DH-07 Cross-cultural databases: what correlates with women's status

The systematic, quantitative study of human societies—spanning pre-industrial foragers, horticulturalists, pastoralists, and agrarian states—provides an unparalleled empirical foundation for understanding the origins, variability, and persistence of women's status and gender roles. Historically, the comparative analysis of the ethnographic record was hindered by scattered anthropological data, conflicting definitions of status, and the profound statistical challenge of cultural non-independence, known as Galton's problem. However, the consolidation of global databases has transformed the study of cultural evolution into a rigorous, econometric, and phylogenetic discipline. Foundational repositories such as the Standard Cross-Cultural Sample (SCCS), established by George P. Murdock and Douglas R. White in 1969 with 186 culturally distinct and geographically dispersed societies, alongside Murdock's Ethnographic Atlas, containing over 1,200 pre-industrial societies, laid the groundwork for large-scale comparative anthropology[1].

More recently, these historical repositories have been integrated into advanced digital architectures like the Database of Places, Language, Culture, and Environment (D-PLACE), which maps cultural variables to linguistic phylogenies and ecological conditions across 1,400 societies[4]. Similarly, the Seshat: Global History Databank focuses on the diachronic evolution of social complexity and institutions[6]. A critical milestone in this field was the validation of these databases against modern survey data. In a 2021 study published in *Economics Letters*, Bahrami-Rad, Becker, and Henrich tested the validity of the Ethnographic Atlas by comparing its historical societal metrics with the self-reported behaviours and attitudes of 790,000 contemporary descendants across 43 countries[8]. Their analysis documented strong, robust positive associations, confirming that the cultural parameters recorded by early ethnographers reliably predict contemporary institutional and psychological variations. By applying phylogenetic comparative methods and econometric instrumental variables to these databases, modern researchers can systematically identify the socio-ecological, technological, and historical predictors of women’s status, autonomy, and the sexual division of labour.

The Tripartite Architecture: Physiology, Behaviour, and Culture

To rigorously interpret the correlates of women's status across the cross-cultural record, researchers must separate human organization into three distinct but perpetually interacting layers: physiology, behaviour, and culture. Failing to distinguish among these layers frequently leads to the pitfalls of biological determinism on one extreme, or radical social constructivism on the other.

Layer 1: Physiology (The Measurable)

The physiological layer consists of universal, biologically measurable, and immutable sex differences rooted in human evolutionary biology. Human sexual dimorphism dictates that men,

on average, possess greater upper-body muscularity, higher bone density, greater grip strength, and a higher cardiovascular capacity for brief bursts of excessive physical energy[1]. Conversely, female physiology bears the obligate mammalian constraints of reproduction: internal gestation and lactation. Prior to the demographic transition, the advent of modern contraception, and the widespread availability of infant formula, women in pre-industrial societies spent the vast majority of their adult lives pregnant or nursing[1]. These physiological parameters act as universal, inflexible constraints on the efficiency and allocation of human labour, creating asymmetric comparative advantages in specific physical tasks depending on the ecological context.

Layer 2: Behaviour (The Statistical)

The behavioural layer represents the statistical expression of physiological constraints as they interact with ecological and economic demands. Crucially, behavioural traits and capabilities manifest as overlapping distributions rather than binary, mutually exclusive categories. When distinguishing what is known about population averages from what can be said about specific individuals, it is vital to recognise massive statistical overlap. For instance, while the average man possesses greater upper-body strength than the average woman, a notable percentage of women are physically stronger than a notable percentage of men. Similarly, psychological and behavioural tendencies—such as risk-taking, physical aggression, or the propensity for direct resource competition—show distinct, measurable differences in their central tendencies (means) between the sexes, while maintaining vast overlap at the individual level[14]. Behavioural specialisation at the societal level is therefore a statistical phenomenon driven by the optimization of aggregate comparative advantage, not an absolute biological imperative that strictly governs every individual.

Layer 3: Culture (The Variable)

The cultural layer represents the normative, institutional, and symbolic frameworks that societies construct to organise, enforce, amplify, or transcend behavioural averages. Culture is highly variable and serves to codify statistical tendencies into rigid gender roles, moral systems, taboos, and laws. Where physiology and average behaviour suggest that women are statistically less likely to possess the grip strength required for heavy animal-drawn ploughing, culture often intervenes to make it a strict religious or social taboo for a woman to even touch a plough[12]. The cultural layer dictates post-marital residence rules (patrilocality versus matrilocality), descent tracking (patriliny versus matriliny), and marital institutions (monogamy versus polygyny). It is exclusively within this cultural layer that "women's status" is negotiated, constrained, and institutionalised, often freezing temporary ecological adaptations into permanent societal laws.

The Sexual Division of Labour: Task Allocation Across Societies

The most fundamental manifestation of gender roles and the bedrock of societal organization is the sexual division of labour. George P. Murdock and Caterina Provost provided the seminal cross-cultural analysis of task allocation in their 1973 paper, "Factors in the Division of Labor by

Sex," published in the journal *Ethnology*[1]. Utilizing the Standard Cross-Cultural Sample, they examined the allocation of 50 distinct technological activities across 185 pre-industrial societies[11].

