

Lisa L.M. Welling and David A. Puts

Introduction

Cues to ovulation status in nonhuman primates are varied and numerous, including exaggerated sexual swellings (Nunn, 1999), changes in proceptive and receptive behavior (Baum, Everitt, Herbert, & Keverne, 1977), and changes in body odor (Clarke, Barrett, & Henzi, 2009). Anthropoid primates (those comprising apes, Old World monkeys, and New World monkeys) differ from the general mammalian pattern of a precise estrous period (Heistermann et al., 2001; Hrdy & Whitten, 1987). Catarrhines (apes and Old World monkeys), in particular, demonstrate ovarian cycles characterized by long follicular phases and extended periods of mating, resulting in alterations or an end to the usual harmonization between ovulation and sexual activity (Heistermann et al., 2001; Hrdy & Whitten, 1987; Nunn, 1999; van Schaik, Hodges, & Nunn, 2000). Certainly, humans are not the only primate species where the female is sexually receptive throughout her cycle. For example, both chimpanzees (*Pan troglodytes*) and bonobos (*Pan paniscus*) practice nonconceptive sexual behavior (sexual activity that cannot result in conception), but female bonobos are especially known for mating with

multiple males throughout the cycle (reviewed in Wrangham, 1993).

Some female primates, such as vervet monkeys (Andelman, 1987) and Hanuman langurs (Heistermann et al., 2001), have apparently evolved the capacity to conceal ovulation from males. This may function to confuse paternity among males, possibly leading to a reduction in infanticide (Heistermann et al., 2001; Hrdy, 1979; Hrdy & Whitten, 1987; van Schaik et al., 2000). Infanticide by males is common among primates when a new male takes over breeding in a single-male group or rises to breeding status in a multi-male group. Although this behavior benefits the infanticidal male by returning nursing females to estrus, it represents a substantial reproductive loss for the females (reviewed in van Schaik et al., 2000), who invest heavily in their offspring. Therefore, an extended period of sexual activity coupled with a polyandrous mating strategy would make assessing paternity difficult (van Schaik et al., 2000; van Schaik, van Noordwijk, & Nunn, 1999), which may affect males' propensity to commit infanticide (Bonies, Launhardt, Epplen, Epplen, & Winkler, 1999; Heistermann et al., 2001; Hrdy, 1979; Robbins, 1995; Soltis, Thomsen, Matsubayashi, & Takenaka, 2000; van Schaik et al., 1999). Concealing ovulation not only would thus confuse paternity but could also potentially allow more room for female choice by preventing dominant males from knowing when to monopolize fertile females.

L.L.M. Welling (✉)
Department of Psychology, Oakland University, 212
Pryale Hall, Rochester, MI 48309, USA
e-mail: welling@oakland.edu

V.A. Weekes-Shackelford and T.K. Shackelford (eds.), *Evolutionary Perspectives on Human Sexual Psychology and Behavior*, Evolutionary Psychology, DOI 10.1007/978-1-4939-0314-6_13.
© Springer Science+Business Media New York 2014

243

Concealed Ovulation in Humans

Several scholars have suggested that human females lack estrus, a sharp increase in sexual interest and activity that typically occurs at or near ovulation, and have also evolved to conceal ovulation from males (Benshoof & Thornhill, 1979; Burley, 1979; Daniels, 1983; Manson, 1986; Marlowe, 2004; Pawłowski, 1999; Sillen-Tullberg & Möller, 1993; Strassmann, 1981; Turke, 1984). Certainly, women are continuously receptive to sexual advances throughout their menstrual cycles, and ovulation is not generally consciously perceived by men or even by the ovulating women themselves (Burley, 1979). Menstruation is the only overt sign of a woman's ovulatory cycle, although there may be other, more subtle cues to a woman's fertility status (discussed later). In fact, scientists did not determine the timing of ovulation until 1930 (Burley, 1979; Campbell, 1966), prior to which some believed a woman could conceive throughout her cycle (Latz, 1939) or were most fertile near or during menstruation (Campbell, 1960). That the timing of peak fertility was unknown by medical professionals and scholars for so long demonstrates how well ovulation is concealed from both men and women. Moreover, while the Hadza, a hunter-gatherer society in Tanzania, know that sex causes conception, most wrongly believe that conception occurs immediately after menstruation ends (Marlowe, 2004). That the timing of conception is unknown in traditional societies similar to those in which humans evolved reinforces the idea that ovulation is not consciously perceived.

Because ovulation appears to be concealed from the women experiencing it, as well as the men around them (Alexander & Noonan, 1979; Burley, 1979; Daniels, 1983; Marlowe, 2004), it may be concealed for more than one purpose. Concealed ovulation may enable women to better deceive their mates (Alexander & Noonan, 1979; Daniels, 1983) and may have evolved as a way of preventing women from avoiding conception through abstinence from intercourse near ovulation (Burley, 1979). If women had

knowledge of ovulation, they would be able to exercise considerable control over their reproductive status, perhaps having fewer children or possibly none at all. Clearly, these practices are nonadaptive as they limit reproductive potential, thus physiological changes that lessened female awareness of ovulation may have been selected because women who were less aware of ovulation would have left more descendants (Burley, 1979). However, it is plausible that human females evolved the capacity to conceal ovulation and human males lost the ability to detect ovulation for several other related reasons. Like scholars have suggested for other primates (van Schaik et al., 1999, 2000), our extended periods of mating would make assessing paternity difficult if mating were polyandrous. Confusing paternity may have the added benefits of improving male behavior toward potential offspring (Sillen-Tullberg & Möller, 1993) and reducing rates of males committing infanticide (Borries et al., 1999; Heistermann et al., 2001; Hrdy, 1979; Robbins, 1995; Solis et al., 2000; van Schaik et al., 1999), as they may be less likely to deduce nonpaternity. Indeed, men favor children who resemble them (Burch & Gallup, 2000; DeBruine, 2004; Platek et al., 2003; Platek, Burch, Panyavin, Wasserman, & Gallup, 2002; Volk & Quinsey, 2002; Welling, Burris, & Puts, 2011) and are more likely to abuse stepchildren or adopted children than biological children (Daly & Wilson, 1984, 1985; Wilson & Daly, 1987, 2002), indicating that doubts surrounding paternity may increase risks to an infant and that these risks may be abated if the timing of peak fertility is unknown.

In line with the above reasoning, Alexander and Noonan (1979) argued that the lack of cues to ovulation evolved to increase paternal certainty and force males into pair bonds. In other words, they suggest that women have evolved the capacity to conceal ovulation to, in essence, trick men into long-term relationships because men will not know when or how often to copulate to ensure conception and will therefore be less tempted to leave the female to look for others to impregnate (see also Strassmann, 1981; Turke, 1984). Extended receptivity, ovulatory

asynchrony across women, and concealed ovulation would thus pressure men to engage in extended courtships and behave increasingly paternally (Alexander & Noonan, 1979; Turke, 1984). Furthermore, men mated to women who do not advertise their fertility status would be less victimized by mate-poaching rivals. This would increase paternity certainty and, by extension, male investment in offspring (Alexander & Noonan, 1979; Symons, 1979; Turke, 1984), which would benefit the woman, Burley (1979), however, pointed out that these arguments (Alexander & Noonan, 1979; Symons, 1979; Turke, 1984) are somewhat flawed because they imply that women obtained mates ancestrally by getting pregnant and that men's explicit purpose in seeking out females is to get them pregnant. First, because women invest more in offspring care (e.g., via gestation and lactation), it would make more sense for women to be relatively certain of male investment prior to becoming pregnant because conceiving before attaining male investment would likely promote, rather than discourage, male abandonment. Burley asserted that "[the] establishment of a pair bond prior to having offspring is a norm found in many, if not most, human cultures, and is certainly found throughout the animal kingdom when biparental care is present" (Burley, 1979, p.839). Also, because of the extended period of offspring dependency in humans, males may also benefit from forming pair bonds as the increased paternal investment likely increased offspring survival (Alexander & Noonan, 1979; Burley, 1979; Sillen-Tullberg & Möller, 1993; Strassmann, 1981), particularly in the mobile hunter-gatherer groups that predominated the ancestral past of humans (Lee & DeVore, 1968). It therefore seems unlikely that concealed ovulation evolved for the purposes of female deception used to force males into pair bonds.

However, Burley's (1979) assertion that concealed ovulation functions to prevent women from avoiding pregnancy is likely incorrect because it assumes that women's receptivity and initiation of sexual activity is not increased as a function of ovulation, which may not be the case. Indeed, women may initiate more sexual

activity during the fertile period of their menstrual cycles than at other times (Adams, Burt, & Gold, 1978; Matteo & Rissman, 1984; but see Brewis & Meyer, 2005). Others have supposed that concealed ovulation allows women greater flexibility in choosing a mate (Benshoof & Thornhill, 1979; Strassmann, 1981; Symons, 1979). Concealing ovulation could facilitate cuckoldry by limiting males' perceived need to guard their partners during peak fertility and could allow women to choose genetically superior men to sire their offspring (Benshoof & Thornhill, 1979). In other words, concealed ovulation might facilitate successful deception by women seeking extra-pair copulations. Also, concealing ovulation may limit indiscriminate attention from males, thereby reducing potentially dangerous attention from unwanted suitors (Provost, Quinsey, & Troje, 2008). Strassmann (1981) suggests that low status males, in particular, would benefit from monogamy and investment (rather than lots of mating effort) if only they could be confident in their paternity. Concealing ovulation from males could offer this confidence by reducing the perceived risk of cuckoldry. As discussed by Marlowe (2004), ovulation would be easy to detect by men if it were in the interest of women for men to be able to detect it.

Relatively recently, evidence that cues to fertility status have not been totally lost has been accumulating (Gangestad & Thornhill, 2008). Women lack the overt cues (e.g., exaggerated sexual swellings) to fertility status that are demonstrated by many fertile nonhuman primate females (Wallen & Zehr, 2004). However, selection pressures favoring complete concealment of ovulation by women, combined with mechanisms to detect fertility status by men, may have resulted in partial concealment of ovulation. Similarly, perhaps complete concealment of ovulation would be maladaptive because women would not be better able to attract high-quality men around ovulation, when conception is more likely, than during infertile phases of the menstrual cycle. Regardless of the possible reasons, it seems that, in contrast to earlier

assertions, women may demonstrate semi-concealed ovulation.

