

Sociosexuality in Women and Preference for Facial Masculinization and Somatotype in Men

Meghan P. Provost, M.A.,^{1,3} Christine Kormos, B.Sc.,²
Graham Kosakoski, B.Sc.,¹ and Vernon L. Quinsey, Ph.D.¹

Received October 6, 2004; revisions received May 5, 2005 and October 19, 2005; accepted October 23, 2005
Published online: 24 June 2006

Sociosexual orientation reflects individual differences in openness to short-term sexual relationships. We predicted that women with less restricted sociosexuality would be differentially attracted to highly masculinized male faces and bodies. In 2 studies, we investigated preference for male masculinization as a function of female sociosexuality. In Study 1, 40 female university students rated the attractiveness of pictures of male faces and somatotypes differing in masculinization level. All women preferred the faces with average levels of masculinity and the mesomorph somatotype; however, women with less restricted sociosexuality found the faces of men more attractive in general and showed relatively greater preference for masculinized bodies than did women with more restricted sociosexuality. In Study 2, 56 women met with 2 equally attractive male confederates, 1 highly masculinized and 1 less masculinized, in a “speed dating” scenario. After each date, women indicated their interest in each man for short-term and long-term relationships via questionnaire. In this more naturalistic context, sociosexuality was related to an increased interest for the more highly masculinized man in the context of short-term dating. Female sociosexuality appears to be related to preferences for higher levels of male masculinization.

KEY WORDS: sociosexual orientation; masculinity preference; facial masculinization; somatotypes.

INTRODUCTION

Men and women differ, on average, in their ideal mating strategies. This discrepancy can largely be explained by inherent differences in their potential reproductive output and corresponding degrees of parental investment (Symons, 1979; Trivers, 1972). According to Trivers, parental investment pertains to the investment of a parent in a particular offspring that increases the probability that said offspring will reproduce at the cost of the parent's ability to invest in other offspring. As described by Bateman (1948), the sex for which reproductive fitness varies least with number of matings invests the most in

offspring. In humans, women have a less variable rate of reproductive success; thus, they tend to invest more in their offspring. Because of this rate of high investment, women also must be choosier than men in mate selection in order to ensure they are choosing a mate that will dedicate resources to offspring.

In assessing the quality (and thus desirability) of a mate, humans appear to rely on multiple criteria, including intelligence, income, age, and physical appearance. There is a cross-cultural consensus regarding which physical features qualify as attractive for each sex (Cunningham, Roberts, Barbee, & Druen, 1995; Perrett, May, & Yoshikawa, 1994) and Gangestad and Simpson (2000) proposed that these worldwide similarities reflect special psychological mechanisms designed to guide romantic interactions. Presumably, such preferences evolved because they conferred a reproductive advantage to individuals who expressed them.

Specifically, male physical attractiveness to women involves several factors. One such factor is body type.

¹Department of Psychology, Queen's University, Kingston, Ontario, Canada.

²Department of Psychology, University of Victoria, Victoria, British Columbia, Canada.

³To whom correspondence should be addressed at Department of Psychology, Queen's University, Kingston, Ontario, Canada K7L 3N6; e-mail: 1mpb@qlink.queensu.ca.

Dixson, Halliwell, East, Wignarajah, and Anderson (2003) recently studied women's preference for male somatotypes. They provided 162 British women and 113 Sri Lankan women with four back-posed male figures (aged 21 years) differing in somatotype (endomorph, ectomorph, mesomorph, and average). The participants rated each drawing for attractiveness on a 6-point scale ranging from unattractive to extremely attractive. Women were found to prefer mesomorphic (muscular) somatotypes, followed by average, ectomorphic (slim), and endomorphic (heavy) types. The mesomorphic type was generally regarded as the most masculine.

Facial characteristics also influence women's perceptions of male physical attractiveness. Male fluctuating asymmetry (FA), that is, the random differences between the left and right side of a physical trait, appears to be inversely proportional to women's estimations of their attractiveness (Gangestad, Thornhill, & Yeo, 1994). Low FA has been associated with good health and is presumed to indicate developmental stability (Jones et al., 2001). Thus, preference for low FA indicates a preference for genes that convey health benefits.

