

# Sex Differences in Sexual Psychology Produce Sex-Similar Preferences for a Short-Term Mate

Todd K. Shackelford, Ph.D.,<sup>1,3</sup> Aaron T. Goetz, B.A.,<sup>1</sup> Craig W. LaMunyon, Ph.D.,<sup>2</sup>  
Brian J. Quintus, B.A.,<sup>1</sup> and Viviana A. Weekes-Shackelford, M.A.<sup>1</sup>

Received October 9, 2003; revision received January 27, 2004; accepted February 24, 2004

We explored aspects of men's and women's short-term sexual psychology as a function of a potential short-term partner's relationship status. A total of 209 men and 288 women reported how likely they would be to pursue a casual sexual relationship with an attractive member of the opposite sex who was (1) married, (2) not married but has casual sexual partners, or (3) not married and has no casual sexual partners. Guided by sperm competition theory, we predicted and found that men prefer short-term sex partners who are not already involved in relationships and hence present a relatively low risk of sperm competition. Because women sometimes use short-term sexual relationships to acquire long-term partners, we predicted and found that women prefer short-term sexual partners who are not already involved in relationships and hence present relatively greater promise as a potential long-term partner. Finally, across each of the three levels of the imagined partner's relationship status, men reported a greater likelihood than did women of pursuing a casual sexual relationship. Discussion addressed methodological limitations and directions for future work.

**KEY WORDS:** short-term mating; sexual psychology; sperm competition; evolutionary psychology.

## INTRODUCTION

Different mating strategies exist between and within the sexes (Buss & Schmitt, 1993; Gangestad & Simpson, 1990, 2000; Symons, 1979; Trivers, 1972). Gangestad and Simpson (2000) defined *mating strategies* as "integrated sets of adaptations that organize and guide an individual's reproductive effort" (p. 575). Men and women have evolved a menu of mating strategies, ranging from short-term mating strategies to long-term mating strategies. When adopting a short-term strategy, for example, men and women might seek brief sexual relationships or terminate quickly potential long-term relationships. In addition, several researchers have described a mixed, or opportunistic, mating strategy, in which men and women

form a pair-bond with one person while remaining open to extra-pair copulations with other people (e.g., Buss, 2003; Cashdan, 1996; Trivers, 1972).

## Men's Short-Term Sexual Psychology

Men more than women may have benefited over human evolutionary history from devoting more reproductive effort to short-term mating (Symons, 1979; Trivers, 1972). Ancestral men who sometimes pursued multiple sexual partners are likely to have outreproduced men who did not. Accordingly, a desire for sexual variety is a key component of men's mating psychology (Buss & Schmitt, 1993; Schmitt et al., 2001; Symons, 1979). Buss and Schmitt (1993), for example, documented that men desire nearly five times as many sexual partners than do women over a lifetime. Men's sexual fantasies also reveal a psychology attuned to sexual variety. Men's sexual fantasies more than women's sexual fantasies include multiple and unfamiliar partners (Ellis & Symons, 1990).

<sup>1</sup>Department of Psychology, Florida Atlantic University, Davie, Florida.

<sup>2</sup>Department of Biological Sciences, California State Polytechnic University, Pomona, California.

<sup>3</sup>To whom correspondence should be addressed at Department of Psychology, Florida Atlantic University, 2912 College Avenue, Davie, Florida 33314; e-mail: tshackel@fau.edu.

### Sperm Competition and Men's Short-Term Mating

Regardless of the mating strategy a man pursues, he may face the adaptive problem of sperm competition. Sperm competition occurs when the sperm of two or more males simultaneously occupy the reproductive tract of a female and compete to fertilize her egg(s) (Parker, 1970). A man who does not avoid sperm competition risks loss of fertilizations, and when those are with his long-term partner, he risks genetic cuckoldry, whereby he invests unwittingly in a child to whom he is genetically unrelated. Independent of men's mating strategies, it is a woman's "double mating" within a 5-day period (the fertile lifetime of human sperm) that produces sperm competition (Baker & Bellis, 1993, 1995). Reports from British women indicate that nearly 30% of those sampled claimed to have been inseminated at some point in their lifetime by two different men within a 24-hr period (Baker & Bellis, 1993).

