



**Testosterone-dependent facial and body traits predict men's
sociosexual attitudes and behaviors**

Journal:	<i>American Journal of Human Biology</i>
Manuscript ID	AJHB-18-0226.R1
Wiley - Manuscript type:	Original Research Article
Date Submitted by the Author:	13-Jan-2019
Complete List of Authors:	Polo, Pablo; Universidad de Playa Ancha, Laboratorio de Comportamiento Animal y Humano, Centro de Estudios Avanzados Muñoz-Reyes, José Antonio; Universidad de Playa Ancha, Laboratorio de Comportamiento Animal y Humano, Centro de Estudios Avanzados Pita, Miguel; Universidad Autónoma de Madrid, Departamento de Biología Shackelford, Todd; Oakland University, Department of Psychology Fink, Bernhard; University of Goettingen, Behavioral Ecology; Hanse-Wissenschaftskolleg, Institute of Advanced Study
Keywords:	male, morphology, sociosexuality, anthropometry

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

1
2
3 Running title: Male morphology and sexual behavior
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13

14 **Testosterone-dependent facial and body traits predict men's sociosexual attitudes and**
15
16
17 **behaviors**
18
19
20
21
22

23 Pablo Polo^{1*}, Jose Antonio Muñoz-Reyes¹, Miguel Pita², Todd K. Shackelford³, Bernhard Fink^{4,5}
24
25
26
27
28

29 ¹*Universidad de Playa Ancha de Ciencias de la Educación, Laboratorio de Comportamiento*
30 *Animal y Humano, Viña del Mar, Chile;*
31
32

33 ²*Universidad Autónoma de Madrid, Departamento de Biología, Madrid, España;*
34
35

36 ³*Oakland University, Department of Psychology, Rochester, MI, USA;*
37
38

39 ⁴*University of Goettingen, Department of Behavioral Ecology, Goettingen, Germany;*
40
41

42 ⁵*Hanse-Wissenschaftskolleg, Institute for Advanced Study, Delmenhorst, Germany.*
43
44
45
46
47

48 *Address correspondence to: Pablo Polo, Universidad de Playa Ancha de Ciencias de la
49 Educación, Laboratorio de Comportamiento Animal y Humano, Viña del Mar, Chile, Email:
50 pablo.polo@upla.cl
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

ABSTRACT

Objectives: Strategic Pluralism Theory contends that human mating strategies are calibrated toward short-term (ST) or long-term (LT) mating according to the expression of condition-dependent traits and characteristics of the social and physical environment. Traits reflecting the effects of testosterone have been considered condition-dependent traits that provide information about the calibration of male mating strategy. We investigated the relationship of muscle mass and facial masculinity with attitudes and behaviors reflecting ST and LT mating tactics. **Methods:** We measured skeletal muscle mass (SMM) through bioelectrical impedance and facial width-to-height (fWHR) in a sample of Chilean men ($n = 206$; mean age = 22.52 ± 4.65 SD), and collected information about sociosexual attitudes and past sexual behaviour. **Results:** Our results showed an interaction effect of SMM and fWHR on unrestricted (but not restricted) sociosexual attitudes and past sexual behavior. Individuals with a consistent expression of both traits (i.e., high SMM and fWHR or low SMM and fWHR) reported higher levels of unrestricted sociosexual attitudes and a greater number of lifetime and previous-year sexual partners. **Conclusions:** These findings suggest that the intensity and consistency of expression of body and facial masculinity is important in signalling male mating tactics and sociosexual attitudes.

Keywords: male; morphology; testosterone; anthropometry; sociosexuality

INTRODUCTION

Natural selection favors traits that facilitate survival and reproduction (Anderson, 1994). Given limited resources, including time and energy, investment in the development, maintenance, and display of such traits is costly and must be considered together with other investments (Stearns, 1992). A foundational trade-off is that between mating effort and parental care (Magrath & Komdeur, 2003). In this regard, humans display physical and psychological traits as part of a mating repertoire that is related to both mating and parental effort (Buss & Schmitt, 2019; Wilson, Miller & Crouse, 2017). Humans are highly altricial (Lovejoy, 1981) and possess neurophysiological systems that facilitate long-term (LT) pair-bonding (Young, 2003). However, infidelity, poaching, and cuckoldry have been documented across cultures (Macintyre & Sooman, 1991; Møller & Birkhead, 1989; Puts, 2010; Wrangham, 1993), indicating that some individuals are prone to pursuit of short-term (ST) mating. These phenomena have motivated the study of traits that underlie variation in human mating strategies (Buss & Schmitt, 2019).

Strategic Pluralism Theory proposes that mating strategies of both men and women are calibrated toward ST or LT mating according to the expression of condition-dependent traits and characteristics of the social and physical environment (Gangestad & Simpson, 2000). Short-term mating tactics can be characterized by low commitment and low investment in the current partner and by a high number of past sexual partners, whereas LT mating tactics include high commitment and high investment in the current partner and fewer past sexual partners (Buss & Schmitt, 1993). Consequently, the pluralistic mating strategy of humans represents a flexible solution to the trade-off between investing in mating or in parenting. This trade-off is especially salient for men, who have higher potential reproductive rates than women due to a difference in minimum obligatory parental investment (Trivers, 1972). As a general pattern, the sex that invests less in parental care is expected to pursue low-investment mating with multiple partners (Symons, 1979). However, pursuing this mating strategy is time-consuming and risky due to the potential consequences of intrasexual competition (Höglund & Sheldon, 1998). It is costly in

1
2
3 terms of foregone paternal investment that in ancestral environments contributed to offspring
4 survival (Geary, 2000). Moreover, such men must be selected as mates by women who accept
5 their lower parental investment. As a result, pursuit of multiple mates may benefit only those
6 men displaying traits that increase their success as a ST mate and in male-male competition for
7 mates (Gangestad & Simpson, 2000). Empirical evidence indicates that there is variation in the
8 expression of ST and LT mating strategies in men and that some of this variation may be
9 attributed to differences in testosterone (T) levels affecting morphology and behavior (Buss &
10 Schmitt, 2019).

11
12 Traits reflecting effects of T, such as body muscularity and facial masculinity (Evans,
13 2004), have been considered condition-dependent traits that provide information about male
14 mating strategy because they are involved in both mate choice and male-male competition.
15 Regarding mate choice, T levels during development correlate with traits that may be honest
16 indicators of immunocompetence in males (Bribiescas, 2001; Foo, Nakagawa, Rhodes &
17 Simmons, 2017). There is some disagreement about the role of T as an immunosuppressant
18 (Nowak, Pawlowski, Borkowska, Augustyniak & Drulis-Kawa, 2018; Scott, Clark, Boothroyd &
19 Penton-Voak, 2012). Such traits are rated as attractive by females pursuing a ST mate. Women
20 prefer facial and bodily masculinity in the context of ST mating (Crossley, Cornelissen & Tovée
21 2012; Dixson, Halliwell, East, Wignarajah & Anderson, 2003; Dixson, Sulikowski, Gouda-Vossos,
22 Rantala & Brooks, 2016; Frederick & Haselton, 2007; Hönekopp, Rudolph, Beier, Liebert &
23 Müller, 2007; Johnson, Hagel, Franklin, Fink & Grammer, 2001; Jones et al., 2018; Little, Cohen,
24 Jones & Belsky, 2007; Marcinkowska, Jasienska & Prokop, 2017; Puts, Jones & DeBruine, 2012;
25 Sell, Lukaszewski & Townsley, 2017; Thornhill & Gangestad, 1999; Valentine, Penke & Perrett,
26 2014). Regarding male-male competition, there is evidence from the study of men's psychology,
27 behavior, and anatomy that intrasexual competition was a source of ancestral selection pressure
28 for men (Puts, 2010). T-dependent traits are related to fighting ability and success in contest
29 competition with other men (Puts, 2015). Accordingly, the role of T-dependent traits seems to

