

面孔吸引力的理论综述

韩容康

浙江理工大学理学院, 浙江 杭州

收稿日期: 2023年9月8日; 录用日期: 2023年10月13日; 发布日期: 2023年10月24日

摘要

面孔吸引力是近年来一个关注热点, 在心理学、社会学乃至生活的方方面面都产生了不小的影响。面孔吸引力是目标人物面孔做诱发的一种积极情绪并驱使他人产生接近的意愿。本文介绍了面孔吸引力在健康、择偶、合作、决策等方面对人们的影响, 从进化论方向、认知方向以及社会文化方向三方面综述了相关的重要理论, 以及前人研究的不足。

关键词

面孔吸引力, 进化心理学, 认知取向, 社会文化取向

A Theoretical Review of Facial Attractiveness

Rongkang Han

School of Science, Zhejiang Sci-Tech University, Hangzhou Zhejiang

Received: Sep. 8th, 2023; accepted: Oct. 13th, 2023; published: Oct. 24th, 2023

Abstract

Facial attractiveness has been a hot spot in recent years, and it has had a big impact in psychology, sociology and even all aspects of life. Facial attractiveness is a positive emotion that the target face induces and drives others to approach. This paper introduces the impact of facial attractiveness on people in health, mate selection, cooperation, decision-making, and reviews the relevant important theories from three aspects: evolutionary direction, cognitive direction and social and cultural direction, as well as the shortcomings of previous research.

Keywords

Facial Attractiveness, Evolutionary Psychology, Cognitive Orientation, Socio-Cultural Orientation

Copyright © 2023 by author(s) and Hans Publishers Inc.

This work is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution International License (CC BY 4.0).

<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>



Open Access

1. 面孔吸引力与“美的就是好的”刻板印象

Dion, Berscheid, & Walster (1972)提出“*What is beautiful is good*”的观点,即“美的就是好的”。Burns & Farina (1987)提出了 A-R-D 理论,该理论解释外貌吸引力具有的三种功能属性:态度(attitude)、强化(reinforce)和方向(directive)。认为高外貌吸引力激发了他人愉悦的情绪体验(态度),并且增加了(正强化)他人积极情绪,促使他人接近(方向)高外貌吸引力个体(比如产生搭讪、约会和微笑等行为)。这个理论用动态角度解释了面孔吸引力如何引发个体的行为。现有许多文献表明,不论观察者是男性还是女性,观察者都认为相对于男性化的女性面孔,女性化的女性面孔被认定为更有吸引力(Komori, Kawamura, & Ishihara, 2009),并且具有跨文化一致性(Scott, Swami, Josephson, & Penton-Voak, 2008),而对于男性面孔的性别化偏好情况则出现分歧,女性偏好男性化的男性和偏好女性化的男性各有证据支持(Fink & Penton-Voak, 2002; Brown, Cash, & Noles, 1986; Cunningham, Barbee, & Pike, 1990; Dunkle & Francis, 1996; Grammer & Thornhill, 1994; Johnston et al., 2001; O'Toole et al., 1998; Penton-Voak et al., 2001; Scheib, Gangestad, & Thornhill, 1999; Dunkle & Francis, 1990; Little, Burt, Penton-Voak, & Perrett, 2001; Little & Hancock, 2002; Penton-Voak et al., 2003; Perrett et al., 1998; Rhodes, Hickford, & Jeffery, 2000)。

2. 面孔吸引力在各领域中的研究意义

在生活中许多方面中(比如法律、商业、政治等领域),都存在着对个体偏好高外貌吸引力的现象。这种偏好甚至影响和改变了选举和法律的审判(Olivola, Funk, & Todorov, 2014; Poutvaara, 2014; Stockemer & Praino, 2015)。Lorenzo, Biesanz, & Human (2010)研究验证了“美的就是好的”这种刻板印象,并且发现高外貌吸引力的个体的自我性格报告被认为具有更高的准确性。总的来说,高外貌吸引力的人自带“光环效应”,并且被认为具有更多积极的人格特质。长得好看的人也比长得不好看的人更容易被人积极地看待和对待(Dion, Berscheid, & Walster, 1972)。

2.1. 面孔吸引力与健康

前人做了大量关于健康与面孔吸引力之间的关系的研究(Kalick et al., 1998; Bogin & Varela-Silva, 2010; Little, 2014; Henderson, Holzleitner, Talamas, & Perrett, 2016; Stephen & Wei, 2015; Weeden & Sabini, 2005)。社会建构主义观点认为外貌吸引力和健康之间没有必然的关系,对是否有吸引力的判断仅仅反映了一种社会理想和大众媒体或时尚业的偏好(Fallon, 1990; Englis et al., 1994; Freedman, 1984)。Kalick et al. (1998)通过纵向采集了 164 名男性和 169 名女性在青春期后期的照片,以及这些人在青春期、中年和成年后期的健康数据,来研究面孔吸引力与身体健康的关系。发现,无论是男性还是女性,青少年时期的面部吸引力都与青少年时期的健康无关,也不能预测青少年时期的健康状况。

过往以进化心理学视角做的研究发现:面孔吸引力可以作为个体身体健康的外在信号,二者有正相关关系(Symons, 1995; Gangestad & Scheyd, 2005)。比如(Henderson & Anglin, 2003)的研究中发现:面孔吸引力被评价越高,个体在生活中的寿命也越长。即面孔吸引力可能与健康存在正相关。而(Hönekopp et al., 2007)的研究发现身体吸引力可以作为预测男性健康的指标,二者呈显著正相关,而健康与面孔吸引力相关不显著。Foo, Simmons, & Rhodes (2017)的研究中发现男性精液质量与其面孔平均化呈负相关,与其面

孔男性化特质呈正相关；女性感知到的健康状态与女性化特征有关，然而研究者并没有在女性中发现健康状态与面孔吸引力的相关。

以上研究表明，面孔吸引力、身体吸引力、健康程度三者关系较为复杂，有待进一步探究。

2.2. 面孔吸引力与择偶

进化论认为一些面孔的特质可以反映身体健康等一系列配偶品质的线索(Rhodes, 2006; Confer, Perilloux, & Buss, 2010)。Maestripieri, Henry, & Nickels (2017)从进化心理学的视角指出，个体倾向高外貌吸引力是为了接近高面孔吸引力的个体，具有一定的功能性。该行为可能会增加与高面孔吸引力的个体成为配偶的可能性。

