

ISCI, Volume 4

Supplemental Information

**Human Listeners Can Accurately Judge
Strength and Height Relative to Self
from Aggressive Roars and Speech**

Jordan Raine, Katarzyna Pisanski, Anna Oleszkiewicz, Julia Simner, and David Reby

Supplemental Information

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

Transparent Methods

All experiments were approved by the University of Sussex's Life Sciences & Psychology Cluster-based Research Ethics Committee (C-REC) (Certificates of approval: ER/JR307/8, ER/JR307/9) and comply with the American Psychological Association's Ethical Principles of Psychologists and Code of Conduct.

Participants

Vocal stimuli were recorded from 30 male and 31 female (M age = 22.79 ± 1.12) drama or acting students from the Royal Central School of Speech and Drama and the University of Sussex, United Kingdom, who received monetary compensation in exchange for their participation.

We recruited separate samples of participants to provide voice-based assessments of the relative strength and height of vocalizers. The sample that rated strength (hereafter Experiment 1) consisted of 19 females and 26 males (age = 31.44 ± 8.33) recruited from Tromsø and surrounding rural towns in Norway ($N = 11$, all fluent English speakers), and from the University of Sussex, UK ($N = 34$), in return for prize draw monetary compensations (5 x £20). The sample that rated height (hereafter Experiment 2) consisted of 31 females and 25 males (age = 34.27 ± 10.39), recruited from the USA using Amazon Mechanical Turk, and compensated with \$1.75 USD. Participants from both experiments provided informed consent and completed the experiment online using a custom computer interface. Data from one female and male

26 participant in Experiment 1, and from two female and two male participants in
27 Experiment 2, who did not complete the experiment but rated more than half of the
28 stimuli, were included in our analysis.

29

30 **Materials**

31

32 **Vocal stimuli.**

33 Vocalizers were audio recorded producing an aggressive roar and aggressive
34 speech in a quiet, anechoic room, standing 150 cm from a Zoom H4n microphone. A
35 chair was placed at this distance to restrict participants from moving closer to the
36 microphone. Vocalizers were instructed to produce the speech sentence, ‘That’s enough,
37 I’m coming for you!’, followed by a nonverbal vocalisation expressing the same
38 motivation, while imagining themselves in a battle or war scenario, about to charge and
39 attack. This resulted in a total of 122 vocal stimuli (see Electronic Supplementary
40 Materials for examples of aggressive roars and aggressive speech).

41 To obtain realistic vocal stimuli, participants were encouraged to take as much
42 time as they needed to immerse themselves in each imagined context, and to ‘let go of
43 their inhibitions’. Participants were also given the option not to vocalise if they felt that
44 they could not naturally produce the sentence or nonverbal vocalisation, and to repeat
45 each sentence or vocalisation until they were satisfied with their portrayal.

46 Recordings were saved as WAV files at 44.1 kHz sampling frequency and 16 bits
47 amplitude resolution.

48

49

50

51 **Physical formidability measures.**

52 We measured the height of vocalizers using metric tape. The average height of
53 our sample of vocalizers (male $M = 182.03 \pm 0.97$ cm; female $M = 167.10 \pm 1.19$ cm)
54 compares well with that of the general UK population (male $M = 175.3$ cm, female $M =$
55 161.9 cm, Moody, 2013). Flexed bicep circumference and handgrip strength were also
56 measured, and these measurements were aggregated to produce a single, equally
57 weighted, z-scored strength value for each subject (following Sell et al. 2009; Puts et al.
58 2011, and others). These measures explain approximately 55% and 24% of the variance
59 in strength as measured by weight-lifting machines in male college students,
60 respectively (Sell et al., 2009).