1
2
3 be related to competition between men by self-promotion as well as by direct contest
4
5 competition (Puts, 2015; Roney, 2009), thereby functioning as dual signals (Berglund, Bisazza &
6
7 Pilastro, 1996).
8
9

10 Previous studies have documented links between male body and facial masculinity and
11
12 sociosexuality. Sociosexuality refers to individual differences in willingness to engage in
13
14 uncommitted sexual relationships and is often considered an aggregation of sexual attitudes and
15
16 behaviors (Jackson & Kirkpatrick, 2007; Penke & Asendorpf, 2008; Simpson & Gangestad, 1991).
17
18 Sociosexual attitudes reflect interest in committed or uncommitted sex. Those with a *restricted*
19
20 sociosexual attitude require commitment and closeness to engage in sexual relationships,
21
22 whereas those with an *unrestricted* sociosexual attitude feel comfortable engaging in sexual
23
24 relationships without commitment or closeness (Gangestad & Simpson, 2000). Sociosexual
25
26 behavior, measured as the number of previous sexual partners, is the behavioral manifestation
27
28 of sociosexual attitudes and reflects the allocation of effort to ST versus LT mating tactics. Self-
29
30 reported measures of body muscularity are positively associated with the number of lifetime
31
32 sexual partners, the number of ST sexual partners, and the number of affairs with already-
33
34 partnered women (Frederick & Haselton, 2007). Moreover, women's ratings of men's
35
36 muscularity are positively correlated with men's display of a ST mating tactic (Gangestad,
37
38 Garver-Apgar, Simpson & Cousin, 2007). Indirect measures of muscularity also are positively
39
40 related to men's ST mating tactic. Concretely, hand grip strength (HGS) and shoulder-to-hip ratio
41
42 (SHR) are positively correlated with unrestricted sociosexual attitudes and several measures of
43
44 mating success, including number of sexual partners, age of first intercourse, number of extra-
45
46 pair copulations, and number of sex partners concomitantly engaged in other relationships
47
48 (Gallup & Fink, 2018; Gallup, White & Gallup, 2007; Hughes & Gallup, 2003; Lukaszewski, Larson,
49
50 Gildersleeve, Roney & Haselton, 2014).
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Direct measures of male muscularity and their relationships with measures of
4
5 sociosexuality are less frequently reported in the literature. Limb muscle volume is positively
6
7 related to the number of lifetime and previous-year sexual partners and negatively related to
8
9 age at first intercourse, whereas fat-free body mass is positively related to the number of
10
11 lifetime sexual partners (Lassek & Gaulin, 2009). However, the association of muscular mass
12
13 (assessed objectively) with sociosexual attitudes has not been investigated. Measures of facial
14
15 masculinization have been associated with unrestricted sociosexual attitudes and greater
16
17 number of sexual partners (Boothroyd, Cross, Gray, Coombes & Gregson-Curtis, 2011;
18
19 Boothroyd, Jones, Burt, DeBruine & Perrett, 2008; Kruger, 2006). Anthropometric measures of
20
21 masculinity, including facial width-to-height ratio (fWHR), have been related in both sexes to sex
22
23 drive and unrestricted sociosexual attitudes (Arnocky et al., 2018). fWHR is a widely-used
24
25 measure of masculinity associated with aggression and dominance (Alrajih & Ward, 2014; Carré
26
27 & McCormick 2008; Geniole, Denson, Dixon, Carré & McCormick, 2015; Haselhuhn, Ormiston
28
29 & Wong, 2015). Further evidence indicates a relationship between fWHR and (a) levels of
30
31 pubertal T controlling for age (Hodges-Simeon, Hanson Sobraske, Samore, Gurven, & Gaulin,
32
33 2016), and (b) levels of adult baseline and reactive T (Lefevre, Lewis, Perrett & Penke, 2013).
34
35 However, these findings have been disputed, as other studies did not find the links between
36
37 fWHR and basal and reactive levels of T (Bird et al., 2016). In addition, there is controversy about
38
39 whether fWHR is a sex-dimorphic facial metric because some studies reported sex differences
40
41 (Geniole et al., 2015) whereas other studies did not (Kramer, 2017; Lefevre, Etchells, Howell,
42
43 Clark & Penton-Voak, 2014).

44
45
46 Most of the previous studies reporting anthropometric correlations with sociosexuality
47
48 were based on indirect measures of muscularity, such as HGS and SHR. In addition, these studies
49
50 considered sociosexual attitudes as a unidimensional construct, precluding the investigation of
51
52 whether T-related traits are independently associated with mating and parenting effort.
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60 Lukaszewski et al. (2014) found that physical strength and attractiveness were related to

1
2
3 unrestricted sociosexual attitude, but unrelated to restricted sociosexual attitude, suggesting
4
5 two independent dimensions of sociosexual attitudes. In the current study, we measured
6
7 skeletal muscular mass (SMM) and fWHR to investigate the relationships between T-related
8
9 morphological traits and sociosexual attitudes and behaviors. Although both traits are related
10
11 to pubertal levels of T, SMM (vs. fWHR) is more dependent on current condition and can be
12
13 modified after the pubertal developmental period. In this regard, inconsistencies in the
14
15 expression of both traits may indicate an inability to maintain a current investment in muscular
16
17 tissue according to their levels of facial markers of pubertal T (i.e., individuals high in fWHR but
18
19 low in SMM) or the ability to overexpress the investment in muscular tissue according to their
20
21 levels of facial markers of pubertal T (i.e., individuals low in fWHR but high in SMM). Accordingly,
22
23 the traits and their consistent or inconsistent expression may convey somewhat different
24
25 information that may affect female decisions and male sociosexual behaviors (Little, Connely,
26
27 Feinberg, Jones & Roberts, 2011; Wagstaff, Sulikowski & Burke, 2015). Furthermore, the use of
28
29 multiple cues in sexual selection processes (e.g., mate choice, sexual coercion) is common in
30
31 many organisms, emphasizing the need to consider multiple traits to increase our understanding
32
33 about sexual selective processes (Candolin, 2003). Thus, in the present study, we investigated
34
35 the joint effect of both variables to evaluate the possibility that different traits correlated with
36
37 T levels interact to predict sexual strategy. We considered both the total SMM and upper-body
38
39 fat-free mass because research indicates that upper-body strength is one of the most important
40
41 traits in intrasexual competition in humans (Puts, 2010; Sell, Hone & Pound, 2012). Accordingly,
42
43 the relationship between T-related traits with sociosexual attitudes and behaviors may be
44
45 greater when considering only traits involved in the upper body.
46
47
48
49
50
51
52

53 We hypothesized that body muscularity and facial masculinity would be related to ST
54
55 but not to LT mating tactics in men. Thus, men with greater SMM (or upper body fat-free mass)
56
57 and fWHR should report a higher unrestricted sociosexual attitude. This relationship should be
58
59 greater when both traits are highly expressed (Hypothesis 1). Moreover, men with greater SMM
60

(upper body fat-free mass) and fWHR should report more past sexual partners, both over the lifetime and in the previous year, and more one-time sexual partners. This relationship should be greater when both traits are highly expressed (Hypothesis 2). Finally, we expected that both traits SMM (upper body fat-free mass) and fWHR would be unrelated to the expression of a restricted sociosexual attitude (Hypothesis 3).

MATERIAL AND METHODS

Participants

Our sample was 206 heterosexual men aged 18 to 38 years ($M = 22.52$, $SD = 4.65$). Participants were recruited from the student and general populations in the region of Valparaíso (Chile) through billboard advertisements. Anthropometric measurements were collected in the *Laboratorio de Comportamiento Animal y Humano, Centro de Estudios Avanzados* of *Universidad de Playa Ancha*. Participants provided written informed consent, and the study protocol was approved by the Ethics Committee of the *Universidad de Playa Ancha*. At the end of the data collection session, participants were dismissed and were paid 5.000 Chilean pesos as a compensation for their time and a variable amount from 0 to 2.000 Chilean pesos according to their choices in several economic games they played as a part of a wider study.