Murdock and Provost generated a "masculinity index" for each task, identifying that a minority of tasks are consistently and rigidly sex-typed across almost all human cultures, while a large proportion of tasks are "swing activities" that are male-dominated in some societies and female-dominated in others, depending heavily on the mode of subsistence[11].

Task Category	Predominant / Exclusive Sex	Examples from the SCCS	Theoretical Explanation
Strictly Male	Male (90-100% of societies)	Ore smelting, metalworking, lumbering, hunting large aquatic fauna, hunting large land fauna, clearing land.	Tasks requiring maximal upper-body physical strength, bursts of excessive energy, distant travel from the home base, or high physical risk[1].
Strictly Female	Female (90-100% of societies)	Cooking, preparing vegetal foods, fetching water, spinning, laundering.	Tasks highly compatible with simultaneous childcare; repetitive, easily interruptible, safe, and located close to the home base[1].
Swing Activities	Variable (Environment dependent)	Agriculture (planting, harvesting), animal husbandry, house building, gathering small land fauna, pottery making.	Task allocation depends on environmental context, the specific sequence of production, and the technological complexity of the local economy[13].

Competing Theoretical Explanations for the Division of Labour

The robust statistical correlations observed in the global allocation of labour are explained by

competing, yet often complementary, anthropological theories that attempt to link the physiological layer to the cultural layer.

The *Childcare Compatibility Hypothesis*, famously articulated by Judith K. Brown in a 1970 article in the *American Anthropologist*, posits that women's tasks are universally structured around the unyielding biological exigencies of childbearing and nursing[1]. Because early weaning was historically impossible without catastrophic infant mortality, women were biologically tethered to infants. Consequently, women universally specialized in tasks that were repetitive, easily interruptible, not dangerous, and did not require long absences from the household[1]. Cooking, which Murdock and Provost found to be exclusively or predominantly assigned to women in 183 of their 185 sampled societies, perfectly fits this biological paradigm[13].

Alternatively, Murdock and Provost (1973) emphasized a *Masculine Advantage Hypothesis*, suggesting that men hold a sheer mechanical advantage for tasks demanding significant upper-body strength and bursts of energy, while women hold a relative advantage for tasks demanding daily, continuous, and meticulous attention[1].

However, Michael L. Burton, Lilyan A. Brudner, and Douglas R. White (1977), publishing in the *American Ethnologist*, heavily critiqued the simplicity of both the strength and childcare hypotheses using "entailment theory." They argued that the sexual division of labour is primarily driven by the *sequence of production* and the economic principles of the economy of effort[1]. If a society relies on women to gather wild vegetation, it is economically efficient for women to also prepare that vegetation; if they prepare it, it is most efficient for them to cook it. Their statistical entailment analysis demonstrated that there is rarely more than one change in sex participation within any given production sequence, creating clusters of gendered tasks based on geographical location and temporal workflow rather than the intrinsic biological requirements of the individual tasks themselves[1].

Predictors of Women's Status, Autonomy, and Power

While the sexual division of labour addresses the mechanical reality of *what* men and women do, a deeper analytical question is *why* the relative status, socio-political power, and bodily autonomy of women vary so drastically across the ethnographic record. Advanced econometric regressions and phylogenetic comparative analyses of cross-cultural databases have isolated several highly robust predictors of women's status.

1. Subsistence Type and Agricultural Technology: The Legacy of the Plough

The degree to which women contribute to primary subsistence, and the societal value placed on that contribution, is heavily dependent on the ecological environment and the specific technology used to exploit it. In 1970, economist Ester Boserup theorised that the introduction of the plough during the Neolithic agricultural revolution fundamentally degraded women's economic status compared to earlier, simpler systems of shifting cultivation (hoe agriculture)[12]. Shifting cultivation is highly labour-intensive, and women actively and equally participate in weeding, planting, and harvesting alongside men. Plough agriculture, however, is immensely capital-intensive and requires significant grip strength and bursts of upper-body power to

control heavy draught animals, yielding a strong physiological comparative advantage to men[12]. Furthermore, the plough effectively eliminates the need for extensive manual weeding, which was traditionally a female-dominated task, thereby structurally pushing women out of the agricultural fields and isolating them within the domestic sphere[12].

Alberto Alesina, Paola Giuliano, and Nathan Nunn provided the definitive empirical test of Boserup's hypothesis in a landmark 2013 paper published in the *Quarterly Journal of Economics*[12]. Using pre-industrial data from the Ethnographic Atlas mapped to contemporary global populations, they demonstrated that the descendants of societies that traditionally practiced plough agriculture exhibit significantly lower rates of female labour force participation (FLFP), lower female participation in national politics, lower rates of female firm ownership, and a substantially higher prevalence of patriarchal attitudes favouring strict gender inequality today[12].

