

Thinking It's a Male Rather Than a Female Is More Likely and Quicker, *Ceteris Paribus*

Stefano Federici (✉ stefano.federici@unipg.it)

University of Perugia

Alessandro Lepri

University of Perugia

Silvia Bacci

University of Florence

Francesco Bartolucci

University of Perugia

Research Article

Keywords: Ceteris Paribus, Quicker, Female, Male, SGAT-A, evolutionary psychological view

Posted Date: October 20th, 2021

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.21203/rs.3.rs-949989/v1>

License: © ⓘ This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.

[Read Full License](#)

Abstract

According to previous ethnomethodological and cognitive studies on sex assignment, if a figure has male sexual characteristics people are more likely to think it is a man than a woman when the figure has female ones. This male attribution bias is definitely reinforced when a penis is apparent in human nude images. We reported findings of three experiments aimed at replicating previous studies by administering the Sex/Gender Attribution Test for Adult (SGAT-A) created by digitally morphing bodies of two human male and female models into realistic images. We observed the sex attribution and response time of 1,706 young adult participants. A cross-cultural comparison was also carried out with a sample of young adult Chinese students. Findings substantially reconfirmed those obtained in previous studies. When male external genitalia were exposed, the odds of male sex attribution were 5.688 compared to 1.823 female attribution when female external genitalia were shown. The male external genitalia overshadow any other features that might rather suggest a female identity. The shortest response times were observed with masculine stimuli. Evolutionary and cultural determinants of the male sex bias are discussed.

Introduction

According to the evolutionary psychological view of the human mind, adaptations are believed to occur at the level of psychological mechanisms rather than at the level of overt behavior¹. This means that the common evolved architecture of the human mind does not contradict the different manifestations of behavior or psychology observed across individuals and cultures. In other words, different environmental inputs can result in different manifested outputs while triggering the same underlying evolved psychology¹. Therefore, we can assume that beyond the individual and cultural differences in gender identity (man, woman, genderqueer, transsexual, transgender, intersex, and more), gender expression (feminine/masculine), gender orientation/attraction (heterosexual/homosexual), gender binary (man vs. woman) or gender spectrum/fluid (between man and woman), gender expression/presentation (dress, demeanor, social behavior, and more), cis- or trans-gender (gender identity align or not align to sex) a universal evolved cognitive mechanism (reasoning, emotion, motivation, and motor control, whether the process that gives rise to it is conscious or unconscious, simple or complex conscious or unconscious) underlies sex recognition and attribution. (We refer to sex as to a set of biological attributes that are associated with physical and physiological features usually categorized as female or male, although there is variation in the biological attributes. We refer to gender as a range of characteristics used to distinguish between men and women and the masculine and feminine attributes culturally assigned to them.²⁻⁴). It seems clear that all of the manifestations of gender have a common element: an individual's ability to discriminate between biological sexes and their expressions. We have been hardwired to recognize a person's sex from the clues that their gender expression and sexual characteristics show us of their biological identity if the variation in individual and cultural differences in which gender manifests itself has not prevented human mate selection and sexual reproduction⁵.

Ito and Urland⁶ have highlighted that our brains form dichotomic categorization of gender with a staggering speed. Findings of electrocortical measures of attention to the gender of multiply categorizable individuals showed that sensitivity to gender information emerged slightly later than the sensitivity to race information seen as early as 122 ms. In addition, brain activation was significantly larger in males than females.

The strength of categorizing individuals is shown not only by the speed and minimal sensory stimuli required for the brain to process group differences and the unconscious automaticity of such processes⁶⁻⁸, but by its presence also in very young children. By age three to four, children already group people by race and gender^{9,10}. They focus on perceptually salient attributes in people (race, sex, age, and attractiveness) and, due to their poor cognitive ability, children categorize them in bipolar terms, incapable of processing all the internal qualities of individual differences¹¹. These cognitive biases, although originating from cognitive human processes, nevertheless tend to be permeable to cultural environments that foster explicit structured schemes to make certain classifications perceptually salient^{11,12}.

In a previous study, Federici and colleagues¹³, investigating what influence human sexual characteristics and gender-linked characteristics binaries have on cognitive processes of sex attribution in adults found that the cultural stereotypes and prejudices that affect sex attribution might not just be a mere cultural product, but rather the consequence of evolved cognitive mechanisms “specialized for solving evolutionarily long-enduring adaptive problems and that these mechanisms have content-specialized representational formats, procedures, cues, and so on”¹. Cognition and its products, the sex/gender representations, are the outcome of determinants both internal to the human organism (brain) and external (culture). The study makes evident that the representation of sex is given by the outcome of sexual characteristics that will fluctuate from those more typically natural/biological (sex) to those more typically cultural (gender), such as clothing or hair length. Moreover, Federici and colleagues, on the basis of their findings, also infer that the universal¹⁴ patriarchal and phallogocentric cultural construction of sex/gender can be explained by an innate intuitive ability to easily grasp and learn these cultural meanings of gender identity. Freud’s version of the one-sex/gender model (having a penis means being a boy and not having a penis means being a girl) “is not only a patriarchal phallogocentric elevation of a ‘biological fact’ into a cultural desideratum. It captures processes of psychological functioning, which reveal to us cognitive mechanisms at the origin of cultural biases”¹³. For instance, among other significant and remarkable results, the adult participants attributed male sex 86% of the time when the penis was shown, but only attributed female sex 67% of the time when the vulva was shown.

The Federici and colleagues’ study¹³ with adult participants was conducted administering the Sex/Gender Attribution Test for Adult (SGAT-A), designed by the authors (SF and AL). It includes 120 images of frontal human nudes created by combining parts of two original photographs of one male and one female model (Supplementary Table S16). For each stimulus randomly presented through an Internet platform, the participants were asked to assign the male or the female sex. In the present study we are

Loading [MathJax]/jax/output/CommonHTML/fonts/TeX/fontdata.js s to SGAT-A obtained by the first study¹³ with

three other studies. In this way, we mean to verify the overall consistency of SGAT-A under similar experimental conditions.

In Experiment 1, the experimental design of Federici and colleagues¹³ was replicated by expanding the sample of participants.