Studies on facial masculinization, however, show apparently contradictory results. Perrett et al. (1998) found that women preferred feminized faces (i.e., individual male faces that have been morphed to certain degrees with an average female face), while other studies have found that women prefer average faces (for a review, see Halberstadt & Rhodes, 2000). Cunningham, Barbee, and Pike (1990) found that women prefer a combination of masculine and feminine—or *baby-face*—features. They used a multiple motives hypothesis, according to which women were thought to prefer men who are both nurturing and dominant, to explain these findings. Thus, faces combining baby-face (nurturing) features, such as large eyes, with masculine (dominant) features, such as prominent cheekbones, were perceived as most desirable. Cunningham et al. hypothesized that less feminized faces suggest better resistance to disease (immunocompetence) because high levels of masculinization requires high levels of testosterone, and high levels of testosterone is related to a decreased immune system (Folstad & Karter, 1992), while more feminized faces suggest greater parental investment.

Penton-Voak et al. (1999) explained the above conflicting results by arguing that dominance and nurturing each provide distinct reproductive benefits. For long-term relationships, women should emphasize attributes associated with good parenting, and are thus attracted to men who appear able and willing to bring resources to the relationship and to future offspring (Buss & Schmitt, 1993). However, while engaging in short-term mating

or extra-pair copulations (EPCs), women should choose men who are more genetically fit than their primary partners. Of course, this mixed mating strategy will be more successful if a woman is trying to receive genetic benefits around ovulation, the time of her peak fertility.

Many studies have indicated that women's preferences change across the menstrual cycle. In addition, Gangestad and Thornhill (1998) found that women prefer the scent of T-shirts worn by men with low FA to those worn by men with high FA, but only during their fertile phase. Additionally, women's preference for facial masculinization has been shown to change across the menstrual cycle and peak during maximum fertility (Johnson, Hagem, Franklin, Flink, & Grammer, 2001; Penton-Voak & Perrett, 2000; Penton-Voak et al., 1999).

In a recent study by Penton-Voak et al. (1999), women were presented with pictures of the faces of five Caucasian or Japanese men that were digitally manipulated to show varying degrees of masculinization. When asked to select the most physically attractive man, women preferred the more masculinized faces during their fertile phase than during their non-fertile phase. However, preference for facial masculinity remained constant across the menstrual cycle when women judged men's attractiveness for long-term relationships. The preference for masculinized faces for short-term sexual relationships during the high-conception risk phase, therefore, could be explained by preference for good genes. Women are thought to have been selected to prefer men who will confer immunocompetence on their offspring; thus, when conception is most likely, they will seek out more masculine-appearing men with whom to copulate.

It is possible that women who are more open to short-term mating have preferences across their menstrual cycle resembling women using long-term mating strategies who are fertile as opposed to those who are not, because they are not seeking long-term investment in their offspring. Openness to short-term mating is an individual difference related to Kinsey's term *sociosexuality*, which refers to, among other things, number of actual and preferred partners, frequency of polygamous sexual fantasies, and attitudes toward engaging in uncommitted sexual relations (Kinsey, Pomeroy, & Martin, 1948; Kinsey, Pomeroy, Martin, & Gebhard, 1953). Simpson and Gangestad (1991) developed a scale to measure sociosexual orientation (the Sociosexual Orientation Inventory or SOI, see Appendix A for items) and found that many of the aforementioned behaviors covaried and suggested sociosexual orientation as the encompassing variable. Individuals at one end of the continuum possess a *restricted* sociosexual orientation—requiring commitment before sex—while individuals at the opposite end possess

an *unrestricted* sociosexual orientation, engaging in sex without commitment.

