

VARIABILITY IN MATING STRATEGIES: DO INDIVIDUAL DIFFERENCES IN
DISPOSITIONAL TRAITS PREDICT SEXUAL PREFERENCES?

A THESIS

SUBMITTED TO THE DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHOLOGY
OF THE STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK AT NEW PALTZ
IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR THE DEGREE OF
MASTER OF ARTS IN PSYCHOLOGY

By

Ashley N. Peterson

December 2011

Notice: Signature Page Not Included

This thesis has been signed and approved by the appropriate parties.

The signature page has been removed from this digital version for privacy reasons.

The signature page is maintained as part of the official version of the thesis in print that is kept in Special Collections of Sojourner Truth Library at SUNY New Paltz.

SUNY New Paltz theses are copyright protected and may be used for education or personal research only.

Reproduction or distribution in part or whole is prohibited without written permission from the author.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank my thesis committee for their time and assistance in helping me complete this process and the resulting thesis. Further, I would especially like to thank my advisor, Glenn Geher, for his time and dedication in teaching me the research process. It is because of his commitment to me as a student I can now write a manuscript on my own. Also, thanks to the New Paltz Evolutionary Psychology Lab for comments and suggestions throughout the research process.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	Acknowledgements.....	iii
II.	Abstract.....	vi
III.	Introduction.....	1
	Personality.....	1
	Sociosexuality.....	4
	Life history strategy.....	5
	Mating intelligence.....	6
	Attachment style.....	7
	Three domains of disgust.....	10
	Sex drive.....	13
IV.	Materials and Methods.....	20
	Participants.....	20
	Measures.....	20
	Procedure.....	22
V.	Results.....	23
	Independent sample t-tests between males and females.....	23
	Correlations between the predictor variables across the sexes.....	25
	Correlations between the predictor variables among males and females.....	28
	Correlations between the predictor and sexual-preference variables across the sexes.....	32
	Correlations between the predictor and sexual-preference variables among males and females.....	34

	Multiple regressions predicting sexual-preferences among males and females.....	36
VI.	Discussion.....	47
	Dispositional predictors of sexual-preferences.....	47
	Sex differences in sexual-preferences.....	51
	Hormonal correlates of sexual-preferences.....	52
	Limitations and future directions.....	52
	Conclusion and implications.....	53
VII.	References.....	55
VIII.	Tables.....	62

ABSTRACT

Prior research by evolutionary psychologists has examined dispositional predictors, such as personality, sociosexuality, life history, and attachment style, in relation to mating, yet only one study has examined how these traits predict an individual's sexual preferences (i.e., Peterson, Geher, & Kaufman, 2011). Thus, the current study, extending the research of Peterson, Geher, and Kaufman (2011), examined previously studied dispositional predictors, including the Big Five, sociosexuality, life history, and mating intelligence, and three additional ones, attachment, sex drive, and disgust sensitivity. A sample of 638 participants completed a battery of measures of each of these traits as well as providing information about their sexual preferences. The traits predicted variability in sexual preferences – with the attachment dimensions, avoidance and anxiety, and sex drive being most predictive. In addition, sex differences emerged (e.g., males reported enjoying most of the sex acts more than females). Discussion focuses on (a) comparing the results of the current study with Peterson, Geher, and Kaufman (2011), (b) sex differences in preferences for the sex acts, and (c) attachment, sex drive, and disgust sensitivity as predictors of sexual preferences.

VARIABILITY IN MATING STRATEGIES: DO INDIVIDUAL DIFFERENCES IN DISPOSITIONAL TRAITS PREDICT SEXUAL PREFERENCES?

Traditionally, Evolutionary Psychology has focused on discovering human universals and sex differences in human mating (e.g., Buss, 2003; Schmitt, 2008) while ignoring individual differences. Today, the field generally recognizes that there is variability and plurality in mating strategies between and within individuals with multiple behavioral routes to reproductive success (Geher & Kaufman, 2011; Simpson & Gangestad, 2000). Recently, individual differences in human mating have been studied; by examining how variability in various personality and dispositional traits reflects variability in underlying mating strategies (i.e., engagement in short-term or long-term mating strategies)(see Nettle & Clegg, 2008). Thus, the current study seeks to extend this research by examining the relationships between several personality variables, including the Big Five, sociosexuality, life history strategy, the attachment dimensions, avoidance and anxiety, pathogen, sexual, and moral disgust sensitivity, sex drive, and mating intelligence, and preferences for particular sex acts (i.e., masturbation, oral sex, vaginal sex, etc.).

Personality

Individual differences in personality traits, such as the Big Five, may reflect variability in mating strategies. For instance, Nettle and Clegg (2008) examined each of the Big Five traits in terms of costs and benefits in the mating domain. In this analysis, variability in personality traits reflects trade-offs in time and energy allocation in five domains, including: mate acquisition vs. mate retention (e.g., extraversion), low vs. high threshold for detecting mating-relevant threats (e.g., neuroticism), low vs. high patience

regarding future possible mating opportunities (e.g., conscientiousness), low vs. high empathy regarding others' interests (e.g., agreeableness), and low vs. high investment in costly, risky courtship signals (e.g., openness to experience).

Extraversion. For instance, extraverts who are generally ambitious, assertive, competitive, sociable, and physically active, tend to be more likely to achieve high status than introverts and; thus, may attract multiple mates increasing reproductive success through short-term mating (Nettle, 2011). However, introverts are generally more successful at long-term mating than extraverts since extraverts are more likely to terminate their relationships and have affairs (Nettle, 2005; Schmit, 2004). In addition, extraverts tend to live fast and die young; more often engaging in risk taking behaviors resulting in more accidents and hospitalizations and early death (Nettle, 2005). Thus, extraversion and introversion can lead to equal reproductive success with extraverts pursuing a short-term mating strategy and introverts pursuing a long-term mating strategy.

Neuroticism. An individual's trait level of Neuroticism "can be interpreted as one's threshold for detecting biologically relevant threats, especially to one's social and sexual relationships," (Nettle & Clegg, 2008, p.125). As such, neurotic individuals tend to have an increased sensitivity to physical danger, an increased perceived vulnerability to disease, and increased anger and hostility in response to social challenges (Nettle, 2011). While beneficial in unsafe environments with high levels of predators and other threats, high levels of neuroticism may produce chronic stress, an increased number of physical health problems, anxiety disorders, and major depression (Neeleman, Sytema, & Wadsworth, 2002 as cited in Nettle & Clegg, 2008). In romantic relationships, neurotics

generally experience decreased relationship satisfaction and quality (Karney & Bradbury, 1997 as cited in Nettle & Clegg, 2008) likely due to worrying about their partner's fidelity in the relationship. Therefore, individuals high in neuroticism have a propensity do poorly in obtaining reproductive success through long-term mating strategies.

Conscientiousness. Conscientious individuals are generally responsible, self-disciplined, have a strong sense of duty to others, and take great care to weigh the future costs and benefits against immediate ones when making decisions. These individuals are generally good long-term mating strategists imposing less stress on their relationships due to their tendency to consider the feelings and situation of their partner (Nettle & Clegg, 2008). However, the conscientious are likely fail in situations that are unpredictable and have to be exploited opportunistically, such as short-term sexual encounters. Unlike highly conscientious individuals, individuals low in conscientiousness tend to be impulsive favoring immediate opportunities with little regard for future consequences, which allows them to maximize their reproductive success through short-term mating.

Agreeableness. Individuals high in agreeableness are predisposed to be empathetic, trusting, gentle, engage in perspective taking and consensus seeking, and have a tendency to follow social norms (Nettle, 2011; Nettle & Clegg, 2008). Therefore, these individuals likely have qualities that make them successful at long-term mating. Supporting this claim, previous research has found that agreeable individuals have increased harmonious relationships (Heaven, 1996 as cited in Nettle & Clegg, 2008), have increased loyalty to mates, and less likely to engage in infidelity (Schmitt, 2004; Schmitt & Buss, 2000). However, due to these same qualities agreeable individuals are

likely to experience decreased career success and some missed short-term sexual opportunities (Nettle, 2011; Nettle & Clegg, 2008).

Openness to experience. Individuals high in openness are generally interested in culture and aesthetics (such as art) and tend to have diverse personal experiences. This trait has been suggested to function as a fitness indicator (i.e., an indicator of ‘good genes’) since the effect of ‘open’ cognition depends on genetic quality. In individuals with good genetic quality, ‘open’ cognition is associated with increased creativity and the production of works in art, music, language, or other domains; thus, leading to increased social status and reproductive success through short-term mating opportunities. The same ‘open’ cognition in individuals with poor genetic quality may lead to disorganized, incoherent, and sometimes psychotic thoughts and mental illness repelling mates and decreasing reproductive success (Nettle & Clegg, 2008).

Sociosexuality

Other traits have also been investigated with an evolutionary rationale in mind, such as sociosexuality and life history strategy. Sociosexuality, defined as one’s willingness to engage in uncommitted sexual relations (Simpson & Gangestad, 1992), is essentially a proxy for the tendency to engage in a short-term mating strategy, characterized by low parental investment and high mating investment. Individuals scoring low (i.e., below the median within their gender on the Sociosexual Orientation Inventory (SOI)) on this trait have a restricted sociosexual orientation and individuals scoring high (i.e., above the median within their gender on the SOI) on this trait have an unrestricted sociosexual orientation. Restricted individuals require greater closeness and commitment in a relationship prior to having sex than unrestricted individuals.

Unrestricted individuals engage in sex earlier in their relationships and often have more than one sexual affair concurrently (Simpson & Gangestad, 1991).

Connection to the Big Five. Studies examining the relationship between sociosexuality and personality have generally found small effect sizes. Nevertheless, Peterson, Geher, and Kaufman (2011) found sociosexuality to be negatively correlated with neuroticism, agreeableness, and conscientiousness. In addition, a much larger study, using data from the International Sexuality Description Project, found in men, sociosexuality was negatively related to neuroticism, agreeableness, and conscientiousness and positively related to extraversion. Sociosexuality, in women, was negatively correlated with agreeableness and conscientiousness and positively correlated with extraversion and openness (Schmitt & Shackelford, 2008).

Life History Strategy

Life History strategy is a dispositional trait measuring how an individual allocates energy between growth and survival (i.e., somatic effort) and reproduction (i.e. reproductive effort) to maximize his or her fitness. In choosing a strategy, individuals face trade-offs between present and future reproduction, the quantity and quality of offspring, and mating effort and parenting effort (Kaplan & Gangestad, 2005). There are considered to be two strategies: the K-strategy (a.k.a. slow Life History strategy) characterized by longer periods of development, delayed sexual maturation, and high amounts of parental investment in a few offspring (i.e., long-term mating strategy) and the r-strategy (a.k.a. fast Life History strategy) characterized by fast development, early sexual maturation, and low amounts of parental investment in many offspring (i.e., short-term mating strategy) (Gladden, Figueredo, & Jacobs, 2009). The optimal strategy to

pursue depends on an individual's environment, where unstable environments with unpredictable rates of mortality generally favor r-strategists and more stable environments with less variable rates of mortality favor K-strategists (Kaplan & Gangestad, 2005).

Connections to the Big Five and Sociosexuality. Across two studies (Gladden, Figueredo, & Jacobs, 2009; Peterson, Geher, & Kaufman, 2011), life history strategy (i.e., being high on K) was positively correlated with extraversion, agreeableness, conscientiousness, and openness and negatively correlated with neuroticism. Sociosexuality is also related to life history strategy. For instance, Kruger and Fisher (2008) found sociosexuality (i.e., having an unrestricted sociosexual orientation) was positively related to several attributes of a fast life history strategy, including the number of sex partners an individual has had in past 12 months, the number of one time sex partners an individual has had, and the number of times an individual has cheated. More directly, life history strategy (i.e., high on K) was found to be negatively related to sociosexuality (Peterson, Geher, & Kaufman, 2011), suggesting that both fast life history strategy and unrestricted sociosexuality are related to short-term mating.

Mating Intelligence

Mating intelligence (MI) is conceptualized as the cognitive mechanisms and mental fitness indicators necessary for the employment of various mating strategies (Geher & Miller, 2008) and varies between individuals in a trait-like manner. MI is computed using the Mating Intelligence Scale (Geher & Kaufman, 2007), a sex-specific measure with four subscales: cross-sex mind reading, mating-relevant self-deception, mating-relevant other-deception, and cognitive courtship display.

Recent studies have found MI to predict individual differences in sexuality in evolutionary predictable ways, suggesting that MI is a valid construct. For instance, O'Brien, Geher, Gallup, and Kaufman (2010) found that males who are higher in MI are more likely than other males to have had hook-up experiences with strangers, acquaintances, and friends; while, females higher in MI were only more likely than other females to have had more hook-up experiences with acquaintances.

Connections to the Big Five, Sociosexuality, and Life History Strategy. Only one known study (Peterson, Geher, & Kaufman, 2011) has examined the relationship between the Big Five, sociosexuality, life history strategy, and MI. Overall, MI had small positive correlations with extraversion and openness and a small negative correlation with neuroticism. Life history strategy was positively related to MI, indicating individuals high in MI endorsed somewhat slower life history strategies. Sociosexuality was found to be unrelated to MI; however, an interesting connection emerged when sociosexuality and MI were found to be individual predictors of the preferences for performing and receiving oral sex and vaginal sex when multiple regressions predicting sexual preferences were performed.

Attachment Style

In adults, attachment style describes how an individual approaches and functions in romantic relationships (Zeifman & Hazan, 1997). In dimensional models of adult attachment style, there are two components of insecure attachment styles: anxiety (or model of self) and avoidance (or model of others). "Attachment anxiety (i.e., negative model of self) is characterized by an expectation of separation, abandonment, or insufficient love; a preoccupation with the availability and responsiveness of others; and

hyperactivation of attachment behavior. Attachment avoidance (i.e., negative model of others) is characterized by a devaluation of the importance of close relationships, avoidance of intimacy and dependence, self-reliance, and relative deactivation of attachment behavior,” (Ravitz, Maunder, Hunter, Sthankiya, & Lancee, 2010, p. 421). Overall, there are four categories of adult attachment style: secure (i.e., low anxiety, low avoidance), dismissing (i.e., low anxiety, high avoidance; also known as avoidant attachment), preoccupied (i.e., high anxiety, low avoidance; the adult version of anxious ambivalent attachment), and fearful (i.e., high anxiety, high avoidance) (Ravitz et al., 2010).

Previous research has found that attachment style is related to reproductive strategy and sexual behavior (Belsky, Steinberg, & Draper, 1991; Schmitt, 2005; Zeifman & Hazan, 1997). For instance, Belsky, Steinberg, and Draper’s (1991) theory of socialization posits that there are two reproductive strategies, which an individual may develop depending on his or her early environment. A child reared in an environment with a family context of marital discord, high stress, inadequate material and monetary resources, and harsh, rejecting, insensitive, and inconsistent parents are expected to develop insecure attachment. Expecting the same unfavorable and unstable environment as reared in during infancy and childhood, these insecurely attached children tend to go through maturation and puberty and engage in sexual activity earlier than individuals securely attached and pursue a short-term mating strategy (i.e., a fast life history strategy).

On the other hand, children raised in early environments characterized by spousal harmony, adequate material and monetary resources, and sensitive, supportive, and

responsive parents develop secure attachments. Expecting the favorable and stable environment later in life as reared in during infancy, these individuals tend to mature and go through puberty and initiate sexual activity later than insecurely attached individuals and pursue a long-term mating strategy (i.e., a slow life history strategy) (Belsky, Steinberg, & Draper, 1991).

Support for the Belsky, Steinberg, and Draper (1991) model has been established using data from the International Sexuality Description Project. In particular, world regions with higher rates of cultural and psychological stress, assessed through the gross domestic product (GDP), life expectancy, national fertility rate, infant mortality rate, had more individuals endorsing a dismissing attachment style, a form of insecure attachment, than areas with lower cultural and psychological stress (Schmitt, 2005).

Connections to the Big Five, Sociosexuality, and Life History Strategy.

Research has also found relationships between adult attachment style to personality, sociosexuality, and life history strategy. The two dimensions of attachment style, both anxiety and avoidance, have been found to be negatively correlated with extraversion, agreeableness, conscientiousness, and openness and positively correlated with neuroticism (Nofle & Shaver, 2006).

Less research examining the connections between sociosexuality, life history strategy, and attachment style has been done. However, in a North American sample, an unrestricted sociosexual orientation was positively correlated with a dismissing attachment style in men and women and a fearful attachment style in women (Schmitt, 2005). As for life history strategy, Figueredo, Vásquez, Brumach, Sefcek, Kirsner, and

Jacobs (2005) in a factor analysis of Life History attributes, adult romantic partner attachment loaded onto Life History strategy factor.

Connection to Sexual Preferences. In addition to being related to reproductive strategy, attachment has been found to be related to sexual preferences in ways related to an individual's model of self (i.e., attachment anxiety) and model of others (i.e., attachment avoidance) (Zeifman & Hazan, 1997). Avoidant adults tend to prefer non-intimate forms of sexual contact, such as oral and anal sex, while ambivalently attached adults tend to prefer intimate forms of sexual contact, such as kissing and cuddling. Securely attached individuals do not prefer one form of sexual contact over another and prefer to engage in sexual contact within a long-term relationship. These findings, in addition, to the fact that avoidantly attached individuals are less likely to have missionary style vaginal sex, suggest that a preference for "alternative" sex acts may serve to reduce the likelihood of pairbonding – since they may be less likely to activate parts of the brain that facilitate pair bond development (see Fisher, 2004).

Three Domains of Disgust

Disgust is a basic human emotion that is culturally universal and functions to motivate individuals to avoid the maladaptive, increasing survival and reproduction. Individual differences in disgust sensitivity have been found, leading to the development of Tybur, Lieberman, and Griskevicius' (2009) Three Domains of Disgust (TDD) model. The TDD, includes three forms of disgust, including: pathogen disgust, sexual disgust, and moral disgust. Pathogen disgust "motivates the avoidance of infectious micro-organisms," (Tybur, Lieberman, & Griskevicius, 2009, p.103) and is "triggered" by stimuli, such as dead bodies, rotting food, and bodily fluids (i.e., phlegm, blood, vomit,

semen). Sexual disgust “motivates the avoidance of sexual partners and behaviors that would jeopardize one’s long-term reproductive success,” (Tybur, Lieberman, & Griskevicius, 2009, p.103) and is the opposite of sexual arousal “triggered” by unwanted sexual contact. Moral disgust “motivates the avoidance of social norm violators,” (Tybur, Lieberman, & Griskevicius, 2009, p.103) who may disturb cooperative relationships, social networks, and group cohesion and is “triggered” by antisocial activities and social transgressions (e.g., lying, stealing).