To examine whether the fact that the penis more than the vulva and the male sexual characteristics more than the female ones are significantly more salient in the sex attribution process^{13,15} was due to cultural effect on gender representation, in Experiment 2, Chinese participants were recruited.

As Federici and colleagues¹³ have assumed, the cultural stereotypes and prejudices that affect gender attribution might be the consequence of cognitive biases, evolved to solve adaptive problems related to survival—namely, to avoid what is the greatest danger: an (angry) adult male. This evolved mechanism fosters reliance on the availability heuristic, less cognitive effort, and fast thinking in male than female recognition¹⁶. Therefore, in Experiment 3, we have also examined the time taken by participants to attribute sex after each stimulus was displayed.

Results

Experiment 1

A z-test was run where the participant's sex as assigned at birth in a binary mode (male/female) was the independent variable and the dependent variables were the proportion of the responses to the SGAT-A (H0: proportion of responses "female" for female respondents = proportion of responses "female" for male respondents; the alternative hypothesis is bidirectional). There were no differences between the groups ($z = -1.55$, $df = 885$, $p = .1213$, assumed equal variances).

One-way between-subject ANOVAs were conducted to compare the effect of the independent variables—extracted from the sociodemographic questionnaire (gender identity, level of education, political orientation, and religion orientation) and from the Kinsey scale (sexual orientation)—based on the sex attribution, the confidence scale, and the pleasantness scale. ANOVA tests did not reveal any significant effect with regard to sex attribution (Supplementary Table S3), with the only exception of a weak but significant effect due to the political orientation ($p = .037$; 41% of female attribution by left-wing and center people vs. 39% of female attributions by right-wing people). Differences were found between participants without political opinions (2.68 vs. 3.22 of left-wing respondents), and those with lower educational level (2.74 for respondents with high school diploma vs. 3.11 for bachelor and 3.19 for master degree graduates) in the confidence as well as in the pleasantness in sex attribution (Supplementary Tables S4 and S5, respectively). Statistically but not substantial significant differences were also found in the confidence as well as in the pleasantness in sex attribution with regard to gender identity and sexual orientation.

We also evaluated the measure's reliability regarding internal consistency calculated with Cronbach's alpha. This coefficient was good ($\alpha = .90$; 95% CI = [.860; .927]) for the sex attribution (male/female) based on the 120 stimuli and excellent ($\alpha = .99$) for both the confidence scale (95% CI = [.991; .993]) and the pleasantness scale (95% CI = [.995; .996]).

The effect of sexual characteristics on sex attribution

Descriptive analyses showed that respondents attributed male sex to 60% of the stimuli. More precisely, the percentage of participants attributing male sex was 84.4% when the stimulus had more masculine variables ($N = 47$ stimuli with male variables > 3), 35.3% when the stimulus had more feminine variables ($N = 47$ stimuli with female variables > 3), and 60.1% when the stimulus was neutral ($N = 26$ stimuli with balanced co-presence of male and female variables), $\chi^2(2, N = 106,212) = 20,911, p < .001$. In the case of neutral stimuli as neutral/female—whenever the vulva is uncovered or the female face is shown when the external genitalia are covered by jeans—and as neutral/male—whenever the penis is uncovered or the female face is shown when the external genitalia are covered—83.3% of the neutral/male stimuli compared to 63.2% of the neutral/female stimuli were congruently attributed $\chi^2(1, N = 106,440) = 5,507, p < .001$. When the penis was exposed in a picture, the participants attributed male sex significantly more often (87.7%) than female sex when the vulva was exposed (69.6%), $\chi^2(1, N = 106,440) = 28,893, p < .001$.

To investigate the effect of sexual characteristics on sex attribution we estimated some mixed logit models for two binary response variables: (i) $Y_{1ij} = 1$ if individual i attributed male sex to image j , and 0 if they attributed female sex ($i = 1, \dots, 887; j = 1, \dots, 120$); (ii) $Y_{2ij} = 1$ if sex attributed by individual i to image j was coherent with the type of image (i.e., masculine vs. feminine), and 0 if the attribution was incoherent ($i = 1, \dots, 887; j = 1, \dots, 120$). Both response variables were regressed on the binary sexual variables characterizing the images, that is, hair (1 if long), face (1 if feminine), hips (1 if wide), body hair (1 if absent), breast (1 if present), vulva (1 if present). Note that all stimuli are active (i.e., equal to 1) when referring to female characteristics. For each response variable, we estimated four mixed logit models, according to whether the model in the image wore unisex jeans (hiding hips and external genitalia) and/or unisex t-shirt (hiding breasts/chest). Thus, we defined the following models:

- Stimuli without jeans and t-shirt variables (model of type 00): all the six sexual characteristics are visible.
- Stimuli without jeans and with t-shirt variables (model of type 01): breast/chest are not visible.
- Stimuli with jeans and without t-shirt (model of type 10): vulva/penis and hips are not visible.
- Stimuli with jeans and with t-shirt (model of type 11): breast/chest, vulva/penis, and hips are not visible.

Models were estimated through the maximum likelihood approach with Laplace approximation, using function `glmer` of R package `lme4`^{17,18}. All the sexual characteristics significantly contribute to the

Loading [MathJax]/jax/output/CommonHTML/fonts/TeX/fontdata.js

attribution of sex (Supplementary Table S6). As expected, the presence of female characteristics reduces the probability of assigning male sex (signs of regression coefficients are negative). When all sexual characteristics are visible (Model 00), the strongest effect is due to the presence of vulva (OR = .030), followed by a feminine face (OR = .250) and the presence of breasts (OR = .281); the presence of long hair provides the smallest contribution (OR = .849). When breasts are covered by t-shirt (Model 01), results are like Model 00. When the external genitalia are covered by jeans (Model 10 and Model 11), the face assumes a relevant role (OR = .092 in Model 10 and OR = .005 in Model 11), together with the presence of breasts (Model 10) and the absence of body hair (Model 11). At the same time, the effect of long hair (gender-linked of secondary sexual characteristics) increases when the number of primary sexual characteristics (penis/vulva) reduces (OR = .740 in Model 10 and OR = .525 in Model 11) (Supplementary Tables S6 and S7).

