

2012

# Personality, Sexual Attitudes, and Unrestricted Sociosexual Behavior in College Women

Marussia Role

Wellesley College, mrole@wellesley.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <https://repository.wellesley.edu/thesiscollection>

---

## Recommended Citation

Role, Marussia, "Personality, Sexual Attitudes, and Unrestricted Sociosexual Behavior in College Women" (2012). *Honors Thesis Collection*. 62.

<https://repository.wellesley.edu/thesiscollection/62>

This Dissertation/Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by Wellesley College Digital Scholarship and Archive. It has been accepted for inclusion in Honors Thesis Collection by an authorized administrator of Wellesley College Digital Scholarship and Archive. For more information, please contact [ir@wellesley.edu](mailto:ir@wellesley.edu).

Personality, Sexual Attitudes, and Unrestricted Sociosexual Behavior in College Women

Marussia (Masha) Rothenberg Role

Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the  
Prerequisite for Honors in Psychology  
Wellesley College

April 2012

© 2012, Marussia (Masha) Rothenberg Role

Acknowledgements

I would like to extend my sincerest thanks to: the Psychology Department and the Office of the Dean of the College for funding the present research; my readers, Dr. Keane and Dr. Brachfield-Child for their helpful comments on my thesis proposal and for taking the time and energy to serve as readers for my thesis committee; my friends and family for supporting me throughout the process of research and writing; Sarah Merrill, for providing crucial organizational support to my research and providing me with uplifting conversations to keep me going; and finally, Dr. Cheek, my advisor, who provided me with the encouragement, insight, and support necessary to bring my thesis to fruition.

## PERSONALITY, SEXUAL ATTITUDES, AND UNRESTRICTED WOMEN

### Abstract

Evolutionary psychology relies heavily on sex-based, biological differences to explain disparities in unrestricted attitudes and casual sex behavior. The present study explores the relations among personality (in particular, Maslow's construct of "dominance-feeling"), sexual attitudes, and women's sexual behavior as an alternative explanation. Eighty-nine Wellesley College women reported their attitudes concerning casual sex, completed personality measures, and reported their past and expected number of sexual partners to investigate 1) whether or not Maslow's 1942 theory and measure of dominance-feeling apply to present-day women and 2) which personality traits are correlated with measures of attitudes toward casual sex and of previous sexual behavior. Dominance-feeling was found to be a reliable measure ( $\alpha = .80$ ) that correlated strongly with other relevant personality measures used, indicating that it still communicates modern concepts to college women. Dominance-feeling was, on average, the most strongly correlated with unrestricted attitudes and casual sex, with sensation-seeking as a close second. It is concluded that the construct of dominance-feeling in the present sample (which, with additional data, may extend to larger populations) provides a better, more full explanation for individual differences in sexual attitudes and behaviors than male-female differences alone.

## PERSONALITY, SEXUAL ATTITUDES, AND UNRESTRICTED WOMEN

### Personality, Sexual Attitudes, and Unrestricted Sociosexual Behavior in College Women

Sex, in the world of evolutionary psychology, is primarily viewed as a mechanism for passing on genetic material (Burney, 2007). Because women have a limited number of eggs and men produce sperm daily, eggs are considered a limited resource, while sperm are an unlimited one. For women (and female mammals, as a whole), it takes a massive amount of time and resources to provide a fetus with the proper nutrients, etc. needed during gestation (Pillsworth & Haselton, 2006). Having a consistent partner during this period of time is ideal for a female, thus, for the provision of resources (Pillsworth & Haselton, 2006). It would seem that women invest far too much in bringing a fetus to term to be evolutionarily motivated to consider any strategy other than that of monogamy and “coupling” (i.e., remaining sexually monogamous with one partner) (Pillsworth & Haselton, 2006). Thus, women “should” be choosy with their mate selection and men, conversely, “should” be motivated to engage in sexual intercourse with many women to increase their chances of passing on their genetic material (Townsend, 1995).

Evolutionary psychology has, nevertheless, been forced to recognize that there are women who do not follow this strict pattern of mate selection; some choose to pursue what is referred to as a “short-term mating strategy,” a set of mating tactics whereby they may pursue casual sex (i.e., sex without a relationship or other emotional commitment) (Jackson & Kirkpatrick, 2007; Bradshaw, Kahn, & Saville, 2010). The mere existence of alternative mating strategies, however, is insufficient to dispel the theory that there are core, evolutionary differences between men and women’s amount of desire for and frequency of casual sex. According to Townsend (1995), though such women with a history of sex without commitment

## PERSONALITY, SEXUAL ATTITUDES, AND UNRESTRICTED WOMEN

(a.k.a., casual sex) exist, such women discover that they are working against their natural desires, feel used by their partners, and proceed to cease casual sex activity. From Townsend's viewpoint, no woman engaging in casual sex is truly a happy or healthy woman (1995; Clark, 2003).

The debate surrounding the male/female division in desire for casual sex as well as enactment of the behavior continues today. Recently, Conley, Moors, Matsick, Ziegler, and Valentine (2011) presented convincing evidence that no such gender gap in the desire for casual sex exists when two factors are eliminated. Conley et al. (2011) explain that when 1) women and men expect a partner to be particularly sexually skilled (i.e., rather than a stranger about whom they know nothing) and 2) the stigma attached to casual sex for women is eliminated (i.e., one does not have friends who will judge him or her for casual sex, etc.), women are as likely as men to accept casual sex offers. The issue of stigma is particularly crucial, as many women expressed concern about "slut-bashing" (i.e., criticism for casual sex or other behaviors considered "slutty") (Conley et al., 2011).

Despite the convincing nature of this evidence, recently, a rebuttal to Conley et al.'s argument was published (Schmitt, Jonason, Byrley, Flores, Illbeck, O'Leary, & Qudrat, 2012). In their rebuttal, Schmitt et al. (2012) argue that women who are interested in casual sex are only "temporarily" interested in it (e.g., for an affair outside of marriage). If they are "chronically" interested in casual sex, they argue, it must be due to extraneous environmental variables (e.g., few males available, assuming heterosexuality) or "insecure parent-child attachment" (Schmitt et al., 2012, p.138).

Current statistics on casual sex behavior appear to support Conley and colleagues' argument over Schmitt and colleagues' rebuttal; that is, contrary to what evolutionary

## PERSONALITY, SEXUAL ATTITUDES, AND UNRESTRICTED WOMEN

psychology would predict, many women are, in fact, motivated to explore mating strategies other than strict monogamy and may even do so for their own enjoyment. In fact, “hooking up” has become as popular, if not more so, than traditional dating on college campuses (Bradshaw et al., 2010). “Hooking up” usually involves sexual activity, although not necessarily sexual intercourse, with a stranger or acquaintance (Paul, McManus, & Hayes, 2000). If the scope is narrowed to “hooking up” in which casual sex is included, results that run contrary to evolutionary expectations are evident; over a third of women (36%) in a recent study report that they have had casual sex (Grello, Welsh, & Harper, 2006). In terms of enjoyment of casual sex, 57% of undergraduate age women in a recent study believed that a casual sex encounter would be “somewhat enjoyable;” if one looks strictly at those who had engaged in casual sex, the percentage that thought it would be “somewhat” or “very enjoyable” jumps to 76% (Weaver & Herold, 2000).

The question thus arises: why do some college-age women engage in casual sex while others do not have sex outside of a relationship context? Sociosexual orientation, the degree of willingness to have sex with a partner with whom one is not in a committed relationship, provides a partial explanation for this question (Simpson & Gangestad, 1991). In their 1991 paper on the development of the Sociosexual Orientation Inventory (SOI), Simpson and Gangestad describe two main types of sociosexual orientation: unrestricted and restricted. Although people with unrestricted sociosexual orientation are inclined to engage in casual sex (and thus have sex with a greater total number of partners over time), those with restricted sociosexual orientation desire romantic intimacy prior to sexual intercourse (Simpson & Gangestad, 1991). Presumably due to their willingness to have sex outside of relationships,

## PERSONALITY, SEXUAL ATTITUDES, AND UNRESTRICTED WOMEN

women of an unrestricted sociosexual orientation are more likely to have a high number of sexual partners than their restricted peers (Ostovich & Sabini, 2004).

Recently, this view of sociosexual orientation has been convincingly critiqued on the basis that attitudes do not always result in behavior; simply because a woman desires to have a great deal of casual sex (i.e., has “unrestricted” sociosexual attitudes), for example, she may not have had the opportunity to have numerous partners (“unrestricted” sociosexual behavior) and thus may not have acted on the attitude (Jackson & Kirkpatrick, 2007). It seems far more productive, thus, to view women as having “unrestricted” (or “restricted”) sociosexual attitudes and as engaging (or not) in casual sex behavior as separate variables rather than grouping them based on the original concept of total sociosexual orientation (Jackson & Kirkpatrick, 2007). Though it is important to understand women’s sociosexual attitudes and behaviors as “unrestricted” or “restricted,” this categorization conveys little concerning what women who possess these attitudes and display these behaviors are actually like as individuals. That is, if it is not a male-female difference that explains unrestricted sociosexual attitudes and casual sex behaviors, what type of person (in this case, woman) possesses unrestricted sociosexual attitudes and has casual sex?

### **Dominance-Feeling and Sociosexuality**

In his 1942 article, personality theorist Abraham Maslow attempted to tackle this complicated question. Maslow insisted that it was primarily personality variables rather than male-female differences that explained unrestricted sociosexual attitudes and behavior (1942). Maslow coined the terms “high dominance-feeling” and “low dominance-feeling” to describe the collection of personality correlates and other descriptors of people (in this study, women) who

## PERSONALITY, SEXUAL ATTITUDES, AND UNRESTRICTED WOMEN

display unrestricted and restricted sociosexual attitudes and behaviors (1942). “High dominance-feeling” women tend to have high self-esteem, be extroverted, be “less religious,” be more “masculine,” and act in unconventional ways (i.e., act with minimal regard for rules) (1942). “Low dominance-feeling” women, in contrast, are shy, introverted, usually have lower self-esteem, and are more traditional (Maslow, 1942). Maslow collected his data through interviews and his two part Social Personality Inventory to determine women’s dominance-feeling rating, masculinity, attitudes toward sex (“sex attitude,” i.e., essentially levels of inhibition concerning sex [p.285]), and other variables he felt could be correlated, including number of male sexual partners (1942).

Maslow’s 1942 findings were consistent with his theory of dominance-feeling. First, he found that having a higher number of male sexual partners was more prevalent in the high dominance-feeling group; the low dominance-feeling women were often virgins and less sexually open-minded (1942). Women who were “high dominance-feeling” were more unrestricted in their sexual behaviors – they enjoyed sex as an act itself, rather than thinking of it as purely a means of procreation (Maslow, 1942; Burney, 2007). Maslow categorized these women as “more masculine” (1942). “Low dominance-feeling” women, in contrast, were “more feminine” and found to be averse to the idea of sex, considering it disgusting or frightening and useful solely for procreative purposes or to maintain a relationship (Maslow, 1942; Burney, 2007). Maslow had just discovered, thus, a fascinating difference not only in the sexual behavior of high dominance and low dominance-feeling women, but also a difference in their attitudes toward sex itself (1942). Essentially, Maslow formulated the idea of individual differences in unrestricted sociosexual attitudes and behaviors long before the 21st Century.

## PERSONALITY, SEXUAL ATTITUDES, AND UNRESTRICTED WOMEN

Maslow's depiction of high dominance-feeling women as unrestricted in their attitudes and behaviors is consistent with current literature, which indicates that women with unrestricted sociosexual orientation (i.e., behaviors and attitudes) continue to have a higher number of lifetime partners and be more masculine than their unrestricted counterparts (Ostovich & Sabini, 2004). Maslow's research population was of a significantly different time period, having been published 70 years before the present study. Because Maslow's (1942) article has been ignored by contemporary researchers, it seems only logical to test Maslow's promising theory and scale (The Social Personality Inventory [SPI]), and thus the present research will explore the question: do Maslow's theory and SPI apply to and work with 21<sup>st</sup> century participants?

A recent study (Cheek, McCracken, Merrill, & Norem, 2012) serves as a promising pilot for this research. In Cheek et al.'s (2012) study, 105 female undergraduate students were recruited to complete the first section of the SPI, with 51 continuing on to complete the second section and an additional measure of sensation-seeking. Maslow's construct of Dominance-feeling (both in the short and long form) correlated significantly in this sample with the original sociosexual orientation inventory (SOI) (short form:  $r = 0.33, p < .01$ ; long form:  $r = 0.38, p < .01$ ), the Short Term Mating Orientation (STMO) subsection of the Expanded Multidimensional Sociosexual Orientation Inventory (EM-SOI) (i.e., essentially unrestricted sociosexual attitudes) (short form:  $r = 0.36, p < .01$ ; long form:  $r = 0.36, p < .05$ ), and the previous sexual behavior items from the EM-SOI (short form:  $r = 0.35, p < .01$ ; long form:  $r = 0.38, p < .05$ ) (Cheek et al., 2012; Jackson & Kirkpatrick, 2007). Given these promising results, the present research moved forward to expand upon this pilot with a larger sample size and additional measures of both sexuality and personality.

## PERSONALITY, SEXUAL ATTITUDES, AND UNRESTRICTED WOMEN

In addition to exploring the applicability of Maslow's theory of dominance-feeling and his personality scale to present-day participants, the following personality variables were selected for comparison with Maslow's personality measure based on their prevalence in present literature as correlates and explanations of women's unrestricted sociosexual attitudes and behaviors. These variables were: sensation-seeking (including sexual boredom), masculinity, self-esteem, dysthymia, the "Big 5" personality variables, and attachment style.

### **Sensation-Seeking and Sexual Boredom**

A variety of personality traits have been correlated with number of sexual partners and unrestricted sexual behaviors. Sensation-seeking can be defined as a dimension of personality characterized by "the need for varied, novel, and complex sensations and experiences and the willingness to take physical and social risks for the sake of such experiences" (Zuckerman, 1979a, p. 10, as cited in Hoyle, Stephenson, Palmgreen, Pugzles Lorch, & Donohew, 2002). Measures of sensation seeking have been the strongest, most consistent personality correlates of unrestricted sociosexual orientation in research conducted over the past twenty years (Cheek et al., 2012; Clark, 2003; Hoyle, Fejfar, & Miller, 2000).

Sexual boredom, a component of sexual sensation-seeking, refers to the degree to which one becomes bored easily with the sexual realm of his or her life (Watt & Ewing, 1996). Sexual boredom is positively correlated with total number of sexual partners throughout the lifetime, number of sexual partners in the past year, and unrestricted sociosexual attitudes toward casual sex (Watt & Ewing, 1996). Unsurprisingly, sexual boredom is also highly correlated with frequent "fantasizing about having sex with someone other than one's most current partner" (Watt & Ewing, p. 64). Taken together, these findings suggest that some women simply have

## PERSONALITY, SEXUAL ATTITUDES, AND UNRESTRICTED WOMEN

casual sex because they enjoy the sensory experience of sex but find they require new partners to gain this thrill (i.e., women may seek new sex partners for the possibility of orgasms). This theory is consistent with Maslow's finding that high dominance-feeling women enjoyed the act of sex itself far more than their low dominance counterparts and had a higher number of sexual partners (1942).

