Is social dominance a sex-specific strategy for infidelity?
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Abstract

The current study investigated personality, psychopathy and mating effort of 84 adults recruited from a large office setting who admitted infidelity whilst involved in another relationship. These were compared with individuals who had not been unfaithful. Measurement scales were reduced by principal components analysis to three general factors; social dominance, manipulativeness, and openness. There was no sex difference in social dominance or openness. Males were higher on the manipulativeness factor. There were no differences in the social dominance or openness factors for individuals admitting affairs compared to those who had not; males who admitted affairs were higher in social dominance. There was an interaction between sex and having had an affair (or not) for the social dominance, this indicated males who had committed infidelity were higher on the social dominance dimension than females who were also unfaithful, the reverse was the case for males and females who had not had affairs. Manipulativeness predicted the number of affairs had and their emphasis on sexuality, whereas social dominance did not. These results suggest male and female infidelity is underpinned by differential personality types as well as differential sexual strategies.

1. Introduction

Infidelity is the main reason cited when petitioning for a divorce (Betzig, 1989), and those who are unfaithful tend to be cautious about discussing such activity. This may be because it involves elements of behaviour participants may not be comfortable admitting to; unmet sexual and emotional needs, opportunism, irresponsibility, and the execution of intentional deceit. As such, infidelity provides a means of examining the darker and more problematic side of human
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experience without having to examine actual criminal offending (Spitzberg & Cupach, 1998). While infidelity affects deep human emotions and bonds driven by evolutionary factors, not everybody necessarily follows the evolutionary script (Buss, 1994, 1998, 2000). Nevertheless, this theory is powerful and the current study seeks to examine the individual differences in personality and mating effort in people who admit to having actually been unfaithful using an evolutionary model.

Some aspects of infidelity reflect sex differences in attitudes to sex itself; thus males typically place less emphasis on emotional attachment for sexual relationships, have a greater desire for anonymous sexual encounters, and desire a greater number of sexual partners than females (Bailey, Gaulin, Agyei, & Gladue 1994; Wright & Reise, 1997). Shifts from this stereotype reflect research with adolescents and young adults rather than the general population (Feldman & Cauffman, 1999; Sheppard, Nelson, & Andreoli-Mathie, 1995). Females typically value emotional attachment, and their sexual relationships are no exception. This may reflect an evolutionary need for females to be generally sure of a male’s personal commitment and his willingness to share resources (as well as genes) before having sex with him. Sexual fantasies reiterate this sexual disparity; men have more sexually focussed fantasies than women, and these are more likely to involve strangers. Women’s sexual fantasies are more likely to have some personal content (e.g. knowledge of their fantasy partner; Ellis & Symonds, 1990).

While infidelity is universal, it is rarely socially acceptable, and double-standards exist between public expression and private practice (Feldman & Cauffman, 2000). A study of normative disapproval to extramarital affairs by Prins, Buunk, and VanYperen (1993) tested the assumption that following AIDS awareness “individuals have become more cautious with regard to sexual relations outside their marriage” (p. 39). General disapproval for infidelity and disapproval of infidelity due to risk of HIV was measured, as were desired and actual extramarital affairs. While neither normative disapproval nor actual affair frequency differed between the sexes, the desire to have an affair was significantly higher for males. “Normative disapproval” showed significant negative correlations for both sexes on desire and behaviour. Disapproval of affairs, even in the light of AIDS awareness, was not correlated with desire and actual behaviour.