Confidence in sex attribution

If we consider the conditions where the penis was exposed, 27.1% of the participants gave a certainty score of 7, indicating they had no doubt about the sex attributed to the stimulus. By contrast, when the vulva was exposed, 20% of the participants gave a certainty score of 7, $\chi^2(1, N = 85,152) = 596.45, p < .001$. When participants attributed female sex, 78.6% of participants declared they were uncertain (scores 1–6), but when participants attributed male sex, 73.2% of participants indicated uncertainty, $\chi^2(1, N = 106,212) = 408.19, p < .001$.

Pleasantness in the co-presence of male and female sexual characteristics

Of the participants, 38.6% found the pictures with the 26 neutral stimuli (balanced co-presence of male and female variables and no clothing) totally unpleasant (score = 1). By contrast, 31.3% and 30.5% of the participants found the stimulus totally unpleasant when it had unbalanced sexual variables with a prevalence of, respectively, female or male characteristics, $\chi^2(2, N = 106,440) = 492.55, p < .001$. In addition, 3.4% of the participants found the neutral stimuli as pleasant (score = 7), respect to 6.2% of female stimuli and 7.8% of male stimuli, $\chi^2(2, N = 106,440) = 494.88, p < .001$.

Experiment 2

A z-test was run where the participant's sex in a binary mode (male/female) was the independent variable, and the dependent variables were the proportion of the responses to the SGAT-A (H0: proportion of responses "female" for female respondents = proportion of responses "female" for male respondents; the alternative hypothesis is bidirectional). There were no differences between the groups ($z = .75, df = 26, p = .4597$, assumed equal variances). We also evaluated the measure's reliability regarding internal consistency calculated with Cronbach's alpha. This coefficient was acceptable ($\alpha = .70$; 95% CI: [.475; .805]) for the sex attribution based on the 120 stimuli and excellent ($\alpha = .99$; 95% CI: [.964; .993]) for the confidence scale. ANOVA tests did not reveal any significant effect (all $p > .10$) with regard to either sex attribution or the confidence in sex attribution.

The effect of sexual characteristics on sex attribution

Descriptive analyses showed that respondents attributed male sex to 58.1% of the stimuli. More precisely, the percentage of participants attributing male sex was 82.0% when the stimulus had more masculine variables, 34.3% when the stimulus had more feminine variables, and 57.8% when the stimulus was neutral (balanced co-presence of male and female variables), $\chi^2(2, N = 3,598) = 658.68, p < .001$. When the penis was exposed in a stimulus, the participants attributed male sex significantly more often (88.4%) than female sex when the vulva was exposed (73.3%), $\chi^2(1, N = 2,878) = 1,114, p < .001$. Considering neutral stimuli as neutral/female—whenever the vulva is uncovered the female face is shown when the external genitalia are covered by jeans—and as neutral/male—whenever the penis is uncovered or the male face is visible when the external genitalia are covered—81.4% of neutral/male images against 65.3% of the neutral/female images were congruently attributed $\chi^2(1, N = 3600) = 119.54, p < .001$.

Confidence in sex attribution

If we consider the conditions where the penis was exposed, 27.1% of the participants gave a certainty score of 7, indicating they had no doubt about the picture's sex. Conversely, when the vulva was exposed, 19.3% of the participants gave a certainty score of 7, $\chi^2(1, N = 2,880) = 24.015, p < .001$. When participants attributed female sex, 80.6% of participants declared they were uncertain (scores 1–6), but when participants attributed male sex, 74.5% of participants indicated uncertainty, $\chi^2(1, N = 3,598) = 16.067, p < .001$. The certainty in sex attribution highlighted that the participants were less certain when they had to attribute female sex to a picture (as opposed to male sex).

Experiment 3

A z-test was run where the participant's sex in a binary mode (male/female) was the independent variable and the dependent variables were the proportion of the responses to the SGAT-A: there were no differences between the groups ($z = .0267, df = 758, p = .9787$, assumed equal variances).

One-way between-subjects ANOVAs were conducted to compare the effect of the independent variables—extracted through the sociodemographic questionnaire (gender identity, level of education, political orientation, and religion orientation) and the Kinsey scale (sexual orientation)—based on the sex attribution and the response times. ANOVA tests did not reveal any significant effect either for the sex attribution or for the response times (Supplementary Tables S12 and S13, respectively).

We also evaluated the reliability of the SGAT-A test regarding internal consistency calculated with Cronbach's alpha: this coefficient was good ($\alpha = .86; 95\% \text{ CI} = [.839; .875]$), even if smaller than what resulted in Experiment 1.

The effect of sexual characteristics on sex attribution

Descriptive analyses showed that respondents attributed male sex to 58.8% of the images. More sex was 82.7% when the stimulus had more

masculine variables, 35.1% when the stimulus had more feminine variable, and 58.6% when the stimulus was neutral, $\chi^2(2, N = 93,368) = 17,077, p < .001$. When the penis was exposed in a picture, the participants attributed male sex significantly more often (84.3%) than they attributed female sex when the vulva was exposed (68.5%), $\chi^2(1, N = 74683) = 21344, p < .001$. Considering the 20 neutral stimuli (balanced co-presence of male and female variables and no clothing) as feminine whenever the vulva is displayed and masculine whenever the penis is displayed, 80.1% of masculine images against the 62.6% of feminine images were correctly attributed, $\chi^2(1, N = 94,560) = 3,526.3, p < .001$.

To investigate the effect of sexual characteristics on sex attribution we estimated four mixed logit models, along the same lines as in Experiment 1 (“The effect of sexual characteristics on sex attribution”). Estimates of fixed effects (Supplementary Tables S14 and S15) returned values in line with those obtained in Experiment 1 (“The effect of sexual characteristics on sex attribution”), except for the Model 01 (breast/chest are not visible) where the presence of vulva is here significant ($p = < .05$), although weak ($OR = .944$) with a negative effect (Supplementary Table S15).