In addition, to individual differences to sex differences in disgust sensitivity have been found (Tybur, Bryan, Lieberman, Caldwell Hooper, & Merriman, 2011). Across all domains of disgust, females are generally more sensitive, especially, in the case of sexual disgust. These findings support evolutionary theory because of the two sexes, females suffer greater reproductive costs from bad sexual choices (i.e., conception of an unwanted child with poor genetic quality, higher chance of contracting a sexual transmitted disease, etc.).

Connections to the Big Five. Only one study has investigated the relationship between pathogen, sexual, and moral disgust sensitivity and personality. Tybur, Lieberman, and Griskevicius (2009) found that of the Three Domains of Disgust: pathogen disgust was positively correlated with neuroticism; sexual disgust was positively correlated with agreeableness and conscientiousness and negatively correlated with openness; and moral disgust was positively correlated with agreeableness, conscientiousness, and extraversion.

Predicted Connections to Sociosexuality and Life History. Relationships between sociosexuality and life history and pathogen, sexual, and moral disgust

sensitivity have not been investigated; however, certain predictions can be made. For instance, an individual's sociosexual orientation is essentially how promiscuous he or she is or how comfortable he or she is with short-term sexual relationships; therefore, sociosexually unrestricted individuals should have lower sensitivities to pathogen, sexual, and moral disgust, in order, to be able to pursue these encounters. Specifically, lower sensitivities enable these individuals to have access to more partners who they deem acceptable and engage in many sex acts (which can result in sexually transmitted diseases and be seen as morally wrong (i.e., infidelity)).

Related, Peterson, Geher, and Kaufman (2011) found life history to be negatively correlated with sociosexuality; thus, individuals with an unrestricted sociosexual orientation tend to pursue a fast life history strategy. Based on this finding and the previous hypothesis, life history should be positively correlated with pathogen, sexual, and moral disgust, so that, slow life history strategists generally are more sensitive to pathogen, sexual, and moral disgust than fast life history strategists.

Predicted Connections to Sexual Preferences. Likewise with sociosexuality and life history, the connections between the Three Domains of Disgust and sexual preferences have yet to be investigated. Most closely related is the work of Tybur, Bryan, Magnan and Caldwell Hooper (2011) who found that when individuals are primed by an olfactory pathogen they indicate greater intentions to practice safe sex through using condoms. However, sexual preferences should be negatively related to pathogen and sexual disgust since sex can be risk to engage in due danger of contracting sexually transmitted diseases (e.g., pathogen disgust) and sexual disgust is directly related to which sex acts an individual sees as appealing.

Sex Drive

Sex drive is known by many names, including, for example, sexual desire, libido, sexual motivation, sexual interest, and sexual appetite, among the lay public and in science. Overall, sex drive is generally an indicator of how interested an individual is in sexual activity. Based on its definition, the intensity of an individual's sex drive should relate to their sexual preferences; in particular, it is logical that individuals with high sex drive should have stronger preferences (i.e., enjoy or like more) for sex acts than individuals with less strong sex drives.

Predicted Connection to the Big Five. Besides having stronger sexual preferences, individuals with a high or low sex drive likely have a certain disposition or personality. Albeit little research has examined the connections between an individual's personality and the intensity of his or her sex drive. The closest related research has been studies examining the relationship between the Big Five and the 'Sexy Seven', a sexuality-based dimension of person description. The 'Sexy Seven' includes two dimensions, sexual restraint and erotophilic disposition, seemingly related to sex drive. Sexual restraints contains traits such as virginal, celibate, abstinent, chaste, and prudent; therefore, is likely related to low sex drive. Erotophilic disposition is likely more directly related to sex drive being comprised of traits such as risqué, kinky, horny, and lustful.

Two studies have analyzed the relationships between the Big Five and the 'Sexy Seven.' Smith, Nezlek, Webster, and Paddock (2007) found that erotophilic disposition was negatively related to agreeableness and conscientiousness and positively related to openness across the sexes. Examining these relations across the sexes, Schmitt and Buss

(2000) found erotophilic disposition to be negatively correlated with agreeableness and conscientious and positively correlated with extraversion among women. Among men, erotophilic disposition negatively correlated with agreeableness and positively correlated with extraversion. In addition, sexual restraint negatively correlated with extraversion among men and women (Schmitt & Buss, 2000). Thus, sex drive likely has these same connections with personality.

Connection to Sociosexuality and Life History. Two studies (Ostovich & Sabini, 2004; Lippa, 2009) have examined the relationship between sociosexuality and sex drive and both have found that sociosexuality is positively related to sex drive. Therefore, individuals endorsing an unrestricted sociosexual orientation generally have higher sex drives than individuals endorsing a restricted sociosexual orientation.

Related, since life history and sociosexuality have been found to be negatively correlated with each other (Peterson, Geher, & Kaufman, 2011), sex drive is likely negatively related to life history. Thus, fast life history strategists should tend to have higher sex drives than slow life history strategists. Additionally, in support of this prediction, Ostovich and Sabini (2004) found sex drive to be moderately positively correlated with the number of sex partners an individual has had and number of times an individual has had sex in the past month, both indicators of fast life history strategy.

Connection with Attachment. Burchell and Ward (2011) have examined the relationship between the attachment dimensions, anxiety and avoidance, and sex drive between the sexes. It was found that sex drive negatively correlated with attachment avoidance in women. This finding was of a small effect-size; therefore, it may not emerge as significant in the current study.

Pilot Study

My previous research (Peterson, Geher, & Kaufman, 2011), examined a facet of mating that has been understudied in the past. Namely, the research examined predictors of preferences for different sexual acts (e.g., vaginal, oral, and anal sex) and if such dispositional variables were key to determining sexual preferences.

Six hundred and seven participants (144 males and 463 females) completed measures of the Big Five, sociosexuality, life history strategy, mating intelligence, and sexual preferences. In addition to the findings between the predictor variables discussed in various subsections above, the traits were found to be predictive of sexual preferences. Sociosexuality was positively related to preferences for all the sex acts, which included the preferences for self-masturbation, masturbation with a partner, performing and receiving oral sex, vaginal sex, and anal sex. Mating intelligence was positively correlated with the preference for vaginal sex. Also using t-tests, a sex difference in the preferences for the sex acts emerged where males showed significantly stronger preferences (than females) for all of the sex acts, except for vaginal sex.

Multiple regressions for each of the sexual preferences were conducted and three predictors were found. Sex (i.e., being male) was a significant predictor of the preference for all of the sex acts except for vaginal sex. Sociosexuality (i.e., having an unrestricted sociosexual orientation) was a significant predictor for all of the sex acts except anal sex. For performing and receiving oral sex and vaginal sex, mating intelligence emerged as a significant predictor.

This research sheds light on factors associated with preferences for different sex acts. The fact that sex acts in our species vary so much is clearly important in

understanding human sexuality – and understanding the factors that predict this variability is obviously crucial in helping us understand human nature.

Current Study

Based on my previous research along with the research of Zeifman and Hazan (1997), the current study will examine adult attachment style, MI, and sexual preferences concurrently (along with the other previously studied predictor variables) to (a) see if the prior findings regarding attachment and MI related to sexual preferences can be replicated, (b) to examine the relationship between MI and attachment dimensions, and (c) to see if MI predicts variability in sexual preferences beyond what is accounted for by attachment dimensions. Also, based on findings relating attachment style to sexual preferences (Zeifman & Hazan, 1997), this study will examine preferences for several intimate acts, such as kissing and cuddling, and face-to-face sexual positions versus non-face-to-face sexual positions in addition to previous studied sexual preferences. Furthermore, individual differences in sensitivity to pathogen, sexual, and moral disgust (i.e., the Three Domains of Disgust) and sex drive will be measured to see how these variables relate to the other predictor variables and sexual preferences.

It is hypothesized that:

1. Attachment avoidance and anxiety will be negatively correlated with life history strategists; so individuals scoring high on these dimensions will tend to be fast life history strategists.
2. The findings of Peterson, Geher, and Kaufman (2011) will be replicated.
 - a. Life history will be negatively correlated with sociosexuality; such that, slow life history strategists are generally sociosexually restricted.

- b. Life history will be positively related to extraversion, agreeableness, conscientiousness, and openness, and negatively related to neuroticism; such that slow life history strategists will score higher on extraversion, agreeableness, conscientiousness, and openness and lower on neuroticism than fast life history strategists.
 - c. Mating intelligence will predict the preference for performing and receiving oral sex and vaginal sex.
 - d. Sociosexuality will predict all the examined sexual preferences — with unrestricted sociosexual orientation corresponding to greater enjoyment of the sex acts.
 - e. Males will be more sociosexually unrestricted and endorse faster life history strategies than females
 - f. Males will indicate that they enjoy all the sex acts (except vaginal sex) more than females.
3. Previous findings pertaining to attachment and personality (Nofhle & Shaver, 2006; Schmitt, 2005) and attachment and sexual preferences (Zeifman & Hazan, 1997) will be replicated, such that:
- a. Both dimensions of attachment, avoidance and anxiety, will be negatively correlated with extraversion, agreeableness, conscientiousness, and openness, and positively correlated with neuroticism.
 - b. Males and females scoring high on the attachment dimension of avoidance will enjoy (i.e., rate themselves as liking) non-intimate sex

- acts, such as performing and receiving oral sex, anal sex, and non-face-to-face vaginal sex positions, including reverse-cowgirl, doggy-style, and spooning, more than individuals scoring low.
- c. Males and females scoring high on the attachment dimension of anxiety will enjoy (i.e., rate themselves as liking) intimate sex acts, such as kissing, cuddling, and face-to-face vaginal sex positions, including missionary position, woman-on-top, and side-to-side, more than individuals scoring low.
4. Life history will positively correlate with pathogen, sexual, and moral disgust, such that a slow life history will correspond to greater sensitivity to pathogen, sexual, and moral disgust.
 5. Sociosexuality will be negatively correlated with pathogen, sexual, and moral disgust, such that an unrestricted sociosexuality will correspond to decreased sensitivity to pathogen, sexual, and moral disgust.
 6. Sexual disgust will negatively correlate with preferences for all the examined sex acts.
 7. Based on the findings of Schmitt and Buss (2000) and Smith et al. (2007), sex drive will be positively correlated with extraversion and openness and negatively correlated with agreeableness and conscientiousness.
 8. The findings of Ostovich and Sabini (2004) will be replicated: Sex drive will be positively related to sociosexuality; such that, individuals with an unrestricted sociosexual orientation will generally have higher sex drives than individuals with restricted sociosexual orientations.

9. Life history will be negatively related to sex drive; thus, fast life history strategists will tend to have higher sex drives than slow life history strategists.
10. Sex drive will be positively correlated with preference for all of the sex acts.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Participants

A total of 638 participants with a mean age of 21.44 years ($SD = 5.65$ years) from a state university began the IRB- approved survey (subsets of this total completed different subsections). The sample included 168 males and 470 females; 148 reported being virgins and 488 reported being non-virgins. Of those reporting sexual orientation, 544 identified as heterosexual, 41 identified as bisexual, 42 identified as homosexual, and 11 identified as “other.”

Measures

Life History: Arizona Life History Battery (ALHB) (Figueredo et al., 2006).

The Mini-K of the ALHB, a 20-item measure, was used to assess Life History Strategy. The items, such as “I often make plans in advance” and “I am often get emotional support and practical help from my blood relatives,” were scored on a 7-point scale from -3 (disagree strongly) to 3 scale (agree strongly). The Cronbach’s alpha for this scale was .72.

Sociosexuality Orientation Inventory (SOI-R) (Penke & Asendorpf, 2008).

The SOI-R is a nine-item scale that includes three subscales, the Behavior, Attitude, and Desire scales. Items were coded on a nine-point scale from 1 (strongly disagree) to 9 (strongly agree). The Cronbach’s alpha for this scale was .82.

Personality: The Big Five Inventory (BFI) (John, Naumann, & Soto, 2008).

The BFI is a 44-item self-report measure of personality and includes subscales of extraversion, neuroticism, agreeableness, conscientiousness, and openness. Responses were scaled on a five-point scale from 1 (disagree strongly) to 5 (agree strongly). The

Cronbach's alphas for the sub-scales of the BFI were .87 for extraversion, .86 for neuroticism, .78 for agreeableness, .80 for conscientiousness, and .78 for openness.

Mating Intelligence (MI) (Geher & Kauhman, 2007). The Mating intelligence scale includes two versions, one for each sex. Each version has 24 true/false questions and includes items, such as “I am good at picking up signals of interest from women” and “I can attract women, but they rarely end up interested in me sexually” for males and “If I wanted to make my current guy jealous, I could easily get the attention of other guys” and “I am usually right on the money about a man's intentions toward me” for females. For the MI scale, the Cronbach's alpha was .58 for the female version and .74 for the male version.

Attachment Style: Experiences in Close Relationships (ECR) (Brennan, Clark, & Shaver, 1998). The ECR is a 36-item measure, including two subscales: Avoidance (or Discomfort with Closeness and Discomfort Depending on Others) and Anxiety (or Fear of Rejection and Abandonment). The Cronbach's alpha for the two subscales was .95 for the Avoidance sub-scale and .93 for the Anxiety sub-scale.

Three-Domain Disgust Scale (Tybur, Lieberman, & Griskevicius, 2009). The Three-Domain Disgust Scale is a 21-item measure of disgust, including three sub-scales: Pathogen Disgust, Sexual Disgust, and Moral Disgust. Sample items, rated for degree of disgust, include: “Stealing a candy bar from a convenience store” (e.g., Moral Disgust); “Hearing two strangers have sex” (e.g., Sexual Disgust); and “Stepping on dog poop” (e.g., Pathogen Disgust). The Cronbach's alphas for the three sub-scales were .74 for Pathogen Disgust, .71 for Sexual Disgust and .75 for Moral Disgust.

Sexual Desire Inventory-2 (SDI-2) (Spector, Carey, & Steinberg, 1996). The SDI-2 is a measure of sex drive or libido, including two sub-scales: solitary sexual desire and dyadic sexual desire. It includes items such as, “How long could you go comfortably without having sexual activity of some kind?” The Cronbach’s alpha for the scale was .90.

Sexual Preferences. Preferences for kissing, cuddling, self-masturbation, masturbation with a partner, receiving oral sex, performing oral sex, vaginal sex, and anal sex and the variants of vaginal sex, including missionary style, woman on top, side-to-side, spooning, doggy style, and reverse cowgirl, were assessed on a 7-point scale from 1 (would not engage in this act/strongly dislike this act) to 7 (strongly like this kind of act).

Procedure

A survey examining life history strategy, sociosexuality, the Big Five, mating intelligence, attachment style, sex drive, disgust sensitivity, and preferences for certain sex acts was administered to participants using surverymonkey.com online survey software. The URL for the survey was distributed via email through school-wide student listservs and included on the psychology subject pool website.

RESULTS

For means and standard deviations of the predictor and sexual-preference variables across the entire sample see Table 1.

Independent Sample t-tests between Males and Females

Independent samples t-tests between males and females were conducted and the results are presented in Table 2. For t-tests on sexual-preference variables, only those males and females who had engaged in the act were included in the analysis. Significant results are discussed below.

Females ($M = 1.12$, $SD = .65$) had significantly higher life history scores than males ($M = .85$, $SD = .74$; $t(457) = 3.40$, $p < .01$); thus, females were more likely to endorse a slow life history compared to males. However, males ($M = 38.95$, $SD = 13.54$) had significantly higher scores on sociosexuality than females ($M = 28.49$, $SD = 12.01$; $t(405) = -7.32$, $p < .01$); indicating that males are more sociosexually unrestricted compared to females. Related, males ($M = 65.76$, $SD = 21.71$) reported having a higher sex drive than females ($M = 59.58$, $SD = 19.14$; $t(382) = -2.65$, $p < .01$). Of the Big Five traits, females were more extraverted (*Females*: $M = 3.29$, $SD = .85$; *Males*: $M = 3.08$, $SD = .90$; $t(464) = 2.52$, $p < .05$), neurotic (*Females*: $M = 3.21$, $SD = .85$; *Males*: $M = 2.87$, $SD = .92$; $t(468) = 3.65$, $p < .01$), and conscientious (*Females*: $M = 3.62$, $SD = .66$; *Males*: $M = 3.44$, $SD = .68$; $t(455) = 2.48$, $p < .05$) than males. In addition, females rated themselves higher on Pathogen Disgust (*Females*: $M = 29.01$, $SD = 6.77$; *Males*: $M = 26.59$, $SD = 6.99$; $t(401) = 3.09$, $p < .01$), Sexual Disgust (*Females*: $M = 23.59$, $SD = 6.87$; *Males*: $M = 15.33$, $SD = 7.87$; $t(392) = 10.01$, $p < .01$), and Moral Disgust

(*Females: M = 27.39, SD = 6.95; Males: M = 24.63, SD = 7.67; t(390) = 3.33, p < .01*) than males.

Among the sexual-preference variables, males reported stronger preferences than females for performing oral sex (*Females: M = 5.32, SD = 1.63; Males: M = 5.99, SD = 1.40; t(349) = -3.58, p < .01*), receiving oral sex (*Females: M = 5.94, SD = 1.44; Males: M = 6.50, SD = .88; t(348) = -4.27, p < .01*), anal sex (*Females: M = 3.44, SD = 1.87; Males: M = 5.50, SD = 1.38; t(148) = -6.73, p < .01*), doggy-style (*Females: M = 6.09, SD = 1.25; Males: M = 6.56, SD = .68; t(294) = -3.92, p < .01*), woman-on-top (*Females: M = 5.98, SD = 1.21; Males: M = 6.54, SD = .80; t(313) = -4.52, p < .01*), and reverse-cowgirl (*Females: M = 5.08, SD = 1.52; Males: M = 6.22, SD = 1.08; t(238) = -6.17, p < .01*). Females reported having stronger preferences for kissing (*Females: M = 6.62, SD = .77; Males: M = 6.43, SD = .76; t(411) = 2.12, p < .05*) and cuddling (*Females: M = 6.63, SD = .76; Males: M = 6.27, SD = 1.02; t(405) = 3.15, p < .01*) than males. There were no differences between males and females in preferences for self-masturbation (*Females: M = 5.38, SD = 1.45; Males: M = 5.50, SD = 1.38; t(384) = -.75, n.s.*), masturbation with a partner (*Females: M = 5.29, SD = 1.43; Males: M = 5.59, SD = 1.21; t(282) = -1.62, n.s.*), vaginal sex (*Females: M = 6.76, SD = .57; Males: M = 6.79, SD = .77; t(326) = -.36, n.s.*), missionary position (*Females: M = 6.42, SD = .77; Males: M = 6.29, SD = 1.16; t(316) = .91, n.s.*), spooning (*Females: M = 5.84, SD = 1.29; Males: M = 6.00, SD = 1.23; t(270) = -.86, n.s.*), and side-to-side (*Females: M = 5.71, SD = 1.32; Males: M = 5.73, SD = 1.17; t(210) = -.05, p < .01*).

