Title: Observers use Facial Masculinity to make Physical Dominance Assessments Following 100-millisecond Exposure.

Graham Albert[1], Erika Wells[2], Steven Arnocky[3], Chang Hong Liu[4], & Carolyn R. Hodges-Simeon[1]

[1]Department of Anthropology, Boston University, Boston, Massachusetts, United States of America

[2]Department of Psychological and Brain Sciences, Boston University, Boston, Massachusetts, United States of America

[3]Department of Psychology, Nipissing University, North Bay, Ontario, Canada

[4]Department of Psychology, Bournemouth University, Bournemouth, UK

Please address correspondence to:
Graham Albert
Department of Anthropology
Boston University
232 Bay Stated Rd.,
Boston, MA, 02215
E-mail: grahama@bu.edu

Abstract

Research has consistently demonstrated that faces manipulated to appear more masculine are perceived as more dominant. These studies, however, have used forced-choice paradigms, in which a pair of masculinized and feminized faces was presented side by side. These studies are susceptible to demand characteristics, because participants may be able to draw the conclusion that faces which appear more masculine should be rated as more dominant. To prevent this, we tested if dominance could be perceived when masculinized or feminized faces were presented individually for only 100-milliseconds. We predicted higher dominance ratings to masculinized faces and better memory of them in a surprise recognition memory test. In the experiment, 94 men rated the physical dominance of 40 facial photographs (masculinized = 20, feminized = 20), which were randomly drawn from a larger set of faces. This was followed by a surprise recognition memory test. Half of the participants were assigned to a condition in which the contours of the facial photographs were set to an oval to control for sexual dimorphism in face shape. Overall, men assigned higher dominance ratings to masculinized faces, suggesting that they can appraise differences in facial sexual dimorphism following very brief exposure. This effect occurred regardless of whether the outline of the face was set to an oval, suggesting that masculinized internal facial features were sufficient to affect dominance ratings. However, participants' recognition memory did not differ for masculinized and feminized faces, which could be due to a floor effect.

Observers use Facial Masculinity to make Physical Dominance Assessments Following 100-millisecond Exposure.

Throughout human evolution, the face has been one of the least occluded body areas and thus an area where observers direct their attention (Calvo & Nummenmaa, 2008; Sell et al., 2009; Sheehan & Nachman et al., 2014), providing abundant information about a person, such as emotion (Marsh, Ambady, & Kleck, 2005), sexuality (Rule, Ambady, & Hallet, 2009), and health (Foo, Simmons, Perrett, Holt, Eastwood, & Rhodes, 2020; Henderson, Holzleitner, Talamas, & Perrett, 2016 Little, Jones, & DeBruine, 2011; Phalane, Tribe, Steel, Cholo, & Coetzee 2017; Rhodes 2006; Schaller 2015). In addition, observers of both sexes use facial morphology to inform their dominance perceptions (Mileva, et al., 2014; Todorov, Olivola, Dotsch, & Mende-Siedlecki, 2015) and assign higher dominance ratings to more stereotypically masculine faces (e.g., Hill et al., 2013 ; Little, Třebický, Havlíček, Roberts, & Kleisner, 2015). Moreover, both sexes rate photographs of men's faces manipulated to appear more masculine (hereafter masculinized) as appearing more physically dominant than the photographs of the same men's faces manipulated to appear more feminine (hereafter feminized).

Masculine faces are those with broader jaws, thicker brow ridges and longer lower face halves (Thornhill & Gangestad, 2006). Facial features develop differently based on the environment in utero (Fink, et al., 2005). For instance, men's faces develop under the influence of testosterone (Marečková, et al., 2011; Roosenboom et al., 2018; Verdonk et al., 1999), which plays an essential role in masculinizing facial appearance. With the onset of puberty and increased testosterone production, male facial growth begins to diverge (Bulygina, et al., 2006), resulting in increased maxilla and mandible prognathism relative to females (Thordarson,

Johannsdottir, & Magnusson, 2005). Thus, during puberty, adolescent boys' level of bioavailable testosterone predicts the probability that naïve observers will identify their facial photographs as male as opposed to female, even after controlling for age (Marečková, et al., 2011).

Drawbacks of the Forced-Choice Paradigm

To date, most research testing the effects of manipulating facial sexual dimorphism on observers' dominance ratings has relied on forced-choice paradigms[1]. In these experiments, participants are presented with a masculinized and feminized version of the same man's face and must indicate which face appears more physically dominant (e.g., Penton-Voak et al., 1999; Todorov, Olivola, Dotsch, & Mende-Siedlecki, 2015; Watkins, Fraccaro, Smith, Vukovic, Feinberg, DeBruine, & Jones 2011). Although these studies support the hypothesis that individuals have the capacity to assess threat from faces, the forced-choice paradigms used in these experiments are subject to demand characteristics (Whitehouse et al., 2002). In forced-choice paradigms, participants are directed to focus attention on two manipulated facial photographs, confounding the situational aspects of the experiment with the participant's response. Participants are forced to choose the more dominant face of the pair, regardless of whether participants would perceive either face as dominant if they were presented outside of this highly artificial situation.

Moreover, by providing the feminized version of the same man's face as a reference upon which participants base their comparisons, the results of these experiments can only demonstrate that on-average masculinized men's faces are rated as more dominant than the feminized version of the same man's face. Forced-choice paradigms do little to determine if observers truly perceive masculinized faces as more physically dominant, reducing generalizability to real world

---

[1] cf., Sherlock, Tegg, Sulikowiski, and Dixson, (2017) for another experiment on the effects of facial masculinity that minimized demand characteristics.

situations. In addition, providing participants with an unlimited amount of time to make their

responses increases the likelihood that participants will attend to the manipulated facial traits.

Therefore, forced-choice inhibits researchers from inferring how facial masculinity affects social

interaction and subsequent decision-making. The limitation of this paradigm represents a large

gap in the knowledge base of perceived male dominance, preventing researchers from

understanding the cognitive processes that precede observers' threat and dominance evaluations.

In the current study, we seek to correct potential confounds of forced-choice paradigms.

