



# Human sexual selection

David Puts

Sexual selection favors traits that aid in competition over mates. Widespread monogamous mating, biparental care, moderate body size sexual dimorphism, and low canine tooth dimorphism suggest modest sexual selection operating over human evolution, but other evidence indicates that sexual selection has actually been comparatively strong. Ancestral men probably competed for mates mainly by excluding competitors by force or threat, and women probably competed primarily by attracting mates. These and other forms of sexual selection shaped human anatomy and psychology, including some psychological sex differences.

## Address

Department of Anthropology and Center for Brain, Behavior and Cognition, Pennsylvania State University, University Park, PA 16802, USA

Corresponding author: Puts, David ([dap27@psu.edu](mailto:dap27@psu.edu))

**Current Opinion in Psychology** 2015, 7:28–32

This review comes from a themed issue on **Evolutionary psychology**

Edited by **Steven W Gangestad** and **Joshua M Tybur**

For a complete overview see the [Issue](#) and the [Editorial](#)

Available online 5th August 2015

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.copsyc.2015.07.011>

2352-250/© 2015 Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.

## Introduction

Recent reviews suggest that human psychological sex differences are typically small [1,2]. For example, Hyde's [2] 'gender similarities hypothesis' states that 'men and women, as well as boys and girls, are more alike than they are different'. Of course, males and females belong to the same species, so we should naturally expect similarity on many dimensions. But the hypothesis that males and females are more alike than different lacks predictive power about where sex differences are likely to lie, and about the direction and magnitude of these differences. Sexual selection theory offers this resolution.

Sexual selection is the type of natural selection that favors traits that aid in obtaining mates. It tends to be strongest where potential mates differ greatly in quality, and especially where members of one sex can monopolize multiple mates, leaving many unmated same-sex competitors [3]. When reproductive success hinges on winning mates, sexual selection may favor even those traits that harm survival if they compensate by boosting mating success.

Here, I review evidence, focusing on recent findings, regarding the strength and forms of sexual selection operating over human evolution and consider how sexual selection has shaped human psychology, including psychological sex differences.

## The strength of human sexual selection

Some evidence suggests that sexual selection has been relatively weak in humans. Although sexual dimorphisms in anatomy and behavior may arise from other selective forces, the presence of sexually dimorphic ornamentation, weaponry, courtship displays, or intrasexual competition indicates a history of sexual selection [3]. However, men's 15–20% greater body mass than women's is comparable to primate species with a modest degree of mating competition among males, and humans lack the canine tooth dimorphism characteristic of many primates with intense male competition for mates [4]. Moreover, humans exhibit biparental care and social monogamy, which tend to occur in species with low levels of male mating competition [5]. Concealed ovulation also hinders men's ability to monopolize women during the fertile phase of their cycles [6].

Yet, it would be misleading to characterize human sexual selection from these observations alone. To start, sexual selection can operate similarly on both sexes, so the magnitudes of sexual dimorphisms may underestimate the intensity of past sexual selection. More importantly, humans are in fact highly sexually dimorphic along dimensions associated with sexual selection. Humans exhibit modest body mass dimorphism only because of another dimorphism: women are 40% more adipose than men, perhaps for gestating and nursing highly encephalized offspring. So far as we know, other primates are not highly dimorphic in adiposity [7]. When we consider aspects of size that are more directly comparable to nonhuman primates, we find that men have about 40% more fat free mass and 60% more muscle mass than women [8]. Human postcranial skeletal dimorphism is also consistent with a primate species in which males are 45–50% heavier than females [9]. These sexual dimorphisms are outside the range of primates with low levels of male mating competition [10].

Humans are also highly sexually dimorphic in several other traits that appear to have been shaped by sexual selection, including facial shape, facial and body hair, and vocal characteristics such as pitch [4,8,11–13,14\*]. And although humans lack pronounced canine size dimorphism, humans employ handheld weapons [4] and fists [14\*] rather than teeth in combat. Manufactured weapons are sexually dimorphic insofar as men are their primary

producers and users [4] and are far more effective than teeth; even technologically unsophisticated societies produce weapons capable of dispatching the fiercest animals.