Cues to Ovulation in Human Females

Increasing research on physical and behavioral cues to women's fertility status has surfaced over the last decade (Gangestad & Thornhill, 2008). For example, women decrease their food consumption and increase their motor activity around ovulation (Fessler, 2003a; Gong, Garrel, & Calloway, 1989), possibly to focus on other important behaviors, such as mating effort (Fessler, 2003a). Among women with premenstrual syndrome, the preovulatory increase in estradiol is associated with an increase in positive mood (Bäckström et al., 1983). Women also experience improved creativity during the pre-ovulatory phase relative to the mid-luteal phase and menses (Krug, Finn, Pietrowsky, Fehm, & Born, 1996; Krug, Stamm, Pietrowsky, Fehm, & Born, 1994) and improvement in some cognitive tasks around ovulation (Becker, Creutzfeldt, Schwibbe, & Wutke, 1982; Broverman et al., 1981). Overall, these studies underline the possibility that hormonal variation across the ovulatory cycle may alter female behavior. Such variations could have implications for women's reproductive status if they influence female or male mating behavior or perceptions of female attractiveness.

The variety and volume of studies investigating human sexual behavior as a function of cycle status are substantial and indicate that the fertile period of the menstrual cycle may be accompanied by an increase in physical attractiveness (e.g., Roberts et al., 2004), sexual motivation (e.g., Grammer, Jütte, & Fischmann, 1997), and sexual activity (e.g., Adams et al., 1978; Wilcox et al., 2004; but see Brewis & Meyer, 2005). Ovulatory cues may even be perceived by men to some extent (Haselton & Gildersleeve, 2011) and may be accompanied by other adaptive behaviors, such as shifts in preferences toward cues to genetic fitness when conception is most likely (Gangestad & Thornhill, 2008; Jones et al., 2008). These subtle

physical and behavioral signs of conception risk indicate that the previously accepted conclusion that women have evolved to conceal ovulation does not fully represent reality.

Changes in Attractiveness

The long-held assumptions that physical cues to human female fertility status and changes in female attractiveness as a function of fertility status have disappeared over time have been challenged by recent findings. Women are rated as more attractive in terms of facial appearance (Puts et al., 2013; Roberts et al., 2004), vocal characteristics (Bryant & Haselton, 2009; Piptone & Gallup, 2008; Puts et al., 2013), and body fat distribution (i.e., have a more attractive waist-to-hip ratio, Kirchengast & Gartner, 2002) around ovulation than at other nonfertile times in their menstrual cycles. Peak fertility is associated with greater breast symmetry (Manning, Scutt, Whitehouse, Leinster, & Walton, 1996; Scutt & Manning, 1996), with symmetric breasts possibly signaling underlying phenotypic quality and fertility in women (Manning, Scutt, Whitehouse, & Leinster, 1997). Finally, one study found that naturally cycling (i.e., not using hormonal contraceptives) exotic dancers receive more tips during peak fertility versus other points in the menstrual cycle (Miller, Tybur, & Jordan, 2007). While it remains unclear whether changes in physical or behavioral characteristics (or both) in women at ovulation are driving this change in male spending patterns, it is nonetheless striking.

Women, similar to females of several other primate species (e.g., Cerda-Molina et al., 2006; Crawford, Boulet, & Drea, 2011; Smith & Abbott, 1998), appear to have a more appealing body odor around peak fertility (Doty, Ford, Preti, & Huggins, 1975; Gildersleeve, Haselton, Larson, & Pillsworth, 2012; Havlíček, Dvořáková, Bartoš, & Flegr, 2006; Kuukasjärvi et al., 2004; Miller & Maner, 2010; Singh & Bronstad, 2001; Thornhill et al., 2003). Doty et al. (1975) found that male judges rated the scent of vaginal secretions sampled at high fertility as more

pleasant than vaginal secretion samples taken from the same women at low fertility. Sampling body odor using cotton pads worn in the armpit for 24 h in 3 different menstrual cycle phases, Havlíček et al. (2006) found that men rated the odor of women in the fertile follicular phase of their menstrual cycles as more attractive than the odor of women in the menstrual or luteal phases. Together with the evidence of increased physical and vocal attractiveness at ovulation, these studies suggest that a woman's attractiveness and, by extension, her ability to attract a mate are highest on the fertile days of her cycle, which would not be expected if ovulation was truly no longer detectable in women. Thus, it appears that men are maximally attracted to ovulating women.

Women also use strategies to augment their physical attractiveness around ovulation, with several studies finding that women modulate their appearance and clothing to enhance their attractiveness when they are most fertile (Durante, Li, & Haselton, 2008; Haselton, Mortezaie, Pillsworth, Bleske-Rechek, & Frederick, 2007; Hill & Durante, 2009; Röder, Brewer, & Fink, 2009; Schwarz & Hassebrauck, 2008), possibly as a reaction to a periovulatory decrease in self-esteem (Hill & Durante, 2009). Using diary data from 40 naturally cycling women and male ratings of photographs, Schwarz and Hassebrauck (2008) found that women dressed more provocatively and were rated as more attractive during high-fertility days compared to low-fertility days (Durante et al., 2008; Haselton et al., 2007). Women also report feeling more attractive and desirable (Röder et al., 2009; but see Schwarz & Hassebrauck, 2008) and draw more revealing, sexier clothing when asked to illustrate an outfit they would wear to a social function (Durante et al., 2008) near ovulation. Lastly, Hill and Durante (2009) found that women's self-esteem decreases near ovulation, when they are most attractive to men, which may function to increase motivation to enhance attractiveness. Collectively, these studies suggest an increase in women's sexual motivation and desire to attract a mate while fertile.

Sexual Behavior and Motivation

Peak fertility is accompanied by an increase in motor (Morris & Udry, 1970) and sexual activities (Morris & Udry, 1982), with some evidence indicating that sexual encounters increase (Wilcox et al., 2004; but see Brewis & Meyer, 2005) and are more likely to be female-initiated around ovulation (Adams et al., 1978; Matteo & Rissman, 1984). Ovulation is also associated with an increase in sexual desire (Stanislaw & Rice, 1988) and fantasy (Regan, 1996), attention to attractive men (Anderson et al., 2010), sexual self-stimulation (Harvey, 1987), and arousal in response to sexually explicit material (Slob, Bax, Hop, Rowland, & van der Werff ten Bosch, 1996; Zillmann, Schweitzer, & Mundorf, 1994). Furthermore, women describe an increased desire for orgasm at peak fertility compared to other points in the menstrual cycle (Regan, 1996), which may have important implications if, as some research suggests (Baker & Bellis, 1993; Wildt, Kissler, Licht, & Becker, 1998; Zervomanolakis et al., 2009), orgasm increases the likelihood of conception. Therefore, contrary to the idea that women have evolved the capacity to conceal ovulation from themselves and others, the signs of peak fertility may simply be less overt than they are in some other primates. Additionally, attitudes toward risk-taking, which are correlated with the probability of victimization (Fetchenhauer & Rohde, 2002), may decrease at ovulation (Bröder & Hohmann, 2003; Chavanne & Gallup, 1998), which suggests that women alter their behavior to avoid rape and possible impregnation by unwanted males, although one study has found that rape is no less frequent during the ovulatory phase of the menstrual cycle (Fessler, 2003b). Similarly, ratings of disgust toward incest increase around mid-cycle (Fessler & Navarrete, 2003). Taken together, these findings intimate an increase in sexual motivation associated with peak fertility that is accompanied by a decrease in behaviors that may lead to a detrimental pairing.

The apparent changes in female sexual psychology associated with conception risk

appear to elevate competition with same-sex competitors over potential mates. Women derogate same-sex competitors by downplaying their physical attractiveness (Fisher, 2004; Jones, Vukovic, Little, Roberts, & DeBruine, 2011; Vukovic et al., 2009; Welling et al., 2007), which causes men to lower their attractiveness ratings of the derogated rivals (Fisher & Cox, 2009). Fisher (2004) found that competition and derogation, meaning any act intended to decrease the perceived value of a rival, increased during periods of the menstrual cycle characterized by high estrogen, such as ovulation. While presumed estrogen level was negatively related to women's ratings of the facial attractiveness of other women, there was no relationship between estrogen and women's ratings of the attractiveness of male faces (Fisher, 2004). Correspondingly, Vukovic et al. (2009) found that postmenopausal women rated photographs of feminine-faced (i.e., attractive, O'Toole et al., 1998) women as more attractive than premenopausal women, but there was no difference in ratings of male faces (see also Jones et al., 2011). This effect was independent of possible effects of participant age and suggests that dislike of attractive same-sex competitors decreases as fertility decreases (Jones et al., 2011; Vukovic et al., 2009). Women also feel more attractive (Röder et al., 2009; Schwarz & Hassebrauck, 2008) and are more willing to spend money on sexy, rather than functional, clothing (Hill & Durante, 2009) around ovulation than at other times, though they do not spend money at an increased rate more generally at ovulation (Röder et al., 2009).

There is some evidence, as indicated by pupil dilation, that women have a greater interest in their primary partners during the fertile phase of the menstrual cycle, but this pattern is also observed in response to attractive opposite-sex celebrities (Laeng & Falkenberg, 2007), suggesting a general response not directed specifically at long-term partners. Additionally, although Brewis and Meyer's (2005) large-scale cross-cultural study on sexual intercourse over the menstrual cycle found no increase in sexual intercourse around ovulation, this study only

looked at coitus rates among married couples. It is possible that ovulation-related changes in sexual behavior would be more evident in short-term mating contexts and/or extra-pair copulations (see Gangestad & Simpson, 2000). Certainly, a significant amount of research suggests that women increase their interest in extra-pair, versus in-pair, men surrounding ovulation. Women are less motivated toward sex for the purposes of intimacy (Sheldon, Cooper, Geary, Howard, & DeSoto, 2006) and are more sexually opportunistic (Gangestad et al., 2010) near ovulation than at other times. They demonstrate a greater interest in attending social gatherings (Haselton & Gangestad, 2006), visiting singles nightclubs without their romantic partner (Grammer et al., 1997), extra-pair men (Gangestad, Thornhill, & Garver, 2002), extra-pair sexual activity (Baker & Bellis, 1995; Bellis & Baker, 1990), and extra-pair sexual fantasies (Gangestad et al., 2002) around ovulation. Women also report less commitment to, and relationship satisfaction with, their current primary partner, and feel and are perceived by others to be more desirable and physically attractive around ovulation, possibly because of increases in estradiol levels (Durante & Li, 2009). Certainly, high estradiol, which first peaks around ovulation in humans (Baird & Fraser, 1974), appears to play a role in female receptivity to copulatory solicitation across several species (Beach, 1948; Kendrick & Dixon, 1985).