男性化特征与男性长期健康有正相关，且通常与基因健康联系在一起，这样女性就可以在择偶过程中获得高质量后代，从而间接受益。并且在漫长的进化过程中，个体已经形成并内化了快速准确地识别具有这些特征的异性的能力。由于这些特征代表了较高的配偶价值，所以这种内化的行为可以增加高面孔吸引力作为伴侣的可能性(Fink & Penton-Voak, 2002; Thornhill & Gangestad, 1999; van Dongen, 2014; Gangestad & Simpson, 2000; 徐华伟等, 2016)。

2.3. 面孔吸引力与合作

最后通牒博弈(ultimatum game, UG)范式是(Güth, Schmittberger, & Schwarze, 1982)提出的，该范式和囚徒困境博弈(Prisoner's Dilemma Game, PDG)范式共同用于个体合作的研究。比如(Mulford, Orbell, Shatto, & Stockard, 1998)的研究用 PDG 范式制造了集体利益与个体利益相矛盾的情境，结果发现：被试都喜欢与高面孔吸引力的人合作，并且被试自我评价和他人评价的交互作用显著，自我评价高的个体也喜欢与他们认为有吸引力的人合作。有研究使用静态面孔图片作为实验材料，也得到了与上述研究类似的发现，即被试都喜欢与面孔吸引力高的异性有更多的合作，且这种结果不受被试性别的影响(Bhagal, Galbraith, & Manktelow, 2016a, 2016b)。高面孔吸引力对合作行为的促进可能是由于“美即是好(being beautiful is good)”的刻板印象导致的。人们通常认为高面孔吸引力的人更值得信赖、更友善，于是人们对其展现出更多的合作和利他行为(Little, Burt, & Perrett, 2006)。

然而，Bhagal 等人用 UG 范式并且用真人互动代替静态面孔材料进行研究，结果发现，被试并未对吸引力高的被试表现出更多的利他行为，合作行为也没有受到被试面孔吸引力的影响，而公平性才是主导被试分配的驱动因素。这种结果不一致的原因可能是身体吸引力在真人互动中并未发生促进利他行为的作用。这与 Saad & Gill (2001)的研究发现一致。

2.4. 面孔吸引力与决策

人类思维活动的最高级形式之一是决策，在人类的社会生活中有重要作用。然而有研究发现，面孔吸引力可以改变个体对决策是否公平的认知。Solnick & Schweitzer (1999)采用 UG 范式研究发现：提议人提供给有吸引力的回应人的钱多余没有吸引力的回应人；也有类似的研究发现回应人更有可能接受面孔吸引力高的异性提议人的不公平分配(Ma, Hu, Jian, & Meng, 2015)。这些证据表明，个体吸引力的高低，导致了别人的区别对待，这支持了美丽溢价假说(Beauty Premium Hypothesis)，然而，已有的一些文献对简单的“美貌溢价假说”提出了质疑。Krupp 及其同事(2011)在信任游戏(TG)中，证实了合作伙伴面部的健康会影响人类的互惠性。Krupp 等人通过实验操纵外表健康(外表健康是吸引力的可靠组成部分)，测试了这种影响是否源于吸引力本身，结果发现参与者没有向有吸引力的游戏伙伴投入更多，而是向有吸引力的伴侣回报更多。然而，在(Solnick & Schweitzer, 1999)的实验中大部分都依赖于吸引力的自然变化，

并没有操纵外表健康从而改变吸引力,这可能会将“吸引力”的一般属性与其中的特定组成部分混为一谈。这也可能是与 Krupp 等人的实验发现不同的原因。

Smith 等人(2009a)在一项研究中发现,只有当参与者知道他们的游戏伙伴可以看到他们时,有吸引力的被试才会比没有吸引力的被试有更多的合作行为。这些发现表明,信任游戏中,信任行为依赖于环境。信任行为的发生不仅与参与者的外表吸引力有关,还与他们是否相信自己能被合作伙伴看到有关。

3. 对面孔吸引力的重要性加以解释的理论取向

为什么人们偏爱有吸引力的面孔,以往对面孔吸引力的解释主要有进化论取向和认知论取向,也有学者提出了社会文化取向(胡媛艳, 2019; 郑毓煌, 陈瑞, 2015)。

3.1. 进化论取向

女性生理周期有 3 个阶段: 月经期(menstrual phase), 排卵期(fertility/ovulation phase)和黄体期(luteal phase), 女性行为和心理状态受生理周期变化的影响(Wilcox, Dunson, & Baird, 2000)。

女性偏好的男性面孔与女性生理周期相关, 生理周期影响雌激素与黄体酮水平, 从而影响了女性对男性化的男性面孔的偏好。男性化的男性脸通常意味着良好的基因和健康条件(Zaidel, Aarde, & Baig, 2005; Fink, Neave, Manning, & Grammer, 2006), 但是也与一些消极的品质相联系, 比如亲代投资意愿较低、强势、难以合作等等; 而女性化的男性面孔与积极的心理品质相联系, 比如亲代投资意愿强、可以信赖、容易合作等(Perrett et al., 1998; Smith et al., 2009b)。过往的许多论文都假设, 在与具有阳刚特征的男性交配所带来的“好基因”利益与其所带来的负面人格特征(如攻击性等)之间存在一种权衡。

有研究认为, 相比于女性化的男性面孔, 男性化的男性面孔有更大的进化优势和遗传免疫力。女性在进化过程中形成了在排卵期更倾向于男性化的男性面孔, 从而保证后代有较好的基因(Little & Jones, 2012; 陈瑞, 郑毓煌, 2015)。Grebe, Gangestad, Garver-Apgar, & Thornhill (2013)的调查发现: 男女的投入在排卵期不会影响女性发起性行为的次数, 而在黄体期男性投入与女性主动发起性行为次数呈负相关; 女性投入与女性主动发起性行为次数呈正相关。Saad & Stenstrom (2012)用跟踪日志法研究女性的行为, 发现她们在黄体期有更多的食物和物质消费行为。这些研究表明: 由于女性在黄体期时不易怀孕, 同时也有获取物质资源的动机, 女性进化出了延展的性能力(extended sexuality), 以模糊男性对自己是否处于排卵期的识别, 从而持续获得男性物质资源。

3.1.1. 配偶价值理论

成为他人潜在伴侣的价值叫个体的配偶价值(Edlund & Sagarin, 2010)。配偶价值一般是通过个体的形态行为特征来推断, 比如自身的健康状态(生育能力、年龄、健康)、基因质量(精子和卵子质量)、表型条件(外貌吸引力)持有资源(社会资源与地位、以及当下和对未来的经济预期)。人们已经进化出识别这些特征的能力, 通过选择将伴侣的配偶价值最大化, 这也会导致配偶选择标准的演变(Howie & Pomiankowski, 2018)。