Infidelity and the desire for more than one partner are clearly important factors of sexual risk taking and strongly underpinned by individual differences. Meta-analysis of 45 studies examining personality factors underlying sexual risk behaviour found high agreeableness (A) and high conscientiousness (C) reliably correlated with lower sexual risk taking (Hoyle, Fejfar, & Miller, 2000). Low A was correlated negatively with greater sexual risk taking, including multiple partners; for low C the strongest correlation was with unprotected sex. This study did not indicate that low C is related to sexual promiscuity, although sensation seeking and impulsivity (sharing constructs with low C) are strongly predictive of sexual risk taking. Miller, Lynam, Zimmerman, Logan, Leukefeld, and Clayton (2000) found that low straightforwardness (one facet of the A construct within Costa and McCrae’s “Big Five” model, characterised by manipulative, deceitful behaviour) was also a strong predictor of sexual promiscuity. Marital commitment does not change matters; Buss and Shackelford (1997) studied 107 couples married for less than a year, examining susceptibility to infidelity within that first year, and how likely the participants were to commit infidelity. They examined both Eysenckian and “Big Five” dimensions of personality, a separate measure of narcissism and contextual variables predictive of susceptibility to sexual infidelity, such as sexual satisfaction, relationship satisfaction, and sources of conflict. Each participant reported
on themselves and their partner, who also completed the scales. This design enabled each person to give a self-rating and to have an intimate peer rating. While low C and high Narcissism generally predicted the desire to commit infidelity, these were better predictors in females. Openness (O) was a predictor of susceptibility to infidelity in men. Psychoticism (P; tough-minded hostility) was significantly and positively correlated with infidelity for both men and women.

While male short-term sexual strategies are perhaps driven primarily by hedonic factors, female short-term sexual strategies are more complex, as they may bestow a range of benefits including greater resources, better or more diverse genes, an option to mate-switch and increased mate manipulation (Buss, 1999; Greiling & Buss, 2000). Scheib (2001) examined the particular thesis that relationship infidelity may enable a female to obtain “good genes”, reasoning that physical health underlies attractiveness, and this may have been more important for the offspring than the milieu provided by a male with good character. In keeping with this thesis, she found that the preference for physical attractiveness in females was specific to the sexual context, women preferring men with good character as colleagues, and perhaps as long-term partners.

Given the differential sexual motivation of males relative to females, it is unsurprising that mating effort (i.e. efforts to attract a sexual partner) is higher in males (Rowe, Vazsonyi, & Figueredo, 1997). A person high in mating effort is more likely to commit infidelity and be sexually promiscuous; they may also be more delinquent and inclined to social failure (Rowe, 1995; Rowe et al., 1997). This overlap is because the means employed by males in attracting a sexual partner involve competition, and delinquency (in an adolescent) or criminal behaviour (in an adult) may be, for some, an effective (or only) tool for acquiring “resources with which to attract a mate” (Rowe et al., 1997, p. 107). Traits such as high narcissism [akin to Machiavellianism (M) and primary psychopathy], low A and high P might thus apply equally to individuals with antisocial personality and those who are sociosexual (Mealey, 1995; Wright & Reise, 1997). The core characteristics of primary psychopathy (lying and manipulativeness, a lack of empathy, and grandiosity) might be thought helpful attributes for infidelity. Secondary psychopathic characteristics such as a lack of long-term goals and an impulsive lifestyle are less obviously relevant. M has a positive correlation with primary and secondary psychopathy (McHoskey, Worzel, & Szyarto, 1998). Relating the five-factor model of personality to the psychopathy construct, Miller, Lynam, Widiger, and Leukefeld (2001) found primary psychopathy reflected a combination of low A and low neuroticism (N), whereas secondary psychopathy involved low C, low A, and high N.

Most studies have examined the desire to commit infidelity rather than actual acts, although the sexual strategies theory suggests that for these strategies to become internalised via a result of sexual selection and adaptation, the actual behaviour must occur (Buss & Schmitt, 1993). The aim of the present study was to examine the personality of self-admitted adulterers in relation to the five-factor model of personality, self-reported “psychopathic” traits, and sexual selection strategies reflecting mating effort, reasoning that these traits all overlap. We expected mating effort to be greater in individuals who were unfaithful, hostile and manipulative factors to be greater in those who commit adultery. We also expected to replicate classic findings such as infidelity to be greater in males and sex-related differences in motivation for unfaithfulness.
2. Method

2.1. Design

Participants completed a brief screening questionnaire and four psychological scales. Based on information obtained in the screening instrument, individuals were classified by sex and whether they had been unfaithful or not. Information was also collected to examine whether the motivation for the affair in those who admitted to such behaviour was driven by emotional or sexual factors. The independent variables were thus whether the person had had an affair or not, and whether they were male or female. The dependent variables were the measures completed by each participant.

