DH-09 Human mating systems and sexual selection

The architecture of human mating systems and sexual selection represents a complex synthesis of ancient evolutionary pressures, ecological constraints, and dynamic cultural institutions. To rigorously understand how males and females navigate partner selection, reproductive skew, and family formation, the evidence must be decoupled into three distinct but interacting layers. The first layer is physiology, encompassing the measurable, biologically fixed dimorphism and genetic legacies that document the ancestral selection pressures exerted on the human species. The second layer is behaviour, capturing the statistical distributions of psychological mate preferences, mating strategies, and the operational dynamics of the "mating market." The third layer is culture, which dictates the highly variable norms, marriage systems, and institutional constraints governing human reproduction across different ecologies. This report provides an exhaustive, evidence-based analysis of these three layers, synthesizing peer-reviewed primary literature, meta-analyses, and cross-cultural demographic data.

Layer 1: The Physiology of Human Mating

The physiological layer of human mating relies on anatomical, demographic, and genetic records to reconstruct the ancestral selection pressures that shaped the species. At the foundational core of this biological reality is anisogamy—the fundamental asymmetry in gamete size and metabolic investment between males and females[1]. This asymmetry establishes the baseline for parental investment theory, predicting that the sex investing more heavily in the production and rearing of offspring (females, via gestation and obligate lactation) will act as the limiting resource for the reproductive success of the sex investing less (males)[3].

Bateman's Principles and the Meta-Analytic Evidence

The evolutionary consequences of anisogamy are encapsulated in Bateman's principles, derived from A.J. Bateman's 1948 experiments on *Drosophila*. Bateman posited three core principles for sexually reproducing species: males exhibit greater variance in reproductive success than females; males exhibit greater variance in mating success than females; and male reproductive success is more steeply dependent on the number of mating partners (the Bateman gradient)[2]. For decades, these principles formed the bedrock of sexual selection theory, positing that males are universally subject to stronger sexual selection than females. However, this paradigm has faced significant controversy. Critics such as Snyder and Gowaty, as well as Tang-Martínez and Ryder, have argued that Bateman's original data was methodologically flawed and that the observed variances could theoretically arise from random mating rather than intense male-male competition[6]. Furthermore, observations of sex-role reversed species suggested that the principles were not absolute laws[6].

To resolve this controversy, Janicke et al. (2016) in *Science Advances* conducted a comprehensive phylogenetic meta-analysis testing Bateman's principles across 72 studies comprising 66 animal species[1]. The meta-analysis confirmed that, across the animal kingdom,

sexual selection is indeed significantly stronger in males.

Metric of Sexual Selection	Meta-Analytic Effect Size	Statistical Significance	Implication
Opportunity for Selection (ΔI)	lnCVR = 0.432 $\pm$ 0.188	$P = 0.022$	Males exhibit significantly higher variance in overall reproductive success.
Opportunity for Sexual Selection (ΔI_s)	lnCVR = 0.151 $\pm$ 0.156	$P = 0.343$	Male variance in mating success is higher, though statistically marginal across all taxa.
The Bateman Gradient ($\Delta \beta_{ss}$)	Hedges' *d* = 0.344 $\pm$ 0.162	$P = 0.033$	Male reproductive success increases significantly more steeply with additional mates.

Table 1: Meta-analytic confirmation of Bateman's Principles (Data from Janicke et al., 2016[2]). Positive effect sizes indicate a male bias.

In human populations, the application of Bateman's principles demonstrates that while both sexes are subject to sexual selection, male reproductive variance has historically been higher. Courtiol et al. (2012) in the *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* (*PNAS*) analyzed a historical monogamous human population in 18th and 19th-century Finland (N = 5,923 individuals)[8]. They calculated an opportunity for selection (I) of 2.27, noting that I was 24.2% higher in males than in females ($P < 0.001$)[9]. The variance in mating success explained a larger portion of the variance in reproductive success for males than for females.

Crucially, however, the human Bateman gradient is complicated by extensive male parental investment. Courtiol et al. (2012) noted that for most men, taking more than one sequential mate was actually associated with *lower* overall reproductive success—except for men in the lowest income quartile—and that the duration of a union was a critical predictor of reproductive fitness[5]. This indicates that while human physiology bears the hallmarks of male intrasexual competition, offspring survival necessitates heavy biparental investment, pulling the

species uniquely toward pair-bonding and attenuating the sheer force of the Bateman gradient seen in other mammals.