Salience of Facial Masculinity on Dominance Appraisals

Automatic attentional processes may underlie perceived dominance evaluations. For

instance, a salient cue biases the processing of incoming information with speed and efficiency

(Posner, Snyder, & Davidson, 1980). To test if individuals automatically attend to masculine

facial characteristics, it is first necessary to determine whether these facial features are

perceptible when presented for short durations. If humans possess an attentional bias towards

cues that signal the presence of a physically dominant and potentially threatening individual in

their environment (i.e., a masculinized face), then it is first necessary to establish that they are

able to use facial masculinity to assess physical dominance from a glimpse towards the target

face. Yet to date, no experiments have tested whether humans can use facial masculinity to make

dominance attributions following brief exposure.

Observers evaluate faces on dominance, the perceived physical strength of the individual,

as well as valence, the trustworthiness of the individual (Oosterhof & Todorov, 2008). Observers

across a wide variety of cultural backgrounds use these lower level dimensions when formulating

first impressions from facial photographs (Jones, 2018). Together, valence and dominance

judgments inform observers of individuals' threat potential, such that those judged to be high on

dominance and low on valence (i.e., those that should be avoided) are judged as threatening (Oosterhof & Todorov, 2008). Many studies have indicated that more masculine faces, determined either by raters or through objective measurements, are rated as more dominant (e.g., Hill et al., 2013; Mefodeva et al., 2020; Penton-Voak et al., 1999; Todorov, Olivola, Dotsch, & Mende-Siedlecki, 2015), stronger (Sell et al., 2009; Tascano et al., 2014; Van Dogen & Sprengers, 2012) and more threatening (Han et al., 2017). Observers dominance ratings appear to increase linearly with the extent of facial masculinization (Mefodeva et al., 2020). Moreover, observers appear to possess the capacity to accurately assess salient emotional features such as aggressiveness as a means of rating threat potential when faces are presented for as little as 39-milliseconds (Bar, Neta, & Linz, 2006; Carré, McCormick, & Mondloch 2009; Todorov, Pakrashi, & Oosterhof, 2009), suggesting that a fleeting glance is enough time for observers to take in relevant information. Other studies have suggested that stimulus salience affects observers' memory for presented faces (Becker, Kenrick, Guerin, & Maner, 2005).

Dominance perception is probably not only detected from transient exposure, but it may also create a lasting trace in memory. Attention to objects in the natural environment can enhance the ability to store featural information in long-term memory (Hollingworth & Henderson, 2002). In support of this, men demonstrate enhanced memory for the location of attractive female faces (Becker, et al., 2005) which may reflect adaptations for locating suitable mates (Becker et al., 2005). If the attentional system has evolved to act in conjunction with the memory system to process and store information about objects, then it could be hypothesized that memory is another process underlying perceived dominance of male faces. An adaptation to remember cues of facial masculinity and associate them with physical dominance and threat could promote responses in observers that could mitigate threat, such as demonstrating deference

or avoiding the physically dominant individual. Therefore, we would expect that individuals should demonstrate a predisposition to first identify the more salient trait of dominance and then store the more masculinized faces in long term memory.

Study Purposes

With little evidence to suggest that dominance is a trait that can be perceived in isolation, the first purpose of the experiment was to test if men assigned higher dominance ratings to masculinized faces compared to feminized faces when they were presented individually. If facial sexual dimorphism is a salient factor that affects observers' assessments of dominance, then participants should rate masculinized men's faces as more dominant irrespective of whether the feminized version of the same face is also presented. In support of this hypothesis, Van Dongen and Sprengers (2012) computed objective measures of facial masculinity using geometric morphometrics and found a strong positive correlation between facial masculinity scores and observers' estimates of the photographed men's upper body strength and dominance, when these faces were presented individually. Similarly, Carré, McCormick, and Mondloch (2009) manipulated, the face width-to-height-ratio (fWHR), one aspect of facial morphology predictive of a predisposition for aggressive behavior (cf., Geniole, Denson, Dixson, Carré, & McCormick, 2015; Haselhuhn, Ormiston, & Wong, 2015). The authors presented target faces individually and found that faces manipulated to be relatively wider were rated as more aggressive. Therefore, we seek to address the issues caused by using forced-choice paradigms, and reduce the potential for introducing demand characteristics into the experimental design, by presenting observers with faces manipulated on sexual dimorphism individually.

The second purpose of the experiment was to test if men could discriminate levels of physical dominance when masculinized and feminized faces were presented for short durations

(i.e., 100-milliseconds), simulating a brief glance towards the target faces (Todorov, Pakrashi, & Oosterhof, 2009). Previous research has demonstrated that observers are able to process salient information from faces, such as physical attractiveness when they are presented for as little as 20 milliseconds (Olson & Marshuetz, 2005; Willis, & Todorov, 2006). As mentioned above, observers appear to possess the capacity to accurately assess salient features related to aggressive intent when rating threat potential. These raters can make assessments in as little as 39 milliseconds (Bar, Neta, & Linz, 2006; Carré, McCormick, & Mondloch, 2009; Todorov, Pakrashi, & Oosterhof, 2009). Research by Todorov and colleagues (2009) suggest that exposure times longer than 100-milliseconds do not significantly improve the accuracy of the observers' threat assessments (Todorov et al., 2009). As such we elect to adhere to the recommendations of Todorov and colleagues and present faces for 100-milliseconds.