### **Masculinity**

Women who are high in masculinity (i.e., traits that are stereotypically male) (Helmreich, Spence, & Wilhelm, 1981) may also gain more opportunities to lose themselves in the pleasure of sex than their feminine counterparts. Recent studies show that women who have high levels of testosterone are more likely to be polyamorous than those who are low in testosterone (van Anders, Hamilton, & Watson, 2007). Women who are more masculine (e.g., more aggressive) also have been found to have less restricted sociosexual attitudes, a greater number of lifetime partners than their more feminine peers, and high self-esteem (Burnett, Anderson, Heppner, 1995; Ostovich & Sabini, 2004). These more "masculine" women who have a higher number of partners are not less valuable mates choices, based on evolutionary measures and participants and interviewer's ratings of attractiveness (Mikach & Bailey, 1999). In fact, in some measures, such as waist-to-hip ratio, reveal that more masculine women are of a higher mate value than their more feminine peers (Mikach & Bailey, 1999).

It seems that masculinity in women has early origins; a number of studies (e.g., Bailey, Dunne, & Martin, 2000) have used the concept of childhood gender nonconformity (i.e., behaving in a manner not traditionally characteristic of one's gender) to determine early enactment of "masculine" behaviors in women. Such behaviors include wishing one were male

## PERSONALITY, SEXUAL ATTITUDES, AND UNRESTRICTED WOMEN

and avoiding feminine clothing (Bailey, Finkel, Blackwelder, & Bailey, 1996). Women who were more masculine in their childhoods (i.e., behaved like “tomboys”) have been found 1) to appear (physically, and in their behavior) more “masculine” and 2) to have had a higher number of sex partners by age 25 than their feminine peers (Mikach & Bailey, 1999). This depiction of masculine, higher self-esteem women as more unrestricted in their attitudes and behaviors is consistent with Maslow’s conception of “high dominance-feeling” women, who he described as “masculine” (1942, p. 259).

It should be noted that, in the present study, the idea of masculinity was subdivided further into its positive and negative components (Helmreich, Spence, & Wilhelm, 1981). Negative masculinity includes traits and behaviors such as being “aggressive” while positive masculinity includes assets such as being “independent” (Spence, Helmreich, & Stapp, 1974). Both were measured in the present study to assess which type of masculinity to investigate which would best correlate with the masculinity referred to in Maslow’s conception of high dominance women and/or with women with unrestricted attitudes and behaviors (see Method section).

### **Self Esteem and Depressive Mood**

Self-esteem and depressive mood (or “dysthymia”) are important factors in the consideration of why some women may choose to engage in unrestricted sexual behavior while others do not. Both depression (and depressive symptoms) and low self-esteem have been correlated with casual sex (Bradshaw et al., 2010; Paul et al., 2000). In particular, adolescent dysthymia has been correlated with unrestricted attitudes and behaviors (Grello, Welsh, & Harper, 2006 as cited in Monahan & Lee, 2008). This combination of low-self esteem and depressive mood runs contrary to the “high dominance-feeling” woman that Maslow depicts

## PERSONALITY, SEXUAL ATTITUDES, AND UNRESTRICTED WOMEN

(1942). Interestingly, high-self esteem, a main component of Maslow's description of "high dominance-feeling" (1942) has likewise been correlated with a higher number of partners (Walsh, 1991). Furthermore, a recent study indicates that there is actually little evidence for a solid link between depressive symptoms and casual sex in adolescence (Monahan & Lee, 2008). Nevertheless, there is a definitive disagreement in the literature concerning the precise role of self-esteem and depressive symptomology (in particular, during adolescence) in unrestricted behavior and attitudes. It is likely that mitigating factors allow both sides to be true; perhaps, for example, women with high self-esteem and low self-esteem do both pursue casual sex, but with different motivations in mind.

Self-esteem and depressive symptoms may also effect how women react to their casual sex experiences. Women report rather mixed experiences with casual sex; although some find the experience pleasurable and worthwhile, others report dissatisfaction with the course of events, including guilt in the aftermath (Paul & Hayes, 2002; Bradshaw et al., 2010). A recent study reports that casual sex may also exacerbate depressive symptoms due to feelings of shame over being a "slut" in the aftermath of "hooking up" (Bradshaw et al., 2010). This impact of casual sex on self-esteem and depression can be explained by cultural norms; Perlman found that high self-esteem was associated with both restricted and unrestricted sexual behaviors depending upon the cultural norms of one's environment (i.e., whether one was surrounded by conservative or liberal attitudes concerning unrestricted sociosexual behavior) (1974). Furthermore, in an environment of moderate attitudes concerning unrestricted sociosexual behavior, the relationship between self-esteem and unrestricted sociosexual attitudes was not significant, indicating that self-esteem's relationship with unrestricted sociosexual behavior can be immensely influenced by external factors such as cultural norms (Perlman, 1974). Conley et al. (2011) reinforce this

point with the recent finding that, when stigma was eliminated and sexual prowess of potential mate was promising, women were as interested in casual sex as men; this indicates that it is the fear of slut-shaming (and the experience of it, internally or from external sources, in the aftermath) that truly causes a blow to women's self-esteem and emotional state.

### **“Big 5” and Other Personality Variables**

The “Big Five” consists of the following five personality traits: extraversion, agreeableness, conscientiousness, neuroticism, and openness. Past research on the “Big Five” has shown that low agreeableness is consistently correlated with casual sex, among other risky sexual behaviors (Hill, 2008). It has been hypothesized that low agreeableness is correlated with high-risk sexual behaviors because people who are low in agreeableness may care less about putting others at risk through such risky sexual activity (Hill, 2008). In a recent study, agreeableness, extraversion and interpersonal dominance were correlated with unrestricted sociosexual behavior, while moderate interpersonal warmth was correlated with fewer sexual partners (Schmitt, 2004). Agreeableness and conscientiousness in this study, however, only weakly correlated with unrestricted sociosexual behavior (Schmitt, 2004).

The effect of shyness on unrestricted sociosexual behavior is particularly intriguing. Given the positive effect of extraversion on number of lifetime partners, one might hypothesize that even if some shy people possess unrestricted sociosexual attitudes, they would be too inhibited to act upon them. In one recent study, shyness had a near zero correlation with number of partners over the past six months and with unrestricted sociosexual attitudes (Cheek, Clark, & Akert, 2004). Shyness did, however, negatively impact factors such as self-esteem; it is unsurprising, thus, that shy women who did have casual sex often did so as a means to validate

## PERSONALITY, SEXUAL ATTITUDES, AND UNRESTRICTED WOMEN

themselves as worthwhile (Cheek et al., 2004). This finding concerning shyness and casual sex is particularly interesting given that it runs contrary to Maslow's theory; his description of low dominance women includes shyness as key trait (1942). Shyness, in addition to the "Big Five" personality traits, thus, certainly merit further exploration in the present study.

### **Attachment Style**

Recently, Schmitt et al. (2012) made the bold claim that many women who engage in casual sex chronically likely had an insecure attachment to their parents. Their claim is not without basis; attachment styles have previously been proposed as an important predictor of comfort with sexual intimacy and relationships (Feeney & Noller, 1990). In their 1990 study, Feeney and Noller found a strong relationship between attachment style and self-esteem, reporting that securely attached individuals scored the highest on self-esteem measures. Self-esteem was also negatively correlated with love addiction (i.e., obsessive desire for love and connection to a partner) (Feeney & Noller, 1990).

Bartholomew and Horowitz (1991) further developed the models of adult attachment used previously, proposing four attachment types based on a low/high levels of "dependence" (need for others' approval to determine self-worth) and low/high levels of avoidance (perceived trustworthiness of others). The four attachment types proposed were: secure (low dependence on others for a sense of self-worth, low avoidance of others), preoccupied (high dependence, low avoidance), dismissing (low dependence, high avoidance), and fearful (high dependence, high avoidance) (Bartholomew & Horowitz, 1991). Based on the proposed attachment styles and data on self-esteem, it is most likely that unrestricted women would be of the attachment type associated with highest self-esteem: secure (Bartholomew & Horowitz, 1991). Women of the

## PERSONALITY, SEXUAL ATTITUDES, AND UNRESTRICTED WOMEN

dismissing subtype, however, are also likely to be of the unrestricted sociosexual orientation, as they depend little on others for their own self-worth (indicating high self-esteem), but are wary of forming close, long-lasting bonds. Neither of these two subtypes of women would be likely to suffer from love addiction because, based on their secure sense of self-worth, they would not find it necessary to devote themselves to another person to an unhealthy degree. It should be noted that neither of these subtypes are of the “insecure” attachment type proposed by Schmitt et al., (2012, p.138) because the independence and self-esteem that is characteristic of high dominance-feeling women is inconsistent with the anxiously insecure attachment types. Such independence is, however, consistent with Maslow’s depiction of high dominance-feeling women.

In addition to the personality characteristics reviewed, it is recognized in the research literature that a number of variables (e.g. religiosity, body image, ethnicity, acculturation) that are not explored in the present results may contribute to variance seen in unrestricted sociosexual attitudes and behaviors (Ahrold, Farmer, Trapnell, & Meston, 2011; Meston & Ahrold, 2010; Pujols, Meston, & Seal, 2010). These variables are listed and described in further detail in the “measures not included in present results” subsection of the following method section, but none of them will be analyzed until a much larger sample of participants has completed the survey.

The present study focused on the exploration of two main questions:

- 1) Do Maslow’s construct of dominance-feeling and Social Personality Inventory (SPI) apply to and work with 21<sup>st</sup> century college women?
- 2) How does Maslow’s construct of dominance-feeling and the SPI compare with the main present-day theories concerning the sources of unrestricted attitudes and behaviors? Does it correlate with unrestricted attitudes and behavior more

## PERSONALITY, SEXUAL ATTITUDES, AND UNRESTRICTED WOMEN

or less than other measures and their associated constructs (e.g., sensation-seeking)?

Concerning question one, it was hypothesized, based in particular on the aforementioned promising results of Cheek et al.'s 2012 pilot study, that both the construct of dominance-feeling and Maslow's scale would apply to and work with 21<sup>st</sup> Century participants. In considering the second question, it was hypothesized that dominance-feeling would trump the other proposed theories as a correlate of and explanation of unrestricted attitudes and behaviors.

### **Method**

#### **Subjects and Procedure**

Ninety-one Wellesley College students who were the first to respond to posted advertisements participated in this study. Of these participants, 89 provided data sufficiently complete for analysis. The entire senior class was e-mailed (i.e., each received personal recruitment emails) advertising a \$10 payment for participation in the study. Facebook and College-based Google groups were also used to advertise the study, and e-mails were sent to students in the Psychology Department's research participation pool, all but the first of which specified that participants must be age 21 or older. A Survey Monkey computer file containing 18 questionnaires was administered to the participants, who had an hour to complete the survey. Students were assured that their responses would be entered into a computer data file without their names or any ID number being included.

#### **Materials**

##### **Measures of Criterion Sex Variables.**

##### *Attitudes.*

## PERSONALITY, SEXUAL ATTITUDES, AND UNRESTRICTED WOMEN

Long-term and short-term mating strategies were measured through the 34-item version of the Expanded Multidimensional Sociosexual Orientation Inventory (EM-SOI; Jackson & Kirkpatrick, 2007). The EM-SOI was developed to assess short-term mating attitudes, long-term mating attitudes, and sexual behavior separately, providing a distinct advantage from the original Sociosexual Orientation Inventory (SOI), which did not directly assess long-term mating attitudes and combined short-term attitudes and behavior into a single 7-item scale score (Simpson & Gangestad, 1991). The first section of the EM-SOI, which is comprised of 20 questions, focuses on two psychological constructs: first, attitudes concerning sex without commitment scored as the 10-item short-term mating orientation (STMO) scale ( $\alpha = .95$ ) and secondly, attitudes toward a committed, long-term romantic relationship scored as the 7-item long-term mating orientation (LTMO) scale ( $\alpha = .88$ ) (Jackson & Kirkpatrick, 2007, as modified by Cheek, McCracken, Merrill, & Norem et al., 2012). Items from the STMO section include statements such as, “Sex without love is OK” and “I believe in taking sexual opportunities when I find them” (rated from one [strongly disagree] to seven [strongly agree]); items from the LTMO section include statements such as, “I can see myself settling down romantically with one special person” and “I am interested in maintaining a long-term romantic relationship with someone special” (using the same rating system as the STMO section) (Jackson & Kirkpatrick, 2007).

### ***Behavior.***

The EM-SOI and Clark’s supplemental sexuality questions also contain items that measure past and predicted future sexual behavior (i.e., separate from those concerning STMO and LTMO attitudes). In the EM-SOI, 3 self-report items are scored as the Previous Sexual Behavior scale ( $\alpha = .83$ ) which are: 1) “During your entire life, with how many partners of the

## PERSONALITY, SEXUAL ATTITUDES, AND UNRESTRICTED WOMEN

opposite sex have you had sexual intercourse?”, 2) “With how many partners of the opposite sex have you had sexual intercourse within the past year?” and 3) “With how many partners of the opposite sex have you had sex on one and only one occasion?” (Jackson & Kirkpatrick, 2007). An additional item concerning future behavior is also included, “With how many partners of the opposite sex do you see foresee having sexual intercourse during the next five years?” which is one of Simpson and Gangestad’s (1991) original SOI items but was not scored on any scale of the EM-SOI by Jackson and Kirkpatrick (2007). Items 1-3 were referred to as “Previous Sexual Behavior with Males” in the present study due to their specific wording about opposite sex partners (i.e., heterosexual focus).

Additional items from Clark’s supplemental sexuality questions were added to the EM-SOI and to their own added section to further gauge past and future sex without commitment and to include same sex behavior. These questions were: 1) “During your entire life, with how many partners of the same sex have you had sexual intercourse?”, 2) “With how many partners of the same sex have you had sexual intercourse within the past year?”, 3) “With how many partners of the same sex have you had sex on one and only one occasion?”, 4) “What is the shortest period of time you have known someone before having sex with him or her?” (rated on a 6-point scale from “less than a day” to “three months or more” with an added “Not applicable” option), 5) “On how many occasions have you had sex with two or more people on one day at different times (i.e., not group sex)?” (rated on a 5-point scale from “never” to “four times or more”), 6) “What is the greatest number of sexual partners you have ever had in one day?”, 7) “With how many partners of the same sex do you foresee having sexual intercourse during the next 5 years?” Item numbers 1-3 were used to calculate a variable we called “Previous Sexual Behavior with Females” (i.e., the same sex equivalent of the Previous Sexual Behavior scale of EM-SOI).

## PERSONALITY, SEXUAL ATTITUDES, AND UNRESTRICTED WOMEN

Items 4-6 (added to Previous Sexual Behavior with Males and Previous Sexual Behavior with Females) were used to calculate “Previous Sexual Behavior Total” – i.e., a compilation of items concerning past sexual behavior that do not specify male or female partners. Item 7 was used in the calculation of participants’ scores on the original SOI.

In order to gauge people’s sexual orientation and degree of sexual fluidity accurately, a modified version of the Modified Kinsey Sexual Orientation Continuum Scale (MKSOCs) was administered (Merrill, Staffaroni, & Cheek, 2011; Kinsey, Pomeroy, & Martin, 1948). The new addition to this scale was the first item, in which participants were given the opportunity to simply self-identify their own sexual orientation. In the second item, participants were asked to rate themselves on a 7- point scale from “exclusively heterosexual” to “exclusively homosexual” (with an additional “other” option) (Merrill, Staffaroni, & Cheek, 2011; Kinsey, Pomeroy, & Martin, 1948).

To measure sex drive, four items from Clark’s supplemental sexuality questions items were fused with Sex-Drive Questionnaire (SDQ) ( $\alpha = .82$  for women) (Ostovich, 2004). Two additional items from Clark’s supplemental sexuality questions were also directed toward measuring sex drive. Participants’ level of sexual desire, thus, was measured through the following six items: 1) “How frequently do you think about sex?” (rated on a 9-point scale from “virtually never” to “almost all of the time”), 2) “Do you consider yourself to be a sexual person?” (rated from “not at all a sexual person” to “a highly sexual person” on a 5-point scale), 3) “How often do you experience sexual desire?” (rated on a 7-point scale from “never” to “several times a day”), 4) “How would you compare your level of sex drive with that of the average person of your gender and age?” (rated from “very much lower” to “very much greater” on a 7-point scale), 5) “On average, over the past 6 months, how often have you masturbated?”