Sociosexual orientation appears to be a stable trait, highly correlated with other aspects of personality. Aspects of sociosexual orientation are correlated with extroversion (see, e.g., Eysenck, 1974), self-monitoring (see, e.g., Snyder et al., 1986), and disinhibition (see, e.g., Zuckerman et al., 1972). In addition, Wright and Reise (1997) found that extroversion is directly associated with and low levels of agreeableness were negatively associated with an unrestricted sociosexuality, across Caucasian and Asian ethnicities. Using a twin study, Bailey, Kirk, Zhu, Dunne, and Martin (2000) found sociosexuality to be more strongly related to additive genetic factors than environmental situation. Thus, though raw scores of individuals may change over a person's lifespan, their respective scores should stay relatively stable. Therefore, sociosexual orientation, as measured by the SOI, is a valid categorization of sociosexual behavior.

Simpson and Gangestad (1992) investigated the relationship between restricted versus unrestricted sociosexual orientations and preference for either personal/parenting qualities or attractiveness/social visibility. They found that participants who possessed a restricted sociosexual orientation rated personal/parenting qualities as more important than attractiveness/social visibility. The opposite was true for participants who possessed a less restricted sociosexual orientation. Thus, it would be expected that women with a less restricted sociosexual orientation would make similar ratings of male attractiveness as fertile women, that is, a preference or increased attraction for highly masculinized men. Two studies investigated this hypothesis by allowing women to rate the attractiveness or dating desirability of images of men (Study 1) and through speed dating-like interactions with male confederates (Study 2).

Study 1

The first study had two objectives. Firstly, to reproduce the results of Dixson et al. (2003) regarding a general preference for masculine somatotypes and, secondly, to investigate whether the preference for masculine somatotypes and masculinized faces is mediated by sociosexuality. Since women with less restricted sociosexuality seem more interested in genetic quality than parental investment (Simpson & Gangestad, 1992), we expected that women with less restricted sociosexuality would differentially prefer highly masculinized faces. We also expected that women would prefer more masculine or mesomorphic body types in general, but that this preference would be greater for women with less restricted sociosexuality.

METHOD

Participants

Forty female students registered in an introductory psychology course at Queen's University participated in this study. Mean participant age was 18.79 years ($SD = 0.73$). Each participant was awarded a bonus of 0.5% toward her course mark.

Measures

The face images were identical to those used in the Penton-Voak et al. (1999) study (i.e., four frontal views of male faces at five different levels of masculinization). The somatotype images presented to the participants were identical to those used in the Dixson et al. (2003) study. We used all eight images (i.e., back images of endomorph, ectomorph, mesomorph, and average, as well as front views of the mesomorph and endomorph somatotypes with and without hair). The women rated each image for attractiveness on a 6-point scale (0 = *unattractive*, 1 = *slightly attractive*, 2 = *mildly attractive*, 3 = *moderately attractive*, 4 = *very attractive*, and 5 = *extremely attractive*). Sociosexuality was assessed with the Sociosexual Orientation Inventory (SOI; Simpson & Gangestad, 1991), removing item 4 ("How often do (did) you fantasize about having sex with someone other than your current (most recent) dating partner?") from the calculation. Item 4 was problematic for numerous reasons. The context of the question was convoluted because sexual fantasy usually involves someone other than a sexual partner, the question can only be answered by someone in a relationship, and statistically this item also had the lowest factor loading of any of the items on the first principal component when developing the SOI scale (0.54 compared to 0.64 on the next lowest loading, see Simpson & Gangestad, 1991).

Procedure

Upon recruitment, all participants read a letter of information and completed a standard consent form, assuring confidentiality and indicating that the present study set out to determine which male characteristics women find attractive. Participants then completed a computerized rating task, which involved viewing the stimuli on the screen and entering 0–5 on the computer via the keyboard, corresponding to the level of attractiveness perceived. The somatotypes and faces were presented separately and the within-set order was randomized for each participant to prevent order effects. Although the

Table I. Mean Ratings for Facial Attractiveness as a Function of Sociosexuality

	Facial category				
	-2	-1	0	1	2
Restricted sociosexuality	1.62 (0.82)	1.71 (0.76)	1.95 (0.81)	1.80 (0.88)	1.75 (0.82)
Unrestricted sociosexuality	1.87 (0.73)	1.88 (0.63)	2.22 (0.68)	2.18 (1.09)	2.03 (0.63)