2.2. Ethics

The current study examined some very personal matters, and thus ethical practice was paramount; the study was passed by the departmental ethics committee, subject to close adherence to the principles of confidentiality and anonymity. To assure participants of confidentiality, an additional envelope was provided with the questionnaires, with instructions to place the completed scales in an envelope and thence into a sealed collecting unit, which was not opened until the study had been completed.

2.3. Participants

Of 120 questionnaires issued 87 (72.5%) were returned. Three questionnaires were excluded from analysis due to incomplete data. Of the 84 participants, 29 (34.5%) were male and 55 (65.5%) female. The sample was an opportunistic broad screening of workers in a large non-academic office. The mean age of participants was 30 (range = 17–53); 54 (64.3%) of the sample were single, 23 (27.4%) married, and 7 (8.3%) divorced. Two participants had homosexual sexual preferences. Occupationally, 69 (82.1%) were full-time employed in the office while 15 (17.9%) were students working over the Summer. No participants were unemployed.

2.4. Measures

1. Brief screening instrument and infidelity index

Participants completed a covering sheet which assessed age, sex, marital status, sexual preference and occupation. This measure also asked about infidelity, asking whether the participant had engaged in sexual relations with someone other than their regular long-term partner. We explicitly did not confine this question to the current relationship, reasoning that while participants may not currently be in a relationship, it was highly likely that they may have been in the past. Participants stated the estimated number of relationships in which they had committed infidelity. Persons who had done this more than six times were given the value of 7 (two participants). While inexact, this reduced the problem of highly skewed data attributable to several very extreme individuals. To examine whether the infidelity was driven by sexual or
emotional factors a single five-point Likert scale was used, in which a response of one would indicate the affair was primarily sexually driven, five primarily emotional. For many cases affairs could be driven by both factors, and a response of three would signify this possibility.

2. The NEO-FFI (Costa & McCrae, 1992)
The NEO-FFI was used to assess general personality traits in the participants. The NEO-FFI is a short form of the more lengthy NEO-PI and assesses the “Big Five” personality dimensions of N, extraversion (E), O, A and C. The NEO-FFI has limitations; in particular the five personality dimensions it indexes are not orthogonal, and the dimensions of N, A and C are more reliable than the O and E dimensions (Egan, Deary, & Austin, 2000). However, these difficulties can be partially overcome statistically, and using a widely used instrument enables some extrapolation of results to other studies using similar measures, as has been the case in this research area.

3. The Self Report Psychopathy Scale (LSRP; Levenson, Kiehl, & Cory, 1995)
The LSRP measured psychopathic (or at least Machiavellian) attributes with a 26-item inventory designed to examine characteristics associated with primary and secondary psychopathy in the general population. Sixteen of the items test primary psychopathy (i.e. the core psychopathic traits of callous, manipulative and egocentric behaviour), while a further 10 items test secondary psychopathy (i.e. lifestyle-driven anti-social behaviour). Levenson et al. (1995) argue that if psychopathy is a consistent construct then the cluster of behaviours and characteristics associated with it should not be confined to the criminal population, and provides a self-report alternative for the PCL-R (Hare, 1991) for non-offending populations. The concordance of the LSRP and the PCL-R is generally fair (Brinkley, Schmitt, Smith, & Newman, 2001).

4. The Mating Effort Scale (MES; Rowe et al., 1997).
The MES is a reliable 10-item scale used to examine intra-sexual competition in both males and females. Responses are given on a five-point scale from strongly disagree to strongly agree.

5. The Marlowe–Crowne Social Desirability Scale (MCSD; Reynolds, 1982)
The MCSD tests for socially desirable response bias, and consists of 13 items and responses are limited to true or false. The short versions of the MCSD correlate highly with the original scale (Loo & Thorpe, 2000). Response bias is a limitation in most studies that use self-report data, and the scale was included to investigate this possibility.