There is psychological, physiological, and genetic evidence that sperm competition is likely to have been a recurrent feature of human evolutionary history. For example, evidence that ancestral women may have had sex with more than one partner within short-time periods is provided by comparative anatomical evidence. Across a variety of nonhuman animals, males have relatively larger testes in species with more intense sperm competition (Short, 1979). Larger testes produce more sperm, resulting in a numerical advantage in sperm competition. Among gorillas, for instance, female promiscuity and sperm competition are rare, and the male gorilla's testes are relatively tiny, comprising 0.03% of body weight. Chimpanzees, in contrast, are highly promiscuous and, despite their smaller body size, males have relatively large testes, comprising 0.30% of body weight. Human testes fall between these two extremes (0.08% of body weight), suggesting intermediate levels of female promiscuity and sperm competition in our evolutionary past (Smith, 1984). For other work suggesting that relative testes weight in human males is "modest and not indicative of strong selection via sperm competition," see Dixson (1998, p. 218).

Men may have evolved physiological and psychological adaptations to avoid sperm competition or to compete more effectively in the context of sperm competition. Baker and Bellis (1993), for example, demonstrated that men may have physiological adaptations designed to increase sperm expenditure when the likelihood of female infidelity and associated sperm competition is high. The likelihood of female infidelity increases as the proportion of time spent together since a couple's last copulation decreases (Baker & Bellis, 1993, 1995). Inseminating more sperm following a separation may function to outnumber or "flush out" rival sperm in the female reproductive

tract (Baker & Bellis, 1995; Parker, 1970). Reasoning that there must be psychological adaptations accompanying these physiological adaptations, Shackelford et al. (2002) demonstrated that men who spent a greater (relative to men who spent a lesser) proportion of time apart from their partner since the couple's last copulation rated their partners to be more physically attractive and showed greater interest in copulating with their partners. Such psychological adjustments may motivate men to copulate with their partners as soon as possible, placing their sperm in competition with rival sperm that may be present.

To avoid sperm competition or to compete more effectively, men may also have evolved mate preferences that function to select as sexual partners women who present the lowest risk of current or future sperm competition. Women who are not in a long-term relationship and do not have casual sexual partners, for example, present a low risk of sperm competition. Consequently, such women may be perceived as desirable short-term sexual partners. Women who are not in a long-term relationship but who engage in short-term matings may present a moderate risk of sperm competition. Because men possess a strong desire for casual sexual partners, women who engage in short-term matings probably do not experience difficulty obtaining willing partners. Because they present an increased risk of sperm competition, women who are not in a long-term relationship but who engage in short-term matings may be perceived to be less desirable than women who are not in a long-term relationship and have no casual sexual partners. Women in a long-term relationship may present the highest risk of sperm competition. Although sexual activity declines slightly with the duration of a mateship (e.g., Klusmann, 2002), the average copulation interval for couples sampled from Western cultures and across all age groups is about 3 days (Baker & Bellis, 1995; Kinsey, Pomeroy, Martin, & Gebhard, 1953; Laumann, Gagnon, Michael, & Michaels, 1994). According to Baker and Bellis's (1993) "topping-up" model, a woman's primary partner maintains an optimum level of sperm in his partner's reproductive tract as a sperm competition tactic. The high risk of sperm competition created by the primary partner's frequent inseminations, therefore, might make women in a long-term relationship least attractive as short-term sexual partners. We hypothesized that, when selecting a short-term sex partner, a man will prefer to place his ejaculate in a reproductive tract with the lowest risk of current or future sperm competition. To test this hypothesis, we generated the following prediction:

*Prediction 1.* A man's reported likelihood of pursuing a short-term sexual relationship with a woman will increase as the risk of sperm competition decreases.

Reported likelihood of pursuing a short-term sexual relationship will be highest when the woman is not married and has no casual sexual partners, next highest when the woman is not married but has casual sexual partners, and lowest when the woman is married.

For men to evolve a short-term sexual psychology, there must have existed a key selection pressure to produce this short-term sexual psychology: women who pursued short-term sexual relationships (Smith, 1984).