Anthropometric Measures

Body Measurements

Body height (cm) was measured barefoot and with a stadiometer (SECA® 213). Skeletal muscle mass (kg), upper-body fat-free mass (kg), and body mass index (BMI) were assessed with a body composition analyzer (Inbody® 370). This device employs a tetrapolar 8-point tactile electrode for measurements through a direct segmental multi-frequency bioelectrical impedance analysis method (DSM-BIA). The technology assumes the body as five cylinders (four limbs and one trunk) and measures the bioelectrical impedance of these parts separately. The DSM-BIA is a valid tool for the assessment of total and segmental body composition (Ling et al.,

2011). The device automatically records skeletal body mass of the full body and fat-free mass, but not skeletal body mass, for each of the five segments.

Facial Measurement

Facial photographs were taken in frontal view with a digital SLR camera (Nikon D7000) under constant conditions of light, head orientation, focal length (3 meters), shutter speed (1/60 seconds) and aperture (f/5.6). Any facial adornment was removed, and participants were instructed to look straight into the camera with a neutral expression.

fWHR was measured from photographs following the protocol provided by Carré and McCormick (2008) and employed in previous studies (Muñoz-Reyes et al., 2014; Sanchez-Pages, Rodriguez-Ruiz & Turiegano, 2014). Four landmarks were placed on digital images of participants' faces using TPSdig software (see <http://life.bio.sunysb.edu/morph>). These landmarks delineate the distance (in pixels) between the upper part of the lip and the forehead (facial height) and the distance between the left and right zygion (facial width). Finally, the width measurement was divided by the height measurement.

Psychometric and sociodemographic measures

Sociosexual Orientation Inventory

Participants completed a Chilean adaptation (Fernández et al., unpublished) of the Multifactorial Sociosexual Orientation Index developed by Jackson and Kirkpatrick (2007). This index assesses unrestricted sociosexual attitudes (10 items), restricted sociosexual attitudes (7 items), and sociosexual behavior (5 items). Three of the sociosexual behavior items are related to previous sexual behavior (lifetime, previous-year and one-time sexual partners), one item to sexual fantasies, and one item to expectations about the number of future sexual partners. In this study, we considered only the attitudinal items and behavioral items related to previous sexual behavior. The attitudinal items are answered on a 7-point Likert scale (1 = *strongly disagree* to 7 = *strongly agree*) and the behavioral items use an open format that requires numerical responses. Internal consistency, measured with Cronbach's alpha, was high for both

1
2
3 unrestricted ($\alpha = .90$) and restricted ($\alpha = .85$) sociosexual attitudes. Three and five individuals
4
5 did not provide information about lifetime and one-time sexual partners, respectively, thus
6
7 reducing the sample size to $n = 203$ and $n = 201$ accordingly.
8
9

10 Sociodemographic questionnaire

11
12 Participants answered a brief questionnaire about their relationship status (i.e., whether
13
14 they were single or in a romantic relationship), the duration of their current relationship
15
16 (months), age (years), sexual orientation (open question), and place where they grew up (open
17
18 question).
19

20 *Data Analysis*

21
22
23 We fitted five general linear models (GLM) to test our three hypotheses. The main
24
25 difference between them was the dependent variable: unrestricted sociosexual attitude for
26
27 Hypothesis 1, lifetime, previous-year, and one-time sexual partners for Hypothesis 2, and
28
29 restricted sociosexual attitude for Hypothesis 3. As commonalities for all GLMs, individuals were
30
31 classified into high- or low-muscular men if their values for SMM were above or below the mean
32
33 value of SMM in the sample, respectively. The same procedure was performed to classify
34
35 individuals as high or low in fWHR. Preliminary analysis with the original variables (i.e.,
36
37 continuous SMM and fWHR) showed that the interaction between both variables was significant
38
39 when analyzing unrestricted sociosexual attitudes, lifetime, and previous-year sexual partners.
40
41 After classification of these variables, these interactions remained significant. BMI and height
42
43 were treated as covariates because they may influence muscularity and fWHR (Lassek & Gaulin,
44
45 2009). Finally, age and current relationship status may affect sociosexual attitudes and behavior;
46
47 thus, both variables were included in the analyses as covariates. We used a step-up strategy to
48
49 identify the simplest model that provides the best fit to the observed data (Burnham &
50
51 Anderson, 2002). Thus, we compared nested models with the likelihood ratio test and selected
52
53 only models that significantly improved the fit of the previous model.
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 The assessment of the distribution of residuals revealed no violation of the assumption
4 of normality for unrestricted and restricted sociosexual attitudes. However, this assumption was
5 violated for lifetime, previous-year, and one-time sexual partners. Log-transformation of data
6 solved the normality violation, but only in the case of lifetime and previous-year sexual partners.
7 In these instances, the results did not differ when considering original or log-transformed data
8 and they are reported for original data. Due to the violation of the normality assumption in the
9 case of one-time sexual partners even after the transformation, we fitted a logistic binary
10 regression considering the following two categories for one-time sexual partners: those men
11 that reported less than two one-time sexual partners and those that reported more than one.
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

24 Finally, consideration of only the upper body fat-free mass instead of the SMM did not
25 change the results. In fact, the variables were highly correlated ($r = .96$, $n = 206$, $p < .001$).
26 Consequently, we report only results from total SMM. We employed IBM SPSS 21 for statistical
27 analysis and set the level of significance to .05.
28
29
30
31
32

33 RESULTS

34
35 Table 1 reports descriptive statistics for physical and behavioral measures. With regard
36 to the relationships of SMM and fWHR with unrestricted sociosexual attitude (Hypothesis 1), the
37 fitted model ($F(4,201) = 5.76$, $p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .103$) is shown in Table 2. There was a main effect
38 of relationship status ($F(1,201) = 11.54$, $p = .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .054$) and an interaction effect of SMM
39 and fWHR ($F(1,201) = 12.59$, $p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .059$). According to estimated marginal means, single
40 men reported higher scores on unrestricted sociosexual attitude ($M = 46.46$, $SE = 1.26$) than men
41 who reported to be in a relationship ($M = 39.96$, $SE = 1.47$; $M \pm SE$ difference = 6.51 ± 1.92 ; $p =$
42 $.001$). Figure 1 illustrates the interaction of SMM and fWHR in relation to unrestricted
43 sociosexual attitude. According to estimated marginal means, high-muscular men reported
44 higher scores of unrestricted sociosexual attitude ($M = 45.59$, $SE = 1.77$) than low-muscular men
45 ($M = 39.35$, $SE = 2.15$) but only if they were classified as high in fWHR ($M \pm SE$ difference = 6.24
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 ± 2.76 ; $p = .025$). The pattern was reversed for individuals classified as low in fWHR, such that
4
5 high-muscular men reported lower scores of unrestricted sociosexual attitude ($M = 40.21$, $SE =$
6
7 2.14) than low-muscular men ($M = 47.70$, $SE = 1.65$; $M \pm SE$ difference = -7.49 ± 2.70 ; $p = .006$).
8
9 Similarly, men high in fWHR reported higher scores on unrestricted sociosexual attitude ($M =$
10
11 45.59 , $SE = 1.77$) than men low on fWHR ($M = 40.21$, $SE = 2.14$) but only if they were classified
12
13 as high in muscularity ($M \pm SE$ difference = 5.38 ± 2.76 ; $p = .053$). Men high on fWHR reported
14
15 lower scores on unrestricted sociosexual attitude ($M = 39.35$, $SE = 2.15$) than men low on fWHR
16
17 ($M = 47.70$, $SE = 1.65$) but only if they were classified as low in muscularity ($M \pm SE$ difference =
18
19 -8.35 ± 2.72 ; $p = .002$).
20
21
22

