ANBEH-D-15-00493-R1

Voice parameters predict sex-specific body morphology in men and women

Katarzyna Pisanski[a,*], Benedict C. Jones[b], Bernhard Fink[c,d], Jillian J.M. O'Connor[a], Lisa M. DeBruine[b], Susanne Röder[c,d], David R. Feinberg[a]

[a)] *Department of Psychology, Neuroscience & Behaviour, McMaster University, Canada*

[b)] Institute of Neuroscience and Psychology, University of Glasgow, Scotland

[c)] Department of Psychology, University of Göttingen, Germany

[d)] Courant Research Centre Evolution of Social Behavior, University of Göttingen, Germany

Running Title: Voice parameters predict sex-specific body size and shape

Word Count (main text and tables): 7001

* Address correspondence to: Katarzyna Pisanski, pisanska@mcmaster.ca

Department of Psychology, Neuroscience & Behaviour, McMaster University, 1280 Main Street West, Hamilton, Ontario, Canada, L8S 4K1. Phone: +1 (905) 525-9140, x. 28664. Fax: +1 (905) 529-6225.

Abstract

Studies of several mammalian species confirm that formant frequencies (vocal tract resonances) predict height and weight better than does fundamental frequency ($F0$, perceived as pitch) in same-sex adults due to differential anatomical constraints. However, our recent meta-analysis [Pisanski et al. (2014) *Animal Behaviour, 95,* 85-99] indicated that formants and $F0$ could explain no more than 10% and 2% of the variance in human height, respectively, controlling for sex and age. Here, we examined whether other voice parameters, many which are affected by sex hormones, can indicate additional variance in human body size or shape, and whether these relationships differ between the sexes. Using a cross-cultural sample of 700 men and women, we examined relationships among 19 voice parameters (min-max $F0$, mean $F0$, $F0$ variability, formant-based vocal tract length estimates, shimmer, jitter, harmonics-to-noise ratio) and 8 indices of body size or shape (height, weight, body-mass-index BMI, hip-, waist- and chest-circumferences, waist-to-hip ratio WHR, chest-to-hip ratio CHR). Our results confirm that formant measures explain the most variance in men's and women's heights and weights, whereas shimmer, jitter, and HNR do not indicate height, weight, or BMI in either sex. In contrast, these perturbation and noise parameters, in addition to $F0$ range and variability, explained more variance in body shape than did formants or mean $F0$, particularly among men. Shimmer or jitter explained the most variance in men's hip circumferences (12%) and CHRs (6%) whereas HNR and formants explained the most variance in women's WHRs (11%), and significantly more than in men's WHRs. Our study represents the most comprehensive analysis of vocal indicators of human body size to date and offers a foundation for future research examining the hormonal mechanisms of voice production in humans and perceptual playback experiments.

Keywords: voice; acoustic communication; sexual selection; formant; fundamental frequency; jitter; shimmer; body size; waist-to-hip ratio; chest-to-hip ratio

Many animals use vocalizations to communicate in social contexts. Vocalizations may communicate an animal's motivation state (Morton, 1977) but can also function as indexical cues to identity, sex, and various physical traits (Ghazanfar & Rendall, 2008; Owren, 2011). Bioacoustic analyses suggest that the vocalizations of mammals contain reliable and perpetually salient information about a vocalizer's body size and mass (Ey, Pfefferle, & Fischer, 2007; Pisanski, Fraccaro, Tigue, O'Connor, Röder, et al., 2014a; Taylor & Reby, 2010), and playback experiments suggest that both human and non-human listeners may use vocalizations to gauge the body size of conspecifics (e.g., humans, *Homo sapiens*: Charlton, Taylor, & Reby, 2013; Pisanski, Fraccaro, Tigue, O'Connor, & Feinberg, 2014b; Rendall, Vokey, & Nemeth, 2007; Smith & Patterson, 2005; red deer, *Cervus elaphus*: Charlton, Reby, & McComb, 2007; koalas, *Phascolarctos cinereus*: Charlton, Whisson, & Reby, 2013; rhesus macques, *Macaca mulatta*: Fitch & Fritz, 2006; dogs, *Canis lupus familiaris*: Taylor, Reby, & McComb, 2010).

Vocal Indicators of Body Size

Following the source-filter theory of speech production (Fant, 1960), researchers attempting to uncover which voice parameters may reliably indicate body size in humans and other mammals have focused on two largely independent features of the voice: mean fundamental frequency ($F0$, produced by vocal fold vibration and perceived as voice pitch) and formant frequencies (produced by filtering of the supralaryngeal vocal tract; Titze, 1994). Among humans, our recent meta-analysis showed that formants predict height and weight more reliably than does $F0$ when sex and age are controlled (Pisanski et al., 2014a). This finding supports the prediction that mammalian formants are more anatomically constrained than is $F0$ (Fitch, 1994, 2000) and corroborates findings from several other mammalian species (reviewed in Kreiman & Sidtis, 2011). However, the meta-analysis also highlighted that formants could explain no more than 10% of the variance in men's heights whereas mean $F0$ explained less than 2%. Formants accounted for even less of the variance in women's heights

(6%) whereas mean *F*0 was not significantly correlated with height among women (Pisanski et al., 2014a). Due to the limited number of studies investigating other kinds of voice-body relationships, the meta-analysis did not test whether vocal features other than mean *F*0 or formants could explain additional variance in human body size, and did not examine relationships between the voice and body shape, such as circumference parameters.

Fundamental Frequency Range and Variability

A growing literature suggests that several voice parameters, in addition to formants and mean *F*0, may indicate body size and shape in one sex or the other. These voice parameters include non-mean-based measures of fundamental frequency such as minimum *F*0, maximum *F*0, and *F*0 variability (the standard deviation of *F*0, *F*0 *sd*) that are sexually dimorphic (Puts, Apicella, & Cardenas, 2012). These source measures indicate the upper and lower range of an individual's voice pitch and the degree to which voice pitch deviates from baseline across an utterance. The standard deviation of men's *F*0 appears to be a particularly reliable indicator of status, correlating negatively with self-reported dominance, reproductive success, and testosterone levels (Hodges-Simeon, Gaulin, & Puts, 2010, 2011). In a cross-cultural study, Puts and colleagues (2012) found that *F*0 *sd* predicted self-reported physical aggression in American men, and was marginally negatively related to arm strength among American but not Hadza men. In that study, however, formants reliably predicted height in both samples of men, whereas *F*0 *sd* did not.

Vocal Perturbation and Noise

Vocal frequency perturbation (jitter), amplitude perturbation (shimmer), and noise (harmonics-to-noise ratio) parameters may also correlate with body size or shape as they relate to the mass and oscillating properties of the vocal folds. Jitter and shimmer measure the mean deviation in voice pitch or amplitude between adjacent cycles, whereas harmonics-to-noise ratio (HNR) measures the relative degree of periodicity to aperiodicity in the voice. A relatively high degree of jitter or shimmer or a low HNR can indicate irregular vocal fold vibration, often caused by laryngeal asymmetry in mass or tension, which can result in vocal breathiness and hoarseness (Buder, 2000). Traditionally these measures have been used by clinicians to assess voice quality in pathological voices (Maryn, Roy, De Bodt, Van Cauwenberge & Corthals, 2009), however several researchers have criticized the validity of jitter and shimmer as reliable indices of voice quality (Hillenbrand, 1987; Maryn et al., 2009; Kreiman & Gerratt, 2005).

Linders, Massa, Boersma and Dejonckere (1995) suggested that jitter and body size may be negatively related to the extent that larger, more massive vocal folds may result in a mechanical dampening of vocal fold oscillation, producing a steadier voice pitch (see also Lieberman 1963; Titze, 1988). However, vocal fold mass is more closely related to sex hormone levels than to height, where for example pubertal increases in testosterone masculinise and enlarge the vocal folds causing *F*0 to drop (Hollien, Green, & Massey, 1994; Prelevic, 2013). Indeed, researchers have long proposed that sex hormones may influence voice perturbation and noise parameters, either by affecting the mass of the vocal folds, or the motor and sensory processes involved in laryngeal control (e.g., Higgins & Saxman, 1989; Silverman & Zimmer, 1978; for more recent work see Gugatschka, Kiesler, Obermayer-Pietsch, Schoekler, Schmid, Groselj-Strele, & Friedrich, 2010; Prelevic, 2013). It follows that jitter, shimmer and HNR may relate to body size and in particular body shape via the shared influence of sex hormones on these vocal properties and on the development and distribution of fat and muscle on the body.