## PERSONALITY, SEXUAL ATTITUDES, AND UNRESTRICTED WOMEN

(rated from “never” to “at least once a day” on a 8-point scale), and 6) “On average, over the past 6 months, how often have you had an orgasm (from sex or masturbating)?” (rated on the same scale) (Clark, 2003; Ostovich, 2004). The added items from Clark’s scale are numbers 1 and 2.

### **Personality Measures.**

In order to test the hypothesis that Maslow’s concept of “dominance-feeling” influences sexual attitudes and behavior, the “Social Personality Inventory” was administered (reliabilities for the two parts,  $r = .90$  and  $.88$  respectively) (Maslow, 1942). The inventory was modified for the present participants to include counter-balance items for questions strictly about men (e.g., “How do you prefer a man to be dressed?” balanced with “How do you prefer a woman to be dressed?”). The measure consists of 61 items total (i.e., parts one and two combined) such as, “What is your attitude toward women who often disregard the usual social, moral, or ethical conventions?” which is rated on a scale from “dislike very much” to “like very much” (Maslow, 1942). The second half of the measure includes statements such as “Making up your own mind” which the participants rate from “dislike very much” to “like very much” (Maslow, 1942).

To compare some of the more contemporary personality correlates and predictors of sex without commitment to Maslow’s theory of dominance-feeling, three measures were administered. First, sensation-seeking was tested. To measure sensation-seeking, a 13-item combined version of the 5-item sensation-seeking subscale of the Emotionality, Activity, Sociability, and Impulsivity (EASI) ( $\alpha = .64$ ; Clark, 2003) and the 8-item Brief Sensation Seeking Scale (BSSS) was administered ( $\alpha = 0.74$ ) (Buss & Plomin, 1975; Hoyle, Stephenson, Palmgreen, Lorch, & Donohew, 2002). Items from the combined measure were rated by participants on a 5-point scale from “very uncharacteristic or untrue, strongly disagree” to “very

## PERSONALITY, SEXUAL ATTITUDES, AND UNRESTRICTED WOMEN

characteristic or true, strongly agree” and include items such as, “I generally seek new and exciting experiences and sensations” (Buss & Plomin, 1975; Hoyle et al., 2002).

Sexual boredom (a sub-construct of sexual sensation-seeking), can certainly motivate one to have more sexual partners and/or engage in more casual sex (Watt & Ewing, 1996). To determine participants’ levels of sexual boredom (i.e., the degree to which one becomes bored easily with the sexual realm of his or her life), the Sexual Boredom Scale (SBS) was administered ( $\alpha = .90$  for sexual monotony,  $.85$  for sexual stimulation) (Watt & Ewing, 1996). This 18-item scale was developed by Watt & Ewing and includes items such as “Sex with the same partner can become tiresome over time” (1996). Participants rated their level of agreement to the statements on a scale from one (highly disagree) to seven (highly agree) (Watt & Ewing, 1996).

Second, to evaluate the relative contribution of masculinity and/or masculinization to unrestricted sexual attitudes and behavior, the Childhood Gender Nonconformity (CGN) scale for Women was administered ( $\alpha = .79$ ; Bailey et al., 1996). Participants rated the degree to which, on a 7-point scale from “strongly agree” to “strongly disagree,” items described their childhood accurately. Items included descriptions such as “As a child I preferred playing with boys rather than girls” and “As a child I usually avoided feminine clothing such as dresses” (Bailey et al., 1996). The order of two items on the original scale (2 and 7) was switched to avoid the original, seemingly abrupt placement of 2 (originally, “As a child I sometimes wished I had been born as a boy rather than a girl”) (Bailey et al., 1996).

Psychological masculinity as a sex role orientation also has been proposed as an explanation for unrestricted attitudes and sex without commitment among women. The Extended Personal Attributes Questionnaire (E-PAQ) was administered for its Positive and

## PERSONALITY, SEXUAL ATTITUDES, AND UNRESTRICTED WOMEN

Negative Masculinity subscales ( $\alpha = .76$  and  $.79$  respectively) (Spence, Helmreich, & Stapp, 1974; Clark, 2003). In the present study, the items from this questionnaire were reconfigured into short descriptive statements, which were rated based on the degree to which the participant felt the statement described him or her on a 5-point scale from “not at all” to “extremely” (Spence, Helmreich, & Stapp, 1974). The 8-item Positive Masculinity subscale and 8-item Negative Masculinity contained items such as “competitive” and “arrogant,” respectively.

Adolescent dysthymia has also been proposed as an important influence in sex without commitment. In order to measure past depressive mood during adolescence (in this case, 13-17 years old was specified), the Short Depression Happiness Scale (SDHS) was administered ( $\alpha = .86$ ) (Joseph, Linley, Harwood, Lewis, & McCollam, 2004). Participants rated their levels of dysthymia during adolescence by rating statements such as “I felt dissatisfied with my life” and “I felt cheerless” on a 4-point scale from “Never” to “Often” (Joseph et al., 2004). An additional item in the background items section also inquired as to level of happiness of the participant’s childhood (Cheek, Bourgeois, Theran, Grimes, & Norem, 2009).

Self-esteem has been proposed for many years as a motivation for women to choose whether or not they engage in sex without commitment, with even Maslow proposing self-esteem playing a key role in dominance-feeling (1940, 1942). Using the 7-item Self-Regard subscale of the Self-Rating Scale ( $\alpha = .82$ ) (Fleming & Courtney, 1984), items such as “How confident do you feel that someday the people you know will look up to you and respect you?” were posed to participants. Items were rated on a 5-point scale that varied on a per-item basis. The Self-Regard measure correlated  $.78$  with Rosenberg’s Self-Esteem Scale, leading the authors to conclude that “that both are measures of the same construct” (Fleming & Courtney, 1984, p. 415).

## PERSONALITY, SEXUAL ATTITUDES, AND UNRESTRICTED WOMEN

Levels of shyness may also lead women to accrue more or less casual sexual experience based on the number of opportunities available due to their inhibitions (or lack thereof). The Revised Cheek and Buss Shyness Scale (RCBS) was inserted within the SRS, thus, to assess participants' levels of shyness ( $\alpha = .90$ ) (Cheek, 1983). Items included, "I am more shy with members of the opposite sex" and "I am socially somewhat awkward" which were rated on a 5-point scale from "very uncharacteristic or untrue, strongly disagree" to "very characteristic or true, strongly agree" (Cheek, 1983).

To determine the additional personality correlates associated with unrestricted sociosexual attitudes and casual sex, the 44-item version of the Big Five Inventory (BFI) was administered (extraversion subscale,  $\alpha = .88$ ; agreeableness subscale,  $\alpha = .75$ ; conscientiousness subscale,  $\alpha = .81$ ; neuroticism subscale,  $\alpha = .83$ ; openness subscale,  $\alpha = .83$ ; John, Donahue, & Kentle, 1991). The "Big 5" or "Five Factor Model" measures if one is high or low on the following five personality traits: openness, conscientiousness, extraversion, agreeableness, and neuroticism (a.k.a., negative affectivity) (Hill, 2008; John, Donahue, & Kentle, 1991). Someone who scores on the low end of openness, for example, would appear "unadventurous," while one who is on the high end of the spectrum tends seek out new experiences (Hill, 2008). Using the BFI, participants rated if the provided statement (e.g., "is talkative," "is reserved") applied to her on a 5-point scale ranging from "disagree strongly" to "agree strongly" (John, Donahue, & Kentle, 1991).

To explore the impact of attachment style on sexual attitudes and behavior, descriptions of attachment styles from Bartholomew and Horowitz's 1991 paper were used. The four attachment styles described were secure, preoccupied, fearful-avoidant, and dismissive-avoidant. Correlations between the attachment descriptions (i.e., attachments styles of participants as rated

## PERSONALITY, SEXUAL ATTITUDES, AND UNRESTRICTED WOMEN

by interviewers), self-ratings of attachment indicators, and ratings by friends were high in previous research, indicating high construct and convergent validity (Bartholomew & Horowitz, 1991). In the present study, participants chose the description that they felt fit them best in the first section (i.e., which consisted of one multiple-choice item) and, in the second section, rated the degree to which they felt each description described them accurately in 4 items (Bartholomew & Horowitz, 1991). The following is an example one such description, which describes the fearful-avoidant style: “I am uncomfortable getting close to others. I want emotionally close relationships, but I find it difficult to trust others completely or to depend on them. I worry that I will be hurt if I allow myself to become close to others” (Bartholomew & Horowitz, 1991).

Finally, two additional demographic items were asked to assess the diversity of the participants. Participants were asked to report their ethnic background from a multiple-choice list of options (including an “other [please specify]” option) as well as their current age for this purpose.

### **Measures Not Included in Present Results.**

Because body image has also been hypothesized as a key factor in sexual attitudes and behavior, body image was assessed using the 5 most predictive items from the Physical Appearance section of Fleming and Courtney’s Self-Rating Scale ( $\alpha = .82$ ) (1984). Items administered included, “How confident are you that others see you as being physically appealing?” and “Do you often wish or fantasize that you were better looking?” (Fleming & Courtney, 1984). Items were rated on a 5-point scale from “never” to “always” with the exception of the previously stated question concerning confidence, which was rated from “not at all confident” to “very confident” (Fleming & Courtney, 1984). In addition to this measure,

## PERSONALITY, SEXUAL ATTITUDES, AND UNRESTRICTED WOMEN

participants reported their height and weight in the background information section to calculate Body Mass Index (BMI).

Religiosity can also effect one's decision to engage in casual sex or not. To gage the effect of religiosity on unrestricted attitudes and engaging in casual sex, the ARIS (Intrinsic Scale of the Allport Ross) was administered (Allport & Ross, 1967). The survey includes 20 items, such as, "I try hard to carry my religion over into all other dealings in life" which are rated on a scale from one (strongly agree) to five (strongly disagree) (Allport & Ross, 1967). Minor modifications were made to one item for ease of comprehension and minimization of potential offending of participants (this item was item 6, "If I were to join a religious group I would prefer to join...") (Allport & Ross, 1967).

Because of the previously discussed effect of culture on casual sex behavior, acculturation was measured in the present study. To measure the effect of acculturation on sexual behavior and attitudes, the Vancouver Index of Acculturation (VIA) was administered ( $\alpha = .79$  for heritage subscale,  $.75$  for mainstream subscale) (Ryder, Alden, & Paulhus, 2000). The scale consists of 20 items, which are rated on a 9-point scale from "strongly disagree" to "strongly agree." Items include, "I often participate in my heritage culture traditions" and "I enjoy social activities with typical North American people" (Ryder, Alden, & Paulhus, 2000).

Clark's supplemental questions were used to assess self-evaluation of one's sexuality (2003). The items used to explore this evaluation were: 1) "How do you feel about the amount of sexual experience you have had so far?" (rated on a 5-point scale from "I wish I had a lot less sexual experience" to "I wish I had a lot more sexual experience"), 2) "What do you feel is the ideal amount of sexual experience for a woman your age?" (with two response boxes labeled "Number of male partners so far" and "Number of female partners so far") 3) "Concerning my

## PERSONALITY, SEXUAL ATTITUDES, AND UNRESTRICTED WOMEN

sexuality and sex life I consider myself:" (followed by a 7-point rating scale from "extremely unhappy" to "extremely happy"), 4) "Concerning my sexual attitudes and behavior, I wish I was:" (followed by a 5-point rating scale from "much less inhibited" to "much more inhibited"), 5) "How would you rate your sexual experiences on a scale from 1 to 7?" (rated from "I much less experienced than most women my age" to "I am much more experienced than most women my age") (Clark, 2003).

Women may also seek out more casual sex opportunities purely for the thrill of orgasm. In particular, women who are classified as "easily orgasmic" (i.e., those who reach orgasm more easily) may be more likely to seek out casual sex opportunities and thus were measured using items from Clark's supplemental questions concerning ease of orgasm, including merged items from the SDQ (Ostovich, 2004; Clark, 2003). The following four items were asked to assess ease of orgasm: 1) "On average, over the past 6 months, how often have you had an orgasm (from sex and/or masturbation)?" (rated from "Never" to "At least once a day" on a 8-point scale), 2) "How easily do you become sexually aroused? (in a sexual situation you are comfortable in)?" (rated on a 5-point scale from "very difficulty, slowly" to "very easily or quickly"), 3) "When masturbating, how often do you achieve orgasm?" (rated from "never" to "always" on an 4-point scale with a not applicable option), 4) "When having sexual relations with a partner, how often do you achieve orgasm?" (rated from "never" to "almost always more than once" on an 8-point scale) and 5) "Have you ever used sex toys such as a vibrator or other objects?" (response options were "yes" or "no") (Clark, 2003).

The following two additional items concerning sexual behavior were asked to understand the context of casual sex behavior and frequency of sexual behavior in a relationship context: 1) "During the time you have been (or were) dating your current or most recent dating partner, have

## PERSONALITY, SEXUAL ATTITUDES, AND UNRESTRICTED WOMEN

(or did) you engage in sex with anyone else?” (responses were selected from “yes,” “no,” and “Never been in a relationship”) and 2) “On average, over the past 6 months, how often have you had sex with a partner?” (rated from “never” to “at least once a day” on a 8-point scale) (Clark, 2003).

To understand the specific motives behind why women may have sex (casual or otherwise), a modified version of the Reasons for Sex was administered (Clark 2003; Hill & Preston, 1996; Meston & Buss, 2007). Each reason is ranked based on the frequency with which it is the participant’s motive for engaging in sexual activity (i.e., from “always” to “never” on a 7-point scale). Items include, “Procreating, wanting to have children” and “Pleasure, excitement, physical thrill” (Clark 2003; Hill & Preston, 1996; Meston & Buss, 2007).

A number of additional measures were added to enrich future explanations of why women choose to engage in casual sex or not. To provide greater depth to this explanation, goal orientations (validation seeking vs. growth seeking) of the participants were determined using an 18-item version of the Goal Orientation Index (GOI) ( $\alpha = .97$  for Validation-Seeking subscale and  $.96$  for Growth-Seeking subscale) (Dykman, 1998) as modified by Ward (2000).

Participants rated the degree to which statements such as, “When I’m faced with difficult or stressful intimate dating situations, I’m likely to view it as an opportunity to learn and grow” on a scale of one (strongly disagree) to seven (strongly agree) (Ward, 2000; Dykman, 1998).

First time sexual behaviors were also important to measure as an indicator of precocity. To this end, the First Time section (FT) of Clark’s (2003) supplemental sexuality questions was administered. The FT contains a total of 9 items, 4 items four of which inquire about first experience of sexual contact, sexual caress, oral sex, and sexual intercourse with a male and/or female (Clark, 2003). Participants entered their age of these first experiences in separate text

## PERSONALITY, SEXUAL ATTITUDES, AND UNRESTRICTED WOMEN

boxes for male partners and female partners. The other 5 items are: 1) “At what age did you first become aware of sex and sexuality?”, 2) “At what age did you first start having daydreams about relationships with boys?”, 3) “At what age did you first start having daydreams about relationships with girls?”, 4) “At what age did you first start thinking of yourself as a sexual person?” and 5) “At what age did you first begin masturbating?”