With regard to our mating system, most marriages are monogamous in all societies, but the strength of sexual selection depends not on the modal mating outcome but on the variance. Sexual selection tends to be strongest where reproductive variance is greatest, and where reproductive differences depend most strongly on mating success. In traditional societies, men's reproductive variances are approximately 2–4 times those of women, though these values vary across societies [15] and over time, suggesting that sex differences in the strength of sexual selection are also variable. Notably, transitions to stratified state-level societies pushed harem sizes and male reproductive disparities to extremes exceeding those found in gorillas and even elephant seals in some cases [16].

Humans deviate from perfect monogamy for several reasons, including polygamous marriage, serial monogamy, and infidelity. Polygynous marriage occurs in about 83% of human societies, and men are likelier to reproduce with a new spouse after divorce, making even societies with exclusively monogamous marriage effectively polygynous in terms of mating and reproduction [17]. Humans are unlike most primates with a multi-male social structure, in which males compete for estrous females. Rather, (mostly) concealed ovulation necessitates male competition to monopolize women throughout the cycle [6,18], producing a social structure in which individual males are mated to one or more females embedded within a larger multi-male, multi-female group. As in hamadryas baboons [19], men's proprietariness over their mates helps maintain these embedded harems [17].

Across species, sexual selection predominates in the sex that invests less in offspring and exhibits greater reproductive variance [3]. In humans and other mammals, this sex is males. The more investing sex — usually females — tends to be choosier about mates, and variation in male mate quality favors female traits such as mate preferences that act as filters on which males successfully mate. Women exhibit preferences for male traits thought to reflect mate quality [20,21\*\*22] and may possess other mate filters, perhaps including orgasm as a mechanism for selective sperm retention [23].

Men are unusual among male mammals in the degree to which they invest in mates and offspring through providing resources, protection, and paternal care. Because time and energy available for reproduction are finite, such investment generally detracts from mating competition. Sexual selection may nonetheless have operated potently among ancestral men due to variance in men's quantity of mates through polygynous marriage, serial monogamy, and extramarital affairs, and in the quality of their partners. Men's

allocation of reproductive effort between investment and mating competition appears to track their own competitiveness for mates [24,25], as well as opportunities to invest in current mates and existing offspring — and to be mediated by testosterone [26].

Benefits conferred by men often cannot be shared among women; male investment in one offspring is unavailable to others, and male–male competition and female proprietariness limit men's ability to distribute genetic benefits widely. Variation in male quality thus engenders female mating competition. Women indeed appear to have evolved traits that increase their access to mates. Women's body fat distribution in particular seems sub-optimal energetically and biomechanically but effective at attracting mates. Deposition of fat on the breasts, hips, and buttocks is universally attractive to men, although the precise amount and relative distributions of adiposity preferred vary across societies and time [27–29].

In sum, sexual selection has probably been weaker in women than in men, but stronger than in most female primates. Sexual selection has probably been somewhat stronger among men than among many — perhaps most — male primates, but weaker than in the most sexually dimorphic primates, such as gorillas, orangutans, and Hamadryas baboons.

### Mechanisms of human sexual selection

Sexual selection can operate through multiple mechanisms, including contests, mate choice, scrambles, sexual coercion, and sperm competition (Table 1). Each of these mechanisms of sexual selection has probably played a role over human evolution, but contest competition — the use of force or threat of force to exclude same-sex competitors from mates — has probably been particularly important in men. By contrast, female mating competition probably mainly took the form of mate choice, which favors sexual ornaments and other traits for attracting mates.