Relationships between perturbation or noise parameters and the human body have been examined in only a small number of studies with mixed results. González (2007) found that jitter correlated positively with women’s body mass, such that heavier women showed more irregularities in their voice pitch, whereas shimmer and HNR were relatively poor indicator’s of women’s, and even less so men's, heights and weights. In contrast, Linders et al. (1995) reported a negative correlation between jitter and height in prepubescent girls and boys independent of gender, suggesting that before puberty, shorter children show more irregularities in their voice pitch than do taller children. Finally, Hamdan et al. (2012) failed to find relationships between jitter or HNR and body size, but reported weak positive relationships between shimmer and trunk fat or muscle mass in men. The largest same-sex sample among these studies included only 81 individuals (González, 2007), which may be too few to detect various voice-body relationships.

Vocal Indicators of Body Shape

There is some evidence that information about body *shape*, not only height and weight, may be present in the human voice. The principle mechanism linking voice to body shape may be hormonal (Hughes & Gallup, 2008). In addition to affecting voice *F*0 and formants, and possibly also perturbation parameters (Abitbol, Abitbol, & Abitbol, 1999; Dabbs & Mallinger, 1999; Lieberman, McCarthy, Hiiemae, & Palmer, 2001), estrogens and androgens affect the circumferences of the waist, hips, and chest and the ratios among them (waist-to-hip ratio, WHR and chest-to-hip ratio, CHR), as well as an individual's body-mass-index or BMI (Blouin, Boivin, & Tchernof, 2008; Derby, Zilber, Brambilla, Morales, & McKinlay, 2006; Evans, Hoffmann, Kalkhoff, & Kissebah, 1983)[1].

Similar to physical height, indices of body shape such as WHR and CHR can provide socially relevant information about an individual (Hughes & Gallup, 2008). For instance, body shape predicts a wide range of health-related factors in both sexes, controlling for body mass (Blouin et al., 2008; Larsson et al., 1984; Seidell, 2009). Among women, WHR and BMI are robust predictors of fecundity and correlate with ratings of women's physical attractiveness from photographs (Kaye, Folsom,

---

[1] These indices of body shape are sexually dimorphic and can vary independently of one another within the same individual. It is also important to note that the distribution of fat and muscle mass on the body that determines body shape is largely independent of the amount of fat and muscle on the body that determines body mass (Singh & Singh, 2011).

Prineas, Potter, & Gapstur, 1990; Singh, 1993; Zaadstra et al., 1993). Women with lower WHRs are also rated as having more attractive voices (Hughes, Dispenza, & Gallup, 2009), and listeners are able to gauge women's WHRs from their voices alone (Hughes, Harrison, & Gallup, 2009). Among men, CHR and height positively predict physical attractiveness and reproductive success (Pawlowski, Dunbar, & Lipowicz, 2000; Swami et al., 2007). Like body size, body shape influences mate preferences across a range of human cultures (Pisanski & Feinberg, 2013) and is likely to be important for both mate selection and intersexual competition.

Few studies have examined vocal indicators of body shape compared to body size, and again the results of this work are mixed. Early studies examined relationships between principal components of voice and body shape (i.e., factor scores) in small samples of men or women (*n* = 26-34), making interpretation of results difficult. In these studies, Collins (2000) and Bruckert et al. (2006) failed to find relationships between voice and body shape components among men, whereas Collins and Missing (2003) reported that women with higher harmonics (integer multiples of $F0$) had lower scores on a body component comprised of BMI, weight, waist- and hip-circumference. Evans, Neave and Wakelin (2006) reported negative relationships between men's mean $F0$ and their shoulder- and chest-circumferences or shoulder-to-hip ratios, but no relationship between men's $F0$ and shoulder-to-waist or waist-to-hip ratios. More recently, in a sample of 109 women, Vukovic, Feinberg, DeBruine, Smith and Jones (2010) reported negative relationships between women's mean $F0$'s and their BMIs and hip-circumferences, but not waist circumferences or WHRs.

Key Research Questions

The present study addresses the key open research questions: (1) Do voice parameters other than formants and mean $F0$ explain additional variance in men's and women's heights and weights (i.e., body size)? (2) Does any voice parameter explain variance in the circumferences and circumference ratios of the waist, hips, and chest (i.e., body shape)? (3) Do voice parameters explain more variance in the body size or shape of one sex than the other? To answer these questions we examined relationships among 19 voice parameters and 8 indices of body size or shape in a large cross-cultural sample of adult men and women. To our knowledge, our study is the first to examine relationships between body shape and any of the following vocal parameters: minimum $F0$, maximum $F0$, $F0$ variability, jitter, shimmer and HNR. Although the voice-body relationships investigated in this study were chosen on the basis of the theoretical and empirical work reviewed above, the study is exploratory in nature. The principle aim of the study is to offer a comprehensive account of vocal correlates of body size and shape in humans that may help researchers to generate novel testable hypotheses concerning the mechanisms and functions of these relationships, and ultimately allow for a meta-analysis of less commonly studied voice-body relationships.

Methods

Sample Characteristics

Voice recordings and body measures derived from a total of 700 (*N*) adults from Canada (*n*= 118 women; 185 men), Scotland (*n*=235 women, 111 men) and Germany (*n*=85 women). Age data were available for the Canadian (men: 18.7 ± 1.5, women: 19 ± 2.3, range 17-30 years) and German samples (23.1 ± 2.2, range 19-30 years). Voice recordings and body measures were initially collected for other research; as a result, age data were unavailable for the Scottish sample and only female participants were included in the German sample. All participants were students at local universities who provided written informed consent to participate in the study and all procedures were approved by the research ethics review board.

Voice Recording

Participants were recorded in a sound attenuated chamber using a professional condenser microphone with a cardioid pick-up pattern and at an approximate distance of 5–10 cm. All participants were recorded speaking five vowel sounds. For the Canadian and German samples the five vowels were /ɑ/, /i/, /ɛ/, /o/, and /u/ (International Phonetic Alphabetic notation). For the UK sample the vowels were /eI/, /i/, /aI/, /o/, and /ju/.

Voice Measurement and Analysis

Voice measurements and analyses were performed in Praat (Boersma & Weenink, 2013). For each vocalizer we analyzed 19 voice parameters including minimum and maximum $F0$, mean $F0$, the standard deviation of $F0$ ($F0$ *sd*), three perturbation or noise parameters (shimmer, jitter, and harmonics-to-noise ratio, HNR), the first to fourth formants ($F1$-$F4$), and several amalgamated formant-based parameters, henceforth termed vocal tract length (VTL) estimates, that included: Average Formant Frequency, Fn (Pisanski & Rendall, 2011); Formant Dispersion, Df (Fitch, 1997), Formant Position, Pf (Puts et al., 2012); Formant Spacing and Apparent Vocal Tract Length derived from formant spacing, ΔF and VTL(ΔF) (Reby & McComb, 2003); Apparent Vocal Tract Length derived from mean formants, VTL(F_i) (adapted from Fitch, 1997; see also Titze, 1994); Geometric Mean Formant Frequency, MFF (Smith & Patterson, 2005); and factor scores from a confirmatory factor analysis, CFA (Turner, Walters, Monaghan, & Patterson, 2009). The algorithms used to compute VTL estimates are provided in Pisanski et al. (2014a). All mean voice measurements were taken from the steady-state portion of each of five isolated vowels per vocalizer, averaged within vocalizers, and then within sex to obtain mean values.