Note. -2: most feminized, 2: most masculinized. Absolute range, 1 (unattractive) to 6 (extremely attractive). Values in parentheses are SDs

participants were presented with both the hairless and hairy somatotype images used in the Dixson et al. (2003) study, only the standard four images (hairless) were used in statistical analysis. Though hirsuteness may be a sign of masculinity, body hair also conveys information in addition to masculinity, such as ethnic status and age that was outside the focus of this study. The participants then completed the SOI scale. Following the completion of the computer tasks, they were given a debriefing form that explained the hypothesis of the study and provided with a list of related articles.

After calculating the SOI scores for the participants ($M = 26.36$, $SD = 18.31$), participants scoring in the first quartile on the SOI were labeled as having restricted sociosexuality, while participants scoring in the fourth quartile were labeled as having unrestricted sociosexuality; thus, the data from 20 participants were used in the final analyses. We only used the extreme SOI scores in order to investigate the particular mating strategies of women with restricted and unrestricted sociosexuality.

RESULTS

The attractiveness rating for each male face was averaged for an overall attractiveness score for each of the five levels of male facial masculinization. Table I shows the mean attractiveness ratings as a function of SOI level and facial masculinization. A 2 (SOI: restricted vs.

unrestricted) \times 5 (facial masculinization level) repeated measures analysis of variance (ANOVA) yielded no significant main effects, $F(1, 18) < 1$ and $F(4, 15) = 2.48$ for SOI and facial masculinization, respectively, or an interaction, $F(4, 15) < 1$.

Table II shows the mean attractiveness ratings as a function of SOI level and somatotype level. A 2 (SOI: restricted vs. unrestricted) \times 4 (somatotype) ANOVA yielded significant main effects for both SOI, $F(1, 18) = 9.8$, $p < .01$, $\eta^2 = .40$, and somatotype, $F(3, 16) = 19.29$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .78$. There was also a significant SOI by somatotype interaction, $F(3, 16) = 4.14$, $p < .05$, $\eta^2 = .40$.

In order to investigate the interaction further, we decomposed it using simple effects analysis. We used a Bonferroni correction for all tests ($\alpha = .0125$ for the simple effects of SOI and $.008$ for the simple comparisons of somatotype). There was only a significant difference for the mesomorph body type between the two levels of SOI, $p = .006$, with women with unrestricted SOI rating the mesomorph body as more attractive. There was a simple main effect of somatotype in the unrestricted SOI category, $F(3, 7) = 24.4$, $p < .001$, but not for the restricted SOI category, $F(3, 7) = 4.3$, $p = .052$. Within the unrestricted category, only the attractiveness ratings for the mesomorph somatotype were different from the other categories (see Table III for statistics), with the mesomorph somatotype having the highest attractiveness ratings.

Table II. Mean Ratings for Somatotype Attractiveness as a function of Sociosexuality

	Somatotype			
	Endomorph	Ectomorph	Mesomorph	Average
Restricted sociosexuality	0.10 (0.32)	0.00 (0.00)	1.40 (1.31)	0.50 (0.52)
Unrestricted sociosexuality	0.10 (0.32)	0.80 (0.92)	2.90 (0.88)	1.00 (0.82)

Note. Absolute range, 1 (unattractive) to 6 (extremely attractive). Values in parentheses are SDs.

Table III. Statistics for the Multiple Comparisons of the Simple Effects on Somatotype

	Ectomorph		Mesomorph		Average	
	<i>F</i> (1, 9)	<i>p</i>	<i>F</i> (1, 9)	<i>p</i>	<i>F</i> (1, 9)	<i>p</i>
Endomorph	7.23	.025	92.80	< .001	10.57	.01
Ectomorph	—	—	36.41	< .001	0.41	.52
Mesomorph			—	—	36.51	< .001
Average					—	—

DISCUSSION

We found that sociosexual orientation influenced preference for somatotype but not for facial masculinization. The study's goal to replicate a portion of the findings of Dixon et al. (2003) was successful because the participants showed a greater preference for mesomorphic somatotypes. Our prediction concerning how the preference for masculinized faces would be mediated by sociosexuality did not produce the expected results. We had predicted that women with less restricted sociosexuality would prefer highly masculinized faces. However, we found no significant differences in the attractiveness ratings given to the facial images.