Genetic Evidence of Historical Reproductive Skew

The historical intensity of male reproductive skew is indelibly recorded in the human genome. Because mitochondrial DNA (mtDNA) is inherited maternally and the non-recombining portion of the Y-chromosome (NRY) is inherited paternally, comparing their genetic diversity allows researchers to estimate the historical effective population sizes of reproducing females versus reproducing males. Wilder et al. (2004) in *Nature Genetics* analyzed variation in a sample of 73 individuals (25 Khoisan, 24 Mongolians, and 24 Papua New Guineans) to minimize the confounding influence of global population subdivision[12].

Wilder et al. demonstrated that the time to the most recent common ancestor (TMRCA) for human mtDNA is approximately twice as old (averaging 92.8 thousand years ago for non-Africans, and 176.5 thousand years ago for Khoisan) as the TMRCA for the NRY (averaging 47.7 thousand years ago for non-Africans, and 73.6 thousand years ago for Khoisan)[12]. This disparity indicates that the effective population size of reproducing females has historically been much larger than that of reproducing males. The authors concluded that rather than a global selective sweep, this bottleneck suggests a consistent pattern of sex-biased demography where a smaller subset of men than women successfully passed on their genes[12].

This genetic skew became extreme with the advent of agriculture. Zeng et al. (2018) in *Nature Communications* analyzed the "Neolithic Y-chromosome bottleneck," a severe demographic event occurring between 5,000 and 3,000 BCE, where Y-chromosome diversity plummeted dramatically across Eurasia, Africa, and the Americas while mtDNA variation remained stable[14]. The authors hypothesized that this was caused by "cultural hitchhiking" and intense intergroup competition between newly formed patrilineal kin groups. In agricultural societies where males remained in their natal clans (patrilocality) and groups violently competed for resources, the extinction of entire male lineages drastically accelerated genetic drift, effectively homogenizing the surviving Y-chromosomes within regions[15].

Sexual Dimorphism and Physical Formidability

Physiological sexual dimorphism in humans is moderate in terms of overall mass but extreme in vectors related to intrasexual combat. While human males are on average only 7% to 10% taller and 15% to 20% heavier than females, this minor disparity masks profound differences in musculoskeletal architecture. Lassek and Gaulin (2009) in *Evolution and Human Behavior* demonstrated that men possess 61% more overall muscle mass, 78% more muscle mass in the upper arms, and roughly 90% greater upper-body strength than females[17].

This massive dimorphism in upper-body strength aligns directly with the mechanics of male-male contest competition, a hallmark of species subjected to intense sexual selection. Lassek and Gaulin (2009) also found that men with greater upper-body strength reported more lifetime sexual partners, yet were simultaneously more likely to be in long-term relationships[19]. The dual utility of strength—serving both as a formidable advantage in physical competition for mates and as an indicator of the ability to provision resources (e.g., hunting, defense)—highlights the complex, overlapping selection pressures operating on human male

physiology[18].

Layer 2: The Behavioural Architecture of the Mating Market

While physiology outlines the structural and ancestral limits of human reproduction, the behavioural layer captures the psychological mechanisms, mate preferences, and strategies that individuals deploy within the "mating market." The mating market functions analogously to an economic system: individuals assess their own mate value and trade it for desired traits in partners, constrained by supply (operational sex ratios), demand (consensual preferences), and ecological context. These behaviours manifest as statistical distributions; while sex differences in preferences show robust divergence at the mean, the distributions of male and female desires overlap significantly, distinguishing aggregate population trends from individual decision-making.

Universal Dimensions of Mate Preferences

The foundational study of cross-cultural human mate preferences was conducted by David Buss (1989) and published in *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*. Drawing on a sample of 10,047 participants across 37 cultures and 33 countries, Buss tested specific evolutionary hypotheses derived from sexual selection and parental investment theories[3]. The findings revealed profound universal sex differences: across all continents, political systems, and mating arrangements, women placed significantly greater value than men on cues of resource acquisition (e.g., good financial prospects, ambition, industriousness). Conversely, men placed significantly greater value on cues of reproductive capacity, specifically youth and physical attractiveness[3].

The magnitude of these differences is extraordinary within the context of psychological research. While typical psychological sex differences yield effect sizes (Cohen's *d*) of 0.20 to 0.30, the sex difference for age preference in mates approaches $d = 2.0$, representing one of the largest and most robust psychological sex differences ever documented[21]. Factor analyses of this 37-culture dataset by Shackelford, Schmitt, and Buss (2005) in *Personality and Individual Differences* identified four universal dimensions of long-term partner evaluation: Love vs. Status/Resources; Dependable/Stable vs. Good Looks/Health; Education/Intelligence vs. Desire for Home/Children; and Sociability vs. Similar Religion[22].