### Women's Short-Term Sexual Psychology

Unlike men, women's short-term sexual psychology is not designed to solve adaptive problems associated with sperm competition—or, at the least, not the same set of adaptive problems. Because fertilization does not occur within men, women are never at risk of competing with rival ova or of being cuckolded genetically. Although the minimum obligatory investment to produce a child may have precluded women from benefiting reproductively from continually devoting more of their mating effort to short-term mating than to long-term mating (Symons, 1979; Trivers, 1972), sometimes women do pursue short-term sexual partners. The hypothesized benefits of women's short-term mating include, but are not limited to, obtaining "good genes," obtaining diverse genes, paternity confusion, exchanging sex for resources, exchanging sex for protection, securing a "backup" mate, acquiring a better mate, and identifying and acquiring a long-term partner (Greiling & Buss, 2000; Hrdy, 1981; Smith, 1984; Smuts, 1985; Symons, 1979).

There is some evidence that supports several of the hypothesized benefits of women's short-term mating (see Greiling & Buss, 2000, for a review). Perhaps the best documented benefit of women's short-term mating is the acquisition of a long-term partner. Buss and Schmitt (1993), for example, hypothesized that women use short-term sexual encounters with men to assess or evaluate potential long-term partners. Women were asked to rate the desirability of several characteristics of a potential short-term sexual partner, from *Extremely Undesirable* to *Extremely Desirable*. Among the characteristics assessed were *already in another relationship*, *promiscuous*, *unfaithful*, and *sleeps around a lot*. As predicted, women rated each of these characteristics as undesirable in a potential short-term partner, supporting the hypothesis that women sometimes use short-term sexual relationships to identify and acquire a long-term partner.

Using an interview methodology, Townsend (1995) provided additional evidence that women sometimes use short-term sexual relationships to acquire a long-term part-

ner. Women pursuing short-term sexual relationships reported anxiety and concern about whether a given short-term sexual relationship might lead to a desirable long-term relationship. Moreover, as the number of short-term sexual partners increased, so too did women's anxiety about the long-term future of a particular relationship, suggesting that the women's anxiety was produced by repeated failures to acquire a long-term partner. Strategic Interference Theory (Buss, 1989a) posits that negative emotions signal interference with an ancestrally adaptive strategy. In this case, women's anxiety may signal interference with a short-term sexual strategy to obtain a long-term partner.

More evidence that women use short-term sexual relationships to acquire a long-term partner is provided by four studies conducted by Greiling and Buss (2000) to assess 13 hypothesized benefits of short-term sex for women. Greiling and Buss (2000) assessed the perceived likelihood of gaining benefits from short-term mating (Study 1), the perceived magnitude of the benefits of short-term mating (Study 2), the contexts that promote short-term sexual relationships (Study 3), and women's individual differences in sociosexuality and the contexts that increase the likelihood of engaging in short-term sex (Study 4). Across all four studies, the hypothesis that women use short-term sexual relationships to identify and acquire a long-term partner received the most support.

Given the strong empirical support for the hypothesis that women sometimes use short-term sexual relationships to acquire a long-term partner, we expected women to prefer as short-term sexual partners men who are not involved in sexual or romantic relationships with other women. To test the hypothesis that, when selecting short-term sexual partners, women prefer men who are not in relationships with other women, we generated the following prediction:

*Prediction 2.* A woman's reported likelihood of pursuing a short-term sexual relationship with a man will increase as the man's availability as a long-term partner increases. Reported likelihood of pursuing a short-term sexual relationship will be highest when the man is not married and has no casual sexual partners, next highest when the man is not married but has casual sexual partners, and lowest when the man is married.

On the basis of previous research and theory (reviewed above, and see, e.g., Ellis & Symons, 1990; Schmitt et al., 2003; Trivers, 1972) on sex differences in sexual strategy, we tested the following prediction, designed to replicate previous empirical work:

*Prediction 3.* Across the three levels of an imagined short-term partner's relationship status, men will report a

greater likelihood of pursuing a short-term sexual relationship than will women.