The final section of the survey inquired about gender identity (with the options “female,” “male,” “transitioning female to male,” “transitioning male to female,” or “other”) in order to better understand the participants’ backgrounds and how this might affect sexual orientation responses. Three additional important background variables concerning age were also measured in the background information section. These items were age when college started, age of menarche, and whether or not the participant was currently on a depression medication. Age and age at the beginning of college were relevant to calculations of items concerning number of sexual partners and other sexual behaviors before and after college. Age of menarche was relevant to gage pubertal onset and for analyses concerning precocity. The depression medication was used to determine if participants’ depressive symptomology was at the clinical level, which could effect, for example, libido.

## Results

### **Demographic information.**

Of the original 91 participants, 89 were analyzed; the data of 3 participants were not used because large sections were missing. The mean age of the participants was 21.4 with an age range of 18-23; 70 of the 89 participants were between 21 and 22. Over half (48 participants, 53.9%) of the participants identified as white/Caucasian. The remaining identified as: Hispanic

## PERSONALITY, SEXUAL ATTITUDES, AND UNRESTRICTED WOMEN

(8), Asian (18), Black/African-American (9), and Indian/South Asian (1). Five participants chose not to identify their ethnic background or identified themselves as “other.” The sexual orientation of our participants was of a predominately heterosexual tilt; 67 participants identified within the range of “exclusively heterosexual” and “predominately heterosexual, but more than incidentally homosexual.” An additional 6 participants identified as “equally heterosexual and homosexual” (i.e., bisexual) with the remaining 15 identifying between “predominately homosexual, but more than incidentally heterosexual” and “exclusively homosexual.” One participant identified as “asexual.” Given the heterosexual tilt of our sample, a strong emphasis was placed on analyzing the heterosexual sexual behavior of the present sample.

### **Measures of Criterion Sex Variables.**

#### *Attitudes and Behaviors Measured Together.*

Participants’ mean score for the original SOI, STMO, LTMO, and Previous Sexual Behaviors with Males (i.e., the original past behavior items of the EM-SOI) were 59.99 ( $SD = 34.79$ ), 3.78 ( $SD = 1.58$ ), 6.16 ( $SD = .90$ ), and 1.94 ( $SD = 2.52$ ) respectively. The mean scores for the original participants on the original SOI, STMO, LTMO, and Previous Sexual Behavior with Males were 38.90 ( $SD = 26.9$ ), 2.67 ( $SD = 1.42$ ), 6.31 ( $SD = .86$ ), and 1.98 ( $SD = 3.60$ ) (Simpson & Gangestad, 1991; Jackson & Kirkpatrick, 2007).

#### *Correlations Among Sex Measures.*

##### *Attitudes.*

The correlations among the sex measures are presented in Table 1. Measures of the Original SOI, STMO, and LTMO were found to be highly reliable ( $\alpha = .79, .94, \text{ and } .89$ , respectively). STMO had the strongest significant positive correlation with the original version of the SOI

## PERSONALITY, SEXUAL ATTITUDES, AND UNRESTRICTED WOMEN

(a.k.a., “Original SOI”) ( $r = .78, p < .01$ ). STMO was also significantly positively correlated with Previous Sexual Behavior with Males ( $r = .45, p < .01$ ), Previous Sexual Behavior with Females ( $r = .31, p < .01$ ), Previous Sexual Behavior – Total ( $r = .57, p < .01$ ), as well as sex drive ( $r = .46, p < .01$ ). Consistent with Jackson and Kirkpatrick’s findings (2007), STMO was negatively correlated with LTMO. LTMO was also significantly negatively correlated with the original SOI ( $r = -.30, p < .01$ ). All other correlations with LTMO were not significant. Not shown in Table 1 is the correlation between the sex measures and the happy childhood item asked, for which there were no significant correlations.

### *Behavior.*

Measures of Previous Sexual Behavior with Males, Previous Sexual Behavior with Females, Previous Sexual Behavior – Total, and sex drive were all found to have high reliability ( $\alpha = .81, .72, .79$ , and  $.85$  respectively). Previous Sexual Behavior with Males was significantly positively correlated with Previous Sexual Behavior – Total ( $r = .92, p < .01$ ) and with sex drive ( $r = .31, p < .01$ ). Previous Sexual Behavior with Females, in contrast, was not significantly correlated with sex drive; it was, however, significantly correlated with Previous Sexual Behavior – Total ( $r = .46, p < .01$ ). Sex drive was significantly, positively correlated with the Original SOI ( $r = .42, p < .01$ ) (see Table 1).

### **Personality Measures.**

#### *Correlations among Personality Measures.*

Table 2 presents the correlations among all personality scales except for the “Big 5.” All scales were found to be highly reliable, with Cronbach’s  $\alpha$  ranging from  $.74$  to  $.91$  (see Table 2 for exact values). Dominance feeling was significantly, positively correlated with all scales except for Shyness (for which it had a significant negative correlation [ $r = -.45, p < .01$ ]) and

Table 1.  
*Correlations Among Sex Measures.*

|                                       | Original SOI | Short Term Mating Orientation | Previous Sexual Behavior with Males | Previous Sexual Behavior with Females | Previous Sexual Behavior – Total | Sex Drive | Long-Term Mating Orientation |
|---------------------------------------|--------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|----------------------------------|-----------|------------------------------|
| Original SOI                          | (.79)        |                               |                                     |                                       |                                  |           |                              |
| Short Term Mating Orientation         | .78**        | (.94)                         |                                     |                                       |                                  |           |                              |
| Previous Sexual Behavior with Males   | .75**        | .45**                         | (.81)                               |                                       |                                  |           |                              |
| Previous Sexual Behavior with Females | .44**        | .31**                         | .12                                 | (.72)                                 |                                  |           |                              |
| Previous Sexual Behavior – Total      | .84**        | .57**                         | .92**                               | .46**                                 | (.79)                            |           |                              |
| Sex Drive                             | .42**        | .46**                         | .31**                               | .15                                   | .38**                            | (.85)     |                              |
| Long-Term Mating Orientation          | -.30**       | -.36**                        | -.04                                | -.12                                  | -.05                             | .13       | (.89)                        |

Note: Numbers in parentheses are alpha coefficients of internal consistency reliability for each scale.

N = 89.

\*\* $p < .01$

PERSONALITY, SEXUAL ATTITUDES, AND UNRESTRICTED WOMEN

Table 2.  
Correlations Among Non-“Big 5” Personality Scales.

|                             | Dominance-Feeling | Sensation Seeking Scale | Sexual Boredom Scale | Childhood Gender Nonconform | Positive Masculinity | Negative Masculinity | Dysthymia | Self-Esteem | Shyness |
|-----------------------------|-------------------|-------------------------|----------------------|-----------------------------|----------------------|----------------------|-----------|-------------|---------|
| Dominance-Feeling           | (.80)             |                         |                      |                             |                      |                      |           |             |         |
| Sensation Seeking Scale     | .45**             | (.82)                   |                      |                             |                      |                      |           |             |         |
| Sexual Boredom Scale        | .34**             | .24*                    | (.90)                |                             |                      |                      |           |             |         |
| Childhood Gender Nonconform | .30**             | .33**                   | .08                  | (.88)                       |                      |                      |           |             |         |
| Positive Masculinity        | .60**             | .37**                   | .10                  | .19                         | (.74)                |                      |           |             |         |
| Negative Masculinity        | .46**             | .12                     | .28**                | .18                         | .15                  | (.78)                |           |             |         |
| Dysthymia                   | -.11              | -.120                   | .15                  | .01                         | -.42**               | -.00                 | (.91)     |             |         |
| Self-Esteem                 | .33**             | .063                    | -.04                 | .06                         | .70**                | .07                  | -.57**    | (.89)       |         |
| Shyness                     | -.45**            | -.36**                  | .01                  | -.13                        | -.48**               | -.14                 | .21*      | -.31**      | (.89)   |

Note: Numbers in parentheses are alpha coefficients of internal consistency reliability for each scale.

N = 89.

\* $p < .05$  \*\* $p < .01$

In the above table, “Nonconform” is an abbreviation for nonconformity.

PERSONALITY, SEXUAL ATTITUDES, AND UNRESTRICTED WOMEN

Table 3.  
*Correlations Between the Big 5 Subscales and Other Personality Scales.*

|                                | Extraversion | Agreeableness | Conscientiousness | Neuroticism | Openness |
|--------------------------------|--------------|---------------|-------------------|-------------|----------|
| Dominance-Feeling              | .48**        | -.31**        | .08               | -.29*       | .15      |
| Sensation Seeking Scale        | .37**        | .00           | -.07              | -.37**      | .16      |
| Sexual Boredom Scale           | .08          | -.20          | .01               | .03         | .02      |
| Childhood Gender Nonconformity | .06          | -.15          | -.02              | -.18        | -.06     |
| Positive Masculinity           | .39**        | -.06          | .38**             | -.52**      | .13      |
| Negative Masculinity           | .28**        | -.61**        | -.26*             | .10         | -.03     |
| Dysthymia                      | -.16         | -.29**        | -.14              | .38**       | -.04     |
| Self-Esteem                    | .20          | -.09          | .29**             | -.45**      | .07      |
| Shyness                        | -.75**       | -.19          | -.03              | .41**       | -.22*    |

Note: N=89 except for SBS, for which N=83      \* $p < .05$  \*\* $p < .01$

Table 4. *Correlations Between Personality Scales and Sex Measures.*

|                                | Original Sociosexual Orientation Inventory | Short Term Mating Orientation | Previous Sexual Behavior with Males | Previous Sexual Behavior with Females | Previous Sexual Behavior – Total | Sex Drive | Long Term Mating Orientation |
|--------------------------------|--|-------------------------------|-------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|----------------------------------|-----------|------------------------------|
| Dominance-Feeling              | .46**                                      | .48**                         | .21*                                | .31**                                 | .30**                            | .29**     | -.23*                        |
| Sensation Seeking Scale        | .42**                                      | .33**                         | .25*                                | .20                                   | .31**                            | .26*      | -.21                         |
| Sexual Boredom                 | .42**                                      | .39**                         | .15                                 | .18                                   | .19                              | -.01      | -.44**                       |
| Childhood Gender Nonconformity | .06  | .01                           | -.04                                | .03                                   | -.02                             | .05       | -.05                         |
| Positive Masc                  | .17  | .23*                          | .03                                 | .14                                   | .08                              | .04       | -.14                         |
| Negative Masc                  | .26*                                       | .11                           | .12                                 | .16                                   | .14                              | -.13      | -.16                         |
| Dysthymia                      | -.02                                       | .03                           | -.02                                | .08                                   | .02                              | .05       | .00                          |
| Self-Regard                    | -.01                                       | .09                           | -.20                                | .10                                   | -.07                             | .70       | -.05                         |
| Shyness                        | -.31*                                      | -.22*                         | -.33**                              | -.24*                                 | -.39**                           | -.32**    | .01                          |
| Extraversion                   | .27**                                      | .25*                          | .26*                                | .19                                   | .31**                            | .20       | -.11                         |
| Agreeableness                  | .04  | -.08                          | .16                                 | -.05                                  | .14                              | .19       | .24*                         |
| Conscientiousness              | -.08                                       | .06                           | -.06                                | -.30**                                | -.13                             | -.03      | -.04                         |
| Neuroticism                    | -.22*                                      | -.15                          | -.09                                | -.26*                                 | -.19                             | -.17      | .11                          |
| Openness                       | .08  | .14                           | .03                                 | .16                                   | .09                              | .23*      | .14                          |

Note: N=89 except for SBS, for which N=83. \* $p < .05$  \*\* $p < .01$

In the above table, “Masc” is an abbreviation for masculinity.

Dysthymia, with which it was not significantly correlated. Sensation-seeking had strong positive correlations with the Sexual Boredom Scale (SBS) ( $r = .24, p < .05$ ), Childhood Gender Nonconformity (CGN) ( $r = .33, p < .01$ ), and Positive Masculinity ( $r = .37, p < .01$ ).

Like dominance-feeling, sensation-seeking also negatively correlates with shyness ( $r = -.36, p < .01$ ), though it correlates to a lesser degree than dominance-feeling ( $r = -.45, p < .01$ ). Looking at the Dominance-Feeling and Sensation-Seeking columns in Table 2, one can clearly see that dominance-feeling consistently correlates with other personality scales more strongly than sensation-seeking.

The Sexual Boredom Scale has a strong positive correlation with negative masculinity ( $r = .28, p < .01$ ) but, interestingly, does not significantly correlate with positive masculinity. Positive masculinity positively correlates with self-esteem ( $r = .70, p < .01$ ) and negatively correlates with both dysthymia and shyness ( $r = -.42$  and  $-.48$ , respectively  $p < .01$ ), which makes particular sense given self-esteem's negative correlation with the same two variables ( $r = -.57$  and  $-.31, p < .01$ ).

#### ***Correlations between the Big 5 Subscales and Other Personality Scales.***

Table 3 presents the correlations between the "Big Five" (extraversion, agreeableness, conscientiousness, neuroticism, and openness) and the other personality scales used in the present study. Dominance-feeling has a significant positive correlation with extraversion ( $r = .48, p < .01$ ); in contrast, it is negatively correlated with agreeableness ( $r = -.31, p < .01$ ) and neuroticism ( $r = -.29, p < .05$ ). Sensation seeking shares this pattern (with  $r = .37$  and  $-.37, p < .01$  for extraversion and neuroticism respectively), though it does not correlate negatively (nor at all, in fact) with agreeableness. Neither sexual boredom nor childhood gender nonconformity correlate significantly with any of the five subscales. Positive masculinity is positively

## PERSONALITY, SEXUAL ATTITUDES, AND UNRESTRICTED WOMEN

correlated with extraversion ( $r = .39, p < .01$ ) and conscientiousness ( $r = .38, p < .01$ ), while it is negatively correlated with neuroticism ( $r = -.52, p < .01$ ). Positive Masculinity shares positive masculinity's positive correlation with extraversion ( $r = .28, p < .01$ ), but is also negatively correlated with agreeableness ( $r = -.61, p < .01$ ) and conscientiousness ( $r = -.26, p < .05$ ).

Dysthymia is also negatively correlated with agreeableness ( $r = -.29, p < .01$ ), which is logical given some of the basic irritable symptoms of depressive mood. Dysthymia was also positively correlated with neuroticism ( $r = .38, p < .01$ ). Self-Esteem is positively correlated with conscientiousness ( $r = .29, p < .01$ ) and negatively correlated with neuroticism ( $r = -.45, p < .01$ ). Finally, shyness is negatively correlated with extraversion ( $r = -.75, p < .01$ ) and openness ( $r = -.22, p < .01$ ), as well as positively correlated with neuroticism ( $r = .41, p < .01$ ).

### *Correlations between Personality Scales and Sex Measures.*

Correlations between the personality scales and the sex measures administered are presented in Table 4. Of particular interest in the present study are dominance-feeling and sensation-seeking, which follow remarkably similar patterns. Both are positively, significantly correlated with the Original SOI, STMO, Previous Sexual Behavior with Males, Previous Sexual Behavior – Total, and Sex Drive, but only dominance-feeling is significantly correlated with Previous Sexual Behavior with Females and LTMO (see Table 4 for exact values). Compared to dominance-feeling, thus, the measure of sensation-seeking had similar, but on average slightly less strong, correlations with all six measures of unrestricted sociosexual orientation compared to Maslow's measure of dominance-feeling, and those two personality scales correlated .45 with each other. In a stepwise multiple regression on the original Sociosexual Orientation Inventory, adding sensation-seeking ( $r = .42$ ) after dominance-feeling ( $r = .46$ ) did increase R to .52, which increased R-Square significantly from .20 to .25 ( $p < .05$ ); the partial correlation for sensation-

## PERSONALITY, SEXUAL ATTITUDES, AND UNRESTRICTED WOMEN

seeking with SOI, after allowing for dominance-feeling, was .28,  $n = 89$ ). Thus, sensation seeking does add some unique variance accounted for above that contributed by dominance feeling in relation to unrestricted sociosexual orientation.