**Table 1**

**Mechanisms of sexual selection probably operating over human evolution.**

Mechanism	Description
Contests	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Exclusion of same-sex competitors through force or threat of force</li> </ul>
Mate choice	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Preferences or other traits that enhance the odds of copulation and/or conception with mates having particular characteristics</li> </ul>
Scrambles	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Competition to locate fertile mates</li> </ul>
Sexual coercion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Use of force or threat against a potential mate, at a cost to her or him, that increases the odds of copulating with the potential mate and/or decreases the potential mate's odds of mating with a competitor</li> </ul>
Sperm competition	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Competition within a single female between the sperm of multiple males</li> </ul>

### Mechanisms of sexual selection in men

Among the great apes — orangutans, gorillas, humans, and chimpanzees — males tend to compete via contest competition, and humans appear to be no exception [4,8]. Ethnographic and archeological evidence make clear that the human ‘state of nature’ includes high levels of male interpersonal violence, feuding, and warfare [30•]. Men also show signs of evolutionary adaptation to violent conflict: compared to women, men are substantially larger, more muscular, more physically competitive and aggressive, produce and use weapons against each other, and exhibit conspicuous sex-specific traits such as beards and deep voices that appear to function as threat displays [4,8,31,32].

Numerous studies have shown that men’s dominance and social status translate into mating and reproductive success in both traditional and industrial societies [4,33••,34]. Women may prefer dominant men and related traits because these characteristics indicate underlying genes that could contribute to offspring fitness [35]. Indeed, a recent meta-analysis supports previous findings that women exhibit stronger preferences for male dominance and contest-relevant traits when they can most exploit associated genetic benefits: during the fertile phase of the ovulatory cycle and for short-term, sexual (vs. long-term, committed) relationships [21••]. These cyclic shifts do not appear to reflect changes in sexual interest in men generally [36]. In the context of long-term relationships, women more strongly prefer mates who are intelligent, caring, friendly, and able to invest resources [22,37].

However, women’s ability to freely choose their mates was probably limited ancestrally by men’s use of force and social power to exclude other men from mates and to coerce women. Over human evolution, male sexual coercion of women probably involved the use of force and threats against wives [38], as well as abduction [4]. Moreover, men’s traits appear to be shaped by selection mainly for contest competition rather than mate attraction. Evidence has begun to accumulate that across cultures, men’s secondary sex traits, such as beards, deep voices, and robust faces are more effective at intimidating other men than they are at attracting women [39••,40,41,42]. This contrasts with a previous emphasis on female mate choice in the literature [8]. In addition, some evidence indicates that men’s mating and reproductive success are more strongly linked to dominance and status among men than attractiveness to women [33••,43].

Genetic, morphological, and behavioral evidence also suggest some sperm competition in men. For example, human sperm are more motile than those of gorillas, in which mating is highly monandrous [44]. However, men’s proprietariness over mates and the risk to women of losing male investment probably promoted female fidelity in ancestral humans. Accordingly, human sperm are less motile and produced less copiously, and associated genes

show evidence of weaker selection than those of species with highly polyandrous mating, such as macaques [45]. Men may also compete for mates via scramble competition. For example, a recent study among the forager/horticulturist Tsimane of Bolivia found that travel distances peak during adolescence, the time of maximal mate searching, and are greater among adolescent males than females [46].

### Mechanisms of sexual selection in women

Although physical aggression is less frequent and less injurious in women than in men, female physical aggression occurs in all societies and is most commonly provoked by competition over mates [47]. Consistent with a function in mating competition, female aggression increases with sexual maturity, a female-biased local sex ratio, and male resource variance [47]. However, ancestral women probably could not monopolize mates through contests as effectively as men could. Men’s larger size and strength would have enabled them to partly circumvent the outcomes of female contests. As a consequence, men could more freely choose mates, probably causing male mate choice to predominate in mating competition among ancestral women.

Indeed, women compete to attract mates [20] and possess anatomical traits seemingly shaped by male mate choice rather than contest competition [8,48]. Several of women’s traits, including gracile facial features, reduced body hair, and high voices, increase the appearance of youth and hence fertility and are preferred by men [49,50]. Women’s body fat distribution also appears to be designed to attract mates [29,51]. Placement of fat on the hips, buttocks, and breasts may advertise fecundity [52] and fat reserves essential to fetal and infant brain development [53].