Correlations Between the Predictor Variables Across the Sexes

Given the large number of variables of examined in this study and number of correlations conducted, the probability of a Type-I error is significantly higher than normal. Therefore, to correct for the increased likelihood of a Type-I error, we chose to use a more conservative alpha-level of .01 to demarcate significant findings. Correlations significant at the .05 alpha-level are considered to be “trends” and may not be generalizable beyond the sample.

For correlations between the predictor variables across the sexes see Table 3. Among the Big Five, agreeableness was positively correlated with extraversion ($r(456) = .20, p < .01$) and negatively correlated with neuroticism ($r(459) = -.36, p < .01$). Conscientiousness was positively correlated with extraversion ($r(445) = .23, p < .01$) and agreeableness ($r(450) = .36, p < .01$) and negatively correlated with neuroticism ($r(446) = -.32, p < .01$). Openness was positively correlated with extraversion ($r(458) = .29, p < .01$) and agreeableness ($r(461) = .12, p < .05$).

Life history was positively correlated with extraversion ($r(443) = .24, p < .01$), agreeableness ($r(340) = .41, p < .01$), conscientiousness ($r(434) = .35, p < .01$), and openness ($r(447) = .10, p < .05$) and negatively correlated with neuroticism ($r(448) = -.19, p < .01$); indicating that slow life history strategists are generally extraverted, emotionally stable (i.e., not neurotic), agreeableness, conscientious, and open to experience. Sociosexuality was negatively correlated with agreeableness ($r(395) = -.17, p < .01$), conscientiousness ($r(383) = -.14, p < .01$), and life history ($r(390) = -.29, p < .01$) and positively correlated with openness ($r(395) = .13, p < .05$); therefore, sociosexually unrestricted individuals are typically fast life history strategists who are open to

experience, but not agreeable or conscientious. Mating intelligence was positively correlated with extraversion ($r(464) = .33, p < .01$), agreeableness ($r(468) = .12, p < .05$), conscientiousness ($r(455) = .26, p < .01$), openness ($r(469) = .26, p < .01$), and life history strategy ($r(457) = .20, p < .01$) and negatively correlated with neuroticism ($r(468) = -.19, p < .01$). Thus, individuals high in mating intelligence tend to be slow life history strategists who are extraverted, agreeable, conscientious, open, but not neurotic.

Of the attachment-style traits, anxiety was negatively correlated with extraversion ($r(464) = -.14, p < .01$), agreeableness ($r(468) = -.25, p < .01$), conscientiousness ($r(455) = -.25, p < .01$), life history ($r(457) = -.21, p < .01$), and mating intelligence ($r(508) = -.23, p < .01$) and positively correlated with neuroticism ($r(468) = .58, p < .01$); indicating anxious individuals generally are fast life history strategists who are introverted, neurotic, unagreeable, non-conscientious, and low in mating intelligence. Similarly, avoidance was negatively correlated with extraversion ($r(463) = -.13, p < .01$), agreeableness ($r(467) = -.30, p < .01$), conscientiousness ($r(454) = -.17, p < .01$), life history ($r(456) = -.30, p < .01$), and mating intelligence ($r(507) = -.22, p < .01$), but positively correlated with sociosexuality ($r(403) = .26, p < .01$). Therefore, individuals high on avoidance tend to be sociosexuality unrestricted and fast life history strategists who are introverted, unagreeable, non-conscientious, and low in mating intelligence.

The three types of disgust were also found to significantly correlate with the other predictor variables (Note: High scores indicate greater sensitivity to disgust of a certain type.). Moral disgust was positively correlated with agreeableness ($r(385) = .25, p < .01$), conscientiousness ($r(372) = .18, p < .01$), and life history ($r(331) = -.20, p < .01$) and was negatively correlated with sociosexuality ($r(390) = .25, p < .01$); thus, individuals

with greater sensitivity to moral disgust generally are agreeable, conscientious, restricted sociosexually, and pursuing a slow life history strategy. Sexual disgust positively correlated with neuroticism ($r(385) = .14, p < .01$), agreeableness ($r(387) = .12, p < .05$), life history ($r(392) = .24, p < .01$), and moral disgust ($r(379) = .45, p < .01$) and negatively correlated with openness ($r(383) = -.11, p < .05$), sociosexuality ($r(331) = -.55, p < .01$), and mating intelligence ($r(392) = -.11, p < .05$). Individuals highly sensitive to sexual disgust tend to be sociosexually restricted, slow life history strategists who are low in mating intelligence, neurotic, agreeable, and un-open to experience. Pathogen disgust was positively correlated with moral disgust ($r(387) = .32, p < .01$) and sexual disgust ($r(390) = .31, p < .01$) and was negatively correlated with openness ($r(392) = -.13, p < .05$) and sociosexuality ($r(338) = -.13, p < .05$); therefore, individuals highly sensitive to pathogen disgust also score high on moral and sexual disgust and are sociosexually restricted and not open to experience.

Sex drive positively correlated with extraversion ($r(368) = .10, p < .05$), neuroticism ($r(375) = .10, p < .05$), sociosexuality ($r(324) = .53, p < .01$), mating intelligence ($r(382) = .15, p < .05$), and anxiety ($r(382) = .12, p < .05$). It was also negatively correlated with life history ($r(381) = -.10, p < .05$), moral disgust ($r(359) = -.13, p < .05$), and sexual disgust ($r(361) = -.44, p < .01$). Consequently, individuals high in sex drive tend to be sociosexuality unrestricted, fast life history strategists, high in mating intelligence who are extraverted, neurotic, and score low on moral disgust and sexual disgust.

Correlations Between the Predictor Variables Among Males and Females

For correlations between the Big Five, life history, sociosexuality, mating intelligence, the attachment-style dimensions, the three domains of disgust, and sex drive among males and females see Table 4. Among males, extraversion was positively correlated with agreeableness ($r(108) = .31, p < .01$), conscientiousness ($r(107) = .23, p < .01$), openness ($r(110) = .40, p < .01$), life history ($r(104) = .41, p < .01$), and mating intelligence ($r(111) = .53, p < .01$) and was negatively correlated with neuroticism ($r(109) = -.28, p < .01$), anxiety ($r(111) = -.22, p < .05$), and avoidance ($r(111) = -.20, p < .05$). Therefore, male extraverts generally are slow life history strategists, high in mating intelligence who are emotionally stable (i.e., low in neuroticism), agreeable, conscientious, and open, but not anxious or avoidant. Neuroticism was positively correlated with anxiety ($r(114) = .61, p < .01$), pathogen disgust ($r(101) = .25, p < .05$), and sex drive ($r(94) = .27, p < .01$) and negatively correlated with agreeableness ($r(111) = -.41, p < .01$), conscientiousness ($r(109) = -.33, p < .01$), life history ($r(108) = -.23, p < .05$), and mating intelligence ($r(114) = -.33, p < .01$); indicating neurotic males tend to be fast life history strategists, low in mating intelligence who are anxious, high in sex drive and highly sensitive to pathogen disgust, and not agreeable or conscientious. Agreeableness positively correlated with conscientiousness ($r(109) = .32, p < .01$), life history ($r(107) = .40, p < .01$), and moral disgust ($r(98) = .30, p < .01$) and negatively correlated with anxiety ($r(113) = -.27, p < .01$) and avoidance ($r(113) = -.37, p < .01$); thus, agreeable males are most often slow life history strategists who are conscientious and highly sensitive to moral disgust, but not anxious or avoidant. Conscientiousness was positively correlated with life history ($r(104) = .33, p < .01$) and mating intelligence

($r(111) = .31, p < .01$) and was negatively correlated with anxiety ($r(111) = -.22, p < .05$), sexual disgust ($r(98) = -.21, p < .05$), and pathogen disgust ($r(99) = -.21, p < .05$).

Conscientious men tend to be slow life history strategists, high in mating intelligence that are not anxious and have low sensitivities to sexual disgust and pathogen disgust.

Openness was positively correlated with life history ($r(96) = .20, p < .05$) and mating intelligence ($r(113) = .43, p < .01$); so, males high in openness to experience generally are slow life history strategists who are high in mating intelligence.

In males, life history was positively correlated with mating intelligence ($r(109) = .30, p < .01$) and moral disgust ($r(99) = .30, p < .01$) and negatively correlated with avoidance ($r(109) = -.31, p < .01$); therefore, males who are slow life history strategists are likely to be high in mating intelligence, highly sensitive to moral disgust, and non-avoidant. Sociosexuality was positively correlated with mating intelligence ($r(100) = .28, p < .01$), avoidance ($r(100) = .30, p < .01$), and sex drive ($r(83) = .58, p < .01$) and was negatively correlated with sexual disgust ($r(88) = -.49, p < .01$). Thus, sociosexually unrestricted males tend to be high in mating intelligence and sex drive, avoidant, and have low sensitivities to sexual disgust. Mating intelligence was negatively correlated with anxiety ($r(123) = -.24, p < .01$) and sexual disgust ($r(101) = -.25, p < .05$).

Avoidance was positively correlated with sex drive ($r(96) = .20, p < .05$). Moral disgust was positively correlated with sexual disgust ($r(99) = .47, p < .01$) and pathogen disgust ($r(99) = .37, p < .01$) and sexual disgust was positively correlated with pathogen disgust ($r(101) = .25, p < .05$).

Of the Big Five traits, among females, extraversion was positively correlated with agreeableness ($r(348) = .16, p < .01$), conscientiousness ($r(338) = .21, p < .01$), openness

($r(348) = .26, p < .01$), life history ($r(339) = .15, p < .01$), mating intelligence ($r(353) = .23, p < .01$), and sex drive ($r(278) = .17, p < .01$) and negatively correlated with neuroticism ($r(347) = -.32, p < .01$) and avoidance ($r(352) = -.11, p < .05$). Therefore, extraverted females are generally slow life history strategists with high mating intelligence and sex drive who are also agreeable, conscientious, open, emotionally stable, and not avoidant. Neuroticism was negatively correlated with agreeableness ($r(348) = -.38, p < .01$), conscientiousness ($r(338) = -.36, p < .01$), life history ($r(340) = -.22, p < .01$), and mating intelligence ($r(354) = -.16, p < .01$) and positively correlated with anxiety ($r(354) = .58, p < .01$); indicating neurotic women tend to be fast life history strategists, low in mating intelligence who are anxious, and are not agreeable or conscientious. Agreeableness was positively correlated with conscientiousness ($r(341) = .36, p < .01$), openness ($r(351) = .12, p < .05$), life history ($r(340) = .41, p < .01$), and moral disgust ($r(287) = .23, p < .01$) and negatively correlated with sociosexuality ($r(298) = -.16, p < .01$) and avoidance ($r(354) = -.28, p < .01$); thus, agreeable females are most likely sociosexually restricted, slow life history strategists who are non-avoidant, conscientious, open to experience, and highly sensitive to moral disgust. Conscientiousness was positively correlated with life history ($r(330) = .34, p < .01$), mating intelligence ($r(344) = .23, p < .01$), and moral disgust ($r(276) = .22, p < .01$) and negatively correlated with avoidance ($r(343) = -.21, p < .01$) and sociosexuality ($r(289) = -.14, p < .05$); as a result, conscientious females tend to be sociosexually restricted, slow life history strategists, high in mating intelligence, highly sensitive to moral disgust, and score low on avoidance. Openness positively correlated with life history ($r(341) = .11, p < .05$) and mating intelligence ($r(356) = .20, p < .01$) and negatively correlated with

anxiety ($r(356) = -.11, p < .05$) and pathogen disgust ($r(292) = -.17, p < .01$). Female high in openness to experience are generally slow life history strategists, high in mating intelligence, who score low on anxiety and have low sensitivities to pathogen disgust.

Life history was positively correlated with mating intelligence ($r(348) = .14, p < .05$), pathogen disgust ($r(291) = .21, p < .01$), sexual disgust ($r(291) = .23, p < .01$), and moral disgust ($r(299) = .12, p < .05$) and was negatively correlated with sociosexuality ($r(295) = -.29, p < .01$) and avoidance ($r(347) = -.30, p < .01$); indicating that slow life history strategists tend to be sociosexually restricted, high in mating intelligence, un-avoidant, and to have high levels of disgust for pathogens, sex, and moral offences. Sociosexuality was positively correlated with avoidance ($r(303) = .24, p < .01$) and sex drive ($r(241) = .48, p < .01$) and negatively correlated with moral disgust ($r(244) = -.20, p < .01$) and sexual disgust ($r(243) = -.47, p < .01$). Therefore, individuals with an unrestricted sociosexual orientation generally are avoidant, have low sensitivities to moral and sexual disgust, and have a high sex drive. Mating intelligence was negatively correlated with anxiety ($r(385) = -.23, p < .01$), avoidance ($r(384) = -.26, p < .01$), and sexual disgust ($r(291) = -.14, p < .05$) and positively correlated with sex drive ($r(286) = .17, p < .01$).

Of the attachment dimensions, among women, only anxiety was positively correlated with sex drive ($r(286) = .13, p < .05$). Among the three domains of disgust, moral disgust was positively correlated with sexual disgust ($r(280) = .40, p < .01$) and pathogen disgust ($r(288) = .27, p < .01$) and negatively correlated with sex drive ($r(266) = -.12, p < .05$). Sexual disgust was positively correlated with pathogen disgust ($r(289) = .29, p < .01$) and negatively correlated with sex drive ($r(267) = -.43, p < .01$).

Correlations Between the Predictor and Sexual-Preference Variables Across the Sexes

For correlations between the predictor and sexual-preference variables across both males and females see Table 5. Among the Big Five traits, extraversion was positively correlated with the preference for kissing ($r(396) = .16, p < .01$) and neuroticism was negatively correlated with the preferences for woman-on-top ($r(306) = -.20, p < .01$) and reverse-cowgirl vaginal sex ($r(233) = -.21, p < .01$). Agreeableness was positively correlated with the preferences for kissing ($r(404) = .10, p < .05$) and cuddling ($r(397) = .13, p < .01$). Conscientious was positively correlated with the preferences for four variants of vaginal sex, including woman-on-top ($r(297) = .13, p < .05$), reverse-cowgirl ($r(228) = .14, p < .05$), spooning ($r(257) = .14, p < .05$), and side-to-side ($r(202) = .18, p < .01$). Openness to experience was positively correlated with the preferences for performing oral sex ($r(340) = .24, p < .01$), vaginal sex ($r(318) = .12, p < .05$), anal sex ($r(145) = .20, p < .05$), and having vaginal sex in the reverse-cowgirl position ($r(231) = .19, p < .01$).

Across the sexes, life history was positively correlated with the preferences for kissing ($r(410) = .11, p < .05$), cuddling ($r(404) = .19, p < .05$), and woman-on-top vaginal sex ($r(312) = .12, p < .05$) and was negatively correlated with the preference for doggy-style vaginal sex ($r(293) = -.12, p < .05$). These findings indicate that slow life history strategists generally like kissing, cuddling, and having vaginal sex with the woman-on-top and do not like having doggy-style vaginal sex. Sociosexuality was positively correlated with the preference for self-masturbation ($r(323) = .27, p < .01$), performing oral sex ($r(285) = .16, p < .01$), receiving oral sex ($r(286) = .12, p < .05$),

doggy-style ($r(232) = .26, p < .01$), reverse-cowgirl ($r(184) = .23, p < .01$), and side-to-side vaginal sex ($r(162) = .20, p < .05$) and negatively correlated with the preference for cuddling ($r(342) = -.21, p < .01$). Therefore, sociosexually unrestricted individuals tend to prefer self-masturbation, performing and receiving oral sex, doggy-style, reverse-cowgirl, and side-to-side vaginal sex and dislike cuddling. Mating intelligence was positively correlated with the preferences for cuddling ($r(405) = .11, p < .05$), the missionary position ($r(318) = .15, p < .01$), and spooning ($r(272) = .15, p < .05$).

Of the attachment-style traits, anxiety negatively correlated with the preferences for woman-on-top ($r(313) = -.22, p < .01$) and reverse-cowgirl vaginal sex ($r(238) = -.18, p < .01$) and positively correlated with the preference for cuddling ($r(405) = .13, p < .01$). Avoidance negatively correlated with the preferences for kissing ($r(411) = -.26, p < .01$), cuddling ($r(404) = -.36, p < .01$), and performing oral sex ($r(349) = -.11, p < .05$).

Among the three domains of disgust, moral disgust was positively correlated with the preference for kissing ($r(371) = .11, p < .05$) and was negatively correlated with the preference for woman-on-top vaginal sex ($r(288) = -.12, p < .05$). Sexual disgust was negatively correlated with the preferences for self-masturbation ($r(355) = -.30, p < .01$), performing oral sex ($r(324) = -.24, p < .01$), receiving oral sex ($r(322) = -.18, p < .01$), anal sex ($r(138) = -.36, p < .01$), doggy-style ($r(275) = -.17, p < .01$), woman-on-top ($r(292) = -.16, p < .01$), and reverse-cowgirl vaginal sex ($r(227) = -.19, p < .01$). Pathogen disgust was positively correlated with the preference for kissing ($r(381) = .13, p < .05$).

Sex drive positively correlated with the preferences for kissing ($r(362) = .11, p < .05$), self-masturbation ($r(348) = .48, p < .01$), masturbation with a partner ($r(259) = .22,$

$p < .01$), performing oral sex ($r(317) = .28, p < .01$), receiving oral sex ($r(315) = .23, p < .01$), missionary position ($r(291) = .18, p < .01$), and doggy-style vaginal sex ($r(270) = .15, p < .05$). Also, sex drive was negatively correlated with the preference for cuddling ($r(358) = -.13, p < .05$).

Correlations Between the Predictor and Sexual-Preference Variables Among Males and Females

Correlations between the predictor and sexual-preference variables are presented in Table 6 for females and Table 7 for males. Among females, extraversion was positively correlated with the preference for kissing ($r(304) = .16, p < .01$) and neuroticism negatively correlated with the preferences for woman-on-top ($r(239) = -.23, p < .01$) and reverse-cowgirl vaginal sex ($r(179) = -.17, p < .05$). Agreeableness was positively correlated with the preferences for cuddling ($r(307) = .14, p < .05$), receiving oral sex ($r(261) = .13, p < .05$), and woman-on-top vaginal sex ($r(241) = .15, p < .05$). Conscientiousness was positively correlated with the preferences for woman-on-top ($r(232) = .17, p < .05$), reverse-cowgirl ($r(132) = .17, p < .05$), and spooning ($r(203) = .18, p < .05$). Openness was positively correlated with the preferences for cuddling ($r(306) = .13, p < .05$), performing oral sex ($r(265) = .20, p < .01$), vaginal sex ($r(249) = .14, p < .05$), and reverse-cowgirl ($r(178) = .18, p < .05$).

