PS-05 Competition, status, risk and hierarchy

The architectural frameworks of human co-existence—whether observed in dyadic partnerships, familial units, small tribal coalitions, or sprawling modern socio-economic systems—are fundamentally shaped by how individuals navigate competition, status, risk, and hierarchy. Understanding these dynamics requires a rigorous examination of the underlying variables that govern human interaction. Chief among these variables is biological sex, a factor that has historically been the subject of profound theoretical debate, methodological scrutiny, and cultural contention.

To develop a robust foundation for understanding how men and women can best live and organize together, it is necessary to move beyond monolithic, deterministic narratives. Human behaviour is not strictly pre-ordained by genetics, nor is it an entirely malleable blank slate written upon by culture. Instead, the empirical evidence demands a stratified approach that examines human interaction across three distinct but interacting layers: *physiology* (the measurable biological and endocrine substrates), *behaviour* (the statistical realities of overlapping psychological distributions), and *culture* (the variable social roles and institutional structures that shape and are shaped by human actors).

This report synthesizes the primary peer-reviewed literature, systematic reviews, and meta-analyses regarding sex differences in competitiveness, risk-taking, status-seeking, and hierarchical organization. By distinguishing what is known about statistical averages from what can be inferred about individuals, and by presenting the strongest evidence on both sides of major academic controversies, this analysis provides an exhaustive assessment of the current scientific consensus.

Layer 1: Physiology

The physiological layer provides the biological hardware through which status, risk, and competitive drives are mediated. Historically, the endocrine system—specifically the role of androgens like testosterone—has been the primary focus of research into sex differences in competitiveness and dominance. However, contemporary neuroendocrinology reveals a highly nuanced, bidirectional relationship between hormones and social context, demonstrating that physiology both drives and responds to behaviour.

Testosterone, Cortisol, and the Dual-Hormone Hypothesis

Testosterone has long been understood to modulate behaviours associated with mating effort, aggression, and status-seeking[1]. The simplistic model of testosterone as a unidirectional, baseline driver of aggression has been largely superseded by more complex, interactionist frameworks. Central to this is the Dual-Hormone Hypothesis, which posits that the relationship between testosterone and status-relevant behaviours—such as dominance, risk-taking, and aggression—is moderated by the glucocorticoid cortisol, a primary stress hormone[1].

Specifically, testosterone is theorized to predict status-seeking behaviour primarily when cortisol levels are low; when cortisol is high, the effects of testosterone on status-seeking are

theoretically blocked or attenuated[1].

To test the robustness of this hypothesis, Geniole et al. (2016) conducted a comprehensive meta-analysis published in *Psychoneuroendocrinology*, encompassing 30 papers, 33 studies, 49 effect sizes, and a total sample size of 8,538 participants[1]. The results provided only marginal support for the Dual-Hormone Hypothesis. The interaction effect between testosterone and cortisol on status-relevant behaviour was statistically significant but remarkably small in magnitude ($r = -0.061$, $p = 0.026$)[1]. While effect sizes were slightly larger for direct measures of status and appeared slightly larger for men than for women, the overall predictive power of baseline hormone interactions on complex social behaviour remains modest[1]. This indicates that hormones act as subtle, context-dependent modulators rather than rigid behavioral determinants.

The Steroid/Peptide Theory of Social Bonds

Moving beyond the exclusive focus on aggression and dominance, van Anders, Goldey, and Kuo (2011) introduced the Steroid/Peptide Theory of Social Bonds (S/P Theory) in *PNAS*, fundamentally reframing the role of androgens[3]. The S/P Theory posits that testosterone responds to social stimuli categorized broadly into two domains: *competition* (which increases testosterone to facilitate resource acquisition and defense) and *nurturance* (which decreases testosterone to facilitate caregiving and bonding)[5].

This model integrates testosterone with peptides like oxytocin and vasopressin to explain how mammals transition between mating/competitive efforts and parenting/bonding efforts[6]. For example, empirical evidence indicates that infant cries and the active engagement in nurturance can rapidly lower testosterone in men, facilitating protective and caregiving behaviours rather than competitive ones[3]. This demonstrates a high degree of physiological plasticity, wherein the demands of a social role directly alter an individual's endocrine profile.

The Controversy: Innate Biology vs. Social Modulation

The degree to which testosterone drives sex differences versus the degree to which gendered socialization drives testosterone remains a subject of intense academic controversy. van Anders et al. (2015) conducted an experiment published in *PNAS* to test whether wielding power—a behavior stereotypically encouraged for men and discouraged for women—would modulate testosterone levels[8]. Utilizing trained actors (15 women, 26 men) performing competitive, power-wielding roles, the researchers found that acting in a masculine, power-wielding manner increased testosterone in women, but not significantly in men[8]. They concluded that cultural pushes for men to wield power might partially explain why testosterone levels are chronically higher in men, arguing that a lifetime of gender socialization contributes to observable "sex differences" in physiology[8].