We measured all $F0$ parameters using Praat's autocorrelation algorithm with a search range set to 65-300 Hz for men and 100-600 Hz for women and measured formants $F1$–$F4$ using Praat's Burg Linear Predictive Coding algorithm with the initial settings of maximum formant set to 5000 Hz for men and 5500 Hz for women. Formants were first overlaid on a spectrogram and formant number was manually adjusted until the best visual fit of predicted onto observed formants was obtained (Boersma & Weenink, 2013; see Praat user manual, www.praat.org). The fundamental frequency and formant measures we obtained (see Table 1) agree well with weighted population-level averages (Pisanski et al., 2014a). From the mean $F1$–$F4$ values we computed eight different VTL estimates (Fn, Df, Pf, ΔF, VTL(ΔF), VTL(F_i), MFF, and CFA; see Table 1 for descriptive statistics, and Pisanski et al. (2014a) for additional details and algorithms used to compute VTL estimates).

We measured one noise parameter (HNR), five frequency perturbation or jitter parameters (local, local absolute, rap, ppq5, and ddp), and six amplitude perturbation or shimmer parameters (local, local dB, apq3, apq5, apq11, dda) using Praat's cross-correlation algorithm (Table 1; see also Baken & Orlikoff, 2000). The five jitter measures correlated significantly with one another (all $r>0.43$, all $P<0.001$), and the five shimmer measures correlated significantly with one another (all $r>0.88$, all $P<0.001$). Hence, using principal component analyses, we reduced each set of measures to a single dimension (henceforth termed Jitter and Shimmer) for which 78% and 94% of the variance was explained, respectively.

Body Size and Shape Measurement

We assessed a total of eight body size and shape measures including height, weight, body-mass-index (BMI), hip-circumference, waist-circumference, chest-circumference, waist-to-hip ratio (WHR), and chest-to-hip ratio (CHR) (see Table 1). Height was measured using a stadiometer or metric tape affixed to the wall and weight was measured using an electronic scale. Participant's BMI was computed as weight (kg) / height $(\mathrm{m})^2$ (where 18.5 to 24.9 indicates normal weight as defined by the World Health Organization). Circumference measures were taken using metric tape following previous work, i.e., waist-circumference was taken at the narrowest point between the rib cage and iliac crest, hip-circumference was taken at the widest point between the waist and thigh, and chest circumference was taken at the widest point with the tape measure placed under the arm pits and, for women, above the breasts (Evans et al., 2006; Hughes, Dispenza, & Gallup, 2004; Singh, 1993; Vukovic et al., 2010). Participant’s WHRs were computed as the ratio of the waist circumference to the hip circumference and CHRs were computed as the ratio of the chest circumference to the hip circumference.

Table 1. Means and standard deviations ($M \pm sd$) of individual vocal parameters and individual indices of body size or shape.

	Men	Women
Voice Parameters ($M \pm sd$)		
$F0$ mean (Hz)	114.16 ± 17.01	210.52 ± 21.58
$F0$ min (Hz)	90.03 ± 17.78	162.76 ± 40.20
$F0$ max (Hz)	179.19 ± 65.14	370.67 ± 146.33
$F0$ sd (Hz)	14.85 ±11.16	33.53 ± 24.19
$F1$ (Hz)	466.61 ± 45.92	516 ± 79
$F2$ (Hz)	1520.45 ± 140.33	1848 ± 200
$F3$ (Hz)	2592.49 ± 132.29	3020 ± 199
$F4$ (Hz)	3493.87 ± 187.54	4100 ± 217
Fn (Hz)	2015.99 ± 93.32	2293.55 ± 247.80
Df (Hz)	1008.84 ± 62.40	1194.79 ± 69.34
Pf (Z(Hz)	-0.58 ± 0.63	0.30 ± 0.47
ΔF (Hz)	1010.66 ± 46.09	1187.16 ± 66.21
VTL(F_i) (cm)	18.75 ± 2.10	15.61 ± 1.63
VTL(ΔF) (cm)	17.35 ± 0.79	14.79 ± 0.84
MFF (Hz)	1589.07 ± 71.37	1847.59 ± 133.57
Jitter local (%)	0.0958 ± 0.037	0.0911 ± 0.05
Jitter local absolute (s)	0.00013 ± 0.00007	0.00006 ± 0.00003
Jitter rap (%)	0.0066 ± 0.004	0.0072 ± 0.004
Jitter ppq5 (%)	0.0067 ± 0.004	0.0070 ± 0.004
Jitter ddp (%)	0.0199 ± 0.011	0.2146 ± 0.013
Shimmer local (%)	0.0958 ± 0.037	0.0911 ± 0.054
Shimmer local (dB)	0.9438 ± 0.315	0.8690 ± 0.454
Shimmer apq3 (%)	0.0416 ± 0.018	0.0425 ± 0.026
Shimmer apq5 (%)	0.0587 ± 0.028	0.0615 ± 0.044
Shimmer apq11(%)	0.0868 ± 0.039	0.0920 ± 0.076
Shimmer dda (%)	0.1249 ± 0.055	0.1285 ± 0.076
HNR (dB)	14.15 ± 3.21	14.73 ± 4.62
Body Measure ($M \pm sd$)		
Height (cm)	179.34 ± 7.16	166.37 ± 6.93
Weight (kg)	74.96 ± 12.44	63.28 ± 10.77
BMI	23.27 ± 3.26	22.87 ± 3.64
hip circ. (cm)	99.55 ± 7.87	99.20 ± 7.69
waist circ. (cm)	83.81 ± 8.12	74.54 ± 7.97
chest circ. (cm)	95.87 ± 8.57	88.67 ± 7.34
WHR	0.84 ± 0.06	0.75 ± 0.05
CHR	0.96 ± 0.07	0.90 ± 0.05

Abbreviations: $F0$ = fundamental frequency; $F1$-$F4$ = first to fourth formant; Fn = average formant frequency; MFF = geometric mean formant frequency; Df = formant dispersion; Pf = formant position; ΔF = formant spacing; VTL(F_i) = apparent vocal-tract length derived from mean formants; VTL(ΔF) = apparent vocal-tract length derived from formant spacing; HNR = harmonics-to-noise-ratio; BMI = body-mass-index; WHR = waist-to-hip ratio; CHR = chest-to-hip ratio; circ. = circumference.

a. See Baken & Orlikoff (2000) for detailed description and comparison of different jitter and shimmer measures.

Statistical Analysis

Shapiro-Wilk tests of normality indicated that many individual voice or body parameters were non-normally distributed. Hence, we examined relationships between the 19 individual voice parameters and 8 individual body size or shape parameters using non-parametric Spearman rank correlations (r_S). We then tested whether the strength of various voice-body relationships differed significantly for samples of men and women by transforming correlation coefficients using Fisher's *r*-to-*z* transformations and running a series of independent-samples inference tests (Myers & Sirois, 2006). As our goal was to examine predictive utility differences in the strength of relationships between sexes, we used the more conservative approach of comparing absolute r_s values (i.e., ignoring the sign of the correlation, which in some cases would have inflated the apparent sex difference). Effect sizes for sex differences in $|r_s|$ are given as Cohen's *q* (Cohen, 1988). All analyses were conducted for each sex separately and all statistical tests were two-tailed with an alpha of .05.

Results

Relationships Between Individual Voice and Body Parameters

Correlations between individual voice parameters and indices of body size and shape are reported in Table 2.

Table 2. Relationships between individual voice parameters and individual indices of body size or shape.