To establish causality and solve the econometric issue of endogenous technological adoption (i.e., the possibility that inherently sexist societies selectively adopted the plough), Alesina, Giuliano, and Nunn utilized an instrumental variable (IV) approach based on the historical geo-climatic suitability of the local environment for growing crops that highly benefited from the plough (e.g., wheat, barley, rye) versus crops that did not (e.g., sorghum, millet, root crops)[12]. The reported effect sizes are massive and highly significant: a one-standard-deviation increase in historical plough use predicts a decline in contemporary fertility of 0.52 children (equivalent to 17% of the sample mean), and a standard deviation reduction in female labour market participation[12]. This finding has been exhaustively replicated across numerous economic datasets, including analyses of second-generation immigrants, proving that the cultural norms generated by the plough persist independently of contemporary economic institutions[27].

2. Pastoralism, Paternity Uncertainty, and Restrictions on Female Sexuality

Societies that rely heavily on animal husbandry, specifically nomadic or transhumant pastoralism, display distinct and often severe cultural adaptations regarding women's bodily autonomy and sexuality. Anke Becker, in a 2019 paper published in the *Review of Economic Studies*, utilised the Ethnographic Atlas to investigate the deep economic origins of cultural restrictions on women's sexuality, such as female genital cutting (FGC), infibulation, strict chastity norms, and restrictions on female freedom of mobility[31].

The theoretical mechanism rests on the intersection of ecology and evolutionary biology. Pastoralist societies required men to be absent from the home settlement for frequent and often highly extended periods to herd livestock across arid or semi-arid landscapes. This structural male absence severely exacerbated the biological problem of paternity uncertainty (the risk of cuckoldry)[31]. Because livestock represents highly concentrated, easily defendable, and directly inheritable male wealth, the economic and evolutionary cost of unwittingly raising an illegitimate child was exceptionally high[31]. Becker hypothesized that these specific ecological conditions incentivised the creation of draconian cultural institutions designed to physically restrict female promiscuity and guarantee chastity prior to marriage[31].

Using a vast sample of over 500,000 women across 34 modern nations, and utilizing local ecological suitability for pastoralism as an instrumental variable to establish causality, Becker's econometric analysis demonstrated that historical reliance on pastoralism strongly and significantly predicts the contemporary prevalence of infibulation (the most invasive and physically restrictive form of FGC) and the adherence to restrictive norms regarding women's mobility[31]. Expanding on this in a 2024 working paper utilizing 1.8 million survey respondents across 122 countries, Becker demonstrated that ancestral pastoralism profoundly and negatively predicts women's contemporary labour market participation. The driving mechanism is the persistent cultural obsession with chastity; women of pastoral descent are significantly more likely to work exclusively for family members rather than unrelated employers to avoid mixed-sex environments[32].

3. Descent, Residence, and the Destructive Influence of Concentrated Wealth

Cross-cultural databases reveal that societal kinship structures—specifically whether descent and inheritance are traced through the mother (matriliny) or the father (patriliny), and whether a newly married couple resides with the wife's family (matrilocality) or the husband's family (patrilocality)—are profound and direct predictors of women's status[33]. In matrilineal and matrilocal societies, women generally enjoy substantially greater political power, resource control, and physical safety against domestic violence, as they remain geographically surrounded by their consanguineal kin rather than isolated among in-laws[35].

However, cross-cultural evidence indicates that matriliny is historically fragile and strongly negatively correlated with the presence of concentrated, inheritable wealth, particularly large livestock. Clare Janaki Holden and Ruth Mace (2003) tested this correlation in a seminal paper published in the *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London, Series B*[36]. To overcome Galton's problem—the statistical trap wherein cultures cannot be treated as independent data points due to shared ancestry, migration, and cultural diffusion—Holden and Mace utilized a rigorous phylogenetic comparative method on a maximum-parsimony language tree of 68 Bantu and Bantoid societies in sub-Saharan Africa[3].

Holden and Mace found that acquiring cattle reliably led formerly matrilineal horticultural societies to shift to patrilineal or mixed descent systems[37]. A dependent coevolutionary statistical model showed a highly significant fit (likelihood ratio = 5.72, $p = 0.02$) compared to an independent model, firmly establishing the causal direction: the adoption of cattle preceded and caused the loss of matriliny[37]. From an evolutionary ecology perspective, cattle represent defendable, highly unequal wealth. Because the institution of polygyny allows men to convert wealth (cattle for bride-price) into reproductive success at a much higher rate than women can, wealthy parents are evolutionarily and economically incentivised to transfer cattle to their sons rather than their daughters, thereby systematically dismantling matrilineal inheritance systems over time[41].

4. Warfare, Pathogen Load, and the Male Supremacy Complex

Polygyny (one man marrying multiple women) is historically permitted in over 80% of the pre-industrial societies recorded in the Ethnographic Atlas, though the actual frequency of

men achieving polygynous marriages varies widely[43]. Polygyny inherently skews the operational sex ratio of a society, leaving a large cohort of unmarried, often disenfranchised men, and treats women as acquirable reproductive resources, which reliably diminishes women's societal autonomy and bargaining power[45].