This finding was aggressively challenged by Stoet and Geary (2016) in a formal critique, who attacked the study on multiple methodological grounds[10]. Stoet and Geary pointed out that the sample size was small and unbalanced, raising severe concerns about the reliability of the group estimates[10]. Furthermore, they highlighted measurement issues: the intra-assay coefficient of variation for testosterone in men was exceptionally high (16%) compared to

women (7%), and the study used different assay methods for men (radio-immunoassay) and women (enzyme-immunoassay) without adequate justification[10]. Most critically, Stoet and Geary noted that the control condition (watching a travel documentary) significantly lowered testosterone in women but not in men, which mathematically drove the reported significant effects associated with the power-wielding condition[10].

In their reply, van Anders et al. (2016) defended their robust within-subject statistical controls, maintaining that the critique conflated the study of "sex differences" with their actual focus on "gendered modulation"[12]. They argued that the natural decline in women's testosterone during the control condition was a standard diurnal effect, and that their larger male sample size meant the null effect in men was not merely an artifact of low statistical power[9]. This debate perfectly encapsulates the current state of the physiological layer: while the endocrine substrates underlying competition and status are sexually dimorphic on average, they are highly plastic, responsive to environmental cues, and deeply intertwined with social experience.

Layer 2: Behaviour

Moving from endocrinology to observable behaviour, the psychological literature relies on statistical distributions to understand how men and women differ in their approach to risk, competition, and status. It is a mathematical imperative to distinguish between group averages and individual predictability.

Averages vs. Individuals and the Gender Similarities Hypothesis

When assessing behavioral differences, researchers utilize effect sizes—most commonly Cohen's d—to measure the standardized difference between two group means. A crucial framework for interpreting these statistics is Hyde's (2005) Gender Similarities Hypothesis, published in the *American Psychologist*, which posits that males and females are similar on most, but not all, psychological variables[13]. In a comprehensive meta-analysis of 124 effect sizes across various psychological domains, Hyde demonstrated that the vast majority (78%) of sex differences are close to zero ($d \leq 0.10$) or small ($0.11 < d < 0.35$)[15].

Because psychological traits form normal (Gaussian) distributions, an effect size of $d = 0.50$ means that the distributions of men and women overlap by roughly 67%[17]. For physical context, Nelson (2012) notes that the sex difference in human height yields an effect size of approximately $d = 2.6$, which represents very little overlap[17]. Most behavioral differences pale in comparison. Therefore, while knowing a population's average provides vital structural insight for macro-organizational design, knowing an individual's sex provides very little predictive power regarding their specific psychological makeup or professional competence[17].

Risk-Taking Behaviour

Risk-taking is deeply intertwined with status acquisition, hierarchical mobility, and resource accumulation. In a foundational meta-analysis of 150 studies, Byrnes, Miller, and Schafer (1999) examined sex differences in risk-taking across five age levels and various task contents[19]. The results demonstrated that men engage in significantly more risk-taking than women in 14 out

of 16 categories, with nearly half of the effect sizes exceeding $d = 0.20$ [19]. This finding has been robustly replicated across decades of research.

Risk Category (Byrnes et al., 1999)	Male vs Female Tendency	Effect Size Observation
Intellectual Risk Taking	Higher in Males	Large
Physical Skills / Physical Danger	Higher in Males	Large
Financial Risk	Higher in Males	Moderate ($d \approx 0.43$)
Health / Safety (e.g., smoking)	Higher in Males	Small to Zero
Social Risk	No Significant Difference	Near Zero ($d = -0.02$)

Byrnes et al. noted that the gender gap in risk-taking is highly age-dependent—being larger in children and teenagers than in adults—and appeared to be shrinking slightly over time, suggesting a sociocultural influence[19]. However, later analyses of the Domain-Specific Risk-Taking (DOSPERT) scale suggest that differences in financial ($d = 0.43$) and physical/recreational risk ($d = 0.39$) have remained relatively stable and have not diminished significantly with modern publication years[21].

Nelson (2012) cautions against the ubiquitous, unqualified claim that "women are more risk-averse than men," noting that methodological choices heavily influence the outcome[17]. Eckel and Grossman (2008) and Croson and Gneezy (2009) highlight in the *Journal of Economic Literature* that gender differences in risk become less pronounced when tasks are contextualized rather than abstract, or when a "safe option" is removed from the choice set[22]. Furthermore, male variance in risk-taking is consistently higher, meaning that while the average man is moderately more risk-prone than the average woman, the most extreme risk-takers (and risk-losers) in any given population are almost exclusively male[17].