That ovulation is associated with increased attractiveness (Bryant & Haselton, 2009; Havlíček et al., 2006; Kirchengast & Gartner, 2002; Kuukasjärvi et al., 2004; Miller et al., 2007; Pipitone & Gallup, 2008; Puts et al., 2013; Roberts et al., 2004; Singh & Bronstad, 2001) and increases in possible sexually motivated behavior (Durante et al., 2008; Grammer et al., 1997; Haselton et al., 2007; Hill & Durante, 2009; Röder et al., 2009; Schwarz & Hassebrauck, 2008) contradicts the supposition that humans have lost estrus. However, it is worth underlining that cues to human fertility over the menstrual cycle are very subtle, indicating that obvious fertility signals that would attract indiscriminate attention,

potentially cause dominant males to monopolize fertile women, and constrain or eliminate female choice would be detrimental. Nonetheless, ovulation is associated with several within-subject changes, including a greater interest in extra-pair men among women with partners who carry less complementary MHC alleles (Garver-Apgar, Gangestad, Thornhill, Miller, & Olp, 2006), among women with less attractive partners (Haselton & Gangestad, 2006; Pillsworth & Haselton, 2006), and among women with less symmetrical partners (Gangestad, Thornhill, & Garver-Apgar, 2005). These latter findings may reflect a tendency to seek out men of better genetic quality when conception is likely. Therefore, it is possible that women engage in a dual-mating strategy, whereby they seek out men of high genetic quality when conception is likely in order to secure good genes for potential offspring and seek out caring, investing mates during other times (Gangestad & Simpson, 2000).

Cyclic Variation in Preferences for Male Traits

According to the ovulatory shift hypothesis, systematic changes in female mating-related behavior and preferences should be expected over the course of the menstrual cycle (Gangestad & Thornhill, 1998; Grammer, 1993; Thornhill & Gangestad, 1999). Women who procreate with genetically fit men may reap reproductive benefits if those genes are passed on to offspring because it could increase the likelihood that the offspring will survive and eventually reproduce themselves. Using this reasoning, preferences should not necessarily remain constant because men who possess good genes may not offer other benefits to the mother and child, such as caring or investing behaviors (Perrett et al., 1998). However, preferences for good genes should be maximal at peak conception (Gangestad & Thornhill, 1998). In fact, there is evidence that men who possess good genes invest less in their mates and offspring (Penton-Voak & Perrett, 2001; Perrett et al., 1998), explaining why

preference shifts for putative cues to good genes are most pronounced when women judge men's attractiveness for a short-term (i.e., sexual) relationship versus a long-term (i.e., committed) one (Gangestad, Simpson, Cousins, Garver-Apgar, & Christensen, 2004; Little, Cohen, Jones, & Belsky, 2007; Little & Jones, 2011; Little, Jones, Penton-Voak, Burt, & Perrett, 2002; Penton-Voak et al., 1999; Puts, 2005).

Several researchers have hypothesized that attractiveness judgments reflect evolved preferences that identify aspects of underlying mate quality and heritable immunity to multiple forms of genetic and environmental stress (e.g., DeBruine, Jones, Crawford, Welling, & Little, 2010; DeBruine, Jones, Little, Crawford, & Welling, 2011; Fink & Penton-Voak, 2002; Langlois, Roggman, & Musselman, 1994; Miller & Todd, 1998; Möller & Thornhill, 1998; Thornhill & Gangestad, 1993). Consistent with this view, male facial attractiveness has been found to be positively related to a genetic profile associated with immunity to infectious diseases (Lie, Rhodes, & Simmons, 2008; Roberts et al., 2005), good semen quality (Soler et al., 2003; but see Peters, Rhodes, & Simmons, 2008), reproductive success (Jokela, 2009), and longevity (Henderson & Anglin, 2003). More specifically, traits such as symmetry and masculinity affect male attractiveness and are thought to signal genetic quality (reviewed in Gangestad & Thornhill, 2008), with symmetric (Miller & Todd, 1998; Thornhill & Möller, 1997; Waynforth, 1998) and masculine (Apicella, Feinberg, & Marlowe, 2007; Rhodes, Chan, Zebrowitz, & Simmons, 2003; Rhodes, Simmons, & Peters, 2005; Thornhill & Gangestad, 2006) traits positively related to long-term health and reproductive success in men.

In line with the ovulatory shift hypothesis, several studies report increases in women's preferences for putative cues to male mate quality, including preferences for the odor of men who are more dominant, symmetrical, and heterozygous at the MHC (Gangestad & Thornhill, 1998; Havlíček, Roberts, & Flegr, 2005; Rikowski & Grammer, 1999; Thornhill et al., 2003; Thornhill

& Gangestad, 1999). Women also demonstrate a stronger preference for male facial symmetry (Little, Jones, Burt, & Perrett, 2007; but see Cárdenas & Harris, 2007; Koehler, Rhodes, Simmons, & Zebrowitz, 2006), the faces of men with symmetrical bodies (Thornhill & Gangestad, 2003), masculine male faces (Johnston, Hagel, Franklin, Funk, & Grammer, 2001; Jones, Little, et al., 2005; Little, Jones, & DeBruine, 2008; Penton-Voak et al., 1999; Penton-Voak & Perrett, 2000; Welling et al., 2007), masculine male body shape (Little, Jones, & Burriss, 2007), masculine vocal characteristics in men's voices (Feinberg et al., 2006; Puts, 2005), and height (Pawlowski & Jasienska, 2005) around ovulation than at other times in the menstrual cycle. These shifts in preferences are likely driven by hormonal variation across the menstrual cycle, although debate still surrounds whether menstrual cycle preference shifts are driven by estradiol (Feinberg et al., 2006; Garver-Appar, Gangestad, & Thornhill, 2008; Roney & Simmons, 2008; Rosen & López, 2009; Rupp et al., 2009), progesterone (Garver-Appar et al., 2008; Jones, Little, et al., 2005; Puts, 2006; Rupp et al., 2009), prolactin (Puts, 2006), testosterone (Welling et al., 2007), cortisol (López, Hay, & Conklin, 2009), or some hormonal combination (Frost, 1994; Garver-Appar et al., 2008; Lukaszewski & Roney, 2009; Puts, 2006; Welling et al., 2007). Furthermore, women's accuracy at classifying faces as male is greatest at peak fertility (Macrae, Alnwick, Milne, & Schloerscheidt, 2002), particularly when those faces are more sex typical (i.e., masculine, Johnston, Miles, & Macrae, 2008). Notably, lesbian women categorize female, not male, faces more accurately around ovulation (Brinsmead-Stockham, Johnston, Miles, & Macrae, 2008), which suggests that these findings are dependent on the mate choice relevance of the target faces.

In line with the above findings for physical traits, preferences for nonphysical traits, such as male-dominant and competitive behavioral displays (Gangestad et al., 2004; Gangestad, Garver-Appar, Simpson, & Cousins, 2007; Lukaszewski & Roney, 2009) and courtship language (Rosen & López, 2009), are also highest around ovulation in women. Using video clips of men competing for a lunch date, Gangestad et al.

(2004) found that women rated men who displayed social presence and direct intrasexual competitiveness as more attractive on high-fertility days of the menstrual cycle than on low-fertility days, although this association was only evident when judging men's attractiveness for a short-term (versus long-term) relationship. More recently, Guéguen (2009a, 2009b) found that women are more likely to agree to a man's request to exchange phone numbers or dance if they are in the late-follicular phase of the menstrual cycle (the fertile phase immediately preceding ovulation) compared to the luteal phase of the menstrual cycle (the nonfertile phase following ovulation), indicating that women may be most receptive to courtship at peak fertility. Therefore, changes in women's preferences for male traits generalize to behavioral ones and are not limited to physical characteristics.

Male Detection of Ovulation

In addition to assuming that ovulation is concealed from women's conscious detection (e.g., Burley, 1979; Daniels, 1983), those who argue that ovulation is concealed also stipulate that it is imperceptible to men (e.g., Marlowe, 2004; Pawlowski, 1999; Strassmann, 1981). That women are rated as more attractive near ovulation (Bryant & Haselton, 2009; Doty et al., 1975; Havlíček et al., 2006; Kirchengast & Gartner, 2002; Kuukasjärvi et al., 2004; Miller & Maner, 2010; Pipitone & Gallup, 2008; Puts et al., 2013; Roberts et al., 2004; Singh & Bronstad, 2001; Thornhill et al., 2003) suggests that physical cues to ovulation can be perceived by others. Moreover, as mentioned earlier, Miller et al. (2007) found that naturally cycling lap dancers earn significantly more money in tips at high fertility (\$335 per shift) than at low fertility (\$260 per shift) across the menstrual cycle. This result effectively demonstrates that women are not only more attractive at ovulation but that this change in attractiveness can also have a direct impact on male behavior.

Attractive women have particularly high mating standards (Buss & Shackelford, 2008), receive more male attention (Buss & Barnes, 1986), and are more likely to be poached by a rival (Schmitt & Buss, 2001). Given that women appear to be more attractive and sexually motivated around mid-cycle and also show more interest in extra-pair copulations, increased attention from long-term partners would be expected in order for men to decrease the likelihood that their partner will stray or be poached by a rival. In fact, three studies have shown a relationship between female conception risk and female perceptions of attentive, jealous, and proprietary behaviors from their male partners (Gangestad et al., 2002; Haselton & Gangestad, 2006; Pillsworth & Haselton, 2006). Jealousy and other mate guarding behaviors are hypothesized to function to reduce the likelihood of a partner straying or being poached (e.g., Buss, 1988; Daly, Wilson, & Weghorst, 1982; Shackelford, Besser, & Goetz, 2008; Shackelford, Goetz, Buss, Euler, & Hoier, 2005; Welling et al., 2011), which, given that the potential reproductive costs of infidelity would be highest around ovulation, would make an increase in these behaviors at peak fertility a potentially adaptive tactic. Gangestad et al. (2002) asked women about their sexual interests and the behavior of their partners twice: once within 5 days before a luteinizing hormone surge (i.e., at high fertility) and once during the luteal phase (i.e., at low fertility). They found that women reported greater interest in, and fantasy about, extra-pair men during the high-fertility test session compared to the low-fertility test session. There was no effect of fertility status on women's interest in or fantasy about their primary partners. Interestingly, women also reported that their primary partners were more attentive and proprietary toward them near ovulation than during the luteal phase, suggesting that men engage in more mate retention tactics when their partners are more likely to get pregnant (Gangestad et al., 2002).