23 To test our second hypothesis, two GLM and a logistic binary regression were fitted.
24
25 Table 3 reports the fitted model for the relationships between SMM and fWHR with the number
26
27 of lifetime sexual partners ($F(4,198) = 15.58$, $p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .239$). There was a main effect of age
28
29 ($F(1,198) = 48.56$, $p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .197$) and an interaction effect of SMM and fWHR ($F(1,198) =$
30
31 8.62 , $p = .004$, $\eta_p^2 = .042$). Age was positively related to number of lifetime sexual partners ($b =$
32
33 $.76$, $SE = .11$, $p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .197$). Figure 2 depicts the interaction of SMM and fWHR in relation
34
35 to the number of lifetime sexual partners. According to estimated marginal means, high-
36
37 muscular men reported more lifetime sexual partners ($M = 7.90$, $SE = .90$) than low-muscular
38
39 men ($M = 4.52$, $SE = 1.09$) but only if they were classified as high in fWHR ($M \pm SE$ difference =
40
41 3.38 ± 1.41 ; $p = .018$). The pattern was reversed for individuals classified as low in fWHR, such
42
43 that high-muscular men reported fewer lifetime sexual partners ($M = 4.51$, $SE = 1.10$) than low-
44
45 muscular men ($M = 6.94$, $SE = .85$; $M \pm SE$ difference = -2.42 ± 1.38 ; $p = .080$). Similarly, men high
46
47 on fWHR reported more lifetime sexual partners ($M = 7.90$, $SE = .90$) than men low on fWHR (M
48
49 $= 4.51$, $SE = 1.10$) but only if they were classified as high in muscularity ($M \pm SE$ difference = 3.39
50
51 ± 1.42 ; $p = .018$). Men high on fWHR reported fewer lifetime sexual partners ($M = 4.52$, $SE =$
52
53 1.09) than men low on fWHR ($M = 6.94$, $SE = .85$) but only if they were classified as low in
54
55 muscularity ($M \pm SE$ difference = -2.42 ± 1.38 ; $p = .080$).
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Table 4 reports the fitted model for the relationships between SMM and fWHR with the
4 number of previous-year sexual partners ($F(3,199) = 3.43, p = .018, \eta_p^2 = .049$). The model only
5 includes the interaction between SMM and fWHR ($F(1,199) = 9.72, p = .002, \eta_p^2 = .047$). Figure 3
6 illustrates the interaction between SMM and fWHR with previous-year sexual partners.
7
8 According to estimated marginal means, high-muscular men reported more previous-year
9 sexual partners ($M = 1.97, SE = .22$) than low-muscular men ($M = 1.05, SE = .27$) but only if they
10 were classified as high in fWHR ($M \pm SE$ difference = $.92 \pm .35; p = .008$). The pattern was reversed
11 for individuals classified as low in fWHR, such that high-muscular men reported fewer previous-
12 year sexual partners ($M = 1.13, SE = .27$) than low-muscular men ($M = 1.72, SE = .21; M \pm SE$
13 difference = $-.60 \pm .34; p = .082$). Similarly, men high on fWHR reported more previous-year
14 sexual partners ($M = 1.97, SE = .22$) than men low on fWHR ($M = 1.13, SE = .27$) but only if they
15 were classified as high in muscularity ($M \pm SE$ difference = $.84 \pm .35; p = .017$). Men high on fWHR
16 reported fewer previous-year sexual partners ($M = 1.05, SE = .27$) than men low on fWHR ($M =$
17 $1.72, SE = .21$) but only if they were classified as low in muscularity ($M \pm SE$ difference = $-.67 \pm$
18 $.34; p = .048$).

19
20
21 Table 5 reports the fitted model for the relationships between SMM and fWHR with the
22 number of one-time sexual partners ($\chi^2 = 7.46, df = 1, p = .006, R^2_{Nagelkerke} = .05$). Only age was a
23 significant predictor of the number of one-time sexual partner ($B = .09, Wald\ tests = 7.08, p =$
24 $.008$). The odds ratio and confident interval for age was 1.10 (95% CI = 1.03-1.18).

25
26
27 Finally, when assessing the relationships of morphological traits with restricted
28 sociosexual attitude (Hypothesis 3), we found that the inclusion of neither a single variable nor
29 their interactions improved the null model significantly (see Table 6).

30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44 45 46 47 48 49 50 51 52 53 54 55 56 57 58 59 60

In humans, T-related traits may provide information about male reproductive investments (Archer, 2006; Muehlenbein & Bribiescas, 2005). Masculine men are expected to invest more in mating, whereas investment in parenting is more strongly related to measures of

1
2
3 socioeconomic status (Gangestad & Simpson, 2000). Body muscularity and fWHR have been
4
5 linked to pubertal, reactive, and basal T levels in men (Hodges-Simeon et al., 2016; Lefevre et
6
7 al., 2013) and these traits are considered condition-dependent traits associated with male
8
9 mating strategy. In the present study, both traits were related to unrestricted sociosexual
10
11 attitude and sociosexual behavior, but not to restricted sociosexual attitude in a sample of
12
13 Chilean men. However, we did not find a main effect of body muscularity and fWHR on
14
15 unrestricted sociosexual attitude and sociosexual behavior; rather, both traits interact with
16
17 these variables. In other words, the expected effect of muscularity on unrestricted sociosexual
18
19 attitude and sociosexual behavior is moderated by fWHR. Accordingly, our main finding supports
20
21 the relationship between T-related traits with unrestricted sociosexual attitude and sociosexual
22
23 behavior, but this relationship is the result of the interaction between both morphological traits,
24
25 suggesting a more complex effect of these traits on male sexual strategy.
26
27
28
29

30 We hypothesized that male muscularity and fWHR would be positively related to
31
32 unrestricted sociosexual attitude (Hypothesis 1) and to the number of lifetime, previous-year,
33
34 and one-time sexual partners (Hypothesis 2). Unrestricted sociosexual attitude is associated
35
36 with mating effort such that it is expected to lead to a greater number of sexual partners.
37
38 Individuals with this orientation tend to pursue uncommitted relationships of short duration
39
40 (Simpson & Gangestad, 1991). Previous studies found that correlates of muscularity (e.g.,
41
42 shoulder to hip ratio, SHR; or hand-grip strength, HGS) are related to number of sexual partners
43
44 and to unrestricted sociosexual attitudes (Gallup et al., 2007; Hughes & Gallup, 2003;
45
46 Lukaszewski et al., 2014). In addition, direct measures of muscularity are also related to number
47
48 of sexual partners (Lassek & Gaulin, 2009). For instance, number of lifetime sexual partners is
49
50 predicted by fat-free mass and limb muscle volume. However, number of previous-year sexual
51
52 partners and age of first sexual intercourse is predicted by limb muscle volume but not by fat-
53
54 free mass (Lassek & Gaulin, 2009). Relatedly, more masculine faces are more attractive to
55
56 women, especially in the context of a ST relationship (Dixson et al., 2016; Johnson et al., 2001;
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Little et al., 2007; Marcinkowska et al., 2017; Puts et al., 2012; Thornhill & Gangestad, 1999;
4
5 Valentine et al., 2014) and more masculine faces are related to unrestricted sociosexual
6
7 attitudes and number of sexual partners (Arnocky et al., 2018; Boothroyd et al., 2011; Boothroyd
8
9 et al., 2008).