Evolutionary ecologist Bobbi S. Low conducted extensive cross-cultural analyses to isolate the ecological predictors of polygyny. Using the SCCS and controlling for phylogenetic non-independence, Low demonstrated that high pathogen stress (disease burden) and high male mortality in warfare are the primary global predictors of appreciable, non-sororal polygyny[35]. High pathogen loads necessitate greater genetic diversity in offspring to survive localized diseases, driving an evolutionary preference for polygynous mating systems; concurrently, endemic warfare drastically reduces the adult male population, creating an artificial surplus of women and driving militaristic, male-supremacist cultural adaptations[35].

This empirical finding heavily supports the "Male Supremacy Complex" proposed by William T. Divale and Marvin Harris in a 1976 article in the *American Anthropologist*. They argued that in pre-industrial societies facing acute environmental constraints and population pressure, endemic warfare became a grim mechanism for demographic control. Because physiology grants men an absolute comparative advantage in hand-to-hand combat and the effective use of pre-industrial weaponry (spears, clubs, heavy bows), societies under existential threat were forced to prioritise male survival, male physical aggression, and male cohesion[47]. To systematically incentivise young men to fight and die for the group, these cultures developed the male supremacy complex: strict patrilocality, the reward of polygyny, total male monopolies on political power, and the intense ideological subjugation of women[47].

5. Kinship Tightness and Moral Systems

The structural variations in kinship not only dictate gender roles but also shape a society's entire moral and cooperative framework. Benjamin Enke, in a 2019 paper published in the *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, utilized variables from the Ethnographic Atlas (such as the presence of cousin marriage, polygamy, extended families, and patrilocal residence) to generate a "kinship tightness" score for historical societies[49]. Enke's analysis reveals that societies with tight, intense kinship systems enforce cooperation through communal moral values, strict in-group loyalty, revenge-taking, and deep concerns with female purity and external shame[49]. In these tight-kinship societies, women are heavily controlled to maintain clan boundaries and honor. Conversely, loose kinship societies (characterized by nuclear families and neolocal residence) enforce cooperation through universal moral values, internalized guilt, and altruistic punishment, creating a cultural environment far more conducive to female autonomy and individualized rights[49].

6. Women's Contribution to Subsistence

A long-standing assumption in early anthropology was that women's status was a direct, linear function of the calories they contributed to the societal diet. Alice Schlegel and Herbert Barry III tested this in a 1986 paper in the *American Anthropologist*, utilizing the SCCS. They found that women's contribution to subsistence is indeed highest in horticultural societies and lowest in societies practicing intensive agriculture or pastoralism[52]. However, subsequent multivariate

regressions revealed a critical confounding variable: high female contribution to subsistence is strongly and positively correlated with non-sororal polygyny[44]. In societies where women are entirely self-supporting through farming or gathering, acquiring multiple wives becomes highly economically advantageous for men, as each additional wife represents a surplus of labour rather than an economic burden[44]. Therefore, female contribution to subsistence only translates to heightened female status and autonomy in societies where strict monogamy or matrilocality simultaneously prevents the commodification of women's labour through polygyny[44].

Deconstructing "Status": Power, Dominance, and Multidimensionality

A central, ongoing controversy in cross-cultural anthropology revolves around whether "women's status" can be treated as a single, unitary variable, and whether "male dominance" is an inescapable cultural universal.

The Multidimensionality of Status (Whyte 1978)

In his seminal and highly rigorous work, *The Status of Women in Preindustrial Societies* (1978), Martin King Whyte drew on a carefully selected cross-cultural sample of 93 societies to systematically debunk the notion that women's status is a monolithic construct[53]. Through complex factor analysis, Whyte identified that variables universally assumed to represent "status"—such as property ownership rights, domestic authority, ritual inclusion, sexual freedom, and political power—simply did not strongly covary across cultures. Instead, his factor analysis yielded 10 entirely independent dimensions of status[56]. A society might grant women immense, unquestioned power in the domestic sphere and significant religious authority, while totally and violently excluding them from formal political leadership or warfare. Whyte's finding remains incredibly robust and has been widely replicated: one cannot meaningfully classify a society as universally "good" or "bad" for women on a single axis; status is fractured, highly contextual, and multi-dimensional[55].

Female Power and Male Dominance (Sanday 1981)

Anthropologist Peggy Reeves Sanday further explored the nuanced origins of sexual inequality in her 1981 book, *Female Power and Male Dominance: On the Origins of Sexual Inequality*[60]. Rejecting the premise of universal female subordination, Sanday analysed 156 tribal societies from the standard cross-cultural databases, constructing a rigorous Guttman scale of female power based on economic control, political participation, and symbolic representation[63]. Sanday theorised that macro-level gender relations are fundamentally determined by a society's historical adaptation to environmental stress. She introduced the influential concepts of "inner orientation" and "outer orientation"[67]. Societies with an inner orientation rely heavily on gathered plant foods (which are reliably controlled by women), experience long periods of environmental harmony and geographic stability, and tend to symbolise ultimate creative power as female (e.g., Earth Goddesses and matriarchal creation myths)[67]. These societies tend heavily toward egalitarianism. Conversely, societies facing severe environmental stress, famine, forced migration, or endemic warfare develop a drastic "outer orientation." They

become hyper-reliant on the hunting of large animals and the waging of war—activities physiologically monopolised by men[68]. This outer orientation breeds systemic male dominance, which Sanday's statistical analysis found to be tightly correlated with high societal incidences of interpersonal violence and a cultural propensity for rape[62].