Of the remaining personality scales and subscales, a number of intriguing correlations can be seen in Table 4. Sexual Boredom is positively correlated with both the original SOI ( $r = .42, p < .01$ ) and STMO ( $r = .33, p < .01$ ) as well as negatively correlated with LTMO ( $r = -.44, p < .01$ ). Positive masculinity is solely correlated with STMO ( $r = .23, p < .01$ ), while negative masculinity is solely correlated with the original SOI ( $r = .26, p < .01$ ). Shyness correlates significantly and negatively with all sex measures except for LTMO, with which its correlation is not significant (see Table 4 for exact values).

Out of the “Big 5,” extraversion correlates with the most sex measures; extraversion correlates positively with the original SOI ( $r = .27, p < .01$ ), STMO ( $r = .25, p < .05$ ), Previous Sexual Behavior with Males ( $r = .26, p < .05$ ), and Previous Sexual Behavior – Total ( $r = .31, p < .01$ ). Agreeableness correlates solely with LTMO ( $r = .24, p < .01$ ), while conscientiousness and neuroticism both correlate solely with Previous Sexual Behavior with Females ( $r = -.30, p < .01$ ;  $r = -.26, p < .05$ ). Openness, unlike any of the other “Big 5,” correlates with sex drive ( $r = .23, p < .05$ ).

The four attachment styles – dismissing, preoccupied, fearful, and secure – were also assessed in terms of their correlation with the sex measures used (not shown in Table 4). Most results were not significant; however, a few significant correlations were found. First, Previous Sexual Behavior – Total and sex drive were both significantly and positively correlated with secure attachment style ( $r = .21, p < .05$ ;  $r = .21, p < .01$ ). Sex drive and LTMO were both also negatively correlated with dismissing attachment style ( $r = -.28, p < .01$ ;  $r = -.21, p < .05$ ).

### Discussion

The main purpose of this study was to confirm and extend Cheek et al.'s (2012) pilot study findings concerning the construct of dominance-feeling and the Social Personality Inventory (SPI) in 21<sup>st</sup> century college women. The first main question explored in the present study, thus, was do Maslow's construct of dominance-feeling and Social Personality Inventory (SPI) apply to and work with 21<sup>st</sup> century college women? The results indicate that 1) the SPI remains a reliable measure in present day samples (see Table 2) and 2) that dominance-feeling remains a construct that conveys modern concepts that resonate strongly with 21<sup>st</sup> century college women, as indicated by the SPI's strong correlations with all personality measures administered except for 2 of the three "Big 5" (conscientiousness and openness) and dysthymia (see Table 2). Neither of the two "Big 5" traits were expected to be particularly predictive of dominance-feeling given Maslow's 1942 descriptions of high dominance-feeling and low dominance-feeling women in addition to prior research on the "Big 5" and sexual behavior. Maslow's original data predicted the lack of correlation seen with dysthymia; he described "brooding, worrying, moodiness" and "weeping" as "relatively uncorrelated" with either high dominance or low dominance-feeling women (1942, p. 261).

The second question of interest was: how do Maslow's construct of dominance-feeling and the SPI compare with the main present-day theories concerning the sources of unrestricted attitudes and behaviors? Three of the present-day theories, shyness, extraversion, and agreeableness, were correlated with a number of intriguing variables. Shyness was negatively correlated with all sex measures except for LTMO, with which it was not significantly correlated (see Table 4). This finding is in contrast to previous finding in which shyness had a near zero correlation with STMO, but strongly supports Maslow's conception of high-dominance versus

## PERSONALITY, SEXUAL ATTITUDES, AND UNRESTRICTED WOMEN

low-dominance women (i.e., in which low-dominance women are quite shy). Extraversion was likewise correlated with a number of sex measures – the Original SOI, STMO, Previous Sexual Behavior with Males, and Previous Sexual Behavior – Total (see Table 4). Extraversion's association with unrestricted sociosexual attitudes and behavior is consistent with the present literature; it is interesting to note, however, that it was not correlated with Previous Sexual Behavior – Females. This result may become significant with a larger sample size. Finally, in contrast to the current literature (e.g., Hill 2008), agreeableness was not negatively (nor positively) correlated with any of the unrestricted attitude and behavior items. In fact, it was only positively correlated with LTMO. This suggests that women in the present sample are not engaging in casual sex because they do not care about putting others at risk, but rather, perhaps, are doing so for their own pleasure (as the strong correlation between sensation-seeking and STMO would suggest).

In sharp contrast to agreeableness' lack of correlations with sex measures, dominance-feeling correlated with every sex measure used in the present study; furthermore, it did so, on average, more strongly than its main theoretical competitor, sensation-seeking (see Table 4). Additional analyses indicated that sensation-seeking did, however, provide some unique variance, and thus that sensation-seeking and dominance-feeling, used together, are the most promising combination for the explanation of unrestricted attitudes and behavior in 21<sup>st</sup> college-age women. As predicted, dominance-feeling was positively correlated with STMO and negatively correlated with LTMO, revealing that unrestricted attitudes and dominance-feeling are definitively linked. Dominance-feeling's strong positive correlation with the three Past Sexual Behavior measures indicates that women who are high in dominance feeling are more likely to have casual sex. Thus, dominance-feeling was not only correlated with both

## PERSONALITY, SEXUAL ATTITUDES, AND UNRESTRICTED WOMEN

unrestricted attitudes and behaviors, but it was also, on average, more strongly correlated with unrestricted attitudes and behaviors than the other present day theories and measures tested.

### *Limitations.*

There are a number of limitations to the present study. First, the number of participants in the present study was somewhat low ( $N = 89$ ); this study would benefit from a larger sample to increase the statistical power of the analyses conducted. Data from additional participants is currently being gathered, which will increase this statistically power and potentially yield significant results for items that, in the present sample, were close to but did not achieve statistical significance.

An additional limitation to this study is the lack of ethnic diversity. Over half of the participants identified as white/Caucasian, with Asian coming in at a close second (see Results). A sample of greater ethnic diversity would allow for stronger conclusions to be made concerning unrestricted attitudes and behaviors in all women, as opposed to in predominately white and Asian populations.

Because the study was conducted at an all women's college, the present sample also lacks diversity in both biological sex and age range. Though administering this survey at a co-educational institution would add a great deal more diversity in biological sex, the age range would still be quite limited. Recruiting from a non-undergraduate sample, thus, would likely add some diversity in both domains.

The college from which participants were recruited is also an important limiting factor. Wellesley College is a diverse, liberal campus; as Perlman (1974) and Conley (2011) both assert, environment plays a large role in determining the degree of stigma attached to casual sex and thus fear of factors such as "slut-shaming." Wellesley College students, because of their liberal

## PERSONALITY, SEXUAL ATTITUDES, AND UNRESTRICTED WOMEN

environment may thus hold more unrestricted attitudes and engage in more casual sex behavior because of the supportive, woman-positive environment provided.

Finally, though an e-mail was sent to all seniors asking for their participation, the current sample included only 89 students. Of the 89 that did participate, it is likely that some participants were particularly motivated to do so because this was a study about sex. It is possible, thus, that the present study had a tilt toward more sexual women or, at least, women who are more open to the discussion of sex.

### *Implications and Future Directions.*

The present study has important implications for the ongoing debate about male-female differences in the field of Evolutionary Psychology. Contrary to Schmitt et al.'s claims (2012), insecure attachment does not correlate strongly with unrestricted attitudes and behaviors; instead, Maslow's construct of dominance feeling correlates strongly with both unrestricted sociosexual attitudes and behaviors in college women. Given the strong correlation of the SPI with the other personality measures, it can be deduced that the SPI accurately measures the set of personality variables included in dominance-feeling, including self-esteem (Maslow, 1942). Plenty of women are engaging in casual sex behavior and, contrary to what Townsend (1995) and Schmitt, et al. (2012) assert there is nothing "wrong" with these women; they did not have depressive symptoms in adolescence, did not have an unhappy childhood, and they do not have low self-esteem (in fact, high dominance-feeling women have high self-esteem and are extroverted). Contrary to what Townsend (1995) asserted, and in support of Clark's 2003 findings, these women are not high in neuroticism; in fact, dominance-feeling was negatively correlated with neuroticism, indicating that these women are less likely to experience negative emotions (e.g.,

## PERSONALITY, SEXUAL ATTITUDES, AND UNRESTRICTED WOMEN

guilt). High dominance-feeling women, thus, are having casual sex and are, quite simply put, enjoying it.

Given the strength of dominance-feeling as an explanation of unrestricted sociosexual attitudes and behaviors, it is crucial that this study be replicated in a different environment to further challenge the current evidence concerning male-female differences. Replicating the present study in multiple co-educational institutions is an important first step; comparing women to men in similar environments would shed further light on the effect of environment (i.e., as opposed to gender) on unrestricted attitudes and behaviors. Multiple environments would be preferable in order to compare findings to Perlman's 1974 study of college campuses and sexual attitudes. Preferably, more ethnically diverse samples could be recruited for the purposes of this follow-up study in order to observe any cross-cultural differences that may exist and the effect they have.

Future studies could also recruit participants from outside of the undergraduate sample. A greater age range in the sample would allow for more definitive conclusions. College, in particular, can be a time of self-definition and experimentation, and thus older samples may provide more concrete results concerning sexual attitudes and behaviors. It would also, however, be particularly intriguing to look at the ways in which participants' attitudes and behaviors change over time; a longitudinal study, thus, would shed a great deal of light on how sexual attitudes and behaviors evolve in different individuals, environments, etc. Through future studies using Maslow's construct of "dominance-feeling," it is hoped that sufficient evidence will be produced such that the tired evolutionary explanation of "male-female" differences as the sole explanation for unrestricted attitudes and behaviors can, at last, be reformed to include individual, personality-based differences.

References

- Allport, G. W., & Ross, J. (1967). Personal religious orientation and prejudice. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 5*, 432-443. doi:10.1037/h0021212
- Ahrold, T. K., Farmer, M., Trapnell, P. D., & Meston, C. M. (2011). The relationship among sexual attitudes, sexual fantasy, and religiosity. *Archives of Sexual Behavior, 40*, 619-630. doi:10.1007/s10508-010-9621-4
- Bailey, J., Dunne, M. P., & Martin, N. G. (2000). Genetic and environmental influences on sexual orientation and its correlates in an Australian twin sample. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 78*, 524-536. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.78.3.524
- Bailey, J. M., Finkel, E., Blackwelder, K., & Bailey, T. (1996). Masculinity, femininity, and sexual orientation. Unpublished manuscript.
- Bartholomew, K., & Horowitz, L. M. (1991). Attachment styles among young adults: A test of a four-category model. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 61*, 226-244. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.61.2.226
- Bradshaw, C., Kahn, A. S., & Saville, B. K. (2010). To hook up or date: Which gender benefits?. *Sex Roles, 62*, 661-669. doi:10.1007/s11199-010-9765-7
- Burnett, J. W., Anderson, W. P., & Heppner, P. (1995). Gender roles and self-esteem: A consideration of environmental factors. *Journal of Counseling & Development, 73*, 323-326. doi:10.1002/j.1556-6676.1995.tb01757.x
- Burney, S. (2007). Consequences of unrestricted female sexuality. Unpublished independent study, Wellesley College, Wellesley MA.

## PERSONALITY, SEXUAL ATTITUDES, AND UNRESTRICTED WOMEN

- Buss, A. H., & Plomin, R. (1975). *A temperament theory of personality development*. NY: Wiley-Interscience.
- Cheek, J.M. (1983). *The Revised Cheek and Buss Shyness Scale (RCBS)*. Unpublished, Wellesley College, Wellesley MA 02181.
- Cheek, J.M., Bourgeois, M.L., Theran, S.A., Grimes, J.O., & Norem, J.K. (2009, February). *Interpreting the factors of the highly sensitive personal scale*. Presented at the annual meeting of the society for Personality and Social Psychology, Tampa, FL.
- Cheek J.M., Clark J., & Akert R. (2004, July). *Shyness, love-shyness, and female sexuality*. Presented at the annual meeting of the American Psychological Association. Honolulu, HI.
- Cheek, J.M., McCracken, C., Merrill, S.M., & Norem, J.K. (2012, January). *Personality and female sexuality: Maslow's research on dominance-feeling revisited*. Presented at the annual meeting of the society for Personality and Social Psychology, San Diego, C.A.
- Clark, J. L. (2003). *Personality, Self-Concept, and Sexual Attitudes and Behavior*. Unpublished honors thesis, Wellesley College, Wellesley MA.
- Conley, T. D., Moors, A. C., Matsick, J. L., Ziegler, A., & Valentine, B. A. (2011). *Women, men, and the bedroom: Methodological and conceptual insights that narrow, reframe, and eliminate gender differences in sexuality*. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 20, 296-300.  
doi:10.1177/0963721411418467
- Dykman, B.M. (1998). *Integrating cognitive and motivational factors in depression: Initial tests of a goal-orientation approach*. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 74, 139-158.  
doi:10.1037/0022-3514.74.1.139

## PERSONALITY, SEXUAL ATTITUDES, AND UNRESTRICTED WOMEN

- Fleming, S., & Courtney, B.E.. (1984.) The dimensionality of self-esteem: II. Hierarchical facet model for revised measurement scales. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *46*, 404-421. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.46.2.404
- Feeney, J. A., & Noller, P. (1990). Attachment style as a predictor of adult romantic relationships. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *58*, 281-291. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.58.2.281
- Grello, C. M., Welsh, D. P., & Harper, M. S. (2006). No Strings Attached: The Nature of Casual Sex in College Students. *Journal of Sex Research*, *43*, 255-267. doi:10.1080/00224490609552324
- Helmreich, R.L., Spence, J.T. & Wilhelm, J.A. (1981). A psychometric analysis of the Personal Attributes Questionnaire. *Sex Roles*, *7*, 1097-1108. doi:10.1007/BF00287587
- Hill, C. A. (2008). *Human sexuality: Personality and social psychological perspectives*. Thousand Oaks, CA US: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Hill, C. A., & Preston, L. K. (1996). Individual differences in the experience of sexual motivation: Theory and measurement of dispositional sexual motives. *Journal of Sex Research*, *33*(1), 27-45. doi:10.1080/00224499609551812
- Hoyle, R. H., Fejfar, M. C., & Miller, J. D. (2000). Personality and sexual risk taking: A quantitative review. *Journal of Personality*, *68*, 1203-1231. doi:10.1111/1467-6494.00132
- Hoyle, R. H., Stephenson, M. T., Palmgreen, P., Pugzles Lorch, E., & Donohew, R. (2002). Reliability and validity of a brief measure of sensation seeking. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *32*, 401-414. doi:10.1016/S0191-8869(01)00032-0
- Jackson, J., & Kirkpatrick, L. A. (2007). The structure and measurement of human mating strategies: Toward a multidimensional model of sociosexuality. *Evolution and Human Behavior*, *28*, 382-391. doi:10.1016/j.evolhumbehav.2007.04.005