Among females, life history was positively correlated with the preferences for kissing ($r(313) = .12, p < .05$), cuddling ($r(313) = .13, p < .05$), woman-on-top ($r(244) = .21, p < .01$), and reverse-cowgirl ($r(183) = .16, p < .05$); therefore, female slow life history strategists tend to like kissing, cuddling, and having woman-on-top and reverse-cowgirl vaginal sex. Sociosexuality was positively correlated with the preferences for

self-masturbation ($r(234) = .21, p < .01$), performing oral sex ($r(223) = .15, p < .05$), doggy-style ($r(186) = .22, p < .01$), and side-to-side vaginal sex ($r(122) = .21, p < .05$); indicating sociosexuality unrestricted females generally enjoy self-masturbation, performing oral sex, and having doggy-style and side-to-side vaginal sex. Mating intelligence was positively correlated with the preferences for cuddling ($r(313) = .13, p < .05$), receiving oral sex ($r(266) = .14, p < .05$), the missionary position ($r(248) = .15, p < .05$), woman-on-top ($r(244) = .19, p < .01$), and spooning ($r(214) = .15, p < .05$).

Of the attachment traits, anxiety was negatively correlated with the preferences for woman-on-top ($r(244) = -.27, p < .01$) and reverse-cowgirl vaginal sex ($r(183) = -.16, p < .05$) and avoidance was negatively correlated with the preferences for kissing ($r(313) = -.29, p < .01$), performing oral sex ($r(272) = -.14, p < .05$), and the missionary position ($r(248) = -.14, p < .05$) in females.

Among the three domains of disgust, sexual disgust was negatively correlated with the preferences for self-masturbation ($r(255) = -.29, p < .01$), performing oral sex ($r(250) = -.18, p < .01$), and anal sex ($r(110) = -.33, p < .01$). Sex drive was positively correlated with the preferences for kissing ($r(278) = .16, p < .01$), self-masturbation ($r(252) = .44, p < .01$), masturbation with a partner ($r(193) = .25, p < .01$), receiving oral sex ($r(239) = .20, p < .01$), and performing oral sex ($r(246) = .25, p < .01$).

Of the Big Five traits, among males, agreeableness was positively correlated with the preference for side-to-side vaginal sex ($r(50) = .29, p < .05$) and was negatively correlated with the preference for spooning ($r(56) = -.27, p < .05$). Conscientiousness was positively correlated with the preference for side-to-side vaginal sex ($r(49) = .31, p < .05$).

and openness was positively correlated with the preferences for performing oral sex ($r(75) = .26, p < .05$) and the missionary position ($r(67) = .25, p < .05$).

In males, life history was positively correlated with the preference for cuddling ($r(91) = .25, p < .05$); indicating that males who are slow life history strategists tend to like cuddling. Sociosexuality was negatively correlated with the preference for cuddling ($r(78) = -.38, p < .01$) and positively correlated with the preference for self-masturbation ($r(89) = .40, p < .01$). Thus, sociosexually unrestricted males generally dislike cuddling and like engaging in self-masturbation.

Of the attachment-traits, anxiety positively correlated with the preferences for kissing ($r(98) = .21, p < .05$) and cuddling ($r(92) = .22, p < .05$) and avoidance negatively correlated with the preference for cuddling ($r(92) = -.43, p < .01$) in males. Among the three domains of disgust, sexual disgust was negatively correlated with the preferences for self-masturbation ($r(100) = -.37, p < .01$) and receiving oral sex ($r(79) = -.43, p < .01$). Sex drive was positively correlated with the preferences for self-masturbation ($r(96) = .58, p < .01$), performing oral sex ($r(71) = .33, p < .01$), receiving oral sex ($r(76) = .33, p < .01$), missionary position ($r(66) = .31, p < .05$), and reverse-cowgirl ($r(50) = .33, p < .05$) and was negatively correlated with the preference for cuddling ($r(85) = -.29, p < .01$).

Multiple Regressions Predicting Sexual-Preferences Among Males and Females

A series of multiple regressions were conducted separately for each sex using SPSS to predict each examined sexual-preference (including kissing, cuddling, self-masturbation, masturbation with a partner, performing and receiving oral sex, vaginal sex, anal sex, and the six different vaginal sex positions) from the predictor variables.

The regressions only included individuals who indicate that they had engaged in a particular sex act.

Kissing. Among females, a significant amount of variability in the preference for kissing was accounted for by the predictor variables ($R^2 = .20$, $F(14, 171) = 3.10$, $p < .01$). Thus, approximately 20% of the variance in a female's preference for kissing can be explained by her personality, life history, sociosexuality, mating intelligence, attachment dimensions, pathogen, sexual, and moral disgust sensitivity, and sex drive. Table 8 displays the unstandardized regression coefficients (B), intercept, and standardized regression coefficients (β) for each predictor. In terms of the individual relationships between the predictor variables and a female's preference for kissing, avoidance ($t(171) = -3.62$, $p < .01$) and sex drive ($t(171) = 3.00$, $p < .01$) each significantly predicted the preference; thus, indicating females who strongly enjoy kissing have a higher sex drive and are less avoidant than those with weaker preferences.

For males, the predictor variables accounted for a significant portion of the variability in their preference for kissing ($R^2 = .40$, $F(14,53) = 2.48$, $p < .01$). Therefore, personality, life history, sociosexuality, mating intelligence, attachment dimensions, pathogen, sexual, and moral disgust sensitivity, and sex drive accounted for 40% of the variance in males' preferences for kissing. For unstandardized regression coefficients (B), intercept, and standardized regression coefficients (β) for each predictor variable see Table 9. Anxiety ($t(53) = 3.84$, $p < .01$) was the only predictor that significantly predicted a male's preference for kissing; suggesting that a male who has strong preference for kissing is more anxious than men with weaker preferences.

Cuddling. Personality, life history, sociosexuality, mating intelligence, attachment dimensions, pathogen, sexual, and moral disgust sensitivity, and sex drive significantly accounted for variance in females' preferences for cuddling ($R^2 = .15$, $F(14,169) = 2.19$, $p < .05$). Fifteen percent of the variability in females' preferences for cuddling was accounted for by the predictor variables. Table 10 presents the unstandardized regression coefficients (B), intercept, and standardized regression coefficients (β). Avoidance ($t(169) = -3.65$, $p < .01$) was the only predictor that individually predicted a female's preference for cuddling. These findings signify that females with strong preferences for cuddling are less avoidant than those with weaker preferences.

Among males, a significant amount of variance in their preference for cuddling was predicted for by the model ($R^2 = .44$, $F(14, 50) = 2.84$, $p < .01$). Thus, 44% of the variance in males' preferences for cuddling was accounted for by personality, life history, sociosexuality, mating intelligence, attachment dimensions, pathogen, sexual, and moral disgust sensitivity, and sex drive. For unstandardized regression coefficients (B), intercept, and standardized regression coefficients (β) see Table 11. Anxiety ($t(50) = 2.16$, $p < .05$) and sex drive ($t(50) = -2.64$, $p < .05$) each individually predicted males' preferences for cuddling; indicating males with stronger preferences are generally more anxious and have a lower sex drive than those with weaker preferences.

Self-Masturbation. For females' preferences for self-masturbation, the predictor variables accounted for a significant portion of the variability ($R^2 = .27$, $F(14, 157)$, $p < .01$). Therefore, personality, life history, sociosexuality, mating intelligence, attachment dimensions, pathogen, sexual, and moral disgust sensitivity, and sex drive accounted for

27% of the variance in females' preferences for self-masturbation. For unstandardized regression coefficients (B), intercept, and standardized regression coefficients (β) of each predictor see Table 12. In terms of individual relationships between the predictors and females' preferences for self-masturbation, neuroticism ($t(157) = 2.57, p < .05$), anxiety ($t(157) = -2.60, p < .05$), sexual disgust ($t(157) = -2.54, p < .05$), and sex drive ($t(157) = 4.43, p < .01$) each significantly predicted the preference. Therefore, females who are neurotic, non-anxious, less sensitive to sexual disgust, and have a high sex drive are likely to have strong preferences for self-masturbation.

Personality, life history, sociosexuality, mating intelligence, attachment dimensions, pathogen, sexual, and moral disgust sensitivity, and sex drive significantly accounted for variance in the preference for self-masturbation among males ($R^2 = .43, F(14, 60) = 3.23, p < .01$). Forty-three percent of the variability in males' preferences for self-masturbation was accounted for by the predictor variables. Table 13 presents the unstandardized regression coefficients (B), intercept, and standardized regression coefficients (β). Only sex drive ($t(60) = 3.42, p < .01$) predicted males' preferences for self-masturbation; indicating that males that like self-masturbation have higher sex drives than those who do not.

Masturbation With A Partner. Among females, regression analyses revealed that the model did not significantly predict the preference for masturbation with a partner ($R^2 = .10, F(14, 110) = .87, n.s.$). Table 14 presents the unstandardized regression coefficients (B), intercept, and standardized regression coefficients (β).

For males, the predictor variables did not account for a significant portion of the variability in their preference for masturbation with a partner ($R^2 = .29, F(14,33) = .95,$

n.s.). Therefore, personality, life history, sociosexuality, mating intelligence, attachment dimensions, pathogen, sexual, and moral disgust sensitivity, and sex drive did not account for variance in males' preferences for masturbation with a partner. For unstandardized regression coefficients (B), intercept, and standardized regression coefficients (β) for each predictor variable see Table 15.

Receiving Oral Sex. Among females, regression analyses revealed that the model did not significantly predict the preference for receiving oral sex ($R^2 = .09$, $F(14, 142) = 1.04$, *n.s.*). Therefore, personality, life history, sociosexuality, mating intelligence, attachment dimensions, pathogen, sexual, and moral disgust sensitivity, and sex drive did not account for variance in females' preferences for receiving oral sex. For unstandardized regression coefficients (B), intercept, and standardized regression coefficients (β) for each predictor variable see Table 16.

For males, the predictor variables accounted for a significant portion of the variability in their preference for receiving oral sex ($R^2 = .44$, $F(14, 40) = 2.24$, $p < .05$). Thus, 44% of the variance in males' preferences for receiving oral sex was accounted for by personality, life history, sociosexuality, mating intelligence, attachment dimensions, pathogen, sexual, and moral disgust sensitivity, and sex drive. For unstandardized regression coefficients (B), intercept, and standardized regression coefficients (β) see Table 17. Mating intelligence ($t(40) = -2.13$, $p < .05$), pathogen disgust ($t(40) = 2.16$, $p < .05$), and sex drive ($t(40) = 2.07$, $p < .05$) each individually predicted males' preferences for receiving oral sex; indicating males with stronger preferences are generally lower in mating intelligence, more sensitive to pathogen disgust, and have a stronger sex drive than those with weaker preferences.

Performing Oral Sex. For females' preferences for performing oral sex, the predictor variables accounted for a significant portion of the variability ($R^2 = .19$, $F(14, 148)$, $p < .01$). Therefore, personality, life history, sociosexuality, mating intelligence, attachment dimensions, pathogen, sexual, and moral disgust sensitivity, and sex drive accounted for 19% of the variance in females' preferences for self-masturbation. For unstandardized regression coefficients (B), intercept, and standardized regression coefficients (β) of each predictor see Table 18. In terms of individual relationships between the predictors and females' preferences for performing oral sex, moral disgust ($t(148) = 2.40$, $p < .05$), sexual disgust ($t(148) = -2.39$, $p < .05$), and sex drive ($t(148) = 2.43$, $p < .05$) each significantly predicted the preference. Therefore, females who are more sensitive to moral disgust, less sensitive to sexual disgust, and have a high sex drive are likely to have strong preferences for performing oral sex.

Personality, life history, sociosexuality, mating intelligence, attachment dimensions, pathogen, sexual, and moral disgust sensitivity, and sex drive significantly accounted for variance in the preference for performing oral sex among males ($R^2 = .46$, $F(14, 38) = 2.28$, $p < .05$). Forty-six percent of the variability in males' preferences for self-masturbation was accounted for by the predictor variables. Table 19 presents the unstandardized regression coefficients (B), intercept, and standardized regression coefficients (β). Neuroticism ($t(38) = -2.57$, $p < .05$), mating intelligence ($t(38) = -2.06$, $p < .05$), and sex drive ($t(38) = 4.11$, $p < .01$) predicted males' preferences for performing oral sex; indicating that males that like performing oral sex are emotionally stable, lower in mating intelligence, and have higher sex drives than those who do not.

Vaginal Sex. For females, the predictor variables did not account for a significant portion of the variability in their preference for vaginal sex ($R^2 = .13$, $F(14, 136) = 1.44$, *n.s.*). Therefore, personality, life history, sociosexuality, mating intelligence, attachment dimensions, pathogen, sexual, and moral disgust sensitivity, and sex drive did not account for variance in females' preferences for vaginal sex. For unstandardized regression coefficients (B), intercept, and standardized regression coefficients (β) for each predictor variable see Table 20.

Among males, regression analyses revealed that the model did not significantly predict the preference for vaginal sex ($R^2 = .38$, $F(14, 32) = 1.38$, *n.s.*). Table 21 presents the unstandardized regression coefficients (B), intercept, and standardized regression coefficients (β).

Anal Sex. Among females, regression analyses revealed that the model did not significantly predict the preference for anal sex ($R^2 = .29$, $F(14, 52) = 1.52$, *n.s.*). Therefore, personality, life history, sociosexuality, mating intelligence, attachment dimensions, pathogen, sexual, and moral disgust sensitivity, and sex drive did not account for variance in females' preferences for anal sex. For unstandardized regression coefficients (B), intercept, and standardized regression coefficients (β) for each predictor variable see Table 22.

For males, the predictor variables did not account for a significant portion of the variability in their preference for anal sex ($R^2 = .98$, $F(14, 1) = 2.86$, *n.s.*). For unstandardized regression coefficients (B), intercept, and standardized regression coefficients (β) for each predictor variable see Table 23.

Missionary Position. Among females, a significant amount of variability in the preference for the missionary position was accounted for by the predictor variables ($R^2 = .17$, $F(14, 136) = 1.96$, $p < .05$). Thus, approximately 17% of the variance in a female's preference for the missionary position can be explained by her personality, life history, sociosexuality, mating intelligence, attachment dimensions, pathogen, sexual, and moral disgust sensitivity, and sex drive. Table 24 displays the unstandardized regression coefficients (B), intercept, and standardized regression coefficients (β) for each predictor. In terms of the individual relationships between the predictor variables and a female's preference for the missionary position, moral disgust ($t(136) = -2.37$, $p < .05$), pathogen disgust ($t(136) = 2.61$, $p < .05$), and sex drive ($t(136) = 2.39$, $p < .05$) each significantly predicted the preference; thus, indicating females who strongly enjoy having vaginal sex in the missionary position have a lower sensitivity to moral disgust, a higher sensitivity to pathogen disgust, and a higher sex drive than those with weaker preferences.

For males, the predictor variables did not account for a significant portion of the variability in their preference for the missionary position ($R^2 = .35$, $F(14, 31) = 1.17$, *n.s.*). Therefore, personality, life history, sociosexuality, mating intelligence, attachment dimensions, pathogen, sexual, and moral disgust sensitivity, and sex drive did not account for variance in males' preferences the missionary position. For unstandardized regression coefficients (B), intercept, and standardized regression coefficients (β) for each predictor variable see Table 25.

Doggy-Style Vaginal Sex. Among females, regression analyses revealed that the model did not significantly predict the preference for doggy-style ($R^2 = .13$, $F(14, 127) =$

1.41, *n.s.*). Table 26 presents the unstandardized regression coefficients (*B*), intercept, and standardized regression coefficients (β).

For males, the predictor variables did not account for a significant portion of the variability in their preference for doggy-style ($R^2 = .31$, $F(14,21) = .68$, *n.s.*). Therefore, personality, life history, sociosexuality, mating intelligence, attachment dimensions, pathogen, sexual, and moral disgust sensitivity, and sex drive did not account for variance in males' preferences for doggy-style. For unstandardized regression coefficients (*B*), intercept, and standardized regression coefficients (β) for each predictor variable see Table 27.

Woman-On-Top Vaginal Sex. Personality, life history, sociosexuality, mating intelligence, attachment dimensions, pathogen, sexual, and moral disgust sensitivity, and sex drive significantly accounted for variance in females' preferences for woman-on-top vaginal sex ($R^2 = .16$, $F(14, 131) = 1.82$, $p < .05$). Sixteen percent of the variability in females' preferences for woman-on-top vaginal sex was accounted for by the predictor variables. Table 28 presents the unstandardized regression coefficients (*B*), intercept, and standardized regression coefficients (β). Sex drive ($t(131) = 2.18$, $p < .05$) was the only predictor that individually predicted a female's preference for woman-on-top vaginal sex. These findings signify that females with strong preferences for woman-on-to vaginal sex have higher sex drives than those with weaker preferences.

Among males, regression analyses revealed that the model did not significantly predict the preference for woman-on-top vaginal sex ($R^2 = .19$, $F(14, 30) = .51$, *n.s.*). Therefore, personality, life history, sociosexuality, mating intelligence, attachment dimensions, pathogen, sexual, and moral disgust sensitivity, and sex drive did not account

for variance in males' preferences for woman-on-top vaginal sex. For unstandardized regression coefficients (B), intercept, and standardized regression coefficients (β) for each predictor variable see Table 29.

Reverse-Cowgirl Vaginal Sex. Among females, regression analyses revealed that the model did not significantly predict the preference for reverse-cowgirl ($R^2 = .10$, $F(14, 92) = .72$, *n.s.*). Table 30 presents the unstandardized regression coefficients (B), intercept, and standardized regression coefficients (β).

For males, the predictor variables did not account for a significant portion of the variability in their preference for reverse-cowgirl ($R^2 = .49$, $F(14, 19) = 1.31$, *n.s.*). Therefore, personality, life history, sociosexuality, mating intelligence, attachment dimensions, pathogen, sexual, and moral disgust sensitivity, and sex drive did not account for variance in males' preferences for reverse-cowgirl. For unstandardized regression coefficients (B), intercept, and standardized regression coefficients (β) for each predictor variable see Table 31.

Spooning. Among females, regression analyses revealed that the model did not significantly predict the preference for spooning ($R^2 = .11$, $F(14, 111) = 1.02$, *n.s.*). Table 32 presents the unstandardized regression coefficients (B), intercept, and standardized regression coefficients (β).