The Controversy: Is Male Dominance a Cultural Universal?

The interpretation of cross-cultural databases has sparked one of the fiercest debates in the social sciences: the universality of male dominance. The strongest evidence on both sides is as follows:

- **Proponents of Universal Asymmetry:** Theorists such as Michelle Rosaldo and Steven Goldberg argued that because women are universally tied to the domestic sphere by the biological realities of gestation and lactation, and men universally monopolise the public/political sphere, a degree of male dominance is an inescapable human universal[69]. Cross-cultural data confirms this statistical reality: in zero out of 185 societies in the SCCS do women exclusively hunt large game, monopolise metalworking, or dominate military leadership[18]. Furthermore, no strictly matriarchal society—defined as a society where women hold absolute, systemic political and military dominance over subjugated men—has ever been reliably documented in the ethnographic record[69].
- **The Critics (Egalitarianism):** Leading critics, including Peggy Sanday, Eleanor Leacock, and Maria Lepowsky, fiercely argue that equating the absence of matriarchy with universal male dominance is a Western ethnocentric fallacy[63]. They point to extensively documented egalitarian societies (such as the Vanatinai of the South Pacific or the pre-colonial Iroquois) where women completely controlled the means of agricultural production, held absolute veto power over the initiation of warfare, and enjoyed total bodily autonomy[69]. They argue that severe male dominance only became pervasive globally with the rise of the agrarian state, the spread of capitalism, and the violent colonial disruption of indigenous egalitarian systems[63].

Ultimately, the databases show that while extreme male dominance (patriarchy) is statistically common and robustly correlated with intensive agriculture, pastoralism, and warfare, absolute male dominance is not a biologically inevitable human universal.

Summary of Robust Findings

1. The sexual division of labour universally allocates tasks requiring high bursts of physical strength or distant travel to men, and tasks compatible with simultaneous childcare to women.
2. The historical adoption of capital-intensive plough agriculture drastically reduced women's participation in primary subsistence, leading to persistent patriarchal norms and significantly reduced female labour force participation in modern descendants.
3. Pastoralist societies generated severe, violent constraints on female sexuality (e.g., genital cutting, strict chastity norms) as an economic defense against paternity uncertainty during extended male absences.
4. The accumulation of defendable, concentrated, highly unequal wealth (such as cattle) consistently destroys egalitarian matrilineal kinship systems in favour of patriliny.

5. Endemic warfare and high pathogen stress reliably predict the emergence of polygynous mating systems and highly militarised, male-supremacist cultural complexes.
6. Women's status is never a single variable; it comprises up to 10 independent dimensions (e.g., domestic authority, political power, property rights) that do not reliably covary.
7. Behavioural sex differences manifest as overlapping statistical distributions at the population level, never as absolute biological binaries at the individual level.
8. Societies that experience acute environmental stress, starvation, or forced migration exhibit significantly higher levels of systemic male dominance and interpersonal gender violence.
9. Female contribution to subsistence only increases female autonomy when it is not economically confounded by the presence of non-sororal polygyny.
10. Phylogenetic controls have proven that cultural traits regarding gender are rarely independent adaptations; they are heavily inherited and preserved from ancestral populations.

Contested or Open Questions

- **The Origin of the Plough vs. State Formation:** Does the plough independently cause patriarchal norms through the division of labour, or is the plough simply a technological proxy for the rise of complex, highly stratified states that institutionalise gender inequality for taxation, military conscription, and elite property transmission?
- **The Female Control Hypothesis:** Are severe restrictions on female sexuality (like infibulation) primarily enforced top-down by men to guarantee paternity, or are they perpetuated laterally and intergenerationally by women to increase their daughters' value in the marriage market within hyper-competitive patriarchal structures?
- **The Myth of Primitive Communism:** Were Pleistocene hunter-gatherers universally egalitarian regarding gender, or did socio-ecological variations create widespread pockets of extreme male dominance long before the Neolithic revolution?
- **Modern Reversibility:** To what extent can modern legal interventions, mass education, and post-industrial economic institutions fully overwrite deep-rooted, phylogenetically inherited cultural norms regarding gender?