### Sexual selection and human psychological sex differences

Viewing ourselves as products of sexual selection can help clarify such psychological and behavioral traits as same-sex aggression, mate preferences, and eagerness to mate, as well as how these are moderated by age, ovulatory cycle phase, local sex ratio, existing offspring, and the like. Sexual selection theory also illuminates sex differences in these traits. When males and females can augment reproduction through different patterns of mating behavior, behavioral sex differences tend to evolve [3]. We cannot precisely predict every sex difference because phylogeny and ecology sometimes produce different evolutionary solutions to similar adaptive problems across species. However, we can predict the broad domains in which sex differences are likeliest, and in many cases, the direction of these differences.

For example, women’s higher investment in offspring through gestation and lactation should favor greater selectivity over mates, whereas men’s lower obligatory

investment should favor greater interest in indiscriminate sex with more partners, as well as increased intrasexual competitiveness over mates. Sex differences reflecting interest in uncommitted sex and same-sex physical aggression are indeed large by conventional standards and appear to be cross-culturally universal [32,54,55]. Yet, there is substantial overlap between the sexes, so that these sex differences may be described as differences in degree rather than in kind [1].

By contrast, some aspects of mating psychology such as mate preferences are inherently multidimensional, and hence the sexes are more appropriately compared using multivariate methods. When several mate preferences from a large cross-cultural data set were recently investigated via multidimensional Mahalanobis distance ( $D$ ), the sexes differed by over 2.4 standard deviations and could be classified with 92.2% accuracy [56••]. Moreover, this analysis omitted a mate preference perhaps so basic — evolutionarily, the *most* basic — as to be often neglected: sexual orientation. Most males are attracted to females and vice versa, a sex difference of approximately 6 standard deviations [57]. If included with other mate preferences, sexual orientation would probably allow nearly perfect sex classification.

## Summary

Contrary to inferences drawn from widespread social monogamy, biparental care, and modest body size and canine tooth dimorphisms, the bulk of evidence suggests stronger sexual selection operating ancestrally in humans than is often assumed (e.g., [58]). Although multiple mechanisms of sexual selection probably played roles in men's and women's evolution, men's psychology, behavior, and anatomy especially show evidence of adaptive design for contest competition, whereas women's phenotypes show greater evidence of design for mate attraction. An understanding of how sexual selection has shaped our own species illuminates such psychobehavioral traits as same-sex aggression, mate preferences, and interest in uncommitted sex, as well as corresponding sex differences.

## References and recommended reading

Papers of particular interest, published within the period of review, have been highlighted as:

- of special interest
- of outstanding interest

1. Carothers BJ, Reis HT: **Men and women are from Earth: examining the latent structure of gender.** *J Pers Soc Psychol* 2013, **104**:385-407.
2. Hyde JS: **The gender similarities hypothesis.** *Am Psychol* 2005, **60**:581-592.
3. Andersson M: **Sexual Selection.** Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press; 1994.
4. Puts DA, Bailey DH, Reno PL: **Contest competition in men.** In *The Handbook of Evolutionary Psychology*. Edited by Buss DM. Wiley & Sons; 2015:526.
5. Lovejoy CO: **Reexamining human origins in light of *Ardipithecus ramidus*.** *Science* 2009, **326**:74e1-748e.
6. Marlowe FW, Berbesque JC: **The human operational sex ratio: effects of marriage, concealed ovulation, and menopause on mate competition.** *J Hum Evol* 2012, **63**:834-842.
7. Zihlman AL, McFarland RK: **Body mass in lowland gorillas: a quantitative analysis.** *Am J Phys Anthropol* 2000, **113**:61-78.
8. Puts DA: **Beauty and the beast: mechanisms of sexual selection in humans.** *Evol Hum Behav* 2010, **31**:157-175.
9. Gordon AD, Green DJ, Richmond BG: **Strong postcranial size dimorphism in *Australopithecus afarensis*: results from two new resampling methods for multivariate data sets with missing data.** *Am J Phys Anthropol* 2008, **135**:311-328.
10. Plavcan JM: **Sexual size dimorphism, canine dimorphism, and male-male competition in primates: where do humans fit in?** *Hum Nat* 2012, **23**:45-67.
11. Dixson A, Dixson B, Anderson M: **Sexual selection and the evolution of visually conspicuous sexually dimorphic traits in male monkeys, apes, and human beings.** *Annu Rev Sex Res* 2005, **16**:1-19.
12. Claes P, Walters M, Shriver MD, Puts D, Gibson G, Clement J, Baynam G, Verbeke G, Vandermeulen D, Suetens P: **Sexual dimorphism in multiple aspects of 3D facial symmetry and asymmetry defined by spatially dense geometric morphometrics.** *J Anat* 2012, **221**:97-114.
13. Puts DA, Jones BC, DeBruine LM: **Sexual selection on human faces and voices.** *J Sex Res* 2012, **49**:227-243.
14. Carrier DR, Morgan MH: **Protective buttressing of the hominin face.** *Biol Rev Camb Phil Soc* 2015, **90**:330-346.  
Theoretical review paper suggesting that multiple anatomical aspects of the hominin facial skeleton and musculature have evolved to protect the face from fracture due to blows from fists. Increased risk of facial injury is hypothesized as a cause of greater facial robusticity in males, and in robust australopiths relative to gracile australopiths and *Homo*.
15. Brown GR, Laland KN, Borgerhoff Mulder M: **Bateman's principles and human sex roles.** *Trends Ecol Evol* 2009, **24**:297-304.
16. Betzig LL: **Darwinism and Differential Reproduction: A Darwinian View of History.** Hawthorne, NY: Aldine de Gruyter; 1986.
17. Daly M, Wilson M: **Homicide.** New York: Aldine de Gruyter; 1988.
18. Puts DA, Bailey DH, Cárdenas RA, Burris RP, Welling LL, Wheatley JR, Dawood K: **Women's attractiveness changes with estradiol and progesterone across the ovulatory cycle.** *Horm Behav* 2013, **63**:13-19.
19. Schreier AL, Swedell L: **The fourth level of social structure in a multi-level society: ecological and social functions of clans in hamadryas baboons.** *Am J Primatol* 2009, **71**:948-955.
20. Cashdan E: **Women's mating strategies.** *Evol Anthropol* 1996, **5**:134-143.
21. Gildersleeve K, Haselton MG, Fales MR: **Do women's mate preferences change across the ovulatory cycle? A meta-analytic review.** *Psychol Bull* 2014, **140**:1205-1259.  
Meta-analysis of 134 effects from 38 published and 12 unpublished studies examined ovulatory cycle shifts in women's preferences for men's traits. Results showed robust increases in preferences for putative markers of men's genetic quality during the fertile phase of the cycle, specifically for 'short-term' attractiveness. Additional analyses indicated that observed cycle shifts were unlikely to be due to experimenter bias.
22. Kenrick DT, Sadalla EK, Groth G, Trost MR: **Evolution, traits, and the stages of human courtship: qualifying the parental investment model.** *J Pers* 1990, **58**:97-116.
23. Wheatley JR, Puts DA: **Evolutionary science of female orgasm.** In *The Evolution of Sexuality*. Edited by Shackelford TK, Hansen RD. Springer International Publishing; 2015:123-148.
24. Lukaszewski AW, Larson CM, Gildersleeve KA, Roney JR, Haselton MG: **Condition-dependent calibration of men's uncommitted mating orientation: evidence from multiple samples.** *Evol Hum Behav* 2014, **35**:319-326.