	Men								Women							
Parameter	height *n*=262	weight *n*=259	BMI *n*=259	hip circ. *n*=100	waist circ. *n*=100	chest circ. *n*=100	WHR *n*=100	CHR *n*=100	height *n*=438	weight *n*=436	BMI *n*=436	hip circ. *n*=297	waist circ. *n*=297	chest circ. *n*=297	WHR *n*=297	CHR *n*=297
F0 mean	**-.17****	-.09	-.01	-.10	-.08	-.09	.09	.03	**-.10***	**-.20****	**-.16****	**-.14***	**-.16****	**-.20****	-.09	-.11
F0 min	-.11†	**-.13***	-.08	.06	-.06	-.11	-.11	**-.20***	.04	-.03	-.05	.03	.01	-.03	-.04	-.09
F0 max	-.15*	**-.19***	**-.13***	**-.33****	-.18†	**-.21***	.10	.09	-.07	**-.16****	**-.14****	-.09†	**-.19****	**-.16****	-.14*	**-.10***
F0 *sd*	-.06	-.11†	-.09	**-.31****	-.13	-.13	.14	.15	-.07	**-.15****	**-.12***	**-.13***	**-.22****	**-.19****	**-.15***	-.09
Shimmer	.03	.01	-.01	**-.33****	-.12	-.10	.14	**.24***	-.05	-.08†	-.06	-.01	**-.22****	-.08	**-.27****	-.10
Jitter	-.01	-.05	-.06	**-.34****	-.15	-.15	.13	.15	-.04	-.08	-.06	-.02	**-.22****	**-.11***	**-.27****	**-.12***
HNR [a]	-.08	-.10	-.07	-.01	-.01	-.17	-.07	**-.21***	**-.11***	-.08	-.05	**-.21****	.08	-.11	**.33****	.14†
F1	**-.15***	**-.26****	**-.21***	**-.24****	-.12	**-.18***	.13	.06	**-.15****	**-.18****	**-.11***	**-.18****	.06	**-.14***	**.26****	.06
F2	-.09	-.02	.04	-.14	-.05	-.14	.16	.06	**-.15****	-.07	-.01	**-.17****	-.09	**-.14***	.08	.06
F3	**-.21****	**-.18****	-.08	**-.22***	-.10	**-.23***	.17†	.01	**-.18****	**-.15****	-.07	**-.18****	**-.16****	**-.17****	-.02	.01
F4	**-.25****	**-.19****	-.08	-.03	-.02	-.07	.10	-.06	**-.26****	**-.25****	**-.14****	**-.27****	**-.13***	**-.22****	.10†	.09
Fn	**-.26****	**-.18***	-.06	-.14	.04	-.15	.15	-.01	**-.22****	**-.19****	**-.10***	**-.25****	-.01	**-.18****	**.30****	**.12***
Df	**-.21****	**-.13***	-.02	.04	-.03	-.01	.07	-.08	**-.23****	**-.22****	**-.12***	**-.24****	**-.16****	**-.20****	.03	.08
Pf	**-.13***	**-.20****	**-.15***	**-.33****	-.14	**-.25***	**.24***	.11	**-.24****	**-.24****	**-.13****	**-.24****	-.07	**-.20****	**.17****	.08
ΔF	**-.25****	**-.18****	-.06	-.09	.03	-.13	.15	-.05	**-.24****	**-.22****	**-.11***	**-.26****	**-.15****	**-.22****	.08	.07
VTL(F_i)	**.18****	**.12***	.04	-.01	.02	.06	-.03	.07	**.16****	**.18****	**.11***	**.17****	-.06	.09†	**-.27****	-.11†
VTL(ΔF)	**.25****	**.18****	.05	.09	.03	.13	-.14	.05	**.25****	**.22****	**.11***	**.26****	**.15****	**.22****	-.08	-.07
MFF	**-.23****	**-.23****	**-.13***	**-.23***	-.11	**-.22***	.17†	.04	**-.23****	**-.21****	**-.11***	**-.23****	-.06	**-.18****	**.18****	.07
CFA [a]	**.27****	**.21****	.09	.18†	.07	.17†	**-.20***	-.05	**-.24****	**-.22****	**-.11***	**-.26****	-.04	**-.22***	**.20****	.05

Abbreviations: $F0$ = fundamental frequency; $F1$-$F4$ = first to fourth formant; Fn = average formant frequency; MFF = geometric mean formant frequency; Df = formant dispersion; Pf = formant position; ΔF = formant spacing; VTL(F_{i}) = apparent vocal-tract length derived from mean formants; VTL(ΔF) = apparent vocal-tract length derived from formant spacing; CFA = confirmatory factor analysis (factor scores); HNR = harmonics-to-noise-ratio; BMI = body-mass-index; WHR = waist-to-hip ratio; CHR = chest-to-hip ratio; circ. = circumference.

Statistical significance of bivariate Spearman's *rho* correlations (r_s) is based on a two-tailed *t* test, where ** $P<0.01$, * $P<0.05$, † $P<0.10$. Significant correlations ($P<0.05$) are bolded.

a. Sample sizes for women's HNRs were 185, and for women's CFA scores were 326 (height), 324 (weight, BMI), and 100 (circumference measures, WHR, CHR).

Vocal tract length estimates.

Compared to all other voice parameters, VTL estimates most strongly predicted height and weight within each sex, explaining upwards of 7.3% and 6.7% of the variance in men's heights and weights, respectively, and 6.7% and 6.3% of the variance in women's heights and weights, respectively. The VTL estimates correlated with men's and women's heights and weights more strongly than did mean $F0$ (barring $F1$ and $F2$) replicating the findings of Pisanski et al. (2014a). Although several VTL estimates correlated significantly with men's and women's BMIs, these relationships were weaker than for height or weight.

Among women, most VTL estimates also correlated significantly with women's hip-, chest- and waist-circumferences. The VTL estimates were also good predictor's of women's WHRs, wherein Fn explained 9% of the variance in WHRs among women. Despite our large sample size (*n*=297), power analysis (alpha=.05, power=.80) indicated that a sample size of only 85 is required for Fn to reliably predict women's WHRs. Among the VTL estimates, only Fn correlated significantly with women's CHRs, but explained a mere 1.4% of the variance. Compared to women, VTL estimates were relatively poor predictors of men's body shapes. Only $F1$, $F3$, Pf, or MFF correlated significantly with men's hip- and chest-circumferences, only Pf and CFA correlated with men's WHRs, and no VTL estimate correlated with men's waist circumferences or CHRs.

Fundamental frequency parameters.

Mean $F0$, while explaining some variance in height within each sex (2.6% among men and 1.9% among women) and in women's weights, BMIs, and circumference measures (up to 4%), did not significantly indicate WHR or CHR in either sex. Rather, $F0$ range and variability were better predictor's of body shape than was mean $F0$. Among these $F0$ parameters, minimum and maximum $F0$ significantly predicted men's and women's CHRs, respectively, and maximum $F0$ and $F0$ *sd* predicted women's WHRs. Maximum *F*0 and *F*0 *sd* also correlated significantly with circumference measures in each sex. Compared to mean *F*0, which did not indicate body shape among men, maximum *F*0 and *F*0 *sd* explained a noteworthy 11% of the variance in men's hip circumferences.

Vocal perturbation and noise parameters.

Shimmer, jitter, and HNR did not correlate with height, weight, or BMI in either sex, with the exception of HNR that explained a significant but small (1.2%) amount of the variance in women's heights. However, each of these parameters significantly predicted one or more indices of body shape including circumference measures, WHRs and CHRs. Compared to all other voice parameters, shimmer explained the most variance in men's CHRs (5.7%), followed by HNR (4.4%), whereas HNR explained the most variance in women's WHRs (10.8%), followed by *F*n (9%), VTL(F_i), jitter and shimmer (each 7.3%).

Sex differences.

Following Fisher's *r*-to-*z* transformations controlling for sample size, we tested whether the 19 individual voice parameters reported in Table 1 indicated body size or shape significantly better in one sex than the other. Our results indicated that HNR and VTL(F_i) predicted women's WHRs better than men's, and the VTL estimates *F*4 and *D*f predicted women's hip circumferences better than men's. In contrast, maximum *F*0, shimmer and jitter each predicted men's hip circumferences better than women's (see Table 3). Several trends were observed that did not reach statistical significance, namely: VTL estimates generally explained more variance in men's than women's heights; noise and perturbation parameters explained more variance in men's than women's CHRs; and mean *F*0 explained more variance in women's than men's weights, BMIs, and circumference measures.

Table 3. Significant sex differences in relationships between the voice and body shape

Body shape parameter	Voice measure	***z***	***p***	***q***
Stronger relationships in men:				
Hip circumference	Shimmer	2.84	<.01	.33
	Jitter	2.85	<.01	.33
	$F0$ max	2.16	.03	.25
Stronger relationships in women:				
WHR	HNR	2.33	.02	.27
	VTL(F_i)	2.11	.03	.25
Hip circumference	$F4$	2.11	.03	.25
	Df	2.43	.01	.29

Abbreviations: $F0$ = fundamental frequency; WHR = waist-to-hip ratio; HNR = harmonics-to-noise-ratio; VTL(F_i) = apparent vocal-tract length derived from mean formants; $F4$ = fourth formant; Df = formant dispersion.