Time response effect on sex attribution

On average, participants took 6.18 seconds to assign sex to the stimulus (min = 1.51; max = 29.28). However, there were significant differences according to the “M,” “F,” and “N” stimuli ($F = 12.71, p < .01$). The shortest times ($M = 5.92$) were observed with “M” stimuli (i.e., with male variables > 3 ; $n = 47$), whereas the longest times were observed when “N” stimuli (i.e., with a balanced co-presence of 3 male and 3 female variables) were displayed ($M = 6.67$).

Method

Experiment 1

Participants

The SGAT-A was administered to 897 Italian Caucasian adults; only 1.1% (10 individuals) did not answer the test. Sex as assigned at birth was female for 598 (67.4%) respondents and male for the remaining 289 (32.6%) respondents. The median age was 21 years (min = 18; max = 90). The majority were undergraduates (52.2%; 54.7% females) (Supplementary Table S1). Of the participants, 95.3% (97.4% females) identified themselves in the man/woman binary gender identity among the 58 gender identity options (Supplementary Table S2). According to the Kinsey scale, 83.7% (82.6% females) affirmed that they were exclusively heterosexual, 1.1% (0.7% females, 2.1% males) were exclusively homosexual, and 3.0% (3.0% females) were bisexual. Moreover, 8.9% (10.4% females, 4.8% males) affirmed to be predominantly heterosexual but with occasional homosexual components.

Materials

A sociodemographic questionnaire was developed ad hoc to collect data on participants' age, sex (as assigned at birth: male/female), gender identity ("I see/define myself a man"; "I see/define myself a woman"; plus Facebook's 56 custom gender options for users who do not identify simply as "man" or "woman"), sexual orientation Kinsey scale;¹⁹, education, citizenship, religious beliefs, and political orientation.

Sex/Gender Attribution Test for Adult (SGAT-A). This test was designed by the authors (SF and AL); it includes 120 images of frontal human nudes created by combining parts of two original photographs of one male and one female model: six from male (short hair, male face, flat chest, narrow hips, penis, and body hair) and six from female (long hair, female face, breast, wide hips, vulva, and no body hair) models, plus two pieces of clothing (pants and t-shirt) (Supplementary Tables S16 and S17). The two original photographs of one male and one female model (Supplementary Table S16, red framed stimuli 1_F1 and 64_M1) were the original images bought from the website www.3d.sk with a perpetual, non-exclusive, non-transferable worldwide license to use the Content for the Permitted Uses. The other 118 stimuli have been created through the software Adobe Photoshop 14. The use of Photoshop worksheets and tools such as "Magic Wand" and Lasso" as well as copy and paste function made it possible to extract and combine the twelve human physical parts and two cloths according to a combinatorial calculation (Supplementary Table S17). An example of the use of Photoshop for stimuli design is provided in Supplementary Table S18.

Those stimuli with a majority of male variables (> 3) were coded with the letter "M" (47 male stimuli), those with a majority of female variables (> 3) with "F" (47 female stimuli), and those with a balanced co-presence of male ($= 3$) and female ($= 3$) variables were coded with "N" (26 neutral stimuli). M, F, and N refer only to the quantitative distribution of the variables in each stimulus (i.e., as the figures were depicted and manipulated) not to an evaluation of a biological sex of the figure represented in the stimulus. For each stimulus presented through an Internet platform, in the Italian language the participants were asked to assign the male or the female sex ("According to you, is the subject in the picture male or female?") and to indicate on two different 7-point Likert-type scales the degree of confidence with regard to the sex attributed to the stimulus ("How confident do you feel about the answer you just gave?") and its pleasantness ("How pleasant is the picture you have just seen?"). Both scales were anchored by 1 = not at all and 7 = totally; higher scores indicate greater levels of confidence/pleasantness.

Procedure

The task was administered individually to each participant in rooms located at the University of Perugia's campus, set up with desks and chairs, with personal computers (PCs) dedicated exclusively to experimentation and protected by a password. After the participant signed the information sheet and the informed consent, the computer was switched on and the www.qualtrics.com platform was started. At this point, the investigator left the room and advised the participant that they could call them back at any time by ringing a reception bell placed on the desk. The Internet platform then provided the participant

with the sociodemographic questionnaire and, afterward, the 120 stimuli of the SGAT-A in random order. The online administration, in total, took about 40 min to complete,

Summary

Among participants in Experiment 1, no differences were found with respect to the independent variables extracted from the sociodemographic questionnaire, except for the political orientation. Participants who declared themselves to be right-wingers attributed the female sex in a lower percentage, showing a greater male bias effect.

What guided the participants in sex attribution were typically three classes of variables: external genitalia; flat chest/breast; and face. Except for the breast variable, which results with a positive value, all other female variables predict sex attribution only if absent. In other words, the predictive power of attribution was given by the presence of male variables. Therefore, as predicted, these effects did not show equal strength between male and female stimuli. When male external genitalia (penis) were visible, the odds of a congruent sex attribution are 5.688 compared to 1.823 when all female sexual characteristics were visible, and certainty in sex attribution was also reported to be greater when participants had attributed male versus female sex (Table S7, Model 00). Moreover, if the male face is associated with the penis, as previously found by Kessler and McKenna¹⁵, this can overshadow all other female cues (face or vulva): For instance, the OR of congruent sex assignment equals 3.209 in the presence of a masculine face and penis, with all the other characteristics being of a feminine type (Table S7, Model 00). Secondary sexual characteristics affect sex attribution only when primary ones are covered. In this case, gender-linked cues (long/short hair), and mainly the face also assumed a relevant role in orienting participants' choices.

The participants found unpleasant the 26 neutral stimuli (with balanced sexual variables) significantly more than how they felt about stimuli codified as male or female.

Experiment 2

Participants

The SGAT-A was administered to 30 Chinese university students (sex as assigned at birth: female = 70%). The median age was 21 years (min = 18; max = 30). Regarding the level of education, only one participant stated that they had not obtained a secondary school diploma, while 19 (63.3%) reached a secondary school diploma (high school), and 10 (33.3%) attended university up to a three-year degree (Supplementary Table S8). Of the participants, 21 (69.9%) identified themselves in the man/woman binary gender identity among the 58 gender identity options, while the remaining 9 (about 30%) did not want to answer the question (Supplementary Table S9). According to the Kinsey scale, 15 (50%) participants affirmed that they were exclusively heterosexual, 9 (30%) predominantly heterosexual but in some circumstances homosexual, one predominantly heterosexual but with a strong homosexual component, 4 (13.3%) essentially bisexual, and one exclusively homosexual.