For males, the predictor variables did not account for a significant portion of the variability in their preference for spooning ($R^2 = .53$, $F(14, 18) = 1.43$, *n.s.*). Therefore, personality, life history, sociosexuality, mating intelligence, attachment dimensions, pathogen, sexual, and moral disgust sensitivity, and sex drive did not account for variance in males' preferences for spooning. For unstandardized regression coefficients (B),

intercept, and standardized regression coefficients (β) for each predictor variable see Table 33.

Side-to-Side Vaginal Sex. Among females, regression analyses revealed that the model did not significantly predict the preference for side-to-side vaginal sex ($R^2 = .18$, $F(14, 78) = 1.21$, *n.s.*). Table 34 presents the unstandardized regression coefficients (B), intercept, and standardized regression coefficients (β).

For males, the predictor variables did not account for a significant portion of the variability in their preference for side-to-side vaginal sex ($R^2 = .51$, $F(14, 18) = 1.32$, *n.s.*). Therefore, personality, life history, sociosexuality, mating intelligence, attachment dimensions, pathogen, sexual, and moral disgust sensitivity, and sex drive did not account for variance in males' preferences for side-to-side vaginal sex. For unstandardized regression coefficients (B), intercept, and standardized regression coefficients (β) for each predictor variable see Table 35.

DISCUSSION

Today, evolutionary psychologists generally recognize that there are individual differences in mating strategies between and among the sexes and that these differences are reflected in sexual preferences. Thus, the current study sought to extend previous research (Peterson, Geher, & Kaufman, 2011) examining personality and dispositional predictors of sexual preferences – specifically, through including sex drive, attachment avoidance and attachment anxiety, and sensitivity to pathogen, sexual, and moral disgust as predictors.

Dispositional Predictors of Sexual Preferences

The predictor variables were slightly inter-correlated with each other supporting previous research. As previously found, individuals endorsing a slow life history generally were sociosexually unrestricted. Furthermore, the findings between the Big Five and life history (c.f., Figueredo, Vásquez, Brumbach, & Schneider, 2004, 2007; Gladden et al., 2009; Peterson, Geher, & Kaufman, 2011) were replicated in an additional sample; indicating that as previously suggested, extraversion, emotional stability (i.e., low neuroticism), agreeableness, conscientiousness, and openness (Gladden et al., 2009) – and perhaps, an restricted sociosexuality – are part of a coordinated slow life history strategy.

Peterson, Geher, and Kaufman's (2011) findings between the dispositional traits or predictors and sexual preferences generally were not replicated. Mating intelligence had been found to be a significant predictor of the preferences for performing and receiving oral sex and vaginal sex across the sexes. However, the current study found mating intelligence to be associated with somewhat different sex acts (except in the case

of males); finding it to be correlated with the preferences for cuddling, missionary position, and spooning across the sexes. Furthermore, multiple regressions analyzed separately by sex found mating intelligence not to be a significant predictor of sexual preferences for females. In males, mating intelligence significantly predicted the preferences for performing and receiving oral sex as found previously.

Sociosexuality, also, did not have the same relationship with sexual preferences between the studies. Peterson, Geher, and Kaufman (2011) found sociosexuality to be a significant predictor for the preference for all of the sex acts and the current study found it to be a significant predictor for the preferences for doggy-style and side-to-side vaginal sex within females. In the case of males, sociosexuality was not a significant predictor of the preferences for any of the sex acts.

Although, an important difference in data analysis between the current study and the previous one was only the data from individuals who had indicated that they had engaged in a sex act were analyzed in the current study. The previous study did not, by contrast, take into account whether an individual had actually engaged in a particular act. Therefore, the present findings suggest that there may be less variability in personality traits among individuals who choose to engage in a specific sex act. Additionally within the sexually active, individuals with higher mating intelligence may have sexual preferences for more intimate sex acts (i.e., cuddling, missionary position, spooning) to facilitate the development of pair bonds with a sex partner (c.f., Fisher, 1994, 2004; Hughes, Harrison, & Gallup, 2007; Miller, 2000).

Attachment Dimensions: Avoidance and Anxiety. The attachment traits, avoidance and anxiety, had several interesting relationships with sexual preferences and

inter-correlating with the other predictor variables. The expected associations with the Big Five were generally found. Anxiety was negatively correlated with extraversion, agreeableness, and conscientiousness and positively correlated with neuroticism across the sexes and avoidance was negatively correlated with extraversion, agreeableness, and conscientiousness. The other hypothesized relationships (i.e., avoidance positively correlating with neuroticism and anxiety and avoidance negatively correlating with openness) were in the expected direction, but found to not be significant.

Previously theorized, but undocumented, attachment avoidance and anxiety were found to be negatively correlated with life history strategy. Therefore, as Belsky, Steinberg, and Draper's (1991) theory of socialization expects, individuals scoring high on either avoidance or anxiety are generally fast life history strategists.

Further, these findings between attachment, personality, and life history support Figueredo and his colleagues' (Figueredo, Vásquez, Brumbach, & Schneider, 2004, 2007; Gladden et al., 2009) claim that life history strategy is made-up of a collections of synchronized personality traits. Slow life history strategists seem to be extraverted, emotionally stable (i.e., low on neuroticism), agreeable, conscientious, open to experience, and not avoidant or anxious, while, fast life history strategists seem to be introverted, neurotic, un-agreeable, un-conscientious, and un-open to experience.

Sexual preferences were generally related to attachment as hypothesized (c.f., Zeifman & Hazan, 1997); however, not necessarily with the sex acts expected. Avoidance was associated with a decreased preference for intimate acts, instead of, an increased preference for non-intimate acts, such as oral sex, anal sex, and non-face-to-face vaginal sex positions, as predicted. Specifically, high avoidance corresponded to

decreased preferences for kissing and cuddling, especially among females. Anxiety was associated with an increase preference for intimate acts. Among males, anxiety was associated with increased preferences for kissing and cuddling; however, among females, it was associated with decreased preferences for woman-on-top and reverse-cowgirl vaginal sex. Anxious females, most likely, do not enjoy these positions since they are the active participant, which places additional stress on them to make sure their partner enjoys his or herself, and these individuals tend to already be neurotic and nervous. Still these findings provide support for the theory that avoidant individuals avoid pair bonding and anxious individuals pursue pair bonding (Fisher, 2004).

Sensitivity to Pathogen, Sexual, and Moral Disgust. As predicted, the Three Domains of Disgust (TDD) were related to sociosexuality, life history, and sex drive. Specifically, across the sexes, sociosexuality was negatively related to the TDD and life history was positively related. Thus, a restricted sociosexual orientation and/or slow life history correspond to greater disgust sensitivity – allowing these individuals to avoid risky sexual behavior.

In the case of sex drive, a high sex drive corresponded to low sensitivity to moral and sexual disgust. These specific relationships likely exist so as not to interfere with an individual with high sex drive's motivation to pursue sex (perhaps sometimes with questionable partners and somewhat taboo positions).

In addition, sexual disgust negatively correlated with several sexual preferences, including self-masturbation, performing and receiving oral sex, anal sex, and non-traditional vaginal sex positions, such as doggy-style, woman-on-top, reverse-cowgirl, as expected. Since sexual disgust motivates an individual to not pursue certain sex acts, it is

no surprise that individuals with greater sensitivity to sexual disgust report not enjoying these acts as much as individuals who are less sensitive.

Sex Drive. A measure of sex drive was included in the current study to determine if the variables found to predict sexual preferences – being male, being sociosexually unrestricted, having a relatively fast life history strategy, and having high mating intelligence — in the previous study mapped onto higher sex drive. These traits were indeed associated with high sex drive suggesting that the significant findings of the previous study were driven by individuals high in sex drive.

Further supporting this claim, sex drive was found to predict increased preference for many of the sex acts in males and females, such as self-masturbation, masturbation, receiving and performing oral sex, vaginal sex, and two variants of vaginal sex, the missionary position and reverse-cowgirl in males and kissing, self-masturbation, performing oral sex, missionary position and woman-on-top in females. Additionally, in males, sex drive was also found to be related to decreased preferences for cuddling – which is interesting since it is usually engaged in after intercourse.

Sex Differences in Sexual-Preferences

Besides examining how dispositional traits predict sexual preferences, analyses were also performed to examine how preferences varied by biological sex. Consistent with previous research (Peterson, Geher, & Kaufman, 2011; Schmitt, 2003, 2005), men generally pursued a more short-term mating strategy than women; with males tending to be faster life history strategists and more sociosexually unrestricted than females.

As Peterson, Geher, and Kaufman (2011), even within a sample including only the sexually active, males liked almost every sex act more than females – except for

masturbation, vaginal sex, and the intimate forms of vaginal sex, including the missionary position, spooning, and side-to-side. However, these findings likely can be attributed to men's possession of a stronger sex drive than women (also c.f., Baumeister, Catanese, & Vohls, 2001).

Hormonal Correlates of Sexual-Preferences

Findings of this study also support previous physiological research. Fisher, Aron, and Brown (2006) propose that reproduction is controlled by three inter-related, yet distinct neural systems: *sex drive*, “evolved to motivate individuals to seek a range of mating partners,” (p. 2173) and associated with androgens (such as testosterone and estrogen) in primates; *attraction*, “evolved to motivate individuals to prefer and pursue specific partners,” (p. 2173) and controlled by mainly the hormone dopamine; and *attachment*, “evolved to motivate individuals to remain together long enough to complete species-specific parenting duties,”(p.2173) and related to the activity of the neuropeptides, oxytocin and vasopressin. Thus, sex drive and the attachment dimensions, avoidance and anxiety, emerging as strong predictors of sexual preferences in the current study is likely tied to human physiology.

Limitations and Future Directions

As the vast majority of psychological research, this study used a non-random convenience sample of college students as participants. Thus, the results of this study may not be generalizable beyond this age and social group. Furthermore, the current research used self-report measures that are subject to demand characteristics and social desirability.

Future research should take into account, women's use of hormonal forms of birth control and their phase in their menstrual cycle since these factors have been found to affect women's sexual behavior and mating psychology (Gangestad, Thornhill, & Garver, 2002; Gangestad, Thornhill, & Garver-Apgar, 2005a, 2005b, 2010; Miller, Tybur, & Jordan, 2007; Peterson, Carmen, & Geher, 2011; Pilsworth, Haselton, & Buss, 2004). Additionally, future studies may want to take into account individual differences in religiosity since this factor has been found to affect sexual preferences and behavior (Thornton & Camburn, 1989).

Conclusion and Implications

This research indicates that there are many variables – including personality traits – that affect sexual preferences within our species. Primary findings from this research are as follows:

1. There are definite sex differences in sexual preferences. Males generally prefer more non-intimate sex acts, such as performing and receiving oral sex and anal sex, than females. While females prefer more intimate acts, such as kissing and cuddling. These results are consistent with findings that males pursue a more short-term oriented mating strategy and females pursue a more long-term oriented mating strategy.
2. Mating intelligence is a more important predictor of males' sexual preferences (than females'). This study found that males who are lower in mating intelligence had greater preferences for performing and receiving oral sex, while mating intelligence was not a significant predictor of female's sexual preferences.

3. Across the examined sex acts, sex drive and the attachment dimensions, avoidance and anxiety, are the strongest predictors of sexual preferences.
4. As previously documented by Figueredo and his colleagues (2004, 2005, 2007), life history includes a series of coordinated personality traits– and perhaps sociosexuality as well. This research supports the idea of life history strategy as a meta-personality variable rooted in evolutionist reasoning.
5. Experience (i.e., whether one has engaged in a specific sex act) has an impact on sexual preferences – as mating intelligence and sociosexuality were not found to be predictors of preferences for certain acts when only looking at participants who had actually engaged in said acts. This is different from how things played out in the research by Peterson, Geher, and Kaufman (2011), who examined preferences for acts regardless of whether people had actually engaged in the acts.

Therefore, human sexual behavior is clearly variable, perhaps the most variable in all of the animal kingdom (see Fisher, 2004); therefore, important to understanding human sexuality and human nature. The Big Five, sociosexuality, life history, mating intelligence, attachment avoidance and anxiety, sensitivity to pathogen, sexual, and moral disgust, and sex drive all predict some portion of the variability. These relationships, further, help us understand why we choose to do what we do in the bedroom.

REFERENCES

- Baumeister, R.F., Catanese, K.R., & Vohs, K.D. (2001). Is there a gender difference in strength of sex drive? Theoretical views, conceptual distinctions, and a review of relevant evidence. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 5, 242-273.
- Belsky, J., Steinberg, L., & Draper, P. (1991). Childhood experience, interpersonal development, and reproductive strategy: An evolutionary theory of socialization. *Child Development*, 62, 647-670.
- Brennan, K. A., Clark, C. L., & Shaver, P. R. (1998). Self-report measurement of adult romantic attachment: An integrative overview. In J. A. Simpson & W. S. Rholes (Eds.), *Attachment theory and close relationships* (pp. 46-76). New York: Guilford Press.
- Burchell J.L., & Ward, J. (2011). Sex drive, attachment style, relationships status, and previous infidelity as predictors of sex differences in romantic jealousy. *Personal and Individual Differences*, 51, 657-661.
- Buss, D.M. (2003). *The evolution of desire: Strategies of human mating*. New York, NY: Basic Books.
- Figueredo, A.J., Vásquez, G., Brumbach, B.H., & Schneider, S.M.R. (2004). The heritability of life history strategy: The K-factor, covitality, and personality. *Social Biology*, 51, 121-143.
- Figueredo, A.J., Vásquez, G., Brumbach, B.H., & Schneider, S.M.R. (2007). The k-factor, covitality, and personality: A psychometric test of life history theory. *Human Nature*, 18, 43-73.
- Figueredo, A.J., Vásquez, G., Brumbach, B.H., Sefcek, J.A., Kirsner, B.R., & Jacobs,

- W.J. (2005). The k-factor: Individual differences in life history strategy. *Personality and Individual Differences, 39*, 1349-1360.
- Fisher, H. (1994). *Anatomy of love: A natural history of mating, marriage, and why we stray*. New York, NY: Random House.
- Fisher, H. (2004). *Why we love: The nature and chemistry of romantic love*. New York, NY: Holt.
- Fisher, H., Aron, A., & Brown, L.L. (2006). Romantic love: A mammalian brain system for mate choice. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B, 361*, 2173-2186.
- Gangestad, S.W., & Simpson, J. A. (2000). The evolution of human mating: Trade-offs and strategic pluralism. *The Behavioral and Brain Sciences, 23*, 573-644.
- Gangestad, S.W., Thornhill, R., & Garver, C.E. (2002). Changes in women's sexual interests and their partner's mate retention tactics across the menstrual cycle: Evidence for shifting conflicts of interest. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London, B, 269*, 975-982.
- Gangestad, S.W., Thornhill, R., & Garver-Apgar, C.E. (2005a). Adaptations to ovulation: Implications for sexual and social behavior. *Current Directions in Psychological Science, 14*, 312-316.
- Gangestad, S.W., Thornhill, R., & Garver-Apgar, C.E. (2005b). Women's sexual interests across the ovulatory cycle depend on primary partner developmental instability. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London, B, 272*, 2023-2027.
- Gangestad, S.W., Thornhill, R., & Garver-Apgar, C.E. (2010). Fertility in the cycle

- predicts women's interest in sexual opportunism. *Evolution and Human Behavior*, 31, 400-411.
- Geher, G. and Kaufman, S.B. (2007). The mating intelligence scale. *Psychology Today*, 40, 78-79.
- Geher, G., and Kaufman, S. B. (2011). Mating intelligence. In R. Sternberg, & S. B. Kaufman (Eds.), *Cambridge Handbook of Intelligence* (pp.603-620). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Geher, G., & Miller, G.F. (Eds., 2008). *Mating Intelligence: Sex, Relationships, and the Mind's Reproductive System*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Gladden, P.R., Figueredo, A.J., & Jacobs, W.J. (2009). Life history strategy, psychopathic attitudes, personality, and general intelligence. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 46, 270-275.
- Hughes, S.M., Harrison, M.A., & Gallup, Jr., G.G. (2007). Sex differences in romantic kissing among college students: An evolutionary perspective. *Evolutionary Psychology*, 5, 612-631.
- John, O. P., Naumann, L. P., & Soto, C. J. (2008). Paradigm shift to the integrative big-five trait taxonomy: History, measurement, and conceptual issues. In O. P. John, R. W. Robins, & L.A. Pervin (Eds.), *Handbook of personality: Theory and research* (pp. 114-158). New York: Guilford Press.
- Lippa, R.A. (2009). Sex differences in sex drive, sociosexuality, and height across 53 nations: Testing evolutionary and social structural theories. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 38, 631-651.
- Kaplan, H.S., & Gangestad, S.W. (2005). Life history theory and evolutionary

- psychology. In D.M. Buss (Ed.), *Handbook of Evolutionary Psychology* (pp.68-95). Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Kruger, D.J., & Fisher, M.L. (2008). Women's life history attributes are associated with preferences in mating relationships. *Evolutionary Psychology*, 6, 289-302.
- Miller, G. (2000). *The mating mind*. New York, NY: Anchor Books.
- Miller, G., Tybur, J.M., & Jordan, B.D. (2007). Ovulatory cycle effects on tip earnings by lap dancers: Economic evidence for human estrus? *Human Behavior and Evolution*, 28, 375-381.
- Nettle, D. (2005). An evolutionary approach to the extraversion continuum. *Evolution and Human Behavior*, 26, 363-373.
- Nettle, D. (2011). Evolutionary perspectives on the five-factor model of personality. In D.M. Buss (Ed.) and P.H. Hawley (Ed.), *The Evolution of Personality and Individual Differences* (pp. 5-28). New York: Oxford University Press, Inc.
- Nettle, D., & Clegg, H. (2008). Personality, mating strategies, and mating intelligence. In G. Geher & G. Miller (Eds.), *Mating intelligence: Sex, relationships, and the mind's reproductive system* (pp. 121-135). New York, NY: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Nofle, E.E., & Shaver, P.R. (2006). Attachment dimensions and the big five personality traits: Associations and comparative ability to predict relationship quality. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 40, 179-208.
- O'Brien, D., Geher, G., Gallup, A.C., Garcia, J.R., and Kaufman, S.B. (2010). Self-perceived mating intelligence predicts sexual behavior in college students: Empirical validation of a theoretical construct. *Imagination, Cognition, and Personality*, 29, 341-362.