个体的外貌特征差异是判断其配偶价值差异的重要特征。虽然实际上善良和智慧在择偶过程中都是必要的考虑条件(Li, Bailey, Kenrick, & Linsenmeier, 2002)。但是男性倾向于选择面孔和身材具有高吸引力的女性, 因为这意味着具有较高的生殖潜力; 而女性则注重男性的社会经济地位, 这是为了给后代提供充足的保障(Buss, 2004; Thornhill, 1998)。在选择配偶时, 外貌吸引力作为男女双方的重要考虑条件, 但外貌吸引力对于男性择偶过程的影响更大。然而以往文献并没有明确解释外貌吸引力在择偶中对男女双方影响程度以及影响程度的差异如何。

Li, Bailey, Kenrick, & Linsenmeier (2002)提出了新的观点解释男女择偶时在面孔吸引力偏好程度上的差异。“必需品”是个体的初级需要,而“奢侈品”是个体满足初级需要后,相对不太重要的部分。前者在预算低限制高情况下首先被考虑,当“必需品”被满足后,个体对其需求下降并且在预算中的比例也减少,个体从而将基础需求转向“奢侈品”需求。Li, Valentine, & Patel (2010)的研究发现:在高限制低预算的情况下,男性仍然优先选择高面孔吸引力的女性交往,而不考虑自身吸引力是否与伴侣匹配。即,男性将伴侣的面孔吸引力而不是社会资源和地位视为必需品;而女性将伴侣的社会资源和地位视为“必需品”而把伴侣的面孔吸引力视为“奢侈品”。女性会选择伴侣与自身面孔吸引力相差不大的伴侣(Todd, Penke, Fasolo, & Lenton, 2007),在男性伴侣社会资源和地位充足的时候,女性才可能降低男性配偶的外貌标准。

然而男性的社会资源和地位的优势并不能完全弥补面孔吸引力缺失带来的损害,即便女性将面孔吸引力视为“奢侈品”,也并不会选择低面孔吸引力的伴侣。男性必须要具有一定的面孔吸引力,否则即便具备理想的人格特质,女性也不会将其选择为合适的伴侣(Agthe, Spörrle, & Maner, 2010)。Li, Bailey, Kenrick, & Linsenmeier (2002)表示:在潜在伴侣进行初步筛选时,女性通常希望确保对方的社会地位至少处于中等水平。男人通常希望,女人的外表吸引力至少是中等水平。在这些必需品上,低于平均水平的伤害远远大于高于平均水平带来的好处。此外,他们的研究结果证实,当选择最受限时,性别偏好的差异最为明显。即,女性和男性偏好模式的差异主要源于对地位、资源和身体吸引力的不同重视。随着预算的增加和限制的减少,女性和男性的择偶偏好更加相似。

3.1.2. 性选择理论

一般来说,自然界生物繁育后代时,雄性产生的是小而廉价的精子,并且可以更快地补充配子并准备下一次交配,而雌性释放大而昂贵的卵子所代表的总投资要大于雄性射精所代表的总投资(Trivers, 1972)。除此之外,雌性通常还要付出比雄性更多的时间和精力来怀孕、哺乳、照顾后代(Møller & Birkhead, 1993; Clutton-Brock, 1991; Schwagmeyer et al., 1999),因此雌性比雄性在繁殖后代上的投入更大,雌性也更愿意选择具有优良基因的伴侣以保证后代存活率。于是雄性必须通过竞争来获得与雌性的交配权,即雄性产生了性内选择(intrasexual selection)。性内选择和性间选择(intersexual election)构成了性选择(Andersson & Iwasa, 1996; 李宏利, 张雷, 2010)。

面孔吸引力是指看到某个面孔所诱发的愉悦情绪体验,并产生驱使他人接近的意愿,研究中通常用面孔吸引力来衡量个体的外貌吸引力。外貌吸引力是一个包含多维度的概念(皮肤、嗓音、面孔吸引力、身体吸引力等)(寇慧等, 2013; 温芳芳, 2016)。在外貌吸引力的众多维度中,面孔吸引力是衡量外貌吸引力最有效的指标,它比身体吸引力有更好的衡量外貌吸引力的作用,过往的研究也大都使用面孔吸引力直接衡量外貌吸引力(Burleson, Hall, & Gutierrez, 2016; Meltzer, McNulty, Jackson, & Karney, 2014; Butler, Saville, Ward, & Ramsey, 2017; Michal, 2018)。而影响面孔吸引力的众多因素中,平均化(averageness)、对称性(symmetry)与性别二态性(sexual dimorphism)是三个最主要的因素(徐华伟, 牛盾, 李倩, 2016; Rhodes, 2006; Trujillo, Jankowitsch, & Langlois, 2014; Yang, Chen, Hu, Zheng, & Wang, 2015)。

相比于外貌条件一般的个体,拥有较高外貌吸引力的个体有更高的恋爱成功率、更多的伴侣和更多的繁衍后代数量,同时高外貌吸引力的个体会吸引更多个体与其建立短期的(短于一个月)伴侣关系;身材更加平均化的男性也有更多婚外性行为(extra-pair copulations, EPC)(Rhodes, 2006; Rhodes et al., 2005; Jokela, 2009; Langlois et al., 2000; Perilloux, Cloud, & Buss, 2013)。偏女性化面孔的女性有更多恋爱时长长于一年的伴侣。同时,具有身体吸引力的男性和面孔偏女性化且对称的女性都比同龄人发生更早的性行为,身材高大的男性和高挑的女性有更多短期伴侣。

3.1.3. 亲子关怀差异理论

配子是交配前亲代投资的一种形式。亲代投资理论(Parental Investment Theory)由(Trivers, 1972)提出, 对于人类而言, 虽然女性有漫长的孕期, 并且对后代有巨大的精力和资源投资, 但是从长远来看, 男女为后代的付出都是巨大的。甚至有证据表明, 男性护理和关怀可以增加他对父亲身份的确定性(Ah-King et al., 2005; Kvarnemo, 2006)。

