

# Review of: "Sociosexuality Expanded: The Role of Light and Dark Personality Traits"

Jonathan Faucher<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Université du Québec à Trois-Rivières

**Potential competing interests:** No potential competing interests to declare.

The paper focuses on documenting the associations between the Light Triad and Dark Triad, and tridimensional sociosexuality. Results from correlation and regression analyses highlight associations between light and dark personality traits and sociosexuality components, especially of Dark Triad Dirty Dozen Psychopathy. I found this paper to be an interesting effort at documenting the role of light and dark personality traits on a specific component of relational/social functioning, and my comments are mostly targeted towards adding on to the manuscript rather than modifying what is currently included.

## Introduction

I have two main suggestions regarding the Introduction. First, at the beginning of the Introduction, the author highlights the relevancy of a tridimensional conceptualization of sociosexuality. However, the explanation of its advantage over a unidimensional understanding of sociosexuality is limitedly discussed, and only further in the Introduction. As the tridimensional framework of sociosexuality is central to this paper (and constitute an innovative feature of this research), I believe that this could be more thoroughly discussed; I also wonder whether the Introduction could be reorganized so that all information regarding sociosexuality would be first discussed; only then the role of determinants of sociosexuality—such as personality—could be discussed.

Second, in line with the previous comment, I believe that, in the Introduction, the author could expand on the relevancy of personality, and especially of light and dark personality traits, on sociosexuality. Again, these variables are instrumental to the paper, and although, as the author clearly stated, previous results support the study of light and dark personality traits, and sociosexuality, the reason why is not directly addressed.

On a minor note, the abbreviation SOI-R is mentioned in the Introduction but only defined in the Method section.

## Method

I believe that all options regarding gender identity could be mentioned—considering that only cisgender woman and cisgender man were ultimately selected by participants, perhaps this could be mentioned in a footnote.

## Discussion

In the Introduction, the author describes socio-cultural factors that might interplay with sociosexuality. These factors are

not really rediscussed after that in the manuscript. I wonder if the author could touch on them in the Discussion and discuss on how these socio-cultural factors could have influenced the results. This is not directly addressed, although the sentence “However, it should also be noted that not all cultures and environments necessarily see promiscuous sexual conduct or high sociosexuality scores as “dirty” (Davis & Whitten, 1987)” seems to imply a role of socio-cultural factors in the results.

The sample includes a significant overrepresentation of participants identifying as a cisgender woman (86,1%). The sample also includes an overrepresentation of participants identifying as heterosexual (85.6%). Perhaps the implications of this sample composition could be addressed in the Discussion, as well as the role of gender identity and sexual orientation in sociosexuality and its interplay with personality.

In the Discussion, I believe that the role of light personality traits in sociosexuality could be discussed with more details. On the one hand, how should we understand the limited role of the Light Triad on sociosexuality? On the other hand, how should we understand that only Faith in Humanity significantly predicts a sociosexuality component (Sociosexual Desire)? On that note, I believe that the statement “Therefore, it is logically negatively associated with a desire for short-term and no-strings-attached sex, which may be linked with manipulateness and a lack of empathy toward others” could be supported by a reference.

Regarding the role of psychopathy, in the Discussion, the author highlights that the results of the current study are coherent with previous investigations. However, they only briefly touch on why psychopathy, as opposed to other Dark Triad traits, is more strongly linked to sociosexuality. They seem to imply that this is linked to a lack of empathy and manipulation but the role of these features in sociosexuality are not explained. It should also be noted that previous research suggests that limited empathy is not exclusive to psychopathy but rather a common feature of all Dark Triad traits (e.g., Paulhus, 2014). Thus, I wonder about the extent to which it is really empathy impairments that explain the uncovered results. Moreover, in the paper, it is suggested that the impulsiveness that characterizes psychopathy could explain the links between psychopathy and sociosexuality. However, to my knowledge, impulsivity is more typically linked to secondary psychopathy, rather than primary psychopathy, and Dark Triad Dirty Dozen Psychopathy is closer to primary psychopathy (e.g., Jones & Paulhus, 2014). Considering all this, I believe that the paragraph on psychopathy could be reformulated to focus more clearly on the specific features of psychopathy that are assessed in the Dark Triad Dirty Dozen.

Jones, D. N., & Paulhus, D. L. (2014). Introducing the Short Dark Triad (SD3): A brief measure of dark personality traits. *Assessment*, 21(1), 28-41. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1073191113514105>

Paulhus, D. L. (2014). Toward a taxonomy of dark personalities. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 23(6), 421-426. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0963721414547737>