2.5. Procedure

Questionnaires were given out with a consent form and an information sheet to the large workplace. Individuals were asked to complete them in their own time and to return them to the sealed unit. After several months the box was removed from the work setting, the scales scored and data coded, then entered into SPSS.

3. Statistics

Initial analysis involved an examination of the raw scores on the instruments broken down by age and sex. A parametric analysis was selected after exploratory analysis of the data found no
highly skewed distributions, and stem and leaf analysis found few genuine outliers. The most parsimonious way of analysis was deemed to be a two-way ANOVA in which the sex of the participant and whether or not they had had an affair were the independent variables, and an interaction between these factors would indicate differential sexual strategies between the sexes. To explore simple relationships between the scales (some of which have not been examined in relation to each other before) Pearson’s $r$ correlations were calculated. Given the NEO-FFI does not represent five orthogonal personality dimensions (Egan et al., 2000), the correlation matrix was reduced to a simpler set of general personality factors. This was done using principal components analysis with Promax rotation (which does not assume the independence of derived factors), from which factor scores for each of the dimensions were then calculated. These factor scores were then analysed using the two-way ANCOVA model used to analyse the raw scores on the scales. This conservative analysis was conducted to avoid getting significant effects via the same predictors due to the indirect effects of prior correlated factors.

4. Results

Eighty-four participants completed the questionnaire package. Of these, 34 (40.4%) individuals (22 female, 12 male) reported having had an affair compared to 50 (33 female, 17 male) who had not. There was no difference in the frequency of males and females reporting affairs compared with control subjects ($\chi^2=0.05$, n.s.). This result shows that, in the current data set, males were not more likely to commit infidelity than females. When the analysis was confined to the 34 participants who had been unfaithful, males showed higher rates of infidelity than females. Divorced people were more likely to answer yes to sexual infidelity, single people were more likely to answer no, and married people were approximately equal in their responses.

4.1. Sex and affair differences on the basic measures

To examine the combined effects of sex differences and whether the participant had had an affair before, we ran a series of two-way ANOVAs in which we examined individual variables by sex (male or female) and affair (no or yes). Table 1 presents these results expressed as $F$-ratios and their associated significance. These results show that males are higher than females on measures of self-rated primary and secondary psychopathy and mating effort. Males were lower than females on measures of A and social desirability. These results are not unexpected given what is already known about sex differences in personality. A comparison based on whether individuals had previously had an affair or not indicated that those who had committed infidelity were lower in A and social desirability, and higher on primary psychopathy and the MES, again reiterating what might be expected from the literature. Perhaps of most interest is the interaction between sex and having had an affair or not. Interactions were observed between these variables and N, E and A indicating sex-differential effects on personality.

4.2. Relationships within the measures

The rate of infidelity, emotional/sexual infidelity and the measures of behaviour and personality were correlated with one another using Pearson’s $r$. The resulting correlation matrix is shown in
Table 2. Frequency of affairs was positively correlated with primary psychopathy, lower A and higher scores on the MES, all supporting the broad hypothesis that higher negative personal traits will be related to greater frequency of infidelity. Primary psychopathy was correlated moderately with secondary psychopathy, more highly (and negatively) with A, and substantially ($r=0.59$, $P<0.001$) with the MES. Secondary psychopathy (with a greater emphasis on antisocial activity rather than interpersonal manipulativeness) was correlated with higher N and lower scores on all personality measures bar O, for which there was no association at all, in keeping with what is known about the personality features of formally recognised offenders. Within the NEO-FFI 6 of the 10 intercorrelations were significant, indicating that, as previously observed, this measure does not measure five independent dimensions of personality (Egan et al., 2000). In the current study N, E and C all overlapped. Associated with primary and, to a lesser extent secondary psychopathy, the MES was also associated with lower A. Social desirability was associated with greater A and C, and with lower self-rated N and psychopathy, supporting views that social desirability measures reflect personality variance as much as dissimulation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2.</th>
<th>Correlation matrix of measures ($n=84$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LSRP -P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rate</td>
<td>0.23**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSRP-P</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSRP-S</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MES</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To avoid noting spurious associations, only correlations significant at ** ($P<0.01$ or higher) are noted.
4.3. Classification of data