Materials

Loading [MathJax]/jax/output/CommonHTML/fonts/TeX/fontdata.js

The sociodemographic questionnaire administered in Experiment 1 was translated to Chinese ideographic language. The translation was performed by a native Chinese speaker, student magistral to the University of Perugia. The chair of Sinology of the University of Perugia performed the back translation according to the guidelines of Beaton et al.²⁰.

The SGAT-A's 120 images were identical to those in Experiment 1. For each stimulus presented randomly through an Internet platform, in Chinese language the participants were asked to assign the male or the female sex and to indicate on a 7-point Likert-type scale the degree of confidence regarding the sex attributed to the stimulus, as in Experiment 1. Unlike Experiment 1, the question about the degree of pleasantness of each image was eliminated, because of the difficulty in rendering the concept of pleasantness in Chinese in a manner comparable to that in Italian. The translation of the SGAT-A's two questions were conducted by the same team as for the sociodemographic questionnaire.

Procedure

All procedures and aspects of data collection and analysis were identical to Experiment 1, except for the mixed logit models that were not estimated because of the reduced sample size. Participants were recruited among those attending the "Marco Polo" and "Turandot" programs of the University for Foreigners of Perugia. These programs are addressed to Chinese students who intend to achieve a university degree in Italian universities and Italian academic institutions of higher education in art and music. Only those students with a stay in Italy not exceeding 4 months and with a very basic knowledge of Italian and English were recruited. Information about the experiment was given to them in the Chinese language, either in writing or with an interpreter.

Summary

In order to test whether the results obtained in Experiment 1 were due to the Western cultural context on gender representation, in the second study Chinese students were recruited. All results substantially replicate those of Experiment 1. Although only first-time students moving to the West with very basic knowledge of English and almost no knowledge of Italian language were selected, nevertheless we cannot claim that they were representative of a Chinese cultural purity. In a globalized world, and particularly among the millennial generation, Western cultural influences extend to and inform Chinese young people in several ways (e.g., through the Internet) just as Chou²¹ argued in his book on homosexuality. Certainly, this phenomenon was known to us even before we conducted Experiment 2. But this pilot result prompts us to investigate further (e.g., with more extensive cross-cultural comparison) how far the absence of differences in sex attribution is due to a globalization of gender attitudes and stereotypes or to metacultural determinants.

Experiment 3

Participants

Loading [MathJax]/jax/output/CommonHTML/fonts/TeX/fontdata.js

The SGAT-A was administered to 779 adults. Sex as assigned at birth was female for 451 (57.9%) respondents and male for the remaining 328 (42.1%) respondents. The median age was 22 years (min = 16; max = 89). The majority were undergraduates (47.8%; 45.9% females) (Supplementary Table S10). Of the participants, 97.2% (98.6% females) identified themselves in the man/woman binary gender identity among the 58 gender identity options (Supplementary Table S11). According to the Kinsey scale, 88.7% (86.7% females) affirmed that they were exclusively heterosexual, 1.2% (0.7% females, 1.8% males) were exclusively homosexual, and 2.1% (2.9% females) were bisexual. Moreover, 5.5% (6.9% females, 3.7% males) affirmed to be predominantly heterosexual but with occasional homosexual components.

Materials

The sociodemographic questionnaire was identical to that of Experiment 1, as were the SGAT-A's 120 stimuli. For each stimulus presented randomly through an Internet platform, the participants were asked to assign the male or the female sex. Unlike Experiment 1, the response time from the presentation of the stimulus to the sex categorization (male/female) was computed. In addition, the questions about the degree of confidence and pleasantness were eliminated, to speed up administration time and the fluidity of the stimulus presentation.

Procedure

All procedures and aspects of data collection and analysis were like those in Experiment 1. In addition, we investigated the relation between the response times and the sex attribution. The response times were calculated on the latency time taken by the respondents from the moment in which the stimulus appeared on the webpage until the moment in which they, after having assigned the sex (male/female), clicked on the "next" button at the bottom of the webpage. Clicking on the "next" button a new stimulus appeared and a new calculation of the latency time started. The response times are measured in seconds.

Summary

In this third experiment we controlled the response time from the presentation of the stimulus to the sex categorization (male/female). Results showed that the more the stimuli were biased toward a binary sex (male/female vs. neutral stimuli) the shorter the latency to sex attribution was computed. Then, stimuli with most male variables take less time and cognitive effort¹⁶ than any other. Like Experiment 1, no differences were found with respect to the independent variables extracted from the sociodemographic questionnaire, not even for political orientation, which was slightly significant in Experiment 1. Experiment 3 also confirmed the salience on the sex attribution of the penis and male face, or male sex-linked cues when the primary characteristics were unavailable to view, compared to female variables, all things being equal.

General Discussion

In the present study, we reported the findings of three experiments aimed at replicating Kessler and McKenna's Overlay Study¹⁵. Unlike Kessler and McKenna, who administered stylized drawings of the human body (Supplementary Table S16), we administered the Sex/Gender Attribution Test for Adult¹³, created by digitally morphing bodies of two human male and female models into realistic images (Supplementary Table S16). We assumed that, because evolved cognitive mechanisms are triggered on very specialized inputs²², more ecological and lifelike stimuli could have returned more reliable information about evolved cognitive processes. We expected, based on previous studies^{13,15}, to find that primary sexual characteristics (genitals) would determine sex attribution (male/female) more than secondary/gender-linked sexual characteristics (short/long hair, male/female face, flat chest, breasts, narrow/wide hips, and body/no body hair), and that male sexual characteristics would determine sex attribution more than female sexual characteristics, with a significantly stronger effect of the penis compared to the vulva, *ceteris paribus*. The results have substantially reconfirmed the results obtained in the previous studies^{13,15}. To facilitate the reading of the data, already discussed experiment by experiment above, we have reported the main results, in synoptic form, in Table 1.