The durability and replicability of these findings were tested three decades later by Walter et al. (2020) in *Psychological Science*. Using a massive replication sample of 14,399 participants across 45 countries, the researchers successfully replicated Buss's core findings. Despite massive globalization, the advent of the internet, and three decades of social change, the central sex differences remained remarkably robust[24].

Study	Sample Size	Scope	Key Findings on Sex Differences in Mate	Replication Status

			Preferences	
Buss (1989)	N = 10,047	37 cultures, 33 countries	Females universally prioritize financial prospects and ambition. Males universally prioritize youth and physical attractiveness.	Foundational Study
Walter et al. (2020)	N = 14,399	45 countries	Confirmed core findings. Men value physical attractiveness more; women value earning potential more (significant Mahalanobis Distance in 100% of countries).	Successfully Replicated

Table 2: Key large-scale cross-cultural studies demonstrating robust, replicable sex differences in human mate preferences[3].

The Controversy: Evolutionary Psychology vs. Biosocial Role Theory

The interpretation of these cross-cultural preferences has sparked one of the most intense and enduring debates in the behavioural sciences. Evolutionary psychologists argue that these preferences are evolved psychological adaptations to recurrent ancestral problems (e.g., the necessity of securing resources for high-cost gestation versus the necessity of identifying peak female fecundity)[4].

In stark contrast, Eagly and Wood (1999) in *American Psychologist* advanced "Biosocial Role Theory" (later updated to Social Role Theory), arguing that mate preferences are predominantly the result of socio-structural power differentials and the gendered division of labor[27].

Re-analyzing Buss's original dataset alongside indices of national gender equality, Eagly and

Wood (1999) posited that women prefer wealthy men not because of an evolved psychological module, but because societies systematically deny women access to structural power and resources. They predicted that as societal gender equality increases, sex differences in mate preferences should attenuate and eventually vanish[28].

Zentner and Mitura (2012) in *Psychological Science* sought to test this by assessing mate preferences in 10 nations and re-analyzing 31 nations using the World Economic Forum's Gender Gap Index. They concluded that sex differentiation in mate preferences declines proportionally to increases in a nation's gender parity, claiming this supported the biosocial model[31]. However, evolutionary psychologists, notably Schmitt (2012), vehemently critiqued these conclusions. Schmitt noted severe methodological flaws in Zentner and Mitura's analysis, including the commission of the ecological fallacy (conflating country-level aggregates with individual-level psychology) and pointing out that while sex differences in resource preferences attenuate slightly in highly egalitarian nations, they are never eliminated, maintaining a medium effect size[29].

The 2020 replication by Walter et al. provided a rigorous, highly powered test of both competing theories. The results were mixed but ultimately favored the evolutionary model for the core traits. Walter et al. found that greater gender equality *does* correlate with both sexes preferring mates closer to their own age (partially supporting biosocial role theory regarding the age gap). However, neither gender equality nor pathogen prevalence robustly predicted or eliminated the fundamental sex differences in preferences for physical attractiveness and financial resources[25]. The evidence strongly indicates that these baseline preferences are universal evolutionary features, even if their specific intensity is slightly calibrated by local social ecology.

Ecological Calibration: Pathogen Prevalence and Ovulatory Shifts

While baseline preferences are universal, ecological stressors calibrate mating behaviour. Gangestad, Haselton, and Buss (2006) in *Evolutionary Psychology* demonstrated that in environments with high pathogen prevalence, both men and women elevate the importance they place on physical attractiveness—a reliable evolutionary cue of health and genetic immunocompetence[33]. Experimental priming of women with cues of pathogen prevalence (N = 65) caused a shift in preference toward "good genes" indicators (e.g., facial masculinity and symmetry) at the expense of "good dad" indicators (e.g., parental investment and provisioning). Conversely, priming women with cues of resource scarcity shifted preferences back toward provisioning capabilities[33].

Further behavioural calibration is hypothesized to occur across the female menstrual cycle. Gangestad and Thornhill (2008) reviewed evidence suggesting that during the highly fertile ovulatory phase, women exhibit shifting preferences toward highly masculine, symmetrical men, particularly for short-term mating contexts[35]. This "ovulatory shift hypothesis" aligns with the concept of strategic pluralism, positing that ancestral women occasionally secured resources from a primary investing partner while securing superior genetic material from a secondary partner during peak fertility[35]. However, this sub-field is currently highly contested. Recent large-scale, pre-registered attempts to replicate ovulatory shifts have yielded mixed or null results, leading critics to argue that earlier findings may have been statistical artifacts of

underpowered studies or publication bias, leaving the magnitude and reliability of these cyclical behavioural shifts an open question in the literature.