在亲代投资理论的基础上, 形成了亲子关怀差异理论(Different Parental Solicitude Theory)。该理论认为: 为了提高生殖成功的概率, 父母会根据子女不同的健康状况和生殖潜能进行相应的投资, 质量高、健康条件好的后代会得到父母更多的投资(Buss, 2004)。类似的(Langlois & Sawin, 1981)研究表明, 与没有吸引力的正常婴儿相比, 有吸引力的婴儿的母性养育/反应性更强。同样, Field & Vega-Lahr (1984)的研究表明, 与面部轻微畸形的婴儿相比, 有吸引力的正常婴儿的母性养育/反应性更强。以上研究表明, 面孔吸引力的高低可以作为衡量父母对后代投入多少的指标, 即, 后代面孔吸引力越高, 父母对其投入程度就越大(Barden, Ford, Jensen, Rogers-Salyer, & Salyer, 1989; Langlois et al., 2000)。

3.2. 社会文化取向

社会文化取向的理论认为人们对面孔吸引力的评价受到社会文化的影响, 因此不同的文化可能对吸引力的判断不同(Berry, 2000)。大多数社会心理学家从“社会文化”的角度来看待吸引力效应(Jackson, 1992)。在一个特定的文化中, 由于社会化导致该文化下的人们形成了什么是有吸引力的看法和共识。虽然大量的研究表明, 人们对有吸引力面孔的判断有跨文化(Rhodes, Harwood, Yoshikawa, Nishitani, & McLean, 2002)、跨年龄(Bronstad & Russell, 2007)的一致性, 但是不同的文化在给予妇女地位和尊重的程度上是不同的。在自给经济或女性生产高市场价值的文化中, 女性地位往往相对较高(Rosenblatt & Cunningham, 1976)。那些女性有更大自主权的社会群体理想化了有明显成熟特征的女性, 而强调女性顺从的文化中理想化了有圆圆的脸颊, 最小的颧骨突出和小嘴巴等较少成熟特征的女性(cf. Banner, 1983)。

也有研究表明, 与老年人的特征相比, 人类对婴儿的反应也更为积极(Alley, 1983; Sternglanz, Gray, & Murakami, 1977), 新生儿的特征似乎引起了成年人本能的保护和照顾反应。人类婴儿越接近理想婴儿的面部结构, 成人的评价就越积极。正如 Jackson (1992)所指出的, 社会文化视角的基本观点是吸引力的决定因素本质上是任意的; 外表吸引力的价值是文化赋予的。

3.3. 认知取向

有吸引力的面孔会激发如杏仁核、眶额皮层、基底神经节等与情绪和奖赏相关的脑区(Ishai, 2007; Winston et al., 2007)。人对面孔是否有吸引力的感知并不受控制, 偏好平均化的面孔可能只是偏好熟悉信息的表现形式, 是自动化的或者是人们认知加工过程中的副产品, 对面孔的偏好可以推广到更广泛的加工目标中, 比如经过计算机处理过的动物和物品。也就是说人们对平均化面孔的偏好仅仅是一种大脑的信息加工方式, 并不能反映进化和择偶的相关信息(Aharon et al., 2001; Rhodes, 2006; Halberstadt & Rhodes, 2003; Winkielman, Halberstadt, Fazendeiro, & Catty, 2006)。

众多研究表明, 在判断异性面孔是否有吸引力时, 男女的认知加工有差异。通过 fMRI 研究也可以观察到男女在看到有吸引力的面孔时不同的脑区被激活。这些脑区主要是与情绪和奖赏有关(O'Doherty et al., 2003; Kranz & Ishai, 2006; Kampe, Frith, Dolan, & Frith, 2001; Nakamura et al., 1998; Cloutier et al., 2008; Aharon et al., 2001; Iaria, Fox, Waite, Aharon, & Barton, 2008; Ishai, 2007; Penton-Voak, Jacobson, & Tribers, 2004; Senior, 2003)。

使用面孔分类任务发现: 面孔刺激的性别和被试性别在丘脑和眶额皮层的激活上有显著的交互作用。

喜欢女性面孔的被试(异性恋的男性和同性恋的女性)对女性面孔激活更大, 喜欢男性面孔的被试(异性恋的女性和同性恋的男性)对男性面孔的激活更大(Kranz & Ishai, 2006)。

有研究发现面孔整体加工的 N170 受面孔性别因素的影响, 不同性别的面孔刺激得到了不同的结果, 这有可能是因为大脑识别面孔时可能同时会处理面孔的性别信息, 于是在面孔性别和激活的脑区之间产生了交互作用(罗一峰等, 2006)。研究者用事件相关电位(ERPs)技术让被试做学习-再认实验任务, 来探究男性在判断女性面孔材料时的脑内变化。结果发现: 在大脑皮层的中前部区域, 有无吸引力的面孔引发的 ERP 早晚成分出现了最大的差异, 有吸引力的女性面孔比无吸引力的女性面孔诱发了更大的 ERP 成分; 并且男生对有吸引力的女性面孔再认正确率更高, 面孔的反应时更长。这可能是由于男性在进化过程中保留了识别有吸引力女性特征的能力, 因为这些特征意味着高生育能力(张妍等, 2010)。

4. 不足与展望

虽然在面孔吸引力领域的研究已经取得不少成果, 但是仍然有些不足。第一, 面孔吸引力研究中的刺激一般是静态的图片刺激, 并且受图片处理方法的影响, 会造成与真实三维立体的面孔吸引力判断的偏差, 未来的研究应尝试以立体的面孔刺激作为实验材料, 来进行面孔吸引力的判断。第二, 面孔吸引力相关的理论中, 有关进化论方面的研究较多, 但是以社会文化角度或者以生物文化社会三方面交互作用的理论研究较少, 这也是未来值得探讨的方向。第三, 在媒体、短视频如此发达的年代, 不同文化下对于美或者有吸引力的定义是否发生改变、生物进化因素和社会文化因素在媒体盛行的时代下是否也会发生改变, 这也是在未来中值得探讨的。

