| Short-Term Mating Interests | -.03 | .03 | -.12** | -.08** | -.16*** | -.20*** | -.02 | .01 | -.02 | .08** |
| Unrestricted Sociosexual Orientation | .12*** | .12*** | -.12*** | -.13*** | -.08* | -.13*** | -.04 | .00 | .07* | .08** |
| Mate Poaching Attempts | .13*** | .09*** | -.13*** | -.10*** | -.09** | -.04 | -.01 | .02 | .03 | .05 |
| Succumbed to Poaching | .04 | -.01 | -.04 | -.06* | -.11** | -.14*** | -.02 | .08** | .03 | .04 |
| Lack of Relationship Exclusivity | .04 | .09*** | -.16*** | -.14*** | -.18*** | -.20*** | .01 | .00 | .00 | .03 |

Big Five and Sexuality across Nations

Eastern Europe

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|--------|--------|---------|---------|--------|---------|--------|---------|------|--------|
| Short-Term Mating Interests | .11** | .13*** | -.06 | -.06 | -.01 | -.16*** | -.11** | -.11*** | .09* | .11** |
| Unrestricted Sociosexual Orientation | .23*** | .21*** | -.13*** | -.15*** | .01 | -.13*** | -.07* | -.07* | .08* | .16*** |
| Mate Poaching Attempts | .19*** | .11*** | -.15*** | -.17*** | -.02 | -.10*** | .01 | -.04 | .09* | .09** |
| Succumbed to Poaching | .10* | .09** | -.01 | -.08* | .03 | -.13*** | .03 | .06 | .06 | .01 |
| Lack of Relationship Exclusivity | .14*** | .08** | -.24*** | -.20*** | -.09** | -.12*** | .01 | .05 | .00 | .06 |

Southern Europe

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|-------|--------|---------|---------|--------|---------|------|------|------|--------|
| Short-Term Mating Interests | .02 | .02 | -.15** | -.11** | -.15** | -.18*** | -.01 | .05 | .01 | .10* |
| Unrestricted Sociosexual Orientation | .13** | .16*** | -.16*** | -.22*** | -.05 | -.14*** | -.06 | .05 | .10* | .19*** |
| Mate Poaching Attempts | .14** | .10** | -.16*** | -.12** | -.08 | -.14*** | -.01 | .05 | .07 | .11** |
| Succumbed to Poaching | .07 | .06 | -.12* | -.09* | -.10 | -.10* | .04 | -.02 | .02 | .04 |
| Lack of Relationship Exclusivity | .10 | .16*** | -.17*** | -.17*** | -.11* | -.22*** | .00 | .04 | .03 | .14*** |

Middle East

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|--------|------|---------|---------|---------|--------|-------|------|------|-------|
| Short-Term Mating Interests | .02 | .07 | -.14** | -.07 | -.26*** | -.02 | .17** | -.06 | -.08 | .08 |
| Unrestricted Sociosexual Orientation | .18*** | .09 | -.18*** | -.12** | .02 | .02 | -.02 | -.02 | .10 | .13** |
| Mate Poaching Attempts | .13** | .01 | -.16** | -.13** | -.11* | -.13** | .10 | .10* | .01 | .04 |
| Succumbed to Poaching | .06 | -.01 | -.07 | -.04 | -.13* | -.01 | .03 | .11* | -.09 | -.04 |
| Lack of Relationship Exclusivity | .16** | .11* | -.21*** | -.17*** | -.17*** | -.09 | .02 | .00 | .05 | .02 |

Africa

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|-------|------|---------|-------|---------|---------|--------|------|------|------|
| Short-Term Mating Interests | .13* | .13* | -.24*** | -.06 | -.30*** | -.24*** | .08 | -.01 | .10 | -.02 |
| Unrestricted Sociosexual Orientation | .08 | .10* | -.14** | -.10* | -.23*** | -.20*** | .07 | -.03 | .11* | .04 |
| Mate Poaching Attempts | .15** | .07 | -.26*** | -.11* | -.20*** | -.17** | .09 | -.01 | .07 | .07 |
| Succumbed to Poaching | .03 | .04 | -.10 | -.12 | -.14* | -.18** | .21*** | .07 | .10 | .03 |
| Lack of Relationship Exclusivity | -.02 | .07 | -.23*** | -.08 | -.25*** | -.10 | .20*** | .00 | .00 | .00 |

Oceania

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|-------|-------|-------|---------|------|--------|------|------|------|------|
| Short-Term Mating Interests | .16** | .05 | -.13* | -.16*** | -.11 | -.13** | -.11 | .08 | .08 | .03 |
| Unrestricted Sociosexual Orientation | .17** | .06 | -.12* | -.12** | -.10 | -.12** | -.02 | .00 | .00 | .06 |
| Mate Poaching Attempts | .04 | .14** | -.08 | -.14** | -.04 | -.06 | .04 | .10* | -.06 | -.01 |

Big Five and Sexuality across Nations

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|--------|--------|---------|---------|---------|---------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| Succumbed to Poaching | .04 | .02 | -.17** | -.11* | -.13 | -.09 | .05 | .10 | .08 | .01 |
| Lack of Relationship Exclusivity | .15** | .05 | -.25*** | -.22*** | -.27*** | -.17*** | .04 | .02 | .08 | -.13** |
| <u>South/SE Asia</u> | | | | | | | | | | |
| Short-Term Mating Interests | .14 | .05 | .07 | -.03 | .15 | .10 | -.17 | -.10 | -.10 | -.11 |
| Unrestricted Sociosexual Orientation | .29** | .22* | .09 | .00 | .21* | -.04 | -.24* | -.01 | .30** | -.06 |
| Mate Poaching Attempts | .25* | .17 | .03 | -.06 | .11 | -.06 | -.14 | .03 | .05 | .01 |
| Succumbed to Poaching | .22 | -.12 | -.13 | .13 | .15 | -.05 | -.16 | .14 | .05 | -.10 |
| Lack of Relationship Exclusivity | -.06 | .09 | -.35*** | -.15 | -.22* | -.14 | .02 | .15 | -.28** | -.24** |
| <u>East Asia</u> | | | | | | | | | | |
| Short-Term Mating Interests | .10* | .10* | -.04 | -.08 | -.05 | -.09* | .03 | .06 | -.01 | .01 |
| Unrestricted Sociosexual Orientation | .18*** | .09* | -.08 | -.17*** | .04 | -.08 | -.04 | -.01 | .08 | .08 |
| Mate Poaching Attempts | .23*** | .10* | -.03 | -.13** | -.02 | -.05 | -.03 | .05 | .09* | .05 |
| Succumbed to Poaching | .12 | .11 | -.01 | -.20*** | .10 | -.14 | -.03 | -.01 | .01 | .04 |
| Lack of Relationship Exclusivity | .04 | -.01 | -.24*** | -.21*** | -.25*** | -.32*** | .08 | .01 | -.01 | -.04 |
| <u>Worldwide Sample</u> | | | | | | | | | | |
| Short-Term Mating Interests | .09*** | .08*** | -.13*** | -.08*** | -.14*** | -.13*** | -.01 | .01 | .03* | .11*** |
| Unrestricted Sociosexual Orientation | .16*** | .14*** | -.12*** | -.14*** | -.04*** | -.11*** | -.04** | -.01 | .08*** | .12*** |
| Mate Poaching Attempts | .15*** | .10*** | -.11*** | -.12*** | -.05*** | -.08*** | .01 | .03* | .05*** | .04*** |
| Succumbed to Poaching | .07*** | .04*** | -.08*** | -.09*** | -.09*** | -.12*** | .03 | .06*** | .02 | .03** |
| Lack of Relationship Exclusivity | .10*** | .07*** | -.21*** | -.19*** | -.19*** | -.20*** | .03 | .04** | .01 | .02 |

Note: M = Men, W = Women. * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$. Reported are partial correlations controlling for the effects of nation within regions.

Agreeableness and Short-Term Mating across Nations

As expected from previous research (Buss and Shackelford, 1997; Costa et al., 1992; Hoyle et al., 2000; Wright, 1999), agreeableness correlated with several measures of short-term mating. Moreover, these correlations were pervasive across sex, and across many major regions of the world (see Table 3).