The third purpose was to assess if facial masculinity affects observers' recognition memory for presented faces. As highlighted, we expect masculinized men's faces to be more salient because of their expected association with the individuals' physical dominance. Previous research has demonstrated that male listeners demonstrate better recognition memory for information previously spoken by lower-pitched, more stereotypically masculine sounding male voices (Albert, Pearson, Arnocky, Wachowiak, Nicol, & Murphy 2018), and that listeners are more sensitive to the identity of speakers when their voices are manipulated to have a lower pitch than when they are manipulated to be a higher pitch (Zhang, Chen, Hodges-Simeon, Albert, Gaulin, & Reid, 2020). This would suggest that men's better memory for lower-pitched voices (Zhang, et al., 2020) or the information spoken by a lower-pitched voice (Albert, et al., 2018) may be due to the fact that this auditory information was more salient at encoding, perhaps because it cued the speakers' physical dominance (e.g., Jones, Feinberg, DeBruine, Little, &

Vukovic, 2010; Puts et al., 2016). Within the visual domain, recent research has demonstrated that naïve observers are more likely to remember the faces of untrustworthy individuals in a recognition memory test, perhaps because remembering such individuals would promote future avoidance of them (Mattarozzi, Todorov, & Codispoti 2015). Relevant to male intersexual competition, during an aggressive-intent categorization task, participants were faster and more accurate at classifying a bearded male as angry compared to a clean-shaven one, demonstrating that males use masculine secondary sexual characteristics to assess formidability (Craig, Nelson, & Dixson, 2019). Conversely, Sherlock, Tegg, Sulikowski, and Dixson (2017) found that increased facial masculinity predicted observer's explicit dominance ratings, but not their implicit responses after being exposed to cues of physical dominance. Therefore, the third purpose of our experiment was to test if men demonstrated better recognition memory for masculinized men's faces over feminized ones.

Hypothesis

Based on the literature reviewed above, and our outlined purposes, we predicted that men would assign significantly higher dominance ratings to masculinized men's faces when they are presented one at a time (purpose 1) for 100-milliseconds (purpose 2). Furthermore, we also expected that men would be more accurate when indicating that they had seen a face from the rating phase when it was masculinized than when it was feminized (purpose 3) and to be more confident in their recognition of masculinized faces. Additionally, we predicted that masculinized and feminized internal facial features would be sufficient to produce the expected differences in observers' dominance ratings. To test for this, we cropped the facial photographs to an oval, to control for facial contour and assign half ($n = 47$) of the participants to view these stimuli. We expected that men who were presented with complete facial photographs would

assign higher dominance ratings to masculinized men's faces than those men who saw only the internal features, because of the effects that masculinized facial contour would have on dominance ratings. We made no predictions regarding differences in men's recognition memory between conditions.

Method

Participants

In this study we chose to use only young men, because research on intrasexual competition would suggest that males are more sensitive to signals of threat potential (Charlton, Taylor & Reby, 2013), due to a history of strong intrasexual competition (Kruger & Nesse 2006; Puts et al., 2016; Wilson & Daly 1985). We expect that this sensitivity to conspecifics' threat potential should be greatest during young adulthood when intrasexual competition is most intense. Participants were 94 male students from (Blinded Institution) between the ages of 18 and 27 (M_{age} = 20.16, *SD* = 2.02). We consulted studies investigating effects of facial masculinity on observers' implicit response to determine our sample size (Ohlsen, van Zoest, & van Vugt, 2013; Watkins et al., 2010). The ethnic composition of the sample was as follows: Caucasian (54%), Asian (32%), Latin American (18 %), Black (12%), South Asian (9%), Arab West Asian (4%), South East Asian (1%). Participants were primarily recruited through the institution's research participation pool and were compensated with course credit. The remaining participants were recruited via advertisements placed throughout the (Blinded Institution) campus, and through online job adds for (Blinded Institution) students and received 20.00 USD for participation. The study and all materials were approved by (Blinded Institution's) IRB in accordance with the declaration of Helsinki for the ethical treatment of human subjects.

Materials

JUDGING FACIAL MASCULINITY

Photographs. We used 57 photographs from the (Blinded Institution) Face Set and 33 from the London Face Set (DeBruine & Jones, 2017). For the (Blinded Institution) Face Set, as part of a larger study on health and human mating, 167 men between the ages of 18 and 39 (M_{age} = 22.71 SD_{age} = 4.71) were photographed from a standardized distance of two meters with a neutral facial expression. For the (Blinded Institution) Face Set, selection criteria for the current investigation were that the photographs were of Caucasian men with no facial scars, jewelry, and minimal to no facial hair. The Caucasian men from the London Face Set (DeBruine & Jones, 2017) were between the ages of 18 and 48 (M_{age} = 27.51, SD_{age} = 7.41). For both face sets participants were photographed with a neutral facial expression. Photographs were originally 4608 × 3456 pixels in size. These were cropped and resized to match the photographs of the London Face Set (DeBruine & Jones, 2017). Between the (Blinded Institution) Face Set and the London Face Set a total of 90 facial photographs were transformed (DeBruine & Jones, 2017).

Stimulus Creation. We used Psychomorph (version 6) to delineate the shape of the face by placing 189 landmark points along contours of major facial features. Next, we aligned the position of the pupils of each photographed face on the same x-y plane. Then we used the Caucasian male and female prototype facial photographs provided by DeBruine and Jones (2017) to manipulate the sexual dimorphism of the 2D face shape of the facial photographs. These prototype male and female facial photographs were created by averaging the x-y points for all Caucasian males' facial photographs together, and all Caucasian female facial photographs together to create the prototypical male and female facial photographs. To create the masculinized and feminized versions of the facial photographs, 75% of the linear differences in the 2D shape between symmetrized versions of the male and female prototype faces were added to or subtracted from each original photograph (e.g., Jones, DeBruine, Main, Little, Welling,

Feinberg, & Tiddeman, 2010). Technical details of the computer graphic methods used to transform two-dimensional face shape in this way are given in Tiddeman et al. (2001) and Perrett et al. (1998). This process generated two faces per original facial photograph, resulting in 180 morphed faces (i.e., 90 masculinized and 90 feminized male faces). Images were then masked around the outline of the face so that hair and clothing cues were not visible. For the rating phase, 20 masculinized and 20 feminized faces were randomly drawn from the larger pool and presented to participants. Please see Figure 1 for an example of the facial photographs used in the experiment.

To control for the effects that masculinized and feminized facial contour had on participants dominance ratings we used GIMP (version 2.10.10), to create a second set of stimuli in which the contour of all photographs were set to ovals. These stimuli were presented to half of the participants to control for affects that the outer face shape may have had on physical dominance ratings. The facial stimuli were presented in the center of the computer screen and subtended 6.08˚ of visual angle horizontally and approximately 7.60˚ of visual angle vertically for both the rating and recognition phases. For the rating phase, presentation of the faces was randomly distributed across participants such that each participant saw a random selection of 20 unique identities of men with masculinized faces and 20 unique identities of men with feminized men's faces. Half of these faces were from the (Blinded Institution) Face Set, while the other half was from the London Face Set (DeBruine & Jones, 2017).