61 To measure flexed bicep circumference (male $M = 32.09 \pm 0.60$ cm; female $M =$
62 28.96 ± 0.70 cm), participants were instructed to rest the elbow of their dominant arm
63 on a table while seated, to clench their fist, and to curl their forearm perpendicular to the
64 table. The experimenter measured the circumference of the bicep at its highest point. A
65 Baseline hydraulic hand dynamometer in its standard use was used to measure the
66 handgrip strength of participants' dominant arm (male $M = 41.57 \pm 1.36$ kg; female $M =$
67 26.98 ± 1.06 kg). Each strength measure was recorded twice per subject and the highest
68 achievable score, representing greatest strength, was used in analyses.

69

70 **Procedure**

71 All playback experiments were completed online on Syntoolkit, a dedicated
72 online testing platform for psychology studies (e.g., Hughes, Gruffydd, Simner & Ward,
73 in press; see Simner & Alvarez, in prep) that is particularly suited to running studies
74 with sensory or multisensory stimuli. Listeners were instructed to use headphones and
75 complete the experiment in a quiet place. To allow listeners to complete the experiment

76 at a comfortable but audible volume, they were instructed to first set their volume to its
77 lowest level. Listeners then heard a demo sound file (amalgamating a loud and quiet
78 stimulus), and were instructed to raise their volume until they could clearly hear the
79 quiet stimulus, while the louder stimulus did not cause discomfort. Following this,
80 listeners were asked not to adjust the volume settings during the experiment unless it
81 became too uncomfortable, and were asked at the end of the experiment if they had
82 done so. Due to the agonistic nature of the stimuli, listeners were made aware that if
83 they felt uncomfortable or distressed listening to the sounds, they could stop the
84 experiment.

85 In playback experiments, vocal stimuli ($n = 122$) were blocked by sex and
86 stimulus type (speech/roar). The order of blocks and stimuli within blocks was
87 randomised. Before each block, participants were reminded to listen to each stimulus in
88 full, and informed that they could take a break at any time. Listeners rated the physical
89 strength (Experiment 1) or height (Experiment 2) of each voice stimulus (“Rate by how
90 much this person is stronger/taller or weaker/shorter than you”) on a 101-point scale
91 from -50 (much weaker/shorter) to 50 (much stronger/taller). We set the slider’s default
92 position to 0 (described as ‘same as you’) and did not compel listeners to move the
93 slider so as not to artificially force directional judgments.

94 Listeners were debriefed upon completion that the roars and screams were acted,
95 and that the vocalizers were not really experiencing aggression or distress. We
96 examined reaction times against stimulus durations to ensure that participants listened to
97 the stimuli before entering their ratings. No participants responded before half of the
98 stimulus had elapsed on more than five trials, thus no listeners were excluded.

99 To assess whether listeners could accurately judge the physical characteristics of
100 vocalizers relative to their own, we measured listeners’ own physical characteristics. In

101 Experiment 1, we used a tailor's tape measure to measure bicep circumference (male M
102 = 33.89 ± 0.46 cm; female $M = 28.12 \pm 0.57$ cm), and a Takei hand dynamometer to
103 measure handgrip strength (male $M = 46.11 \pm 1.67$ kg; female $M = 33.03 \pm 1.10$ kg), in
104 identical fashion to measurements taken from vocalizers. These measures were taken in
105 person, prior to the listener completing the playback experiment online at a time of their
106 choosing. Both vocalizer and listener strength z-scores were calculated based on a
107 pooled sample of the listeners' and the vocalizers' measurements. Experiment 2 relied
108 on a self-report measure of height given at the start of the playback experiment (male M
109 = 176.38 ± 1.30 cm; female $M = 169.36 \pm 1.48$ cm). The validity of self-report measures
110 of height has been extensively studied, and despite slight overestimations, self-reported
111 height closely reflects measured height within the age range of our sample of listeners
112 (Krul, Daanen, & Choi, 2011; Lim, Seubsman, & Sleight, 2009; Parker, Dillard, &
113 Phillips, 1994; Wada et al., 2005).