Table 1
 Synoptic table of the main results obtained in the three studies (Experiments 1, 2, and 3)

	Experiment 1	Experiment 2	Experiment 3
Participants (N = 1,706)	n = 897 Mean age = 21 Females = 54.7%	n = 30 Mean age = 21 Females = 70%	n = 779 Mean age = 22 Females = 57.9%
Kinsey scale	Heterosexual = 83.7%	Heterosexual = 50%	Heterosexual = 88.7%
Political opinions effect on sex attribution	Left-wing: lower percentage of female sex attribution	No difference	No difference
Cronbach's alpha	$\alpha = .90$ sex attribution $\alpha = .99$ confidence $\alpha = .99$ pleasantness	$\alpha = .70$ sex attribution $\alpha = .99$ confidence	$\alpha = .86$ sex attribution
Male attribution (vs. female attribution)	60% all stimuli 84.4% male stimuli 35.3% female stimuli 60.1% neutral stimuli 83.3% neutral/male 63.2% neutral/female 87.7% penis exposed 69.6% vulva exposed	58.1% all stimuli 82.0% male stimuli 34.3% female stimuli 57.8% neutral stimuli 81.4% neutral/male 65.3% neutral/female 88.4% penis exposed 73.3% vulva exposed	58.8% all stimuli 82.7% male stimuli 35.1% female stimuli 58.6% neutral stimuli 80.1% neutral/male 62.6% neutral/female 84.3% penis exposed 68.5% vulva exposed
Confidence (certain = score 7)	27.1% penis exposed 20% vulva exposed	27.1% penis exposed 19.3% vulva exposed	Not applicable
Confidence (uncertain = scores 1–6)	78.6% on female attribution 73.2% on male attribution	80.6% on female attribution 74.5% on male attribution	Not applicable
Unpleasantness (score 1)	Neutral stimuli = 38.6% Female stimuli = 31.3% Male stimuli = 30.5%	Not applicable	Not applicable

When the penis was apparent in a picture, the participants attributed male sex significantly more often (84.3–88.4 percent) than female sex when the vulva was apparent (69.6–73.3 percent). In other words, when male external genitalia were exposed (not covered by clothes), the odds of male sex attribution are 5.688 compared to 1.823 female attribution when female genitalia were exposed (Experiment 1). In addition, the certainty in sex attribution was reported to be greater when participants had attributed male versus female sex (Experiments 1 and 2). Furthermore, the participants attributed male sex to neutral stimuli 2.34, 2.83, and 2.17 times more often when the penis was displayed than when the vulva was shown in the Experiments 1, 2, and 3, respectively.

All findings had a strong statistical significance (Experiments 1, 2, and 3, $p < .001$), substantially confirming those found by Federici and colleagues¹³ with the same realistic stimuli (SGAT-A) and by Kessler and McKenna¹⁵ with stylized drawings of the human body (Overlay Study).

Although all the sexual characteristics significantly contribute to the attribution of sex, female attribution appears to be triggered only when every other male cue has been excluded (Experiments 1 and 3). In other words, the presence of female characteristics reduces the probability of assigning male sex. Therefore, all other things being constant, a female cue is recognized as such only in the absence of male cues. Whereas a male sex cue most likely equals male, a female cue equals female with much less probability, confirming Federici et al.'s¹³ and Kessler and McKenna's¹⁵ findings.

The most salient variables were the penis followed by masculine face. The face assumed a prevalent role along with the flat chest and breast only when the external genitalia were covered by jeans (Experiments 1 and 3). The male face is an excellent predictor of male sex attribution^{23,24} and, if associated with the penis can overshadow all other female cues^{13,15}. These findings have confirmed what other similar studies found^{13,15,25}: The penis and male sexual characteristics make the difference in sex recognition.

The salience of male versus female sexual characteristics suggests that the psychological mechanism does not operate on a dichotomous concept and binary sex categorization, but rather to solve an adaptive problem of avoiding at all costs a false negative by detecting a female when it is male²⁶. In fact, for all individuals (e.g., infants, females), the risk of socializing with a male is greater than with a female, because male individuals tend to be physically stronger and much more aggressive. From this perspective, to mistake a female when it is a male is potentially more dangerous than the opposite for human survival. Therefore, a subtraction is applied to the higher danger condition (male) to get to the lack-of-danger condition (non-male). In other words, to survive, it is much more convenient to make a wrong female than a wrong male sex attribution. These errors of judgment are determined by cognitive mechanisms evolved by natural selection that “occurred despite the fact that subjects were encouraged to be accurate and were rewarded for the correct answers”²⁷.

In Experiment 3, we have also examined the time taken by participants to attribute sex after each stimulus was displayed. As expected, the shortest times were observed with masculine stimuli (i.e., with

Loading [MathJax]/jax/output/CommonHTML/fonts/TeX/fontdata.js

neutral stimuli (i.e., with a balanced co-presence of 3 male and 3 female variables; Supplementary Tables S16 and S17). This result mirrors those by Simpkins²⁴, who showed participants images of parts of real human faces, created by photographing 28 people who varied by sex, ethnicity, and age, on the grounds that the face is “usually the first source of information available about a person”²³. The study concluded with a significant disproportion between the times in which the participants attributed male sex to the stimuli compared to times in which they attributed female sex to the stimuli. This was similarly demonstrated in the study by Wenzlaff and colleagues²⁵, which replicated Kessler and McKenna’s study using eye tracking on digital reproductions of original stimuli. Participants gazed longer when they attributed female sex when a penis was present, than when they attributed male sex with a vulva shown. This is indicative of higher cognitive effort and more difficulty ignoring the penis as opposed to the vulva. Attributing a female sex when the individual might be a male requires a more careful and effortful attentional and decision-making process that also involves inhibiting the cognitive bias mechanism of male preference.