25. Gangestad SW, Simpson JA: **On the evolutionary psychology of human mating: trade-offs and strategic pluralism.** *Behav Brain Sci* 2000, **23**:573-587.
26. Puts DA, Pope LE, Hill AK, Cardenas RA, Welling LL, Wheatley JR, Marc Breedlove S: **Fulfilling desire: evidence for negative feedback between men's testosterone, sociosexual psychology, and sexual partner number.** *Horm Behav* 2015, **70**:14-21.
27. Bovet J, Raymond M: **Preferred women's waist-to-hip ratio variation over the last 2,500 years.** *PLOS ONE* 2015, **10**:e0123284.
28. Wheatley JR, Apicella CA, Burriss RP, Cárdenas RA, Bailey DH, Welling LLM, Puts DA: **Women's faces and voices are cues to reproductive potential in industrial and forager societies.** *Evol Hum Behav* 2014, **35**:264-271.
29. Dixon BJ, Vasey PL, Sagata K, Sibanda N, Linklater WL, Dixon AF: **Men's preferences for women's breast morphology in New Zealand, Samoa, and Papua New Guinea.** *Arch Sex Behav* 2011, **40**:1271-1279.
30. Gat A: **Proving communal warfare among hunter-gatherers: the quasi-rousseauan error.** *Evol Anthropol* 2015, **24**:111-126.
- Review paper examining evidence regarding the antiquity of violence and warfare in humans, and finding support for high levels of warfare, feuding, and homicide across forager societies prior to pacification by state-level societies.
31. Deane RO, Geary DC, Puts DA, Ham SA, Kruger J, Fles E, Winegard B, Grandis T: **A sex difference in the predisposition for physical competition: males play sports much more than females even in the contemporary U.S..** *PLoS ONE* 2012, **7**:e49168.
32. Deane RO, Smith BA: **Sex differences in sports across 50 societies.** *Cross-Cult Res* 2013, **47**:268-309.
33. Hill AK, Hunt J, Welling LLM, Cárdenas RA, Rotella MA, •• Wheatley JR, Dawood K, Shriver MD, Puts DA: **Quantifying the strength and form of sexual selection on men's traits.** *Evol Hum Behav* 2013, **34**:334-341.
- Study examining linear, quadratic, and cross-product relationships between putative sexually selected traits in men, attractiveness to female acquaintances, dominance among male peers, and number of sexual partners. Results showed stronger support for sexual selection via male contests than via female choice: Dominance and associated traits predicted men's numbers of sex partners, but attractiveness to women and associated traits did not.
34. von Rueden C, Gurven M, Kaplan H: **Why do men seek status? Fitness payoffs to dominance and prestige.** *Proc Roy Soc B* 2011, **278**:2223-2232.
35. Krams IA, Skrinda I, Kecko S, Moore FR, Krama T, Kaasik A, Meija L, Lietuvietis V, Rantala MJ: **Body height affects the strength of immune response in young men, but not young women.** *Sci Rep* 2014, **4**:6223.
36. Bosio J, Suschinsky K, Puts DA, Chivers M: **Category specificity of women's sexual arousal across the menstrual cycle.** *Arch Sex Behav* 2014, **43**:941-952.
37. Buss DM: **Sex differences in human mate preferences: evolutionary hypotheses tested in 37 cultures.** *Behav Brain Sci* 1989, **12**:1-49.
38. Smuts B: **Male aggression against women: an evolutionary perspective.** *Hum Nat* 1992, **3**:1-44.
39. Scott IM, Clark AP, Josephson SC, Boyette AH, Cuthill IC, •• Fried RL, Gibson MA, Hewlett BS, Jamieson M, Jankowiak W, Honey PL, Huang Z, Liebert MA, Purzycki BG, Shaver JH, Snodgrass JJ, Sosis R, Sugiyama LS, Swami V, Yu DW, Zhao Y, Penton-Voak IS: **Human preferences for sexually dimorphic faces may be evolutionarily novel.** *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* 2014, **111**:14388-14393.
- Study examining the effects of facial masculinity/femininity on perceptions of attractiveness and aggressiveness across 12 populations with diverse levels of economic development. Preferences for masculinity/femininity in opposite-sex faces were highly variable across populations for both women's and men's faces. By contrast, facial masculinity was consistently associated with perceptions of aggressiveness, and these perceptions increased with urbanization.