Competitiveness and the Tournament Paradigm

Perhaps the most robust finding in modern behavioral economics regards the gender gap in the *willingness* to compete, independent of the *ability* to compete. The seminal laboratory experiment by Niederle and Vesterlund (2007) published in the *Quarterly Journal of Economics*

established a paradigm that has survived countless replications globally[25].
In their experiment, 80 participants (40 men and 40 women) were tasked with solving real-effort mathematical problems under two compensation schemes: a non-competitive piece-rate and a competitive tournament[25]. Despite performing equally well in both formats, their preferences for future compensation diverged drastically: 73% of men chose the competitive tournament, compared to only 35% of women[25]. Niederle and Vesterlund demonstrated that this gap was driven primarily by male overconfidence (men consistently overestimated their relative rank) and a fundamental gender difference in the psychological preference for competition itself[25]. Consequently, low-ability men entered the tournament too often (harming their payoffs), while high-ability women shied away from the tournament too often (leaving potential gains unrealized)[25].
This phenomenon emerges early in development. Gneezy and Rustichini (2004) conducted a field study in the *American Economic Review* with 9- and 10-year-old children running on a track[30]. When running alone against a clock, boys and girls performed equally. However, when placed in head-to-head competition, boys significantly improved their running times, while the performance of girls remained stagnant or slightly deteriorated[30].
Crucially, the gender gap in competitiveness has profound real-world implications for macro-level hierarchies. Buser, Niederle, and Oosterbeek (2014) correlated this specific incentivized measure of competitiveness with the career track choices of secondary school students in the Netherlands[32]. They found that boys were substantially more likely than equally-able girls to choose prestigious, math- and science-intensive study profiles. Astoundingly, the laboratory measure of competitiveness accounted for up to 23% of the gender difference in actual career profile choices, proving that competition aversion acts as a major filter in the labor market long before actual discrimination can occur[32].
However, contextual caveats exist that prove behaviour is not an absolute biological mandate. Saccardo, Pietrasz, and Gneezy (2022) conducted a massive field experiment ($N = 97,678$) across working-age adults[34]. They found that while the traditional gender gap in competition persists in the general non-STEM population (where women's participation dropped 25.5% under competitive conditions), it statistically vanished among men and women who had sorted into Science, Technology, Engineering, and Math (STEM) fields[34]. In STEM populations, men and women responded to competition identically, suggesting that intense self-selection filters out competition-averse women before they reach elite professional echelons[34].

Responses to Winning and Losing

The willingness to compete is heavily influenced by how individuals process feedback from previous competitive outcomes. Buser (2016) demonstrated striking differences in how men and women respond to competitive setbacks in repeated real-effort tasks[35]. Following a loss, women fundamentally reduced their subsequent effort and productivity, regardless of the monetary value of the prize at stake[35]. For men, a loss only negatively impacted subsequent effort if the prize at stake was significantly large[35].
Overall, responses to previous competitive outcomes explained roughly 11% of the observed

variation in the work effort of women, but only about 4% of the variation in the work effort of men[35]. This differential response to negative feedback accounted for roughly half of the gender performance gap in repeated competitive environments, providing a behavioral mechanism for why women may self-select out of hyper-competitive, continuous-tournament careers (e.g., investment banking, litigation, high-level politics)[35].

Dominance vs. Prestige

When individuals compete, they are ultimately vying for status and hierarchical rank. Cheng, Tracy, Foulsham, Henrich, and Kingstone (2013) delineated two distinct, viable strategies for ascending social hierarchies in the *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*: Dominance and Prestige[38].

Dominance involves the use of force, intimidation, or aggressive assertiveness to induce fear and compliance[38]. Prestige involves the sharing of expertise, knowledge, or specific know-how to gain freely conferred respect and admiration[38]. In a series of studies utilizing round-robin group judgments and eye-tracking technology, Cheng et al. found that both strategies successfully elevate an individual to the top of a hierarchy. Group members yielded actual behavioral influence and visual attention to both dominant and prestigious individuals[38]. However, the social externalities diverged sharply: prestigious leaders were highly liked and viewed as cooperative role models, whereas dominant leaders were actively disliked, despite their influence[38]. While men exhibit higher variance in dominance-oriented physical aggression (as demonstrated by Archer, 2004), both men and women effectively utilize prestige strategies to navigate organizational networks[41].

Aggression and Male Variability

The statistical analysis of behaviour must account for variance, commonly addressed by Baumeister's argument regarding "male variability and extremes." Across many physiological, cognitive, and psychological metrics, male populations exhibit a flatter, wider bell curve compared to female populations. This statistical reality means there are more men at the absolute bottom of societal hierarchies (experiencing homelessness, incarceration, and early mortality) and more men at the absolute top (CEOs, political leaders).

This variability is intrinsically linked to evolutionary pressures on physical aggression. Archer's (2004, 2009) meta-analytic reviews demonstrate that sex differences in direct physical aggression are highly pronounced, increase in magnitude corresponding with the degree of physical risk, peak in young adulthood, and are mediated by greater male impulsivity and lower fear of physical danger[41]. Male variability in risk and aggression is theorized to be part of a sexually selected adaptive complex, wherein high-risk strategies historically yielded either massive reproductive payoffs (status and resources) or absolute failure (death or ostracization), selecting against cautious moderation in males[42].

Layer 3: Culture

If physiology provides the hardware and statistical distributions describe the behavioral software, culture provides the operating system. The ways in which status, risk, and hierarchy are manifested are deeply contingent on cultural architecture, historical social roles, and the

specific composition of groups.

Warriors and Worriers: Coalition Formation

Evolutionary psychologist Joyce Benenson provides a compelling framework for understanding the divergent ways men and women organize socially. In her thesis *Warriors and Worriers: The Survival of the Sexes*, Benenson argues that the sexes have evolved distinct tactics for peer relations, coalition formation, and competitive hierarchy[44].