Statistical significance is based on a two-tailed test comparing correlation coefficients following Fisher's *r*-to-*z* transformations. Only significant relationships ($p<.05$) are shown in this table. Effect sizes are given as Cohen's *q*, and all fall around the lower threshold of a medium effect size (.30).

General Discussion

Our findings demonstrate that the human voice can indicate both body size and shape among adult men and women. We extend the findings of a recent meta-analysis (Pisanski et al., 2014a), and show that in addition to formant frequencies, several other voice parameters including minimum and maximum $F0$, $F0$ variability, jitter, shimmer, and HNR may communicate meaningful information about body size or shape. We emphasize, however, that these voice parameters could explain only a small amount of the variation in various indices of human body size and shape controlling for sex and age, and in some cases, the strength of voice-body relationships varied between men and women. Our key findings are discussed in detail below.

Vocal Tract Length Estimates

Formants are constrained by the length and dimensions of the mammalian vocal tract that in turn is positively related to skull size and height between and within sexes (Fitch, 2000; Fitch & Giedd, 1999). Thus, formants predict vocal tract length in many mammals including humans (Fitch & Hauser, 2003; Taylor & Reby, 2010). In men, formants also appear to predict circulating levels of testosterone (Bruckert et al., 2006; Evans, Neave, Wakelin, & Hamilton, 2008) that can affect muscularity and the distribution of fat on men's bodies (Blouin et al., 2008), but it remains unknown whether sex hormones affect the formant frequencies of women's voices. Our results indicate that formant-based VTL estimates correlate with men's and women's heights and weights more reliably than other voice parameter investigated in this study. In addition, our study shows that VTL estimates correlate with one or more indices of body shape in each sex, including hip-, waist-, and chest-circumferences, WHRs and CHRs.

Formants were particularly robust indicators of body shape among women. One previous study tested but failed to find significant relationships between women's voice parameters (principal components representing *F*0 and formants) and body shape. This may be because the authors used factor scores in their regression analyses and a sample of only 30 women (Collins & Missing, 2003). Thus, our study presents the first evidence that formants can explain variation in women's body shapes given an adequate sample size (here, *n*=297, but power analysis suggested that a sample of *n*=85 would suffice). Moreover, many individual VTL estimates explained several times more variance in women's than men's circumference measures and WHRs. Indeed, only four formant measures (*F*1, *F*3, *P*f and MFF) significantly predicted variation in men's hip-circumferences and chest-circumferences, and one (CFA) predicted variation in men's WHRs, whereas no voice parameter predicted men's waist-circumferences. Theoretically, the finding that women's voices may carry information about their WHRs is in line with a growing body of literature implicating the 'hour-glass' shape of a woman's body as a key indicator of her age, fertility status, and health (Pisanski & Feinberg, 2013; Singh & Singh, 2011). As an important determinant of her physical attractiveness and desirability as a potential mate, a woman's body shape may be advertised through various modalities, including her voice. However, on a proximate level, the mechanism linking formants to women's WHRs remains unclear and will require a more comprehensive understanding of the relative roles of androgens and estrogens on formant production (particularly among women) and on regional fat distribution.

Fundamental Frequency Parameters

Previous studies have shown that when sex and age are controlled, mean fundamental frequency (*F*0 or voice pitch) is a weak predictor of height in humans (Pisanski et al., 2014a) and of body size in many other mammals (for reviews, see Ey et al., 2007; Fitch & Hauser, 2003). The mass and tension of the vocal folds determine mean *F*0 (Titze, 1994). However, human vocal folds can develop and grow independently of the rest of the body, as their mass appears more closely related to testosterone levels at puberty and into adulthood than to body size (Dabbs & Mallinger, 1999; Harries, Walker, Williams, Hawkins, & Hughes, 1997).

In our study, mean *F*0 predicted weight, BMI and body circumferences only among women, and did not predict WHR or CHR in either sex. Our results suggest that while mean *F*0 may indicate women's body masses, it is a relatively poor predictor of body shape in either sex, generally supporting the results of past work (Bruckert et al., 2006; Collins, 2000; but see controlling for age: Evans et al., 2006). Also in line with our results are those of a meta-analysis that showed a negative relationship between mean *F*0 and weight among women but not men (Pisanski et al. 2014a). One other study reported a significant negative correlation between women's mean *F*0 and factor scores derived from a principal component that included women's weights, BMIs, percentage body fat, waist- and hip-circumferences, and WHRs (Vukovic et al., 2010), however it is difficult to ascertain whether this relationship was driven by body mass, body shape, or both. One possible explanation for the apparent negative relationship between women's mean *F*0 and body mass is that relatively higher levels of androgens and/or lower levels of estrogens may cause some women to develop both more masculine voices (larger vocal folds and lower *F*0, Abitol et al., 1999; Titze, 1994) as well as more masculine bodies (heavier and more muscular, Björntorp, 1991; Blouin et al., 2008). The lack of a relationship between mean *F*0 and body mass in men suggests that the ratio of estrogens to androgens may play a key role in driving this relationship.

Although research in other animals indicates that a variety of voice features produced by the vocal source (i.e., the larynx and vocal folds for terrestrial mammals) play a role in acoustic communication (see, e.g., Reby & McComb, 2003; Tyack & Miller, 2002), most human studies examining the indexical functions of voice have focused on mean *F*0 (for reviews, see Feinberg, 2008; Puts, Jones, & DeBruine, 2012b). Our results indicate that *F*0 range and variability are generally better predictors of body shape than is mean *F*0. In particular, minimum *F*0 explained several times more variation in men's CHRs, and maximum *F*0 in men's circumference measures, than did mean *F*0. Indeed, physical height and the girth of the chest relative to the lower body are key predictor's of men's, but not women's, physical attractiveness (Pawlowski et al., 2000; Swami et al., 2007).

Similar to Puts et al. (2012), whose study samples included men from the northeastern US and Tanzania, we found that *F*0 variability was unrelated to height among men (and women) from three additional cultures. However, our results indicated that *F*0 *sd* explained 10% of the variance in men's hip-circumferences and correlated negatively with women's weight's, BMIs, circumferences measures and WHRs. Thus, in our study, low *F*0 variability indicated larger body circumferences in both sexes and more masculine (lower) WHRs among women. Other recent work investigating *F*0 variability in humans suggests that this sexually dimorphic voice parameter may be an important signal of quality. Low *F*0 variability produces a perceptually monotone voice that is more common among men than women (Puts et al., 2012), is associated with self-reported physical dominance and reproductive success in men (Hodges-Simeon et al., 2010, 2011), and may also predict circulating levels of testosterone and physical strength (Puts et al., 2012).

Vocal Perturbation and Noise Parameters

To our knowledge, no previous study has investigated relationships between perturbation or noise parameters and body shape. We found that jitter, shimmer and HNR each indicated one or more indices of body shape in both men and women. Shimmer and jitter correlated negatively with hip circumferences among men and with waist- and chest-circumferences among women. Both parameters explained around 12% of the variance in men's hip-circumferences, significantly more than in women's hip-circumferences.

Among women, shimmer and jitter correlated negatively with WHR (explaining 7% of the variance) and jitter with CHR, whereas HNR correlated positively with WHR and explained more variance in women's WHRs (11%) than did any other voice parameter. Thus, women with relatively low jitter and shimmer (less perturbation) and high HNRs (less noise) had relatively more masculine body shapes (higher WHRs or CHRs) than did other women. Some researchers have speculated that relationships between perturbation or noise parameters and body shape may be related to sex hormone levels, particularly among women (Linders et al., 1995; Silverman & Zimmer, 1978; Prelevic, 2013). As the vocal folds have androgen receptors that are sensitive to an influx in circulating testosterone, which increases vocal fold mass (Titze, 1994), women with relatively high androgen and/or low estrogen levels may experience a greater increase in vocal fold mass compared to other women. On the basis that larger vocal folds may oscillate with fewer irregularities than smaller vocal folds (Linders et al., 1995), jitter and shimmer may be lower, and HNR higher, among women with more masculine hormonal profiles and more masculine body shapes. Our results support this prediction for women, but not men, among whom shimmer correlated positively, and HNR negatively, with CHR. The possible mechanism linking voice perturbation and noise parameters to men's body shapes is unclear.