North and South America. Among North American men, lower agreeableness was associated significantly with interest in short-term mating, unrestricted sociosexuality, short-term mate poaching attempts, succumbing to short-term mate poaching attempts, and lower relationship exclusivity (i.e., greater infidelity). Among North American women, lower agreeableness was associated significantly with interest in short-term mating, unrestricted sociosexuality, short-term mate poaching attempts, succumbing to short-term mate poaching attempts, and lower relationship exclusivity. Among both men and women, it appeared that the link was strongest between low agreeableness and low relationship exclusivity. For example, using Fisher's r to z' transformation, the correlation between agreeableness and lacking relationship exclusivity among women, $r(2183) = -.20$, $p < .001$, was stronger than the links between agreeableness and interests in short-term mating, $z = 2.31$, $p < .01$, unrestricted sociosexuality, $z = 1.03$, $p = .15$, short-term mate poaching attempts, $z = 1.37$, $p = .08$, or succumbing to short-term mate poaching, $z = 2.83$, $p < .01$. In South America, most of the correlations between agreeableness and short-term mating were negative, although only the correlation with succumbing to short-term mate poaching was significant for men (see Table 3).

Europe. In Western Europe, most correlations between agreeableness and short-term mating were negative and all but one reached statistical significance. Among Western European men, lower agreeableness was associated with more short-term mating interest, higher sociosexuality, more frequent short-term mate poaching attempts, and lower relationship exclusivity. Among Western European women, lower agreeableness was associated with every measure of short-term mating. Again, the strongest links were between agreeableness and relationship exclusivity. In Eastern Europe, all associations between agreeableness and short-term mating were negative and most were significant for both men and women, especially lower relationship exclusivity. In Southern Europe, all associations between agreeableness and short-term mating were negative and all were significant among both men and women. As with most of Europe and North America, the links between agreeableness and relationship exclusivity were numerically the largest associations.

Middle East and Africa. In the Middle East, low agreeableness was associated significantly with short-term mating interest, unrestricted sociosexuality, short-term mate poaching attempts, and lower relationship exclusivity among men. Among Middle Eastern women, lower agreeableness was associated significantly with unrestricted sociosexuality, short-term mate poaching attempts, and with lower relationship exclusivity. For both men and women, the links with relationship exclusivity were numerically the greatest. Among African men, lower agreeableness was associated with short-term mating interest, unrestricted sociosexuality, short-term mate poaching attempts, and a lack of relationship exclusivity. For women in Africa, lower agreeableness was associated significantly with more unrestricted sociosexuality and with making short-term mate poach attempts.

Oceania, South/Southeast Asia, and East Asia. Among Oceanic men, lower agreeableness was associated significantly with more interest in short-term mating, more unrestricted sociosexuality, having succumbed to short-term mate poaching attempts, and with lower relationship exclusivity. Among Oceanic women, lower agreeableness was associated significantly with all facets of short-term mating. Again, the links between agreeableness and short-term mating were numerically greatest with lower relationship exclusivity. In South/Southeast Asia, lower agreeableness was associated only with lower relationship exclusivity, and this was significant only for men. Among East Asian men, lower agreeableness was associated significantly only with a lack of relationship exclusivity. Among East Asian women, lower agreeableness was associated significantly with more unrestricted sociosexuality, making short-term mate poach attempts, having succumbed to short-term mate poach attempts, and especially with lower relationship exclusivity.

Conscientiousness and Short-Term Mating across Nations

As expected from previous research (Buss and Shackelford, 1997; Costa et al., 1992; Hoyle et al., 2000; Wright, 1999), conscientiousness correlated with several measures of short-term mating. Moreover, these correlations were pervasive across sex, and across many major regions of the world (see Table 3).

North and South America. Among North American men, lower conscientiousness was associated significantly with interest in short-term mating, unrestricted sociosexuality, short-term mate poaching attempts, succumbing to short-term mate poaching attempts, and lower relationship exclusivity (i.e., greater infidelity). Among North American women, lower conscientiousness was associated significantly with interest in short-term mating, unrestricted sociosexuality, short-term mate poaching attempts, succumbing to short-term mate poaching attempts, and lower relationship exclusivity. Among both men and women, it appeared the link was largest between conscientiousness and relationship exclusivity. Using Fisher's r to z ' transformation, the correlation between conscientiousness and lacking relationship exclusivity among women, $r(2183) = -.25$, $p < .001$, was significantly stronger than the links between conscientiousness and interests in short-term mating, $z = 4.01$, $p < .001$, sociosexuality, $z = 4.66$, $p < .001$, short-term mate poaching attempts, $z = 5.31$, $p < .001$, or succumbing to short-term mate poaching, $z = 4.33$, $p < .001$. In South America, most of the correlations between conscientiousness and short-term mating were negative, although only the correlation with relationship exclusivity was significant for men.

Europe. In Western Europe, most correlations between conscientiousness and short-term mating were negative. All but one reached statistical significance. Among Western European men, lower conscientiousness was associated with every measure of short-term mating. Among Western European women, lower conscientiousness was associated with more short-term mating interests, higher sociosexuality, more frequent short-term mate poaching attempts, having succumbed to short-term mate poaching attempts, and with low relationship exclusivity. Again, the numerically greatest links were between conscientiousness and relationship exclusivity for both sexes. Among Eastern European men, low conscientiousness was associated only with low relationship exclusivity. However, all associations between conscientiousness and short-term mating were negative and significant for women. In Southern Europe, all associations between conscientiousness and short-term mating were negative and all were significant among women;

especially strong was the negative correlation with relationship exclusivity. Among men from Eastern Europe, the only significant correlation was with short-term mating interests.

Middle East and Africa. In the Middle East, all associations between conscientiousness and short-term mating were negative and significant for men, with the exception of sociosexuality. For Middle Eastern women, the only significant correlation was between lower conscientiousness and short-term mate poaching attempts. Among African men, all associations between conscientiousness and short-term mating were negative and significant. Among African women, all associations between conscientiousness and short-term mating were negative and significant, with the exception of relationship exclusivity. Overall, higher levels of conscientiousness were linked with lower levels of short-term mating.

Oceania, South/Southeast Asia, and East Asia. Among Oceanic men, lower conscientiousness was associated with lower relationship exclusivity. Among women, lower conscientiousness was associated with more interest in short-term mating, more unrestricted sociosexuality, and with lower relationship exclusivity in Oceania. In South/Southeast Asia, lower conscientiousness was associated with lower relationship exclusivity, but this was significant only for men. Among South/Southeast Asian men, higher conscientiousness was associated with higher sociosexuality. This is the only instance across the ISDP in which short-term mating was significantly linked with higher conscientiousness. Among East Asian men, lower conscientiousness was associated only with lower relationship exclusivity. Among East Asian women, lower conscientiousness was associated with more short-term mating interest and with lower relationship exclusivity.

Neuroticism and Short-Term Mating across Nations

As expected from previous research (Buss and Shackelford, 1997; Costa et al., 1992; Hoyle et al., 2000; Wright, 1999), neuroticism correlated with several measures of short-term mating (see Table 3). However, these correlations were much less pervasive across sex and world regions compared to previous findings.

North and South America. Among North American men, neuroticism was not associated with short-term mating orientation. Among North American women, in contrast, higher neuroticism was significantly associated with interest in short-term mating, unrestricted sociosexuality, short-term mate poaching attempts, succumbing to short-term mate poaching attempts, and lower relationship exclusivity. This is the first set of findings in which men and women displayed conspicuously different correlational profiles. For men, neuroticism was not an indicator of short-term mating, but for women it was an indicator of all aspects of short-term mating—from short-term mating interests to lacking relationship exclusivity. Most of these sex differences in neuroticism-sexuality links either were statistically significant or at least approached significance. For example, using Fisher's r to z ' transformation, the correlation between neuroticism and short-term mating interests in women, $r(1962) = +.05$, $p < .05$, was marginally stronger than the link between neuroticism and short-term mating interests in men, $z = 1.31$, $p < .10$, and the correlation between neuroticism and lacking relationship exclusivity in women, $r(2183) = +.06$, $p < .01$, was significantly stronger than the link between neuroticism and lacking relationship exclusivity in men, $z = 1.96$, $p < .05$. In South America, the correlations between neuroticism and short-term mating did not reach statistical significance.

Europe. In Western Europe, the correlations between neuroticism and short-term mating did not reach statistical significance, with the exception that among women neuroticism

positively correlated with succumbing to short-term mate poaching attempts by others. Among Eastern European men and women, neuroticism was negatively associated with interests in short-term mating and sociosexuality. In Southern Europe, none of the associations between neuroticism and short-term mating reached the level of statistical significance.