- Ostovich, J.M., & Sabini, J. (2004). How are sociosexuality, sex drive, and lifetime number of sexual partners related? *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *30*, 1255-1266.
- Penke, L., and Asendorpf, J. B. (2008). Beyond global sociosexual orientations: A more differentiated look at sociosexuality and its effects on courtship and romantic relationships. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *95*, 1113-1135.
- Peterson, A.N., Carmen, R.A., & Geher, G. (2011). Ovulatory shifts in mating intelligence. *Unpublished manuscript*.
- Peterson, A., Geher, G., & Kaufman, S.B. (2011). Predicting preferences for sex acts: Which traits matters most, and why? *Evolutionary Psychology*, *9*, 371-389.
- Pillsworth, E.G., Haselton, M.G., & Buss, D.M. (2004). Ovulatory shifts in female sexual desire. *Journal of Sex Research*, *41*, 55-65.
- Ravitz, P., Maunder, R., Hunter, J., Sthankiya, B., & Lancee, W. (2010). Adult attachment measures: A 25-year review. *Journal of Psychosomatic Research*, *69*, 419-432.
- Schmitt, D.P. (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. (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. (2005). Is short-term mating the maladaptive result of insecure attachment?

- A test of competing evolutionary perspectives. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 6, 747-768.
- Schmitt, D.P. (2008). Evolutionary perspectives on romantic attachment and culture: How ecological stressors influence dismissing orientations across genders and geographies. *Cross-Cultural Research*, 42, 220-247.
- Schmitt, D.P., & Buss, D.M. (2000). Sexual dimensions of person description: Beyond or subsumed by the big five? *Journal of Personality*, 34, 141-177.
- Schmitt, D.P., & Shackelford, T.K. (2008). Big five traits related to short-term mating: From personality to promiscuity across 46 nations. *Evolutionary Psychology*, 6, 246-282.
- Simpson, J.A., & Belsky, J. (2008). Attachment theory within a modern evolutionary framework. In J. Cassidy and P.R. Shaver (Eds.), *Handbook of Attachment: Theory, Research, and Clinical Applications* (pp.131-157). New York: Guilford Press.
- Simpson, J.A., & Gangestad, S.W. (1991). Personality and sexuality: Empirical relations and an integrative model. In K. McKinnney and S. Sprecher (Eds.), *Sexuality in Close Relationships* (pp. 71-92). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum Associates.
- Simpson, J.A. & Gangestad, S.W. (1992). Sociosexuality and romantic partner choice. *Journal of Personality*, 60, 31-51.
- Smith, C.V., Nezlek, J.B., Webster, G.D., & Paddock, E.L. (2007). Relationships between daily sexual interactions and domain-specific and general models of personality traits. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 24, 497-515.
- Spector, I.P., Carey, M.P., & Steinberg, L. (1996). The sexual desire inventory:

- Development, factor structure, and evidence of reliability. *Journal of Sex and Marital Therapy*, 22, 175-190.
- Thornton, A., & Camburn, D. (1989). Religious participation and adolescent sexual behavior and attitudes. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 51, 641-653.
- Tybur, J.M., Bryan, A.D., Lieberman, D., Caldwell Hooper, A.E., & Merriman, L.A. (2011). Sex differences and sex similarities in disgust sensitivity. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 51, 343-348.
- Tybur, J.M., Bryan, A.D., Magnan, R.E., & Caldwell Hooper, A.E. (2011). Smells like safe sex: Olfactory pathogen primes increase intentions to use condoms. *Psychological Science*, 22, 478-480.
- Tybur, J.M., Lieberman, D., & Griskevicius, G. (2009). Microbes, mating, and morality: Individual differences in three functional domains of disgust. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 97, 103-122.
- Zeifman, D. & Hazan, C. (1997). Attachment: The bond in pair bonds. In Simpson, J.A. and Kenrick, D.T. (Eds.), *Evolutionary Social Psychology* (pp. 237-263). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

Table 1. Descriptive Statistics for Predictor and Sexual-Preference Variables across the sexes.

Variable	<i>N</i>	Mean	<i>SD</i>
Extraversion ¹	464	3.24	.86
Neuroticism ¹	468	3.13	.88
Agreeableness ¹	468	3.86	.65
Conscientiousness ¹	455	3.58	.67
Openness ¹	469	3.89	.59
Life history ²	457	1.05	.68
Sociosexuality ³	405	31.07	13.18
Mating intelligence ⁴	588	12.1	3.69
Anxiety ⁵	508	3.76	1.23
Avoidance ⁵	507	2.89	1.20
Moral disgust ⁶	390	26.69	7.23
Sexual disgust ⁶	392	21.46	8.00
Pathogen disgust ⁶	401	28.39	6.90
Sex drive ⁷	382	61.13	19.97
Pref. kissing ⁸	433	6.50	.86
Pref. cuddling ⁸	429	6.48	.93
Pref. self-masturbation ⁸	430	5.08	1.74
Pref. masturbation with a partner ⁸	428	4.65	1.73
Pref. receiving oral sex ⁸	430	5.66	1.66
Pref. performing oral sex ⁸	428	5.10	1.80
Pref. vaginal sex ⁸	429	6.25	1.32
Pref. anal sex ⁸	430	2.87	1.86
Pref. missionary position ⁸	426	5.89	1.33
Pref. doggy-style ⁸	427	5.53	1.59
Pref. woman-on-top ⁸	426	5.64	1.44
Pref. reverse cowgirl ⁸	426	4.73	1.56
Pref. spooning ⁸	426	5.24	1.49
Pref. side-to-side ⁸	419	4.92	1.44

Note.

¹ Higher scores indicate that a participant scored higher on this trait (*Range* = 1-5).

² High scores indicate a participant endorses a slow life history strategy, low scores indicate a participant endorses a fast life history strategy (*Range* = -3 – 3).

³ High scores indicate a participant endorses an unrestricted sociosexual orientation, low scores indicate a participant endorses a restricted sociosexual orientation (*Range* = 0 – 81).

⁴ Higher scores indicate that a participant has higher mating intelligence (*Range* = 0 – 24).

⁵ Higher scores indicate that a participant scored higher on this attachment trait (*Range* = 0 – 7).

⁶ Higher scores indicate stronger disgust (*Range* = 0 – 42).

⁷ Higher scores indicate a participant reports a higher sex drive (*Range* = 0 – 109).

⁸ Lower scores indicate a strong dislike or unwillingness to engage in a particular sex act, higher scores indicate a stronger preference for a particular sex act (*Range* = 1- 7).

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$.

Table 2. Means of predictor and sexual-preference variables among males and females.

Variable	Female		Male		<i>t</i>	<i>d</i>
	<i>N</i>	Mean (<i>SD</i>)	<i>N</i>	Mean (<i>SD</i>)		
Extraversion ¹	353	3.29 (.85)	111	3.08 (.90)	2.52 *	.21
Neuroticism ¹	354	3.21 (.85)	114	2.87 (.92)	3.65 **	.34
Agreeableness ¹	355	3.89 (.65)	113	3.77 (.64)	1.74	.16
Conscientiousness ¹	344	3.62 (.66)	111	3.44 (.68)	2.48 *	.23
Openness ¹	356	3.88 (.59)	113	3.94 (.61)	-.91	-.08
Life history ²	348	1.12 (.65)	109	.85 (.74)	3.40 **	.53
Sociosexuality ³	305	28.49 (12.01)	100	38.95 (13.54)	-7.32 **	-.73
Mating intelligence ⁴	441	12.25 (3.49)	147	11.65 (4.23)	1.56	.21
Anxiety ⁵	385	3.78 (1.22)	123	3.67 (1.27)	.92	.08
Avoidance ⁵	384	2.87 (1.21)	123	2.93 (1.20)	-.48	-.04
Moral disgust ⁶	291	27.39 (6.95)	99	24.63 (7.67)	3.33 **	.34
Sexual disgust ⁶	291	23.59 (6.87)	101	15.33 (7.87)	10.02 **	1.01
Pathogen disgust ⁶	299	29.01 (6.77)	102	26.59 (6.99)	3.09 **	.31
Sex drive ⁷	286	59.58 (19.14)	96	65.76 (21.71)	-2.65 **	-.27
Pref. kissing ⁸	313	6.62 (.77)	98	6.43 (.76)	2.12 *	.21
Pref. cuddling ⁸	313	6.63 (.76)	92	6.27 (1.02)	3.15 **	.57
Pref. self-masturbation ⁸	282	5.38 (1.45)	104	5.50 (1.38)	-.75	-.08
Pref. masturbation with a partner ⁸	213	5.29 (1.43)	71	5.59 (1.21)	-1.62	-.19
Pref. receiving oral sex ⁸	266	5.94 (1.44)	82	6.50 (.88)	-4.27 **	-.57
Pref. performing oral sex ⁸	272	5.32 (1.63)	77	5.99 (1.40)	-3.58 **	-.61
Pref. vaginal sex ⁸	256	6.76 (.57)	72	6.79 (.77)	-.36	-.04
Pref. anal sex ⁸	118	3.44 (1.87)	30	5.50 (1.38)	-6.73 **	-1.75
Pref. missionary position ⁸	248	6.42 (.77)	70	6.29 (1.16)	.91	.20
Pref. doggy-style ⁸	235	6.09 (1.25)	59	6.56 (.68)	-3.92 **	-.60
Pref. woman-on-top ⁸	244	5.98 (1.21)	69	6.54 (.80)	-4.52 **	-.70
Pref. reverse cowgirl ⁸	183	5.08 (1.52)	55	6.22 (1.08)	-6.17 **	-1.11
Pref. spooning ⁸	214	5.84 (1.29)	58	6.00 (1.23)	-.86	-.11
Pref. side-to-side ⁸	161	5.71 (1.32)	51	5.73 (1.17)	-.05	-.01

Note. Sexual-preference analyses are conducted with only participants who have engaged in a particular sex act.

¹ Higher scores indicate that a participant scored higher on this trait (*Range* = 1-5).

² High scores indicate a participant endorses a slow life history strategy, low scores indicate a participant endorses a fast life history strategy (*Range* = -3 – 3).

³ High scores indicate a participant endorses an unrestricted sociosexual orientation, low scores indicate a participant endorses a restricted sociosexual orientation (*Range* = 0 – 81).

⁴ Higher scores indicate that a participant has higher mating intelligence (*Range* = 0 – 24).

⁵ Higher scores indicate that a participant scored higher on this attachment trait (*Range* = 0 – 7).

⁶ Higher scores indicate stronger disgust (*Range* = 0 – 42).

⁷ Higher scores indicate a participant reports a higher sex drive (*Range* = 0 – 109).

⁸ Lower scores indicate a strong dislike or unwillingness to engage in a particular sex act, higher scores indicate a stronger preference for a particular sex act (*Range* = 1- 7).

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$.

Table 3. Correlations between predictor variables across the sexes.

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
1. Extraversion													
2. Neuroticism	-.29												
	456												
3. Agreeableness	.20**	-.36**											
	456	459											
4. Conscientiousness	.23**	-.32**	.36**										
	445	447	450										
5. Openness	.29**	-.08	.12*	.04									
	458	460	461	451									
6. Life History	.24**	-.19**	.41**	.35**	.10*								
	443	448	340	434	447								
7. Sociosexuality	.08	-.02	-.17**	-.14**	.13*	-.29**							
	390	396	395	383	395	390							
8. Mating intelligence	.33**	-.19**	.12*	.26**	.26**	.20**	.10						
	464	468	468	455	469	457	405						
9. Anxiety	-.14**	.58**	-.25**	-.25**	-.08	-.21**	.01	-.23**					
	464	468	468	455	469	457	404	508					
10. Avoidance	-.13**	.07	-.30**	-.17**	-.09	-.30**	.26**	-.22**	.07				
	463	467	467	454	468	456	403	507	507				
11. Moral disgust	.09	-.04	.25**	.18**	.06	.25**	-.20**	.01	.01	-.11			
	377	382	385	372	381	390	331	390	390	389			
12. Sexual disgust	-.04	.14**	.12*	.02	-.11*	.24**	-.55**	-.11*	.09	-.04	.45**		
	379	385	387	374	383	392	331	392	392	391	379		
13. Pathogen disgust	.06	.08	.04	-.01	-.13*	.11	-.13*	.04	.10	-.08	.32**	.31**	
	387	393	395	382	392	401	338	401	401	400	387	390	
14. Sex drive	.10*	.10*	-.09	.00	.09	-.10*	.53**	.15*	.12*	-.03	-.13*	-.44**	.00
	368	375	376	363	373	381	324	382	382	381	359	361	369

Note. * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$.

Table 4. Correlations between predictor variables among males and females.

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
1. Extraversion	-	-.28**	.31**	.23*	.40**	.41**	.01	.53**	-.22*	-.20*	.11	-.05	.09	-.01
		109	108	107	110	104	95	111	111	111	94	96	97	90
2. Neuroticism	-.32**	-	-.41**	-.33**	.00	-.23*	.04	-.33**	.61**	.12	-.04	.10	.25*	.27**
	347		111	109	111	108	98	114	114	114	98	100	101	94
3. Agreeableness	.16**	-.38**	-	.32**	.15	.40**	-.09	.14	-.27**	-.37**	.30**	.05	-.12	-.10
	348	348		109	110	107	97	113	113	113	98	100	101	95
4. Conscientiousness	.21**	-.36**	.36**	-	-.06	.33**	.00	.31**	-.22*	-.07	.03	-.21*	-.21*	.04
	338	338	341		109	104	94	111	111	111	96	98	99	92
5. Openness	.26**	-.09	.12*	.08	-	.10	.20*	.43**	-.01	-.14	.06	-.17	.02	.20
	348	349	351	342		106	96	113	113	113	97	99	100	93
6. Life History	.15**	-.22**	.41**	.34**	.11*	-	-.15	.30**	-.07	-.31**	.30**	.13	.00	-.03
	339	340	340	330	341		95	109	109	109	99	101	102	95
7. Sociosexuality	.16**	.04	-.16**	-.14*	.10	-.29**	-	.28**	-.13	.30**	-.11	-.49**	-.04	.58**
	295	298	298	289	299	295		100	100	100	87	88	88	83
8. Mating intelligence	.23**	-.16**	.10	.23**	.20**	.14*	.08	-	-.24**	-.12	-.07	-.25*	-.02	.19
	353	354	355	344	356	348	305		123	123	99	101	102	96
9. Anxiety	-.11	.58**	-.25	-.26	-.11*	-.28	.08	-.23**	-	.04	.01	.19	.17	.12
	353	354	355	344	356	348	304	385		123	99	101	102	96
10. Avoidance	-.11*	.06	-.28**	-.21**	-.08	-.30**	.24**	-.26**	.08	-	-.15	-.10	.05	.20*
	352	353	354	343	355	347	303	384	384		99	101	102	96
11. Moral disgust	.06	-.09	.23**	.22**	.09	.21**	-.20**	.02	.00	-.10	-	.47**	.37**	-.09
	283	284	287	276	284	291	244	291	291	290		99	99	93
12. Sexual disgust	-.11	.05	.11	.05	-.05	.23**	-.47**	-.14*	.04	-.03	.40**	-	.25*	-.44
	283	285	294	276	284	291	243	291	291	290	280		101	94
13. Pathogen disgust	.04	-.02	.08	.04	-.17**	.12*	-.10	.04	.07	-.09	.27**	.29**	-	.01
	290	292	294	283	292	299	250	299	299	298	288	289		95
14. Sex drive	.17**	.07	-.08	.01	.03	-.11	.48**	.17**	.13*	-.12	-.12*	-.43**	.03	-
	278	271	281	271	280	286	241	286	286	285	266	267	274	

Note. Correlations among females are below the diagonal and correlations among males are above the diagonal.

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$.

Table 5. Correlations between predictor and sexual-preference variables across the sexes.

	<i>Kissing</i>	<i>Cuddling</i>	<i>Self-Mast.</i>	<i>Mast. with partner</i>	<i>Perform oral sex</i>	<i>Receive oral sex</i>	<i>Vaginal Sex</i>	<i>Anal Sex</i>	<i>Missionary position</i>	<i>Doggy-style</i>	<i>Woman-on-top</i>	<i>Reverse-cowgirl</i>	<i>Spooning</i>	<i>Side-to-side</i>
1. Extraversion	.16**	.11	.06	.05	.05	.08	.08	.08	.08	.03	-.03	.04	.04	.02
	396	390	374	273	336	333	314	143	305	283	301	229	259	202
2. Neuroticism	-.02	.01	.04	-.08	-.06	-.07	-.02	-.01	-.02	.00	-.20**	-.21**	-.09	-.12
	402	397	378	278	340	339	320	144	312	287	306	233	265	206
3. Agreeableness	.10*	.13**	-.04	.00	-.01	.12*	-.05	-.05	-.04	-.07	.09	.10	.04	.07
	404	397	381	281	342	341	321	147	312	288	308	233	265	207
4. Conscientiousness	.09	.08	.07	.06	.06	.09	.01	.01	.06	.03	.13*	.14*	.14*	.18**
	391	385	369	270	331	329	309	141	302	281	297	228	257	202
5. Openness	.11	.09	.07	-.04	.24**	.07	.12*	.20*	.05	.13*	.10	.19**	.07	.12
	401	395	377	277	340	338	318	145	310	286	304	231	264	205
6. Life History	.11*	.19**	.02	.05	-.07	.05	.08	-.08	.04	-.12*	.12*	.10	.05	.03
	410	404	385	283	348	347	327	148	317	293	312	238	271	211
7. Sociosexuality	-.03	-.21**	.27**	-.02	.16**	.12*	.10	.11	.02	.26**	.02	.23**	.04	.20*
	347	342	323	230	285	286	265	110	257	232	252	184	211	162
8. Mating intelligence	.07	.11*	.02	.07	.06	.10	.07	.00	.15**	.04	.10	.03	.15*	.09
	411	405	386	284	349	348	328	148	318	294	313	238	272	212
9. Anxiety	.10	.13**	-.03	-.06	-.06	-.03	.00	-.04	-.03	-.03	-.22**	-.18**	-.10	-.06
	411	405	386	284	349	348	328	148	318	294	313	238	272	212
10. Avoidance	-.26**	-.36**	.06	-.07	-.11*	-.07	-.06	-.06	-.09	.01	-.07	.04	-.07	.03
	411	404	385	284	349	348	328	148	318	294	313	238	272	212
11. Moral disgust	.11*	.04	-.07	.01	.00	.03	-.06	-.13	-.03	-.06	-.12*	-.09	-.05	.02
	371	363	351	265	322	319	301	139	293	271	288	222	250	193
12. Sexual disgust	-.01	.10	-.30**	-.04	-.24**	-.18**	-.08	-.36**	.00	-.17**	-.16**	-.19**	-.03	-.03
	373	366	355	265	324	322	305	138	297	275	292	227	255	196
13. Pathogen disgust	.13*	.09	-.08	.02	-.03	.03	.00	.01	.08	-.01	-.10	-.09	-.06	-.11
	381	374	361	273	332	330	312	141	303	281	298	231	260	201
14. Sex drive	.11*	-.13*	.48**	.22**	.28**	.23**	.09	.16	.18**	.15*	.08	.04	.09	.10
	362	358	348	259	317	315	299	137	291	270	286	217	249	196

Note. Correlations include only participants in the sample that have engaged in a particular sex act.