Our results further indicate that although perturbation and noise parameters predicted body shape, these parameters could not reliably predict height, weight, or BMI in either sex. Previous work has also generally failed to find robust relationships between these parameters and adult height (González, 2007; Hamdan et al., 2012; but see in children: Linders et al., 1995), however two studies reported significant positive relationships between jitter or shimmer and certain indices of body mass including body surface area, trunk fat, or muscle mass (González, 2007; Hamdan et al., 2012). As the results of studies to date are mixed, additional studies are needed to determine whether relatively taller or heavier adults show more irregularities in the pitch and amplitude of their voices than do others.

Limitations and Future Directions

Our voices and bodies change throughout the lifespan, but the most drastic changes occur at puberty and after the age of about 50 (Abitol et al., 1999; Hollien, Green & Massey, 1994). Hence, in the present study, we focused our analyses on adults aged 17-30 years to reduce possible age effects on voice-body relationships. Age data were unavailable for one sample (Scotland), however the sample was comprised of University students whose ages likely fell within this range. To test whether the strength of voice-body relationships changes across the lifespan, future work should include samples with a wider age range, including pre-pubescent children. Moreover, although our study included three large and independent samples of adults from Canada, Scotland and Germany, future replications of this work would also benefit from including multiple other cross-cultural samples, particularly from less industrialized regions of the world.

The voice-body relationships reported in this exploratory study warrant replication, particularly those between perturbation or noise parameters and body shape. Reliable measurement of jitter and shimmer is inherently difficult, particularly with voices in which these parameters are high, as their measurement requires accurate identification of cycle boundaries and may also vary as a function of recording hardware, acoustic analysis software, and verbal content (Buder, 2000; Maryn et al., 2009). These parameters can also be difficult to detect and discriminate acoustically (Hillenbrand, 1987; Kreiman & Gerratt, 2005). The average values of jitter, shimmer, and HNR in our samples fell within a non-pathological normal range. However, the mechanisms potentially linking these parameters to body size or shape remain unclear. In our study we have speculated about possible hormonal mechanisms linking variation in the human voice to variation in body size and shape, but we did not measure hormone levels in this study. Future studies may focus on further identifying the hormonal mechanisms of voice production in humans and elucidating the proximate causes of the relationships and sex differences in vocal cues to body size and shape reported here.

Unfortunately we cannot infer from our data whether sex differences in vocal cues to body size and shape are the product of sexual selection. It is equally likely, for instance, that men have been selected to exaggerate their body size by lowering the frequencies of their voices (Fitch & Giedd, 1999; Fitch & Reby, 2001; Morton, 1977), and may modulate their formants more than women in ways that reduce the degree to which formants honestly indicate body mass and shape, which are more malleable and variable than is height. At a proximate level, many factors may contribute to sex differences in vocal cues to body size and shape. The vocal tract and resultant formants are sexually dimorphic (Fitch

& Giedd, 1999; Titze, 1989). There are also marked sex differences in steroid hormone concentrations and in their effect on vocal anatomy (Abitbol et al., 1999; Lieberman et al., 2001) and on fat distribution (Blouin et al., 2008; Singh, 1993). All or any of these factors may affect the relative degree to which vocal parameters predict variation in body size and shape within and between sexes.

Intimately tied to the question of whether reliable indicators of body size and shape are present in the voice is whether listeners are able to accurately gauge size and shape from the voice and, if so, which vocal parameters listeners use to do so. Perceptual studies of voice have generally focused on listener's assessments of height and weight (Bruckert et al., 2006; Collins, 2000; Gonzalez, 2006; Krauss, Freyberg, & Morsella, 2002; Pisanski et al., 2014b; Rendall et al., 2007; Smith & Patterson, 2005). Although accuracy in these tasks is generally low, these studies indicate that listeners can gauge height and weight from the voice above chance, and that accuracy is highest (about 60%) in two-alternative forced choice paradigms. Compared to height and weight, relatively few studies have examined assessment of body shape from the voice. Hughes, Harrison and Gallup (2009) found that listeners were able to gauge women's WHRs (but not shoulder-to-hip ratios, SHRs), and men's SHRs (but not WHRs) from the voice alone. Future studies may test whether the sex of the listener affects the accuracy of body shape assessments, as there is some evidence that men are better than women in voice-based assessments of height (Charlton et al., 2013; but see also Rendall et al., 2007). Moreover, while it is clear that listeners utilize both $F0$ and formant information to gauge height (Charlton et al., 2013; Rendall et al., 2007; Pisanski et al, 2014b), it remains unknown whether listeners use jitter, shimmer or HNR to gauge either body size or shape from the voice. Evidence that listeners are generally insensitive to perturbation parameters in the normal range of variation (Kreiman & Gerratt, 2005) suggests that this is unlikely.

Conclusions

We examined relationships among a wide array of voice parameters and indices of both body size and shape in a large cross-cultural sample of men and women. In response to our research questions outlined in the Introduction, our results revealed that: (1) Formants predict height and weight in both men and women better than does any other voice parameter, including mean $F0$ and non-mean-based $F0$ parameters ($F0$ range and variability); (2) Various $F0$, formant, noise and perturbation parameters predicted body shape among men or women. Notably, $F0$ range and variability were better predictors of body shape than was mean $F0$ in both sexes, formants could explain a similar amount of variance in women's body shapes as in women's body sizes, and jitter, shimmer and HNR were particularly good predictors of body shape including women's WHRs and men's CHRs; (3) Various VTL estimates predicted women's WHRs and hip circumferences significantly better than men's, but shimmer, jitter and maximum $F0$ predicted men's hip circumferences better than women's. By informing and guiding future research investigating the mechanisms and functions of vocal communication in humans, these findings may provide further insight into how the human voice and body have been shaped by sexual selection (Puts et al., 2012b), and may offer practical applications for estimating the body size of vocalizers in criminal profiling and remote medical monitoring of obese or malnourished patients.

References

Abitbol, J., Abitbol, P., & Abitbol, B. (1999). Sex hormones and the female voice. *Journal of Voice*, *13*(3), 424–446. http://doi.org/10.1016/S0892-1997(99)80048-4

Baken, R. J., & Orlikoff, R. F. (2000). *Clinical measurement of speech and voice*. San Diego, CA: Singular Publishing Group.

Björntorp, P. (1991). Adipose tissue distribution and function. *International Journal of Obesity, 15*, 67-81.

Blouin, K., Boivin, A., & Tchernof, A. (2008). Androgens and body fat distribution. *The Journal of Steroid Biochemistry and Molecular Biology*, *108*(3-5), 272–280. http://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsbmb.2007.09.001

Boersma, P. & Weenink, D. (2013). *Praat: Doing phonetics by computer*. [Computer program].

Bruckert, L., Liénard, J. S., Lacroix, A., Kreutzer, M., & Leboucher, G. (2006). Women use voice parameters to assess men's characteristics. *Proceedings of the Royal Society Biological Sciences Series B, 273*, 83-89. http://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2005.3265

Buder, E. H. (2000). Acoustic analysis of voice quality: A tabulation of algorithms 1902–1990. In Kent, R. D. & Ball, M. J. (Eds.), *Voice quality measurement* (pp. 119–244). San Diego, CA: Singular Publishing Group.