## PERSONALITY, SEXUAL ATTITUDES, AND UNRESTRICTED WOMEN

- John, O. P., Donahue, E. M., & Kentle, R. L. (1991). The Big Five Inventory--Versions 4a and 54. Berkeley, CA: University of California, Berkeley, Institute of Personality and Social Research.
- Joseph, S., Linley, P., Harwood, J., Lewis, C., & McCollam, P. (2004). Rapid assessment of well-being: The Short Depression-Happiness Scale (SDHS). *Psychology and Psychotherapy: Theory, Research and Practice*, 77, 463-478. doi:10.1348/1476083042555406
- Kinsey, A., Pomeroy, W., & Martin, C. (1948). *Sexual Behavior in the Human Male*. Oxford England: Saunders.
- Maslow, A. H. (1940). A test for dominance-feeling (self-esteem) in college women. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 12, 255-270.
- Maslow, A.H. (1942). Self-esteem (dominance-feeling) and sexuality in women. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 16, 259-294. doi:10.1080/00224545.1942.9714120
- Merrill, S. M., Staffaroni, L. M., & Cheek, J. M. (March, 2011). *In Your Wildest Dreams: The Effect of Sexual Orientation on Women's Sexual Fantasies*. Poster presented at the Eastern Psychological Association Conference. Cambridge, MA.
- Meston, C. M., & Ahrold, T. (2010). Ethnic, gender, and acculturation influences on sexual behaviors. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 39 (1), 179-189. doi:10.1007/s10508-008-9415-0
- Meston, C.M., & Buss, D.M. (2007). Why humans have sex. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 36, 477-507. doi:10.1007/s10508-007-9175-2
- Mikach, S. M., & Bailey, J. (1999). What distinguishes women with unusually high numbers of sex partners?. *Evolution and Human Behavior*, 20(3), 141-150. doi:10.1016/S1090-5138(98)00045-2
- Monahan, K. C., & Lee, J. M. (2008). Adolescent sexual activity: Links between relational context and depressive symptoms. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 37, 917-927. doi:10.1007/s10964-007-9256-5

## PERSONALITY, SEXUAL ATTITUDES, AND UNRESTRICTED WOMEN

- Ostovich, J. M. (2004). Validation of a new, brief measure of sex drive. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Pennsylvania.
- 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. doi:10.1177/0146167204264754
- Paul, E. L., & Hayes, K. A. (2002). The casualties of 'casual' sex: A qualitative exploration of the phenomenology of college students' hookups. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, *19*, 639–661. doi:10.1177/0265407502195006
- Paul, E. L., McManus, B., & Hayes, A. (2000). 'Hookups': Characteristics and correlates of college students' spontaneous and anonymous sexual experiences. *Journal of Sex Research*, *37*(1), 76-88. doi:10.1080/00224490009552023
- Perlman, D. (1974). Self-esteem and sexual permissiveness. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, *36*, 470-473. doi:10.2307/350717
- Pillsworth, E.G., Haselton, M.G. (2006). Women's sexual strategies: The evolution of long-term bonds and extrapair sex. *Annual Review of Sex Research*, *17*, 59-100.
- Pujols, Y., Meston, C. M., & Seal, B. N. (2010). The association between sexual satisfaction and body image in women. *Journal of Sexual Medicine*, *7*, 905-916. doi:10.1111/j.1743-6109.2009.01604.x
- Ryder, A. G., Alden, L. E., & Paulhus, D. L. (2000). Is acculturation unidimensional or bidimensional? A head-to-head comparison in the prediction of personality, self-identity, and adjustment. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *79*(1), 49-65. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.79.1.49

## PERSONALITY, SEXUAL ATTITUDES, AND UNRESTRICTED WOMEN

- 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. doi: 10.1002/per.520
- Schmitt, D.P., Jonason, P.K., Byerley, G.J., Flores, S.D., Illbeck, B.E., O'Leary, K.N., & Qudrat, A. (2012). A Reexamination of sex differences in sexuality: New studies reveal old truths. *Current Directions in Psychological Science, 21*(2), 135-139. doi: 10.1177/0963721412436808
- Simpson, J. A. & Gangestad, S. W. (1991). Individual differences in sociosexuality: Evidence for convergent and discriminant validity. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 60*, 870-883. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.60.6.870
- Spence, J.T., Helmreich, R.L., & Holahan, C.K. (1979). Negative and positive components of psychological masculinity and femininity and their relationships to self-reports of neurotic and acting out behaviors. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 37*, 1673 – 1682.
- Townsend, J.M. (1995). Sex without emotional involvement: An evolutionary interpretation of sex differences. *Archives of Sexual Behavior, 24*(2), 173-206. doi:10.1007/BF01541580
- van Anders, S. M., Hamilton, L., & Watson, N. V. (2007). Multiple partners are associated with higher testosterone in North American men and women. *Hormones and Behavior, 51*, 454-459. doi:10.1016/j.yhbeh.2007.01.002
- Walsh, A. (1991). Self-esteem and sexual behavior: Exploring gender differences. *Sex Roles, 25*, 441-450. doi:10.1007/BF00292533
- Watt, J. D., & Ewing, J. E. (1996). Toward the development and validation of a measure of sexual boredom. *Journal of Sex Research, 33*(1), 57-66. doi:10.1080/00224499609551815
- Ward, K.L. (2000). Feminist identity development, sociosexual orientation and individual differences in college aged women. Unpublished honors thesis, Wellesley College, Wellesley MA.

PERSONALITY, SEXUAL ATTITUDES, AND UNRESTRICTED WOMEN

Weaver, S. J., & Herold, E. S. (2000). Casual sex and women: Measurement and motivational issues.

*Journal of Psychology and Human Sexuality*, 12(3), 23-41. doi:10.1300/J056v12n03\_02

*Appendix A*

**Original Sociosexual Orientation Inventory (SOI) – Modified  
(Simpson & Gangestad, 1991; Clark, 2003)**

Instructions: Please answer the following questions by selecting the phrase that best describes your answer to the question. Keep in mind that we are not looking for any individual's responses, but rather that we will be looking at group trends. Please answer honestly.

Note: Where not otherwise defined, by “sex” we mean any kind of intimate bodily contact between two (or more) people. For the purposes of this survey, “sex” does NOT refer to mouth-to-mouth kissing or cuddling.

1. With how many partners of the opposite sex have you had sexual intercourse within the past year?
2. With how many partners of the same sex have you had sexual intercourse within the past year?
3. With how many different partners of the opposite sex do you foresee yourself having sexual intercourse during the next five years?
4. With how many different partners of the same sex do you foresee yourself having sexual intercourse during the next five years?
5. With how many partners of the opposite sex have you had sex with on one and only one occasion?

Before college \_\_\_\_\_ after starting college \_\_\_\_\_

Total \_\_\_\_\_

6. With how many partners of the same sex have you had sex with on one and only one occasion?

Before college \_\_\_\_\_ after starting college \_\_\_\_\_

Total \_\_\_\_\_

7. How often do you fantasize about having sex with someone other than your current dating partner?

Rating scale:

1 = Never, 2 = Once every two or three months, 3 = Once a month, 4 = Once every two weeks, 5 = Once a week, 5 = A few times each week, 6 = Nearly every day, 7 = At least once a day

Rating scale for items 8 – 10:

|                      |                   |                   |
|----------------------|-------------------|-------------------|
| 1= Strongly disagree | 4= Neutral        | 7= Strongly agree |
| 2= Disagree          | 5= Somewhat agree |                   |
| 3= Somewhat disagree | 6= Agree          |                   |

8. Sex without love is OK.
9. I can imagine myself being comfortable enjoying “casual” sex with different partners.
10. I would have to be closely attached to someone (both emotionally and psychologically) before I could feel comfortable and fully enjoy having sex with him or her.

*Appendix B*

**STMO, LTMO, Past Behavior with Males, Past Behavior with Females, and  
Past Behavior –Total**

**(Jackson & Kirkpatrick, 2007; Cheek, McCracken, Merrill, & Norem, 2012; Clark, 2003)**

Instructions for all: Please answer the following questions by selecting the phrase that best describes your answer to the question. Keep in mind that we are not looking for any individual's responses, but rather that we will be looking at group trends. Please answer honestly.

Note: Where not otherwise defined, by “sex” we mean any kind of intimate bodily contact between two (or more) people. For the purposes of this survey, “sex” does NOT refer to mouth-to-mouth kissing or cuddling.

Rating system for STMO and LTMO:

|                      |                   |                   |
|----------------------|-------------------|-------------------|
| 1= Strongly disagree | 4= Neutral        | 7= Strongly agree |
| 2= Disagree          | 5= Somewhat agree |                   |
| 3= Somewhat disagree | 6= Agree          |                   |

**STMO:**

1. I can easily imagine myself being comfortable and enjoying “casual” sex with different partners.
2. I can imagine myself enjoying a brief sexual encounter with someone I find very attractive.
3. I could easily imagine myself enjoying one night of sex with someone I would never see again.
4. Sex without love is OK.
5. I could enjoy sex with someone I find highly desirable even if that person does not have long-term potential.
6. I would consider having sex with a stranger if I could be assured that it was safe and he/she was attractive.
7. I would never consider having a brief sexual relationship with someone.
8. Sometimes I would rather have sex with someone I did not care about.
9. I believe in taking sexual opportunities when I find them.
10. I would have to be closely attached to someone (both emotionally and psychologically) before I could feel comfortable and fully enjoy having sex with him or her.

**LTMO:**

1. I am interested in maintaining a long-term romantic relationship with someone special.
2. I hope to have a romantic relationship that lasts the rest of my life.
3. I would like to have a romantic relationship that lasts forever.
4. Long-term romantic relationships are *not* for me.
5. Finding a long-term romantic partner is *not* important to me.
6. I can easily see myself engaging in a long-term romantic relationship with someone special.
7. I can see myself settling down romantically with one special person.

**Previous Sexual Behavior with Males:**

## PERSONALITY, SEXUAL ATTITUDES, AND UNRESTRICTED WOMEN

1. During your entire life, with how many partners of the opposite sex have you had sexual intercourse?

Before college \_\_\_\_\_ after starting college \_\_\_\_\_

Total \_\_\_\_\_

2. With how many partners of the opposite sex have you had sexual intercourse within the past year?

3. With how many partners of the opposite sex have you had sex with on one and only one occasion?

Before college \_\_\_\_\_ after starting college \_\_\_\_\_

Total \_\_\_\_\_

### **Previous Sexual Behavior with Females:**

1. During your entire life, with how many partners of the same sex have you had sexual intercourse?

Before college \_\_\_\_\_ after starting college \_\_\_\_\_

Total \_\_\_\_\_

2. With how many partners of the same sex have you had sexual intercourse within the past year?

3. With how many partners of the same sex have you had sex with on one and only one occasion?

Before college \_\_\_\_\_ after starting college \_\_\_\_\_

Total \_\_\_\_\_

### **Previous Sexual Behavior – Total:**

Scores from Previous Sexual Behavior with Males and Previous Sexual Behavior with Females were added to the following items:

1. What is the shortest period of time you have known someone before having sex with him or her?

Rating Scale: 1 = Less than a day, 2 = Less than one week, 3 = Less than two weeks, 4 = Less than a month, 5 = Less than a couple months, 6 = Three months or more, 7 = Not applicable

2. On how many occasions have you had sex with two or more people on one day, at different times (i.e., NOT group sex)?

Rating Scale: 1 = Never, 2 = Once, 3 = Twice, 4 = Three times, 5 = Four times or more

3. What is the greatest number of sexual partners you have ever had in one day? \_\_\_\_\_

## *Appendix C*

PERSONALITY, SEXUAL ATTITUDES, AND UNRESTRICTED WOMEN

**Modified Kinsey Sexual Orientation Continuum Scale (MKSOCS)**  
**(Merrill, Staffaroni, & Cheek, 2011; Kinsey, Pomeroy, & Martin, 1948)**

Instructions: Based on both psychological reactions and overt experience, please rate yourself as follows:

1. Exclusively heterosexual
2. Predominantly heterosexual, only incidentally homosexual
3. Predominantly heterosexual, but more than incidentally homosexual
4. Equally heterosexual and homosexual
5. Predominantly homosexual, but more than incidentally heterosexual
6. Predominantly homosexual, only incidentally heterosexual
7. Exclusively homosexual

Other (please describe): \_\_\_\_\_

## PERSONALITY, SEXUAL ATTITUDES, AND UNRESTRICTED WOMEN

(Ostovich, 2004; Clark, 2003)

Instructions: The following questions ask about your sexual and social behaviors. Keep in mind that we are not looking for any individual's responses, but rather that we will be looking at group trends. Please answer honestly.

Note: Where not otherwise defined, by "sex" we mean any kind of intimate bodily contact between two (or more) people. For the purposes of this survey, "sex" does NOT refer to mouth-to-mouth kissing or cuddling.

1. How frequently do you think about sex?  
Rating scale: 9-point scale from 1 = virtually never to 9 = almost all of the time
2. Do you consider yourself to be a sexual person?  
Rating scale: 5-point scale from 1 = not at all a sexual person to 5 = a highly sexual person
3. How often do you experience sexual desire?  
Rating scale: 1 = Never, 2 = Less than once a month, 3 = About once a month, 4 = About once a week, 5 = Several times a week, 6 = Daily, 7 = Several Times a day
4. How would you compare your level of sex drive with that of the average person of your gender and age?  
Rating Scale: 1 = Very much lower, 2 = Lower, 3 = Slightly lower, 4 = About the same, 5 = Slightly greater, 6 = Greater, 7 = Very much greater
5. On average, over the past 6 months, how often have you masturbated?  
Rating scale: 1 = Never, 2 = Once every few months, 3 = About once a month, 4 = 2 or 3 times a month, 5 = Once a week, 6 = A few times each week, 7 = Nearly every day, 8 = At least once a day.
6. On average, over the past 6 months, how often have you had an orgasm (from sex or masturbating)?  
Rating scale: Same as question 5

### *Appendix E* Modified Social Personality Inventory Parts I & II

PERSONALITY, SEXUAL ATTITUDES, AND UNRESTRICTED WOMEN

(Maslow, 1940)

**Part I**

Instructions: Answer these questions by selecting the word or phrase that applies to you and that most closely expresses your attitudes or feelings.

1. Do you think women are catty and petty?

Rating: Most are      Many are      Some are      A few are      Rare exceptions are

2. Do you feel that you have a “stronger personality” than other women you associate with?

Rating: Than almost all      Than most      Than many      Than some      Than a few or none

3. What is your attitude toward women who often disregard the usual social, moral, or ethical conventions?

Rating: Dislike very much      Dislike somewhat      Neither like nor dislike

Like somewhat      Like very much

4. Are you repelled by the sight of physical cruelty?

Rating: Always      Usually      Sometimes      Seldom      Never

5. How do you prefer a man to be dressed?

Rating: Very carefully      Carefully      Casually

Somewhat carelessly      Carelessly

5b. How do you prefer a woman to be dressed?

Rating: Same as 5

6. How many of the men that you know of about your own age do you dominate?

Rating: Most      Many      Some      A few      None

7. What is your attitude toward men who *look* as if they could be brutal?

PERSONALITY, SEXUAL ATTITUDES, AND UNRESTRICTED WOMEN

Rating: Very much repelled   Somewhat repelled   Neither repelled nor attracted  
Somewhat attracted   Very much attracted

8. Have you broken or inwardly rebelled against rules (sorority, college, club, etc)?

Rating: Very often   Often   Sometimes   Seldom   Never

9. How do you regard a man who is frequently blunt in his speech?

Rating: Like very much   Like somewhat   Neither like nor dislike  
Dislike somewhat   Dislike very much

10. How would you feel about accidentally going to a formal party in street clothes?

Rating: Dislike very much   Dislike somewhat   Neither like nor dislike  
Like Somewhat   Like very much

11. How many women that you know, of about your own age, do you dominate?

Rating: Most   Many   Some   A few   None

12. How do you react to the shy, timid, bashful kind of man?

Rating: Like very much   Like somewhat   Neither like nor dislike  
Dislike somewhat   Dislike very much

12b. How do you react to the shy, timid, bashful kind of woman?