Haselton and Gangestad (2006) expanded on the above work, finding that partnered women reported more extra-pair flirtations and an

increase in mate guarding tactics by their partners near ovulation. The increase in mate retention tactics was modulated by female attractiveness, whereby the mid-cycle shift in mate guarding behaviors by primary partners was higher for less attractive women versus attractive women (who experience relatively high levels of mate guarding throughout the cycle). Also, this male increase in proprietary behaviors during their partner's fertile phase is strongest in men with partners demonstrating a stronger desire to engage in extra-pair mating (Gangestad et al., 2002; Haselton & Gangestad, 2006), suggesting either that women's attention to extra-pair men may drive this increased attention or that men are sensitive to other fertility-associated cues and become more responsive to the threat of extra-pair men as a result. Men do indeed increase their ratings of the dominance of other men when their partners are fertile (Burriss & Little, 2006), which supports the notion that men are able to detect the increased risk of cuckoldry, at least to some extent. Importantly, these findings demonstrate that partner ovulation-dependent shifts in male behavior may be sensitive to possible fitness rewards (Haselton & Gangestad, 2006). Similarly, women with less sexually attractive partners report receiving more love and attention from their male partners around ovulation than women who rated their partners as more sexually attractive (Pillsworth & Haselton, 2006). While these reported increases in mate retention tactics may be reactionary to women's increased attractiveness (e.g., Miller et al., 2007) and interest in extra-pair males (e.g., Gangestad et al., 2002), these findings contrast with the concept that ovulation is fully concealed. However, converging evidence from the male partners themselves is needed because, at present, it is not clear whether these female perceptions reflect an actual increase in male behavior or whether women simply notice these behaviors more when their interest in extra-pair men is highest.

A recent double-blind study provides additional evidence that men both perceive subtle cues to ovulation and that those cues affect their mating behaviors. Miller and Maner (2010) investigated how the scents of women at peak

fertility influence male endocrinological responses by having men smell T-shirts worn by women near ovulation or T-shirts worn by the same women during the luteal (nonfertile) phase of the menstrual cycle. Prior to smelling the T-shirt randomly assigned to them, men provided a baseline saliva sample that was used to measure testosterone level. Next, participants smelled the T-shirt three times over a 15-min interval and then provided another saliva sample. They found that, when controlling for baseline testosterone levels, testosterone was substantially higher in men exposed to the odor of a woman close to ovulation than in men exposed to the odor of a woman in the luteal phase of her cycle (Miller & Maner, 2010; but see Roney & Simmons, 2012). This is the first research to provide direct evidence that olfactory cues to female fertility across the menstrual cycle can influence male hormonal responses. Testosterone levels in men are associated with competitiveness and dominance (Mazur & Booth, 1998; Zitzmann & Nieschlag, 2001), which are behavioral cues that women find particularly attractive at ovulation (Gangestad et al., 2004). Significantly, some evidence suggests that men's testosterone levels respond to mating-relevant cues, such as interacting with a woman (Roney & von Hippel, 2010; Roney, Lukaszewski, & Simmons, 2007; Roney, Mahler, & Maestriperi, 2003) or viewing erotic films (Hellhammer, Hubert, & Schürmeyer, 1985; Rubin, Henson, Falvo, & High, 1979), suggesting that testosterone may be related to an increase in men's mating motivation. In line with this hypothesis, male exposure to the scent of a woman near ovulation leads to increased implicit accessibility of sexual concepts and heightened perceptions of women's sexual arousal (Miller & Maner, 2011). Men are also more likely to mimic a woman (a behavior that reflects attraction between people) and make risky decisions (a decision-making strategy men use to display desirable traits to women) when face-to-face with a fertile-phase female confederate than when interacting with a confederate during other nonfertile menstrual cycle phases (Miller & Maner, 2011). These findings thus imply that men not only perceive cues to female

conception risk but also that these cues may have a direct influence on their behavior.

Hormonal Contraceptives

It is highly probable that the various changes that occur over the ovulatory cycle are driven by natural changes in hormone levels (e.g., Garver-Appar et al., 2008; Jones et al., 2008; Jones, Little, et al., 2005; Little et al., 2008; Little, Burris, Tufte, & Jones, 2006; Puts, 2006; Puts et al., 2013; Welling et al., 2007). Given this relationship, it is perhaps predictable that these hormone-mediated changes in women's appearance, behavior, and preferences are largely absent in women using hormonal contraceptives (e.g., Gangestad et al., 2007; Guéguen, 2009; Jones, Perrett, et al., 2005; Krug et al., 1994; Laeng & Falkenberg, 2007; Little, Jones, & Burriss, 2007; Pawlowski & Jasienska, 2005; Penton-Voak et al., 1999; Puts, 2005, 2006; Rosen & López, 2009). For example, changes in gross electrical activity in the brain over the menstrual cycle, and the corresponding increase in scores on certain performance tasks during the periovulatory period, are not present in women using hormonal contraceptives (Becker et al., 1982). Also, the rise in female-initiated sexual activity around peak fertility is eliminated in hormonal contraceptive users (Adams et al., 1978).

Hormonal contraceptives may interfere with the cyclic nature of women's attractiveness. As mentioned, women are rated as more attractive around ovulation compared to other points in the cycle (e.g., Bryant & Haselton, 2009; Miller et al., 2007; Pipitone & Gallup, 2008; Puts et al., 2013; Roberts et al., 2004), but studies have found no such variation in attractiveness in women using contraceptives (Kuukasjärvi et al., 2004; Miller et al., 2007; Pipitone & Gallup, 2008). In contrast to naturally cycling women, hormonally contracepting lap dancers showed no earnings peak associated with cycle phase (Miller et al., 2007). Pill users also show no peak in odor (Kuukasjärvi et al., 2004) or vocal (Pipitone & Gallup, 2008) attractiveness. This may limit women's overall ability to attract a

high-quality mate. Additionally, women's potentially adaptive shifts in preferences over the menstrual cycle, such as increases in preferences for masculinity (Penton-Voak et al., 1999; Puts, 2006) and male scent (Thornhill & Gangestad, 2003), and shifts in attention toward courtship language (Rosen & López, 2009) are not present in hormonal contraceptive users. These findings have led some researchers to speculate that the hormonal contraceptive pill may detrimentally influence mate preferences and mate choice (Alvergne & Lummaa, 2009; Havlíček & Roberts, 2009; Roberts, Gosling, Carter, & Petrie, 2008; Wedekind & Furi, 1997; Welling, 2013). Regardless, the absence of menstrual cycle shifts in attractiveness, behavior, and preferences in hormonal contraceptive users emphasizes the importance of underlying hormonal mechanisms on human mating behavior and psychology.

Conclusions

Previously, it has been argued that women would not benefit from advertising their fertility status for several reasons, such as the possibility that advertising high conception risk may lead to unwanted male attention that could constrain female choice (Gangestad & Thornhill, 2008; Thornhill & Gangestad, 2008). However, because women are more attractive, appear more sexually motivated, and increase their preferences for putative cues to male genetic quality around ovulation and because men appear capable of detecting these subtle cues to ovulation, it is evident that ovulation is not entirely concealed. This has led some to speculate that women have evolved to conceal cues to ovulation but that men have simultaneously evolved to detect ovulation (Gangestad & Thornhill, 2008; Haselton & Gildersleeve, 2011; Thornhill & Gangestad, 2008). This view stipulates that the existing signs of approaching ovulation are not shaped by selection but leak out despite female selection to conceal them. Alternatively, it is possible that selection favored cues that are subtle enough to allow women to avoid unwanted male attention but

that also allow them to attract attention from desired mates at opportune times. Behavioral cues could be especially easily directed toward desired mates. This would provide women with clear reproductive advantages and may also benefit male partners, who may be more likely than other men to detect these fertility-related changes in their partners (Haselton & Gildersleeve, 2011) and may engage in tactics designed to reduce the risk of cuckoldry (Gangestad et al., 2002; Haselton & Gangestad, 2006; Pillsworth & Haselton, 2006).

As mentioned, the specific endocrine mechanisms behind women's changes in attractiveness, behavior, and preferences are still under debate. In many species, including nonhuman primates (Wallen & Zehr, 2004), estrogen seems to facilitate estrus behaviors (Giraldi et al., 2004). In human females, although some researchers have found associations with estradiol and periovulatory changes (Feinberg et al., 2006; Garver-Appar et al., 2008; Roney & Simmons, 2008; Rosen & López, 2009; Rupp et al., 2009), other work has found independent effects of progesterone (Jones, Little, et al., 2005), prolactin (Puts, 2006), testosterone (Welling et al., 2007), cortisol (López et al., 2009), or a combination of various hormones (Frost, 1994; Garver-Appar et al., 2008; Lukaszewski & Roney, 2009; Puts, 2006; Welling et al., 2007). For instance, Puts et al. (2013) found that progesterone and its interaction with estradiol negatively predicted vocal attractiveness and overall (facial plus vocal) attractiveness to men across the cycle but that progesterone alone negatively predicts ratings of facial attractiveness. Therefore, it is possible that the causes of estrus-like behaviors in women are less straightforward than similar behaviors in other primates, indicating that more work on the hormonal mechanisms underpinning women's cyclic shifts is clearly needed.

Contrary to earlier assertions, current research suggests that women's ovulatory status is not entirely hidden. Although overt signals that indicate impending ovulation,

like those present in some other primates (Baum et al., 1977; Clarke et al., 2009; Nunn, 1999), are absent or reduced in human females, subtle indicators of peak fertility remain. Indeed, observable cues to ovulation and associated shifts in behavior and preferences are becoming increasingly well documented. Continued investigation of these cyclic shifts promises to further illuminate important design features of human mating psychology and elucidate the mating dynamics of ancestral human populations.