We had also expected that women would prefer more masculine or mesomorphic body types, in general, but that the preference would be greater for women with less restricted sociosexuality. Our findings indicated that women with unrestricted sociosexuality generally gave higher attractiveness ratings for all somatotypes than women with restricted sociosexuality, with a significant difference on the mesomorph body type. We also found an interaction between SOI score and body type, driven by the preference of women with an unrestricted sociosexuality for the mesomorph body type. Thus, it appears that women with less restricted sociosexuality may employ a mating strategy that attempts to acquire good genes from potential sexual partners.

Study 2

As with Study 1, we investigated whether sociosexuality mediated attraction to masculinity. In this study, two confederate men with different degrees of physical masculinization, interacted with women in a mock speeddating experiment. Using real men as stimuli, we investigated how sociosexuality affected preference for higher male masculinization.

METHOD

Participants

Fifty-five heterosexual undergraduate women from Queen's University (M age = 19.16 years, $SD = 1.22$) who were not using hormonal birth control participated in this study. Participants were compensated with either course credit or \$5.00. Three participants knew one of the confederates prior to the study; however, because the full purpose of the study was not revealed to the women prior to their participation, we included their interest ratings for the unknown confederate.

Measures

Prior to the commencement of the study, we photographed the faces and clothed bodies of 10 prospective confederates (recruited through advertisements posted in the Film and Drama Departments at Queen's University). We showed these pictures to 10 naive undergraduate women at Queen's University. These women rated the physical masculinization of potential confederates on a 9-point scale, ranging from 1 (*highly masculinized*) to 9 (*highly feminized*), and attractiveness on a scale ranging from 1 (*attractive*) to 9 (*unattractive*). We calculated mean and SD values for the masculinization and attractiveness of each man and selected the two men who differed the most from one another in terms of perceived masculinization, but who received the most similar attractiveness ratings. Through this process, we selected a relatively highly masculinized confederate ($M = 1.80$) and a relatively less masculinized confederate ($M = 5.40$) who received fairly equal attractiveness ratings ($M = 5.90$ and 5.80 , respectively). Both confederates (age 19 and 21 years) were students in the Drama Department at Queen's University. Each man received \$350 for his involvement in the study.

Participants completed a package containing five questionnaires. The pre-date demographic questionnaire contained questions about age, relationship status, and

type of birth control used, if any (to confirm that participants were not using hormonal birth control). Two of the post-date questionnaires independently assessed the participant's level of interest in each confederate for a dating, short-term relationship, and long-term relationship. Participants rated their responses on a 9-point scale, ranging from 1 (*not at all interested*) to 9 (*extremely interested*). A forced-choice relative judgments questionnaire asked participants to compare confederates to each other and indicate which one they would be more interested in for a dating, short-term, and long-term relationship, using 4-point scales, ranging from 1 (*very interested in Candidate A*) to 4 (*very interested in Candidate B*) that were subsequently recoded to represent interest in the less versus more masculinized confederate respectively. Participants also completed the SOI. As in Study 1, we calculated SOI scores (excluding question 4) for each participant ($M = 21.97$, $SD = 17.12$) and we classified women scoring in the top quartile as "unrestricted" ($n = 11$) and women scoring in the bottom quartile as "restricted" ($n = 13$).

Procedure

The confederates memorized two character profiles, equal in activity level, interests, and with comparable programs of study. We provided the confederates with plain and logo free T-shirts to remove any potential confound arising from their choice of clothing. We paired confederate T-shirt color with a character profile, so that whoever was wearing a forest green T-shirt was always the "John" character, while the confederate wearing a navy blue T-shirt was always the "Dan" character.