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$.

Table 6. Correlations between predictor and sexual-preference variables among females.

	<i>Kissing</i>	<i>Cuddling</i>	<i>Self-Mast.</i>	<i>Mast. with partner</i>	<i>Perform oral sex</i>	<i>Receive oral sex</i>	<i>Vaginal Sex</i>	<i>Anal Sex</i>	<i>Missionary position</i>	<i>Doggy-style</i>	<i>Woman-on-top</i>	<i>Reverse-cowgirl</i>	<i>Sponting</i>	<i>Side-to-side</i>
1. Extraversion	.16**	.09	.07	.01	.06	.12	.08	.12	.08	.03	.00	.04	.06	-.05
	304	304	276	208	264	257	248	115	241	229	237	178	207	155
2. Neuroticism	-.03	-.02	.05	-.06	-.01	-.03	-.03	.11	-.04	.04	-.23**	-.17*	-.13	-.12
	306	307	276	209	265	259	250	115	244	230	239	179	209	157
3. Agreeableness	.10	.14*	-.07	-.01	-.01	.13*	-.02	-.05	-.01	-.05	.15*	.13	.12	.00
	308	307	279	211	267	261	251	117	244	231	241	179	209	157
4. Conscientiousness	.10	.05	.04	.02	.05	.10	.05	.01	.11	.07	.17*	.17*	.18*	.14
	297	297	269	203	257	251	241	112	236	225	232	175	203	153
5. Openness	.10	.13*	.04	-.09	.20**	.05	.14*	.12	-.01	.12	.08	.18*	.07	.11
	306	306	276	209	265	259	249	115	243	230	238	178	209	156
6. Life History	.12*	.13*	-.01	.07	-.03	.11	.11	-.05	.08	-.11	.21**	.16*	.10	-.01
	313	313	282	213	272	266	256	118	248	235	244	183	214	161
7. Sociosexuality	.07	-.07	.21**	-.01	.15*	.03	.10	.08	.02	.22**	-.06	.15	.06	.21*
	264	264	234	172	223	219	207	89	200	186	196	140	167	122
8. Mating intelligence	.07	.13*	.00	.07	.08	.14*	.03	.05	.15*	.04	.19**	.09	.15*	.06
	313	313	282	213	272	266	256	118	248	235	244	183	214	161
9. Anxiety	.06	.09	-.05	-.08	-.06	-.03	-.04	-.04	-.05	.01	-.27**	-.16*	-.13	-.05
	313	313	282	213	272	266	256	148	248	235	244	183	214	161
10. Avoidance	-.29**	-.34	.03	-.08	-.14*	-.08	-.08	-.06	-.14*	-.01	-.09	.01	-.11	.02
	313	312	281	213	272	266	256	148	248	235	244	183	214	161
11. Moral disgust	.10	-.01	-.06	.02	.09	.12	-.04	-.04	-.05	-.03	-.13	-.04	-.02	.03
	279	276	253	198	249	242	233	112	227	216	223	170	196	145
12. Sexual disgust	-.06	.03	-.29**	-.02	-.18**	-.04	-.06	-.33**	-.02	-.10	-.08	-.05	-.05	-.05
	279	277	255	197	250	243	235	110	229	218	225	173	199	147
13. Pathogen disgust	.10	.09	-.06	.01	.02	.07	.03	.05	.10	.03	-.08	-.07	-.01	-.07
	286	284	260	204	257	250	241	112	234	223	230	176	203	151
14. Sex drive	.16**	-.02	.44**	.25**	.25**	.20**	.02	.16	.13	.13	.03	-.08	.10	.07
	278	273	252	193	246	239	232	137	225	216	222	167	196	149

Note. Correlations include only participants in the sample that have engaged in a particular sex act.

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$.

Table 7. Correlations between predictor and sexual-preference variables among males.

	<i>Kissing</i>	<i>Cuddling</i>	<i>Self-Mast.</i>	<i>Mast. with partner</i>	<i>Perform oral sex</i>	<i>Receive oral sex</i>	<i>Vaginal Sex</i>	<i>Anal Sex</i>	<i>Missionary position</i>	<i>Doggy-style</i>	<i>Woman-on-top</i>	<i>Reverse-cowgirl</i>	<i>Sponting</i>	<i>Side-to-side</i>
1. Extraversion	.11	.11	.05	.23	.11	.02	.13	.32	.08	.10	-.06	.22	-.01	.24
	92	86	98	65	72	76	66	28	64	54	64	51	52	47
2. Neuroticism	-.04	-.04	.05	-.07	-.12	-.05	.03	-.03	-.01	.08	.14	-.05	.05	-.12
	96	90	102	69	75	80	70	29	68	57	67	54	56	49
3. Agreeableness	.07	.05	.06	.07	0.11	.17	-.14	.25	-.14	-.15	-.06	.21	-.27*	.29*
	96	90	102	70	75	80	70	30	68	57	67	54	56	50
4. Conscientiousness	.04	.10	.15	.22	.19	.16	-.09	-.02	-.07	-.10	.08	.18	.02	.31*
	94	88	100	67	74	78	68	29	66	56	65	53	54	49
5. Openness	.16	.04	.13	.09	.26*	.04	.06	.30	.25*	.06	.06	.04	.05	.18
	95	89	101	68	75	79	69	30	67	56	66	53	55	49
6. Life History	.04	.25*	.11	.04	-.09	-.12	-.01	-.06	-.07	-.08	-.17	.12	-.12	.15
	97	91	103	70	76	81	71	30	69	58	68	55	57	50
7. Sociosexuality	-.13	-.38**	.40**	-.20	.02	.23	-.01	-.23	.07	.26	.04	.12	-.26	.15
	83	78	89	58	62	67	58	21	57	46	56	44	44	40
8. Mating intelligence	.02	.02	.10	.09	.01	.01	.16	.09	.13	.06	-.22	-.02	.15	.19
	98	92	104	71	76	82	72	30	70	59	69	55	58	51
9. Anxiety	.21*	.22*	.04	.04	.05	.05	.10	.06	.00	-.15	.09	-.12	.06	-.09
	98	92	104	71	77	82	72	30	70	59	69	55	58	51
10. Avoidance	-.18	-.43**	.14	-.07	-.07	-.13	-.02	-.29	.03	.12	-.04	.06	.06	.06
	98	92	104	71	77	82	72	30	70	59	69	55	58	51
11. Moral disgust	.08	.05	-.09	.03	-.16	-.18	-.10	-.02	.00	-.07	.18	.05	-.13	.00
	92	87	98	67	73	77	68	27	66	55	65	52	54	48
12. Sexual disgust	-.08	.04	-.37**	.10	-.16	-.43**	-.12	.05	-.07	-.18	-.07	-.07	.14	.02
	94	89	100	68	74	79	70	28	68	57	67	54	56	49
13. Pathogen disgust	.16	-.03	-.11	.12	-.09	.04	-.07	.31	-.01	.01	.04	.18	-.17	-.23
	95	90	101	69	75	80	71	29	69	58	68	55	57	50
14. Sex drive	.05	-.29**	.58**	.12	.33**	.33**	.22	.06	.31*	.17	.15	.33*	.03	.18
	89	85	96	66	71	76	67	26	66	54	64	50	53	47

Note. Correlations include only participants in the sample that have engaged in a particular sex act.

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$.

Table 8. Multiple regression predicting the preference for kissing among females.

Predictor Variable	<i>b</i>	<i>SE(b)</i>	β	<i>t</i>
Intercept	6.11	.81		7.50**
Extraversion	.03	.07	.04	.52
Neuroticism	.01	.08	.02	.17
Agreeableness	-.02	.09	-.02	-.22
Conscientiousness	.02	.09	.02	.23
Openness	-.03	.09	-.03	-.36
Life history	.00	.10	.00	.01
Sociosexuality	.00	.01	.03	.34
Mating intelligence	-.01	.02	-.04	-.46
Anxiety	.01	.06	.01	.13
Avoidance	-.19	.05	-.30	-3.62**
Moral disgust	.02	.01	.20	2.37*
Sexual disgust	-.01	.01	-.09	-1.01
Pathogen disgust	.00	.01	.02	.22
Sex drive	.01	.00	.24	3.00**

$R^2 = .20, F(14, 171) = 3.10, p < .01$

Note. This analysis includes only participants in the sample that have engaged in kissing.

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$.

Table 9. Multiple regression predicting the preference for kissing among males.

Predictor Variable	<i>b</i>	<i>SE(b)</i>	β	<i>t</i>
Intercept	3.89	1.43		2.71**
Extraversion	.23	.12	.24	1.86
Neuroticism	-.26	.15	-.29	-1.78
Agreeableness	.08	.18	.06	.47
Conscientiousness	.06	.16	.05	.35
Openness	.11	.17	.08	.62
Life history	-.31	.17	-.24	-1.82
Sociosexuality	-.01	.01	-.09	-.49
Mating intelligence	.01	.03	.04	.28
Anxiety	.38	.10	.58	3.84**
Avoidance	-.15	.09	-.22	-1.69
Moral disgust	.03	.02	.26	1.77
Sexual disgust	-.03	.02	-.25	-1.50
Pathogen disgust	.02	.02	.14	1.17
Sex drive	.00	.01	.03	.18

$R^2 = .40, F(14, 53) = 2.48, p < .01$

Note. This analysis includes only participants in the sample that have engaged in kissing.

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$.

Table 10. Multiple regression predicting the preference for cuddling among females.

Predictor Variable	<i>b</i>	<i>SE(b)</i>	β	<i>t</i>
Intercept	6.83	.72		9.47**
Extraversion	.02	.06	.03	.37
Neuroticism	.00	.07	.00	.02
Agreeableness	.02	.08	.02	.25
Conscientiousness	.03	.08	.03	.37
Openness	-.04	.08	-.04	-.46
Life history	-.07	.08	-.07	-.85
Sociosexuality	-.01	.01	-.10	-1.09
Mating intelligence	.02	.02	.01	1.18
Anxiety	.04	.05	.08	.87
Avoidance	-.17	.05	-.30	-3.65**
Moral disgust	.01	.01	.01	.16
Sexual disgust	.00	.01	-.04	-.43
Pathogen disgust	.00	.01	-.01	-.14
Sex drive	.00	.00	.05	.55

$R^2 = .15$, $F(14, 169) = 2.19$, $p < .05$

Note. This analysis includes only participants in the sample that have engaged in cuddling.

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$.

Table 11. Multiple regression predicting the preference for cuddling among males.

Predictor Variable	<i>b</i>	<i>SE(b)</i>	β	<i>t</i>
Intercept	7.80	1.84		4.24**
Extraversion	.06	.16	.05	.40
Neuroticism	-.01	.19	-.01	-.05
Agreeableness	-.06	.23	-.04	-.26
Conscientiousness	-.05	.21	-.03	-.21
Openness	.00	.22	.00	.01
Life history	.20	.22	.13	.92
Sociosexuality	-.02	.02	-.21	-1.16
Mating intelligence	.04	.04	.11	.86
Anxiety	.27	.13	.31	2.16*
Avoidance	-.21	.12	-.23	-1.72
Moral disgust	.01	.02	.07	.44
Sexual disgust	-.05	.03	-.36	-1.97
Pathogen disgust	.01	.02	.05	.37
Sex drive	-.02	.01	-.37	-2.64*

$R^2 = .44, F(14, 50) = 2.84, p < .01$

Note. This analysis includes only participants in the sample that have engaged in cuddling.

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$.

Table 12. Multiple regression predicting the preference for self-masturbation among females.

Predictor Variable	<i>b</i>	<i>SE(b)</i>	β	<i>t</i>
Intercept	4.51	1.61		2.81**
Extraversion	-.07	.13	-.04	-.52
Neuroticism	.45	.17	.25	2.57*
Agreeableness	-.21	.18	-.09	-1.20
Conscientiousness	.27	.18	.12	1.51
Openness	.01	.19	.01	.07
Life history	.23	.19	.10	1.23
Sociosexuality	.00	.01	-.02	-.20
Mating intelligence	-.06	.03	-.14	-1.77
Anxiety	-.29	.11	-.24	-2.60*
Avoidance	.11	.10	.09	1.05
Moral disgust	.02	.02	.11	1.36
Sexual disgust	-.05	.02	-.23	-2.45*
Pathogen disgust	-.02	.02	-.10	-1.32
Sex drive	.03	.01	.36	4.43**

$R^2 = .27, F(14, 157) = 4.14, p < .01$

Note. This analysis includes only participants in the sample that have engaged in self-masturbation.

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$.

Table 13. Multiple regression predicting the preference for self-masturbation among males.

Predictor Variable	<i>b</i>	<i>SE(b)</i>	β	<i>t</i>
Intercept	2.79	2.17		1.29
Extraversion	.00	.20	.00	-.02
Neuroticism	-.09	.23	-.06	-.37
Agreeableness	.16	.29	.07	.54
Conscientiousness	.19	.26	.09	.73
Openness	-.02	.28	-.01	-.07
Life history	.20	.26	.10	.77
Sociosexuality	.02	.02	.16	1.06
Mating intelligence	-.06	.05	-.16	-1.22
Anxiety	.06	.16	.05	.39
Avoidance	-.01	.14	-.01	-.07
Moral disgust	.01	.03	.04	.29
Sexual disgust	-.02	.03	-.13	-.85
Pathogen disgust	-.01	.02	-.06	-.57
Sex drive	.03	.01	.48	3.42**

$R^2 = .43$, $F(14, 60) = 3.23$, $p < .01$

Note. This analysis includes only participants in the sample that have engaged in self-masturbation.

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$.

Table 14. Multiple regression predicting the preference for masturbation with a partner among females.

Predictor Variable	<i>b</i>	<i>SE(b)</i>	β	<i>t</i>
Intercept	7.69	2.13		3.62**
Extraversion	-.15	.17	-.09	-.85
Neuroticism	-.05	.22	-.03	-.22
Agreeableness	-.15	.23	-.07	-.63
Conscientiousness	.14	.24	.06	.57
Openness	-.32	.25	-.13	1.29
Life history	-.17	.25	-.08	-.70
Sociosexuality	-.02	.01	-.17	-1.44
Mating intelligence	-.01	.05	-.02	-.23
Anxiety	-.07	.15	-.06	-.48
Avoidance	-.12	.14	-.08	-.85
Moral disgust	.02	.02	.11	.98
Sexual disgust	-.04	.03	-.18	-1.41
Pathogen disgust	.01	.02	.03	.29
Sex drive	.02	.01	.18	1.75

$R^2 = .10$, $F(14, 110) = .87$, *n.s.*

Note. This analysis includes only participants in the sample that have engaged in masturbation with a partner.

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$.

Table 15. Multiple regression predicting the preference for masturbation with a partner among males.

Predictor Variable	<i>b</i>	<i>SE(b)</i>	β	<i>t</i>
Intercept	3.31	3.35		.99
Extraversion	.40	.33	.26	1.19
Neuroticism	-.45	.35	-.31	-1.30
Agreeableness	-.33	.44	-.15	-.74
Conscientiousness	.44	.37	.22	1.20
Openness	.08	.44	.04	.18
Life history	-.50	.43	-.25	-1.16
Sociosexuality	-.03	.03	-.33	-1.19
Mating intelligence	-.02	.07	-.05	-.24
Anxiety	.12	.24	.11	.49
Avoidance	.02	.25	.02	.08
Moral disgust	.02	.05	.10	.47
Sexual disgust	.02	.05	.09	.38
Pathogen disgust	.02	.04	.08	.42
Sex drive	.03	.01	.46	2.29*

$R^2 = .29$, $F(14, 33) = .95$, *n.s.*

Note. This analysis includes only participants in the sample that have engaged in masturbation with a partner.

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$.

Table 16. Multiple regression predicting the preference for receiving oral sex among females.

Predictor Variable	<i>b</i>	<i>SE(b)</i>	β	<i>t</i>
Intercept	2.82	1.81		1.56
Extraversion	.13	.15	.08	.88
Neuroticism	.17	.19	.10	.91
Agreeableness	.11	.20	.05	.54
Conscientiousness	.21	.21	.09	1.00
Openness	-.06	.21	-.03	-.31
Life history	-.01	.21	-.01	-.07
Sociosexuality	-.01	.01	-.05	-.50
Mating intelligence	-.01	.04	-.01	-.12
Anxiety	.02	.12	.01	.13
Avoidance	.02	.12	.02	.19
Moral disgust	.04	.02	.16	1.68
Sexual disgust	-.04	.02	-.19	-1.89
Pathogen disgust	.03	.02	.14	1.49
Sex drive	.01	.01	.11	1.27

$R^2 = .09$, $F(14, 142) = 1.04$, *n.s.*

Note. This analysis includes only participants in the sample that have received oral sex.

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$.

Table 17. Multiple regression predicting the preference for receiving oral sex among males.

Predictor Variable	<i>b</i>	<i>SE(b)</i>	β	<i>t</i>
Intercept	5.03	1.92		2.62*
Extraversion	.24	.18	.21	1.34
Neuroticism	-.33	.20	-.32	-1.64
Agreeableness	.11	.25	.07	.44
Conscientiousness	.26	.21	.18	1.21
Openness	-.16	.23	-.10	-.68
Life history	-.34	.25	-.22	-1.39
Sociosexuality	.01	.01	.18	.92
Mating intelligence	-.09	.04	-.31	-2.13*
Anxiety	.24	.14	.30	1.74
Avoidance	-.13	.11	-.17	-1.13
Moral disgust	-.02	.03	-.15	-.90
Sexual disgust	-.02	.03	-.15	-.79
Pathogen disgust	.04	.02	.29	2.16*
Sex drive	.02	.01	.32	2.07*

$R^2 = .44$, $F(14, 40) = 2.24$, $p < .05$

Note. This analysis includes only participants in the sample that have received oral sex.

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$.

Table 18. Multiple regression predicting the preference for performing oral sex among females.