We collected self-report data from over 500 men and women to test the prediction that a man's reported likelihood of pursuing a short-term sexual relationship with a woman will increase as the risk of sperm competition decreases (Prediction 1), the prediction that a woman's reported likelihood of pursuing a short-term sexual relationship with a man will increase as the man's availability as a long-term partner increases (Prediction 2), and the prediction that, across the three levels of an imagined short-term partner's relationship status, men will report a greater likelihood of pursuing a short-term sexual relationship than will women (Prediction 3).

## METHOD

### Participants

A total of 209 heterosexual men and 288 heterosexual women participated in this study. Participants fulfilled a research requirement or were recruited from psychology courses, in exchange for nominal extra course credit. Men ranged in age from 18 to 51 years, with a mean of 19.7 ( $SD = 4.0$ ), and women ranged in age from 18 to 45 years, with a mean of 20.8 ( $SD = 5.3$ ).

### Materials

Participants completed a short survey. Participants were asked their age and sex and then were instructed to read the following scenario:

Imagine that you have traveled alone several hundred miles from your home city to attend a two-day business conference. You have not previously met anyone who is attending the conference. Imagine now that you meet a woman [man] that you find extremely sexually attractive and who finds you extremely sexually attractive. This woman [man] also has traveled alone several hundred miles from her [his] home city (which is not the same as your home city) to attend this short conference. Like you, she [he] has not previously met anyone at this conference. You have the opportunity to have a one-night stand (sexual intercourse for just one-night) with this woman [man]. You and she [he] both know that you will never see each other again. You talk for a few minutes and learn a few things about her [him], including her [his] current involvement in other relationships. Imagine that she [he] tells you one of three facts:

- (1) She [He] is *married*, OR
- (2) She [He] is *NOT married*, but she [he] IS involved in *casual sexual relationships*, OR

- (3) She [He] is *NOT married*, and she [he] is *NOT* involved in any casual sexual relationships.

Three separate questions asked participants how likely they would be to have a one night stand (sexual intercourse for just one night) with the potential short-term partner in the scenario upon learning that the person was (1) married or (2) not married but involved in casual sexual relationships or (3) not married and not involved in any casual sexual relationships. We randomized across participants the order in which the three questions appeared. A Likert-type scale was used ranging from 0 (*Not at all Likely*) to 9 (*Extremely Likely*).

### Procedure

Participants were sampled using two methods. About half the participants received credit toward a required research participation component of an introductory psychology course, and about half received nominal extra credit toward one of several psychology courses.

Participants were given a consent form, the survey, and a 9- by-12-in. brown security envelope. The participant was instructed to read and sign the consent form, complete the survey, place the completed survey in the envelope, and then seal the envelope. The participant was instructed not to seal the consent form inside the envelope, to maintain anonymity. The participant was instructed to place the sealed envelope in a box that contained other sealed envelopes. The participant was asked to place the signed consent form in a separate envelope that contained other signed consent forms. The research assistant explained to the participant the purpose of the study, answered any questions, and thanked the participant for his participation.

## RESULTS

We performed a 2 (sex)  $\times$  3 (imagined partner's relationship status) analysis of variance on ratings of the likelihood of pursuing a short-term sexual relationship. The results revealed significant main effects for Sex,  $F(1, 466) = 254.34$ ,  $p < .001$ ,  $\eta^2 = .35$ , and Imagined Partner's Relationship Status,  $F(2, 466) = 197.30$ ,  $p < .001$ ,  $\eta^2 = .30$ , but the Sex  $\times$  Imagined Partner's Relationship Status interaction was not significant,  $F(2, 466) < 1$ . Effect sizes for  $F$  tests ( $\eta^2$ ) are reported to signify the proportion of variance accounted for and are defined as *small* if  $\eta^2 = .0099$ , *medium* if  $\eta^2 = .0588$ , and *large* if  $\eta^2 = .1379$  or greater (Cohen, 1988).