Averages vs. Individuals: Sexual Strategies Theory

A critical distinction must be made between aggregate statistical behaviour and individual decision-making. Mate preference research relies heavily on self-reported desires, which consistently capture population-level sexual dimorphism. However, what people *state* they desire correlates only moderately with the traits of the actual partners they select. Real-world mating occurs within a multi-dimensional mating market where individuals must compromise their idealized preferences based on their own mate value, geographic proximity, shared values, and serendipity[24]. At the individual level, the distributions of male and female behaviours exhibit massive overlap; many women prioritize physical attractiveness over income, and many men prioritize status over youth.

Sexual Strategies Theory (SST), formulated by Buss and Schmitt (1993) in *Psychological Review* and updated in the *Annual Review of Psychology* (2019), explicitly predicts this variance. SST notes that humans did not evolve a singular mating strategy, but rather a flexible menu of short-term, long-term, serial, and extra-pair strategies[4]. The deployment of these strategies is highly context-dependent, shifting based on operational sex ratios, individual life-history trajectories, and perceived mate value, bridging the gap between population averages and individual variance[4].

Layer 3: The Cultural Evolution of Mating Institutions

While physiology and psychological preferences represent the deep evolutionary constraints of the species, human mating systems—the formal, institutionalized rules of marriage and reproduction—are culturally highly variable. Culture acts as an independent layer that can amplify, suppress, or channel evolved psychological desires into specific societal structures.

The Prevalence of Polygyny and the Threshold Model

Historically, the vast majority of human societies have operated within mildly to highly polygynous frameworks. According to George P. Murdock's Ethnographic Atlas, which analyzed 1,231 historical and pre-industrial societies globally, monogamy is culturally anomalous on a historical scale[37].

Marriage System	Number of Societies	Percentage of Sample
Strict Monogamy	186	~15%
Occasional Polygyny	453	~37%
Frequent Polygyny	588	~48%

Table 3: Prevalence of human marriage systems based on Murdock's Ethnographic Atlas (N =

1,231)[37].
Thus, roughly 85% of documented human societies permitted men to take multiple wives, aligning with the evolutionary advantages of elite male reproductive skew. However, it is crucial to note that even in highly polygynous societies, the majority of individual marriages remained monogamous due to the extreme wealth required to support multiple wives[38].
The existence of polygyny is widely explained by the Polygyny Threshold Model (PTM). The PTM posits that women will opt to share a highly resourced man rather than monopolize a resource-poor man if the variance in male wealth is so extreme that half a rich man's estate provides better fitness outcomes than a poor man's entire estate[39].
However, polygyny presents a persistent demographic puzzle. The prevailing assumption in sociology, evolutionary psychology, and political science has been that high rates of polygyny inevitably skew the marriage market, locking vast numbers of low-status men out of marriage and creating a volatile pool of frustrated, unmarried males prone to violence, crime, and insurgency[41].
Recent demographic modeling by Ross et al. (2025) in *PNAS* challenged this foundational assumption. Analyzing 84.1 million records from 74 censuses across 30 countries, Ross et al. demonstrated that marriage markets are generally skewed feminine due to two demographic realities: higher male mortality (a universal female survival advantage) and the universal spousal age gap (men consistently marrying younger women)[42]. These demographic parameters ensure that populations can mathematically sustain moderate to high levels of polygyny (e.g., elites having 2.5 wives on average) without systematically excluding large proportions of men from marriage[42]. This finding forces a re-evaluation of the assumption that polygyny is inherently destabilizing due to a surplus of unmarried men.

Non-Classical Polyandry

While polygyny maximizes male reproductive variance, polyandry (one woman, multiple husbands) was long thought to be an exceedingly rare anomaly confined almost exclusively to the Himalayas and the Marquesas Islands. However, Starkweather and Hames (2012) in *Human Nature* documented at least 53 non-classical societies worldwide that permit polyandrous unions[45]. They demonstrated that polyandry reliably emerges as a highly adaptive, facultative response in egalitarian societies facing high male mortality or an operational sex ratio severely skewed toward males[45]. This underscores the flexibility of human cultural institutions in solving localized ecological problems.