10
11
12 Our results partially support the first and second hypotheses but also reveal several
13
14 unexpected patterns. High-muscular men reported higher unrestricted sociosexual attitude and
15
16 more lifetime and previous-year sexual partners than low-muscular men, but only when their
17
18 fWHR was above the mean value. The same is true for men high in fWHR compared to men low
19
20 on fWHR, but only when their muscularity is above the mean. However, high-muscular men
21
22 reported lower unrestricted sociosexual attitude and fewer lifetime and previous-year sexual
23
24 partners than low-muscular men, when their fWHR were below the mean value. Similarly, men
25
26 high in fWHR reported lower unrestricted sociosexual attitude and fewer lifetime and previous-
27
28 year sexual partners than men low in fWHR, when their muscularity was below the mean. These
29
30 results are in contrast to our expectations, given that men that had low expression of both traits
31
32 indicated unrestricted sociosexual attitude and more lifetime and previous-year sexual partners.
33
34 Thus, men with a low T profile were behaving similarly to individuals with a high T profile.
35
36
37
38
39

40
41 Men with average or even feminine faces are preferred by women for LT relationships
42
43 (Little, Jones, Penton-Voak, Burt & Perrett, 2002). In addition, men with less muscular bodies
44
45 are perceived as having higher commitment and being less volatile than men with more
46
47 muscular bodies and, therefore, may also be preferred by women seeking a LT relationship
48
49 (Frederick & Haselton, 2007). A possible explanation for the association of low muscularity and
50
51 low fWHR to number of sexual partners and unrestricted sociosexual attitude is that men with
52
53 lower T are exploiting their attractiveness as LT partners to increase their number of ST sexual
54
55 partners. Another possible explanation is that men with less muscular bodies and low fWHR are
56
57 less preferred by women, and pursue any sexual opportunity. These individuals might be
58
59
60

1
2
3 expected to report high unrestricted sociosexual attitude as a consequence of their
4
5 opportunistic behavior when choosing a mate, and a higher number of sexual partners if they
6
7 are unable to maintain a sexual partner. Regardless of the possible explanation, our results
8
9 parallel the findings reported by Gettler et al. (2017). They found that both high and low levels
10
11 of androgenicity in men are related to lower relationship stability and decreased paternal care.
12
13 Whereas the authors argued that high androgenicity may be related to a ST mating strategy, the
14
15 effects reported for low androgenicity may be caused by balancing selection favoring parental
16
17 care in individuals with intermediate levels of androgenicity (Gettler et al., 2017). As a corollary,
18
19 men in the current study that displayed inconsistent traits (i.e., low muscularity and high fWHR
20
21 or high muscularity and low fWHR) report lower unrestricted sociosexual attitude and fewer
22
23 lifetime and previous-year sexual partners, suggesting that the consistent expression of T-
24
25 related traits in the face and body is important in determining male mating strategy.
26
27
28
29

30
31 These results raise several questions. For example, why are there “inconsistent”
32
33 phenotypes regarding the expression of muscularity and fWHR? Although identifying the
34
35 physiological mechanisms that lead to a different expression of these traits is not the purview
36
37 of this study, the development of a muscular body depends on several variables in addition to
38
39 pubertal levels of T. In this regard, drive for muscularity, defined as the dissatisfaction with
40
41 current level of muscularity and preoccupation with performing behaviors geared toward
42
43 increasing muscularity, is negatively related to self-esteem both in adolescent and adult males
44
45 (Bergeron & Tylka, 2007; Smolak & Stein, 2006). In turn, self-esteem is positively associated with
46
47 physical attractiveness and appearance (Judge & Cable, 2004). Therefore, men with high
48
49 muscularity and low fWHR may have low self-esteem and little previous mating success. The
50
51 high levels of muscularity of these men may be an attempt to compensate for their lesser facial
52
53 masculinization or lesser facial attractiveness. Individuals displaying high pubertal T in their face
54
55 morphology but with low muscle mass may be signaling incompetence to develop muscular
56
57 tissue in accordance with their phenotypic markers of T. These two explanations link
58
59
60

1
2
3 inconsistency in the expression of muscularity and fWHR with lower mating success; however,
4
5 this inconsistent expression may be signaling intermediate levels of androgenicity rather than
6
7 self-esteem issues or incompetence to develop muscular tissue. In accord with the results of
8
9 Gettler et al. (2017) in which men with intermediate androgenicity invested more in paternal
10
11 care and reported higher stability in their relationships, the lower number of sexual partners
12
13 reported by men with inconsistent expression of these traits may be indicative of a LT mating
14
15 strategy. It is interesting to note that whereas men with inconsistent expression of these traits
16
17 are less oriented toward unrestricted sociosexual attitude, they do not differ in their orientation
18
19 toward restricted sociosexual attitude.
20
21
22

23
24 In contrast to the number of lifetime and previous-year sexual partners, the number of
25
26 one-time sexual partners is not explained by SMM nor fWHR as initially hypothesized.
27
28 Considering the low effect sizes reported in this study, the need to categorize the variable
29
30 number of one-time sexual partners in order to perform a logistic binary regression may explain
31
32 the null results. Alternatively, we assumed that the number of partners with whom one has had
33
34 one-time sex was indicative of ST mating strategy. However, one-time sexual partners may be
35
36 indicative of being unable to maintain a relationship.
37
38
39

40
41 Muscularity and fWHR did not predict restricted sociosexual attitudes, consistent with
42
43 our third hypothesis. This null result documents that traits predicting unrestricted sociosexual
44
45 attitudes do not predict restricted sociosexual attitudes in the opposite direction. Accordingly,
46
47 both facets of sociosexual orientation can be understood as two dimensions rather than as
48
49 opposite poles of the same dimension. Our results are in accord with those of previous studies
50
51 (Jackson & Kirkpatrick, 2007; Thomas & Stewart-Williams, 2018) and emphasize the importance
52
53 of considering these two attitudes as different dimensions. Furthermore, this conceptualization
54
55 of unrestricted vs. restricted sociosexuality, or ST vs. LT mating orientation, is more in
56
57 accordance with the theoretical proposal of strategic pluralism which argues that humans have
58
59
60

1
2
3 evolved to pursue multiple mating tactics that in some cases may be pursued simultaneously
4
5 (Gangestad & Simpson, 2000; Jackson & Kirkpatrick, 2007).
6
7

8 Our study has several limitations. The sample size is near the threshold of the necessary
9
10 size to detect effect sizes that are typical of these studies (Lukaszewski et al., 2014). Moreover,
11
12 we used a psychometric test to estimate sociosexual orientation which seems to be less
13
14 referenced in previous studies than other questionnaires (e.g., Penke & Asendorpf, 2008). This
15
16 circumstance may limit the comparison of our results with previous studies. Finally, despite the
17
18 consideration of two different traits denoting pubertal T levels in the current study, future
19
20 studies will benefit from the inclusion of other measures of facial and body masculinity.
21
22

23
24 In conclusion, our study links sociosexual attitudes and behaviors with direct
25
26 morphological measures of muscularity assessed by bioelectrical impedance, and shows that
27
28 body muscularity and fWHR are related to ST (but not LT) mating tactics. The use of two
29
30 morphological traits allowed us to investigate the relationship between pubertal T-related traits
31
32 and men's ST mating tactics. Both the intensity and consistency in the expression of these traits
33
34 seem to be important in predicting male mating strategies. In addition, we showed that the
35
36 fWHR influenced the relationship between body muscularity and sociosexual attitudes and
37
38 behaviors, suggesting that despite being a controversial measure, this metric is related to male
39
40 ST mating strategy. Finally, our results evidenced the importance of considering two dimensions
41
42 of sociosexual attitudes (i.e. ST and LT mating orientation) since these dimensions are not
43
44 completely dependent.
45
46
47
48

49 **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

50
51
52 Research was founded by a project FONDECYT postdoctorado (#3160366) to PP and
53
54 FONDECYT regular (#1170513) from the government of Chile. **Three independent reviewers**
55
56 **provided valuable comments and suggestions on an earlier version of the manuscript.**
57
58
59
60

AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS

1
2
3 PP and JAMR designed the study and collected the data. PP analysed the data and
4
5 drafted the manuscript. PP, JAMR, MP, TDS and BF edited the manuscript for intellectual content
6
7 and provided critical comments on the manuscript.
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