Procedure

Participants were tested individually. All participants had normal or corrected to normal vision. The visual acuity of all participants was tested using a Snellen vision screening test. The visual acuity of participants was ($M_{Snellen} = 23.83$, $SD_{Snellen} = 7.35$). In order to participate in the

current experiment participants' visual acuity could not be above a Snellen ratio of 20/40. No

participants were excluded due to poor visual acuity. All testing took place at a single computer

station (Dell XPS 8930 Tower Desktop - 8th Gen). We used a chin rest to ensure that all

participants sat 50 cm from the computer monitor. Participants viewed the facial photographs on

an Asus 24 LED FHD computer monitor, with a 60Hz refresh rate. Psychophysics toolbox 3

(version 3.0.15) with Matlab (2018a) was used to present stimuli and record participants'

responses.

Rating phase. Figure 1A provides a complete schematic of a rating trial. Participants

completed 40 trials of the rating phase. Each trial began with the presentation of a fixation cross

in the center of the screen for 500ms. The fixation cross subtended 0.57˚ of visual angle

vertically and horizontally. This was followed by the presentation of a face for 100ms. Following

the presentation of the face, participants were presented with a Likert-type rating scale and rated

the physical dominance of each face from 1 (not at all dominant) to 7 (very dominant).

Participants were told that a physically dominant man was defined as one who would probably

win a fistfight against the average man. After making their rating participants proceeded to the

next trial.

Recognition phase. Following the rating phase, participants completed 40 trials of a

surprise recognition memory task. Figure 1B provides a complete schematic of a recognition

trial. Participants were presented with 40 unique face identities on the screen one at a time. Half

of these faces were randomly selected from the faces presented during the rating phase

("targets"). The other half were new faces ("lures") not previously presented in the rating phase.

Half of the targets were masculinized faces, while the other half were feminized faces. The two

types were also equally divided among the new face lures. By designing the recognition memory

phase this way, we were trying to prevent participants from committing incorrect acceptances caused by seeing the facial photograph of the opposite dimorphism manipulation. After presentation of a face, participants were asked to indicate whether they recognized the image as a face presented during the previous task. Participants pressed '4' on the keypad to indicate a correct target and '6' to indicate a new lure. Each face remained on the screen until they made their decision. Following their decision, participants rated how confident they were in their old/new classification using a 10-point Likert rating scale ranging from 1 (not at all confident) to 10 (very confident). After rating their confidence, the next trial began.

—Insert Figure 1 about here—

Analytic Plan

Analysis was conducted in *R* (version 3.6.2; R core team). For the rating phase, we used the *lmer* function from the package, *lme4* (Bates, Maechler, Bolker, & Walker 2015) to conduct a mixed effects linear regression with Maximum Likelihood estimation. For the regression, participant identity, photographed individual identity and trial number were random effects. The random slope of participant identity was allowed to vary according to sexual dimorphism. Face sexual dimorphism (i.e., masculinized or feminized), face contour (full face or oval), face set (London face set or Face Set Blinded for Review) along with their interactions were the fixed effects. Participants' dominance rating (1= not at all dominant to 7 = very dominant) was the dependent variable for this analysis. To assess the amount of variance explained by our fixed and random effects, we computed Pseudo R^2 using the *r.squaredGLMM* function from the Multi-Model Inference (*MuMIn*) package (Barton, 2019).

To analyze the results of the recognition memory phase we conducted a repeated measures ANOVA using the *ez* package (Lawrence, 2016). Because we wanted to reduce the effects that careless responding had on our analysis of participants' recognition memory,

participants with an accuracy below chance in the recognition phase (i.e., $\leq 50\%$) were removed from the analysis. This resulted in the exclusion of 21 participants from the analysis of participants' sensitivity and confidence ratings. For ANOVAs we report the generalized eta square as our estimate of effect size (Bakeman 2005). The d' score for masculinized and feminized faces were calculated for each participant. This measure was computed based on the hit (H) and false alarm (FA) rates, where $d = z(\text{H}) - z(\text{FA})$ (Macmillan & Creelman 1991; Stanislaw & Todorov, 1999). d' score served as the dependent variable. Additionally, we computed participants' mean confidence ratings for correct trials in the recognition memory task.

Results

Rating

The fixed effect of sexual dimorphism was a significant predictor of participants' physical dominance ratings ($b = 0.34$, SE $= 0.09$, $t = 3.54$, $p < .001$). However, neither the fixed effect of face contour ($b = 0.03$, SE $= 0.15$, $t = 0.19$, $p = .85$), the fixed effect of face set ($b = -0.18$, SE $= 0.12$, $t = -1.43$, $p = .15$), nor any of the interactions amongst the fixed effects ($bs < 0.19$, $ts < 1.39$, $p > .17$), predicted participants physical dominance ratings. The total proportion of variance explained by both the fixed and random effects was 35.24%. When only the fixed effects were considered, the total proportion of variance explained was 3.72%. Please see Table 1 for a report of the regression coefficients, t-values, 95% confidence intervals, and Pseudo R^2 of the fixed effects, and Table 2 for the variance and standard deviations of the random effects.

—Insert Figure 2 about here—

—Insert Table 1 and 2 about here—

Recognition

JUDGING FACIAL MASCULINITY

We began by conducting a one-samples t-test to assess whether participants sensitivity to previously presented faces was above chance (i.e., greater than 0). Participants sensitivity for previously presented faces was significantly above chance levels, $t(145) = 13.60$, $p < .001$ $d = 1.13$.