Imposed Monogamy as a Cultural Innovation

Despite the historical dominance of polygyny and the deep physiological markers of male reproductive skew, normative, institutionalized monogamy rapidly became the dominant global marriage system over the last few centuries. Henrich, Boyd, and Richerson (2012) in *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B* theorized that imposed monogamy is a cultural innovation driven by inter-group competition and cultural group selection[47].
According to Henrich et al., as human societies grew into large, complex agricultural states, the extreme wealth inequality naturally favored intense polygyny among elites. However, normative monogamy provided profound group-level advantages. By enforcing monogamy, societies

artificially suppress male intra-sexual competition and flatten reproductive skew. Henrich et al. argue that this dramatically reduces the population of unattached, status-seeking males, leading directly to measurable drops in crime rates, including murder, rape, robbery, and fraud[38]. Furthermore, monogamy redirects male metabolic and economic effort away from the endless, zero-sum pursuit of additional wives and toward paternal investment. This shift lowers the spousal age gap, reduces fertility rates (yielding higher-quality offspring investment), and drives massive increases in economic productivity and savings[47]. Consequently, societies that adopted normative monogamy outcompeted, economically and militarily, societies that permitted elite polygyny[48].

An alternative, though complementary, theory is offered by Ross et al. (2025) in *PNAS*. They utilized Bayesian phylogenetic multilevel models across 186 societies to argue that the decline of polygyny was not necessarily driven by group-level conflict, but rather by the increasing importance of rivalrous, heritable wealth—specifically, the privatization of land[39]. When land is scarce and divided among heirs, polygyny drastically fragments estates, destroying intergenerational wealth. Normative monogamy thus coevolved with secure inheritance and land privatization to mitigate conflict over heritable wealth[39]. Both theories agree, however, that strict monogamy is a cultural technology built to override the natural human tendency toward reproductive skew in the presence of extreme inequality.

Extra-Pair Paternity and Serial Monogamy

Even within culturally enforced monogamous frameworks, human mating strategies exhibit opportunistic variance. Extra-pair paternity (EPP)—where a child is biologically fathered by someone other than the social father—provides a genetic measure of sexual fidelity. Larmuseau et al. (2016) in *Current Biology* utilized genetic and genealogical data spanning 500 years in Flanders, Western Europe, to show that historical EPP rates were remarkably low, averaging roughly 1%[50]. However, these rates spiked to nearly 6% among low socioeconomic classes in dense, 19th-century urban centers, indicating that anonymity and local resource scarcity manipulate the incentives for sexual fidelity[50].

Context / Population	Source	Estimated Extra-Pair Paternity (EPP) Rate
Historical Western Europe (Flanders, 500 years)	Larmuseau et al. (2016)[50]	~1% (Average)
19th-Century Urban Poor (Flanders)	Larmuseau et al. (2016)[50]	~6% (Peak)
Himba Pastoralists (Namibia)	Scelza et al. (2020)[51]	Highly elevated (specific % varies, cited as one of the highest recorded)

Table 4: Variance in Extra-Pair Paternity rates highlights the facultative nature of human fidelity based on cultural and ecological contexts.

Conversely, Scelza et al. (2020) in *Nature Human Behaviour* examined the Himba pastoralists of Namibia, discovering some of the highest EPP rates ever recorded in a human population. In this culture, both men and women engage in extensive concurrent partnerships, balancing formal marital obligations with informal romantic partners, demonstrating that high rates of non-marital fertility can be socially integrated and adaptive under certain ecological conditions[51].

Ultimately, in modern Western societies, the biological impulse for multiple partners combined with the cultural enforcement of monogamy has largely resolved into *serial monogamy*—a sequence of exclusive pair-bonds, often punctuated by divorce and remarriage. This system historically allowed high-status males to reproduce across multiple younger partners over a lifespan without violating the cultural strictures against simultaneous polygyny.

Conclusion

1. Gametic asymmetry (anisogamy) generates Bateman's principles, resulting in stronger sexual selection and higher reproductive variance for males than females across the animal kingdom.
2. The human genome confirms intense ancestral male reproductive skew, with mitochondrial DNA (female lineage) tracing back to a much larger effective population than the Y-chromosome (male lineage).
3. Humans exhibit massive physiological dimorphism designed for physical contest competition, with males possessing approximately 90% greater upper-body strength than females.
4. Cross-culturally, women consistently place a higher statistical value on cues of resource acquisition, ambition, and social status in long-term mates than men do.
5. Cross-culturally, men consistently place a higher statistical value on cues of youth and physical attractiveness in long-term mates than women do.
6. These psychological sex differences in mate preferences are highly robust, having replicated across 45 countries and surviving decades of modernization and globalization.
7. While increases in societal gender equality successfully narrow the preferred spousal age gap, they do not eliminate the fundamental sex differences regarding preferences for attractiveness and resources.
8. Culturally, roughly 85% of historical human societies permitted polygyny, aligning with the evolutionary advantages of elite male reproductive skew.
9. Imposed normative monogamy is a recent cultural innovation that successfully overrides natural reproductive skew, reducing societal crime and drastically increasing paternal investment.
10. Human mating strategies are highly facultative; while the psychological architecture for pair-bonding is universal, behaviours like extra-pair paternity and serial monogamy shift dramatically based on local ecology and cultural constraints.