Middle East and Africa. In the Middle East, men with higher neuroticism reported higher levels of short-term mating interests. Middle Eastern women who reported higher neuroticism were likely to also report having made short-term mate poaching attempts and having succumbed to the poaching attempts of others. Among African men, higher neuroticism was associated with short-term mate poaching attempts and lower relationship exclusivity. None of the associations between neuroticism and short-term mating reached the level of statistical significance among African women.

Oceania, South/Southeast Asia, and East Asia. The only significant relationship between neuroticism and short-term mating in Oceania was the link between high neuroticism and high rates of short-term mate poaching attempts among women. In South/Southeast Asia, the only significant relationship between neuroticism and short-term mating was the link between high neuroticism and low sociosexuality among men. In East Asia, there were not significant associations between neuroticism and short-term mating.

Openness and Short-Term Mating across Nations

According to previous research (e.g., Costa et al., 1992; Hoyle et al., 2000; Wright, 1999), openness should be relatively unrelated to measures of short-term mating. We found several significant associations between openness and short-term mating, but these associations were inconsistent across sex and world regions (see Table 3).

North and South America. Among North America men, openness was negatively correlated with all measures of short-term mating. The two measures associated with infidelity were related significantly to low openness, including succumbing to short-term mate poaches and lacking relationship exclusivity. North American women, in contrast, displayed the opposite pattern. Those who scored higher on openness expressed more interest in short-term mating and were sociosexually unrestricted. This was the second instance where men and women displayed different correlational profiles. For men, openness was an indicator of lower levels of extra-pair short-term mating, $r(1222) = -.10$, $p < .001$, whereas for women openness was an indicator of higher levels of short-term mating interest, $r(1962) = +.11$, $p < .001$, and unrestricted sociosexuality, $r(2239) = +.11$, $p < .001$. In South America, the correlations between openness and short-term mating did not reach statistical significance for women. However, among South American men openness was associated with higher sociosexuality, more short-term mate poaching attempts, succumbing to short-term mate poaching attempts, and lower relationship exclusivity.

Europe. In Western Europe, the correlations between openness and short-term mating did not reach statistical significance among men, with the exception that openness correlated positively with sociosexuality. Among Western European women, openness correlated positively with short-term mating interests and sociosexuality. In Eastern Europe, openness correlated significantly and positively with most measures of short-term mating for both men and women. The exceptions were that openness did not correlate with succumbing to short-term mate poaching attempts or with lower relationship exclusivity. In Southern Europe, openness

correlated significantly and positively with most measures of short-term mating among women, but only sociosexuality correlated significantly with openness among men.

Middle East and Africa. Among women in the Middle East, openness correlated positively and significantly with sociosexuality. There were no significant correlations for Middle Eastern men. In Africa, most correlations were in the positive direction, but few were significant. African men with higher openness reported higher levels of sociosexuality, but no such correlation was identified for African women.

Oceania, South/Southeast Asia, and East Asia. The only significant relationship between openness and short-term mating in Oceania was the link between openness and lower relationship exclusivity among women. Oceanic women who lacked relationship exclusivity scored lower on openness. In South/Southeast Asia, both men and women who lacked relationship exclusivity scored lower on openness. However, among men from South/Southeast Asia higher openness was associated with higher sociosexuality. In East Asia, the only significant relationship between openness and short-term mating was the link between higher openness and higher rates of short-term mate poaching attempts among men. Given the disputed nature of openness as a fundamental factor of personality (John and Srivastava, 1999; McCrae and Costa, 1997), these inconsistent results are not surprising.

Personality and Short-Term Mating in the Worldwide ISDP Sample

Looking across the total 46-nation sample of the ISDP (see bottom of Table 3), extraversion was positively correlated with every measure of short-term mating among both men and women (after controlling for the effects of individual nation). Controlling for the effect of nation was necessary for if an individual nation was particularly high on both extraversion and short-term mating this could artificially inflate the correlation between these two variables. Low agreeableness and low conscientiousness were indicative of short-term mating across both sexes and all measures of short-term mating in the worldwide sample. Neuroticism was negatively related to sociosexuality among men, but was positively associated with short-term mate poaching attempts, succumbing to poaching attempts, and a lack of relationship exclusivity in women. Openness was positively linked to most measures of short-term mating in men and women across the worldwide sample.


Personality Traits as Risk-Factors for Short-Term Mating Tendencies

In addition to considering each trait individually, we examined how the Big Five dimensions of personality served, in isolation and in combination, as predictors of short-term mating. Across the entire ISDP, we performed a standard multiple regression on each measure of short-term mating, entering the Big Five traits, sex of participant, and nation of participant simultaneously as predictor variables. In each case, the Big Five dimensions contributed unique predictive power after controlling for all other variables. For example, considering the semipartial correlations between personality traits and short-term mating interests, extraversion ($sr^2 = .09, p < .001$), agreeableness ($sr^2 = -.07, p < .001$), conscientiousness ($sr^2 = -.11, p < .001$), neuroticism ($sr^2 = -.02, p < .05$), and openness ($sr^2 = .08, p < .001$) all shared unique variance with short-term mating interests. Overall, 15% of the variance in short-term mating interests was accounted for by all predictor variables ($R = .39, p < .001$, Adjusted $R^2 = .15$), about 3% of which came from the unique contributions of the Big Five, 1.5% came from shared variance

among the Big Five, 0.5% was attributable to the nation of the participant, and 10% was attributable to the sex of participant. The amount of variance in short-term mating explained by sex of participant was twice the amount explained by personality traits and nation combined (see also Schmitt, 2005a).

In another attempt to examine the individual and combined effects of personality on sexuality, we categorized each participant in the ISDP as either high or low on each of the Big Five using a median split. We treated high extraversion, low agreeableness, low conscientiousness, high neuroticism (for women), low neuroticism (for men), and high openness as “predictive” of short-term mating. Low extraversion, high agreeableness, high conscientiousness, low neuroticism (for women), high neuroticism (for men), and low openness were treated as “not predictive” of short-term mating. As seen in Figure 1, conscientiousness showed the largest difference between predictive and not predictive personality traits, $t(10292) = 10.04$, $p < .001$, $d = .20$), followed by openness $t(10291) = 8.31$, $p < .001$, $d = .16$), agreeableness, $t(10291) = 8.00$, $p < .001$, $d = .16$), extraversion, $t(10290) = 5.55$, $p < .001$, $d = .11$), and neuroticism, $t(10290) = 4.18$, $p < .001$, $d = .08$).

Figure 1. Personality traits as predictive of short-term mating interests in the International Sexuality Description Project.




Each person was also given an overall “personality risk” score, ranging from 0 to 5, depending on how many of their Big Five traits were in the predictive direction of short-term mating. For example, if a woman scored high on extraversion, low on agreeableness, low on conscientiousness, high on neuroticism, and high on openness, she received a personality risk score of 5 because each of her Big Five traits were predictive of short-term mating. If a woman scored low on extraversion, high on agreeableness, high on conscientiousness, low on neuroticism, and low on openness, she received a personality risk score of 0. Overall, 52 men (1% of men) and 231 women (4% of women) had a score of 0 personality risk for short-term mating, 479 men (11%) and 1006 women (16%) had a personality risk score of 1, 1312 men (31%) and 1946 women (32%) had a personality risk score of 2, 1436 men (34%) and 1799 women (29%) had a personality risk score of 3, 758 men (18%) and 876 women (14%) had a personality risk score of 4, and 138 men (3%) and 259 women (4%) had a risk score of 5.

For each sexuality measure, personality risk was significantly related to short-term mating, with incremental increases in personality risk associated with higher levels of short-term mating. For example, the overall main effect of personality risk on short-term mating interests was significant, $F(5, 10280) = 39.16, p < .001$, and according to Tukey’s *HSD* most of the differences between levels of personality risk (i.e., the difference between 0 and 1, 1 and 2, 2 and 3, and 3 and 4) were significant. However, the difference between levels 4 and 5 was not significantly different.

In Figure 2, we depict the short-term mating interests of men and women separately across the different personality risk categories. The main effect of sex on short-term mating interests was significant, $F(1, 10280) = 382.32, p < .001$, as was the interaction of personality risk and sex, $F(5, 10280) = 3.82, p < .01$, indicating that the effects of personality risk on short-term mating interests were different for men and women. According to Tukey’s *HSD* within each sex, among men the incremental increases in personality risk were significant only between 1 and 2, and 2 and 3. Once three personality traits were predictive of short-term mating, further personality indicators of short-term mating did not add predictive power for men. Among women, the incremental increases in personality risk were significant only between 1 and 2, and 3 and 4. After two personality traits were predictive of short-term mating, it took two additional personality indicators of short-term mating to add significant predictive power.