Consistent with Prediction 1, men's likelihood of pursuing a short-term sexual relationship was lowest when

imagining that the woman was married ( $M = 3.99$ ,  $SD = 3.48$ ), next lowest when imagining that the woman was not married but involved in casual sexual relationships ( $M = 4.74$ ,  $SD = 3.24$ ), and highest when imagining that the woman was not married and not involved in any casual sexual relationships ( $M = 6.53$ ,  $SD = 3.18$ ). Correlated-means tests using Bonferroni's correction for alpha inflation ( $.05/3 = .017$ ) revealed that the likelihood of pursuing a short-term sexual relationship differed significantly for all three comparisons: married versus not married but involved in casual sexual relationships,  $t(199) = |3.41|$ ,  $p < .01$ ,  $d = 0.48$ ; married versus not married and not involved in any casual sexual relationships,  $t(199) = |10.75|$ ,  $p < .01$ ,  $d = 1.52$ ; and not married but involved in casual sexual relationships versus not married and not involved in any casual sexual relationships,  $t(199) = |9.45|$ ,  $p < .01$ ,  $d = 1.34$ . Effect sizes ( $d$ ) are reported to signify the difference between means in standard deviation units. Effect sizes are defined as *small* if  $d = 0.20$ , *medium* if  $d = 0.50$ , and *large* if  $d = 0.80$  or greater (Cohen, 1988).

Consistent with Prediction 2, women's likelihood of pursuing a short-term sexual relationship was lowest when imagining that the man was married ( $M = 0.72$ ,  $SD = 1.61$ ), next lowest when imagining that the man was not married but involved in casual sexual relationships ( $M = 1.19$ ,  $SD = 1.87$ ), and highest when imagining that the man was not married and not involved in any casual sexual relationships ( $M = 3.03$ ,  $SD = 3.21$ ). Correlated-means tests using Bonferroni's correction for alpha inflation ( $.05/3 = .017$ ) revealed that the likelihood of pursuing a short-term sexual relationship differed significantly for all three comparisons: married versus not married but involved in casual sexual relationships,  $t(267) = |3.98|$ ,  $p < .01$ ,  $d = 0.49$ ; married versus not married and not involved in any casual sexual relationships,  $t(267) = |12.99|$ ,  $p < .01$ ,  $d = 1.59$ ; and not married but involved in casual sexual relationships versus not married and not involved in any casual sexual relationships,  $t(267) = |12.75|$ ,  $p < .01$ ,  $d = 1.56$ .

Consistent with Prediction 3, the sexes differed in reported likelihood of pursuing a short-term sexual relationship. Independent means  $t$  tests using Bonferroni's correction for alpha inflation ( $.05/3 = .017$ ) revealed that, at each of the three levels of an imagined short-term partner's relationship status, men reported a greater likelihood of pursuing a short-term sexual relationship than did women: married,  $t(466) = 13.55$ ,  $p < .01$ ,  $d = 1.27$ ; not married but involved in casual sexual relationships,  $t(466) = 14.93$ ,  $p < .01$ ,  $d = 1.40$ ; and not married and not involved in any casual sexual relationships,  $t(466) = 11.69$ ,  $p < .01$ ,  $d = 1.10$ .

There were no significant correlations between the participant's age and reported likelihood of pursuing a short-term relationship when imagining the individual was married (men:  $r = .01$ , *ns*; women:  $r = .04$ , *ns*), not married but involved in casual sexual relationships (men:  $r = .06$ , *ns*; women:  $r = -.04$ , *ns*), and not married and not involved in any casual sexual relationships (men:  $r = .06$ , *ns*; women:  $r = -.10$ , *ns*). Thus, neither men's nor women's age was related to their reported likelihood of pursuing a short-term relationship with an imagined individual.

## DISCUSSION

The risk of sperm competition is likely to have been a recurrent adaptive problem confronted by ancestral males (Baker & Bellis, 1995; Shackelford et al., 2002; Smith, 1984; Wyckoff, Wang, & Wu, 2000). We hypothesized that men, therefore, may have evolved mate preferences that motivate selection as short-term sexual partners women who present the lowest risk of current or future sperm competition. The risk of sperm competition for a man increases with a prospective short-term partner's involvement in one or more relationships. As predicted, we found that men's reported likelihood of pursuing a short-term sexual relationship was lowest when imagining that the potential short-term partner was married, next lowest when imagining that she was not married but involved in casual sexual relationships, and highest when imagining that she was not married and not involved in any casual sexual relationships. These results suggest that, when selecting short-term sexual partners, men do so in part to avoid sperm competition. We do not presume that men are consciously attempting to avoid sperm competition; selection does not have to design conscious awareness in order for adaptive behavior to be executed.