Experiment 2 also provided us with pilot data on cross-cultural differences on sex attribution. Comparing different cultures allows us to investigate whether the process of sex attribution can be ascribed more to human universals^{14,28}—that is, to the effect of evolved psychological mechanisms—rather than to the influence of memes. Although the results were based on a small-scale sample, not generalizable to be representative of another culture (Chinese), nevertheless they encourage us to continue our cross-cultural research. The fact that the young Chinese participants behaved similarly to those of the two Italian samples in attributing sex to stimuli from Western human models allows us to infer that the psychological mechanism of sex recognition may be metacultural and precede any form of ethnic differentiation. In the Pleistocene, our ancestors must have already been able to reliably proceed, being adaptively successfully in recognizing the sex of conspecifics despite the individual phenotypic variation. We do not have a recognition mechanism that can differentiate a chicken from a hen, because it is not essential to our fitness. But we certainly needed to know how to discriminate the sex of a Neanderthal, Denisovans, or Homo sapiens²⁹ before any ethnic (cultural) differentiation.

Overall, the study supports the assumption that thinking a person is a male rather than a female is more likely and quicker, *ceteris paribus*, because maximizing male sex attribution reduces the risk of a false negative. We read these results not by limiting ourselves to an ethnomethodological perspective, as Kessler and McKenna did in the 1970s, but by integrating this with assumptions from evolutionary psychology and cognitive science according to an Integrated Causal Model stating that “the distinction between the biologically determined and the nonbiologically determined can be seen to be a nondistinction”³⁰.

The adaptive strategy, evolved in a psychological architecture of mind, neither excludes nor minimizes the cultural gender construction. Human minds and behavior, human artifacts and culture are

all biological phenomena—aspects of the phenotypes of humans and their relationships with one

Loading [MathJax]/jax/output/CommonHTML/fonts/TeX/fontdata.js ed by a cognitive architecture, embodied in a

physiological system, which interacts with the social and nonsocial world that surrounds it.³⁰

This suggests that what Kessler and McKenna¹⁵ argued from a constructionist point of view that “[sex] assignment’ and ‘gender construction’ may be synonymous”¹⁵ does not contradict the biological outlook according to psychological adaptive mechanisms evolved to respond to specific problems raised by the environment affecting human sex attribution. The fact that, in a phallocentric culture, a penis makes somebody more often a male person rather than a female one does not negate the fact that these cultural constructions were guided by an adapted mind¹. There is no doubt that, in patriarchal cultures, the female role is derived from the space left free by the male role, though still under patriarchal control. So we can read biological cues as cultural: “the only sign of femaleness is an absence of male cues”¹⁵. However, this does not contradict that what culture has expressed, strengthened, sedimented, socially stratified, and handed down through cultural products and memes may have evolved from cognitive processes that have guaranteed human survival^{31–35}. In case of ambiguity or complexity in the detection of sex cues, a cognitive bias has saved humans from a risky encounter with an aggressive male^{26,36,37}. Cultural contents (e.g., phallocentrism, patriarchalism, androcentrism, etc.) cannot precede those psychological mechanisms that had produced them. This is not to say that culture only echoes mental contents. Alexander³⁸ summarizes this point well as follows: “I have not suggested that culture precisely tracks the interests of the genes—obviously this is not true—but that, in historical terms, it does so much more closely than we might have imagined” (p. 142).

Once produced, the culture constitutes part of that environment within which the mechanisms of natural selection evolve. And since not only does the environment select the individual, but the individual modifies the environment, culture cannot completely introduce content that goes beyond the boundaries of those cognitive constraints within which all variations are possible and learnable. Otherwise, the content would be unlearnable, inexperienced and, therefore, without effect on the individual behavior and the phenotypic evolution.

How could we have evolved without developing a computational cognitive system specific enough to solve the problem of sex attribution in an infinite combinatorial variety of phenotypic and genetic variables? Just by combining six variables of primary and secondary male and female sexual characteristics and two clothes, we produced 120 stimuli. Combinatorial explosion refers to the fact that with each new degree of freedom added, or dimension, or choice added, the total number of alternative possibilities quickly explodes. If only we were to combine the SGAT-A variables with other well-known variables that influence sex recognition—such as tone of voice, body posture and gait, social status, and so on³⁹—the alternatives would soon multiply endlessly. Yet, each of us solves this “frame problem” without great difficulty or cognitive effort, in a matter of milliseconds⁶. This makes us lean toward a domain-specific mechanism that cooperates and competes with other evolved mechanisms of our adapted mind that have evolved for adaptive success and ensure good fitness in Pleistocene.

Declarations

Loading [MathJax]/jax/output/CommonHTML/fonts/TeX/fontdata.js

Compliance with Ethical Standards

Human and Animal Rights. The project was approved by the Committee of Bioethics of the University of Perugia, protocol no. 2019-34. The observational study was carried out with full respect for the dignity of the human being and his/her fundamental rights, as dictated by the Declaration of Helsinki and the rules of Good Clinical Practice issued by the European Council.

Informed Consent. Informed consent was obtained from all individual participants included in the study.

Acknowledgements

We sincerely thank Ms. Giulia Setteposte for her valuable contribution in the creation of the SGAT-A images.

Author Contributions

S.F. and A.L. equally contributed to study design, SGAT-A design, data interpretation, data collection, literature search, supplementary figures, table 1 and supplementary tables, writing, and editing. F.B. and S.B. contributed to study design, data analysis, data interpretation, supplementary figures and tables, writing, and editing. All authors reviewed the manuscript.

Competing financial interests

The authors declare no competing financial interests.

References

1. Tooby, J. & Cosmides, L. in *The Adapted Mind: Evolutionary Psychology and the Generation of Culture* (eds Jerome H. Barkow, Leda Cosmides, & John Tooby) 19–136 (Oxford University Press, 1992).
2. Bazarra-Fernandez, A. in *Handbook on Sexuality: Perspectives, Issues and Role in Society* (eds Nicholas E. Peterson & Whitney Campbell) 213–225 (Nova Science, 2012).
3. Coen, S. & Banister, E. (Canadian Institutes of Health Research, Ottawa, CA, 2012).
4. Heidari, S., Babor, T. F., De Castro, P., Tort, S. & Curno, M. Sex and Gender Equity in Research: rationale for the SAGER guidelines and recommended use. *Research Integrity and Peer Review* **1**, 2, doi:10.1186/s41073-016-0007-6 (2016).
5. Symons, D. *The Evolution of Human Sexuality*. (Oxford University Press, 1981).
6. Ito, T. A. & Urland, G. R. Race and gender on the brain: electrocortical measures of attention to the