Contested or Open Questions

- **The Ovulatory Shift Hypothesis:** Do women reliably experience shifts in mating

preferences toward highly masculine, "good-genes" males during the fertile window of their menstrual cycle, or are these effects statistical artifacts of underpowered studies?

- **Biosocial vs. Evolutionary Origins:** To what exact extent do local gender hierarchies construct mate preferences, and how much is genetically hardwired? Where is the exact boundary line?
- **The Drivers of Imposed Monogamy:** Did normative monogamy spread globally due to cultural group selection (outcompeting violent, polygynous societies) or primarily as an economic mechanism to prevent the fragmentation of privatized, heritable land?
- **Marriage Market Demographics:** Does high polygyny inherently lead to a large, destabilizing pool of unmarried men (as historically assumed), or do female survival advantages and spousal age gaps absorb this skew without leaving men structurally unmarried, as recent demographic models suggest?

5 to 10 Most Important Sources to Read in Full

1. **Buss, D. M. (1989).** "Sex differences in human mate preferences: Evolutionary hypotheses tested in 37 cultures." *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*.
2. **Walter, K. V., et al. (2020).** "Sex Differences in Mate Preferences Across 45 Countries: A Large-Scale Replication." *Psychological Science*.
3. **Henrich, J., Boyd, R., & Richerson, P. J. (2012).** "The puzzle of monogamous marriage." *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B*.
4. **Janicke, T., et al. (2016).** "Darwinian sex roles confirmed across the animal kingdom." *Science Advances*.
5. **Eagly, A. H., & Wood, W. (1999).** "The Origins of Sex Differences in Human Behavior: Evolved Dispositions Versus Social Roles." *American Psychologist*.
6. **Courtiol, A., et al. (2012).** "Natural and sexual selection in a monogamous historical human population." *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*.
7. **Lassek, W. D., & Gaulin, S. J. C. (2009).** "Costs and benefits of fat-free muscle mass in men: relationship to mating success, dietary requirements, and native immunity." *Evolution and Human Behavior*.
8. **Ross, H. G., Sear, R., & Fortunato, L. (2025).** "High rates of polygyny do not lock large proportions of men out of the marriage market." *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*.
9. **Zeng, T. C., Aw, A. J., & Feldman, M. W. (2018).** "Cultural hitchhiking and competition between patrilineal kin groups explain the post-Neolithic Y-chromosome bottleneck." *Nature Communications*.
10. **Buss, D. M., & Schmitt, D. P. (1993/2019).** "Sexual Strategies Theory: An evolutionary perspective on human mating." *Psychological Review / Annual Review of Psychology*.

Implications for Living Together

Note: In drawing implications from evolutionary biology, one must strictly avoid the naturalistic fallacy—the assumption that because a behaviour is "natural" or evolved, it is therefore morally "good" or socially desirable. Evolution optimizes for genetic propagation in ancestral environments, not human happiness, ethical flourishing, or modern societal stability.

For couples, families, and organizations seeking to design environments where men and

women can best live together, the research highlights that humans are fundamentally a pair-bonding species burdened with the physiological and psychological remnants of a highly competitive, mildly polygynous past.

For Couples and Families: Both men and women must recognize that they bring distinct, evolved psychological biases to the mating market. Acknowledging that male psychology is statistically more visually stimulated by cues of youth and physical attractiveness, and that female psychology is statistically more attuned to resource stability and ambition, can prevent resentment and foster realistic expectations in relationship dynamics. Because the human pair-bond is facultative rather than obligate, lifelong monogamy requires continuous, deliberate effort to sustain. The high rate of parental investment required for human children strongly incentivizes dual-parent households, but couples should be aware that the impulses for short-term mating and extra-pair liaisons are embedded in human architecture. These impulses must be consciously managed through transparent communication, trust-building, and shared values, rather than expecting biological perfection.

For Organizations: The vast disparity in male upper-body strength and the deep evolutionary history of male-male contest competition mean that environments without strictly enforced rules can easily default to male-dominated hierarchies driven by aggression and zero-sum status competition. Organizations must consciously design egalitarian structures, blind review processes, and strict anti-harassment policies to override these deep-seated primate politics. Furthermore, understanding the "biosocial" layer indicates that as women gain equal access to resources and structural power, some axes of mating behavior (such as the spousal age gap) equalize, leading to more peer-based partnerships. Organizations that support female economic independence inadvertently foster more egalitarian domestic and social arrangements.