The likelihood or selective importance of sperm competition in humans are issues of scholarly debate and controversy. Those questioning the application of sperm competition to humans (e.g., Birkhead, 2000; Dixson, 1998; Gomendio, Harcourt, & Roldán, 1998) contend that sperm competition in humans, although possible, may not be as intense as in other species with adaptations to sperm competition. Recent work on the psychological, behavioral, and anatomical evidence of human sperm competition (e.g., Gallup et al., 2003; Goetz et al., 2004; Pound, 2002; Shackelford et al., 2002), however, was not considered in these previous critiques of human sperm competition. When considering all of the evidence of adaptations to sperm competition in men and in women, including the current research, it is reasonable to conclude

that sperm competition may have been a recurrent and selectively important feature of human evolutionary history.

Women's short-term sexual psychology is not influenced by sperm competition in the same manner as is men's short-term sexual psychology; however, women's short-term sexual psychology may be tuned to the prospect of forming a long-term relationship (e.g., Buss & Schmitt, 1993; Greiling & Buss, 2000; Townsend, 1995). We tested the hypothesis that women may use short-term sexual relationships to identify and acquire a long-term partner. As predicted, women's reported likelihood of pursuing a short-term sexual relationship was lowest when imagining that the man was married, next lowest when imagining that the man was not married but involved in casual sexual relationships, and highest when imagining that the man was not married and not involved in any casual sexual relationships. Availability as a long-term partner is highest for men who are not married and not involved in any casual sexual relationships, lower for men who are not married but engage in casual sexual relationships, and lowest for men who are married. The results suggest that the likelihood of developing a long-term relationship may be one criterion women use (although not necessarily with conscious awareness) to evaluate the attractiveness of a potential short-term sexual relationship. These results concur with Buss and Schmitt's (1993) demonstration that women rate as undesirable in a potential short-term partner current long-term romantic involvement with another woman. Finally, the current results replicate, using a different paradigm, the finding that a short-term sexual strategy looms larger in male than in female psychology (e.g., Clark & Hatfield, 1989; Ellis & Symons, 1990; Okami & Shackelford, 2001; Schmitt, Shackelford, & Buss, 2001; Schmitt et al., 2003).

Although the current and previous research suggests that women sometimes pursue short-term sexual partners as a means of identifying and acquiring a long-term partner, this should not be interpreted to mean that women have one psychological mechanism for selecting both short-term and long-term partners. Using a short-term sexual strategy to secure a long-term partner is likely to be just one function of women's short-term mating. Other possible functions of women's short-term mating, such as obtaining "good genes" (Symons, 1979) or receiving protection (Smith, 1984), for example, might recruit different evaluative mechanisms than those recruited for selecting a long-term partner. When seeking a short-term sexual partner who may only make a genetic contribution, for example, a psychology that places greater value on male physical attractiveness and health may be activated instead of a psychology that places greater value on likelihood of

resource provisioning and other characteristics that define a desirable long-term partner.

One might argue that, by preferring as short-term mates people who are not currently involved in other relationships, both men and women are simply avoiding the costs associated with contracting a sexually transmitted disease (STD). The data, however, are not consistent with this hypothesis. The potential mate most likely to be infected with an STD is the one having casual sex with different partners and, therefore, this potential mate would be least preferred according to this hypothesis. The married potential mate, however, is the least preferred as a short-term sexual partner. Although important, avoiding STD does not seem to be a key criterion that men and women use to select short-term sexual partners.

Another alternative interpretation of these data may be that men prefer short-term sex with women who are not involved in other relationships because, like women, men use short-term mating to identify and acquire a long-term partner. However, this interpretation is difficult to reconcile with research documenting that women who are easily sexually accessible are perceived by men to be undesirable as long-term partners (for a review of this research, see Buss, 2003). Men are not likely to use short-term mating to identify and acquire long-term mates because women consenting to such matings are excluded from consideration as a long-term partner. Indeed, a woman's sexual withholding may function to encourage a man to consider a woman as a long-term partner rather than as a short-term sexual partner (Buss, 2003).