The Most Important Sources to Read in Full

1. Alesina, A., Giuliano, P., & Nunn, N. (2013). "On the Origins of Gender Roles: Women and the Plough." *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*.
2. Sanday, P. R. (1981). *Female Power and Male Dominance: On the Origins of Sexual Inequality*. Cambridge University Press.
3. Whyte, M. K. (1978). *The Status of Women in Preindustrial Societies*. Princeton University Press.
4. Murdock, G. P., & Provost, C. (1973). "Factors in the Division of Labor by Sex: A Cross-Cultural Analysis." *Ethnology*.
5. Becker, A. (2019). "On the Economic Origins of Restrictions on Women's Sexuality." *Review of Economic Studies*.
6. Holden, C. J., & Mace, R. (2003). "Spread of cattle led to the loss of matrilineal descent in

Africa: a coevolutionary analysis." *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London. Series B*.
7. Boserup, E. (1970). *Woman's Role in Economic Development*. St. Martin's Press.
8. Enke, B. (2019). "Kinship, Cooperation, and the Evolution of Moral Systems." *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*.
9. Divale, W. T., & Harris, M. (1976). "Population, Warfare, and the Male Supremacy Complex." *American Anthropologist*.
10. Schlegel, A., & Barry, H. (1986). "The Cultural Consequences of Female Contribution to Subsistence." *American Anthropologist*.

Implications for living together

The cross-cultural record emphatically demonstrates that the way men and women live together is neither biologically predetermined by a rigid genetic blueprint, nor entirely socially arbitrary; rather, it represents a complex series of deep cultural adaptations to specific ecological, economic, and technological constraints. Avoiding the naturalistic fallacy is paramount here: the fact that human societies have historically adapted to resource scarcity, warfare, and wealth accumulation by stratifying gender roles does not mean such stratification is morally "good," functionally optimal, or biologically necessary for modern environments.

For modern couples and families, the ethnographic data reveals that power dynamics within the home are intimately tied to the division of labour and the control of tangible resources. When economic structures demand that one partner specialise exclusively in market production (acting as the modern equivalent of the ancestral ploughman or the pastoral herdsman) while the other specialises entirely in domestic care, structural imbalances in autonomy and bargaining power predictably follow. To foster genuinely egalitarian partnerships, modern couples must actively and consciously design their division of labour to avoid extreme, gendered specialisation, ensuring both partners maintain access to external resources, independent income, and broad social support networks.

For organisations, communities, and macro-level societies, the legacy of ancestral institutions—from the plough to pastoralism to tight kinship networks—demonstrates that cultural norms possess profound historical inertia. Organisations attempting to promote gender parity cannot simply rely on superficial policy changes; they must actively address the deep-rooted, often unconscious cultural scripts that erroneously equate aggressive "masculine" traits with effective leadership (a remnant of the outer-oriented, warfare-driven male supremacy complex). The cross-cultural databases show conclusively that societies thrive in egalitarianism when they actively reduce the severe environmental stressors (like resource scarcity, physical insecurity, and endemic conflict) that historically triggered patriarchal adaptations, thereby creating the stable ecological space required for human equality to flourish.

Works cited

1. Sexual Division of Labor in Agriculture - eScholarship.org, https://escholarship.org/content/qt88h0d858/qt88h0d858.pdf?v=lg
2. THE MURDOCK LEGACY: THE ETHNOGRAPHIC ATLAS ... - Ovid, https://www.ovid.com/journals/ccres/pdf/10.1177/106939718802200107~the-murd

ock-legacy-the-ethnographic-atlas-and-the-search-for
3. (PDF) Does Mr. Galton Still Have a Problem? Autocorrelation in the, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/242148557_Does_Mr_Galton_Still_Have_a_Problem_Autocorrelation_in_the_Standard_Cross-Cultural_Sample
4. Coding culture: challenges and recommendations for comparative, https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC10427479/
5. (PDF) D-PLACE: A Global Database of Cultural, Linguistic and, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/305073364_D-PLACE_A_Global_Database_of_Cultural_Linguistic_and_Environmental_Diversity
6. Quantitative historical analysis uncovers a single dimension ... - PNAS, https://www.pnas.org/doi/10.1073/pnas.1708800115
7. 3.09 Collaborative Historical Information Analysis - Patrick Manning, https://patrickmanningworldhistorian.com/wp-content/uploads/2021/01/D2.2017.Collaborative-Historical-Information-Analysis.pdf
8. Tabulated nonsense? Testing the validity of the Ethnographic Atlas, https://econpapers.repec.org/RePEc:eee:ecolet:v:204:y:2021:i:c:s0165176521001579
9. Tabulated nonsense? Testing the validity of the Ethnographic Atlas, https://ideas.repec.org/a/eee/ecolet/v204y2021ics0165176521001579.html
10. Ancestral origins of environmental (in)attention - arXiv, https://arxiv.org/html/2509.09598v2
11. Social Role Theory of Sex Differences and Similarities - USC Dornsife, https://dornsife.usc.edu/wendy-wood/wp-content/uploads/sites/183/2023/10/Eagly.Wood_.Johannnesen-Schmidt.2004_The_social_role_theory_of_sex_differences_and_similiarities.pdf
12. WOMEN AND THE PLOUGH Alberto F. Alesina Paola Giuliano, https://www.nber.org/system/files/working_papers/w17098/w17098.pdf
13. a note on the division of labor by sex - OpenBU, https://open.bu.edu/bitstreams/3e81f171-e025-420f-87f9-5c8648daf9d5/download
14. CESifo Working Paper No. 12173 - ifo Institut, https://www.ifo.de/DocDL/cesifo1_wp12173.pdf
15. When Inequality Fails: Power, Group Dominance, and Societal, https://jspp.psychopen.eu/index.php/jspp/article/view/4745/4745.html
16. The origins of sex differences in human behavior - Semantic Scholar, https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/The-origins-of-sex-differences-in-human-behavior%3A-Eagly-Wood/165704d26e023b0e16ec0c4d117da24a0b96b12a
17. The Origins of Gender Roles: Women and the Plough (Preliminary), https://sites.santafe.edu/~bowles/Origins_Gender.pdf
18. A Bioeconomic Approach to Marriage and the Sexual Division of Labor, https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC5486514/
19. A Cross-Cultural Analysis of the Sexual Division of Labor, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/227854981_Entailment_Theory_and_Method_A_Cross-Cultural_Analysis_of_the_Sexual_Division_of_Labor
20. (PDF) The Sexual Division of Labor - ResearchGate,