From early childhood, males tend to form large, hierarchical coalitions (peer groups) oriented around complex, rule-based, inter-group competition[45]. Men engage in conspicuous public contests for status and are more willing to directly interfere with a rival's success[46]. Despite the frequency and intensity of these contests, male competition is highly ritualized; after a contest, men are generally capable of accepting a status differential and reintegrating into the cooperative coalition without lingering animosity[46]. This allows men to maintain the large, unified networks historically necessary for warfare, hunting, and modern corporate enterprise[47].

Women, conversely, specialize in intensive, dyadic (one-on-one) bonds[45]. Evolutionary pressures placed a premium on female survival to ensure the rearing of highly dependent human offspring; hence, women evolved as "worriers," highly attuned to physical risk and harm-aversion[44]. Because female reproductive success historically depended less on massive resource accumulation and more on offspring survival, women avoid direct physical contests[48]. Instead, female competition is often covert, egalitarian in appearance, and enforces strict norms regulating direct conflict. When women compete for status or resources within a group, they frequently utilize social exclusion, gossip, and alliance manipulation rather than direct confrontation[44].

Consequently, Benenson's thesis suggests that shifting the sex composition of an institution from male-dominated to female-dominated inherently shifts the institutional culture from one that tolerates direct conflict and steep hierarchies to one that prioritizes consensus, equity, and harm-aversion[44].

The Grand Controversy: Evolutionary Psychology vs. Social Role Theory

The origins of these psychological sex differences represent the most profound theoretical divide in the behavioral sciences: the debate between Evolutionary Psychology and Social Role Theory.

The Evolutionary Perspective (David Buss): Evolutionary psychologists argue that human sex differences reflect evolved psychological adaptations to the disparate adaptive problems faced by males and females in ancestral environments[50]. Buss (1989) provided the seminal empirical support for this in a massive study of 10,047 participants across 37 diverse cultures published in *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*[51]. Buss tested predictions derived from Trivers's Parental Investment Theory, which notes that because women bear the heavy biological costs of gestation and lactation, they will be the choosier sex, prioritizing mates who possess the status, resources, and ambition to invest in offspring[51]. Conversely, because men's reproductive bottleneck is access to fertile females, men will prioritize cues of youth and reproductive

capacity[51]. Buss found these preferences to be robust and universal across all 37 cultures, arguing that psychological sex differences—including men's intense drive for resource-yielding status to attract mates—are hardwired evolutionary modules[51].

Social Role Theory (Alice Eagly & Wendy Wood): Eagly and Wood (1999, 2012) directly challenge the evolutionary module hypothesis with their Biosocial Construction Theory (or Social Role Theory), published extensively in the *American Psychologist* and *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*[50]. They argue that the causal arrow does not point directly from genetic evolution to psychological modules. Instead, the ultimate cause of sex differences is the basic physical dimorphism of humans: men's greater size and strength, and women's capacity for childbearing and lactation[50].

Historically, these physical differences dictated a highly efficient division of labor: women managed domestic and child-rearing duties, while men undertook tasks requiring bursts of physical force (hunting, warfare, plowing)[50]. According to Eagly and Wood, societies construct "gender roles" to support this division of labor. Through childhood socialization, cultural expectations, and hormonal enabling, men and women develop the psychologies required to fulfill their culturally assigned roles[56].

In a direct re-analysis of Buss's 37-cultures data, Eagly and Wood demonstrated that as societies become more egalitarian and women gain independent access to resources, the sex differences in mate preferences (women preferring high-status men, men preferring young domestic women) begin to shrink[58]. Therefore, Social Role Theory posits that men are not inherently more competitive or status-obsessed by genetic mandate, but because they have been culturally funneled into provider and leadership roles that demand agentic, competitive behaviour[55].

Teams, Leadership, and Organizational Dynamics

Whether derived from evolved adaptations or socialized roles, the observable differences between men and women profoundly impact how modern teams and organizations function.

Collective Intelligence: Woolley et al. (2010), in a landmark study published in *Science*, investigated the "collective intelligence" (c-factor) of groups—the ability of a team to perform consistently well across a wide variety of tasks[59]. Surprisingly, the average IQ of the individual group members was not a strong predictor of team performance[60]. Instead, the c-factor was strongly correlated with the equality of conversational turn-taking and the social sensitivity of the group members[59]. Because women, on average, score higher on measures of social sensitivity and engage in more egalitarian communication, groups with a higher proportion of women demonstrated significantly higher collective intelligence[59].

Strategic Decision Making: However, the optimization of gender composition depends heavily on the specific environmental demands placed on the team. Apesteguia, Azmat, and Iriberri (2012) studied a large-scale business simulation game involving undergraduates and MBA students in *Management Science*[62]. They found that teams composed of three women were significantly outperformed by all other gender combinations[62]. The performance deficit was entirely explained by strategic decision-making: all-female teams were significantly less aggressive in their pricing strategies, invested less in R&D, and prioritized social sustainability

initiatives over aggressive profit maximization[62]. Thus, while female-dominated teams excel at collaborative problem solving and internal cohesion, they may exhibit competitive reluctance in hyper-aggressive, zero-sum market environments[62].