The use of imagined scenarios may represent a limitation of this study. We asked participants to imagine that they met an extremely sexually attractive person of the opposite sex and had the opportunity to have a one-night stand or brief sexual affair. People might respond differently to an imagined scenario than to a comparable "real-life" situation. When reading an imagined scenario, men and women may respond in a way that reflects how they would like to behave in a comparable real-life situation, instead of how they actually would behave. Nevertheless, previous research indicates that the mating desires and preferences reported by men and women in response to imagined partners or scenarios often correspond to the real-life mating decisions that people make (see Buss, 2003, for a review).

Another potential limitation of this study concerns the ecological validity of the imagined scenario. The scenario stated that the participant and the potential short-term partner "will never see each other again." There may be some doubt that our ancestors' social environments included a situation in which two individuals from different

locations met briefly and returned to their respective homes with no future contact. The scenario might parallel a clandestine tryst between members of neighboring tribes, a probable although perhaps not frequent occurrence in ancestral environments (see Buss, 2003). Although the likelihood that these lovers would have no future contact is low, if they were inclined to reestablish contact, this would not be difficult, rendering plausible the hypothesis that women sometimes use short-term mating to identify and acquire long-term mates.

Just as men and women desire certain qualities in a long-term partner (Buss, 1989b, 2003), so too do they desire certain qualities in a short-term sexual partner. When selecting a short-term sexual partner, men prefer women who present the lowest risk of sperm competition and women prefer men who present the greatest availability as a long-term partner. Men and women faced different adaptive problems when selecting short-term sexual partners. The results of the current research suggest, however, that the sexes evolved similar solutions to these different problems, including selecting as short-term partners people who are not involved in one or more other relationships. Behavioral convergence as a result of different selection pressures is not an uncommon evolutionary occurrence. Both men and women, for example, experience jealousy. For men, this emotion is designed to combat paternity uncertainty, whereas for women it is designed to prevent loss of her partner's investment (Buss, Larsen, Westen, & Semmelroth, 1992; Daly, Wilson, & Weghorst, 1982; Symons, 1979). Men and women sometimes evolve similar solutions to different adaptive problems.