To assess if observers demonstrated better recognition memory for masculinized men's faces, we conducted a 2 (Dimorphism: masculinized, feminized) $\times$ 2 (Face Contour: full face, oval) mixed factorial ANOVA in which observers' sensitivity (d') served as the dependent variable. Neither the main effect of dimorphism, $F(1, 71) = .31$, $p = .58$, $\eta_G^2 = .003$, ($M_{fem} = 0.25$, $SD_{fem} = 0.23$, $M_{masc} = 0.23$, $SD_{masc} = 0.20$), nor the main effect of condition ($M_{oval} = 0.24$, $SD_{oval} = 0.22$, $M_{full} = 0.25$, $SD_{full} = 0.22$), $F(1, 71) = .10$, $p = .75$, $\eta_G^2 < .001$, were significant. The dimorphism by condition interaction was not significant, $F(1, 71) = .02$, $p = .88$, $\eta_G^2 < .001$.

[2]We conducted a 2 (Dimorphism: masculinized, feminized) $\times$ 2 (Face Contour: full face, oval) mixed factorial ANOVA in which observers' confidence served as the dependent variable. Neither the main effect of dimorphism, $F(1, 69) = .31$, $p = .58$, $\eta_G^2 = .003$, ($M_{fem} = 5.82$, $SD_{fem} = 1.68$, $M_{masc} = 5.68$, $SD_{masc} = 1.57$) ,nor the main effect of condition, $F(1, 69) = .01$, $p < .91$, $\eta_G^2 < .001$, ($M_{oval} = 5.73$, $SD_{oval} = 1.66$, $M_{full} = 5.77$, $SD_{full} = 1.59$)was significant. Neither was the interaction between these factors, $F(1, 69) = 1.10$, $p = .30$, $\eta_G^2 = .001$.[3]

General Discussion

Our hypothesis regarding men's physical dominance ratings were confirmed. Across both contour conditions, men assigned significantly higher physical dominance ratings to individually presented masculinized men's faces, compared to individually presented feminized faces. This

---

[2] Please note that the pattern of results for the mixed factorial ANOVA were unchanged when all participants were included in the analysis: all $Fs(1, 95) < .40$, $p > .52$, $\eta_G^2 < .003$.

[3] Please note that the pattern of results for the mixed factorial ANOVA were unchanged when all participants were included in the analysis: all $Fs(1,78) < 2.14$, $p > .15$, $\eta_G^2 < .002$.

effect occurred regardless of the face set that the face was drawn from, indicating that the sexual

dimorphism manipulation, and not the other factors affected observers' dominance ratings. The

ability to judge dominance was not affected by the brief ($100ms$) presentation time. This would

suggest that even under brief visual exposure, men can capture cues for physical dominance.

Men's ability to assess the physical dominance of other men from their faces remains fairly

consistent regardless of whether men are presented with the face with its outline or with faces in

which the outline has been set to fit an oval, thus erasing some of the width and height

information. The results imply that observers are primarily relying on internal facial features

when formulating their physical dominance assessments. Together, the results of the rating task

of our experiment suggests that men use facial sexual dimorphism under conditions of brief

visual exposure to formulate their physical dominance perceptions and that these perceptions are

primarily based on internal facial features. Although the current study relied on explicit ratings, it

goes beyond previous investigations, because observers were not given an unlimited amount of

time to inspect each face. Rather, the time of stimulus presentation was just within the limits of

the ability to make an accurate assessment (Todorov, et al., 2009).

The above findings compliment research suggesting that individuals can accurately assess

physical strength (Tascano et al., 2014; Van Dongen & Sprengers, 2012) and aggressiveness

(Carré et al., 2009; Little, et al., 2015; Sell et al., 2010) from faces, and that these assessments

are related to facial sexual dimorphism. Previous research has shown that sexually dimorphic

facial features are associated with testosterone during development (Marečková, et al., 2011;

Roosenboom et al., 2018; Verdonk et al., 1999; Welker et al., 2016; cf. Hodges-Simeon et al.,

2016, Hodges-Simeon et al., 2018; Hodges-Simeon et al., 2020) and that testosterone levels are

associated with increased aggression during challenge (Gray et al., 2019) and muscle mass (e.g.,

Griggs et al., 1989). Therefore, an adaptation to rapidly assess conspecific's dominance from faces would benefit its bearers by allowing them to avoid interactions with individuals who could cause them serious physical harm.

We would also predict that masculinized faces, indicative of men with greater physical dominance, would leave a lasting trace in memory. However, observers did not differ in their ability to recognize masculinized faces over feminized ones. Moreover, participants were not more confident in their recognition memory for previously presented masculinized men's faces over feminized ones. During the rating phase, the number of faces presented to participants should have contributed to task difficulty. Perhaps equally important, participants were exposed to each face for only 100 *ms*, which may have been insufficient to encode each face into long-term memory. In addition, the task was likely made even more difficult because participants were not instructed to remember the presented faces. In order to reduce the likelihood of producing a floor effect, future investigations should assess whether presenting observers with the faces for longer durations or presenting participants with fewer faces at encoding improves memory.

Our study was limited in that we only evaluated men's ratings of and recognition memory for masculinized and feminized men's faces; however, in future investigations we intend to collect data from both sexes. The sex differences in strength make women more vulnerable to aggression and thus suggest greater female sensitivity to threat (e.g., Geniole & McCormick 2013; Lassek & Gaulin 2009). Future studies should aim to test women's ability to assess physical dominance from masculinized and feminized men's faces while controlling for the affects that masculinized and feminizing these faces has on women's attractiveness perceptions. Other studies could prime participants with victory or defeat in a lab-based competition and then

have them complete a similar face rating and recognition memory test to assess if individuals

primed with defeat are more sensitive to cues of masculinity than those primed with victory

(Denson, Dixson, Tibubos, Zhang, Harmon-Jones, & Kasumovic, 2020; Watkins & Jones 2012).

In future investigations, researchers should seek to confirm that manipulating the degree of facial

sexual dimorphism scales linearly with observer's dominance perceptions, even when these faces

are presented for extremely short durations (Mefodeva et al., 2020). Further investigations could

manipulate sexually dimorphic facial traits (e.g., lower face length, brow ridge prominence)

individually and evaluate which manipulation produces the greatest changes in observers'

dominance ratings (Dixson, 2018; Bulygina, et al., 2006; Thordarson, et al., 2005). This would

allow researchers to gain a more nuanced understanding on which characteristics observers are

basing their dominance assessments, and could inform future research on male intrasexual

competition.