Leadership Styles and Role Congruity: When individuals attain high-status leadership roles, they often lead differently based on sex. Eagly and Johnson's (1990) meta-analysis of 162 studies published in the *Psychological Bulletin* found that female leaders exhibit a more democratic, interpersonally-oriented, and participative style, whereas male leaders are more autocratic, task-oriented, and directive[65].

However, female leaders face a structural paradox outlined by Eagly and Karau's (2002) Role Congruity Theory[68]. Leadership roles are traditionally associated with "agentic" traits (assertion, competitiveness, dominance)—traits stereotypic of men. The female gender role prescribes "communal" traits (kindness, nurturance, consensus-building). When a woman assumes a leadership role, she faces a double bind: if she acts communally, she is perceived as lacking the agentic toughness required of a leader; if she acts agentically (exhibiting dominance and high competitiveness), she violates the female gender role and suffers social backlash, resulting in lower likability and resistance from subordinates[68]. This double bind, combined with lower female baseline political ambition and differential recruitment as noted by Fox and Lawless (2004) in a study of 3,765 eligible candidates, explains significant variances in elite hierarchical representation[70].

Implications for Living Together

What, then, follows from this vast literature for couples, families, organizations, and societies? In answering this, we must strictly avoid the naturalistic fallacy—the assumption that because a biological difference is "natural" or statistically observable, it is therefore morally "good" or prescriptively ideal. Averages do not dictate destinies, but ignoring the reality of statistical distributions leads to systemic friction.

1. **For Couples and Families:** Both the Steroid/Peptide theory and Social Role theory suggest that caregiving and domestic intimacy actively modulate human biology and psychology. When fathers engage deeply in nurturance, their physiology adapts (lowering testosterone, raising oxytocin), reducing competitive friction and increasing pair-bond stability. Acknowledging that men and women may have distinct historical sensitivities to risk and status allows couples to intentionally negotiate financial and social decision-making without pathologizing the other's innate caution or ambition.
2. **For Organizations and Teams:** The evidence dictates that diversity is not merely a moral imperative, but a functional optimization strategy. All-male teams risk hyper-competition, overconfidence, and reckless pricing/strategic errors due to extreme agentic behaviour. All-female teams risk under-competition, avoidance of necessary conflict, and lagging in zero-sum market environments. Organizations must consciously design environments that leverage female collective intelligence (social sensitivity and equal turn-taking) while structurally mitigating the female penalty in tournament-style promotions (where highly capable women shy away from competing against overconfident, lower-ability men).
3. **For Societies and Politics:** Societies are currently undergoing a structural shift. As

institutions transition from male-dominated hierarchies to mixed or female-majority networks, the operating system shifts from one of public contests and steep dominance hierarchies to one prioritizing equity, consensus, and harm-aversion. Societies must recognize that neither extreme is optimal. Unchecked male status-seeking leads to extreme inequality and physical violence; unchecked female consensus-seeking and harm-aversion can stifle necessary risk-taking, technological innovation, and direct conflict resolution. The goal of a sophisticated society is to engineer institutions that harness prestige-based leadership (which benefits both sexes) while creating structured, bounded arenas for necessary competition that do not trigger the psychological aversion mechanisms that suppress female participation.

Summary of Robust Findings

Finding	Description
Statistical Overlap	Men and women's psychological traits overlap substantially (78% of effect sizes are small or zero); knowing a group average provides little predictive power for an individual.
Male Variability	Men exhibit a wider variance in behaviour, populating both the extreme low (incarceration/homelessness) and extreme high (CEOs/leaders) ends of risk, status, and physical aggression distributions.
Tournament Entry	On average, men are twice as likely to enter competitive tournaments than women of equal ability, driven by male overconfidence and differing psychological preferences for competition.
Reaction to Loss	Men respond to competitive losses by maintaining effort (unless the prize is massive), whereas women are more likely to reduce subsequent effort following a loss, explaining significant performance gaps in repeated tasks.
Risk-Taking Profile	In 14 of 16 categories, men exhibit higher baseline risk-taking (especially physical and

	financial), though this gap fluctuates based on social context and framing.
Dominance vs Prestige	Social status can be achieved via Dominance (force/fear) or Prestige (knowledge/respect); both strategies yield influence, but only Prestige leaders are liked and viewed cooperatively.
Collective Intelligence	Groups with higher proportions of women demonstrate higher "collective intelligence" due to increased social sensitivity and egalitarian conversational turn-taking.
Strategic Decision Making	All-female groups excel at cooperation but often underperform in aggressive, zero-sum economic strategies (lower R&D, less aggressive pricing) compared to mixed or all-male groups.
Leadership Styles	Female leaders tend to be more democratic and participative, while male leaders lean toward autocratic and directive styles, subjecting women to the "Role Congruity" double bind.
Endocrine Bidirectionality	Endocrine responses are bidirectional: hormones like testosterone facilitate competitive status-seeking, but social roles and the act of caregiving or wielding power actively alter baseline hormonal states.