For Peer Review

REFERENCES

- Alrajih, S., & Ward, J. (2014). Increased facial width-to-height ratio and perceived dominance in the faces of the UK's leading business leaders. *British Journal of Psychology*, *105*, 153-161. doi: 10.1111/bjop.12035
- Andersson, M. B. (1994). *Sexual selection*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Archer, J. (2006). Testosterone and human aggression: an evaluation of the challenge hypothesis. *Neuroscience & Biobehavioral Reviews*, *30*, 319-345. doi: 10.1016/j.neubiorev.2004.12.007
- Arnocky, S., Carré, J. M., Bird, B. M., Moreau, B. J. P., Vaillancourt, T., Ortiz, T., & Marley, N. (2018). The facial width-to-height ratio predicts sex drive, sociosexuality, and intended infidelity. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, *47*, 1375-1385. doi: 10.1007/s10508-017-1070-x
- Bergeron, D., & Tylka, T. L. (2007). Support for the uniqueness of body dissatisfaction from drive for muscularity among men. *Body Image*, *4*, 288-295. doi: 10.1016/j.bodyim.2007.05.002
- Berglund, A., Bisazza, A., & Pilastro, A. (1996). Armaments and ornaments: an evolutionary explanation of traits of dual utility. *Biological Journal of the Linnean Society*, *58*, 385-399. doi: 10.1111/j.1095-8312.1996.tb01442.x
- Bird, B. M., Cid Jofré, V. S., Geniole, S. N., Welker, K. M., Zilioli, S., Maestripieri, D., . . . Carré, J. M. (2016). Does the facial width-to-height ratio map onto variability in men's testosterone concentrations? *Evolution and Human Behavior*, *37*, 392-398. doi: 10.1016/j.evolhumbehav.2016.03.004
- Boothroyd, L. G., Cross, C. P., Gray, A. W., Coombes, C., & Gregson-Curtis, K. (2011). Perceiving the facial correlates of sociosexuality: Further evidence. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *50*, 422-425. doi: 10.1016/j.paid.2010.10.017
- Boothroyd, L. G., Jones, B. C., Burt, D. M., DeBruine, L. M., & Perret, D. I. (2008). Facial correlates of sociosexuality. *Evolution and Human Behavior*, *29*, 211-218.

- 1
2
3 Bribiescas, R. G. (2001). Reproductive ecology and life history of the human male. *American*
4
5 *Journal of Physical Anthropology*, 116(S33), 148-176. doi: 10.1002/ajpa.10025
6
7
8 Burnham, K. P., & Anderson, D. (2002). *Model selection and multi-model inference. A Practical*
9
10 *information-theoretic approach* (2nd ed.). New York: Springer.
11
12 Buss, D. M., & Schmitt, D. P. (1993). Sexual strategies theory: an evolutionary perspective on
13
14 human mating. *Psychological Review*, 100, 204-232.
15
16 Buss, D. M., & Schmitt, D. P. (2019). Mate preferences and their behavioral manifestations.
17
18 *Annual Review of Psychology*, 70. doi: 10.1146/annurev-psych-010418-103408
19
20
21 Candolin, U. (2003). The use of multiple cues in mate choice. *Biological Reviews*, 78, 575-595.
22
23 doi: 10.1017/S1464793103006158
24
25 Carré, J. M., & McCormick, C. M. (2008). In your face: facial metrics predict aggressive behaviour
26
27 in the laboratory and in varsity and professional hockey players. *Proceedings of the*
28
29 *Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, 275, 2651-2656.
30
31
32 Crossley, K. L., Cornelissen, P. L., & Tovée, M. J. (2012). What is an attractive body? Using an
33
34 interactive 3D program to create the ideal body for you and your partner. *PloS One*, 7,
35
36 e50601. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0050601
37
38
39 Dixson, A. F., Halliwell, G., East, R., Wignarajah, P., & Anderson, M. J. (2003). Masculine
40
41 somatotype and hirsuteness as determinants of sexual attractiveness to women.
42
43 *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 32, 29-39. doi: 10.1023/a:1021889228469
44
45
46 Dixson, B. J. W., Sulikowski, D., Gouda-Vossos, A., Rantala, M. J., & Brooks, R. C. (2016). The
47
48 masculinity paradox: facial masculinity and beardedness interact to determine women's
49
50 ratings of men's facial attractiveness. *Journal of Evolutionary Biology*, 29, 2311-2320.
51
52 doi: 10.1111/jeb.12958
53
54
55 Evans, N. A. (2004). Current concepts in anabolic-androgenic steroids. *The American Journal of*
56
57 *Sports Medicine*, 32, 534-542. doi: 10.1177/0363546503262202
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Foo, Y. Z., Nakagawa, S., Rhodes, G., & Simmons, L. W. (2017). The effects of sex hormones on
4 immune function: a meta-analysis. *Biological Reviews*, *92*, 551-571. doi:
5 doi:10.1111/brv.12243
6
7
8
9 Frederick, D. A., & Haselton, M. G. (2007). Why is muscularity sexy? Tests of the fitness indicator
10 hypothesis. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *33*, 1167-1183. doi:
11 doi:10.1177/0146167207303022
12
13
14
15
16 Gallup, A. C., & Fink, B. (2018). Handgrip strength as a Darwinian fitness indicator in men.
17 *Frontiers in Psychology*, *9*. doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2018.00439
18
19
20 Gallup, A. C., White, D. D., & Gallup Jr, G. G. (2007). Handgrip strength predicts sexual behavior,
21 body morphology, and aggression in male college students. *Evolution and Human*
22 *Behavior*, *28*, 423-429. doi: 10.1016/j.evolhumbehav.2007.07.001
23
24
25
26
27
28 Gangestad, S. W., Garver-Apgar, C. E., Simpson, J. A., & Cousins, A. J. (2007). Changes in women's
29 mate preferences across the ovulatory cycle. *Journal of Personality and Social*
30 *Psychology*, *92*, 151-163. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.92.1.151
31
32
33
34
35 Gangestad, S. W., & Simpson, J. A. (2000). The evolution of human mating: Trade-offs and
36 strategic pluralism. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, *23*, 573-587.
37
38
39 Geary, D. C. (2000). Evolution and proximate expression of human paternal investment.
40 *Psychological Bulletin*, *126*, 55-77. doi: 10.1037/0033-2909.126.1.55
41
42
43
44 Geniole, S. N., Denson, T. F., Dixson, B. J., Carré, J. M., & McCormick, C. M. (2015). Evidence from
45 meta-Analyses of the facial width-to-height ratio as an evolved cue of threat. *PLoS One*,
46 *10*, e0132726. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0132726
47
48
49
50 Gettler, L. T., Ryan, C. P., Eisenberg, D. T. A., Rzhetskaya, M., Hayes, M. G., Feranil, A. B., . . .
51
52 Kuzawa, C. W. (2017). The role of testosterone in coordinating male life history
53 strategies: The moderating effects of the androgen receptor CAG repeat polymorphism.
54 *Hormones and Behavior*, *87*, 164-175. doi: 10.1016/j.yhbeh.2016.10.012
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Haselhuhn, M. P., Ormiston, M. E., & Wong, E. M. (2015). Men's facial width-to-height ratio
4 predicts aggression: A meta-analysis. *PloS One*, *10*, e0122637. doi:
5
6 10.1371/journal.pone.0122637
7
8
9
10 Hodges-Simeon, C. R., Hanson Sobraske, K. N., Samore, T., Gurven, M., & Gaulin, S. J. C. (2016).
11 Facial width-to-height ratio (fWHR) is not associated with adolescent testosterone
12 levels. *PloS One*, *11*, e0153083. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0153083
13
14
15
16 Höglund, J., & Sheldon, B. C. (1998). The cost of reproduction and sexual selection. *Oikos*, *83*,
17
18 478-483. doi: 10.2307/3546675
19
20
21 Hönekopp, J., Rudolph, U., Beier, L., Liebert, A., & Müller, C. Physical attractiveness of face and
22
23 body as indicators of physical fitness in men. *Evolution and Human Behavior*, *28*, 106-
24
25 111. doi: 10.1016/j.evolhumbehav.2006.09.001
26
27
28 Hughes, S. M., & Gallup, G. G. (2003). Sex differences in morphological predictors of sexual
29
30 behavior: Shoulder to hip and waist to hip ratios. *Evolution and Human Behavior*, *24*,
31
32 173-178. doi: [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1090-5138\(02\)00149-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1090-5138(02)00149-6)
33
34
35 Jackson, J. J., & Kirkpatrick, L. A. (2007). The structure and measurement of human mating
36
37 strategies: toward a multidimensional model of sociosexuality. *Evolution and Human*
38
39 *Behavior*, *28*, 382-391. doi: 10.1016/j.evolhumbehav.2007.04.005
40
41
42 Johnston, V. S., Hagel, R., Franklin, M., Fink, B., & Grammer, K. (2001). Male facial attractiveness:
43
44 Evidence for hormone-mediated adaptive design. *Evolution and Human Behavior*, *22*,
45
46 251-267.
47
48 Jones, B. C., Hahn, A. C., Fisher, C. I., Wang, H., Kandrik, M., Han, C., . . . DeBruine, L. M. (2018).
49
50 No compelling evidence that preferences for facial masculinity track changes in
51
52 women's hormonal status. *Psychological Science*, *29*, 996-1005. doi:
53
54 10.1177/0956797618760197
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Judge, T. A., & Cable, D. M. (2004). The Effect of Physical Height on Workplace Success and
4
5 Income: Preliminary Test of a Theoretical Model. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *89*, 428-
6
7 441. doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.89.3.428
8
9