40. Apicella CL, Feinberg DR: **Voice pitch alters mate-choice-relevant perception in hunter-gatherers.** *Proc Roy Soc B* 2009, **276**:1077-1082.
41. Dixon BJ, Vasey PL: **Beards augment perceptions of men's age, social status, and aggressiveness, but not attractiveness.** *Behav Ecol* 2012, **23**:481-490.
42. Puts DA, Hodges C, Cárdenas RA, Gaulin SJC: **Men's voices as dominance signals: vocal fundamental and formant frequencies influence dominance attributions among men.** *Evol Hum Behav* 2007, **28**:340-344.
43. Smith EA, Bird RB, Bird DW: **The benefits of costly signaling: Merriam turtle hunters.** *Behav Ecol* 2003, **14**:116-126.
44. Nascimento JM, Shi LZ, Meyers S, Gagneux P, Loskutoff NM, Botvinick EL, Berns MW: **The use of optical tweezers to study sperm competition and motility in primates.** *J R Soc Interface* 2005, **5**:297-302.
45. Zhou T, Wang G, Chen M, Zhang M, Guo Y, Yu C, Zhou Z, Si W, Sha J, Guo X: **Comparative analysis of macaque and human sperm proteomes: insights into sperm competition.** *Proteomics* 2015, **15**:1564-1573.
46. Miner EJ, Gurven M, Kaplan H, Gaulin SJC: **Sex difference in travel is concentrated in adolescence and tracks reproductive interests.** *Proceedings* 2014:281.
47. Campbell A: **The evolutionary psychology of women's aggression.** *Philos Trans R Soc Lond B Biol Sci* 2013, **368**:20130078.
48. Barber N: **The evolutionary psychology of physical attractiveness: sexual selection and human morphology.** *Ethol Sociobiol* 1995, **16**:395-424.
49. Collins SA, Missing C: **Vocal and visual attractiveness are related in women.** *Anim Behav* 2003, **65**:997-1004.
50. Cunningham MR: **Measuring the physical in physical attractiveness: quasi-experiments in the sociobiology of female facial beauty.** *J Pers Soc Psychol* 1986, **50**:925-935.
51. Singh D, Dixon BJ, Jessop TS, Morgan B, Dixon AF: **Cross-cultural consensus for waist-hip ratio and women's attractiveness.** *Evol Hum Behav* 2010, **31**:176-181.
52. Jasinska G, Ziolkiewicz A, Ellison PT, Lipson SF, Thune I: **Large breasts and narrow waists indicate high reproductive potential in women.** *Proc Biol Sci* 2004, **271**:1213-1217.
53. Lassek WD, Gaulin S: **Waist-hip ratio and cognitive ability: is gluteofemoral fat a privileged store of neurodevelopmental resources?** *Evol Hum Behav* 2008, **29**:26-34.
54. Schmitt DP: **Sociosexuality from Argentina to Zimbabwe: a 48-nation study of sex, culture, and strategies of human mating.** *Behav Brain Sci* 2005, **28**:247-275 [discussion 275-311].
55. Ellis L, Hershberger S, Field E, Wersinger S, Pellis S, Geary D, Palmer C, Hoyenga K, Hetsroni A, Karadi K: **Sex Differences: Summarizing More than a Century of Scientific Research.** New York: Taylor and Francis; 2008.
56. Conroy-Beam D, Buss DM, Pham MN, Shackelford TK: **How sexually dimorphic are human mate preferences?** *Pers Soc Psychol Bull* 2015.
- Study exploring the distance between men's and women's mate preferences in multidimensional space utilizing a sample of 10,153 participants from 37 cultures. Sex differences in mate preferences were very large (Mahalanobis  $D = 2.41$ ) and decreased with increasing gender equality, but nevertheless remained large across all samples. Multidimensional sex differences in mate preferences were large relative to cross-cultural variability.
57. Hines M: **Brain Gender.** New York: Oxford University Press; 2004.
58. Wood W, Eagly AH: **A cross-cultural analysis of the behavior of women and men: implications for the origins of sex differences.** *Psychol Bull* 2002, **128**:699-727.