

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

John Johnson¹

¹ Pennsylvania State University

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

There are some interesting findings here, and they would be better served if the author works on his presentation of ideas. For starters, the introduction could be better organized to indicate what has been accepted as relatively established about sociosexuality and its measurement and what, exactly, is the missing information about sociosexuality that the current study provides. As the paper now stands, the missing information that the study provides is introduced too soon as the first sentence, "There is a dearth of research on the tridimensional framework of sociosexuality concerning its determinants, especially Light personality traits (Fernandez Del Rio et al., 2019)." The problem with this introduction is that it immediately uses an undefined concept (sociosexuality) and an undefined perspective (the tridimensional framework), which may be confusing to readers.

It would be better to begin with the classic conception of sociosexuality by Kinsey and its well-known operationalization by Simpson and Gangestad (1991), followed by the development of the concept and its operationalization with the tridimensional framework by Penke and Asendorpf (2008), and then finally what is still unknown about the determinants of the components in the tridimensional framework. A new introduction could look something like the following:

Sociosexuality is a concept that sex research pioneer Alfred Kinsey used to describe individual differences in people's willingness to engage in casual sex [add reference if you want]. This concept was operationalized by Simpson and Gangestad (1991) with their Sociosexual Orientation Inventory (SOI). The SOI, which has been used in many studies (see Simpson, Wilson, & Winterheld, 2004), characterizes sociosexuality as a unidimensional continuum with two poles: restricted sociosexuality (i.e., preference for sex in long-term and committed relationships) and unrestricted sociosexuality (i.e., choice for short-term and no-strings-attached sex).

Despite the many successes of the SOI in research, Penke and Asendorpf (2008) note that Simpson and Gangstad's assumption of sociosexuality as a unidimensional construct has limited our understanding of sociosexuality. Penke and Asendorpf presented an alternative perspective, the tridimensional framework, which conceptualized sociosexuality into three dimensions: sociosexual behavior (i.e., prior sexual experience), attitudes towards sex without commitment (i.e., views about casual sex), and sociosexual desire (i.e., dispositional motivation concerning the effort put forth in both short-term and long-term sexual relationships).

The research of Penke and Asendorpf (2008) and subsequent research (Barrada et al., 2018; Fernandez Del Rio et al., 2019) with a revised SOI (the SOI-R) has supported the tridimensional framework. Nonetheless, there has been little

research on personality traits that might serve as unique predictors of these three aspects of sociosexuality. In particular, the Light Triad traits (Nascimento et al., 2018) have not been well-examined as unique predictors of sociosexuality. The current study seeks to expand our understanding of sociosexuality by creating different prediction models for each sociosexual dimension, looking at the prediction value of Light and Dark personality traits.

Although some editing for clarity could be conducted on the remainder of the manuscript after the introduction, there is little I would change in terms of substantive material. One thing that the author might attempt is to address the significance of dividing sociosexuality into behavior, attitudes, and desire, and why dark or light traits might be associated with some, but not all, of these three components. As it stands now, the paper is mostly descriptive, simply listing which correlations are significant and which contribute to explaining additional variance in multiple regression, without explaining *why* the three components have unique predictors. This will not be an easy task, as even Penke and Asendorpf were not completely clear on how the three components of sociosexuality are unique. The three components tend to go together, to be sure; someone with positive attitudes about casual sex and a desire for casual sex is more likely to engage in that behavior. But it is also possible to have positive attitudes or desires *without* engaging in the behavior, which is why there might be different predictors for the components.

One final note. I would add to the Limitations the fact that the sample is almost entirely female. The results might therefore be more applicable to females than males, and additional data should be gathered with a male sample.