- doi:10.1037/0022-3514.85.4.616 (2003).
7. Ito, T. A. & Bartholow, B. D. The neural correlates of race. *Trends Cogn. Sci.* **13**, 524–531, doi:10.1016/j.tics.2009.10.002 (2009).
 8. Ito, T. A. & Urland, G. R. The influence of processing objectives on the perception of faces: An ERP study of race and gender perception. *Cognitive, Affective, & Behavioral Neuroscience* **5**, 21–36, doi:10.3758/CABN.5.1.21 (2005).
 9. Bigler, R. S. & Liben, L. S. Cognitive Mechanisms in Children's Gender Stereotyping: Theoretical and Educational Implications of a Cognitive-based Intervention. *Child Dev.* **63**, 1351–1363, doi:10.1111/j.1467-8624.1992.tb01700.x (1992).
 10. Sapolsky, R. M. *Behave: The Biology of Humans at Our Best and Worst.* (Penguin Press, 2017).
 11. Rutland, A. The development of national prejudice, in-group favouritism and self-stereotypes in British children. *Br. J. Soc. Psychol.* **38**, 55–70, doi:10.1348/014466699164031 (1999).
 12. Meloni, F., Federici, S. & Dennis, J. L. Parents' Education Shapes, but Does not Originate, the Disability Representations of Their Children. *PLOS ONE* **10**, e0128876, doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0128876 (2015).
 13. Federici, S., Lepri, A. & D'Urzo, E. Sex/Gender Attribution: When the Penis Makes the Difference. *Arch. Sex. Behav.*, doi:10.1007/s10508-021-02152-z (2021).
 14. Brown, D. E. *Human Universals.* (McGraw-Hill, 1991).
 15. Kessler, S. J. & McKenna, W. *Gender: An Ethnomethodological Approach.* (University of Chicago Press., 1978).
 16. Kahneman, D. *Thinking, fast and slow.* (Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 2011).
 17. Bates, D., Mächler, M., Bolker, B. & Walker, S. Fitting Linear Mixed-Effects Models Using lme4. *Journal of Statistical Software* **67**, 1–48, doi:10.18637/jss.v067.i01 (2015).
 18. Bates, D. *et al.* lme4: Linear Mixed-Effects Models using 'Eigen' and S4 [version 1.1-26]. (2020). <<https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=lme4>>.
 19. Kinsey, A. C., Pomeroy, W. B. & Martin, C. E. *Sexual Behavior in the Human Male.* (Saunders, 1948).
 20. Beaton, D., Bombardier, C., Guillemin, F. & Ferraz, M. B. Guidelines for the process of cross-cultural adaptation of self-report measures. *Spine* **25**, 3186–3191, doi:10.1097/00007632-200012150-00014 (2000).
 21. Chou, W.-S. *Tongzhi: Politics of Same-sex Eroticism in Chinese Societies.* (Haworth Press, 2000).
 22. Fodor, J. A. *The Modularity of Mind.* (MIT Press, 1983).
 23. Jackson, L. A. *Physical Appearance and Gender: Sociobiological and Sociocultural Perspectives.* (State University of New York Press, 1992).
 24. Simpkins, J. J. *Creating Constructs through Categorization: Gender and Race* Master of Arts thesis, University of Central Florida, (2014).
 25. Wenzlaff, F., Briken, P. & Dekker, A. If there's a penis, it's most likely a man: Investigating the social

- doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0193616 (2018).
26. Navarrete, C. D. *et al.* Fear Extinction to an Out-Group Face: The Role of Target Gender. *Psychol. Sci.* **20**, 155–158, doi:10.1111/j.1467-9280.2009.02273.x (2009).
 27. Tversky, A. & Kahneman, D. Judgment under Uncertainty: Heuristics and Biases. *Science* **185**, 1124–1131, doi:10.1126/science.185.4157.1124 (1974).
 28. Atran, S. Folk biology and the anthropology of science: Cognitive universals and cultural particulars. *Behav. Brain Sci.* **21**, 547–569, doi:10.1017/s0140525x98001277 (1998).
 29. Ackermann, R. R. *et al.* Hybridization in human evolution: Insights from other organisms. *Evol Anthropol* **28**, 189–209, doi:10.1002/evan.21787 (2019).
 30. Cosmides, L. & Tooby, J. in *The Adapted Mind: Evolutionary Psychology and the Generation of Culture* (eds Jerome H. Barkow, Leda Cosmides, & John Tooby) 137–159 (Oxford University Press, 1992).
 31. Barkow, J. H. in *The Adapted Mind: Evolutionary Psychology and the Generation of Culture* (eds Jerome H. Barkow, Leda Cosmides, & John Tooby) Ch. 666, 627–637 (Oxford University Press, 1992).
 32. Buss, D. M. Human nature and culture: An evolutionary psychological perspective. *J. Pers.* **69**, 955–978, doi:10.1111/1467-6494.696171 (2001).
 33. Carruthers, P., Laurence, S. & Stich, S. (Oxford University Press, New York, NY, USA, 2006).
 34. Lumsden, C. J. & Wilson, E. O. *Genes, Mind, and Culture: The Coevolutionary Process*. (Harvard University Press, 1981).
 35. Ji, L.-J. & Yap, S. Culture and cognition. *Current Opinion in Psychology* **8**, 105–111, doi:10.1016/j.copsy.2015.10.004 (2016).
 36. Dimberg, U. & Öhman, A. Behold the Wrath: Psychophysiological Responses to Facial Stimuli. *Motivation and Emotion* **20**, 149–182, doi:10.1007/bf02253869 (1996).
 37. Dimberg, U., Thunberg, M. & Elmehed, K. Unconscious Facial Reactions to Emotional Facial Expressions. *Psychol. Sci.* **11**, 86–89, doi:10.1111/1467-9280.00221 (2000).
 38. Alexander, R. D. *Darwinism and Human Affairs*. (University of Washington Press, 1979).
 39. Buss, D. M. *Evolutionary Psychology: The New Science of the Mind*. 6th edn, (Routledge, 2019).

Supplementary Files

This is a list of supplementary files associated with this preprint. Click to download.

- [Federicietal2021ThinkingitsamaleSISREP.pdf](#)