Participants were recruited for a speed dating study. We attempted to have two women come into the laboratory together (to increase the realism of the speed dating scenario), but about half of the sessions were done with individual women. After obtaining consent for the study, the women completed a demographic questionnaire. Then, each woman spent three minutes alone with each confederate on her "speed date." Following the first speed

date, the participants answered questions on their level of interest in the man they had just met for a dating, short-term, and long-term relationships. Then, the same procedure was followed with the second confederate. Once participants met with both men, they indicated their relative interest in each man for the three types of relationships and completed the SOI.

RESULTS

Preliminary analyses showed that there were no significant effects on attractiveness ratings as a function of whether or not the women participated individually or came in pairs. Using a repeated measures ANOVA, we investigated differences in interest ratings for both confederates over short-term and long-term relationships. Table IV shows the mean attractiveness ratings as a function of SOI, actor's masculinization, and relationship type. A 2 (SOI: restricted vs. unrestricted) \times 2 (actor's masculinization: low vs. high) \times 2 (relationship type: short-term vs. long-term) ANOVA revealed a significant interaction between SOI and relationship type, $F(1,22) = 12.83$, $p < .01$.

Simple effects analysis on SOI category, with a Bonferroni correction for multiple comparisons, indicated no significant difference on interest ratings for different relationship types. Simple effects analysis on the relationship type indicated that women in the restricted category had different interest scores across relationship type, preferring long-term relationships to short-term relationships, $F(1, 12) = 10.97$, $p < .01$. There was no significant difference in ratings for women with unrestricted sociosexuality.

In order to investigate further the effect of sociosexual orientation on dating preference, we investigated the women's relative preference for each confederate for each short-term and long-term relationships. We calculated a difference score by subtracting the postdate relative interest value for short-term mating from the value for long-term mating; thus, higher values indicated a preference for the more masculinized man for short-term

Table IV. Mean Interest Ratings as a Function of Masculinization, Relationship Type, and Sociosexuality

	Less masculinized		More masculinized	
	Short term	Long term	Short term	Long term
Restricted sociosexuality	1.92 (1.71)	3.54 (2.33)	2.08 (1.94)	3.46 (2.03)
Unrestricted sociosexuality	3.32 (2.24)	2.91 (2.17)	3.82 (1.78)	3.18 (2.09)

Note. Absolute range, 1 (*not at all interested*) to 9 (*extremely interested*). Values in parentheses are *SDs*

relationships and lower scores indicated a preference for the less masculinized man for long-term relationships. There was a significant difference in the difference scores between women with restricted and unrestricted sociosexuality (M restricted = -0.25 , $SD = 0.62$; M unrestricted = 0.27 , $SD = 0.65$; $t(20) = 1.77$, $p < .05$, one-tailed).

DISCUSSION

In this study, we were able to determine that sociosexual orientation appeared to affect relative preference for highly masculinized men. As shown in the relative interest ratings, women with unrestricted sociosexuality showed higher interest ratings for short-term relationships with the masculinized man, and women with restricted sociosexuality showed higher interest ratings for the less masculinized man for long-term relationships.

GENERAL DISCUSSION

In the preceding studies, we investigated if women with high SOI scores, as compared to women with low SOI scores, behaved similarly to women at peak fertility. Specifically, we were interested in testing the preferences of women with varying levels of sociosexual orientation for male masculinization. In the first study, both groups of women appeared to prefer men whose high levels of masculinity (somatotypes) implied high levels of genetic quality. However, women with less restricted sociosexuality differentially found the masculine (i.e., mesomorph) body shape to be more attractive than other body shapes, and they gave higher attractiveness ratings than women with restricted sociosexuality. Thus, these women may be more sensitive to cues signifying high levels of genetic quality than women with restricted sociosexualities.

In the second study, we found that women with unrestricted sociosexuality had a greater interest in the more masculinized confederate for short-term relationships, using a forced-choice paradigm. Because men's facial asymmetry has been shown to significantly covary with their facial masculinization (Gangestad & Thornhill, 2003), both FA and masculinization are thought to indicate underlying developmental stability and thus genetic quality. Therefore, these findings are consistent with those of Simpson and Gangestad (1991, 1992), who have shown that women with higher sociosexuality tend to prefer more symmetrical men, especially for short-term relationships. Again, women with high SOI scores appeared to be pursuing a strategy consistent with acquiring genetic

benefits as opposed to good-parenting benefits from short-term mates. Thus, these findings support the notion that willingness to engage in short-term mating is directly associated with preference for men who show indicators of genetic fitness (Simpson & Gangestad, 1991, 1992) and that masculinization is a cue of high genetic quality (Swaddle & Reiersen, 2002).