Predictor Variable	<i>b</i>	<i>SE(b)</i>	β	<i>t</i>
Intercept	5.40	1.93		2.79**
Extraversion	.05	.16	.03	.33
Neuroticism	.12	.20	.06	.61
Agreeableness	-.32	.21	-.13	-1.52
Conscientiousness	-.05	.22	-.02	-.23
Openness	.11	.22	.04	.49
Life history	-.10	.22	-.04	-.45
Sociosexuality	.01	.01	.11	1.12
Mating intelligence	-.05	.04	-.09	-1.06
Anxiety	-.16	.13	-.12	-1.23
Avoidance	-.24	.12	-.18	-1.97
Moral disgust	.05	.02	.22	2.40*
Sexual disgust	-.06	.02	-.22	-2.39*
Pathogen disgust	.02	.02	.06	.77
Sex drive	.02	.01	.20	2.43*

$R^2 = .19$, $F(14, 148) = 2.44$, $p < .01$

Note. This analysis includes only participants in the sample that have performed oral sex.

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$.

Table 19. Multiple regression predicting the preference for performing oral sex among males.

Predictor Variable	<i>b</i>	<i>SE(b)</i>	β	<i>t</i>
Intercept	7.09	3.06		2.31*
Extraversion	.30	.28	.17	1.04
Neuroticism	-.80	.31	-.50	-2.57*
Agreeableness	-.46	.40	-.19	-1.16
Conscientiousness	.14	.33	.06	.43
Openness	.58	.40	.22	1.43
Life history	-.77	.40	-.33	-1.91
Sociosexuality	-.04	.02	-.36	-1.78
Mating intelligence	-.14	.07	-.30	-2.06*
Anxiety	.03	.23	.02	.13
Avoidance	-.10	.18	-.09	-.55
Moral disgust	-.02	.04	-.09	-.49
Sexual disgust	.00	.04	.02	.09
Pathogen disgust	.00	.03	.01	.09
Sex drive	.05	.01	.66	4.11**

$R^2 = .46$, $F(14, 38) = 2.28$, $p < .05$

Note. This analysis includes only participants in the sample that have performed oral sex.

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$.

Table 20. Multiple regression predicting the preference for vaginal sex among females.

Predictor Variable	<i>b</i>	<i>SE(b)</i>	β	<i>t</i>
Intercept	7.24	.53		13.67**
Extraversion	.05	.04	.10	1.10
Neuroticism	-.07	.05	-.15	-1.36
Agreeableness	-.07	.06	-.11	-1.20
Conscientiousness	.00	.06	.01	.06
Openness	-.07	.06	-.10	-1.13
Life history	.07	.06	.11	1.19
Sociosexuality	.00	.00	.01	.11
Mating intelligence	-.01	.01	-.05	-.54
Anxiety	.00	.03	.00	-.03
Avoidance	-.03	.03	-.09	-.94
Moral disgust	.00	.01	.04	.42
Sexual disgust	-.01	.01	-.20	-1.97
Pathogen disgust	.01	.01	.11	1.25
Sex drive	.00	.00	.15	1.72

$R^2 = .13, F(14, 136) = 1.44, n.s.$

Note. This analysis includes only participants in the sample that have engaged in vaginal sex.

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$.

Table 21. Multiple regression predicting the preference for vaginal sex among males.

Predictor Variable	<i>b</i>	<i>SE(b)</i>	β	<i>t</i>
Intercept	6.51	.95		6.82**
Extraversion	.07	.07	.17	.93
Neuroticism	-.14	.09	-.40	-1.59
Agreeableness	-.10	.11	-.17	-.84
Conscientiousness	-.02	.09	-.04	-.24
Openness	.03	.11	.04	.24
Life history	-.12	.12	-.22	-1.08
Sociosexuality	-.01	.01	-.20	-.91
Mating intelligence	.00	.02	.03	.13
Anxiety	.08	.06	.29	1.35
Avoidance	-.04	.06	-.16	-.77
Moral disgust	.00	.01	.06	.33
Sexual disgust	.00	.01	-.05	-.29
Pathogen disgust	.01	.01	.17	1.05
Sex drive	.01	.00	.56	2.83**

$R^2 = .38$, $F(14, 32) = 1.38$, *n.s.*

Note. This analysis includes only participants in the sample that have engaged in vaginal sex.

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$.

Table 22. Multiple regression predicting the preference for anal sex among females.

Predictor Variable	<i>b</i>	<i>SE(b)</i>	β	<i>t</i>
Intercept	-1.91	3.69		-.52
Extraversion	.02	.30	.01	.07
Neuroticism	.45	.42	.19	1.06
Agreeableness	.38	.48	.13	.80
Conscientiousness	-.02	.43	-.01	-.04
Openness	.09	.48	.03	.19
Life history	-.08	.45	-.03	-.18
Sociosexuality	-.01	.03	-.03	-.19
Mating intelligence	.05	.08	.09	.62
Anxiety	.34	.29	.21	1.16
Avoidance	-.38	.27	-.21	1.38
Moral disgust	.06	.04	.22	1.34
Sexual disgust	-.12	.05	-.45	-2.53*
Pathogen disgust	.03	.04	.12	.79
Sex drive	.02	.02	.16	1.16

$R^2 = .29, F(14, 52) = 1.52, n.s.$

Note. This analysis includes only participants in the sample that have engaged in anal sex.

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$.

Table 23. Multiple regression predicting the preference for anal sex among males.

Predictor Variable	<i>b</i>	<i>SE(b)</i>	β	<i>t</i>
Intercept	17.83	15.64		1.14
Extraversion	1.29	.76	.73	1.70
Neuroticism	.09	1.68	.06	.05
Agreeableness	-.36	2.03	-.13	-.18
Conscientiousness	-1.66	1.85	-.72	-.90
Openness	1.47	.71	.63	2.09
Life history	-1.62	2.49	-.83	-.65
Sociosexuality	-.09	.03	-1.14	-2.75
Mating intelligence	-.20	.16	-.63	-1.24
Anxiety	-1.01	1.87	-1.06	-.54
Avoidance	-.96	.48	-.92	-1.99
Moral disgust	.16	.18	1.00	.88
Sexual disgust	-.09	.19	-.66	-.50
Pathogen disgust	-.06	.27	-.26	-.21
Sex drive	-.02	.11	-.36	-.22

$R^2 = .98$, $F(14, 1) = 2.86$, *n.s.*

Note. This analysis includes only participants in the sample that have engaged in anal sex.

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$.

Table 24. Multiple regression predicting the preference for the missionary position among females.

Predictor Variable	<i>b</i>	<i>SE(b)</i>	β	<i>t</i>
Intercept	4.81	1.04		4.62**
Extraversion	.06	.08	.06	.65
Neuroticism	-.01	.10	-.01	-.05
Agreeableness	.05	.12	.04	.38
Conscientiousness	.06	.12	.05	.55
Openness	-.15	.12	-.11	-1.27
Life history	.09	.12	.07	.76
Sociosexuality	.01	.01	.13	1.29
Mating intelligence	.04	.02	.14	1.57
Anxiety	-.03	.07	-.05	-.49
Avoidance	-.08	.07	-.12	-1.24
Moral disgust	-.03	.01	-.23	-2.37*
Sexual disgust	.01	.01	.11	1.13
Pathogen disgust	.03	.01	.23	2.61*
Sex drive	.01	.01	.21	2.39*

$R^2 = .17$, $F(14, 136) = 1.96$, $p < .05$

Note. This analysis includes only participants in the sample that have engaged in vaginal sex in the missionary position.

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$.

Table 25. Multiple regression predicting the preference for missionary position among males.

Predictor Variable	<i>b</i>	<i>SE(b)</i>	β	<i>t</i>
Intercept	4.22	3.04		1.39
Extraversion	.05	.23	.04	.20
Neuroticism	-.48	.27	-.46	-1.76
Agreeableness	-.39	.35	-.22	-1.10
Conscientiousness	.06	.26	.04	.22
Openness	.72	.33	.41	2.17*
Life history	-.12	.36	-.07	-.33
Sociosexuality	.00	.02	.01	.04
Mating intelligence	-.04	.07	-.12	-.55
Anxiety	.00	.18	.00	-.02
Avoidance	-.04	.17	-.05	-.24
Moral disgust	-.01	.04	-.06	-.32
Sexual disgust	.03	.03	.16	.84
Pathogen disgust	.02	.03	.10	.58
Sex drive	.03	.01	.50	2.48*

$R^2 = .35$, $F(14, 31) = 1.17$, *n.s.*

Note. This analysis includes only participants in the sample that have engaged in vaginal sex in the missionary position.

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$.

Table 26. Multiple regression predicting the preference for doggy-style among females.

Predictor Variable	<i>b</i>	<i>SE(b)</i>	β	<i>t</i>
Intercept	4.57	1.71		2.67*
Extraversion	-.13	.14	-.09	-.96
Neuroticism	.01	.17	.01	.07
Agreeableness	-.07	.20	-.03	-.34
Conscientiousness	.23	.19	.11	1.20
Openness	.26	.20	.12	1.34
Life history	-.22	.20	-.11	-1.11
Sociosexuality	.03	.01	.27	2.36*
Mating intelligence	-.07	.03	-.17	-1.77
Anxiety	-.03	.11	-.03	-.29
Avoidance	-.23	.11	-.21	-2.06*
Moral disgust	-.01	.02	-.04	-.38
Sexual disgust	.01	.02	.07	.61
Pathogen disgust	.02	.02	.11	1.24
Sex drive	.01	.01	.08	.87

$R^2 = .13$, $F(14, 127) = 1.41$, *n.s.*

Note. This analysis includes only participants in the sample that have engaged in doggy-style vaginal sex.

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$.

Table 27. Multiple regression predicting the preference for doggy-style among males.

Predictor Variable	<i>b</i>	<i>SE(b)</i>	β	<i>t</i>
Intercept	5.71	2.93		1.95
Extraversion	.11	.21	.13	.50
Neuroticism	-.02	.26	-.03	.08
Agreeableness	-.32	.33	-.28	-.96
Conscientiousness	.09	.23	.09	.38
Openness	.13	.27	.11	.47
Life history	.40	.35	.36	1.15
Sociosexuality	.02	.02	.41	1.34
Mating intelligence	-.02	.06	-.11	-.36
Anxiety	.03	.17	.06	.20
Avoidance	.11	.16	.20	.68
Moral disgust	-.03	.03	-.24	-.94
Sexual disgust	.00	.03	-.01	-.03
Pathogen disgust	-.02	.02	-.16	-.71
Sex drive	.01	.01	.25	.92

$R^2 = .31, F(14, 21) = .68, n.s.$

Note. This analysis includes only participants in the sample that have engaged in doggy-style vaginal sex.

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$.

Table 28. Multiple regression predicting the preference for woman-on-top among females.

Predictor Variable	<i>b</i>	<i>SE(b)</i>	β	<i>t</i>
Intercept	5.01	1.53		3.29**
Extraversion	-.16	.12	-.12	-1.34
Neuroticism	-.14	.15	-.10	-.92
Agreeableness	.12	.17	.07	.68
Conscientiousness	.20	.17	.11	1.19
Openness	.10	.18	.05	.57
Life history	.06	.17	.03	.37
Sociosexuality	-.01	.01	-.13	-1.21
Mating intelligence	.05	.03	.13	1.45
Anxiety	-.15	.10	-.16	-1.48
Avoidance	.00	.10	.00	.02
Moral disgust	-.01	.02	-.07	-.69
Sexual disgust	-.01	.02	-.08	-.78
Pathogen disgust	.01	.02	.07	.83
Sex drive	.02	.01	.20	2.18*

$R^2 = .16$, $F(14, 131) = 1.82$, $p < .05$

Note. This analysis includes only participants in the sample that have engaged in vaginal sex with the woman-on-top.

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$.

Table 29. Multiple regression predicting the preference for woman-on-top among males.

Predictor Variable	<i>b</i>	<i>SE(b)</i>	β	<i>t</i>
Intercept	5.19	1.95		2.66*
Extraversion	.15	.17	.21	.92
Neuroticism	.03	.22	.04	.13
Agreeableness	-.05	.26	-.05	-.20
Conscientiousness	.10	.18	.10	.52
Openness	.18	.22	.17	.81
Life history	-.28	.26	-.28	-1.07
Sociosexuality	.01	.01	.20	.72
Mating intelligence	-.04	.04	-.22	-.95
Anxiety	.01	.13	.02	.09
Avoidance	-.09	.13	-.18	-.72
Moral disgust	.03	.02	.32	1.34
Sexual disgust	.00	.02	-.02	-.10
Pathogen disgust	.00	.02	.02	.10
Sex drive	.00	.01	-.08	-.33

$R^2 = .19$, $F(14, 30) = .51$, *n.s.*

Note. This analysis includes only participants in the sample that have engaged in vaginal sex with the woman-on-top.

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$.

Table 30. Multiple regression predicting the preference for reverse-cowgirl among females.

Predictor Variable	<i>b</i>	<i>SE(b)</i>	β	<i>t</i>
Intercept	2.36	2.75		.86
Extraversion	-.10	.20	-.05	-.49
Neuroticism	.03	.26	.02	.12
Agreeableness	-.01	.29	-.01	-.03
Conscientiousness	.27	.28	.11	.96
Openness	.46	.31	.17	1.49
Life history	.28	.31	.11	.90
Sociosexuality	.03	.02	.21	1.53
Mating intelligence	.02	.06	-.05	-.41
Anxiety	-.08	.16	-.07	-.49
Avoidance	.07	.17	.05	.41
Moral disgust	.00	.03	.01	.05
Sexual disgust	-.01	.03	-.05	-.36
Pathogen disgust	.01	.03	.03	.24
Sex drive	-.01	.01	-.07	-.64

$R^2 = .10$, $F(14, 92) = .72$, *n.s.*

Note. This analysis includes only participants in the sample that have engaged in reverse-cowgirl vaginal sex.

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$.

Table 31. Multiple regression predicting the preference for reverse-cowgirl among males.

Predictor Variable	<i>b</i>	<i>SE(b)</i>	β	<i>t</i>
Intercept	-.40	4.25		-.09
Extraversion	.33	.35	.23	.96
Neuroticism	-.34	.41	-.27	-.84
Agreeableness	.07	.51	.04	.14
Conscientiousness	.72	.37	.40	1.97
Openness	-.03	.40	-.01	-.06
Life history	.10	.51	.06	.19
Sociosexuality	.03	.03	.34	1.18
Mating intelligence	-.09	.09	-.27	-1.01
Anxiety	.18	.27	.18	.66
Avoidance	.08	.25	.09	.34
Moral disgust	-.06	.05	-.32	-1.17
Sexual disgust	.07	.05	.40	1.51
Pathogen disgust	.02	.04	.10	.47
Sex drive	.04	.02	.54	2.35*

$R^2 = .49, F(14, 19) = 1.31, n.s.$

Note. This analysis includes only participants in the sample that have engaged in reverse-cowgirl vaginal sex.

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$.

Table 32. Multiple regression predicting the preference for spooning among females.

Predictor Variable	<i>b</i>	<i>SE(b)</i>	β	<i>t</i>
Intercept	4.21	1.80		2.34*
Extraversion	-.05	.14	-.04	-.35
Neuroticism	-.06	.18	-.04	-.34
Agreeableness	-.04	.20	-.02	-.20
Conscientiousness	.24	.20	.12	1.19
Openness	.00	.21	.00	.02
Life history	.29	.23	.14	1.25
Sociosexuality	.01	.01	.09	.72
Mating intelligence	.04	.04	.11	1.08
Anxiety	-.04	.12	-.04	-.31
Avoidance	-.15	.13	-.12	-1.25
Moral disgust	-.02	.02	-.09	-.82
Sexual disgust	.00	.02	.00	-.02
Pathogen disgust	.01	.01	.03	.25
Sex drive	.02	.01	.17	1.68

$R^2 = .11$, $F(14, 111) = 1.02$, *n.s.*

Note. This analysis includes only participants in the sample that have engaged in spooning.

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$.

Table 33. Multiple regression predicting the preference for spooning among males.

Predictor Variable	<i>b</i>	<i>SE(b)</i>	β	<i>t</i>
Intercept	1.68	2.62		.64
Extraversion	.23	.22	.25	1.05
Neuroticism	.33	.24	.45	1.40
Agreeableness	.10	.32	.09	.32
Conscientiousness	.47	.22	.45	2.19*
Openness	.07	.27	.06	.25
Life history	-.30	.30	-.27	-.98
Sociosexuality	.01	.01	.13	.49
Mating intelligence	.09	.06	.42	1.64
Anxiety	.04	.16	.07	.26
Avoidance	-.08	.16	-.15	-.54
Moral disgust	-.01	.03	-.08	-.30
Sexual disgust	.07	.03	.55	2.28*
Pathogen disgust	-.03	.02	-.26	-1.26
Sex drive	-.01	.01	-.17	-.81

$R^2 = .53$, $F(14, 18) = 1.43$, *n.s.*

Note. This analysis includes only participants in the sample that have engaged in spooning.

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$.

Table 34. Multiple regression predicting the preference for side-to-side vaginal sex among females.

Predictor Variable	<i>b</i>	<i>SE(b)</i>	β	<i>t</i>
Intercept	3.84	1.88		2.04
Extraversion	-.32	.18	-.22	-1.83
Neuroticism	-.26	.16	-.22	-1.19
Agreeableness	.03	.21	.01	.12
Conscientiousness	.42	.24	.21	1.75
Openness	.22	.24	.11	.95
Life history	-.12	.23	-.06	-.54
Sociosexuality	.03	.01	.30	2.12*
Mating intelligence	-.01	.04	-.04	-.34
Anxiety	.08	.12	.09	.63
Avoidance	-.07	.13	-.07	-.54
Moral disgust	.01	.02	.06	.44
Sexual disgust	.00	.02	.01	.08
Pathogen disgust	.01	.02	.06	.48
Sex drive	.00	.01	.01	.07

$R^2 = .18$, $F(14, 78) = 1.21$, *n.s.*

Note. This analysis includes only participants in the sample that have engaged in side-to-side vaginal sex.

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$.

Table 35. Multiple regression predicting the preference for side-to-side vaginal sex among males.

Predictor Variable	<i>b</i>	<i>SE(b)</i>	β	<i>t</i>
Intercept	-6.00	4.34		-1.38
Extraversion	.46	.38	.33	1.21
Neuroticism	-.04	.37	-.04	-.11
Agreeableness	.45	.45	.26	1.00
Conscientiousness	.97	.38	.57	2.55*
Openness	.19	.49	.10	.38
Life history	-.16	.54	-.09	-.29
Sociosexuality	.05	.03	.57	1.81
Mating intelligence	.06	.09	.19	.69
Anxiety	.34	.24	.41	1.45
Avoidance	.08	.25	.09	.30
Moral disgust	-.05	.05	-.26	-.99
Sexual disgust	.10	.05	.56	1.94
Pathogen disgust	-.04	.04	-.22	-.94
Sex drive	.01	.02	.23	.87

$R^2 = .51$, $F(14, 18) = 1.32$, *n.s.*

Note. This analysis includes only participants in the sample that have engaged in side-to-side vaginal sex.

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$.