Figure 2. Personality risk level related to short-term mating interests in the International Sexuality Description Project.



Nation-Level Relationships between Personality Traits and Short-Term Mating

In addition to relating personality traits to short-term mating within regions, we correlated national profiles of personality and short-term mating (see Table 4). Although nation-level scores do not always correlate in the same way as individual-level scores (assuming so is often called the ecological fallacy), we expected nation-level correlations to mirror some of those found within regions, especially the robust findings for extraversion, agreeableness, and conscientiousness.


Table 4. Nation-Level Personality Traits Related to Nation-Level Short-Term Mating among Men and Women across 46 Nations of the International Sexuality Description Project

| National Short-Term Mating | National Personality Traits | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|-----------------------------|----------|---------------|----------|-------------------|----------|-------------|----------|----------|----------|
| | Extraversion | | Agreeableness | | Conscientiousness | | Neuroticism | | Openness | |
| | <u>M</u> | <u>W</u> | <u>M</u> | <u>W</u> | <u>M</u> | <u>W</u> | <u>M</u> | <u>W</u> | <u>M</u> | <u>W</u> |
| Short-Term Mating Interests | | | | | | | | | | |
| Men | .19 | .39** | -.38** | -.16 | -.28* | -.12 | -.02 | .23 | .32* | .44*** |
| Women | .18 | .45*** | -.19 | .02 | -.12 | .02 | -.15 | -.06 | .17 | .35** |
| Unrestricted Sociosexual Orientation | | | | | | | | | | |
| Men | .38** | .47*** | -.03 | .11 | .15 | .24* | -.44*** | -.13 | .29* | .41** |
| Women | .27* | .51*** | -.11 | .01 | .06 | .14 | -.38** | -.28* | .15 | .30* |
| Mate Poaching Attempts | | | | | | | | | | |
| Men | .34** | .35** | .01 | .13 | .12 | .24* | -.20 | -.06 | .09 | .29* |
| Women | .39** | .37** | -.09 | -.04 | .14 | .17 | -.30* | -.23 | -.02 | .07 |
| Succumbed to Poaching | | | | | | | | | | |
| Men | .20 | .13 | -.24* | -.30* | -.12 | -.06 | .09 | .18 | -.06 | .05 |
| Women | .19 | .18 | -.12 | -.10 | -.12 | -.12 | -.08 | -.11 | -.11 | .03 |
| Lack of Relationship Exclusivity | | | | | | | | | | |
| Men | .15 | .13 | -.15 | -.14 | -.20 | -.25* | .22 | .31* | -.18 | -.20 |
| Women | .32* | .04 | .18 | .18 | .20 | .14 | -.07 | .00 | -.09 | -.08 |

Note: M = Men, W = Women. * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$.

As seen in Table 4, national levels of extraversion tended to positively correlate with national levels of short-term mating. This association was sometimes larger among women's scores than among men's, such as the marginal difference in short-term mating interest correlations (based on Fisher's r to z ; $z = 1.36$, $p < .10$). A scatterplot of women's national extraversion scores related to women's nation-level sociosexuality, $r(44) = +0.51$, $p < .001$, is presented in Figure 3. Many of the most extraverted women, as well as women with the highest sociosexual levels, tend to be found in Europe (e.g., Serbia, Croatia, Switzerland, and Austria). The most introverted women, who were also low on sociosexuality, tended to reside in Asia and Africa (e.g., South Korea, Japan, Hong Kong, and Ethiopia). Very few nations had introverted women who scored high on sociosexuality, although French and Belgian women came close to this profile in that they were relatively introverted and were moderate on sociosexuality.


Figure 3. National levels of women's extraversion related to national levels of women's sociosexuality across 46 nations of the International Sexuality Description Project, $r(44) = +.51$, $p < .001$.



National levels of agreeableness were associated with lower short-term mating tendencies at the national level. For example, in nations where men were disagreeable, national levels of short-term mating interest were higher (see Figure 4). The most agreeable men tended to reside in Africa (e.g., Congo, Ethiopia, Botswana, and Zimbabwe), and these same nations contained men who were very low in short-term mating interests. In contrast, the most disagreeable men

tended to reside in Europe and South America (e.g., Latvia, Lithuania, Argentina, and Peru), and these nations had men who were relatively high in short-term mating interests. This same trend was observed in terms of men succumbing to short-term mate poaching. Among nations with disagreeable women, men tended to go along with short-term mate poaching as well.

Figure 4. National levels of men's agreeableness related to national levels of men's short-term mating interests across 46 nations of the International Sexuality Description Project, $r(44) = -.38$, $p < .01$.



National levels of conscientiousness were sometimes associated with lower short-term mating tendencies. For example, higher levels of national conscientiousness were associated with lower levels of short-term mating interests in men, just as with the individual-level analyses. Looking at the cross-sex linkages, women's conscientiousness was linked to increased levels of sociosexuality and to more short-term mate poaching among men. However, women's conscientiousness was negatively correlated with men's lack of relationship exclusivity.


National levels of neuroticism were almost always negatively linked with national short-term mating tendencies. For example, in nations with neurotic men, national levels of sociosexuality were lower. The most neurotic men tended to reside in Asian nations (e.g., Japan, South Korea, Taiwan, and Hong Kong), the same nations where men have relatively low levels

of sociosexuality (see Figure 5). The nations with the least neurotic men (e.g., Morocco, Finland, Slovenia, and Croatia) tended to have men who scored high on sociosexuality. In the individual-level analyses, the findings were rather equivocal—sometimes neuroticism was linked with less short-term mating, sometimes with more short-term mating (e.g., men in the Middle East and Africa). However, the national-level findings were clear, with higher levels of neuroticism linked with less short-term mating in men. Looking at the cross-sex linkages, neuroticism among women was sometimes linked with increased short-term mating in men (e.g., lack of relationship exclusivity).

Finally, national levels of openness were positively associated short-term mating, with the exception of indicators of extra-pair mating. In nations where men were high on openness, there was a trend for men to have higher short-term mating interests and to have higher sociosexuality. In nations where women were high on openness, there was a trend for women to have higher short-term mating interests and to have higher sociosexuality. Women's high openness was also associated with increased short-term mating among men, including higher national levels of men's short-term mating interests, sociosexuality, and short-term mate poaching attempts.

Overall, the relationships among national profiles of personality traits and national profiles of short-term mating tended to mirror those identified at the individual level. Extraverted nations were, on average, more short-term oriented than introverted nations. Disagreeable nations were more short-term oriented than agreeable nations. Men were more short-term oriented in nations low on conscientiousness, and women's conscientiousness was linked to greater short-term mating among men. Neurotic nations tended to have lower short-term mating tendencies, although across the sexes women's neuroticism was linked with higher short-term mating in men. Higher levels of openness were generally associated with more short-term mating in both sexes.

Figure 5. National levels of men's neuroticism related to national levels of men's sociosexuality across 46 nations of the International Sexuality Description Project, $r(44) = -.44$, $p < .001$.



Discussion

As part of the International Sexuality Description Project, 13,243 participants from 46 nations responded to self-report measures of personality and sexuality. As expected, several traits showed consistent links with short-term mating. Extraversion was universally associated with interest in short-term mating, unrestricted sociosexuality, having engaged in short-term mate poaching attempts, having succumbed to short-term poaching attempts, and lacking relationship exclusivity. Low agreeableness and conscientiousness also were related to short-term mating, especially with measures of extra-pair mating (i.e., succumbing to short-term poaching attempts

and lacking relationship exclusivity). Neuroticism and openness were related to short-term mating, although these links were less consistent across sex and world region.

Some Traits Correlate with Short-Term Mating More than Others

As expected, three traits from among the Big Five stood out as consistently related to short-term mating. Within regions and across nations, higher extraversion, lower agreeableness, and lower conscientiousness are linked with higher levels of short-term mating. Neuroticism was an equivocal correlate, being associated with more short-term mating in some nations and less short-term mating in others. Openness also was inconsistently related to short-term mating, with the association depending on both sex and world region.