10 Kramer, R. S. S. (2017). Sexual dimorphism of facial width-to-height ratio in human skulls and
11
12 faces: A meta-analytical approach. *Evolution and Human Behavior*, *38*, 414-420. doi:
13
14 10.1016/j.evolhumbehav.2016.12.002
15

16 Kruger, D. J. (2006). Male facial masculinity influences attributions of personality and
17
18 reproductive strategy. *Personal Relationships*, *13*, 451-463. doi: 10.1111/j.1475-
19
20 6811.2006.00129.x
21
22

23 Lassek, W. D., & Gaulin, S. J. C. (2009). Costs and benefits of fat-free muscle mass in men:
24
25 relationship to mating success, dietary requirements, and native immunity. *Evolution*
26
27 *and Human Behavior*, *30*, 322-328. doi: 10.1016/j.evolhumbehav.2009.04.002
28
29

30 Lefevre, C. E., Etchells, P. J., Howell, E. C., Clark, A. P., & Penton-Voak, I. S. (2014). Facial width-
31
32 to-height ratio predicts self-reported dominance and aggression in males and females,
33
34 but a measure of masculinity does not. *Biology Letters*, *10*, 20140729. doi:
35
36 10.1098/rsbl.2014.0729
37
38

39 Lefevre, C. E., Lewis, G. J., Perrett, D. I., & Penke, L. (2013). Telling facial metrics: facial width is
40
41 associated with testosterone levels in men. *Evolution and Human Behavior*, *34*, 273-279.
42
43 doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.evolhumbehav.2013.03.005>
44

45 Ling, C. H. Y., de Craen, A. J. M., Slagboom, P. E., Gunn, D. A., Stokkel, M. P. M., Westendorp, R.
46
47 G. J., & Maier, A. B. (2011). Accuracy of direct segmental multi-frequency bioimpedance
48
49 analysis in the assessment of total body and segmental body composition in middle-
50
51 aged adult population. *Clinical Nutrition*, *30*, 610-615. doi: 10.1016/j.clnu.2011.04.001
52
53

54 Little, A. C., Cohen, D. L., Jones, B. C., & Belsky, J. (2007). Human preferences for facial
55
56 masculinity change with relationship type and environmental harshness. *Behavioral*
57
58 *Ecology and Sociobiology*, *61*, 967-973. doi: 10.1007/s00265-006-0325-7
59
60

1
2
3 Little, A. C., Connely, J., Feinberg, D. R., Jones, B. C., & Roberts, S. C. (2011). Human preference
4 for masculinity differs according to context in faces, bodies, voices, and smell.
5
6 *Behavioral Ecology*, 22(4), 862-868. doi: 10.1093/beheco/arr061
7
8
9

10 Little, A. C., Jones, B. C., Penton-Voak, I. S., Burt, D. M., & Perrett, D. I. (2002). Partnership status
11 and the temporal context of relationships influence human female preferences for
12 sexual dimorphism in male face shape. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological*
13 *Sciences*, 269, 1095-1100. doi: 10.1098/rspb.2002.1984
14
15
16
17

18 Lovejoy, C. O. (1981). The origin of man. *Science*, 211, 341-350.
19

20 Lukaszewski, A. W., Larson, C. M., Gildersleeve, K. A., Roney, J. R., & Haselton, M. G. (2014).
21 Condition-dependent calibration of men's uncommitted mating orientation: evidence
22 from multiple samples. *Evolution and Human Behavior*, 35, 319-326. doi:
23 10.1016/j.evolhumbehav.2014.03.002
24
25
26
27
28
29

30 Macintyre, S., & Sooman, A. (1991). Non-paternity and prenatal genetic screening. *The Lancet*,
31 338, 869-871. doi: 10.1016/0140-6736(91)91513-T
32
33

34 Magrath, M. J. L., & Komdeur, J. (2003). Is male care compromised by additional mating
35 opportunity? *Trends in Ecology & Evolution*, 18, 424-430. doi: 10.1016/S0169-
36 5347(03)00124-1
37
38
39
40

41 Marcinkowska, U. M., Jasienska, G., & Prokop, P. (2017). A comparison of masculinity facial
42 preference among naturally cycling, pregnant, lactating, and post-menopausal women.
43 *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 47, 1367-1374. doi: 10.1007/s10508-017-1093-3
44
45
46
47

48 Møller, A. P., & Birkhead, T. R. (1989). Copulation behaviour in mammals: evidence that sperm
49 competition is widespread. *Biological Journal of the Linnean Society*, 38, 119-131. doi:
50 doi:10.1111/j.1095-8312.1989.tb01569.x
51
52
53

54 Muehlenbein, M. P., & Bribiescas, R. G. (2005). Testosterone-mediated immune functions and
55 male life histories. *American Journal of Human Biology*, 17, 527-558. doi:
56 10.1002/ajhb.20419
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Muñoz-Reyes, J. A., Iglesias-Julios, M., Martín-Elola, C., Losada-Pérez, M., Monedero, I., Pita, M.,
4
5 & Turiégano, E. (2014). Changes in preference for male faces during the menstrual cycle
6
7 in a Spanish population. *Anales de Psicología/Annals of Psychology*, *30*, 667-675. doi:
8
9 10.6018/analesps.30.2.145221
10
11
12 Nowak, J., Pawłowski, B., Borkowska, B., Augustyniak, D., & Drulis-Kawa, Z. (2018). No evidence
13
14 for the immunocompetence handicap hypothesis in male humans. *Scientific Reports*, *8*,
15
16 7392. doi: 10.1038/s41598-018-25694-0
17
18
19 Penke, L., & Asendorpf, J. B. (2008). Beyond global sociosexual orientations: a more
20
21 differentiated look at sociosexuality and its effects on courtship and romantic
22
23 relationships. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *95*, 1113-1135.
24
25
26 Puts, D. A. (2010). Beauty and the beast: mechanisms of sexual selection in humans. *Evolution*
27
28 *and Human Behavior*, *31*, 157-175. doi: 10.1016/j.evolhumbehav.2010.02.005
29
30
31 Puts, D. A., Bailey, D. H., & Reno, P. L. (2015). Contest competition in men. In D. M. Buss (Ed.),
32
33 *The handbook of evolutionary psychology* (pp. 835-402). Hoboken: Wiley.
34
35
36 Puts, D. A., Jones, B. C., & DeBruine, L. M. (2012). Sexual selection on human faces and voices.
37
38 *Journal of Sex Research*, *49*, 227-243.
39
40
41 Roney, J. R. (2009). The role of sex hormones in the initiation of human mating relationships. In
42
43 P. T. Ellison & P. B. Gray (Eds.), *The endocrinology of social relationships* (pp. 246-269).
44
45 Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.
46
47
48 Sanchez-Pages, S., Rodriguez-Ruiz, C., & Turiegano, E. (2014). Facial masculinity: How the choice
49
50 of measurement method enables to detect its influence on behaviour. *PLoS One*, *9*,
51
52 e112157. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0112157
53
54 Scott, I. M., Clark, A. P., Boothroyd, L. G., & Penton-Voak, I. S. (2012). Do men's faces really signal
55
56 heritable immunocompetence? *Behavioral Ecology*, *24*(3), 579-589. doi:
57
58 10.1093/beheco/ars092
59
60