参考文献

- 胡媛艳(2019). 性别二态性对男性面孔吸引力感知偏好的影响. 博士学位论文, 重庆: 西南大学.
- 寇慧, 苏艳华, 张妍, 孔繁昌, 胡媛艳, 王洋, 陈红(2013). 面孔吸引力的影响因素: 观察者假设. *心理科学进展*, 21(12), 2144-2153.
- 李宏利, 张雷(2010). 求偶动机对男性冒险行为倾向的影响. *心理学报*, 42(5), 618-624.
- 罗一峰, 吴钢, 周曙, 吕田明, 陆兵勋, 刘玲, 等(2006). 面孔认知中性别信息对 N170 的影响. *中国临床康复*, 10(26), 1-3.
- 温芳芳(2016). 男性化与女性化: 面孔吸引力研究. 华中师范大学出版社.
- 徐华伟, 牛盾, 李倩(2016). 面孔吸引力和配偶价值: 进化心理学视角. *心理科学进展*, 24(7), 1130-1138.
- 张妍, 孔繁昌, 陈红, 向燕辉, 高笑, 陈敏燕(2010). 男性对女性面孔吸引力的认知偏好: 来自 ERP 的证据. *心理学报*, 42(11), 1060-1072.
- 郑毓煌, 陈瑞(2015). 进化的女性生理周期: 波动的繁衍动机和行为表现. *心理科学进展*, 23(5), 836-848.
- Agthe, M., Spörrle, M., & Maner, J. K. (2010). Don't Hate Me Because I'm Beautiful: Anti-Attractiveness Bias in Organizational Evaluation and Decision Making. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 46, 1151-1154. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2010.05.007>
- Aharon, I., Etcoff, N., Ariely, D., Chabris, C. F., O'Connor, E., & Breiter, H. C. (2001). Beautiful Face Shave Variable Reward Value: fMRI and Behavioral Evidence. *Neuron*, 32, 537-551. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0896-6273\(01\)00491-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0896-6273(01)00491-3)
- Ah-King, M., Kvarnemo, C., & Tullberg, B. S. (2005). The Influence of Territoriality and Mating System on the Evolution of Male Care: A Phylogenetic Study on Fish. *Journal of Evolutionary Biology*, 18, 371-382. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1420-9101.2004.00823.x>
- Alley, T. R. (1983). Infantile Head Shape as an Elicitor of Adult Protection. *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly*, 29, 411-427.
- Andersson, M., & Iwasa, Y. (1996). Sexual Selection. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution*, 11, 53-58. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0169-5347\(96\)81042-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/0169-5347(96)81042-1)
- Banner, L. W. (1983). *American Beauty*. University of Chicago Press.
- Barden, R. C., Ford, M. E., Jensen, A. G., Rogers-Salyer, M., & Salyer, K. E. (1989). Effects of Craniofacial Deformity in Infancy on the Quality of Mother-Infant Interactions. *Child Development*, 60, 819-824. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1131022>

- Berry, D. S. (2000). Attractiveness, Attraction, and Sexual Selection: Evolutionary Perspectives on the Form and Function of Physical Attractiveness. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, 32, 273-342. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0065-2601\(00\)80007-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0065-2601(00)80007-6)
- Bhagal, M. S., Galbraith, N., & Manktelow, K. (2016a). Physical Attractiveness, Altruism and Cooperation in an Ultimatum Game. *Current Psychology*, 36, 549-555. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12144-016-9443-1>
- Bhagal, M. S., Galbraith, N., & Manktelow, K. (2016b). Sexual Selection and the Evolution of Altruism: Males Are More Altruistic and Cooperative towards Attractive Females. *Letters on Evolutionary Behavioral Science*, 7, 10-13. <https://doi.org/10.5178/lebs.2016.42>
- Bogin, B., & Varela-Silva, M. I. (2010). Leg Length, Body Proportion, and Health: A Review with a Note on Beauty. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 7, 1047-1075. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph7031047>
- Bronstad, P. M., & Russell, R. (2007). Beauty Is in the “We” of the Beholder: Greater Agreement on Facial Attractiveness among Close Relations. *Perception*, 36, 1674-1681. <https://doi.org/10.1068/p5793>
- Brown, T. A., Cash, T. F., & Noles, S. W. (1986). Perceptions of Physical Attractiveness among College Students: Selected Determinants and Methodological Matters. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 126, 305-316. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00224545.1986.9713590>
- Burleson, M. H., Hall, D. L., & Gutierrez, S. E. (2016). Age Moderates Contrast Effects in Women’s Judgments of Facial Attractiveness. *Evolutionary Behavioral Sciences*, 10, 179-187. <https://doi.org/10.1037/ebs0000040>
- Burns, G. L., & Farina, A. (1987). Physical Attractiveness and Self-Perception of Mental Disorder. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, 96, 161-163. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-843X.96.2.161>
- Buss, D. M. (2004). *Evolutionary Psychology: The New Science of the Mind*. Pearson/Allyn and Bacon.
- Butler, E. E., Saville, C. W. N., Ward, R., & Ramsey, R. (2017). Physical Attraction to Reliable, Low Variability Nervous Systems: Reaction Time Variability Predicts Attractiveness. *Cognition*, 158, 81-89. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cognition.2016.10.012>
- Cloutier, J., Heatherton, T. F., Whalen, P. J., & Kelley, W. M. (2008). Are Attractive People Rewarding? Sex Differences in the Neural Substrates of Facial Attractiveness. *Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience*, 20, 941-951. <https://doi.org/10.1162/jocn.2008.20062>
- Clutton-Brock, T. H. (1991). *The Evolution of Parental Care*. Princeton University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9780691206981>
- Confer, J. C., Perilloux, C., & Buss, D. M. (2010). More than Just a Pretty Face: Men’s Priority Shifts toward Bodily Attractiveness in Short-Term versus Long-Term Mating Contexts. *Evolution and Human Behavior*, 31, 348-353. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.evolhumbehav.2010.04.002>
- Cunningham, M. R., Barbee, A. P., & Pike, C. L. (1990). What Do Women Want? Facialmetric Assessment of Multiple Motives in the Perception of Male Facial Physical Attractiveness. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 59, 61-72. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.59.1.61>
- Dion, K., Berscheid, E., & Walster, E. (1972). What Is Beautiful Is Good. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 24, 285-305. <https://doi.org/10.1037/h0033731>
- Dunkle, J. H., & Francis, P. L. (1990). The Role of Facial Masculinity/Femininity in the Attribution of Homosexuality. *Sex Roles*, 23, 157-167. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00289863>
- Dunkle, J. H., & Francis, P. L. (1996). “Physical Attractiveness Stereotype” and the Attribution of Homosexuality Revisited. *Journal of Homosexuality*, 30, 13-29. https://doi.org/10.1300/J082v30n03_02
- Edlund, J. E., & Sagarin, B. J. (2010). Mate Value and Mate Preferences: An Investigation into Decisions Made with and without Constraints. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 49, 835-839. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2010.07.004>
- Englis, B. G., Solomon, M. R., & Ashmore, R. D. (1994). Beauty before the Eyes of the Beholder: The Cultural Encoding of Beauty Types in Magazine Advertising and Music Television. *Journal of Advertising* 23, 49-64. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00913367.1994.10673441>
- Fallon, A. (1990). Culture in the Mirror: Sociocultural Determinants of Body Image. In T. F. Cash, & T. Pruzinsky (Eds.), *Body Images: Development, Deviance, and Change* (pp. 80-109). Guilford Press.
- Field, T., & Vega-Lahr, N. (1984). Early Interactions between Infants with Cranio-Facial Anomalies and Their Mothers. *Infant Behavior and Development*, 7, 527-530. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0163-6383\(84\)80012-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0163-6383(84)80012-0)
- Fink, B., & Penton-Voak, I. (2002). Evolutionary Psychology of Facial Attractiveness. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 11, 154-158. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-8721.00190>
- Fink, B., Neave, N., Manning, J. T., & Grammer, K. (2006). Facial Symmetry and Judgments of Attractiveness, Health and Personality. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 41, 491-499. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2006.01.017>