Future research might profitably investigate why some traits appear to relate more consistently to short-term mating than others. One factor might be the relationship between personality and sexual libido or lust (Regan and Berscheid, 1999). Extraversion, for example, has been linked to higher libido (Eysenck, 1976), which might help explain why extraverts engage in more mating overall. To explain mating specific to the short-term context, however, the traits of low agreeableness and low conscientiousness may be necessary additions. Low agreeableness and low conscientiousness have been linked with social dominance and antisocial tendencies (Paulhus and Williams, 2002; Wiebe, 2004)—tendencies that may serve as key factors in turning short-term mating desires into short-term mating behavior (Aromaeki, Lindman, and Eriksson, 2002; Asendorpf, 1998; Linton and Wiener, 2001; McHoskey, 2001; Mealey, 1995), especially extra-pair mating (Egan and Angus, 2004; Schmitt, 2004; Schmitt et al., 2004) and risky sexual practices (McMahon, Malow, and Penedo, 1998).

Sex Differences in the Correlates of Short-Term Mating

Some of the personality correlates of short-term mating varied in systematic ways across sex. Extraversion was associated with short-term mating among men and women. Similarly, low agreeableness and conscientiousness were associated with short-term mating regardless of sex. However, the correlational profile of neuroticism displayed apparent sex differences. In North America, neuroticism was associated with increased short-term mating only among women. This was also true among women from Western Europe, Middle East, and Oceania. In contrast, neuroticism among women and men from Eastern Europe was associated with decreased short-term mating, and men from the Middle East and Africa who were more neurotic were more oriented toward short-term mating. Overall, neuroticism was usually associated with decreased short-term mating in men (e.g., lower sociosexuality) and increased short-term mating in women (e.g., especially increased levels of infidelity).

Among North America men, openness was negatively correlated with all measures of short-term mating, especially indicators of extra-pair mating. North American women displayed a different pattern. Those women who scored high on openness were more likely to express interest in short-term and to be sociosexually unrestricted. This was the second instance, after the neuroticism correlates, where men and women displayed apparently different personality-sexuality correlations (see also Clark, 2006). However, across most regions of the world both men and women who were high in openness were likely to have higher levels of short-term mating interests and behaviors.

National Differences in Personality and Short-Term Mating

In some nations people are more extraverted than in others (McCrae, 2001), and in some nations people are more oriented toward short-term mating than in others (Schmitt, 2005a; Schmitt et al., 2003). In the ISDP, national variability in short-term mating tends to track national variability in extraversion. In nations with more introverted people, such as South Korea, Hong Kong, Japan, and Ethiopia, short-term mating tends to be lower. This is true within men and within women, and within nations and across nations. Agreeableness and conscientiousness show similar patterns. In nations that score lower on agreeableness, such as Latvia, Lithuania, Argentina, and Peru, short-term mating interests are higher. In nations with higher agreeableness, such as most African nations, short-term mating is lower. In nations with higher neuroticism, such as Japan, South Korea, Taiwan, and Hong Kong, short-term mating is lower than in nations with lower levels of neuroticism, such as Finland, Slovenia, Croatia, and New Zealand.

Limitations and Alternative Explanations

The present research has several limitations. First, the personality and sexuality questionnaires in the ISDP, like all individual difference questionnaires, have a certain degree of measurement error (Andersen and Broffitt, 1988; Catania, McDermott, and Pollack, 1986). In the context of the many translations involved in the ISDP, it is likely that measurement error played a role in limiting our findings. However, as many of the findings were replicated across sexes and nations, it is plausible that lesser measurement error would produce larger correlations than those reported in this article. Still, using additional techniques such as the bogus pipeline procedure (Alexander and Fisher, 2000) and accounting for social desirability biases (Eysenck and Eysenck, 1971; Paulhus and Reid, 1991), may improve the veridicality of self-report responses to ISDP surveys in the future.

Second, many of the current samples were relatively small (see Table 1), and the sampling techniques used were convenience-based, rather than representative. As a result, the present findings should be interpreted with care. Because the ISDP primarily sampled college students, any generalizations beyond this population may be inappropriate. Future research taking sampling factors into account, and utilizing true representative sampling of nations and their many co-cultures, will be needed to verify the current personality-sexuality links.

Third, there may be a host of extraneous variables that account for the personality-sexuality associations identified in the ISDP. Observed regional differences in the ISDP may be due to cultural disparities in the links between personality and short-term mating, but they may also result from inappropriate translations or the non-identical response styles across nations (Church and Lonner, 1998; Heine, Buchtel, and Norenzayan, 2008; McCrae, 2001; van de Vijver and Leung, 2000). Cultural values and beliefs outside the realm of the Big Five might also function as third variable causes of the links between personality and short-term mating (e.g., Bond et al., 2004; Hofstede, 2001).

Finally, in this research we have assumed that personality traits lead to short-term mating. An equally plausible alternative is that the causal links between personality and sexuality flow in the opposite direction. That is, short-term mating interests and behaviors may lead to the development of particular personality traits. Engaging in mate poaching, for example, could lead

people to become disagreeable just as much as disagreeableness could lead to mate poaching. Personality and sexuality also could reinforce one another, serving as a feedback loop that once initiated becomes difficult to disengage. Such could be the origin of adult romantic attachment styles, love styles, and other psychological constructs that involve the confluence of personality traits and romantic relationships (Schmitt, 2005b).

Implications and Future Research Directions

This research makes several contributions to our understanding of the links between personality and sexuality. First, the findings previously reported using only American and European samples have now been replicated and extended across many different nations, including non-Western nations. The traits of extraversion, agreeableness, and conscientiousness have been implicated in short-term mating across 10 major regions of the world. Second, our findings show that sex plays a role in moderating some personality-sexuality linkages (e.g., neuroticism), and that sex is a larger predictor of short-term mating than either personality traits or national origin (see also Schmitt, 2005a). Third, for the first time nations have been shown to vary along personality dimensions in ways that directly relate to short-term mating attitudes and behaviors at the national level. This provides new evidence that personality and sexuality are psychologically and sociologically intertwined.

An implication of the current findings is that if health care workers wish to attempt to control short-term mating (as a key risk factor for the spread of sexually-transmitted diseases, for example), it may be most effective to concentrate on the developmental and physiological factors associated with extraversion, agreeableness, and conscientiousness (Graziano and Eisenberg, 1997; Hogan and Ones, 1997; Lucas et al., 2000; Watson and Clark, 1997; Zuckerman, 1994), rather than other traits. In each case, however, the moderating effects of local culture should be incorporated (Church, 2000). Future research might explore whether certain personality clusters or “types” that reflect combinations of high extraversion, low agreeableness, and low conscientiousness predispose individuals toward short-term mating in the same way across all cultures (Asendorpf and van Aken, 1999).

Future researchers also might examine whether certain sub-traits or facets of extraversion, agreeableness, and conscientiousness are more important in predicting short-term mating than others. The Big Five Inventory (Benet-Martinez and John, 1998) used in the ISDP is not able to distinguish among the different facets of the Big Five. Neither is it designed to diagnose extreme and maladaptive levels of these traits. The relationship between extraversion and short-term mating may be driven in some nations by those with high levels of positive emotion, for example, whereas in other nations the link may be based on high activity level. The relationship between agreeableness and short-term mating may be driven in women by extremely low trust, whereas among men it is low empathy that leads to short-term mating. The current study, with its use of higher-order personality traits and broad-based sexuality measures, may have just scratched the surface of important personality-sexuality relationships and their cultural variations.