Contested or Open Questions

Question	**Core Debate**
The Origin of Sex Differences	To what exact degree are psychological sex differences hardwired by ancestral evolutionary pressures (Buss) versus

	socially constructed through the division of labor and cultural gender roles (Eagly & Wood)?
Hormonal Social Modulation	Does the act of wielding power permanently alter human biology, and are female endocrine systems as responsive to hierarchical dominance cues as male systems, given the methodological disputes (e.g., van Anders vs. Stoet & Geary)?
The Gender Equality Paradox	Why do sex differences in certain competitive and occupational choices (like STEM sorting and math self-selection) occasionally grow *larger* in societies with the highest levels of structural gender equality?
Female Competition	What are the exact evolutionary mechanisms and modern organizational impacts of covert female competition, specifically social exclusion and reputation destruction, compared to male physical aggression?
Dual-Hormone Validity	Is the interaction between testosterone and cortisol robust enough to reliably predict complex human status-seeking behaviour outside of controlled laboratory settings, given the marginal effect sizes in recent meta-analyses?

Essential Sources to Read in Full

Author(s) & Year	Title	Journal / Publisher	Rationale for Reading
Niederle, M., & Vesterlund, L.	*Do Women Shy Away From*	Quarterly Journal of Economics	The foundational text establishing

(2007)	*Competition? Do Men Compete Too Much?*		the massive gender gap in willingness to compete versus actual ability.
Eagly, A. H., & Wood, W. (1999)	*The Origins of Sex Differences in Human Behavior: Evolved Dispositions Versus Social Roles.*	American Psychologist	The primary articulation of Social Role Theory, directly challenging strict evolutionary determinism.
Buss, D. M. (1989)	*Sex Differences in Human Mate Preferences: Evolutionary Hypotheses Tested in 37 Cultures.*	Behavioral and Brain Sciences	The most robust empirical defense of evolutionary psychology regarding status, risk, and human mating.
Woolley, A. W., et al. (2010)	*Evidence for a Collective Intelligence Factor in the Performance of Human Groups.*	Science	Crucial for understanding how female social sensitivity and egalitarian communication optimize team dynamics.
Benenson, J. F. (2014)	*Warriors and Worriers: The Survival of the Sexes.*	Oxford University Press	A comprehensive evolutionary synthesis of how men and women form distinct coalitions and navigate risk.
Cheng, J. T., et al. (2013)	*Two Ways to the Top: Evidence That Dominance and Prestige Are*	Journal of Personality and Social Psychology	Vital for disaggregating the concept of "status" into force versus

	Distinct Yet Viable Avenues to Social Rank and Influence.		freely conferred respect.
Byrnes, J. P., et al. (1999)	*Gender Differences in Risk Taking: A Meta-Analysis.*	Psychological Bulletin	The definitive statistical breakdown of risk profiles across various behavioral domains and age groups.
Apesteguia, J., et al. (2012)	*The Impact of Gender Composition on Team Performance and Decision Making: Evidence from the Field.*	Management Science	A rigorous look at the downsides of female-dominated teams in aggressive, zero-sum market scenarios.
Hyde, J. S. (2005)	*The Gender Similarities Hypothesis.*	American Psychologist	The statistical cornerstone for understanding why overlapping bell curves mean averages do not define individuals.
Buser, T., et al. (2014)	*Gender, Competitiveness, and Career Choices.*	Quarterly Journal of Economics	The definitive link showing how lab-measured competitiveness accounts for real-world socioeconomic tracking.

Works cited

1. A meta-analytical evaluation of the dual-hormone hypothesis, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/329845235_A_meta-analytical_evaluati