The systematic associations between the different measures in the study suggest that there are general underlying variables that account for much of the observed variance. To test this a principal factor analysis with Promax rotation was conducted on the four scales used in the study; this method was legitimate as there were nine times as many subjects as there were variables put into the analysis, optimising the likely stability of the solution. The oblique Promax rotation was used to accommodate the correlated nature of the underlying variables, which avoided imposing a false model which assumed and optimised independence of the factors, as would varimax rotation. This analysis generated three principal components, accounting for 71.6% of the observed test variance, and required six iterations to converge (Table 3). The three components were defined by their high positive or negative loadings on the test measures. To optimise conservatism of factor interpretation, only loadings of over 0.5 were used to define the derived dimensions. Factor 1 had high negative loadings for secondary psychopathy and N, and high loadings for E, A, C and social desirability. This was labelled social dominance. Factor 2 was defined by high positive loadings for primary psychopathy and the MES, and a high negative loading on A, and was labelled manipulativeness. The third factor had high positive loadings for E and O, and reflected outgoingness.

4.3.1. Sex and affair differences on the derived factors

The Promax rotation assumes the factors are correlated, and this was confirmed during the analysis, with factor 1 correlating with factors 2 and 3 at −0.28 and 0.34, respectively. These correlations, though not huge, indicate that social dominance is associated with outgoingness and negatively associated with manipulativeness. Factor 2 and factor 3 were uncorrelated to one another. Using the smaller set of dimensions we tested for interactions between sex and whether the person had committed infidelity or not using a two-way ANCOVA (Table 4), correcting each factor for the influence of the other two factors. Even after correction, an interaction was found

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rotated factors (six iterations)</th>
<th>F1 ‘social dominance’</th>
<th>F2 ‘manipulativeness’</th>
<th>F3 ‘outgoingness’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Primary psychopathy</td>
<td>−0.30</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>−0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary psychopathy</td>
<td>−0.84</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>−0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neuroticism</td>
<td>−0.69</td>
<td>−0.18</td>
<td>−0.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extraversion</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Openness</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>−0.10</td>
<td>0.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreeableness</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>−0.68</td>
<td>0.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conscientiousness</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>−0.28</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mating effort</td>
<td>−0.24</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social desirability</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>−0.45</td>
<td>0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eigenvalue</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>1.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Variance</td>
<td>40.40</td>
<td>18.60</td>
<td>12.60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3
Principal components analysis (with Promax rotation) of measures for all participants (n = 84)
between sex and having an affair for social dominance. This suggested that males who committed infidelity were higher in social dominance than those who had not, whereas this relationship reversed for females. Females who admitted to having had a sexual relationship with another person whilst ostensibly committed to another person were lower in social dominance than those who had not. This result suggests a differential sexual strategy in operation for males and females who decide to have sex with a person who is not their regular partner. A similar analysis (correcting for the influence of the other factors) for manipulativeness showed strong significant effects for sex and whether the person had engaged in an affair (both which may be expected), but no interaction. The same analysis for the outgoingness (controlling for social dominance and manipulativeness) found no differences by sex or sexual infidelity. These results suggest a specific differential personality effect across the sexes for persons who have affairs.

4.3.2. Correlations between the derived factors and infidelity

To examine whether greater dominance, manipulativeness or outgoingness would lead to the individual committing more infidelity or emphasising the sexual element of their infidelity, correlations were calculated between the derived factors and the emotional–sexual trade-off score and the frequency of infidelity measure. Only in the case of the manipulativeness factor was there an association with increased sexual emphasis (\( r = 0.41, \ P < 0.001 \)) and frequency of infidelity (\( r = 0.45, \ P < 0.001 \)).