Acknowledgements

The authors thank Melinda Jones, Jessica Nadler, Jeff Taylor, Aaron T. Goetz, and Rick Michalski for their comments on an earlier draft of this article. The authors would also like to thank all the members of the International Sexuality Description Project, including: Lidia Alcalay, Pontificia Universidad Católica

de Chile, Santiago, Chile; Juri Allik, University of Tartu, Tartu, Estonia; Lara Ault, University of Louisville, USA; Ivars Austers, University of Latvia, Riga, Latvia; Kevin L. Bennett, University of New Mexico, USA; Gabriel Bianchi, Slovak Academy of Sciences, Bratislava, Slovak Republic; Fredric Boholst, University of San Carlos, Cebu City, Philippines; Mary Ann Borg Cunen, University of Malta, Msida, Malta; Johan Braeckman, Ghent University, Ghent, Belgium; Edwin G. Brainerd Jr., Clemson University, USA; Leo Gerard A. Caral, University of San Carlos, Cebu City, Philippines; Gabrielle Caron, Université Laval, Québec, Québec, Canada; Maria Martina Casullo, University of Buenos Aires, Buenos Aires, Argentina; Michael Cunningham, University of Louisville, USA; Ikuo Daibo, Osaka University, Osaka, Japan; Charlotte De Backer, Ghent University, Ghent, Belgium; Eros De Souza, Illinois State University, USA; Rolando Diaz-Loving, National Autonomous University of Mexico, Mexico City, Mexico; Gláucia Diniz, University of Brasilia, Brasilia, Brazil; Kevin Durkin, The University of Western Australia, Crawley, Australia; Marcela Echegaray, University of Lima, Lima, Peru; Ekin Eremsoy, Bogaziçi Üniversitesi, Istanbul, Turkey; Harald A. Euler, University of Kassel, Kassel, Germany; Ruth Falzon, University of Malta, Msida, Malta; Maryanne L. Fisher, York University, Toronto, Ontario, Canada; Dolores Foley, University of Queensland, Brisbane, Australia; Douglas P. Fry, Åbo Akademi University, Turku, Finland; Sirpa Fry, Åbo Akademi University, Turku, Finland; M. Arif Ghayur, Al-Akhawayn University, Ifrane, Morocco; Vijai N. Giri, Indian Institute of Technology, Kharagpur, India; Debra L. Golden, University of Hawaii-Manoa, USA; Karl Grammer, Ludwig-Boltzmann-Institute for Urban Ethology, Vienna, Austria; Liria Grimaldi, University of Catania, Catania, Italy; Jamin Halberstadt, University of Otago, Dunedin, New Zealand; Shamsul Haque, University of Dakah, Dakah, Bangladesh; Dora Herrera, University of Lima, Lima, Peru; Janine Hertel, Technische Universität Chemnitz, Chemnitz, Germany; Heather Hoffmann, Knox College, USA; Danica Hooper, University of Queensland, Brisbane, Australia; Zuzana Hradilekova, Comenius University, Bratislava, Slovak Republic; Jasna Hudek-Kene-evi, University of Rijeka, Rijeka, Croatia; Jas Jaafar, University of Malaya, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia; Margarita Jankauskaite, Vilnius University, Vilnius, Lithuania; Heidi Kabangu-Stahel, Centre d'Enseignement les Gazelles, Kinsasha-Gombe, Democratic Republic of the Congo; Igor Kardum, University of Rijeka, Rijeka, Croatia; Brigitte Khoury, American University of Beirut, Beirut, Lebanon; Hayrran Kwon, Kwangju Health College, Shinchang-dong, Republic of Korea; Kaia Laidra, University of Tartu, Tartu, Estonia; Anton-Rupert Laireiter, Institute of Psychology, University of Salzburg, Salzburg, Austria; Dustin Lakerveld, University of Utrecht, Utrecht, the Netherlands; Ada Lampert, The Ruppin Institute, Emek Hefer, Israel; Maryanne Lauri, University of Malta, Msida, Malta; Marguerite Lavallée, Université Laval, Québec, Québec, Canada; Suk-Jae Lee, National Computerization Agency, Yongingsi Gyonggido, Republic of Korea; Luk Chung Leung, City University of Hong Kong, Hong Kong; Kenneth D. Locke, University of Idaho, USA; Vance Locke, The University of Western Australia, Crawley, Australia; Ivan Luksik, Slovak Academy of Sciences, Bratislava, Slovak Republic; Ishmael Magaisa, University of Zimbabwe, Harare, Zimbabwe; Dalia Marcinkeviciene, Vilnius University, Vilnius, Lithuania; André Mata, University of Lisbon, Lisbon, Portugal; Rui Mata, University of Lisbon, Lisbon, Portugal; Barry McCarthy, University of Central Lancashire, Preston, United Kingdom; Michael E. Mills, Loyola Marymount University, USA; Nhlanhla J. Mkhize, University of Natal, Scottsville, South Africa; João Moreira, University of Lisbon, Lisbon, Portugal; Sérgio Moreira, University of Lisbon, Lisbon, Portugal; Miguel Moya, University of Granada, Granada, Spain; M. Munyae, University of Botswana, Gaborone, Botswana; Patricia Noller, University of Queensland, Brisbane, Australia; Hmoud Olmat, University of Jordan, Amman, Jordan; Adrian Opre, Babes Bolyai University, Cluj Napoca, Romania; Alexia Panayiotou, University of Cyprus, Nicosia, Cyprus; Nebojsa Petrovic, University of Belgrade, Belgrade, Serbia; Karolien Poels, Ghent University, Ghent, Belgium; Miroslav Popper, Slovak Academy of Sciences, Bratislava, Slovak Republic; Maria Poulimenou, KPMG Kyriacou Counsultants SA, Athens, Greece; Volodymyr P'yatokha, Volyn Regional Hospital, Lutsk, Volyn, Ukraine; Michel Raymond, Université de Montpellier II, Montpellier, France; Ulf-Dietrich Reips, Universität Zürich, Zürich, Switzerland; Susan E. Reneau, University of Alabama, USA; Sofia Rivera-Aragon, National Autonomous University of Mexico, Mexico City, Mexico; Wade C. Rowatt, Baylor University, USA; Willibald Ruch, Queens University Belfast, Belfast, Northern Ireland;

Velko S. Rus, University of Ljubljana, Ljubljana, Slovenia; Marilyn P. Safir, University of Haifa, Haifa, Israel; Sonia Salas, Universidad de La Serena, La Serena, Chile; Fabio Sambataro, University of Catania, Catania, Italy; Kenneth N. Sandnabba, Åbo Akademi University, Turku, Finland; Marion K. Schulmeyer, Universidad Privada de Santa Cruz de la Sierra, Santa Cruz, Bolivia; Astrid Schütz, Technische Universität Chemnitz, Chemnitz, Germany; Tullio Scrimali, University of Catania, Catania, Italy; Mithila B. Sharan, Indian Institute of Technology, Kharagpur, India; Phillip R. Shaver, University of California at Davis, USA; Francis Sichona, University of Dar es Salaam, Dar es Salaam, Tanzania; Franco Simonetti, Pontificia Universidad Católica de Chile, Santiago, Chile; Tilahun Sineshaw, Ramapo College of New Jersey, USA; R. Sookdew, University of Natal, Scottsville, South Africa; Tom Speelman, Ghent University, Ghent, Belgium; Spyros Spyrou, Cyprus College, Nicosia, Cyprus; H. Canan Sümer, Middle East Technical University, Ankara, Turkey; Nebi Sümer, Middle East Technical University, Ankara, Turkey; Marianna Supekova, Slovak Academy of Sciences, Bratislava, Slovak Republic; Tomasz Szlendak, Nicholas Copernicus University, Torun, Poland; Robin Taylor, University of the South Pacific, Suva, Fiji; Bert Timmermans, Vrije Universiteit Brussel, Brussels, Belgium; William Tooke, SUNY-Plattsburgh, USA; Ioannis Tsaousis, University of the Aegean, Mytilene, Lesbos, Greece; F.S.K. Tungaraza, University of Dar es Salaam, Dar es Salaam, Tanzania; Griet Vandermassen, Ghent University, Ghent, Belgium; Tim Vanhoomissen, Vrije Universiteit Brussel, Brussels, Belgium; Frank Van Overwalle, Vrije Universiteit Brussel, Brussels, Belgium; Ine Vanwesenbeeck, Netherlands Institute of Social Sexological Research, Utrecht, the Netherlands; Paul L. Vasey, University of Lethbridge, Lethbridge, Alberta, Canada; João Verissimo, University of Lisbon, Lisbon, Portugal; Martin Voracek, University of Vienna Medical School, Vienna, Austria; Wendy W. N. Wan, University of Hong Kong, Hong Kong; Ta-Wei Wang, Yuan Ze University, Chung-Li, Taiwan; Peter Weiss, Charles University, Prague, Czech Republic; Andik Wijaya, Couple Clinic Indonesia, Surabaya, Indonesia; Liesbeth Woertman, Utrecht University, Utrecht, the Netherlands; Gahyun Youn, Chonnam National University, Kwangju, Republic of Korea; Agata Zupanèiè, University of Ljubljana, Ljubljana, Slovenia. The author also thanks Susan Sprecher (USA), Del Paulhus (Canada), Glenn D. Wilson (England), Qazi Rahman (England), Alois Angleitner (Germany), Angelika Hofhansl (Austria), Mircea Miclea (Romania), Tamio Imagawa (Japan), Minoru Wada (Japan), Junichi Taniguchi (Japan), and Yuji Kanemasa (Japan) for their help with data collection and for contributing significantly to the samples used in this study.