Charlton, B. D., Reby, D., & McComb, K. (2007). Female red deer prefer the roars of larger males. *Biology Letters*, *3*(4), 382–385. http://doi.org/10.1098/rsbl.2007.0244

Charlton, B. D., Taylor, A. M., & Reby, D. (2013). Are men better than women at acoustic size judgements?. *Biology Letters*, *9*, 20130270. http://doi.org/10.1098/rsbl.2013.0270

Charlton, B. D., Whisson, D. A., & Reby, D. (2013). Free-ranging male koalas use size-related variation in formant frequencies to assess rival males. *PLoS ONE*, *8*(7), e70279. http://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0070279

Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences* (2nd ed.). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Collins, S. A. (2000). Men's voices and women's choices. *Animal Behaviour*, *60*(6), 773–780. http://doi.org/10.1006/anbe.2000.1523

Collins, S. A., & Missing, C. (2003). Vocal and visual attractiveness are related in women. *Animal Behaviour*, *65*(5), 997–1004. http://doi.org/10.1006/anbe.2003.2123

Dabbs, J. M., & Mallinger, A. (1999). High testosterone levels predict low voice pitch among men. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *27*(4), 801–804. http://doi.org/10.1016/S0191-8869(98)00272-4

Derby, C. A., Zilber, S., Brambilla, D., Morales, K. H., & McKinlay, J. B. (2006). Body mass index, waist circumference and waist to hip ratio and change in sex steroid hormones: the Massachusetts male ageing study. *Clinical Endocrinology*, *65*(1), 125–131. http://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2265.2006.02560.x

Evans, D. J., Hoffmann, R. G., Kalkhoff, R. K., & Kissebah, A. H. (1983). Relationship of androgenic activity to body fat topography, fat cell morphology, and metabolic aberrations in premenopausal women. *The Journal of Clinical Endocrinology & Metabolism*, *57*(2), 304–310. http://doi.org/10.1210/jcem-57-2-304

Evans, S., Neave, N., & Wakelin, D. (2006). Relationships between vocal characteristics and body size and shape in human males: An evolutionary explanation for a deep male voice. *Biological Psychology*, *72*(2), 160–163. http://doi.org/10.1016/j.biopsycho.2005.09.003

Evans, S., Neave, N., Wakelin, D., & Hamilton, C. (2008). The relationship between testosterone and vocal frequencies in human males. *Physiology & Behavior*, *93*(4-5), 783–788. http://doi.org/10.1016/j.physbeh.2007.11.033

Ey, E., Pfefferle, D., & Fischer, J. (2007). Do age- and sex-related variations reliably reflect body size in non-human primate vocalizations? A review. *Primates*, *48*(4), 253–267. http://doi.org/10.1007/s10329-006-0033-y

Fant, G. (1960). *Acoustic theory of speech production*. The Hague: Mouton.

Feinberg, D. R. (2008). Are human faces and voices ornaments signaling common underlying cues to mate value? *Evolutionary Anthropology*, *17*(2), 112–118. http://doi.org/10.1002/evan.20166

Fitch, W. T. (1994). *Vocal tract length perception and the evolution of language* (Doctoral dissertation). Brown University, Providence, RI.

Fitch, W. T. (1997). Vocal tract length and formant frequency dispersion correlate with body size in rhesus macaques. *Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*, *102*(2), 1213–1222. http://doi.org/10.1121/1.421048

Fitch, W. T. (2000). The evolution of speech: a comparative review. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, *4*(7), 258–267. http://doi.org/10.1016/S1364-6613(00)01494-7

Fitch, W. T., & Fritz, J. B. (2006). Rhesus macaques spontaneously perceive formants in conspecific vocalizations. *Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*, *120*(4), 2132–2141. http://doi.org/10.1121/1.2258499

Fitch, W. T., & Giedd, J. (1999). Morphology and development of the human vocal tract: A study using magnetic resonance imaging. *Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*, *106*(3), 1511–1522. http://doi.org/10.1121/1.427148

Fitch, W. T., & Hauser, M. (2003). Unpacking "honesty": vertebrate vocal production and the evolution of acoustic signals. In A. Simmons, A. N. Popper, & R. R. Fay (Eds.), *Acoustic Communication* (65-137). New York, NY: Springer.

Ghazanfar, A. A., & Rendall, D. (2008). Evolution of human vocal production. *Current Biology*, *18*(11), R457–R460. http://doi.org/10.1016/j.cub.2008.03.030

González, J. (2007). Correlations between speakers' body size and acoustic parameters of voice. *Perceptual and Motor Skills*, *105*(1), 215–220. http://doi.org/10.2466/pms.105.1.215-220

Gugatschka, M., Kiesler, K., Obermayer-Pietsch, B., Schoekler, B., Schmid, C., Groselj-Strele, A., & Friedrich, G. (2010). Sex hormones and the elderly male voice. *Journal of Voice, 24*(3), 369-373.

Hamdan, A.-L., Al-Barazi, R., Tabri, D., Saade, R., Kutkut, I., Sinno, S., & Nassar, J. (2012). Relationship between acoustic parameters and body mass analysis in young males. *Journal of Voice*, *26*(2), 144–147. http://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvoice.2011.01.011

Harries, M. L. L., Walker, J. M., Williams, D. M., Hawkins, S., & Hughes, I. A. (1997). Changes in the male voice at puberty. *Archives of Disease in Childhood*, *77*(5), 445–447. http://doi.org/10.1136/adc.77.5.445

Hodges-Simeon, C. R., Gaulin, S. J. C., & Puts, D. A. (2010). Different vocal parameters predict perceptions of dominance and attractiveness. *Human Nature*, *21*(4), 406–427. http://doi.org/10.1007/s12110-010-9101-5

Hodges-Simeon, C. R., Gaulin, S. J. C., & Puts, D. A. (2011). Voice correlates of mating success in men: examining "contests" versus "mate choice" modes of sexual selection. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, *40*(3), 551–557. http://doi.org/10.1007/s10508-010-9625-0

Hollien, H., Green, R., & Massey, K. (1994). Longitudinal research on adolescent voice change in males. *Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*, *96*, 2646–2654.

Hughes, S. M., Dispenza, F., & Gallup Jr, G. G. (2004). Ratings of voice attractiveness predict sexual behavior and body configuration. *Evolution and Human Behavior*, *25*(5), 295–304. http://doi.org/10.1016/j.evolhumbehav.2004.06.001

Hughes, S. M., & Gallup Jr, G. G. (2008). Why are we attracted to certain voices? Voice as an evolved medium for the transmission of psychological and biological information. In K. Ivdebski (Ed.), *Emotions in the Human Voice, Volume 2: Clinical Evidence*. California: Plural Publishing, Inc.

Hughes, S. M., Harrison, M. A., & Gallup Jr, G. G. (2009). Sex-specific body configurations can be estimated from voice samples. *Journal of Social, Evolutionary, and Cultural Psychology*, *3*(4), 343–355.

Kaye, S. A., Folsom, A. R., Prineas, R. J., Potter, J. D., & Gapstur, S. M. (1990). The association of body fat distribution with lifestyle and reproductive factors in a population study of postmenopausal women. *International Journal of Obesity*, *14*(7), 583–591.

Krauss, R. M., Freyberg, R., & Morsella, E. (2002). Inferring speakers' physical attributes from their voices. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, *38*(6), 618-625.

Kreiman, J., & Gerratt, B. R. (2005). Perception of aperiodicity in pathological voice. *Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*, *117*(4), 2201-2211.

Kreiman, J., & Sidtis, D. (2011). *Foundations of voice studies: An interdisciplinary approach to voice production and perception*. West Sussex, UK: Wiley-Blackwell. doi:10.1002/9781444395068

Larsson, B., Svärdsudd, K., Welin, L., Wilhelmsen, L., Björntorp, P., & Tibblin, G. (1984). Abdominal adipose tissue distribution, obesity, and risk of cardiovascular disease and death: 13 year follow up of participants in the study of men born in 1913. *British Medical Journal*, *288*(6428), 1401–1404.

Lieberman, P. (1963). Some acoustic measures of the fundamental periodicity of normal and pathologic larynges. *Journal of the Acoustical Society of America, 35*(3), 344-353.