For Societies: The data overwhelmingly suggest that normative, institutionalized monogamy is one of the most effective cultural technologies ever invented for societal stability. By suppressing the natural tendency toward elite male polygyny, monogamy drastically flattens reproductive skew. While new demographic models suggest polygyny does not strictly lock out as many men as previously thought, enforced monogamy undoubtedly shifts male energy away from the endless, aggressive pursuit of mating monopolies and redirects it into long-term paternal investment, savings, and economic productivity. Therefore, modern societies function best when their legal and cultural frameworks heavily incentivize stable, monogamous family units and actively discourage extreme concentrations of reproductive or material wealth.

Works cited

1. (PDF) Darwinian sex roles confirmed across the animal kingdom, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/294090096_Darwinian_sex_roles_confirmed_across_the_animal_kingdom
2. Darwinian sex roles confirmed across the animal kingdom - PMC - NIH, https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC4758741/
3. Sex differences in human mate preferences - UT Psychology Labs, https://labs.la.utexas.edu/buss/files/2015/10/buss-1989-sex-differences-in-human

-mate-preferences.pdf
4. Mate Preferences and Their Behavioral Manifestations, https://labs.la.utexas.edu/buss/files/2018/09/Mate-Preferences-and-Their-Behavioral-Manifestations-2019.pdf
5. (PDF) A matter of time: Bateman's principles and mating success as, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/372309136_A_matter_of_time_Bateman's_principles_and_mating_success_as_count_and_duration_across_social_strata_in_contemporary_Finland
6. Bateman gradients reflect variation in sexual selection in a species, https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC9545144/
7. Darwin and the impact of sex-role reversal on sexual selection, https://www.henshaw-lab.com/uploads/5/9/1/0/59106019/fritzsche_et_al_2021_biol_j_linnean_soc.pdf
8. Natural and sexual selection in a monogamous historical human, https://www.pnas.org/doi/abs/10.1073/pnas.1118174109
9. Natural and sexual selection in a monogamous historical human, https://www.pnas.org/doi/pdf/10.1073/pnas.1118174109
10. 23. Bateman's Principles and the Study of Evolutionary Demography, https://pure.mpg.de/rest/items/item_3630968_1/component/file_3630969/content
11. A matter of time: Bateman's principles and mating success as count, https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC10336387/
12. Genetic Evidence for Unequal Effective Population Sizes of Human, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/8393487_Genetic_Evidence_for_Unequal_Effective_Population_Sizes_of_Human_Females_and_Males
13. Natural Selection Reduced Diversity on Human Y Chromosomes, https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC3886894/
14. Anthropology Essay: The Neolithic Y-Chromosome Bottleneck: A, https://medium.com/@stonewalljacksoncollins/the-neolithic-y-chromosome-bottleneck-a-multifactorial-analysis-of-demographic-transition-in-early-c4eb2ee160f0
15. Cultural hitchhiking and competition between patrilineal kin groups, https://eurogenes.blogspot.com/2018/05/cultural-hitchhiking-and-competition.html
16. Something Weird Happened to Men 7,000 Years Ago, And We, https://www.sciencealert.com/neolithic-y-chromosome-bottleneck-warring-patrilineal-clans
17. A meta-analysis of the relationships between sexually dimorphic, https://www.biorxiv.org/content/10.1101/2020.03.06.980896v1.full.pdf
18. Why do men tend to be larger, taller, and stronger than women?, https://www.reddit.com/r/AskAnthropology/comments/hj3uuz/why_do_men_tend_to_be_larger_taller_and_stronger/
19. Upper Body Strength Predicts Sexual Partner Count in Men and, https://neurosciencenews.com/body-strength-sexual-partner-psychology-28366/
20. (PDF) Sex differences in human mate preferences - ResearchGate,