Received 7 March 2008; Revision submitted 22 April 2008; Accepted 23 April 2008

References

- Alexander, M.G., and Fisher, T.D. (2003). Truth and consequences: Using the bogus pipeline to examine sex differences in self-reported sexuality. *Journal of Sex Research*, 40, 27-35
- Allik, J., and McCrae, R. R. (2004). Towards a geography of personality traits: Patterns of profiles across 36 cultures. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 35, 13-28.
- Andersen, B.L., and Broffitt, B. (1988). Is there a reliable and valid self-report measure of sexual behavior? *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 17, 509-525.
- Aromaeki, A.S., Lindman, R.E., and Eriksson, C.J.P. (2002). Testosterone, sexuality and antisocial personality in rapists and child molesters: A pilot study. *Psychiatry Research*, 110, 239-247.
- Asendorpf, J.B. (1998). Personality effects on social relationships. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 74, 1531-1544.
- Asendorpf, J.B., and van Aken, M.A. (1999). Resilient, overcontrolled, and undercontrolled personality prototypes in childhood: Replicability, predictive power, and the trait-type issue. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 77, 815-832.

- Ball, S.A., and Schottenfeld, R.S. (1997). A five-factor model of personality and addiction, psychiatric AIDS risk severity in pregnant and postpartum cocaine misusers. *Substance Abuse and Misuse*, 32, 25-41.
- Barnes, G.E., Malamuth, N.M., and Cheek, J.V.P. (1984). Personality and sexuality. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 5, 159-182.
- Barta, W.D., and 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.
- Benet-Martinez, V., and John, O.P. (1998). Los Cinco Grandes across cultures and ethnic groups: Multitrait-multimethod analyses of the Big Five in Spanish and English. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 75, 729-750.
- Bond, M.H., Kwok Leung, A.A., Kwok-Kit, T., de Carrasquel, S.R., Murakami, F., Yamaguchi, S. et al. (2004). Culture-level dimensions of social axioms and their correlates across 41 cultures. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 35, 548-570.
- Bringle, R.G., and Buunk, B.P. (1991). Extradyadic relationships and sexual jealousy. In K. McKinney and S. Sprecher (Eds.), *Sexuality in close relationships* (pp. 135-153). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Brislin, R.W. (1993). *Understanding culture's influence on behavior*. New York, NY: Harcourt Brace.
- Buss, D.M. (2000). *The dangerous passion*. New York: The Free Press.
- Buss, D. M. (2003). *The evolution of desire* (rev. ed.). New York: Basic Books.
- Buss, D.M., and Schmitt, D.P. (1993). Sexual strategies theory: An evolutionary perspective on human mating. *Psychological Review*, 100, 204-232.
- Buss, D.M., and Shackelford, T.K. (1997). Susceptibility to infidelity in the first year of marriage. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 31, 193-221.
- Catania, J.A., McDermott, L.J., and Pollack, L.M. (1986). Questionnaire response bias and face-to-face interview sample bias in sexuality research. *Journal of Sex Research*, 22, 52-72.
- Church, A.T. (2000). Culture and personality: Toward an integrated cultural trait psychology. *Journal of Personality*, 68, 651-703.
- Church, A.T. (2001). Personality measurement in cross-cultural perspective. *Journal of Personality*, 69, 979-1006.
- Church, A.T., and Lonner, W.J. (1998). The cross-cultural perspective in the study of personality. Rationale and current research. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 29, 32-62.
- Clark, A.P. (2006). Are the correlates of sociosexuality different for men and women? *Personality and Individual Differences*, 41, 1321-1327.
- Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences* (2nd ed.). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum
- Cooper, M.L., Agocha, V.B., and Sheldon, M.S. (2000). A motivational perspective on risky behaviors: The role of personality and affect regulatory processes. *Journal of Personality*, 68, 1059-1088.
- Costa, P.T., Jr., Fagan, P.J., Piedmont, R.L., Ponticas, Y., and Wise, T.N. (1992). The five-factor model of personality and sexual functioning in outpatient men and women. *Psychiatric Medicine*, 10, 199-215.

- Costa, P. T., Jr., and McCrae, R. R. (1992). *Revised NEO Personality Inventory (NEO-PI-R) and NEO Five-Factor Inventory (NEO-FFI) professional manual*. Odessa, FL: Psychological Assessment Resources.
- Costa, P.T., Jr., and Widiger, T.A. (Eds.). (1994). *Personality disorders and the five-factor model of personality*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Digman, J.M. (1990). Personality structure: Emergence of the five-factor model. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 41, 417-440.
- Egan, V, and Angus, S. (2004). Is social dominance a sex-specific strategy for infidelity? *Personality and Individual Differences*, 36, 575-586.
- Eysenck, H.J. (1971). Hysterical personality and sexual adjustment, attitudes and behavior. *Journal of Sex Research*, 7, 274-281.
- Eysenck, H.J. (1976). *Sex and personality*. London: Open Books.
- Eysenck, H.J., and Eysenck, S.B.G. (1975). *Eysenck Personality Questionnaire manual*. San Diego, CA: Educational and Industrial Testing Services.
- Eysenck, S.B., and Eysenck, H.J. (1971). Attitudes to sex, personality and lie scale scores. *Perceptual and Motor Skills*, 33, 216-218.
- Fenigstein, A., and Preston, M. (2007). The desired number of sexual partners as a function of gender, sexual risks, and the meaning of "ideal." *Journal of Sex Research*, 44, 89-95.
- Franzini, L.R., and Sideman, L.M. (1994). Personality characteristics of condom users. *Journal of Sex Education and Therapy*, 20, 110-118.
- Goldberg, L.R. (1990). An alternative "description of personality": The Big-Five factor structure. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 59, 1216-1229.
- Gottman, J.M. (1994). *What predicts divorce? The relationship between marital processes and marital outcomes*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Graziano, W.G., and Eisenberg, N.H. (1997). Agreeableness: A dimension of personality. In R. Hogan, J. Johnson, and S. Briggs (Eds.), *Handbook of personality psychology* (pp. 795-824). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- Heine, S.J., Buchtel, E.E., and Norenzayan, A. (2008). What do cross-national comparisons of personality traits tell us? The case of conscientiousness. *Psychological Science*, 19, 309-313.
- Heine, S. J., Lehman, D. R., Markus, H. R., and Kitayama, S. (1999). Is there a universal need for positive self-regard? *Psychological Review*, 106, 766-94.
- Hofstede, G. (2001). *Culture's consequences: Comparing values, behaviors, institutions, and organizations across nations* (2nd. ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Hogan, J., and Ones, D.S. (1997). Conscientiousness and integrity at work. In R. Hogan, J. Johnson, and S. Briggs (Eds.), *Handbook of personality psychology* (pp. 849-870). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- Hoyle, R.H., Fejfar, M.C., and Miller, J.D. (2000). Personality and sexual risk taking: A quantitative review. *Journal of Personality*, 68, 1203-1231.
- Jackson, J.J., and Kirkpatrick, L.A. (2007). The structure and measurement of human mating strategies: Toward a multidimensional model of sociosexuality. *Evolution and Human Behavior*, 28, 382-391.
- John, O. P., and Srivastava, S. (1999). The Big Five trait taxonomy: History, measurement, and theoretical perspective. In L. A. Pervin, and O. P. John (Eds.), *Handbook of personality: Theory and research* (2 ed., pp. 102-138). New York: Guilford Press.
- Kelly, S., and Dunbar, R. I. M. (2001). Who dares, wins: heroism versus altruism in women's