on_of_the_dual-hormone_hypothesis_Does_cortisol_moderate_the_relationship_between_testosterone_and_status_dominance_risk_taking_aggression_and_psychopathy
2. Effects of competition outcome on testosterone concentrations in, https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/27720891/
3. Exploring the hormonal and neural correlates of paternal protective, https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC8451880/
4. Sari M. van Anders, Ph.D. - Queen's University, https://www.queensu.ca/psychology/van-anders-lab/assets/vita/vitavanAnders2025.pdf
5. Exploring the Associations Between Testosterone, Accommodation, https://digitalcommons.lib.uconn.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=8190&context=dissertations
6. testosterone reactivity and parental care motivation in men, https://digitalcommons.humboldt.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=3408&context=etd
7. VU Research Portal - Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam, https://research.vu.nl/ws/portalfiles/portal/138005079/A+M++Lotz+-+thesis.pdf
8. Effects of gendered behavior on testosterone in women and men, https://www.pnas.org/doi/10.1073/pnas.1509591112
9. Reply to Stoet and Geary: Effects of gendered behavior on ... - PNAS, https://www.pnas.org/doi/10.1073/pnas.1522837113
10. Challenges for determining the causal effects between ... - PNAS, https://www.pnas.org/doi/10.1073/pnas.1522422113
11. (PDF) Challenges for determining the causal effects between social, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/291955961_Challenges_for_determining_the_causal_effects_between_social_behavior_and_testosterone
12. Effects of gendered behavior on testosterone, not sex differences, as, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/299495050_REPLY_TO_STOET_AND_GEARY_Effects_of_gendered_behavior_on_testosterone_not_sex_differences_as_research_focus
13. Gender Similarities Hypothesis - DORAS | DCU Research Repository, https://doras.dcu.ie/32718/3/Encyclopedia%20of%20Sexual%20Psychology%20and%20Behavior_Gender%20Similarity%20Hypothesis.pdf
14. The Gender Similarities Hypothesis | Request PDF - ResearchGate, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/7589797_The_Gender_Similarities_Hypothesis
15. Janet Shibley Hyde Sinks Stereotypes With Data, https://www.psychologicalscience.org/observer/janet-shibley-hyde-sinks-stereotypes-with-data
16. American Psychologist Evaluating Gender Similarities and, https://www.deempathischeorganisatie.nl/wp-content/uploads/2020/02/Zell-Krizan-Teeter-meta-analyse-over-sekseverschillen-in-empathie-2014-1.pdf
17. Are Women Really More Risk-Averse than Men?, https://www.diw.de/documents/dokumentenarchiv/17/diw_01.c.409673.de/gender

studiestagung_nelsonpaper.pdf
18. Gender similarities and differences - PubMed, https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/23808917/
19. Gender Differences in Risk Taking: A Meta-Analysis - ResearchGate, https://www.researchgate.net/profile/James-Byrnes-2/publication/271767506_Gender_differences_in_risk_taking_A_meta-analysis/links/56e9904208ae95bddc29f1a6/Gender-differences-in-risk-taking-A-meta-analysis.pdf
20. Lifespan age differences and gender effects on task difficulty choices, https://pure.mpg.de/rest/items/item_3498028_9/component/file_3575320/content
21. GENDER DIFFERENCES IN RISK-TAKING BEHAVIORS, https://digital.library.txst.edu/server/api/core/bitstreams/235070fa-35bf-4a7c-9d6f-e19f0b4404ae/content
22. A Reconsideration of Gender Differences in Risk Attitudes, https://docs.iza.org/dp8184.pdf
23. Gender Differences in Preferences - IDEAS/RePEc, https://ideas.repec.org/a/aea/jeclit/v47y2009i2p448-74.html
24. Sex differences in sensation-seeking: a meta-analysis - PMC - NIH, https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC3757272/
25. Do Women Shy away from Competition? Do Men Compete too Much?, https://web.stanford.edu/~niederle/Niederle.Vesterlund.QJE.2007.pdf
26. Culture and Gender Differences in Willingness to Compete, https://andreaskotsadam.wordpress.com/wp-content/uploads/2020/06/competition_june17.pdf
27. Gender Differences in Competitiveness - ifo Institut, https://www.ifo.de/DocDL/dice-report-2017-2-boeheim-gruebl-lackner-june.pdf
28. Do Women Shy Away From Competition? Do Men Compete Too, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/24091981_Do_Women_Shy_Away_From_Competition_Do_Men_Compete_Too_Much
29. Men too sometimes shy away from competition: the case of team, https://d-nb.info/1191311309/34
30. (PDF) Gender and Competition at a Young Age - ResearchGate, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/4727137_Gender_and_Competition_at_a_Young_Age
31. Explaining gender differences in competitiveness - EconStor, https://www.econstor.eu/bitstream/10419/32599/1/622374273.pdf
32. Gender, Competitiveness and Career Choices, https://www.nber.org/system/files/working_papers/w18576/w18576.pdf
33. Gender, Willingness to Compete and Career Choices Along The, https://papers.tinbergen.nl/17081.pdf
34. Gender Differences in Response to Competitive Organization, https://www.nber.org/system/files/working_papers/w30062/w30062.pdf
35. DEPARTMENT OF ECONOMICS DISCUSSION PAPER SERIES, https://ora.ox.ac.uk/objects/uuid:b8beb3f5-9f98-468a-a29a-09d3f4a52012/files/mdd739d7c3906c74c8e0eda9cd48c7e99
36. Gender Differences and Dynamics in Competition: The Role of Luck*,