Most interestingly, the relative interest for the more masculinized man for short-term relationships was observable in a contrived social setting. That is, participants were aware that they would be participating in a study on speed dating where they would be interacting with men. Very few studies on women's preferences have been done involving real-time interactions with men and many potential confounds arise from conducting a study using confederates as opposed to standardized computer-generated stimuli. For instance, although the confederates followed character profiles, on occasion they were required to deviate from these profiles in order to respond to unanticipated questions. Therefore, all participants did not receive the same information about confederates. Likewise, the confederate's moods could not be totally consistent across all study days, and so it is possible that they were more amiable with some participants over others. Having only two confederate men in this study was an unfortunate necessity, due to time and other constraints. However, despite the loss of tight experimental control as a result of using confederates, such a methodology was worthwhile because it allowed for a closer approximation of actual interactions between the sexes, and thus makes results of this study more applicable to real-life phenomena.

Across both studies, an unrestricted sociosexual orientation appeared to be related to a mating strategy focused on receiving genetic benefits from male partners, as opposed to other possible benefits. Such a mating strategy is similar to that employed by women during times of peak fertility. In addition, like naturally cycling women, those with unrestricted sociosexuality also appear to make a distinction between short-term and long-term relationships, such that when forced to choose a preference for a sexual partner, women who chose the less masculinized men also had low SOI scores. Thus, individual differences affect mating preferences in a way that may benefit women's reproductive success.

APPENDIX A

1. How many different partners do you foresee yourself having sex with during the next 5 years? (please give a specific, realistic estimate)

2. With how many different partners have you had sex (sexual intercourse) within the past year?
3. With how many different partners have you had sex on one and only one occasion?
4. How often do you fantasize about having sex with someone other than your dating partner?
5. I think that sex without love is OK.
6. I can imagine myself being comfortable and enjoying "casual" sex with different partners.
7. 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/her.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We would like to thank I. Penton-Voak for supplying us with the face stimuli, and the confederate men who helped with this study. Also, thanks to A. Clark, the Editor, and three anonymous reviewers for helpful suggestions on earlier versions of this article. We would also like to acknowledge the support of a SSHRC postgraduate scholarship to Meghan Provost.