- mate choice. *Human Nature*, 12, 89-105.
- Lameiras Fernandez, M., and Rodriguez Castro, Y. (2003). The Big Five and sexual attitudes in Spanish students. *Social Behavior and Personality*, 31, 357-362.
- Linton, D.K., and Wiener, N.I. (2001). Personality and potential conceptions: Mating success in a modern Western male sample. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 31, 675-688.
- Little, A. C., Cohen, D. L., Jones, B. C., and Belsky, J. (2007). Human preferences for facial masculinity change with relationship type and environmental harshness. *Behavioral Ecology and Sociobiology*, 61, 967-973.
- Little, A. C., Jones, B. C., Penton-Voak, I. S., Burt, D. M., and Perrett, D. I. (2002). Partnership status and the temporal context of relationships influence human female preferences for sexual dimorphism in male face shape. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London B*, 269, 1095-1100.
- Lucas, R.E., Diener, E., Grob, A., Suh, E.M., and Shao, L. (2000). Cross-cultural evidence for the fundamental features of extraversion. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 79, 452-468.
- Malamuth, N.M. (1998). An evolutionary-based model integrating research on the characteristics of sexually coercive men. In Adair, J.G. et al. (Eds.), *Advances in psychological science* (pp. 151-184). Hove, UK: Psychology Press, Ltd.
- Markey, C.N., Markey, P.M., and Tinsley, B.J. (2003). Personality, puberty, and preadolescent girls' risky behaviors: Examining the predictive power of the Five-Factor Model of personality. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 37, 405-419.
- Mashegoane, S., Moalusi, K.P., Ngoepe, M.A., and Pelzter, K. (2002). Sexual sensation seeking and risky sexual behavior among South African university students. *Social Behavior and Personality*, 30, 475-484.
- McCown, W. (1992). Contributions of the EPN paradigm to HIV prevention: A preliminary study. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 12, 1301-1303.
- McCrae, R. R. (2001). Trait psychology and culture: Exploring intercultural comparisons. *Journal of Personality*, 69, 819-846.
- McCrae, R. R. (2002). NEO-PI-R data from 36 cultures: Further intercultural comparisons. In R. R. McCrae, and J. Allik (Eds.), *The five-factor model of personality across cultures* (pp. 105-126). New York: Kluwer Academic/Plenum Publisher.
- McCrae, R.R., and Costa, Jr., P.T. (1997). Conceptions and correlates of openness to experience. In R. Hogan, J. Johnson, and S. Briggs (Eds.), *Handbook of personality psychology* (pp. 826-848). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- McHoskey, J.W. (2001). Machiavellianism and sexuality: On the moderating role of biological sex. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 31, 779-789.
- McMahon, R.C., Malow, R.M., and Penedo, F.J. (1998). Substance abuse problems, psychiatric severity, and HIV risk in Millon Clinical Multiaxial Inventory-II personality subgroups. *Psychology of Addictive Behaviors*, 12, 3-13.
- Mealey, L. (1995). The sociobiology of sociopathy: An integrated evolutionary model. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 18, 523-599.
- Naff Johnson, C. (1997). Independent and interactive effects of personality and alcohol use on AIDS-related risky sexual behavior. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 57, 9-B. (UMI No. 95006-071).

- Paul, E.L., McManus, B., and Hayes, A. "Hookups": Characteristics and correlates of college students' spontaneous and anonymous sexual experiences. *Journal of Sex Research*, 37, 76-88.
- Paulhus, D.L., and Reid, D. (1991). Enhancement and denial in socially desirable responding. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 60, 307-317.
- Paulhus, D.L., and Williams, K.M. (2002). The "Dark Triad" of personality: Narcissism, Machiavellianism and psychopathy. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 36, 556-563.
- Pinkerton, S.D., and Abramson, P.R. (1996). Decision making and personality factors in sexual risk-taking for HIV/AIDS: A theoretical integration. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 19, 713-723.
- Regan, P.C., and Berscheid, E. (1999). *Lust: What we know about human sexual desire*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Ripa, C.P.L., Hansen, H.S., Mortensen, E.L., Sanders, S.A., and Reinisch, J.M. (2001). A Danish version of the Sensation Seeking Scale and its relation to a broad spectrum of behavioral and psychological characteristics. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 30, 1371-1386.
- Scheib, J. E. (2001). Context-specific mate choice criteria: women's trade-offs in the contexts of long-term and extra-pair mateships. *Personal Relationships*, 8, 371-389.
- Schenk, J., and Pfrang, H. (1986). Extraversion, neuroticism, and sexual behavior: Interrelationships in a sample of young men. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 15, 449-455.
- Schmitt, D.P. (1996). A lexical analysis of human sexuality: Examining the psychological structure and developing an empirical measure of individual differences in sexual description. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 56, 12-B. (UMI No. 95011-095).
- Schmitt, D.P. (2004). The Big Five related to risky sexual behavior across 10 world regions: Differential personality associations of sexual promiscuity and relationship infidelity. *European Journal of Personality*, 18, 301-319.
- Schmitt, D.P. (2005a). Sociosexuality from Argentina to Zimbabwe: A 48-nation study of sex, culture, and strategies of human mating. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 28, 247-275.
- Schmitt, D.P. (2005b). Is short-term mating the maladaptive result of insecure attachment? A test of competing evolutionary perspectives. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 31, 747-768.
- Schmitt, D.P., Alcalay, L., Allensworth, M., Allik, J., Ault, L., Austers, I., et al. (2004). Patterns and universals of adult romantic attachment across 62 cultural regions: Are models of self and other pancultural constructs? *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 35, 367-402.
- Schmitt, D.P., Alcalay, L., Allik, J., Ault, L., Austers, I., Bennett, K.L., et al. (2003). Universal sex differences in the desire for sexual variety: Tests from 52 nations, 6 continents, and 13 islands. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 85, 85-104.
- Schmitt, D.P., and Buss, D.M. (2000). Sexual dimensions of person description: Beyond or subsumed by the Big Five? *Journal of Research in Personality*, 34, 141-177.
- Schmitt, D.P., and 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., Duntley, J., Tooke, W., and Buss, D.M. (2001). The desire for sexual variety as a key to understanding basic human mating strategies. *Personal Relationships*, 8, 425-455.
- Shafer, A.B. (2001). The big five and sexuality trait terms as predictors of relationships and sex. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 35, 313-338.

- Shelton, J.D., Halperin, D.T., Nantulya, V., Potts, M., Gayle, H.D., and Holmes, K.K. (2004). Partner reduction is crucial for balanced “ABC” approach to HIV prevention. *British Medical Journal*, 328, 891-893.
- Simpson, J.A., and Gangestad, S.W. (1991). Individual differences in sociosexuality: Evidence for convergent and discriminant validity. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 60, 870-883.
- Smith, R. L. (1984). Human sperm competition. In R. L. Smith (Ed.), *Sperm competition and the evolution of animal mating systems* (pp. 601-660). New York: Academic Press.
- Snyder, M., Simpson, J.A., Gangestad, S. (1986). Personality and sexual relations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 51, 181-190.
- Spector, P.E. (1992). *Summated rating scale construction*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Trobst, K.K., Herbst, J.H., Masters, H.L., III., and Costa, P.T., Jr. (2002). Personality pathways to unsafe sex: Personality, condom use and HIV risk behaviors. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 36, 117-133.
- Trobst, K.K., Wiggins, J.S., Costa, P.T., Jr., Herbst, J.H., McCrae, R.R., and Masters, H.L., III. (2000). Personality psychology and problem behaviors: HIV risk and the Five-Factor Model. *Journal of Personality*, 68, 1233-1252.
- van de Vijver, F. J. R., and Leung, K. (2000). Methodological issues in psychological research on culture. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 31, 33-51.
- Watson, D., and Clark, L.A. (1997). Extraversion and its positive emotional core. In R. Hogan, J. Johnson, and S. Briggs (Eds.), *Handbook of personality psychology* (pp. 767-793). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- Webster, G.D., and Bryan, A. (2007). Sociosexual attitudes and behaviors: Why two factors are better than one. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 41, 917-922.
- Wiebe, R.P. (2004). Delinquent behavior and the five-factor model: Hiding in the adaptive landscape. *Individual Differences Research*, 2, 38-62.
- Wiederman, M.W. (1997). Extramarital sex: Prevalence and correlates in a national survey. *The Journal of Sex Research*, 34, 167-174.
- Wilson, D., Manual, A., and Lavelle, S. (1992). Personality characteristics of Zimbabwean men who visit prostitutes: Implications for AIDS prevention programs. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 13, 275-279.
- Wright, T.M. (1999). Female sexual behavior: Analysis of Big Five trait facets and domains in the prediction of sociosexuality. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 59, 10-B. (UMI No. 95008-111).
- Wright, T.M., and Reise, S.P. (1997). Personality and unrestricted sexual behavior: Correlations of sociosexuality in Caucasian and Asian college students. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 31, 166-192.
- Zuckerman, M. (1993). P-impulsive sensation seeking and its behavioral, psychophysiological biochemical correlates. *Neuropsychobiology*, 28, 30-36.
- Zuckerman, M. (1994). *Psychobiology of personality*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Zuckerman, M., and Kuhlman, D.M. (2000). Personality and risk-taking: Common biosocial factors. *Journal of Personality*, 68, 999-1029.
- Zuckerman, M., Kuhlman, D.M., Joireman, J., Teta, P., and Kraft, M. (1994). *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 65, 757-768.