https://ora.ox.ac.uk/objects/uuid:aa7aa1b3-8334-4290-a5fb-51546db11cc9/files/me7b708442fbb27e4fa6223543f4496ee
37. Gender differences and dynamics in competition: the role of luck, https://mpra.ub.uni-muenchen.de/38220/1/MPRA_paper_38220.pdf
38. (PDF) Two Ways to the Top: Evidence That Dominance and Prestige, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/233722729_Two_Ways_to_the_Top_Evidence_That_Dominance_and_Prestige_Are_Distinct_Yet_Viable_Avenues_to_Social_Rank_and_Influence
39. evidence that dominance and prestige are distinct yet viable, https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/23163747/
40. What Kind of a Leader Are You? | Psychology Today Canada, https://www.psychologytoday.com/ca/blog/sex-murder-and-the-meaning-of-life/201606/what-kind-of-a-leader-are-you
41. Sex differences in adolescent physical aggression, https://dspace.library.uu.nl/server/api/core/bitstreams/767032b3-2735-4653-825e-ecbe47089f1e/content
42. Does sexual selection explain human sex differences in aggression?, https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/behavioral-and-brain-sciences/article/does-sexual-selection-explain-human-sex-differences-in-aggression/8C918A2FDAA8C234BFB192F282BF3F27
43. Does sexual selection explain human sex differences in aggression?, https://knowledge.lancashire.ac.uk/id/eprint/1155/1/archer_J_does_sexual_selection_explain_2009.pdf
44. From Worriers to Warriors: The Cultural Rise of Women, https://journalofcontroversialideas.org/article/5/2/294/htm
45. Sex Differences in Human Peer Relationships: A Primate's-Eye View, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/330736212_Sex_Differences_in_Human_Peer_Relationships_A_Primate's-Eye_View
46. Joyce Benenson Doctor of Philosophy Lecturer at Harvard University, https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Joyce-Benenson
47. The Origins of Conflict (Part I) - The Cambridge World History of, https://www.cambridge.org/core/books/cambridge-world-history-of-violence/origins-of-conflict/87E023C19BE5CCCCCDE541912136BDC7
48. Female Competition: Allies & Adversaries | PDF | Friendship - Scribd, https://www.scribd.com/document/735425716/The-development-of-human-female-competition-Allies
49. #HelenAndrews isn't just saying men and women are different. She's, https://www.facebook.com/freethoughtlives/posts/helenandrews-isnt-just-saying-men-and-women-are-different-shes-arguing-something/1552807216856968/
50. The Origins of Sex Differences in Human Behavior, https://labs.psych.ucsb.edu/roney/james/other%20pdf%20readings/Eagly_Wood_1999.pdf
51. Sex differences in human mate preferences: Evolutionary, https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/behavioral-and-brain-sciences/article/sex-differences-in-human-mate-preferences-evolutionary-hypotheses-tested-in-

37-cultures/0E112ACEB2E7BC877805E3AC11ABC889
52. Dimensions of Women's Mate Preferences - PMC, https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC10480887/
53. Key Study: Mate preference across cultures (Buss, 1989), https://www.themantic-education.com/ibpsych/2018/11/28/key-study-buss-cross-cultural-study-on-mate-preference-1989/
54. Social Role Theory of Sex Differences (2016) | Alice H. Eagly, https://scispace.com/papers/social-role-theory-of-sex-differences-3d93wc6cws
55. 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
56. Biosocial Construction of Sex Differences and Similarities in Behavior, https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/Biosocial-Construction-of-Sex-Differences-and-in-Wood-Eagly/4563b569c69d83f42236994ac441652e4805e221/figure/2
57. 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_.Diekman.2000_Social_role_theory_of_sex_differences_and_similarities.pdf
58. The Origins of Sex Differences in Human Behavior | Request PDF, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/232520455_The_Origins_of_Sex_Differences_in_Human_Behavior
59. (PDF) The role of gender in team collaboration and performance, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/228196582_The_role_of_gender_in_team_collaboration_and_performance
60. A recipe for dyadic collective intelligence for well-structured tasks, https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC12460217/
61. (PDF) What makes a team smarter? More women - ResearchGate, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/51453001_What_makes_a_team_smarter_More_women
62. The Impact of Gender Composition on Team Performance and, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/261970788_The_Impact_of_Gender_Composition_on_Team_Performance_and_Decision_Making_Evidence_from_the_Field
63. (PDF) The Impact of Gender Composition on Team Performance, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/228516728_The_Impact_of_Gender_Composition_on_Team_Performance_and_Decision_Making_Evidence_from_the_Field
64. Strength in Numbers? Gender Composition, Leadership, and, https://www.journals.uchicago.edu/doi/10.1086/729578
65. The Leadership Styles of Women and Men - Alice H. Eagly ... - CUNY, https://files.blogs.baruch.cuny.edu/wp-content/blogs.dir/5527/files/2017/06/Leadership-Styles-of-Men-and-Women.pdf
66. Gender and leadership styles: A review of the past decade, https://repository.tilburguniversity.edu/bitstreams/5347aba7-43e7-45bc-9a41-b7f

ef5518f77/download
67. Gender and Leadership Style: A Meta-Analysis - ResearchGate, https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Blair-Johnson/publication/27403973_Gender_and_Leadership_Style_A_Meta-Analysis/links/09e4150a240057db56000000/Gender-and-Leadership-Style-A-Meta-Analysis.pdf
68. how inclusive leadership builds trust but produces unequal, https://www.emerald.com/edi/article-pdf/doi/10.1108/EDI-10-2025-0719/11763102/edi-10-2025-0719en.pdf
69. Editorial: Gender Roles in the Future? Theoretical Foundations and, https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC6739437/
70. Social Roles and Women's Underrepresentation in Politics, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/325867325_The_Ties_That_Double_Bind_Social_Roles_and_Women's_Underrepresentation_in_Politics