Lieberman, D. E., McCarthy, R. C., Hiiemae, K. M., & Palmer, J. B. (2001). Ontogeny of postnatal hyoid and larynx descent in humans. *Archives of Oral Biology*, *46*(2), 117–128. http://doi.org/10.1016/S0003-9969(00)00108-4

Linders, B., Massa, G. G., Boersma, B., & Dejonckere, P. H. (1995). Fundamental voice frequency and jitter in girls and boys measured with electroglottography: influence of age and height. *International Journal of Pediatric Otorhinolaryngology*, *33*(1), 61–65. http://doi.org/10.1016/0165-5876(95)01197-J

Maryn, Y., Roy, N., De Bodt, M., Van Cauwenberge, P., & Corthals, P. (2009). Acoustic measurement of overall voice quality: A meta-analysis. *Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*, *126*(5), 2619-2634.

Morton, E. S. (1977). On the occurrence and significance of motivation-structural rules in some bird and mammal sounds. *The American Naturalist*, *111*(981), 855–869.

Myers, L. and Sirois, M. J. (2006). Spearman correlation coefficients, differences between. *Encyclopedia of Statistical Sciences, 12*. doi: 10.1002/0471667196.ess5050.pub2

Nadhuroua, B., Gambaa, M., Andriaholinirinab, N.V., & Ouledic, A., & Giacomaa, C. (2015). The vocal communication of the mongoose lemur (*Eulemur mongoz*): Phonation mechanisms, acoustic features and quantitative analysis. *Ethology Ecology & Evolution*. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/03949370.2015.1039069

Owren, M. J. (2011). Human voice in evolutionary perspective. *Acoustics Today*, *7*(4), 24–33.

Pawlowski, B., Dunbar, R. I. M., & Lipowicz, A. (2000). Evolutionary fitness: Tall men have more reproductive success. *Nature*, *403*(6766), 156–156. http://doi.org/10.1038/35003107

Pisanski, K., & Feinberg, D. (2013). Cross-cultural variation in mate preferences for averageness, symmetry, body size, and masculinity. *Cross-Cultural Research*, *47*(2), 162–197. http://doi.org/10.1177/1069397112471806

Pisanski, K., Fraccaro, P. J., Tigue, C. C., O'Connor, J. J. M., & Feinberg, D. R. (2014b). Return to Oz: Voice pitch facilitates assessments of men's body size. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Human Perception and Performance*, *40*(4), 1316–1331. http://doi.org/10.1037/a0036956

Pisanski, K., Fraccaro, P. J., Tigue, C. C., O'Connor, J. J. M., Röder, S., Andrews, P. W., … Feinberg, D. R. (2014a). Vocal indicators of body size in men and women: a meta-analysis. *Animal Behaviour*, *95*, 89–99. http://doi.org/10.1016/j.anbehav.2014.06.011

Pisanski, K., & Rendall, D. (2011). The prioritization of voice fundamental frequency or formants in listeners' assessments of speaker size, masculinity, and attractiveness. *Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*, *129*(4), 2201. http://doi.org/10.1121/1.3552866

Prelevic, G. M. (2013). The effects of sex hormones on the female voice. *The Journal of Musical Performance*, *2*(4), 93-103.

Sitverman, E. & Zimmer, C. (1978). Effect of the menstrual cycle on voice quality. *Archives of Otolaryngology*, *104*, 7-10.

Puts, D. A., Apicella, C. L., & Cardenas, R. A. (2012a). Masculine voices signal men's threat potential in forager and industrial societies. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, *279*(1728), 601–609. http://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2011.0829

Puts, D. A., Jones, B. C., & DeBruine, L. M. (2012b). Sexual selection on human faces and voices. *The Journal of Sex Research*, *49*(2-3), 227–243. http://doi.org/10.1080/00224499.2012.658924

Reby, D., & McComb, K. (2003). Anatomical constraints generate honesty: acoustic cues to age and weight in the roars of red deer stags. *Animal Behaviour*, *65*(3), 519–530. http://doi.org/10.1006/anbe.2003.2078

Rendall, D., Vokey, J. R., & Nemeth, C. (2007). Lifting the curtain on the Wizard of Oz: Biased voice-based impressions of speaker size. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Human Perception and Performance*, *33*(5), 1208–1219. http://doi.org/10.1037/0096-1523.33.5.1208

Seidell, J. C. (2009). Waist circumference and waist/hip ratio in relation to all-cause mortality, cancer and sleep apnea. *European Journal of Clinical Nutrition*, *64*(1), 35–41. http://doi.org/10.1038/ejcn.2009.71

Silverman, E. M., & Zimmer, C. H. (1978). Effect of the menstrual cycle on voice quality. *Archives of Otolaryngology, 104*(1), 7-10.

Singh, D. (1993). Adaptive significance of female physical attractiveness: Role of waist-to-hip ratio. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *65*(2), 293–307. http://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.65.2.293

Singh, D., & Singh, D. (2011). Shape and significance of feminine beauty: an evolutionary perspective. *Sex Roles*, *64*(9-10), 723–731. http://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-011-9938-z

Smith, D. R. R., & Patterson, R. D. (2005). The interaction of glottal-pulse rate and vocal-tract length in judgments of speaker size, sex, and age. *Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*, *118*(5), 3177–3186. http://doi.org/10.1121/1.2047107

Swami, V., Smith, J., Tsiokris, A., Georgiades, C., Sangareau, Y., Tovée, M. J., & Furnham, A. (2007). Male physical attractiveness in Britain and Greece: A cross-cultural study. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, *147*(1), 15–26. http://doi.org/10.3200/SOCP.147.1.15-26

Taylor, A. M., & Reby, D. (2010). The contribution of source-filter theory to mammal vocal communication research: Advances in vocal communication research. *Journal of Zoology*, *280*(3), 221–236. http://doi.org/10.1111/j.1469-7998.2009.00661.x

Taylor, A. M., Reby, D., & McComb, K. (2010). Size communication in domestic dog, *Canis familiaris,* growls. *Animal Behaviour*, *79*(1), 205–210. http://doi.org/10.1016/j.anbehav.2009.10.030

Titze, I. R. (1988). The physics of small-amplitude oscillation of the vocal folds*. Journal of the Acoustical Society of America, 83*(4), 1536-1552.

Titze, I. R. (1989). Physiologic and acoustic differences between male and female voices. *Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*, *85*(4), 1699–1707. http://doi.org/10.1121/1.397959

Titze, I. R. (1994). *Principles of vocal production*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall.

Turner, R. E., Walters, T. C., Monaghan, J. J. M., & Patterson, R. D. (2009). A statistical, formant-pattern model for segregating vowel type and vocal-tract length in developmental formant data. *Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*, *125*(4), 2374–2386. http://doi.org/10.1121/1.3079772

Tyack, P. L., & Miller, E. H. (2002). Vocal anatomy, acoustic communication and echolocation. In *Marine Mammal Biology: An Evolutionary Approach* (pp. 142–184). Oxford, England: Blackwell Science.

Vukovic, J., Feinberg, D., DeBruine, L., Smith, F., & Jones, B. (2010). Women's voice pitch is negatively correlated with health risk factors. *Journal of Evolutionary Psychology*, *8*(3), 217–225. http://doi.org/10.1556/JEP.8.2010.3.2

Wadewitz, P., Hammerschmidt, K., Battaglia, D., Witt, A., Wolf, F., & Fischer, J. (2015). Characterizing vocal repertoires-hard vs. soft classification approaches. *PloS One*, *10*(4), e0125785. http://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0125785

Zaadstra, B. M., Seidell, J. C., Van Noord, P. A., te Velde, E. R., Habbema, J. D., Vrieswijk, B., & Karbaat, J. (1993). Fat and female fecundity: Prospective study of effect of body fat distribution on conception rates. *British Medical Journal*, *306*(6876), 484–487. http://dx.doi.org/10.1136/bmj.306.6876.484

Acknowledgements

We thank Diana Borak, Michael Burt, R. Elisabeth Cornwell, Lisa De Couto, Paul J. Fraccaro, Anthony Little, Fiona Moore, David Perrett, Miriam Law Smith, Cara C. Tigue, and Michael Stirrat for assistance with data collection, Stephanie Wu for assistance with voice measurements, and Paul W. Andrews for statistical aid. Portions of this work were supported by grants from the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada, the Canadian Foundation for Innovation, the European Research Council (Starting Grant 282655, OCMATE), Ontario's Ministry of Research and Innovation (Early Researcher Award Program ER11-08-084) and the German Research Foundation.