- Foo, Y. Z., Simmons, L. W., & Rhodes, G. (2017). Predictors of Facial Attractiveness and Health in Humans. *Scientific Reports*, 7, Article No. 39731. <https://doi.org/10.1038/srep39731>
- Freedman, R. J. (1984). Reflections on Beauty as It Relates to Health in Adolescent Females. *Women and Health*, 9, 29-45. https://doi.org/10.1300/J013v09n02_03
- Gangestad, S. W., & Scheyd, G. J. (2005). The Evolution of Human Physical Attractiveness. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 34, 523-548. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.anthro.33.070203.143733>
- Gangestad, S. W., & Simpson, J. A. (2000). The Evolution of Human Mating: Trade Offs and Strategic Pluralism. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 23, 573-644. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0140525X0000337X>
- Grammer, K., & Thornhill, R. (1994). Human (Homo Sapiens) Facial Attractiveness and Sexual Selection: The Role of Symmetry and Averageness. *Journal of Comparative Psychology*, 108, 233-242. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0735-7036.108.3.233>
- Grebe, N. M., Gangestad, S. W., Garver-Apgar, C. E., & Thornhill, R. (2013). Women's Luteal-Phase Sexual Proceptivity and the Functions of Extended Sexuality. *Psychological Science*, 24, 2106-2110. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0956797613485965>
- Güth, W., Schmittberger, R., & Schwarze, B. (1982). An Experimental Analysis of Ultimatum Bargaining. *Journal of Economic Behavior and Organization*, 3, 367-388. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0167-2681\(82\)90011-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/0167-2681(82)90011-7)
- Halberstadt, J., & Rhodes, G. (2003). It's Not Just Average Faces That Are Attractive: Computer-Manipulated Averageness Makes Birds, Fish, and Automobiles Attractive. *Psychonomic Bulletin and Review*, 10, 149-156. <https://doi.org/10.3758/BF03196479>
- Henderson, A. J., Holzleitner, I. J., Talamas, S. N., & Perrett, D. I. (2016). Perception of Health from Facial Cues. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, 371, Article ID: 20150380. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rstb.2015.0380>
- Henderson, J. A., & Anglin, J. M. (2003). Facial Attractiveness Predicts Longevity. *Evolution and Human Behavior*, 24, 351-356. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1090-5138\(03\)00036-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1090-5138(03)00036-9)
- Hönekopp, J., Rudolph, U., Beier, L., Liebert, A., & Müller, C. (2007). Physical Attractiveness of Face and Body as Indicators of Physical Fitness in Men. *Evolution and Human Behavior*, 28, 106-111. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.evolhumbehav.2006.09.001>
- Howie, J. M., & Pomiankowski, A. (2018). Mate Value. In T. Shackelford, & V. Weekes-Shackelford (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of Evolutionary Psychological Science* (pp. 1-8). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-16999-6_1802-1
- Iaria, G., Fox, C. J., Waite, C. T., Aharon, I., & Barton, J. J. S. (2008). The Contribution of the Fusiform Gyrus and Superior Temporal Sulcus in Processing Facial Attractiveness: Neuropsychological and Neuroimaging Evidence. *Neuroscience*, 155, 409-422. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroscience.2008.05.046>
- Ishai, A. (2007). Sex, Beauty and the Orbitofrontal Cortex. *International Journal of Psychophysiology*, 63, 181-185. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijpsycho.2006.03.010>
- Jackson, L. A. (1992). *Physical Appearance and Gender: Sociobiological and Sociocultural Perspectives*. State University of New York Press.
- Johnston, V. S., Hagel, R., Franklin, M., Fink, B., & Grammer, K. (2001). Male Facial Attractiveness: Evidence for Hormone-Mediated Adaptive Design. *Evolution & Human Behavior*, 22, 251-267. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1090-5138\(01\)00066-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1090-5138(01)00066-6)
- 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. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.evolhumbehav.2009.03.006>
- Kalick, S. M., Zebrowitz, L. A., Langlois, J. H., & Johnson, R. M. (1998). Does Human Facial Attractiveness Honestly Advertise Health? Longitudinal Data on an Evolutionary Question. *Psychological Science*, 9, 8-13. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9280.00002>
- Kampe, K. K. W., Frith, C. D., Dolan, R. J., & Frith, U. (2001). Reward Value of Attractiveness and Gaze. *Nature*, 413, 589-589. <https://doi.org/10.1038/35098149>
- Komori, M., Kawamura, S., & Ishihara, S. (2009). Effect of Averageness and Sexual Dimorphism on the Judgment of Facial Attractiveness. *Vision Research*, 49, 862-869. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.visres.2009.03.005>
- Kranz, F., & Ishai, A. (2006). Face Perception Is Modulated by Sexual Preference. *Current Biology*, 16, 63-68. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cub.2005.10.070>
- Krupp, D. B., DeBruine, L. M., & Jones, B. C. (2011). Apparent Health Encourages Reciprocity. *Evolution and Human Behavior*, 32, 198-203. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.evolhumbehav.2010.10.001>
- Kvarnemo, C. (2006). Evolution and Maintenance of Male Care: Is Increased Paternity a Neglected Benefit of Care? *Beha-*