- 1
2
3 Sell, A., Hone, L. S. E., & Pound, N. (2012). The importance of physical strength to human males.
4
5 *Human Nature*, 23, 30-44. doi: 10.1007/s12110-012-9131-2
6
7
8 Sell, A., Lukazsweski, A. W., & Townsley, M. (2017). Cues of upper body strength account for
9
10 most of the variance in men's bodily attractiveness. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B:*
11
12 *Biological Sciences*, 284, 20171819. doi: 10.1098/rspb.2017.1819
13
14
15 Simpson, J. A., & Gangestad, S. W. (1991). Individual differences in sociosexuality: evidence for
16
17 convergent and discriminant validity. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 60,
18
19 870-883.
20
21 Smolak, L., & Stein, J. A. (2006). The relationship of drive for muscularity to sociocultural factors,
22
23 self-esteem, physical attributes gender role, and social comparison in middle school
24
25 boys. *Body Image*, 3, 121-129. doi: 10.1016/j.bodyim.2006.03.002
26
27
28 Stearns, S. C. (1992). *The evolution of life histories*. Oxford: Oxford University Press
29
30
31 Symons, D. (1979). *The evolution of human sexuality*. New York: Oxford University Press.
32
33
34 Thomas, A. G., & Stewart-Williams, S. (2018). Mating strategy flexibility in the laboratory:
35
36 Preferences for long- and short-term mating change in response to evolutionarily
37
38 relevant variables. *Evolution and Human Behavior*, 39, 82-93. doi:
39
40 10.1016/j.evolhumbehav.2017.10.004
41
42
43 Thornhill, R., & Gangestad, S. W. (1999). Facial attractiveness. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 3,
44
45 452-460.
46
47
48 Trivers, R. (1972). Parental investment and sexual selection. In B. Campbell (Ed.), *Sexual selection*
49
50 *and the descent of man 1871-1971* (pp. 136-179). Chicago: Aldine-Atherton.
51
52
53 Valentine, K. A., Li, N. P., Penke, L., & Perrett, D. I. (2014). Judging a man by the width of his face.
54
55 *Psychological Science*, 25, 806-811. doi: 10.1177/0956797613511823
56
57
58 Wagstaff, D. L., Sulikowski, D., & Burke, D. (2015). Sex-differences in preference for looking at
59
60 the face or body in short-term and long-term mating contexts. *Evolution, Mind and*
Behaviour, 13(1), 1-17. doi: 10.1556/2050.2015.0003

1
2
3 Wilson, M. L., Miller, C. M., & Crouse, K. N. (2017). Humans as a model species for sexual
4 selection research. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, 284,
5 20171320. doi: 10.1098/rspb.2017.1320
6
7
8

9
10 Wrangham, R. W. (1993). The evolution of sexuality in chimpanzees and bonobos. *Human*
11 *Nature*, 4, 47-79. doi: 10.1007/bf02734089
12
13

14 Young, L. J. (2003). The neural basis of pair bonding in a monogamous species: A model for
15 understanding the biological basis of human behavior. In K. W. Wachter & R. A. Bulatao
16 (Eds.), *Offspring: Human Fertility Behavior in Biodemographic Perspective* (pp. 91-103).
17 Washington: National Academies Press.
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

TABLES

Table 1. Mean and standard deviation, and median, minimum and maximum values for each variable according to their distribution.

	<i>M</i> ± <i>SD</i>	<i>N</i>		<i>Mdn</i> (min, max)	<i>N</i>
UnSA	44.46 ± 14.10	206	Lifetime partners	4 (0, 50)	203
ReSA	39.04 ± 10.09	206	Last year partners	1 (0, 12)	206
SMM	32.27 ± 4.11	206	One-time partners	1 (0, 10)	201
fWHR	2.11 ± 0.17	206	BMI	23.40(16.70, 36.20)	206
Age	22.36 ± 4.46	206			
Height	173.41 ± 6.29	206			

Note: UnSA: Unrestricted sociosexual attitude, ReSA: Restricted sociosexual attitude, fWHR: Facial width to height ratio, BMI: Body mass index.

Table 2. Unrestricted sociosexual attitude fitted model.

	<i>b</i>	t-value	<i>p</i>	η_p^2
Intercept	42.34	20.07	< .001***	.667
RS = Single	6.51	3.40	.001**	.054
fWHR = Low	-5.38	-1.95	.053	.018
SMM = Low	-6.24	-2.26	.025*	.025
fWHR = Low *	13.73	3.55	< .001***	.059
SMM = Low				

Predictor variables: RS (relationship status): single/paired, fWHR (facial width to height ratio): low/high, SMM (skeletal muscle mass): low/high. Outcome variable: Unrestricted sociosexual attitude.

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$

Table 3. Lifetime sexual partners fitted model.

	<i>b</i>	t-value	<i>p</i>	η_p^2
Intercept	-9.04	2.69	.001**	.054
Age	.76	6.97	< .001***	.197
fWHR = Low	-3.39	-2.39	.018*	.028
SMM = Low	-3.38	-2.39	.018*	.028
fWHR = Low *	5.81	2.94	.004**	.042
SMM = Low				

Predictor variables: Age, fWHR (facial width to height ratio): low/high, SMM (skeletal muscle mass): low/high. Outcome variable: Number of lifetime sexual partners.

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$

Table 4. Previous-year sexual partners fitted model.

	<i>b</i>	t-value	<i>p</i>	η_p^2
Intercept	1.97	8.98	< .001***	.288
fWHR	-.84	-2.41	.017*	.028
SMM	-.92	-2.66	.008**	.034
fWHR*SMM	1.51	3.12	.002**	.047

Predictor variables: fWHR (facial width to height ratio): low/high, SMM (skeletal muscle mass): low/high. Outcome variable: Number of previous-year sexual partners.

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$

Table 5. One-time sexual partners fitted model.

	<i>b</i>	Wald	<i>p</i>	Exp(<i>b</i>)
Intercept	-2.76	11.61	.001**	.063
Age	.09	7.08	.008**	1.099

Predictor variables: Age in years. Outcome variable: One-time sexual partners.

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$

Table 6. Restricted sociosexual attitude fitted model.

	<i>b</i>	t-value	<i>p</i>	η_p^2
Intercept	38.36	1.36	.175	.009
RS = Single	-.23	-.16	.877	< .001
fWHR = Low	3.14	1.48	.140	.011
SMM = Low	1.10	.45	.655	.001
fWHR = Low *	-1.15	-.39	.695	.001
SMM = Low				
Height	-.02	-.13	.896	< .001
BMI	.00	.01	.993	< .001
Age	.11	.59	.556	.002


Predictor variables: RS (relationship status): single/paired, fWHR (facial width to height ratio): low/high, SMM (skeletal muscle mass): low/high, height, BMI (body mass index), age. Outcome variable: Restricted sociosexual attitude.

FIGURE LEGENDS

1
2
3
4
5
6
7 *Figure 1.* Estimated marginal means of unrestricted sociosexual attitude scores for low (black
8 bars) and high (dotted bars) muscular men when fWHR was low and high.


9
10
11
12 *Figure 2.* Estimated marginal means of the number of lifetime sexual partners for low (black
13 bars) and high (dotted bars) muscular men when fWHR was low and high. **Estimated marginal**
14 **means were calculated considering the mean value of age.**

15
16
17
18
19 *Figure 3.* Estimated marginal means of the number of lifetime sexual partners for low (black
20 bars) and high (dotted bars) muscular men when fWHR was low and high.
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60




127x76mm (300 x 300 DPI)

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60



127x76mm (300 x 300 DPI)



127x76mm (300 x 300 DPI)