5. Discussion

The current study examined self-reported acts of sexual infidelity in individuals engaged in ongoing relationships in relation to personality, psychopathy and mating effort. Following the previous literature we expected sex differences between males and females in the degree of infidelity. When analysis was confined exclusively to the participants who had committed infidelity, males had higher rates than females. This indicates that sex-related parental investment factors are in operation even when infidelity occurs, with females being fussier about whom they are willing to be unfaithful with. We found males were higher in primary and secondary psychopathy, and mating effort than females; females were higher in N, A and social desirability. Those who committed infidelity were predictably higher than those who did not on measures of primary
psychopathy and mating effort, and were also lower in A and social desirability. The scales of
psychopathy, psychopathy, mating effort and social desirability were all substantially correlated
and easily reduced to three underlying factors—social dominance, manipulativeness, and open-
ness. A sex by infidelity ANCOVA found that it was only in the case of stable dominance that a
differential sex-related strategy occurred. This showed that more socially dominant men were
more likely to have extra-pair copulation, as were less socially dominant women; the reverse (less
socially dominant men, more socially dominant women) was the case for those that did not.
Manipulativeness was greater in males and in individuals who had affairs, but did not show any
interaction; openness did not differentiate sex or adulterers, or the interaction of these variables.

The strength of the current study is our examination of actual sexual infidelity in normal adults
rather than the hypothesised desire for multiple partners in student populations. This is a strong
test of hypotheses underlying infidelity. In addition, we collected descriptive information assess-
ing the personalities of the individuals in a range of domains to examine whether particular types
of males and females were more likely to carry out this behaviour. Within this experimental
design the study was unable to determine whether the personalities of individuals who are
unfaithful are actually complementary. This because we did not ask about current extra-rela-
tionship affairs or the personalities of the dyad involved. Nor could we examine if the infidelity
reflected dissatisfaction in the unfaithful person’s main relationship. Whilst such a natural history
approach would clarify whether our cross-sectional observations were correct, the controversial
and ethical complexities of this research area make such a study understandably difficult to con-
duct. Females attach to cues in males reflecting greater potential resource acquisition (Buss,
1989). While we could establish that the men who were unfaithful were socially dominant, we
do not know if these males were also materially successful and powerful. While our data does
not provide answers to the more complex questions of rationale behind infidelity, it does give
evidence to suggest that individual differences in personality may be salient to such behaviour.

Buss and Shackelford (1997) and Hoyle et al (2000) note that personality traits like manipu-
lation, deceitfulness, low A and high psychopathy are more common in individuals who are more
likely to be unfaithful, and males are higher than females on these traits. We found no interaction
between sex and infidelity for such traits. This is relatively straightforward to understand; irre-
respective of biological sex, the skills needed to carry out infidelity and mate-stealing require an
active willingness to betray another’s trust and intimacy, and to find a way to have sex with
another person despite the other person’s mate-guarding strategies. We observed significant
correlations between high mating effort, low A and high primary psychopathy and frequency of
infidelity. Taken in conjunction with the association seen between mating effort and primary
psychopathy, our results provide further evidence that psychopathic-type self-reports are mark-
edly associated with short-term, opportunistic and exploitative sexual strategies (Rowe, 1995).

The present study shows personality and behaviour to be important predictors of sexual in-
fidelity in humans, and that the personalities of male and female adulterers differ relative to males
and females who remain faithful. Unfaithful males are higher on a dimension defined by E, low
N, A, C and seeking to present themselves in a socially desirable way. Unfaithful females are
lower on this dimension, and are thus more likely to be low in E, high N, lower in C and A and
indifferent to expressing themselves in a socially desirable way. One way of interpreting this result
is that males with such attributes are seen as more dominant and successful. Females at the other
end of the same dimension may seek to increase their access to such characteristics, and perhaps
even seek genes that increase the probability of imparting such characteristics to their offspring, and thus are in some way driven to seek out such individuals. Males following a short-term sexual strategy will not be concerned with personality characteristics that might make for a good mother. One way to test this hypothesis might be to examine how long someone is unfaithful with the same partner.
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