- vioral Ecology*, 17, 144-148. <https://doi.org/10.1093/beheco/ari097>
- Langlois, J. H., & Sawin, D. B. (1981). Infant Physical Attractiveness as an Elicitor of Differential Parenting Behaviors. In *The Biennial Meetings of the Society for Research in Child Development*.
- Langlois, J. H., Kalakanis, L., Rubenstein, A. J., Larson, A., Hallam, M., & Smoot, M. (2000). Maxims or Myths of Beauty? A Meta-Analytic and Theoretical Review. *Psychological Bulletin*, 126, 390-423. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.126.3.390>
- Li, N. P., Bailey, J. M., Kenrick, D. T., & Linsenmeier, J. A. (2002). The Necessities and Luxuries of Mate Preferences: Testing the Tradeoffs. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 82, 947-955. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.82.6.947>
- Li, N. P., Valentine, K. A., & Patel, L. (2010). Mate Preferences in the US and Singapore: A Cross-Cultural Test of the Mate Preference Priority Model. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 50, 291-294. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2010.10.005>
- Little, A. C. (2014). Facial Attractiveness. *Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews: Cognitive Science*, 5, 621-634. <https://doi.org/10.1002/wcs.1316>
- Little, A. C., & Hancock, P. J. B. (2002). The Role of Masculinity and Distinctiveness in Judgments of Human Male Facial Attractiveness. *British Journal of Psychology*, 93, 451-464. <https://doi.org/10.1348/000712602761381349>
- Little, A. C., & Jones, B. C. (2012). Variation in Facial Masculinity and Symmetry Preferences across the Menstrual Cycle Is Moderated by Relationship Context. *Psychoneuroendocrinology*, 37, 999-1008. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psyneuen.2011.11.007>
- Little, A. C., Burt, D. M., & Perrett, D. I. (2006). What Is Good Is Beautiful: Face Preference Reflects Desired Personality. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 41, 1107-1118. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2006.04.015>
- Little, A. C., Burt, D. M., Penton-Voak, I. S., & Perrett, D. I. (2001). Self-Perceived Attractiveness Influences Human Female Preferences for Sexual Dimorphism and Symmetry in Male Faces. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Science*, 268, 39-44. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2000.1327>
- Lorenzo, G. L., Biesanz, J. C., & Human, L. J. (2010). What Is Beautiful Is Good and More Accurately Understood: Physical Attractiveness and Accuracy in First Impressions of Personality. *Psychological Science*, 21, 1777-1782. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0956797610388048>
- Ma, Q., Hu, Y., Jiang, S., & Meng, L. (2015). The Undermining Effect of Facial Attractiveness on Brain Responses to Fairness in the Ultimatum Game: An ERP Study. *Frontiers in Neuroscience*, 9, Article No. 77. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fnins.2015.00077>
- Maestripieri, D., Henry, A., & Nickels, N. (2017). Explaining Financial and Prosocial Biases in Favor of Attractive People: Interdisciplinary Perspectives from Economics, Social Psychology, and Evolutionary Psychology. *Behavioral & Brain Sciences*, 40, E19. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0140525X16000340>
- Meltzer, A. L., McNulty, J. K., Jackson, G. L., & Karney, B. R. (2014). Sex Differences in the Implications of Partner Physical Attractiveness for the Trajectory of Marital Satisfaction. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 106, 418-428. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0034424>
- Michal, K. (2018). Do Gender and Physical Attractiveness Affect College Grades? *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 43, 151-161. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2017.1307320>
- Møller, A. P., & Birkhead, T. R. (1993). Certainty of Paternity Covaries with Paternal Care in Birds. *Behavioral Ecology and Sociobiology*, 33, 261-268. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02027123>
- Mulford, M., Orbell, J., Shatto, C., & Stockard, J. (1998). Physical Attractiveness, Opportunity, and Success in Everyday Exchange. *American Journal of Sociology*, 103, 1565-1592. <https://doi.org/10.1086/231401>
- Nakamura, K., Kawashima, R., Nagumo, S., Ito, K., Sugiura, M., Kato, T. et al. (1998). Neuroanatomical Correlates of the Assessment of Facial Attractiveness. *Neuroreport*, 9, 753-757. <https://doi.org/10.1097/00001756-199803090-00035>
- O'Doherty, J., Winston, J., Critchley, H., Perrett, D., Burt, D. M., & Dolan, R. J. (2003). Beauty in a Smile: The Role of Medial or Bitofrontalcortex in Facial Attractiveness. *Neuropsychologia*, 41, 147-155. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0028-3932\(02\)00145-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0028-3932(02)00145-8)
- 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 & Cognition*, 26, 146-160. <https://doi.org/10.3758/BF03211378>
- Olivola, C. Y., Funk, F., & Todorov, A. (2014). Social Attributions from Faces Bias Human Choices. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 18, 566-570. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tics.2014.09.007>
- Penton-Voak, I. S., Jacobson, A., & Trivers, R. (2004). Populational Differences in Attractiveness Judgments of Male and Female Faces: Comparing British and Jamaican Samples. *Evolution and Human Behavior*, 25, 355-370.