Conclusions.

The results of our experiment demonstrate, for the first time, that men assign higher

physical dominance ratings to masculinized men's faces when they are presented individually.

Moreover, we show that men use facial sexual dimorphism to make dominance attributions after

only being exposed to each face for *100 ms*. Our results suggest that men rely on internal facial

features when making their dominance assessments. This provides some of the strongest

evidence to date that men *perceive* masculinized faces as belonging to more physically dominant

men and provides insights into the types of cues men use during dominance contests.

Conflicts of interest. The authors have no conflicts of interest to report.

References

Albert, G., Pearson, M., Arnocky, S., Wachowiak, M., Nicol, J., & Murphy, D. R. (2018). Effects of Masculinized and Feminized Male Voices on Men and Women's Distractibility and Implicit Memory. *Journal of Individual Differences*. *39* 151-165. doi:10.1027/1614-0001/a000259.

Bakeman, R. (2005). Recommended effect size statistics for repeated measures designs. *Behavior research methods, 37*(3), 379-384. doi:10.3758/BF03192707

Barton, K., & Barton, M. K. (2019). Package '*MuMIn*'. R package version, 1(6).

Bates, D., Maechler, M., Bolker, B., Walker, S., Christensen, R. H. B., Singmann, H., ... & Bolker, M. B. (2015). Package 'lme4'. *Convergence, 12*(1), 2.

Bentin, S., McCarthy, G., & Wood, C. C. (1985). Event-related potentials, lexical decision and semantic priming. *Electroencephalography and clinical Neurophysiology*, *60*(4), 343-355.doi: 10.1016/0013-4694(85)90008-2

Calvo, M. G., & Nummenmaa, L. (2008). Detection of emotional faces: salient physical features guide effective visual search. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General, 137*(3), 471-494. doi:10.1037/a0012771

Carlson, J. M., & Reinke, K. S. (2008). Masked fearful faces modulate the orienting of covert spatial attention. *Emotion*, *8*(4), 522.doi: 10.1037/a0012653

Carré, J. M., & McCormick, C. M. (2008). In your face: Facial metrics predict aggressive behaviour in the laboratory and in varsity and professional hockey players. Proceedings of the Royal Society of London B: Biological Sciences, *275*(1651), 2651-2656. doi:10.1098/rspb.2008.0873

JUDGING FACIAL MASCULINITY

Carré, J. M., McCormick, C. M., & Mondloch, C. J. (2009). Facial structure is a reliable cue of aggressive behavior. Psychological Science, *20*(10), 1194-1198. doi:10.1111/j.1467-9280.2009.02423.x

Charlton, B. D., Taylor, A. M., & Reby, D. (2013). Are men better than women at acoustic size judgements? *Biology Letters, 9*(4), 20130270.

Craig, B. M., Nelson, N. L., & Dixson, B. J. (2019). Sexual selection, agonistic signaling, and the effect of beards on recognition of men's anger displays. Psychological Science, 30, 728-738.

Denson, T. F., Dixson, B. J., Tibubos, A. N., Zhang, E., Harmon-Jones, E., & Kasumovic, M. M. (2020). Violent video game play, gender, and trait aggression influence subjective fighting ability, perceptions of men's toughness, and anger facial recognition. *Computers in Human Behavior*, *104*, 106175.

Dixson, B. J. (2018). Is male facial width-to-height ratio the target of sexual selection?. *Archives of Sexual Behavior, 47*(4), 827-828. doi:10.1007/s10508-018-1184-9

Fenske, M. J., & Eastwood, J. D. (2003). Modulation of focused attention by faces expressing emotion: evidence from flanker tasks. Emotion, *3*(4), 327-343. doi:10.1037/1528-3542.3.4.327

Fink, B., Grammer, K., Mitteroecker, P., Gunz, P., Schaefer, K., Bookstein, F. L., & Manning, J. T. (2005). Second to fourth digit ratio and face shape. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences,* 272(1576), 1995-2001. doi:10.1098/rspb.2005.3179

Fink, B., Neave, N., & Seydel, H. (2007). Male facial appearance signals physical strength to women. American Journal of Human Biology, *19*(1), 82-87. doi:10.1002/ajhb.20583

Geniole, S. N., Denson, T. F., Dixson, B. J., Carré, J. M., & Mccormick, C. M. (2015). Evidence

from meta-analyses of the facial width-to-height ratio as an evolved cue of threat. *PLOS

ONE, 10*(7). doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0132726

Geniole, S. N., & McCormick, C. M. (2013). Taking control of aggression: Perceptions of

aggression suppress the link between perceptions of facial masculinity and

attractiveness. *Evolutionary Psychology*, *11*(5), doi: 147470491301100507.

Gray, P. B., Straftis, A. A., Bird, B. M., McHale, T. S., & Zilioli, S. (2019). Human reproductive

behavior, life history, and the Challenge Hypothesis: A 30-year review, retrospective and

future directions. *Hormones and behavior*.

Griggs, R. C., Kingston, W., Jozefowicz, R. F., Herr, B. E., Forbes, G., & Halliday, D. (1989).

Effect of testosterone on muscle mass and muscle protein synthesis. *Journal of applied

physiology (Bethesda, Md.: 1985)*, *66*(1), 498.

Han, C., Kandrik, M., Hahn, A. C., Fisher, C. I., Feinberg, D. R., Holzleitner, I. J., ... & Jones, B.

C. (2017). Interrelationships Among Men's Threat Potential, Facial Dominance, and

Vocal Dominance. *Evolutionary Psychology*, *15*(1), 1-4. doi:10.1177/1474704917697332

Haselhuhn, M. P., Ormiston, M. E., & Wong, E. M. (2015). Men's facial width-to-height ratio

predicts aggression: A meta-analysis. *PLoS ONE, 8, 10*(4).

doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0122637.