https://www.researchgate.net/publication/295694773_The_Sexual_Division_of_Labor
21. Gender and Sexuality – Discovering Cultural Anthropology, https://pressbooks.cuny.edu/discoveringculturalanthropology/chapter/chapter-10/
22. Hands, Tools, Weapons (1982) - Red Sails, https://redsails.org/hands-tools-weapons/
23. (PDF) On the Origin of Gender Roles: Women and the Plough, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/228283391_On_the_Origin_of_Gender_Roles_Women_and_the_Plough
24. Traditional agricultural practices and the sex ratio today | PLOS One, https://journals.plos.org/plosone/article?id=10.1371/journal.pone.0190510
25. NBER WORKING PAPER SERIES ETHNOGRAPHIC AND FIELD, https://www.nber.org/system/files/working_papers/w27918/w27918.pdf
26. Fertility and the Plough Alberto Alesina, Paola Giuliano, and Nathan, https://www.nber.org/system/files/working_papers/w16718/w16718.pdf
27. Revisiting the Ancient Origins of Gender Inequality CAMA Working, https://crawford.anu.edu.au/sites/default/files/2025-08/11a_2025_Vu_Original_Feb2025.pdf
28. Economic Gains from Gender Inclusion: New Mechanisms, New, https://www.imf.org/-/media/files/publications/sdn/2018/sdn1806.pdf
29. Differential effects of war and socialism on female labour force, https://www.econstor.eu/bitstream/10419/112748/1/832191868.pdf
30. Historical Ecospirituality and Environmental Attitudes - Econtribute, https://www.econtribute.de/RePEc/ajk/ajkdps/ECONtribute_377_2025.pdf
31. On the Economic Origins of Restrictions on Women's Sexuality, https://www.econstor.eu/bitstream/10419/201996/1/cesifo1_wp7770.pdf
32. Ancestral Pastoralism and Women's Contemporary Labor Market, https://www.ankebeckerecon.com/uploads/1/3/9/6/139626230/2025_wp_pastoralism_labormarket.pdf
33. Marital Residence among Foragers | Current Anthropology, https://www.journals.uchicago.edu/doi/10.1086/382256
34. Can Policy Change Culture? Government Pension Plans and, https://www.aeaweb.org/content/file?id=13933
35. Female allies and female power: A cross-cultural analysis, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/257492055_Female_allies_and_female_power_A_cross-cultural_analysis
36. Phylogenetic approach to the evolution of color term systems - PNAS, https://www.pnas.org/doi/abs/10.1073/pnas.1613666113
37. (PDF) Spread of Cattle Led to the Loss of Matrilineal Descent in Africa, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/8967288_Spread_of_Cattle_Led_to_the_Loss_of_Matrilineal_Descent_in_Africa_A_Coevolutionary_Analysis
38. Spread of cattle led to the loss of matrilineal descent in Africa - PMC, https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC1691535/
39. (PDF) A Phylogenetic Approach to Cultural Evolution - ResearchGate, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/7080881_A_Phylogenetic_Approach_to