Rating: Same as 12

13. Which do you prefer for company, men or women? (In sports, intellectual activities, hiking, theatres, conversation, etc)

Rating: Always prefer women   Usually prefer women   No preference

PERSONALITY, SEXUAL ATTITUDES, AND UNRESTRICTED WOMEN

Usually prefer men      Always prefer men

14. Do you consider yourself more or less sympathetic to the woes and troubles of your friends and acquaintances than the average?

Rating: Very much more than the average woman    Somewhat more    Average  
Somewhat less    Very much less

15. Do your friends and acquaintances come to you for advice concerning their personal problems?

Rating: Very frequently    Frequently    Sometimes    Rarely    Never

16. How often are you apt to be the leader in such activities as organizing and running clubs, discussion groups, committees, etc.?

Rating: Much more frequently than the average woman      Somewhat more frequently  
Average    Somewhat less frequently than average    Much less than average

17. How quickly do you make the ordinary decisions of everyday life?

Rating: Very quickly    Rather quickly    Average    Rather slowly    Very slowly

18. Are you troubled with feelings of inferiority?

Rating: Much more than the average woman      Somewhat more than the average woman  
About average      Somewhat less than the average woman  
Much less than the average woman

19. Do you tend to ignore the feelings of others when accomplishing some end that is important for you?

Rating: Usually    Often    Sometimes    Seldom    Never

20. How often are people successful in taking advantage of you?

PERSONALITY, SEXUAL ATTITUDES, AND UNRESTRICTED WOMEN

Rating: Usually      Often      Sometimes      Seldom      Never

21. How important is it for your feeling of security that the people about you like you?

Rating: Very important      Fairly important      Slightly important

Completely unimportant

22. How do you feel about being a housewife and mother as a life job?

Rating: Completely satisfying      Would also like some outside work or activities

Would also like much outside work or activities

Would also like a career or job of my own at the same time      Would prefer a career

23. How often do you tell people what you think of them when they do something you dislike?

Rating: Very frequently      Often      Sometimes      Rarely      Never

24. Must your ideal man, in your private life, observe the customary niceties of behavior (politeness, etiquette, manners, etc.)?

Rating: Always or almost always      Most of the time      Often      Sometimes      Rarely or never

24b. Must your ideal woman, in your private life, observe the customary niceties of behavior (politeness, etiquette, manners, etc.)?

Rating: Same as 24

25. How do you feel about men who always follow the usual social conventions (manner, customs, etiquette?)

Rating: Like very much      Like somewhat      Neither like nor dislike

Dislike somewhat      Dislike very much

25b. How do you feel about women who always follow the usual social conventions (manner, customs, etiquette?)

## PERSONALITY, SEXUAL ATTITUDES, AND UNRESTRICTED WOMEN

Rating: Same as 25

26. How often do you blush?

Rating: Very frequently      Frequently      Sometimes      Rarely      Almost never or never

27. How frequently are you embarrassed?

Rating: same as 26

### Part II

Answer the following questions by choosing the phrase from the rating scale (e.g., dislike, like) that best describes how you feel about the phrase presented.

Rating scale for all items:

1 = Dislike very much, 2 = Dislike, 3 = Neutral, 4 = Like, 5 = Like very much

1. Aloofness in a person you have just met
2. Worldliness (rather than pseudo sophistication)
3. A career (for you)
4. Men who antagonize you somewhat
- 4.b. Women who antagonize you somewhat
5. Making up your own mind
6. Fame (not mere notoriety)
7. Men of whom you are a bit afraid
- 7.b. Women of whom you are a bit afraid
8. Unconventional language
9. To be an executive
10. Strong-willed people
11. Risqué stories
12. Very dominant men
13. Very dominant women
14. Being a leader
15. Sweet, "feminine" type of girl as your friend
16. Playing cards for money
17. Driving a car at great speed
18. Being popular with men
- 18.b. Being popular with women
19. Men who are never profane
- 19.b. Women who are never profane
20. Being hypnotized
21. Sewing
22. Discussing politics
23. Discussing people's personalities

PERSONALITY, SEXUAL ATTITUDES, AND UNRESTRICTED WOMEN

- 24. Betting on horse-races
- 25. Justifiable conceit in a man
- 25.b. Justifiable conceit in a woman

*Appendix F*  
**Sensation Seeking Scale**

**Sensation Seeking Impulsivity section of the EASI and  
Brief Sensation Seeking Scale (BSSS)  
(Buss & Plomin, 1975; Hoyle, Stephenson, Palmgreen, Lorch, & Donohew, 2002)**

Instructions: Please read each item carefully and decide to what extent it is characteristic of your feelings and behavior. Select the response that best describes to what extent the description is characteristic of your feelings and behavior.

Rating scale:

- 1 = very uncharacteristic or untrue, strongly disagree
- 2 = uncharacteristic
- 3 = neutral
- 4 = characteristic
- 5 = very characteristic or true, strongly agree

1. I generally seek new and exciting experiences and sensations.
2. I'll try anything once.
3. I sometimes do "crazy" things just to be different.
4. I'm happiest in familiar surroundings.
5. I get bored easily.
6. I would like to explore strange places.
7. I get restless when I spend too much time at home.
8. I like to do frightening things.
9. I like wild parties
10. I would like to take off on a trip with no pre-planned routes or timetables.
11. I prefer friends who are excitingly unpredictable.
12. I would like to try bungee jumping.
13. I would love to have new and exciting experiences, even if they are illegal.

## PERSONALITY, SEXUAL ATTITUDES, AND UNRESTRICTED WOMEN

(Watt & Ewing, 1996)

Instructions: Please answer the following questions by selecting the phrase that best describes your answer to your question. Keep in mind that we are not looking for any individual's responses, but rather that we will be looking at group trends. Please answer honestly.

Note: Where not otherwise defined, by "sex" we mean any kind of intimate bodily contact between two (or more) people. For the purposes of this survey, "sex" does NOT refer to mouth-to-mouth kissing or cuddling.

Rating scale:

|                      |                   |                 |
|----------------------|-------------------|-----------------|
| 1= Highly disagree   | 4= Neutral        | 7= Highly agree |
| 2= Disagree          | 5= Somewhat agree |                 |
| 3= Somewhat disagree | 6= Agree          |                 |

1. I frequently find it difficult to sustain my sexual interest in a relationship.
2. I could never get enough sexual pleasure from just one relationship.
3. I get very restless if I remain in the same sexual relationship for any length of time.
4. I would prefer a short-term sexual relationship to a longer term one.
5. It takes very little change and variety in a relationship to keep me sexually satisfied.
6. I sometimes doubt whether or not I could remain sexually faithful in a long-term (or monogamous) relationship.
7. I prefer sexual relationships that are exciting and unpredictable.
8. I would not stay in a relationship that was sexually dull.
9. I usually feel constrained and frustrated in a long-term sexual relationship.
10. Sex frequently becomes an unexciting and predictable routine.
11. It's only natural to grow old of having sex with the same partner.
12. Sex frequently becomes unexciting in a long-term relationship.
13. I often get bored having sexual intercourse with the same partner.
14. I get tired of having sex in the same "old ways."
15. Maintaining my sexual interest in a relationship is never difficult.
16. It would be very hard for me to find a relationship that is sexually exciting enough.
17. I'm more interested in excitement and stimulation in a sexual relationship than security and commitment.
18. Sex with the same partner can become tiresome over time.

### *Appendix H*

**Childhood Gender Nonconformity (CGN)  
(Bailey Finkel, Blackwelder, & Bailey, 1996)**

## PERSONALITY, SEXUAL ATTITUDES, AND UNRESTRICTED WOMEN

Instructions: Please answer the following questions as they pertain to you during childhood (age 12 and below).

Rating Scale for all items: 1 = Strongly Agree, 2 = Somewhat Agree, 3 = Slightly Agree, 4 = Uncertain, 5 = Slightly Disagree, 6 = Somewhat Disagree, 7 = Strongly Disagree

1. As a child I was called a "tomboy" by my peers.
2. As a child I sometimes wished I had been born a boy rather than a girl.
3. As a child I preferred playing with boys rather than girls.
4. As a child I often felt that I had more in common with boys than girls.
5. As a child I usually avoided feminine clothing such as dresses.
6. As a child I liked competitive sports such as football, baseball, and basketball.
7. I was a masculine girl.

*Appendix I*  
**Positive Masculinity & Negative Masculinity**  
**From the E-PAQ (Spence, Helmreich, & Stapp, 1974)**

## PERSONALITY, SEXUAL ATTITUDES, AND UNRESTRICTED WOMEN

Instructions: The items below inquire about what kind of person you think you are. Each item consists of an adjective or other description, such as "artistic." Choose the phrase that describes the degree to which the adjective or description accurately describes you/your personality.

Rating scale for all items: 1 = Not at all, 2 = Somewhat, 3 = Moderate, 4 = Very Much, 5 = Extremely

### Positive Masculinity:

1. Independent
2. Passive
3. Competitive
4. Decisive
5. Give up easily
6. Self-confident
7. Feels inferior
8. Goes to pieces under pressure

### Negative Masculinity:

1. Arrogant
2. Boastful
3. Egotistical
4. Greedy
5. Dictatorial
6. Cynical
7. Looks out only for self
8. Hostile

*Appendix J*  
**Dysthymia (Adolescent) and Happy Childhood**  
**(Joseph, Linley, Harwood, Lewis, & McCollam, 2004;**  
**Cheek, Bourgeois, Theran, Grimes, & Norem, 2009)**

## PERSONALITY, SEXUAL ATTITUDES, AND UNRESTRICTED WOMEN

### Dysthymia (Adolescent)

Instructions: A number of statements that people have made to describe how they feel are given below. Please read each one and tick the box which best describes how you usually felt when you were 13-17 years old. Some statements describe positive feelings and some describe negative feelings. You may have experienced both positive and negative feelings at different times.

|                                      | Never | Rarely | Sometimes | Often |
|--------------------------------------|-------|--------|-----------|-------|
| (1) I felt dissatisfied with my life |       |        |           |       |
| (2) I felt happy                     |       |        |           |       |
| (3) I felt cheerless                 |       |        |           |       |
| (4) I felt pleased with the way I am |       |        |           |       |
| (5) I felt that life was enjoyable   |       |        |           |       |
| (6) I felt that life was meaningless |       |        |           |       |

### Happy Childhood Item

Instructions: Please answer the following items to the best of your ability. Estimate if needed.

1. Looking back on your experience of growing up, how happy was your childhood?

Rating scale: 1 = Very unhappy, 2 = Unhappy, 3 = A little unhappy, 4 = Mixture of happy and unhappy, 5 = Mostly happy, 6 = Very happy, 7 = Extremely happy

***Appendix K***  
**Self-Regard**  
**Self-Regard items from Self-Rating Scale (SRS)**

## PERSONALITY, SEXUAL ATTITUDES, AND UNRESTRICTED WOMEN

**(Fleming & Courtney, 1984)**

Instructions: Please answer the following questions by selecting the response that best describes your answer to the question. For statements, choose the response that best describes how true the statement is of you.

Rating scale for items 3 and 6: Not at all confident (1), Not very confident (2), Somewhat confident (3), Confident (4), Very confident (5)

Rating scale for items 1, 2, 4, 5, and 7: Never (1), Rarely (2), Sometimes (3), Often (4), Always (5)

1. How often do you feel inferior to most of the people you know?
2. Do you ever think that you are a worthless individual?
3. How confident do you feel that someday the people you know will look up to you and respect you?
4. Do you ever feel so discouraged with yourself that you wonder whether you are a worthwhile person?
5. How often do you dislike yourself?
6. In general, how confident do you feel about your abilities?
7. How often do you have the feeling that there is nothing you can do well?

*Appendix L*  
**Shyness**  
**The Revised Cheek & Buss Scale RCBS**

## PERSONALITY, SEXUAL ATTITUDES, AND UNRESTRICTED WOMEN

(Cheek, 1983)

**Note: RCBS was administered in conjunction with SRS – see above**

Instructions: Please answer the following questions by selecting the response that best describes your answer to the question. For statements, choose the response that best describes how true the statement is of you.

Rating scale for all:

- 1 = Very uncharacteristic or untrue, strongly disagree
- 2 = Uncharacteristic
- 3 = Neutral
- 4 = Characteristic
- 5 = Very characteristic or true, strongly agree

1. I feel tense when I'm with people I don't know well.
2. I am socially somewhat awkward.
3. I do not find it difficult to ask other people for information.
4. I am often uncomfortable at parties and other social functions.
5. When in a group of people, I have trouble thinking of the right things to talk about.
6. It does not take me long to overcome my shyness in new situations.
7. It is hard for me to act natural when I am meeting new people.
8. I feel nervous when speaking to someone in authority.
9. I have no doubts about my social competence.
10. I have trouble looking someone right in the eye.
11. I feel inhibited in social situations.
12. I do not find it hard to talk to strangers.
13. I am more shy with members of the opposite sex.

*Appendix M*  
**The “Big 5:” Extraversion, Agreeableness, Conscientiousness,  
Neuroticism, and Agreeableness**

## PERSONALITY, SEXUAL ATTITUDES, AND UNRESTRICTED WOMEN

### **Big Five Inventory, 44 item version (BFI [v44]) (John, Donahue, & Kentle, 1991)**

Here are a number of characteristics that may or may not apply to you. For example, do you agree that you are someone who likes to spend time with others? Please write a number next to each statement to indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with that statement.

- 1 = Disagree strongly
- 2 = Disagree a little
- 3 = Neither Agree nor Disagree
- 4 = Agree a little
- 5 = Agree strongly

The following items in each category were then rated based on the rating scale above.

#### ***I See Myself as Someone Who...***

##### Extraversion:

1. Is talkative
2. Is reserved
3. Is full of energy
4. Generates a lot of enthusiasm
5. Tends to be quiet
6. Has an assertive personality
7. Is sometimes shy, inhibited
8. Is outgoing, sociable

##### Agreeableness:

1. Tends to find fault with others
2. Is helpful and unselfish with others
3. Starts quarrels with others
4. Has a forgiving nature
5. Is generally trusting
6. Can be cold and aloof
7. Is considerate and kind to almost everyone
8. Is sometimes rude to others
9. Likes to cooperate with others

##### Conscientiousness:

1. Does a thorough job
2. Can be somewhat careless
3. Is a reliable worker
4. Tends to be disorganized
5. Tends to be lazy
6. Perseveres until the task is finished
7. Does things efficiently
8. Makes plans and follows through with them

## PERSONALITY, SEXUAL ATTITUDES, AND UNRESTRICTED WOMEN

9. Is easily distracted

Neuroticism:

1. Is depressed, blue
2. Is relaxed, handles stress well
3. Can be tense
4. Worries a lot
5. Is emotionally stable, not easily upset
6. Can be moody
7. Remains calm in tense situations
8. Gets nervous easily

Openness:

1. Is original, comes up with new ideas
2. Is curious about many different things
3. Is ingenious, a deep thinker
4. Has an active imagination
5. Is inventive
6. Values artistic, aesthetic experiences
7. Prefers work that is routine
8. Likes to reflect, play with ideas
9. Has few artistic interests
10. Is sophisticated in art, music, or literature

*Appendix N*  
**Attachment Types**  
**(Bartholomew & Horowitz, 1991)**

# PERSONALITY, SEXUAL ATTITUDES, AND UNRESTRICTED WOMEN

## Part One

Instructions: The following are descriptions of four typical patterns of feelings in close relationships. While no description fits everyone perfectly, please select the one that does the best job of describing the way you usually feel in close relationships.