Hill, A. K., Hunt, J., Welling, L. L., Cárdenas, R. A., Rotella, M. A., Wheatley, J. R., ... & Puts,

D. A. (2013). Quantifying the strength and form of sexual selection on men's traits.

Evolution and Human Behavior, 34(5), 334341.doi:10.1016/j.evolhumbehav.2013.05.004

Hodges-Simeon, C. R., Sobraske, K. N. H., Samore, T., Gurven, M., & Gaulin, S. J. (2016). Facial width-to-height ratio (fWHR) is not associated with adolescent testosterone levels. *PloS one*, *11*(4).

Hodges-Simeon, C. R., Richardson, G. B., Hanson Sobraske, K. N., Samore, T., Gurven, M., & Gaulin, S. J. (2018). Response: Commentary: Facial width-to-height ratio (fWHR) is not associated with adolescent testosterone levels. *Frontiers in psychology*, *9*, 160.

Hollingworth, A., & Henderson, J. M. (2002). Accurate visual memory for previously attended objects in natural scenes. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Human Perception and Performance, 28*(1), 113–136.doi:10.1037/0096-1523.28.1.113

Jones, B. C., DeBruine, L. M., Main, J. C., Little, A. C., Welling, L. L., Feinberg, D. R., & Tiddeman, B. P. (2009). Facial cues of dominance modulate the short-term gaze-cuing effect in human observers. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London B: Biological Sciences*, *277*(1681), 617-624. doi: 10.1098/rspb.2009.1575

Keppel, G. & Underwood, B. J. (1962) Proactive inhibition in short-term retention of single items. *Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behavior,1,* 153-161.

Kruger, D. J., & Nesse, R. M. (2006). An evolutionary life-history framework for understanding sex differences in human mortality rates. *Human nature, 17*(1), 74-97.

Langton, S. R., Law, A. S., Burton, A. M., & Schweinberger, S. R. (2008). Attention capture by faces. *Cognition*, *107*(1), 330-342. doi:10.1016/j.cognition.2007.07.012

Lawrence, M, A., (2016). ez: Easy Analysis and Visualization of Factorial Experiments. R package version 4.4-0. https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=ez

Little, A. C., Jones, B. C., & DeBruine, L. M. (2011). Facial attractiveness: evolutionary based

research. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences,*

366(1571), 1638-1659

Little, A. C., Třebický, V., Havlíček, J., Roberts, S. C., & Kleisner, K. (2015). Human perception

of fighting ability: facial cues predict winners and losers in mixed martial arts fights.

Behavioral Ecology, *26*(6), 1470-1475. doi:10.1093/beheco/arv089

Liu, C. H., & Chen, W. (2018). The boundary of holistic processing in the appraisal of facial

attractiveness. *Royal Society open science*, *5*(6), 171616.

Macmillan, N. A., & Creelman, C. D. Cambridge University Press; New York: 1991. Detection

theory: A user's guide.

Maner, J. K., Kenrick, D. T., Becker, D. V., Delton, A. W., Hofer, B., Wilbur, C. J., & Neuberg,

S. L. (2003). Sexually selective cognition: beauty captures the mind of the

beholder. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *85*(6), 1107-1120.

doi:10.1037/0022-3514.85.6.1107

Mattarozzi, K., Todorov, A., & Codispoti, M. (2015). Memory for faces: the effect of facial

appearance and the context in which the face is encountered. *Psychological*

Research, *79*(2), 308-317.

Mefodeva, V., Sidari, M. J., Chau, H., Fitzsimmons, B., Antoine, G., Clarkson, T. R., ... &

Dixson, B. J. (2020). Multivariate intra-sexual selection on men's perceptions of male

facial morphology. *Adaptive Human Behavior and Physiology*, 1-27.

Mileva, V. R., Cowan, M. L., Cobey, K. D., Knowles, K. K., & Little, A. C. (2014). In the face

of dominance: Self-perceived and other-perceived dominance are positively associated

with facial-width-to-height ratio in men. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *69*, 115-118. doi:10.1016/j.paid.2014.05.019

Ohlsen, G., Van Zoest, W., & Van Vugt, M. (2013). Gender and facial dominance in gaze cuing: Emotional context matters in the eyes that we follow. *PloS one, 8*(4), e59471. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0059471

Olson, I. R., & Marshuetz, C. (2005). Facial attractiveness is appraised in a glance. Emotion, 5(4), 498-502. doi: 10.1037/1528-3542.5.4.498

Oosterhof, N. N., & Todorov, A. (2008). The functional basis of face evaluation. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, *105*(32), 11087-11092. doi:10.1073/pnas.0805664105

Penton-Voak, I. S., Jones, B. C., Little, A. C., Baker, S., Tiddeman, B., Burt, D. M., & Perrett, D. I. (2001). Symmetry, sexual dimorphism in facial proportions and male facial attractiveness. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London. Series B: Biological Sciences*, *268*(1476), 1617-1623.

Perrett, D. I., Lee, K. J., Penton-Voak, I., Rowland, D., Yoshikawa, S., Burt, D. M., ... & Akamatsu, S. (1998). Effects of sexual dimorphism on facial attractiveness. *Nature*, 394(6696), 884-887. doi:10.1038/29772

Posner, M. I., Snyder, C. R., & Davidson, B. J. (1980). Attention and the detection of signals. *Journal of experimental psychology: General, 109*(2), 160-174. doi:10.1037/0096-3445.109.2.160

Puts, D. A. (2010). Beauty and the beast: Mechanisms of sexual selection in humans. *Evolution and Human Behavior*, *31*(3), 157-175. doi:10.1016/j.evolhumbehav.2010.02.005

Puts, D. A., Apicella, C. L., & Cárdenas, R. A. (2011). Masculine voices signal men's threat potential in forager and industrial societies. Proceedings of the Royal Society of London B: Biological Sciences, rspb20110829. doi: 10.1098/rspb.2011.0829

Puts, D. A., Hill, A. K., Bailey, D. H., Walker, R. S., Rendall, D., Wheatley, J. R., ... & Jablonski, N. G. (2016). Sexual selection on male vocal fundamental frequency in humans and other anthropoids. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences, 283*(1829), 20152830.

Re, D. E., Lefevre, C. E., DeBruine, L. M., Jones, B. C., & Perrett, D. I. (2014). Impressions of dominance are made relative to others in the visual environment. *Evolutionary Psychology*, *12*(1), 251-263. doi:147470491401200118.