114

115 **Coding and Statistical Analysis**

116

117 To examine strength/height estimation in functionally relevant terms, we divided
118 the actual difference in strength/height into five categories. In Experiment 1, percentage
119 differences between -10% and 10% were coded as 'similar strength', differences
120 between $\pm 10\%$ and $\pm 30\%$ were coded as 'vocalizer is stronger (weaker) than listener',
121 and differences greater than $\pm 30\%$ were coded as 'vocalizer is much stronger (weaker)
122 than listener'. In Experiment 2, we calculated by how many centimetres the vocalizer
123 was taller than the listener. Values were coded into identical categories of 11 cm
124 intervals. This interval was chosen as it produced a similar distribution to that observed
125 for our actual strength difference categories.

126 In both experiments, we coded the rated difference in strength/height between
127 listener and vocalizer into three categories. Ratings between 45 and 55 were categorised
128 as ‘rated as similar strength’, and ratings above (below) this range were coded as
129 ‘vocalizer rated as stronger (weaker)’. We computed a linear mixed multinomial logistic
130 regression, testing the effects of the actual strength/height difference between listener
131 and vocalizer, vocalizer sex, listener sex, and stimulus type on the rated difference
132 between listener and vocalizer, excluding actual difference categories with sample sizes
133 less than 15. In all models, we included listener identity as a subject variable, and
134 vocalizer identity as a random factor, thus allowing the intercepts and slopes of the
135 relationships between predictors and outcomes to vary between both vocalizers and
136 listeners and testing null hypotheses based on the average of these intercepts and slopes.

137

138

139 **List of Supplemental Audio Files**

140 (F = female vocalizer; M = male vocalizer)

141

142 F01 Roar.wav

143 F01 Speech.wav

144 F02 Roar.wav

145 F02 Speech.wav

146 F03 Roar.wav

147 F03 Speech.wav

148 M01 Roar.wav

149 M01 Speech.wav

150 M02 Roar.wav

151 M02 Speech.wav

152 M03 Roar.wav

153 M03 Speech.wav

154

155 **References**

156

157 Hughes, J.E.A., Gruffydd, E., Simner, J., and Ward, J. (in press). Synaesthesia aids in
158 savant-skill acquisition: training calendar calculation in sequence-space synaesthetes.
159 Cortex.

160

161 Krul A.J., Daanen H.A.M. and Choi H., Self-reported and measured weight, height and
162 body mass index (BMI) in Italy, The Netherlands and North America, *Eur. J. Public*
163 *Health* **21**, 2011, 414–419.

164

165 Lim L.L., Seubsman S. and Sleigh A., Validity of self-reported weight, height, and body
166 mass index among university students in Thailand: implications for population studies
167 of obesity in developing countries, *Popul. Health Metr.* **7**, 2009, 15.

168

169 Moody, A. (2013). Adult anthropometric measures, overweight and obesity (Health
170 Survey for England - 2012). NHS. Retrieved from
171 <http://digital.nhs.uk/catalogue/PUB13218>.

172

173 Parker J.M., Dillard T.A. and Phillips Y.Y., Impact of using stated instead of measured
174 height upon screening spirometry, *Am. J. Respir. Crit. Care Med.* **150** (6 Pt 1), 1994,
175 1705–1708.

176

177 Sell A., Cosmides L., Tooby J., Sznycer D., von Rueden C. and Gurven M., Human
178 adaptations for the visual assessment of strength and fighting ability from the body and
179 face, *Proc. R. Soc. Lond. B Biol. Sci.* **276**, 2009, 575–584.

180

181 Simner, J., & Alvarez, J. (in prep). The Syntoolkit: an online testing platform for
182 behavioural research experiments.

183

184 Puts, D.A., Apicella, C.L., & Cárdenas, R.A., Masculine voices signal men's threat
185 potential in forager and industrial societies, *Proc. R. Soc. Lond. B Biol. Sci.*
186 rspb20110829.

187

188 Wada K., Tamakoshi K., Tsunekawa T., Otsuka R., Zhang H., Murata C. and
189 Toyoshima H., Validity of self-reported height and weight in a Japanese workplace
190 population, *Int. J. Obes. (Lond.)* **29**, 2005, 1093–1099.

191