https://www.researchgate.net/publication/231858845_Sex_differences_in_human_mate_preferences_Evolutionary_hypotheses_tested_in_37_cultures
21. What are the sociocultural interpretations of David Buss's theory on, https://www.reddit.com/r/AskSocialScience/comments/oyylp7/what_are_the_sociocultural_interpretations_of/
22. Universal dimensions of human mate preferences - Todd Shackelford, https://www.toddkshackelford.com/downloads/Shackelford-Schmitt-Buss-PAID-2005.pdf
23. (PDF) Universal Dimensions of Human Mate Preferences, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/222557486_Universal_Dimensions_of_Human_Mate_Preferences
24. 14 Gender Differences in Human Mate Preferences - FORRT, https://forrt.org/open-social-psychology/chapter26.html
25. (PDF) Sex Differences in Mate Preferences Across 45 Countries, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/340068405_Sex_Differences_in_Mate_Preferences_Across_45_Countries_A_Large-Scale_Replication
26. Sexual strategies theory - Wikipedia, https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Sexual_strategies_theory
27. The Origins of Sex Differences in Human Behavior | Request PDF, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/232520455_The_Origins_of_Sex_Differences_in_Human_Behavior
28. Social Role Theory: Gender Differences Explained | PDF - Scribd, https://www.scribd.com/document/966109304/Eagly-Social-Role-Theory-pdf
29. Nations' Gender Gap Predicts Degree of Sex Differentiation in Mate, https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC10480977/
30. Personality and Gender Differences in Global Perspective, https://bura.brunel.ac.uk/bitstream/2438/21110/2/FullText.pdf
31. Nations' Gender Gap Predicts Degree of Sex Differentiation in Mate, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/230763257_Stepping_Out_of_the_Caveman's_Shadow_Nations'_Gender_Gap_Predicts_Degree_of_Sex_Differentiation_in_Mate_Preferences
32. [PDF] Stepping Out of the Caveman's Shadow - Semantic Scholar, https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/Stepping-Out-of-the-Caveman%E2%80%99s-Shadow-Zentner-Mitura/4e3a9f5a49cba46a073e08f547caf9eb7b2d4625
33. Experimental evidence that women's mate preferences are directly, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/51242184_Experimental_evidence_that_women's_mate_preferences_are_directly_influenced_by_cues_of_pathogen_prevalence_and_resource_scarcity
34. Exposure to visual cues of pathogen contagion changes ... - PMC, https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC3107643/
35. Evidence for Menstrual Cycle Shifts in Women's Preferences ... - PMC, https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC10480918/
36. Women's Preferences: Precopulatory Adaptations (Chapter 1), https://www.cambridge.org/core/books/cambridge-handbook-of-evolutionary-perspectives-on-sexual-psychology/womens-preferences-precopulatory-adaptati

ons/9C3988FA80C936A9978BACA87B55F2B0
37. Monogamy may be a choice or even a product of civilization, but in, https://www.reddit.com/r/monogamy/comments/y7reg9/monogamy_may_be_a_choice_or_even_a_product_of/
38. Why humans are monogamous by nature - evidence from research!, https://www.reddit.com/r/monogamy/comments/u5nwbp/why_humans_are_monogamous_by_nature_evidence_from/
39. Competition for heritable wealth, not cultural group selection ... - PNAS, https://www.pnas.org/doi/pdf/10.1073/pnas.2514328122
40. No evidence that polygynous marriage is a harmful cultural practice, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/283293124_No_evidence_that_polygynous_marriage_is_a_harmful_cultural_practice_in_northern_Tanzania
41. Did We Evolve to Be Monogamous? - Psychology Today, https://www.psychologytoday.com/us/blog/culture-mind-and-brain/201610/did-we-evolve-be-monogamous
42. High rates of polygyny do not lock large proportions of men ... - PNAS, https://www.pnas.org/doi/10.1073/pnas.2508091122
43. Polygyny, Inequality, and Social Unrest* - APSA Preprints, https://preprints.apsanet.org/engage/api-gateway/apsa/assets/orp/resource/item/614d8ed718be8522602e8109/original/polygyny-inequality-and-social-unrest.pdf
44. High rates of polygyny do not lock large proportions of men out of, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/396180872_High_rates_of_polygyny_do_not_lock_large_proportions_of_men_out_of_the_marriage_market
45. A Survey of Non-Classical Polyandry - ResearchGate, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/225293025_A_Survey_of_Non-Classical_Polyandry
46. Chapter x: Marriage types - Brunel University Research Archive, https://bura.brunel.ac.uk/bitstream/2438/31011/1/FullText.pdf
47. The puzzle of monogamous marriage - PMC - NIH, https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC3260845/
48. (PDF) The Puzzle of Mmonogamous Marriage - ResearchGate, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/221772273_The_Puzzle_of_Mmonogamous_Marriage
49. Competition for heritable wealth, not cultural group selection, drives, https://www.pnas.org/doi/10.1073/pnas.2514328122
50. A Historical-Genetic Reconstruction of Human Extra-Pair Paternity, https://bio.kuleuven.be/eeb/tw/pdfs/larmuseau-etal-currbiol-2019.pdf
51. Scelza et al 2020 ehb.pdf - Sean Prall, https://sprall.github.io/pubs/Scelza%20et%20al%202020%20ehb.pdf
52. Research - BROOKE A. SCELZA, https://bscelza.weebly.com/research.html
53. The Role of Spousal Separation on Norms Related to Gender and, https://www.mdpi.com/2076-0760/10/5/174