_Cultural_Evolution
40. Revisiting Cross-Cultural Research in Economics - Boris Gershman, https://www.borisgershman.com/research/phyloatlas/PhyloAtlas_Nov24.pdf
41. [PDF] Spread of cattle led to the loss of matrilineal descent in Africa, https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/Spread-of-cattle-led-to-the-loss-of-matrilineal-in-Holden-Mace/c16f8ba36d37f9c3401c3b927fed835679b5ec68
42. The disequilibrium of double descent: changing inheritance norms, https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC6664134/
43. (PDF) Pathogen stress and polyygny in humans - ResearchGate, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/237010625_Pathogen_stress_and_polyygny_in_humans
44. The Matrilocal Tribe - ResearchGate, https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Doug_Jones8/publication/221886610_The_Matrilocal_Tribe_An_Organization_of_Demic_Expansion/links/55771f1a08ae7521586e129d/The-Matrilocal-Tribe-An-Organization-of-Demic-Expansion.pdf?ref=quillette.com
45. Sex ratios and gender norms: why both are needed to understand, https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/evolutionary-human-sciences/article/sex-ratios-and-gender-norms-why-both-are-needed-to-understand-sexual-conflict-in-humans/33A525F6047F01C8425BEC785D9255E2
46. Polygamy (Polygyny, Polyandry) - ResearchGate, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/327433275_Polygamy_Polygyny_Polyandry
47. A Cross-cultural Test of Nancy Jay's Theory About Women, https://vc.bridgew.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1482&context=jiws
48. What Is Sexual Inequality? On the Definition and... : Cross-Cultural, https://www.ovid.com/journals/ccres/fulltext/10.1177/106939719402800304~what-is-sexual-inequality-on-the-definition-and-range-of
49. Kinship, Cooperation, and the Evolution of Moral Systems - NBER, https://www.nber.org/system/files/working_papers/w23499/w23499.pdf
50. Kinship, Cooperation, and the Evolution of Moral Systems | NBER, https://www.nber.org/papers/w23499
51. Reconnecting Morality with Political Economy, https://www.imf.org/en/publications/fandd/issues/2025/03/reconnecting-morality-with-political-economy-benjamin-enke
52. The Cultural Consequences of Female Contribution to Subsistence, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/230107496_The_Cultural_Consequences_of_Female_Contribution_to_Subsistence
53. (PDF) Sexual selection under parental choice in agropastoral societies, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/247233178_Sexual_selection_under_parental_choice_in_agropastoral_societies
54. (PDF) Studying Societies and Cultures - Academia.edu, https://www.academia.edu/30058944/Studying_Societies_and_Cultures
55. THE SHADOW OF THE DALAI LAMA: SEXUALITY, MAGIC AND, https://survivorbb.rapeutation.com/viewtopic.php?f=174&t=969

56. The Status of Women in Preindustrial Societies, https://www.magersandquinn.com/product/STATUS-OF-WOMEN-IN-PREINDUSTRI/3768077
57. The Behavioral Ecology of Male Violence - Quillette, https://quillette.com/2018/02/24/behavioral-ecology-male-violence/
58. Measurement of Women's Agency in Egypt: A National Validation, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/283166291_Measurement_of_Women's_Agency_in_Egypt_A_National_Validation_Study
59. (PDF) In-Law Preferences in China: What Parents Look for in the, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/319454482_In-Law_Preferences_in_China_What_Parents_Look_for_in_the_Parents_of_Their_Children's_Mates
60. (PDF) Gender inequality in childhood: Toward a life course, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/225539609_Gender_inequality_in_childhood_Toward_a_life_course_perspective
61. The Decline and Rise of Democracy: A Global History from Antiquity, https://dokumen.pub/the-decline-and-rise-of-democracy-a-global-history-from-antiquity-to-today-9780691177465-0691177465-9780691201955-0691201951.html
62. (PDF) The Threat of Rape: Its Psychological Impact on Non, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/375353923_The_threat_of_rape_Its_psychological_impact_on_nonvictimized_women
63. Female Power and Male Dominance: On the Origins of Sexual, https://books.google.com/books/about/Female_Power_and_Male_Dominance.html?id=39ScGI-T3J0C
64. Going Home: An Anthropological Memoir | Request PDF, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/229824036_Going_Home_An_Anthropological_Memoir
65. Toward a Theory of the Status of Women1 - ResearchGate, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/227696924_Toward_a_Theory_of_the_Status_of_Women1
66. Matrix: a Journal for Matricultural Studies The Socio-Cultural Context, https://www.networkonculture.ca/assets/matrix/Volume%201,%20Issue%20I%20(May%202020)/5%20The%20Socio-Cultural%20Context%20of%20Rape%20%20Sanday/5%20%20The%20Socio-Cultural%20Context%20of%20Rape.%20A%20Cross-Cultural%20Study%20%20Sanday.pdf
67. the significance of the sexual division of labour to economic, http://www.sfu.ca/~mcohen/publications/women/significance%20division%20of%20labour.pdf
68. Theorizing Power - dokumen.pub, https://dokumen.pub/download/theorizing-power-9780230246560-0230246567-9780230246577-0230246575.html
69. What Is Sexual Inequality? - Ovid, https://www.ovid.com/journals/ccres/pdf/10.1177/106939719402800304~what-is-sexual-inequality-on-the-definition-and-range-of
70. "Explanations" of Male Dominance - Verso Books,

https://www.versobooks.com/blogs/news/3440-explanations-of-male-dominance
71. Male Dominance Versus Female Hidden Power - Cairn, https://shs.cairn.info/article/OUSA_221_0119/pdf?lang=en
72. Maria Lepowsky, Fruit of the Motherland: Gender in an Egalitarian, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/277818833_Maria_Lepowsky_Fruit_of_the_Motherland_Gender_in_an_Egalitarian_Society_and_Raymond_C_Kelly_Constructing_Inequality_The_Fabrication_of_a_Hierarchy_of_Virtue_among_the_Etoro_Expanding_the_Feminist_Deba