References

- Adams, D., Burt, A., & Gold, A. R. (1978). Rise in female-initiated sexual activity at ovulation and its suppression by oral contraception. *New England Journal of Medicine*, 299, 1145–1150.
- Alexander, R. D., & Noonan, K. M. (1979). Concealment of ovulation, parental care and human social evolution. In N. Chagnon & W. Irons (Eds.), *Evolutionary biology and human social behavior*. North Scituate, MA: Duxbury Press.
- Alvergne, A., & Lummaa, V. (2009). Does the contraceptive pill alter mate choice in humans? *Trends in Ecology and Evolution*, 25, 171–179.
- Andelman, S. J. (1987). Evolution of concealed ovulation in vervet monkeys (*Cercopithecus aethiops*). *The American Naturalist*, 129, 785–799.
- Anderson, U. S., Perea, E. F., Vaughn Becker, D., Ackerman, J. M., Shapiro, J. R., Neuberg, S. L., et al. (2010). I only have eyes for you: Ovulation redirects attention (but not memory) to attractive men. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 46, 804–808.
- Apicella, C. L., Feinberg, D. R., & Marlowe, F. W. (2007). Voice pitch predicts reproductive success in male hunter-gatherers. *Biological Letters*, 3, 682–684.
- Bickstirn, T., Sanders, D., Lesak, R., Davidson, D., Warner, P., & Bancroft, J. (1983). Mood, sexuality, hormones, and the menstrual cycle. II. Hormone levels and their relationship to the premenstrual syndrome. *Psychosomatic Medicine*, 45, 503–507.
- Baird, D. T., & Fraser, I. S. (1974). Blood production and ovarian secretion rates of estradiol-17 β and estrone in women throughout the menstrual cycle. *The Journal of Clinical Endocrinology and Metabolism*, 38, 1009–1017.
- Baker, R. R., & Bellis, M. A. (1993). Human sperm competition: Ejaculate manipulation by females and a function for the female orgasm. *Animal Behaviour*, 46, 887–909.
- Baker, R. R., & Bellis, M. A. (1995). *Human sperm competition: Copulation, masturbation and infidelity*. London: Chapman and Hall.
- Baum, M. J., Everitt, B. J., Herbert, J., & Keverne, E. B. (1977). Hormonal basis of proceptivity and receptivity in female primates. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 6, 173–192.
- Beach, F. A. (1948). *Hormones and behavior: A survey of interrelationships between endocrine secretions and patterns of overt response*. Oxford, England: Hoeber.
- Becker, D., Croustfield, G. D., Schwilke, M., & Wuntke, W. (1982). Changes in physiological, EEG and psychological parameters in women during the spontaneous menstrual cycle and following oral contraceptives. *Psychoneuroendocrinology*, 7, 75–90.
- Bellis, M. A., & Baker, R. R. (1990). Do females promote sperm competition? Data for humans. *Animal Behaviour*, 40, 997–999.
- Benshoof, L., & Thornhill, R. (1979). The evolution of monogamy and the loss of estrus in humans. *Journal of Social and Biological Structures*, 2, 95–106.
- Borries, C., Launhardt, K., Epplen, C., Epplen, J. T., & Winkler, P. (1999). Males as infant protectors in human languages (*Presbytis entellus*) living in multimale groups—Defence pattern, paternity and sexual behaviour. *Behavioural Ecology and Sociobiology*, 46, 350–356.
- Brewis, A., & Meyer, M. (2005). Demographic evidence that human ovulation is undetectable (at least in pairs bonds). *Current Anthropology*, 46, 465–471.
- Brinsmead-Stockham, K., Johnston, L., Miles, L., & Macrae, C. N. (2008). Female sexual orientation and menstrual influences on person perception. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 44, 729–734.
- Bröder, A., & Hohmann, N. (2003). Variations in risk taking behavior over the menstrual cycle: An improved replication. *Evolution and Human Behavior*, 24, 397–398.
- Broverman, D. M., Vogel, W., Klaitner, E. L., Majcher, D., Shea, D., & Paul, V. (1981). Changes in cognitive task performance across the menstrual cycle. *Journal of Comparative and Physiological Psychology*, 95, 646–654.
- Bryant, G. A., & Haselton, M. G. (2009). Vocal cues of ovulation in human females. *Biological Letters*, 5, 12–15.
- Burch, R. L., & Gallup, G. G. (2000). Perceptions of paternal resemblance predict family violence. *Evolution and Human Behavior*, 21, 429–435.
- Burley, N. (1979). The evolution of concealed ovulation. *American Naturalist*, 114, 835–858.
- Burris, R. P., & Little, A. C. (2006). Effects of partner conception risk phase on male perception of dominance in faces. *Evolution and Human Behavior*, 27, 297–305.
- Buss, D. M. (1988). From vigilance to violence: Tactics of mate retention in American undergraduates. *Ethology and Sociobiology*, 9, 291–317.
- Buss, D. M., & Barnes, M. (1986). Preferences in human mate selection. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 50, 559–570.
- Buss, D. M., & Shackelford, T. K. (2008). Attractive women want it all: Good genes, economic investment, parenting proclivities, and emotional commitment. *Evolutionary Psychology*, 6, 134–146.
- Campbell, F. (1960). Birth control and the Christian churches. *Population Studies*, 14, 131–147.
- Campbell, B. G. (1966). *Human evolution*. Chicago, IL: Aldine.
- Cárdenas, R. A., & Harris, L. J. (2007). Do women's preferences for symmetry change across the menstrual cycle? *Evolution and Human Behavior*, 28, 96–105.
- Cerdá-Molina, A. L., Hernández-López, L., Chavira, R., Cárdenas, M., Paez-Ponce, D., Cervantes De la Luz, H., et al. (2006). Endocrine changes in male stumptailed macaques (*Macaca arctoides*) as a response to odor stimulation with vaginal secretions. *Hormones and Behavior*, 49, 81–87.
- Chavanne, T. J., & Gallup, G. G. (1998). Variation in risk taking behavior among female college students as a function of the menstrual cycle. *Evolution and Human Behavior*, 19, 27–32.
- Clarke, P. M. R., Barrett, L., & Henzi, S. P. (2009). What role do olfactory cues play in chacma baboon mating? *American Journal of Primatology*, 71, 493–502.
- Crawford, J. C., Boulet, M., & Drea, C. M. (2011). Sniffing wrong: Hormonal contraception in lemurs alters critical female odour cues. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, 278, 122–130.
- Daly, M., & Wilson, M. (1984). A sociobiological analysis of human infanticide. In G. Hausfater & S. Hrdy (Eds.), *Infanticide: Comparative and evolutionary perspectives* (pp. 487–502). New York: Aldine Press.
- Daly, M., & Wilson, M. (1985). Child abuse and other risks of not living with both parents. *Ethology and Sociobiology*, 6, 197–210.
- Daly, M., Wilson, M., & Weghorst, S. J. (1982). Male sexual jealousy. *Ethology and Sociobiology*, 3, 11–27.
- Daniels, D. (1983). The evolution of concealed ovulation and self-deception. *Ethology and Sociobiology*, 4, 69–87.
- DeBruine, L. M. (2004). Resemblance to self increases the appeal of child faces to both men and women. *Evolution and Human Behavior*, 25, 142–154.
- DeBruine, L. M., Jones, B. C., Crawford, J. R., Welling, L. L. M., & Little, A. C. (2010). The health of a nation predicts their mate preferences: Cross-cultural variation in women's preferences for masculinized male faces. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, 277, 2405–2410.
- DeBruine, L. M., Jones, B. C., Little, A. C., Crawford, J. R., & Welling, L. L. M. (2011). Further evidence for regional variation in women's masculinity preferences. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, 278, 813–814.
- Doty, R. L., Ford, M. E., Preti, G., & Huggins, G. R. (1975). Changes in the intensity and pleasantness of human vaginal odors during the menstrual cycle. *Science*, 190, 1316–1318.
- Durante, K. M., & Li, N. P. (2009). Oestradiol level and opportunistic mating in women. *Biological Letters*, 5, 179–182.
- Durante, K. M., Li, N. P., & Haselton, M. G. (2008). Changes in women's choice of dress across the ovulatory cycle: Naturalistic and laboratory task-based evidence. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 34, 1451–1460.
- Feinberg, D. R., Jones, B. C., Law Smith, M. J., Moors, F. R., DeBruine, L. M., Cornwell, R. E., et al. (2006). Menstrual cycle, trait estrogen level, and masculinity preferences in the human voice. *Hormones and Behavior*, 49, 215–222.
- Fessler, D. M. T. (2003a). No time to eat: An adaptationist account of periovulatory behavioral changes. *The Quarterly Review of Biology*, 78, 3–21.
- Fessler, D. M. T. (2003b). Rape is not less frequent during the ovulatory phase of the menstrual cycle. *Sexualities, Evolution and Gender*, 5, 127–147.
- Fessler, D. M. T., & Navarrete, C. D. (2003). Domain-specific variation in disgust sensitivity across the menstrual cycle. *Evolution and Human Behavior*, 24, 406–417.
- Fetchnauer, D., & Rohde, P. A. (2002). Evolutionary personality psychology and victimology: Sex differences in risk attitudes and short-term orientation and their relation to sex differences in victimizations. *Evolution and Human Behavior*, 23, 233–244.
- Fink, B., & Penton-Voak, I. (2002). Evolutionary psychology of facial attractiveness. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 11, 154–158.
- Fisher, M. L. (2004). Female intrasexual competition decreases female facial attractiveness. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London B*, 271, S283–S285.
- Fisher, M. L., & Cox, A. (2009). The influence of female attractiveness on competitor derogation. *Journal of Evolutionary Psychology*, 7, 141–155.
- Prost, P. (1994). Preference for darker faces in photographs at different phases of the menstrual cycle: Preliminary assessment of evidence for a hormonal relationship. *Perceptual and Motor Skills*, 79, 507–514.
- Gangestad, S. W., Garver-Appar, C. E., Simpson, J. A., & Cousins, A. J. (2007). Changes in women's mate preferences across the cycle. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 92, 151–163.
- Gangestad, S. W., & Simpson, J. A. (2000). The evolution of human mating: Trade-offs and strategic pluralism. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 23, 573–644.
- Gangestad, S. W., Simpson, J. A., Cousins, A. J., Garver-Appar, C. E., & Christensen, P. N. (2004). Women's preferences for male behavioral displays change across the menstrual cycle. *Psychological Science*, 15, 203–207.
- Gangestad, S. W., & Thornhill, R. (1998). Menstrual cycle variation in women's preferences for the scent of symmetrical men. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, 265, 927–933.
- Gangestad, S. W., & Thornhill, R. (2008). Human estrus. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, 275, 991–1000.
- Gangestad, S. W., Thornhill, R., & Garver, C. E. (2002). Changes in women's sexual interests and their partners' mate-retention tactics across the menstrual