REFERENCES

- Bailey, J. M., Kirk, K. M., Zhu, G., Dunne, M. P., & Martin, N. G. (2000). Do individual differences in sociosexual represent genetic or environmentally contingent strategies? Evidence from the Australian twin registry. *Journal of Personal and Social Psychology, 78*, 537–545.
- Bateman, A. J. (1948). Intra-sexual selection in *Drosophila*. *Heredity, 2*, 349–368.
- Buss, D. M., & Schmitt, D. P. (1993). Sexual strategies theory: An evolutionary perspective on human mating. *Psychological Review, 100*, 204–232.
- Cunningham, M. R., Barbee, A. P., & Pike, C. L. (1990). What do women want? Facialmetric assessment of multiple motives in the perception of male facial physical attractiveness. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 59*, 61–72.
- Cunningham, M. R., Roberts, A. R., Barbee, A. P., & Druen, P. B. (1995). "Their ideas of beauty are, on the whole, the same as ours": Consistency and variability in the cross-cultural perception of female physical attractiveness. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 68*, 261–279.
- Dixon, A. F., Halliwell, G., East, R., Wignarajah, P., & Anderson, M. J. (2003). Masculine somatotypes and hirsuteness as determinants of sexual attractiveness to women. *Archives of Sexual Behavior, 32*, 22–39.
- Eysenck, H. J. (1974). Personality, premarital sexual permissiveness, and assortative mating. *Journal of Sex Research, 10*, 47–51.
- Folstad, I., & Karter, A. J. (1992). Parasites, bright males, and the immunocompetence handicap. *The American Naturalist, 139*, 603–622.
- Gangestad, S. W., & Simpson, J. A. (1990). Toward an evolutionary history of female sociosexual variation. *Journal of Personality, 58*, 69–96.
- Gangestad, S. W., & Simpson, J. A. (2000). The evolution of human mating: Trade-offs and strategic pluralism. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences, 23*, 573–644.
- Gangestad, S. W., & Thornhill, R. (1998). Menstrual cycle variation in women's preferences for scent of symmetrical men. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London B Biological Science, 265*, 927–933.
- Gangestad, S. W., & Thornhill, R. (2003). Facial masculinity and fluctuating asymmetry. *Evolution and Human Behavior, 24*, 231–241.
- Gangestad, S. W., Thornhill, R., & Yeo, R. A. (1994). Facial attractiveness, developmental stability, and fluctuating asymmetry. *Ethology and Sociobiology, 15*, 73–85.
- Halberstadt, J., & Rhodes, G. (2000). The attractiveness of nonface averages: Implications for an evolutionary explanation of the attractiveness of average faces. *Psychological Science, 11*, 285–289.
- Johnson, V. S., Hagel, R., Franklin, M., Flink, B., & Grammer, K. (2001). Male facial attractiveness: Evidence for hormone-mediated adaptive design. *Evolution and Human Behavior, 22*, 251–267.
- Jones, B. C., Little, A. C., Penton-Voak, I. S., Tiddeman, B. P., Burt, D. M., & Perrett, D. I. (2001). Facial symmetry and judgments of apparent health: Support for a "good genes" explanation of the attractiveness-symmetry relationship. *Evolution and Human Behavior, 22*, 417–429.
- Kinsey, A. C., Pomeroy, W. B., & Martin, C. E. (1948). *Sexual behavior in the human male*. Philadelphia: Saunders.
- Kinsey, A. C., Pomeroy, W. B., Martin, C. E., & Gebhard, P. H. (1953). *Sexual behavior in the human female*. Philadelphia: Saunders.
- Penton-Voak, I. S., & Perrett, D. I. (2000). Female preference for male faces changes cyclically: Further evidence. *Evolution and Human Behavior, 21*, 39–48.
- Penton-Voak, I. S., Perrett, D. I., Castles, D. L., Kobayashi, T., Burt, D. M., Murray, L. K., et al. (1999). Menstrual cycle alters face preference. *Nature, 399*, 741–742.
- Perrett, D. I., Lee, K., Penton-Voak, I., Burt, D. M., Rowland, D., Yoshikawa, S., et al. (1998). Sexual dimorphism and facial attractiveness. *Nature, 394*, 884–886.
- Perrett, D. I., May, K. A., & Yoshikawa, S. (1994). Facial shape and judgments of female attractiveness. *Nature, 368*, 239–242.
- Simpson, J. A., & Gangestad, S. W. (1991). Individual differences in sociosexuality: Evidence for convergent and discriminant validity. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 60*, 870–883.
- Simpson, J. A., & Gangestad, S. W. (1992). Sociosexuality and romantic partner choice. *Journal of Personality, 60*, 31–51.
- Snyder, M., Simpson, J. A., & Gangestad, S. (1986). Personality and sexual relations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 51*, 181–190.
- Swaddle, J. P., & Reiersen, G. W. (2002). Testosterone increases perceived dominance but not attractiveness in human males. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London B Biological Science, 269*, 2285–2289.
- Symons, D. (1979). *The evolution of human sexuality*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Trivers, R. L. (1972). Parental investment and sexual selection. In B. Campbell (Ed.), *Sexual selection and the descent of man* (pp. 136–179). Chicago, IL: Aldine-Atherton.
- Wright, T. M., & 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., Bone, R. N., Near, R., Mangelsdorf, D., & Brustman, B. (1972). What is the sensation seeker? Personality trait and experience correlates of the Sensation Seeking Scales. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 39*, 308–321.