A. I am comfortable without close emotional relationships. It is very important to me to feel independent and self-sufficient, and I prefer not to depend on others or have others depend on me.

B. I want to be completely emotionally intimate with others, but I often find that others are reluctant to get as close as I would like. I am uncomfortable being without close relationships, but I sometimes worry that others don't value me as much as I value them.

C. I am uncomfortable getting close to others. I want emotionally close relationships, but I find it difficult to trust others completely or to depend on them. I worry that I will be hurt if I allow myself to become close to others.

D. It is easy for me to become emotionally close to others. I am comfortable depending on others and having others depend on me. I don't worry about being alone or having others not accept me.

## Part Two

Instructions: Please rate the extent to which each of the above descriptions is like you by selecting the appropriate rating below.

Rating: 1 = Not at all like me, 2 = Not like me, 3 = Not very much like me, 4 = Somewhat like me, 5 = A little like me, 6 = Like me, 7 = Very much like me

|                |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|----------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Description A: | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| Description B: | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| Description C: | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| Description D: | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

### *Appendix O* **Ethnic Background and Age Demographic Information**

PERSONALITY, SEXUAL ATTITUDES, AND UNRESTRICTED WOMEN

1. What is your ethnic background?

White/ Caucasian    Hispanic    Asian    Black/African-American  
Pacific Islander    Native American    Indian/ South Asian    Middle Eastern  
Other (please specify) \_\_\_\_\_

2. How old are you?

*Appendix P*  
**Measures and Items Not Reported on in The Present Study**

## PERSONALITY, SEXUAL ATTITUDES, AND UNRESTRICTED WOMEN

### **Body Image (Fleming & Courtney, 1984)**

Instructions: Please answer the following questions by selecting the response that best describes your answer to the question. For statements, choose the response that best describes how true the statement is of you.

Rating scale for all but 5: 1 = Never, 2 = Rarely, 3 = Sometimes, 4 = Often, 5 = Always

Rating scale for 5: 1 = Not at all confident, 2 = Not very confident, 3 = Somewhat confident, 4 = Confident, 5 = Very confident

1. Have you ever felt ashamed of your physique or figure?
2. Do you often feel that most of your friends or peers are more physically attractive than yourself?
3. Do you often wish or fantasize that you were better looking?
4. Have you ever been concerned or worried about your ability to attract potential romantic and/or sexual partners?
5. How confident are you that others see you as being physically appealing?

From the Background Information/ Demographic information section:

Instructions: Please answer the following items to the best of your ability. Estimate if needed.

1. What is your height and weight?  
Height (total feet + inches, e.g. 60 inches = 5'0):  
Weight:

### **Religiosity (Allport & Ross, 1967)**

## PERSONALITY, SEXUAL ATTITUDES, AND UNRESTRICTED WOMEN

Instructions: Please read each item carefully and decide the extent to which you agree with the statement, then select the phrase which best reflects how much you agree or disagree with the statement.

Rating scale for all items except 6: 1 = Strongly agree, 2 = Agree, 3 = Neither agree nor disagree, 4 = Disagree, 5 = Strongly disagree

Rating scale for item 6: 1 = A bible study group, 2 = A social fellowship, 3 = Neither of these options – different religious group, 4 = Neither of these options – not religious

1. I try hard to carry my religion over into all other dealings in life.
2. Quite often I have been keenly aware of the presence of God or the Divine Being.
3. My religious beliefs are what really lie behind my whole approach to life.
4. The prayers I say when I am alone carry as much meaning and personal emotions as those said by me during services.
5. If not prevented by unavoidable circumstances, I attend my house of worship.
6. If I were to join a religious group I would prefer to join...
7. Religion is especially important to me because it answers many questions about the meaning of life.
8. I read literature about my faith.
9. It is important to me to spend periods of time in private religious thought and meditation.
10. What religion offers me most of is comfort when sorrows and misfortune strike.
11. One reason for my being a congregation member is that such membership helps to establish a person in the community.
12. The purpose of prayer is to secure a happy and peaceful life.
13. It doesn't matter so much what I believe as long as I lead a moral life.
14. Although I am a religious person, I refuse to let religious considerations influence my everyday affairs.
15. My house of worship is most important as a place to formulate good social relations.
16. Although I believe in my religion, I feel there are many more important things in life.
17. I pray chiefly because I have been taught to pray.
18. A primary reason for my interest in religion is that my house of worship is a congenial social activity.
19. Occasionally, I find it necessary to compromise my religious beliefs in order to protect my social and economic well-being.
20. The primary purpose of prayer is to gain relief and protection.

**Acculturation (Ryder, Alden, & Paulhus, 2000)**

## PERSONALITY, SEXUAL ATTITUDES, AND UNRESTRICTED WOMEN

Instructions: Please answer each question as carefully as possible by circling one of the numbers to the right of each question to indicate your degree of agreement or disagreement.

Many of these questions will refer to your heritage culture, meaning the culture that has influenced you most (other than North American culture). It may be the culture of your birth, the culture in which you have been raised, or another culture that forms part of your background. If there are several such cultures, pick the one that has influenced you most (e.g., Irish, Chinese, Mexican, Black). If you do not feel that you have been influenced by any other culture, please try to identify a culture that may have had an impact on previous generations of your family.

1. Please write your heritage culture in the space provided:\_\_\_\_\_

Rating for items 2 – are:

1 = Strongly disagree, 2 = Moderately disagree, 3 = Disagree, 4 = Neutral/ Depends, 5 = Slightly agree, 6 = Agree, 7 = Moderately agree, 8 = Strongly agree

2. I often participate in my heritage cultural traditions.
3. I often participate in mainstream North American cultural traditions.
4. I would be willing to marry a person from my heritage culture.
5. I would be willing to marry a North American person.
6. I enjoy social activities with people from the same heritage culture as myself.
7. I enjoy social activities with typical North American people.
8. I am comfortable working with people of the same heritage culture as myself.
9. I am comfortable working with typical North American people.
10. I enjoy entertainment (e.g., movies, music) from my heritage culture.
11. I enjoy North American entertainment (e.g., movies, music).
12. I often behave in ways that are typical of my heritage culture.
13. I often behave in ways that are 'typically North American.'
14. It is important for me to maintain or develop the practices of my heritage culture.
15. It is important for me to maintain or develop North American cultural practices.
16. I believe in the values of my heritage culture.
17. I believe in mainstream North American values.
18. I enjoy the jokes and humor of my heritage culture.
19. I enjoy typical North American jokes and humor.
20. I am interested in having friends from my heritage culture.
21. I am interested in having North American friends.

### **Self-Evaluation of Own Sexuality (Clark, 2003)**

## PERSONALITY, SEXUAL ATTITUDES, AND UNRESTRICTED WOMEN

The following questions ask about your sexual and social behaviors. Keep in mind that we are not looking for any individual's responses, but rather that we will be looking at group trends. Please answer honestly.

Note: Where not otherwise defined, by “sex” we mean any kind of intimate bodily contact between two (or more) people. For the purposes of this survey, “sex” does NOT refer to mouth-to-mouth kissing or cuddling.

1. How do you feel about the amount of sexual experience you have had so far?  
Rating scale: 1 = I wish I had a lot less sexual experience, 2 = I wish I had somewhat less sexual experience, 3 = I am satisfied with the amount of sexual experience I have had, 4 = I wish I had somewhat more sexual experience, 5 = I wish I had a lot more sexual experience
2. What do you feel is the ideal amount of sexual experience for a woman your age? (with two  
Number of male partners so far: \_\_\_\_\_  
Number of female partners so far: \_\_\_\_\_
3. Concerning my sexuality and sex life I consider myself  
Rating scale: 1 = Extremely unhappy, 2 = Basically unhappy, 3 = More unhappy than happy, 4 = Neither happy nor unhappy; neutral, 5 = More happy than unhappy, 6 = Basically happy, 7 = Extremely happy
4. Concerning my sexual attitudes and behavior, I wish I was  
Rating scale: 1 = Much less inhibited, 2 = Less inhibited, 3 = About as I am now, 4 = More inhibited, 5 = Much more inhibited
5. How would you rate your sexual experiences on a scale from 1 to 7?  
Rated on a 1 - 7 scale where:  
1 = I am much less experienced than most women my age  
3 = I have an average amount of sexual experience for women my age  
7 = I am much more experienced than most women my age

**“Easily Orgasmic” Women/ Ease of Orgasm (Ostovich, 2004; Clark, 2003)**

## PERSONALITY, SEXUAL ATTITUDES, AND UNRESTRICTED WOMEN

1. On average, over the past 6 months, how often have you had an orgasm (from sex and/or masturbation)?  
1 = Never, 2 = Once every few months, 3 = About once a month, 4 = 2 or 3 times a month, 5 = Once a week, 6 = A few times each week, 7 = Nearly every day, 8 = At least once a day
2. How easily do you become sexually aroused (in a sexual situation you are comfortable in)?  
Rated from 1-5 where 1 = very difficultly, slowly and 5 = very easily or quickly
3. When masturbating, how often do you achieve orgasm?  
Rating scale: 1 = Never, 2 = Sometimes, 3 = Often, 4 = Always, 5 = N/A do not masturbate
4. “When having sexual relations with a partner, how often do you achieve orgasm?  
Rating scale: 1 = Never, 2 = Sometimes once, 3 = Always once, 4 = Sometimes more than once, 5 = Usually more than once, 6 = Almost always more than once, 7 = Have not had sexual relations with a partner
5. Have you ever used sex toys such as a vibrator or other objects?  
Yes No

### **Additional Items Concerning Sexual Behavior (Clark, 2003)**

## PERSONALITY, SEXUAL ATTITUDES, AND UNRESTRICTED WOMEN

1. During the time you have been (or were) dating your current or most recent dating partner, have (or did) you engage in sex with anyone else?  
Yes    No    Never been in a relationship
2. On average, over the past 6 months, how often have you had sex with a partner?  
1 = Never, 2 = Once every few months, 3 = About once a month, 4 = 2 or 3 times a month, 5 = Once a week, 6 = A few times each week, 7 = Nearly every day, 8 = At least once a day

**Modified Reasons For Sex (Clark 2003; Hill & Preston, 1996; Meston & Buss, 2007)**

## PERSONALITY, SEXUAL ATTITUDES, AND UNRESTRICTED WOMEN

The next section contains items regarding the reasons you might engage in sexual activity. These items may feel very personal. Please answer them to the best of your ability and comfort, remembering that all information will be kept confidential.

Note: Where not otherwise defined, by “sex” (or "sexual activity") we mean any kind of intimate bodily contact between two (or more) people. For the purposes of this survey, “sex” does NOT refer to mouth-to-mouth kissing or cuddling.

1. Have you engaged in sexual activity?  
Yes    No

If yes was selected, the survey program proceeded on to questions 2 – 13. If no was selected, the participant skipped the following section.

Rating scale: 1 = Always, 2 = Almost always, 3 = Frequently, 4 = Sometimes, 5 = Infrequently, 6 = Very rarely, 7 = Never

For me, sex with another person is about...

1. Relief from stress, improving my mood
  2. Pleasure, excitement, physical thrill
  3. Expressing value for a partner, showing love
  4. Feeling valued by a partner, feeling loved
  5. Enhancing feelings of personal power, feeling sexually desirable
  6. Experiencing the power of a partner, desire to be dominated
  7. Nurturing or comforting to improve a partner’s psychological state
  8. Improving or salvaging my current relationship
  9. Wanting to get back at my partner for cheating on me, getting revenge or “evening the score”
  10. Gaining sexual experience/knowledge, acquiring a variety of sexual experiences
  11. Procreating, wanting to have children
  12. Nothing in particular; it “just happens;” It's easier to go all the way than to stop
  13. Being closer to God; experiencing spiritual connection and inspiration
- Other (please specify frequency): \_\_\_\_\_

**Goal Orientation (Dykman, 1998 as modified by Ward, 2000)**

## PERSONALITY, SEXUAL ATTITUDES, AND UNRESTRICTED WOMEN

Instructions: Read each item carefully. Using the scale below, choose the statement from the rating scale that best describes you.

Rating scale for all items:

- 1 = strongly disagree**
- 2 = moderately disagree**
- 3 = slightly disagree**
- 4 = equally agree and disagree**
- 5 = slightly agree**
- 6 = moderately agree**
- 7 = strongly agree**

1. My interactions with potential dating partners often feel like a test of whether or not I'm a likeable person.
2. Growth within an intimate relationship is more important to me than protecting myself from my fears.
3. I look upon potential problems in intimate relationships as opportunities for growth rather than as threats to my self-esteem.
4. Compared to other people, I tend to approach stressful intimate situations as if my basic self-worth, competence, or likeability was "at stake."
5. I approach difficult dating situations welcoming the opportunity to learn from my mistakes.
6. I feel like I'm always testing out whether or not I really "measure up" in sexual situations.
7. Whether it be in sports, sexual relationships, or job/school activities, I feel like I'm still trying to prove that I'm worthwhile, competent, or likeable person.
8. My approach to challenging situations with dating partners is that I'd rather make a mistake and learn from the experience than sit back and never try.
9. When I'm faced with difficult or stressful intimate dating situations, I'm likely to view it as an opportunity to learn and grow.
10. I tend to view difficult or stressful intimate situations as all-or-none tests of my basic worth as a person.
11. I feel like I'm constantly trying to prove that I'm as competent as other sexually active people around me.
12. When I approach new or difficult sexual situations, I'm less concerned with the possibility of failure than with how I can grow from the experience.
13. I look upon possible setbacks and rejection from sexual partners as part of life since I know that such experiences will help me grow as a person in the long run.
14. In sexual situations, one of the main things I'm striving for is to prove that I'm really "good enough."
15. My approach to potential dating situations is one of always needing to prove my basic worth, competence, or likeability.
16. I approach difficult dating situations knowing that I can accept failure or rejection as long as I learn and grow from the experience.
17. How well I perform in sexual situations is a direct measure of my basic self-worth, competence, or likeability as a person.
18. In intimate situations that could end in failure or rejection, it's natural for me to focus on how I can grow or what I can learn from the experience.

### **First Time Sexual Behaviors (Clark, 2003)**

## PERSONALITY, SEXUAL ATTITUDES, AND UNRESTRICTED WOMEN

Instructions: For the following items, please leave the responses blank if they are not applicable to you. Keep in mind that we are not looking for any individual's responses, but rather that we will be looking at group trends. Please answer honestly.

1. At what age did you first become aware of sex and sexuality?
2. At what age did you first start having daydreams about relationships with boys?
3. At what age did you first start having daydreams about relationships with girls?
4. At what age did you first start thinking of yourself as a sexual person?
5. At what age did you first begin masturbating?

Note: Please leave the response as blank if the item does not apply to you.

6. At what age did you have your first experience of sexual contact with  
a male? Age:  
a female? Age:
7. At what age did you have your first sexual caress with  
a male? Age:  
a female? Age:
8. At what age did you have your first sexual caress with  
a male? Age:  
a female? Age:
9. At what age did you have your first experience of oral sex with  
a male? Age:  
a female? Age:
10. At what age did you lose your virginity by having sexual intercourse for the first time  
with  
a male? Age:  
a female? Age:

### **Gender Identity & Additional Background Variables**

Instructions: Please answer the following items to the best of your ability. Estimate if needed.

1. What gender do you identify as?

PERSONALITY, SEXUAL ATTITUDES, AND UNRESTRICTED WOMEN

Female

Male

Transitioning male to female

Transitioning female to male

Other (please specify): \_\_\_\_\_

2. What was your age when you started college?
3. At what age was your first menstrual period (menarche)?
4. Are you currently taking an antidepressant medication (e.g. Prozac, Celexa, etc.)?  
Yes                      No