- cycle: Evidence for shifting conflicts of interest. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, 269, 975-982.
- Gangestad, S. W., Thornhill, R., & Garver-Appar, C. E. (2005). Women's sexual interests across the ovulatory cycle depend on primary partner developmental instability. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, 272, 2023-2027.
- Gangestad, S. W., Thornhill, R., & Garver-Appar, C. E. (2010). Men's facial masculinity predicts changes in their female partners' sexual interests across the cycle, whereas men's intelligence does not. *Evolution and Human Behavior*, 31, 412-424.
- Garver-Appar, C. E., Gangestad, S. W., & Thornhill, R. (2008). Hormonal correlates of women's mid-cycle preference for the scent of symmetry. *Evolution and Human Behavior*, 29, 223-232.
- Garver-Appar, C. E., Gangestad, S. W., Thornhill, R., Miller, R. D., & Olp, J. (2006). Major histocompatibility complex alleles, sexual responsiveness, and unfaithfulness in romantic couples. *Psychological Science*, 17, 830-835.
- Gildersleeve, K. A., Haselton, M. G., Larson, C. M., & Pillsbury, E. G. (2012). Body odor attractiveness as a cue of impending ovulation in women: Evidence from a study using hormone-confirmed ovulation. *Hormones and Behavior*, 61, 157-166.
- Giraldi, A., Marson, L., Nappi, R., Pfau, J., Traish, A. M., Vardi, Y., et al. (2004). Physiology of female sexual function: Animal models. *The Journal of Sexual Medicine*, 1, 237-253.
- Gong, E. J., Garrel, D., & Calloway, D. H. (1989). Menstrual cycle and voluntary food intake. *The American Journal of Clinical Nutrition*, 49, 252-258.
- Grammer, K. (1993). 5- α -androst-16en-3 α -on: A male pheromone? A brief report. *Ethology and Sociobiology*, 14, 201-208.
- Grammer, K., Jütte, A., & Fischmann, B. (1997). Der Kampf der Geschlechter und der Krieg der Signale. In B. Karstschneider (Ed.), *Liebe, Lust, und Leidenschaft. Sexualität im Spiegel der Wissenschaft*. Stuttgart: Hirzel.
- Gudeken, N. (2009a). Menstrual cycle phases and female receptivity to a courtship solicitation: An evaluation in a nightclub. *Evolution and Human Behavior*, 30, 351-355.
- Gudeken, N. (2009b). The receptivity of women to courtship solicitation across the menstrual cycle: A field experiment. *Biological Psychology*, 80, 321-324.
- Harvey, S. M. (1987). Female sexual behavior: Fluctuations during the menstrual cycle. *Journal of Psychosomatic Research*, 31, 101-110.
- Haselton, M. G., & Gangestad, S. W. (2006). Conditional expression of women's desires and men's mate guarding across the ovulatory cycle. *Hormones and Behavior*, 49, 509-518.
- Haselton, M. G., & Gildersleeve, K. A. (2011). Can men detect ovulation? *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 20, 87-92.
- Haselton, M. G., Mortezaie, M., Pillsbury, E. G., Blieske-Rechek, A. L., & Frederick, D. A. (2007). Ovulatory shifts in human female ornamentation: Near ovulation, women dress to impress. *Hormones and Behavior*, 51, 40-45.
- Havlicek, J., Drošáková, R., Bartoš, L., & Flegr, J. (2006). Non-advertized does not mean concealed: Body odour changes across the human menstrual cycle. *Ethology*, 112, 81-90.
- Havlicek, J., & Roberts, S. C. (2009). MHC-correlated mate choice in humans: A review. *Psychoneuroendocrinology*, 34, 497-512.
- Havlicek, J., Roberts, S. C., & Flegr, J. (2005). Women's preference for dominant male odour: Effects of menstrual cycle and relationship status. *Biology Letters*, 1, 256-259.
- Heistermann, M., Ziegler, T., van Schaik, C. P., Launhardt, K., Winkler, P., & Hodges, J. K. (2001). Loss of oestrus, concealed ovulation and paternity confusion in free-ranging Hanuman langurs. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London. Series B: Biological Sciences*, 268, 2445-2451.
- Helthammer, D. H., Hubert, W., & Schlömer, T. (1985). Changes in saliva testosterone after psychological stimulation in men. *Psychoneuroendocrinology*, 10, 77-81.
- Henderson, J. J. A., & Anglin, J. M. (2003). Facial attractiveness predicts longevity. *Evolution and Human Behavior*, 24, 351-356.
- Hill, S. E., & Durante, K. M. (2009). Do women feel worse to look their best? Testing the relationship between self-esteem and fertility status across the menstrual cycle. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 35, 1592-1601.
- Hirby, S. B. (1979). Infanticide among mammals: A review, classification, and examination of the implications for the reproductive strategies of females. *Ethology and Sociobiology*, 1, 13-40.
- Hirby, S. B., & Whitten, P. L. (1987). Patterning of sexual activity. In B. S. Smuts, D. L. Cheney, R. M. Seyfarth, R. W. Wrangham, & T. T. Struhsaker (Eds.), *Primate societies* (pp. 370-384). Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Johnston, V. S., Hagel, R., Franklin, M., Fink, B., & Grammer, K. (2001). Male facial attractiveness: Evidence for hormone-mediated adaptive design. *Evolution and Human Behavior*, 21, 251-267.
- Johnston, L., Miles, L., & Macrae, C. N. (2008). Was that a man? Sex identification as a function of menstrual cycle and masculinity. *Applied Cognitive Psychology*, 22, 1185-1194.
- Jokela, M. (2009). Physical attractiveness and reproductive success in humans: Evidence from the late 20th century United States. *Evolution and Human Behavior*, 30, 342-350.
- Jones, B. C., DeBruine, L. M., Perrett, D. I., Little, A. C., Feinberg, D. R., & Law Smith, M. J. (2008). Effects of menstrual cycle phase on face preferences. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 37, 78-84.
- Jones, B. C., Little, A. C., Boothroyd, L., DeBruine, L. M., Feinberg, D. R., Law Smith, M. J., et al. (2005). Commitment to relationships and preferences for femininity and apparent health in faces are strongest on days of the menstrual cycle when progesterone level is high. *Hormones and Behavior*, 48, 283-290.
- Jones, B. C., Perrett, D. I., Little, A. C., Boothroyd, L., Cornwall, R. E., Feinberg, D. R., et al. (2005). Menstrual cycle, pregnancy and oral contraceptive use alter attraction to apparent health in faces. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, 272, 347-354.
- Jones, B. C., Vukovic, J., Little, A. C., Roberts, S. C., & DeBruine, L. M. (2011). Circum-menopausal changes in women's preferences for sexually dimorphic shape cues in peer-aged faces. *Biological Psychology*, 87, 453-455.
- Kendrick, K. M., & Dixon, A. F. (1985). Effects of oestradiol 17 β , progesterone and testosterone upon proceptivity and receptivity in ovariectomized common marmosets (*Callithrix jacchus*). *Physiology and Behavior*, 34, 123-128.
- Kirchengast, S., & Garner, M. (2002). Changes in fat distribution (WHR) and body weight across the menstrual cycle. *Collegium Anthropologicum*, 26, 47-57.
- Koehler, N., Rhodes, G., Simmons, L. W., & Zebrowitz, L. A. (2006). Do cyclic changes in women's face preferences target cues to long-term health? *Social Cognition*, 24, 641-656.
- Krug, R., Finn, M., Pietrowsky, R., Fehm, H. L., & Born, J. (1996). Jealousy, general creativity, and coping with social frustration during the menstrual cycle. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 25, 181-199.
- Krug, R., Stamm, U., Pietrowsky, R., Fehm, H. L., & Born, J. (1994). Effects of menstrual cycle on creativity. *Psychoneuroendocrinology*, 19, 21-31.
- Kaukajärvi, S., Eriksson, C. J. P., Koskela, E., Mappes, T., Nissinen, K., & Rantala, M. J. (2004). Attractiveness of women's body odors over the menstrual cycle: The role of oral contraceptives and receiver sex. *Behavioral Ecology*, 15, 579-584.
- Laeng, B., & Falkenberg, L. (2007). Women's pupillary responses to sexually significant others during the hormonal cycle. *Hormones and Behavior*, 52, 520-530.
- Langlois, J. H., Roggman, L. A., & Musselman, L. (1994). What is average and what is not average about attractive faces. *Psychological Science*, 5, 214-219.
- Latz, L. J. (1939). *The rhythm of sterility and fertility in women*. Chicago, IL: Latz Foundation.
- Lee, R. B., & DeVore, I. (1968). *Man the hunter*. Oxford, England: Aldine.
- Lie, H. C., Rhodes, G., & Simmons, L. W. (2008). Genetic diversity revealed in human faces. *Evolution*, 62, 2473-2486.
- Little, A. C., Burriss, R. P., Tufte, A. D., & Jones, B. C. (2006). Hormone mediated preferences for bodies and faces. *Journal of Reproductive and Infant Psychology*, 24, 270.
- Little, A. C., Cohen, D. L., Jones, B. C., & Belsky, J. (2007). Human preferences for facial masculinity change with relationship type and environmental harshness. *Behavioral Ecology and Sociobiology*, 61, 967-973.
- Little, A. C., & Jones, B. C. (2011). Variation in facial masculinity and symmetry preferences across the menstrual cycle is moderated by relationship context. *Psychoneuroendocrinology*, 37, 999-1008.
- Little, A. C., Jones, B. C., & Burriss, R. P. (2007). Preferences for masculinity in male bodies change across the menstrual cycle. *Hormones and Behavior*, 51, 633-639.
- Little, A. C., Jones, B. C., Burriss, R. P., & Perrett, D. I. (2007). Preferences for symmetry in faces change across the menstrual cycle. *Biological Psychology*, 76, 209-216.
- Little, A. C., Jones, B. C., & DeBruine, L. M. (2008). Preferences for variation in masculinity in real male faces change across the menstrual cycle: Women prefer more masculine faces when they are more fertile. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 45, 478-482.
- Little, A. C., Jones, B. C., Penton-Voak, I. S., Burriss, D. M., & Perrett, D. I. (2002). Partnership status and the temporal context of relationships influence human female preferences for sexual dimorphism in male face shape. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, 269, 1095-1100.
- López, H. H., Hay, A. C., & Cooklin, P. H. (2009). Attractive men induce testosterone and cortisol release in women. *Hormones and Behavior*, 56, 84-92.
- Lukaszewski, A. W., & Roney, J. R. (2009). Estimated hormones predict women's mate preferences for dominant personality traits. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 47, 191-196.
- Macrae, C. N., Alinwick, K. A., Milne, A. B., & Schiesscheidt, A. M. (2002). Person perception across the menstrual cycle: Hormonal influences of social-cognitive functioning. *Psychological Science*, 13, 532-536.
- Manning, J. T., Scott, D., Whitehouse, G. H., & Leinster, S. J. (1997). Breast asymmetry and phenotypic quality in women. *Evolution and Human Behavior*, 18, 223-236.
- Manning, J. T., Scott, D., Whitehouse, G. H., Leinster, S. J., & Walton, J. M. (1996). Asymmetry and the menstrual cycle in women. *Ethology and Sociobiology*, 17, 129-143.
- Manson, W. C. (1986). Sexual cyclicity and concealed ovulation. *Journal of Human Evolution*, 15, 21-30.
- Marlowe, F. W. (2004). Is human ovulation concealed? Evidence from conception beliefs in a hunter-gatherer society. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 33, 427-432.
- Mateo, S., & Rissman, E. F. (1984). Increased sexual activity during the midcycle portion of the human menstrual cycle. *Hormones and Behavior*, 18, 249-255.
- Mazar, A., & Booth, A. (1998). Testosterone and dominance in men. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 21, 353-397.
- Miller, S. L., & Maner, J. K. (2010). Scent of a woman: Men's testosterone responses to olfactory ovulation cues. *Psychological Science*, 21, 276-283.