- <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.evolhumbehav.2004.06.002>
- 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*, 268, 1617-1623. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2001.1703>
- Penton-Voak, I. S., Little, A. C., Jones, B. C., Burt, D. M., Tiddeman, B. P., & Perrett, D. I. (2003). Female Condition Influences Preferences for Sexual Dimorphism in Faces of Male Humans (Homo Sapiens). *Journal of Comparative Psychology*, 117, 264-271. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0735-7036.117.3.264>
- Perilloux, C., Cloud, J. M., & Buss, D. M. (2013). Women's Physical Attractiveness and Short-Term Mating Strategies. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 54, 490-495. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2012.10.028>
- Perrett, D. I., Lee, K. J., Penton-Voak, I. S., Rowland, D., Yoshikawa, S., Burt, D. M. et al. (1998). Effects of Sexual Dimorphism on Facial Attractiveness. *Nature*, 394, 884-887. <https://doi.org/10.1038/29772>
- Poutvaara, P. (2014). Facial Appearance and Leadership: An Overview and Challenges for New Research. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 25, 801-804. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2014.08.003>
- Rhodes, G. (2006). The Evolutionary Psychology of Facial Beauty. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 57, 199-226. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.57.102904.190208>
- Rhodes, G., Harwood, K., Yoshikawa, S., Nishitani, M., & McLean, I. (2002). The Attractiveness of Average Faces: Cross-Cultural Evidence and Possible Biological Basis. In G. Rhodes, & L. A. Zebrowitz (Eds.), *Facial Attractiveness: Evolutionary, Cognitive and Social Perspectives* (pp. 35-58). Ablex.
- Rhodes, G., Hickford, C., & Jeffery, L. (2000). Sex-Typicality and Attractiveness: Are Supermale and Superfemale Faces Super-Attractive. *British Journal of Psychology*, 91, 125-140. <https://doi.org/10.1348/000712600161718>
- Rhodes, G., Simmons, L. W., & Peters, M. (2005). Attractiveness and Sexual Behavior: Does Attractiveness Enhance Mating Success? *Evolution and Human Behavior*, 26, 186-201. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.evolhumbehav.2004.08.014>
- Rosenblatt, P. C., & Cunningham, M. R. (1976). Sex Differences in Cross Cultural Perspective. In B. Lloyd, & J. Archer (Eds.), *Exploring Sex Differences*. Academic Press.
- Saad, D., & Gill, T. (2001). Sex Differences in the Ultimatum Game: An Evolutionary Psychology Perspective. *Journal of Bioeconomics*, 3, 171-193. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1020583425623>
- Saad, G., & Stenstrom, E. (2012). Calories, Beauty, and Ovulation: The Effects of the Menstrual Cycle on Food and Appearance-Related Consumption. *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, 22, 102-113. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcps.2011.10.001>
- Scheib, J. E., Gangestad, S. W., & Thornhill, R. (1999). Facial Attractiveness, Symmetry and Cues of Good Genes. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London, Series B*, 266, 1913-1917. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.1999.0866>
- Schwagmeyer, P. L., St Clair, R. C., Moodie, J. D., Lamey, T. C., Schnell, G. D., & Moodie, M. N. (1999). Species Differences in Male Parental Care in Birds: A Reexamination of Correlates with Paternity. *The Auk*, 116, 487-503. <https://doi.org/10.2307/4089381>
- Scott, I., Swami, V., Josephson, S. C., & Penton-Voak, I. S. (2008). Context-Dependent Preferences for Facial Dimorphism in a Rural Malaysian Population. *Evolution and Human Behavior*, 29, 289-296. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.evolhumbehav.2008.02.004>
- Senior, C. (2003). Beauty in the Brain of the Beholder. *Neuron*, 38, 525-528. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0896-6273\(03\)00293-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0896-6273(03)00293-9)
- Smith, F. G., DeBruine, L. M., Jones, B. C., Krupp, D. B., Welling, L. L. M., & Conway, C. A. (2009a). Attractiveness Qualifies the Effect of Observation on Trusting Behavior in an Economic Game. *Evolution and Human Behavior*, 30, 393-397. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.evolhumbehav.2009.06.003>
- Smith, F. G., Jones, B. C., Welling, L. L. W., Little, A. C., Vukovic, J., Main, J. C., & DeBruine, L. M. (2009b). Waist-Hip Ratio Predicts Women's Preferences for Masculine Male Faces, but Not Perceptions of Men's Trustworthiness. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 47, 476-480. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2009.04.022>
- Solnick, S. J., & Schweitzer, M. E. (1999). The Influence of Physical Attractiveness and Gender on Ultimatum Game Decisions. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 79, 199-215. <https://doi.org/10.1006/obhd.1999.2843>
- Stephen, I. D., & Wei, T. K. (2015). Healthy Body, Healthy Face? Evolutionary Approaches to Attractiveness Perception. In S. Haque, & E. Sheppard (Eds.), *Culture and Cognition: A Collection of Critical Essays* (pp. 45-65). Peter Lang AG.
- Sternglanz, S. H., Gray, J. L., & Murakami, M. (1977). Adult Preferences for Infantile Facial Features: An Ethological Approach. *Animal Behavior*, 25, 108-115. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0003-3472\(77\)90072-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/0003-3472(77)90072-0)
- Stockemer, D., & Praino, R. (2015). Blinded by Beauty? Physical Attractiveness and Candidate Selection in the U.S. House of Representatives. *Social Science Quarterly*, 96, 430-443. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ssqu.12155>
- Symons, D. (1995). *Beauty Is in the Adaptations of the Beholder: The Evolutionary Psychology of Human Female Sexual Attractiveness* (A. P. R. & P. S. D. Eds.). The University of Chicago Press.

- Thornhill, R. (1998). Physical Attractiveness and the Theory of Sexual Selection: Results from Five Populations. *American Journal of Human Biology*, 10, 541-542. [https://doi.org/10.1002/\(SICI\)1520-6300\(1998\)10:4<541::AID-AJHB14>3.0.CO;2-8](https://doi.org/10.1002/(SICI)1520-6300(1998)10:4<541::AID-AJHB14>3.0.CO;2-8)
- Thornhill, R., & Gangestad, S. W. (1999). Facial Attractiveness. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 3, 452-460. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1364-6613\(99\)01403-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1364-6613(99)01403-5)
- Todd, P. M., Penke, L., Fasolo, B., & Lenton, A. P. (2007). Different Cognitive Processes Underlie Human Mate Choices and Mate Preferences. *Proceedings of National Academy Science of the USA*, 104, 15011-15016. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.0705290104>
- Trivers, R. L. (1972). Parental Investment and Sexual Selection. In B. Campbell (Ed.), *Sexual Selection and the Descent of Man* (pp. 136-179). Aldine Press.
- Trujillo, L. T., Jankowitsch, J. M., & Langlois, J. H. (2014). Beauty Is in the Ease of the Beholding: A Neurophysiological Test of the Averageness Theory of Facial Attractiveness. *Cognitive Affective & Behavioral Neuroscience*, 14, 1061-1076. <https://doi.org/10.3758/s13415-013-0230-2>
- van Dongen, S. (2014). Associations among Facial Masculinity, Physical Strength, Fluctuating Asymmetry and Attractiveness in Young Men and Women. *Annals of Human Biology*, 41, 205-213. <https://doi.org/10.3109/03014460.2013.847120>
- Weeden, J., & Sabini, J. (2005). Physical Attractiveness and Health in Western Societies: A Review. *Psychological Bulletin*, 131, 635-653. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.131.5.635>
- Wilcox, A. J., Dunson, D., & Baird, D. D. (2000). The Timing of the “Fertile Window” in the Menstrual Cycle: Day Specific Estimates from a Prospective Study. *British Medical Journal*, 32, 1259-1262. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.321.7271.1259>
- Winkielman, P., Halberstadt, J., Fazendeiro, T., & Catty, S. (2006). Prototypes Are Attractive Because They Are Easy on the Mind. *Psychological Science*, 17, 799-806. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9280.2006.01785.x>
- Winston, J., O’Doherty, J., Kilner, J., Perrett, D., & Dolan, R. (2007). Brain Systems for Assessing Facial Attractiveness. *Neuropsychologia*, 45, 195-206. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuropsychologia.2006.05.009>
- Yang, T., Chen, H., Hu, Y., Zheng, Y., & Wang, W. (2015). Preferences for Sexual Dimorphism on Attractiveness Levels: An Eye-Tracking Study. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 77, 179-185. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2014.12.005>
- Zaidel, D. W., Aarde, S. M., & Baig, K. (2005). Appearance of Symmetry, Beauty, and Health in Human Faces. *Brain and Cognition*, 57, 261-263. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bandc.2004.08.056>