## REFERENCES

- Baker, R. R., & Bellis, M. A. (1993). Human sperm competition: Ejaculate adjustment by males and the function of masturbation. *Animal Behaviour*, *46*, 861–885.
- Baker, R. R., & Bellis, M. A. (1995). *Human sperm competition: Copulation, masturbation, and infidelity*. London: Chapman & Hall.
- Birkhead, T. (2000). *Promiscuity: An evolutionary history of sperm competition and sexual conflict*. London: Faber and Faber.
- Buss, D. M. (1989a). Conflict between the sexes: Strategic interference and the evocation of anger and upset. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *56*, 735–747.
- Buss, D. M. (1989b). Sex differences in human mate preferences: Evolutionary hypotheses tested in 37 cultures. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, *12*, 1–49.
- Buss, D. M. (2003). *The evolution of desire: Strategies of human mating* (2nd ed.). New York: Basic Books.
- Buss, D. M., & Schmitt, D. P. (1993). Sexual strategies theory: An evolutionary perspective on human mating. *Psychological Review*, *100*, 204–232.
- Buss, D. M., Larsen, R. J., Westen, D., & Semmelroth, J. (1992). Sex differences in jealousy: Evolution, physiology and psychology. *Psychological Science*, *3*, 251–255.
- Cashdan, E. (1996). Women's mating strategies. *Evolutionary Anthropology*, *5*, 134–143.
- Clark, R. D., & Hatfield, E. (1989). Gender differences in receptivity to sexual offers. *Journal of Psychology and Human Sexuality*, *2*, 39–55.
- Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences* (2nd ed). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Daly, M., Wilson, M., & Weghorst, J. (1982). Male sexual jealousy. *Ethology and Sociobiology*, *3*, 11–27.
- Dixson, A. F. (1998). *Primate sexuality: Comparative studies of the prosimians, monkeys, apes, and human beings*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Ellis, B. J., & Symons, D. (1990). Sex differences in fantasy: An evolutionary psychological approach. *Journal of Sex Research*, *27*, 527–556.
- Gallup, G. G., Burch, R. L., Zappieri, M. L., Parvez, R. A., Stockwell, M. L., & Davis, J. A. (2003). The human penis as a semen displacement device. *Evolution and Human Behavior*, *24*, 277–289.
- Gangestad, S. W., & Simpson, J. A. (1990). Toward an evolutionary history of female sociosexual variation. *Journal of Personality*, *58*, 69–96.
- Gangestad, S. W., & Simpson, J. A. (2000). The evolution of human mating: Trade-offs and strategic pluralism. *Behavior and Brain Sciences*, *23*, 573–587.
- Goetz, A. T., Shackelford, T. K., Weekes-Shackelford, V. A., Euler, H. A., Hoier, S., & Schmitt, D. P. (2004). *Mate retention, semen displacement, and human sperm competition: A preliminary investigation of tactics to prevent and correct female infidelity*. Manuscript submitted for publication.
- Gomendio, M., Harcourt, A. H., & Roldán, E. R. S. (1998). Sperm competition in mammals. In T. R. Birkhead & A. P. Møller (Eds.), *Sperm competition and sexual selection* (pp. 667–756). New York: Academic Press.
- Greilich, H., & Buss, D. M. (2000). Women's sexual strategies: The hidden dimension of women's short-term extra-pair mating. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *28*, 929–963.
- Hrdy, S. B. (1981). *The woman that never evolved*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Kinsey, A. C., Pomeroy, W. B., Martin, C. E., & Gebhard, P. H. (1953). *Sexual behavior in the human female*. Philadelphia: W. B. Saunders.
- Klusmann, D. (2002). Sexual motivation and the duration of partnership. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, *31*, 275–287.
- Laumann, E. O., Gagnon, J. H., Michael, R. T., & Michaels, S. (1994). *The social organization of sexuality: Sexual practices in the United States*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Okami, P., & Shackelford, T. K. (2001). Human sex differences in sexual psychology and behavior. *Annual Review of Sex Research*, *12*, 186–241.
- Parker, G. A. (1970). Sperm competition and its evolutionary consequences in the insects. *Biological Reviews*, *45*, 525–567.
- Pound, N. (2002). Male interest in visual cues of sperm competition risk. *Evolution and Human Behavior*, *23*, 443–466.
- Schmitt, D. P., Alcalay, L., Allik, J., Ault, L., Austers, I., Bennett, K. L., et al. (2003). Universal sex differences in the desire for sexual variety: Tests from 52 nations, 6 continents, and 13 islands. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *85*, 85–104.
- Schmitt, D. P., Shackelford, T. K., & Buss, D. M. (2001). Are men really more oriented toward short-term mating than women?: A critical review of theory and research. *Psychology, Evolution, and Gender*, *3*, 211–239.
- Schmitt, D. P., Shackelford, T. K., Duntley, J., Tooke, W., & Buss, D. M. (2001). The desire for sexual variety as a tool for understanding basic human mating strategies. *Personal Relationships*, *8*, 425–462.
- Shackelford, T. K., LeBlanc, G. J., Weekes-Shackelford, V. A., Bleske-Rechek, A. L., Euler, H. A., & Hoier, S. (2002). Psychological

- adaptation to human sperm competition. *Evolution and Human Behavior*, 23, 123–138.
- Short, R. V. (1979). Sexual selection and its component parts, somatic and genital selection, as illustrated by man and the great apes. *Advances in the Study of Behavior*, 9, 131–158.
- Smith, R. L. (1984). Human sperm competition. In R. L. Smith (Ed.), *Sperm competition and the evolution of animal mating systems* (pp. 601–660). New York: Academic Press.
- Smuts, B. B. (1985). *Sex and friendship in baboons*. New York: Aldine de Gruyter.
- Symons, D. (1979). *The evolution of human sexuality*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Townsend, J. M. (1995). Sex without emotional involvement: An evolutionary interpretation of sex differences. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 24, 173–206.
- Trivers, R. L. (1972). Parental investment and sexual selection. In B. Campbell (Ed.), *Sexual selection and the descent of man* (pp. 136–179). Chicago: Aldine.
- Wyckoff, G. J., Wang, W., & Wu, C. (2000). Rapid evolution of male reproductive genes in the descent of man. *Nature*, 403, 304–308.