- Miller, S. L., & Maner, J. K. (2011). Ovulation as a male mating prime: Subtle signs of women's fertility influence men's mating cognition and behavior. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 100, 295–308.
- Miller, G. F., & Todd, P. M. (1998). Mate choice turns cognitive. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 2, 190–198.
- Miller, G., Tybur, J. M., & Jordan, B. D. (2007). Ovary cycle effects on tip earnings by lap dancers: Economic evidence for human estrus? *Evolution and Human Behavior*, 28, 375–381.
- Møller, A. P., & Thornhill, R. (1998). Bilateral symmetry and sexual selection: A meta-analysis. *American Naturalist*, 151, 174–192.
- Morris, N. M., & Udry, J. R. (1970). Variations in pedometer activity during the menstrual cycle. *Obstetrics and Gynecology*, 35, 199–201.
- Morris, N. M., & Udry, J. R. (1982). Epidemiological patterns of sexual behavior in the menstrual cycle. In R. C. Friedman (Ed.), *Behavior and the menstrual cycle* (pp. 129–154). New York: Marcel Dekker.
- Nunn, C. L. (1999). The evolution of exaggerated sexual swellings in primates and the graded-signal hypothesis. *Animal Behavior*, 58, 229–246.
- O'Toole, A. J., Deffenbacher, K. A., Valentin, D., McKee, K., Huff, D., & Abdi, H. (1998). The perception of face gender: The role of stimulus structure in recognition and classification. *Memory and Cognition*, 26, 146–160.
- Pawlowski, B. (1999). Loss of oestrus and concealed ovulation in human evolution: The case against the sexual selection hypothesis. *Current Anthropology*, 40, 257–276.
- Pawlowski, B., & Jasienska, G. (2005). Women's preferences for sexual dimorphism in height depend on menstrual cycle phase and expected duration of relationship. *Biological Psychology*, 70, 38–43.
- Penton-Voak, I. S., & Perrett, D. I. (2000). Female preference for male faces changes cyclically—Further evidence. *Evolution and Human Behavior*, 21, 39–48.
- Penton-Voak, I. S., & Perrett, D. I. (2001). Male facial attractiveness: Perceived personality and shifting female preferences for male traits across the menstrual cycle. *Advances in the Study of Behavior*, 30, 219–259.
- Penton-Voak, I. S., Perrett, D. I., Castles, D. L., Kobayashi, T., Bart, D. M., Murray, L. K., et al. (1999). Menstrual cycle alters face preference. *Nature*, 399, 741–742.
- Perrett, D. I., Lee, K. J., Penton-Voak, I. S., Rowland, D. R., Yoshikawa, S., Bart, D. M., et al. (1998). Effects of sexual dimorphism on facial attractiveness. *Nature*, 394, 884–887.
- Peters, M., Rhodes, G., & Simmons, L. W. (2008). Does attractiveness in men provide clues to semen quality? *Journal of Evolutionary Biology*, 21, 572–579.
- Pillsworth, E. G., & Haselton, M. G. (2006). Male sexual attractiveness predicts differential ovulatory shifts in female extra-pair attraction and male mate retention. *Evolution and Human Behavior*, 27, 247–258.
- Pipitone, R. N., & Gallup, G. G. (2008). Women's voice attractiveness varies across the menstrual cycle. *Evolution and Human Behavior*, 29, 268–274.
- Platsek, S. M., Burch, R. L., Panyavin, I. S., Wasserman, B. H., & Gallup, G. G. (2002). Reactions to children's faces—Resemblance affects males more than females. *Evolution and Human Behavior*, 23, 159–166.
- Platsek, S. M., Critton, S. R., Burch, R. L., Frederick, D. A., Myers, T. E., & Gallup, G. G. (2003). How much paternal resemblance is enough? Sex differences in hypothetical investment decisions but not in the detection of resemblance. *Evolution and Human Behavior*, 24, 81–87.
- Provost, M. P., Quinsey, V. L., & Troje, N. F. (2008). Differences in gait across the menstrual cycle and their attractiveness to men. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 37, 598–604.
- Puts, D. A. (2005). Mating context and menstrual phase affect women's preferences for male voice pitch. *Evolution and Human Behavior*, 26, 388–397.
- Puts, D. A. (2006). Cyclic variation in women's preferences for masculine traits: Potential hormonal causes. *Human Nature*, 17, 114–127.
- Puts, D. A., Bailey, D. H., Cárdenas, R. A., Burris, R. P., Welling, L. L. M., Wheatley, J. R., et al. (2013). Women's attractiveness changes with estradiol and progesterone across the ovulatory cycle. *Hormones and Behavior*, 63(1), 13–19. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.yhbeh.2012.11.007>
- Regan, P. C. (1996). Rhythms of desire: The association between menstrual cycle phases and female sexual desire. *The Canadian Journal of Human Sexuality*, 5, 145–156.
- Rhodes, G., Chan, I., Zebrowitz, L. A., & Simmons, L. W. (2003). Does sexual dimorphism in human faces signal health? *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, 270, 893–895.
- Rhodes, G., Simmons, L. W., & Peters, M. (2005). Attractiveness and sexual behavior: Does attractiveness enhance mating success? *Evolution and Human Behavior*, 26, 186–201.
- Rikowski, A., & Grammer, K. (1999). Human body odour, symmetry and attractiveness. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, 266, 869–874.
- Robbins, M. M. (1995). A demographic analysis of male life history and social structure of mountain gorillas. *Behaviour*, 132, 21–47.
- Roberts, S. C., Gosling, L. M., Carter, V., & Petrie, M. (2008). MHC-correlated odour preferences in humans and the use of oral contraceptives. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, 275, 2715–2722.
- Roberts, S. C., Havlicek, J., Flegel, J., Hruskova, M., Little, A. C., Jones, B. C., et al. (2004). Female facial attractiveness increases during the fertile phase of the menstrual cycle. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, 271, S270–S272.
- Roberts, S. C., Little, A. C., Gosling, L. M., Perrett, D. I., Carter, V., Jones, B. C., et al. (2005). MHC-heterozygosity and human facial attractiveness. *Evolution and Human Behavior*, 26, 213–226.
- Röder, S., Brewer, G., & Fink, B. (2009). Menstrual cycle shifts in women's self-perception and motivation: A daily report method. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 47, 616–619.
- Ronay, R., & von Hippel, W. (2010). The presence of an attractive woman elevates testosterone and physical risk taking in young men. *Social Psychological and Personality Science*, 1, 57–64.
- Roney, J. R., Lukaszewski, A. W., & Simmons, Z. L. (2007). Rapid endocrine responses of young men to social interactions with young women. *Hormones and Behavior*, 52, 326–333.
- Roney, J. R., Mahler, S. V., & Maestripieri, D. (2003). Behavioral and hormonal responses of men to brief interactions with women. *Evolution and Human Behavior*, 24, 365–375.
- Roney, J. R., & Simmons, Z. L. (2008). Women's estradiol predicts preference for facial cues of men's testosterone. *Hormones and Behavior*, 53, 14–19.
- Roney, J. R., & Simmons, Z. L. (2012). Men smelling women: Null effects of exposure to ovulatory sweat on men's testosterone. *Evolutionary Psychology*, 10, 703–713.
- Rosen, M. L., & López, H. H. (2009). Menstrual cycle shifts in attentional bias for courtship language. *Evolution and Human Behavior*, 30, 131–140.
- Rubin, H. B., Henson, D. E., Falvo, R. E., & High, R. W. (1979). The relationship between men's endogenous levels of testosterone and their penile responses to erotic stimuli. *Behaviour Research and Therapy*, 17, 305–312.
- Rupp, H. A., James, T. W., Kettererson, E. D., Sengelaub, D. R., Janssen, E., & Heiman, J. R. (2009). Neural activation in women in response to masculinized male faces: Mediation by hormones and psychosocial factors. *Evolution and Human Behavior*, 30, 1–10.
- Schmitt, D. P., & Buss, D. M. (2001). Human mate poaching: Tactics and temptations for infiltrating existing relationships. *Interpersonal Relations and Group Processes*, 80, 894–917.
- Schwarz, S., & Hassebrauck, M. (2008). Self-perceived and observed variations in women's attractiveness throughout the menstrual cycle—A diary study. *Evolution and Human Behavior*, 29, 282–288.
- Scutt, D., & Manning, J. T. (1996). Symmetry and ovulation in women. *Human Reproduction*, 11, 2477–2480.
- Shackelford, T. K., Besser, A., & Goetz, A. T. (2008). Personality, marital satisfaction, and probability of marital infidelity. *Individual Differences Research*, 6, 13–25.
- Shackelford, T. K., Goetz, A. T., Buss, D. M., Euler, H. A., & Hoier, S. (2005). When we hurt the ones we love: Predicting violence against women from men's mate retention. *Personal Relationships*, 12, 447–463.
- Sheldon, M. S., Cooper, M. L., Geary, D. C., Houard, M., & DeSoto, M. C. (2006). Fertility cycle patterns in motives for sexual behavior. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 32, 1659–1673.
- Sillen-Tullberg, B., & Møller, A. P. (1993). The relationship between concealed ovulation and mating systems in anthropoid primates: A phylogenetic analysis. *American Naturalist*, 141, 1–25.
- Singh, D., & Bronstad, P. M. (2001). Female body odour is a potential cue to ovulation. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, 268, 797–801.
- Slob, A. K., Bax, C. M., Hop, W. C. J., Rowland, D. L., & van der Werff ten Bosch, J. J. (1996). Sexual arousability and the menstrual cycle. *Psychoneuroendocrinology*, 21, 545–558.
- Smith, T. E., & Abbott, D. H. (1998). Behavioral discrimination between circumgenital odor from peri-ovulatory dominant and anovulatory female common marmosets (*Callithrix jacchus*). *American Journal of Primatology*, 46, 265–284.
- Soler, C., Núñez, M., Gutiérrez, R., Núñez, J., Medina, P., Sancho, M., et al. (2003). Facial attractiveness in men provides clues to semen quality. *Evolution and Human Behavior*, 24, 199–207.
- Solis, J., Thomsen, R., Matsushayashi, K., & Takenaka, O. (2000). Infanticide by resident males and female counter-strategies in wild Japanese macaques (*Macaca fuscata*). *Behavioral Ecology and Sociobiology*, 48, 195–202.
- Stanislav, H., & Rice, F. J. (1988). Correlation between sexual desire and menstrual cycle characteristics. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 17, 499–508.
- Straussmann, B. I. (1981). Sexual selection, paternal care, and concealed ovulation in humans. *Ethology and Sociobiology*, 2, 31–40.
- Symons, D. (1979). *The evolution of human sexuality*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Thornhill, R., & Gangestad, S. W. (1993). Human facial beauty: Averageness, symmetry, and parasite resistance. *Human Nature*, 4, 237–269.
- Thornhill, R., & Gangestad, S. W. (1999). The scent of symmetry: A human sex pheromone that signals fitness? *Evolution and Human Behavior*, 20, 175–201.
- Thornhill, R., & Gangestad, S. W. (2003). Do women have evolved adaptation for extra-pair copulation? In E. Voland & K. Grammer (Eds.), *Evolutionary aesthetics* (pp. 341–368). Heidelberg: Springer.
- Thornhill, R., & Gangestad, S. W. (2006). Facial sexual dimorphism, developmental stability, and susceptibility to disease in men and women. *Evolution and Human Behavior*, 27, 131–144.
- Thornhill, R., & Gangestad, S. W. (2008). *The evolutionary biology of human female sexuality*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Thornhill, R., Gangestad, S. W., Miller, R., Scheyd, G., McCollough, J. K., & Franklin, M. (2003). Major histocompatibility complex genes, symmetry, and body scent attractiveness in men and women (*Homo sapiens*). *Behavioral Ecology*, 14, 668–678.