Rhodes (2006). The evolutionary psychology of facial beauty. *Annual Review of Psychology, 57*, 199-206. doi:10.1146/annurev.psych.57.102904.190208

Rule, N. O., Ambady, N., & Hallett, K. C. (2009). Female sexual orientation is perceived accurately, rapidly, and automatically from the face and its features. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 45*(6), 1245-1251. doi:10.1016/j.jesp.2009.07.010

Schaller, M. (2015). The behavioral immune system. *The handbook of evolutionary psychology,* 1-19. doi:10.1002/9781119125563.evpsych107

Searcy, W. A., & Nowicki, S. (2005). The evolution of animal communication: Reliability and deception in signaling systems. Princeton University Press.

Sell, A., Cosmides, L., Tooby, J., Sznycer, D., von Rueden, C., & Gurven, M. (2009). Human adaptations for the visual assessment of strength and fighting ability from the body and face. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London B: Biological Sciences, 276*(1656), 575-584. doi:10.1098/rspb.2008.1177

Sherlock, J. M., Tegg, B., Sulikowski, D., & Dixson, B. J. (2017). Facial masculinity and beardedness determine men's explicit, but not their implicit, responses to male dominance. *Adaptive Human Behavior and Physiology, 3*(1), 14-29. doi:10.1007/s40750-016-0047-7

Sherry, D. F., & Schacter, D. L. (1987). The evolution of multiple memory systems. *Psychological Review*, *94*(4), 439-454. doi:10.1037/0033-295X.94.4.439

Smith, D. S., Jones, B. C., Feinberg, D. R., & Allan, K. (2012). A modulatory effect of male voice pitch on long-term memory in women: evidence of adaptation for mate choice? *Memory and Cognition*, *40*(1), 135-144. doi:10.3758/s13421-011-0136-6

Smith, D. S., Jones, B. C., & Allan, K. (2013). Socio-sexuality and episodic memory function in women: further evidence of an adaptive "mating mode". *Memory & cognition*, *41*(6), 850-861.

Stanislaw, H., & Todorov, N. (1999). Calculation of signal detection theory measures. *Behavior research methods, instruments, & computers, 31*(1), 137-149. doi:10.3758/BF03207704

Thornhill, R., & Gangestad, S. W. (2006). Facial sexual dimorphism, developmental stability, and susceptibility to disease in men and women. *Evolution and Human Behavior, 27*(2), 131-144. doi:10.1016/j.evolhumbehav.2005.06.001

Tiddeman. B., &. Perrett. D, Moving Facial Image Transformations Based On Static 2D Prototypes (Feb 5-9 2001), Proc. 9th Int. Conf. In Central Europe on Computer Graphics, Visualization and Computer Vision 2001, Pilsen, Czech Republic.

Todorov, A., Olivola, C. Y., Dotsch, R., & Mende-Siedlecki, P. (2015). Social attributions from faces: Determinants, consequences, accuracy, and functional significance. *Annual review of psychology, 66*, 519-545.

Toscano, H., Schubert, T. W., & Sell, A. N. (2014). Judgments of dominance from the face track physical strength. *Evolutionary Psychology*, *12*(1), 1-18. doi:10.1177/147470491401200101

van Wingen, G., Mattern, C., Verkes, R. J., Buitelaar, J., & Fernández, G. (2008). Testosterone biases automatic memory processes in women towards potential mates. *Neuroimage*, *43*(1), 114-120.

Van Dongen, S., & Sprengers, E. (2012). Hand grip strength in relation to morphological measures of masculinity, fluctuating asymmetry and sexual behaviour in males and females. In Sex Hormones. InTech.

Watkins, C. D., Debruine, L. M., Feinberg, D. R., & Jones, B. C. (2013). A sex difference in the context-sensitivity of dominance perceptions. *Evolution and Human Behavior*, *34*(5), 366-372. doi:10.1016/j.evolhumbehav.2013.06.004

Watkins, C. D., Jones, B. C., & DeBruine, L. M. (2010). Individual differences in dominance perception: Dominant men are less sensitive to facial cues of male dominance. *Personality and Individual Differences, 49*(8), 967-971. doi:10.1016/j.paid.2010.08.006

Watkins, C. D., & Jones, B. C. (2012). Priming men with different contest outcomes modulates their dominance perceptions. *Behavioral Ecology, 23*(3), 539-543. doi:10.1093/beheco/arr221

Welker, K. M., Bird, B. M., & Arnocky, S. (2016). Commentary: Facial width-to-height ratio (fWHR) is not associated with adolescent testosterone levels. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *7*, 1745. doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2016.01745

Westfall, J., Kenny, D. A., & Judd, C. M. (2014). Statistical power and optimal design in experiments in which samples of participants respond to samples of stimuli. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General, 143*(5), 2020.doi: 10.1037/xge0000014

Whitehouse, W. G., Orne, E. C., & Dinges, D. F. (2002). Demand characteristics: Toward an understanding of their meaning and application in clinical practice. *Prevention & Treatment, 5*(1), 34i. doi:10.1037/1522-3736.5.1.534i

Willis, J., & Todorov, A. (2006). First impressions: Making up your mind after a 100-ms exposure to a face. *Psychological science*, *17*(7), 592-598. *Psychological science,* 17(7), 592-598. doi:10.1111/j.1467-9280.2006.01750.x

Wilson, M., & Daly, M. (1985). Competitiveness, risk taking, and violence: The young male syndrome. *Ethology and sociobiology, 6*(1), 59-73. doi:10.1016/0162-3095(85)90041-X

Yarmey, A. D. (1974). Proactive interference in short-term retention of human faces. *Canadian Journal of Psychology/Revue canadienne de psychologie*, *28*(3), 333.

Zhang, J., Chen, B. B., Hodge-Simeon, C., Albert, G., Gaulin, S. J., & Reid, S. A. (2020). Elevated recognition accuracy for low-pitched male voices in men with higher threat potential: Further evidence for the retaliation-cost model in humans. *Evolution and Human Behavior.*doi:10.1016/j.evolhumbehav.2020.08.008