- Thornhill, R., & Møller, A. P. (1997). Developmental stability, disease and medicine. *Biological Reviews*, 72, 497–548.
- Turke, P. W. (1984). Effects of ovulatory concealment and synchrony on protobomimid mating systems and parental roles. *Ethology and Sociobiology*, 5, 33–44.
- van Schaik, C. P., Hodges, J. K., & Nunn, C. L. (2000). Paternity confusion and the ovarian cycles of female primates. In C. P. van Schaik & C. H. Janson (Eds.), *Infanticide by males and its implications* (pp. 361–387). Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press.
- van Schaik, C. P., van Noordwijk, M. A., & Nunn, C. L. (1999). Sex and social evolution in primates. In P. C. Lee (Ed.), *Primate socioecology* (pp. 204–240). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Volk, A., & Quinsey, V. L. (2002). The influence of infant facial cues on adoption preferences. *Human Nature*, 13, 437–455.
- Vukovic, J., Jones, B. C., DeBruine, L. M., Little, A. C., Feinberg, D. R., & Welling, L. M. (2009). Circumcissural effects on women's judgements of facial attractiveness. *Biological Letters*, 5, 62–64.
- Wallen, K., & Zehr, J. L. (2004). Hormones and history: The evolution and development of primate female sexuality. *Journal of Sex Research*, 41, 101–112.
- Wayforth, D. (1998). Fluctuating asymmetry and human male life-history traits in rural Belize. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, 265, 1497–1501.
- Wedekind, C., & Firi, S. (1997). Body odour preferences in men and women: Do they aim for specific MHC combinations or simply heterozygosity? *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, 264, 1471–1479.
- Welling, L. L. M. (2013). Psychobehavioral effects of hormonal contraceptive use. *Evolutionary Psychology*, 11(3), 718–742.
- Welling, L. L. M., Burriss, R. P., & Puts, D. A. (2011). Mate retention behavior modulates men's preferences for self-resemblance in infant faces. *Evolution and Human Behavior*, 32, 118–126.
- Welling, L. L. M., Jones, B. C., DeBruine, L. M., Conway, C. A., Law Smith, M. J., Little, A. C., et al. (2007). Raised salivary testosterone in women is associated with increased attraction to masculine faces. *Hormones and Behavior*, 52, 156–161.
- Wilcox, A. J., Baird, D. D., Dunson, D. B., McConaughey, D. R., Kessner, J. S., & Weinberg, C. R. (2004). On the frequency of intercourse around ovulation: Evidence for biological influences. *Human Reproduction*, 19, 1539–1543.
- Wildt, L., Kistler, S., Licht, P., & Becker, W. (1998). Sperm transport in the human female genital tract and its modulation by oxytocin as assessed by hysterosalpingoscopy, hysteroscopy, electrohysteroscopy and Doppler sonography. *Human Reproduction Update*, 4, 655–666.
- Wilson, M., & Daly, M. (1987). Risk of maltreatment of children living with stepparents. In R. J. Gelles & J. B. Lancaster (Eds.), *Child abuse and neglect: Biosocial dimensions* (pp. 215–232). Hawthorne, New York: Aldine de Gruyter.
- Wilson, M., & Daly, M. (2002). Infanticide. In M. Pagel (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of evolution*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Wrangham, R. (1993). The evolution of sexuality in chimpanzees and bonobos. *Human Nature*, 4, 47–79.
- Zervomanolakis, I., Ott, H. W., Müller, J., Seebor, B. E., Fries, S. C., Matile, V., et al. (2009). Uterine mechanisms of ipsilateral directed spermatozoa transport: Evidence for a contribution of the utero-ovarian counter-current system. *European Journal of Obstetrics and Gynecology and Reproductive Biology*, 144, S45–S49.
- Zillmann, D., Schweitzer, K. J., & Mundorf, N. (1994). Menstrual cycle variation of women's interest in erotica. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 23, 579–597.
- Zitzmann, M., & Nieschlag, E. (2001). Testosterone levels in healthy men and the relation to behavioural and physical characteristics: Facts and constructs. *European Journal of Endocrinology*, 144, 183–197.

Women's Preferences for Male Facial Features

14

Lisa M. DeBruine

Human Face Preferences

Humans face perception is highly specialized and a focus of much research in diverse areas (Little, Jones, & DeBruine, 2011a). One area of particular interest is whether and how face perception functions in mate choice. Opposite-sex face preferences are proposed to function, at least in part, to identify appropriate mates (Little, Jones, & DeBruine, 2011b; Thornhill & Gangestad, 1999). Because an ideal mate for both men and women is one who is healthy, fertile, and investing, one might predict few sex differences in preferences for traits that signal these attributes. Indeed, both men and women show preferences for traits that have been linked to health, such as symmetry and averageness (reviewed in Little et al., 2011b; Rhodes, 2006). The same prediction might be made for preferences for enhanced sex-typical characteristics (i.e., male masculinity and female femininity), but research shows that men tend to have strong, consistent preferences for feminine female faces, while women do not have strong, consistent preferences for masculine male faces (Perrett et al., 1998).

In this chapter, I will briefly review the evidence for similarity between women's and men's face preferences before focusing on

women's preferences for male masculinity. First, I will review the evidence for a sex difference in preferences for exaggerated sex-typical characteristics in opposite-sex faces. Next, I will outline the trade-off theory (Gangestad & Simpson, 2000) and evidence supporting this explanation for systematic variation in women's preferences for male masculinity. Finally, I will describe some of the controversy surrounding certain aspects of this theory.

Sex Similarity in Face Preferences

Symmetry

Symmetry is proposed to be a useful proxy for health and quality because levels of fluctuating asymmetry (i.e., nondirectional deviations from perfect symmetry) increase when organisms are subject to a wide range of stressors during development, such as pathogens or genetic diseases (Thornhill & Møller, 1997). While some have proposed that preferences for symmetry are simply an artifact of human visual perception (Enquist & Arak, 1994; Enquist & Johnstone, 1997), both men and women prefer symmetry in upright, but not inverted, opposite-sex faces (Little & Jones, 2003). Indeed, the correlation between measured asymmetry and attractiveness judgments is same for male and female faces (Jones et al., 2001). Additionally, while ecological factors and individual differences affect the extent of preferences for symmetry, both men

L.M. DeBruine (✉)
Institute of Neuroscience and Psychology, University of
Glasgow, Scotland G12 8QB, UK
e-mail: lisa.debruine@glasgow.ac.uk

V.A. Weekes-Shackelford and T.K. Shackelford (eds.), *Evolutionary Perspectives on Human Sexual Psychology and Behavior*, Evolutionary Psychology, DOI 10.1007/978-1-4939-0314-6_14,
© Springer Science+Business Media New York 2014