

Summaries of papers for the Gender and Cultural bias debate

Paper 1: Buss, D. M. (1989). Sex differences in human mate preferences: Evolutionary hypotheses tested in 37 cultures. *Behavioral and brain sciences*, 12(1), 1-14.

Contemporary mate preferences can provide important clues to human reproductive history. Little is known about which characteristics people value in potential mates. Five predictions were made about sex differences in human mate preferences based on evolutionary conceptions of parental investment, sexual selection, human reproductive capacity, and sexual asymmetries regarding certainty of paternity versus maternity. The predictions centered on how each sex valued earning capacity, ambition—industriousness, youth, physical attractiveness, and chastity. Predictions were tested in data from 37 samples drawn from 33 countries located on six continents and five islands (total $N = 10,047$). For 27 countries, demographic data on actual age at marriage provided a validity check on questionnaire data. Females were found to value cues to *resource acquisition* in potential mates more highly than males. Characteristics signaling *reproductive capacity* were valued more by males than by females. These sex differences may reflect different evolutionary selection pressures on human males and females; they provide powerful cross-cultural evidence of current sex differences in reproductive strategies. Discussion focuses on proximate mechanisms underlying mate preferences, consequences for human intrasexual competition, and the limitations of this study.

Paper 2: Liu, D., Wellman, H. M., Tardif, T., & Sabbagh, M. A. (2008). Theory of mind development in Chinese children: a meta-analysis of false-belief understanding across cultures and languages. *Developmental psychology*, 44(2), 523.

Theory of mind is claimed to develop universally among humans across cultures with vastly different folk psychologies. However, in the attempt to test and confirm a claim of universality, individual studies have been limited by small sample sizes, sample specificities, and an overwhelming focus on Anglo-European children. The current meta-analysis of children's false-belief performance provides the most comprehensive examination to date of theory-of-mind development in a population of non-Western children speaking non-Indo-European languages (i.e., Mandarin and Cantonese). The meta-analysis consisted of 196 Chinese conditions (127 from mainland China and 69 from Hong Kong), representing responses from more than 3,000 children, compared with 155 similar North American conditions (83 conditions from the United States and 72 conditions from Canada). The findings show parallel developmental trajectories of false-belief understanding for children in China and North America coupled with significant differences in the timing of development across communities—children's false-belief performance varied across different locales by as much as 2 or more years. These data support the importance of both universal trajectories and specific experiential factors in the development of theory of mind.

Paper 3: Taylor, S. E., Klein, L. C., Lewis, B. P., Gruenewald, T. L., Gurung, R. A., & Updegraff, J. A. (2000). Biobehavioral responses to stress in females: tend-and-befriend, not fight-or-flight. *Psychological review*, 107(3), 411.

The human stress response has been characterized, both physiologically and behaviorally, as "fight-or-flight." Although fight-or-flight may characterize the primary physiological responses to stress for both males and females, we propose that, behaviorally, females' responses are more marked by a pattern of "tend-and-befriend." Tending involves nurturant activities designed to protect the self and offspring that promote safety and reduce distress; befriending is the creation and maintenance of social networks that may aid in this process. The biobehavioral mechanism that underlies the tend-and-befriend pattern appears to draw on the attachment-caregiving system, and neuroendocrine evidence from animal and human studies suggests that oxytocin, in conjunction with female reproductive hormones and endogenous opioid peptide mechanisms, may be at its core. This previously unexplored stress regulatory system has manifold implications for the study of stress.

Paper 4: Eagly, A. H. (1978). Sex differences in influenceability. *Psychological Bulletin*, 85(1), 86.

Examines the hypothesis that women are more influenceable than men in a variety of situations. For persuasion research and for conformity studies not involving group pressure, there is scant empirical support for a sex difference, and for group pressure conformity research, there is support among a substantial minority of studies. Also explored is the possibility that various sex differences in social influence studies are a product of contextual features of experimental settings. This is suggested by the fact that findings reporting greater influenceability among females were more prevalent in studies published prior to 1970 than in those published in the 1970s. Finally, sex differences in various psychological processes that may mediate persuasion and conformity are evaluated as possible explanations for those influenceability sex differences that appear to be genuine. It is suggested that a propensity to yield inherent in the female sex role appears to account for some aspects of influenceability findings, but a 2nd explanation, a tendency for women more than men to be oriented to interpersonal goals in group settings, is also plausible.

Paper 5: Jaffee, S., & Hyde, J. S. (2000). Gender differences in moral orientation: a meta-analysis. *Psychological bulletin*, 126(5), 703.

C. Gilligan's critique of L. Kohlberg's theory of moral reasoning and her assertion that two modes of moral reasoning (justice and care) exist have been the subject of debate within the field of psychology for more than 15 years. This meta-analysis was conducted to review quantitatively the work on gender differences in moral orientation. The meta-analysis revealed small differences in the care orientation favoring females ($d = -.28$) and small differences in the justice orientation favoring males ($d = .19$). Together, the moderator variables accounted for 16% of the variance in the effect sizes for care reasoning and 17% of the variance in the effect sizes for justice reasoning. These findings do not offer strong support for the claim that the care orientation is used predominantly by women and that the justice orientation is used predominantly by men.

Paper 6: Costa Jr, P. T., Terracciano, A., & McCrae, R. R. (2001). Gender differences in personality traits across cultures: robust and surprising findings. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 81(2), 322.

Secondary analyses of Revised NEO Personality Inventory data from 26 cultures ($N = 23,031$) suggest that gender differences are small relative to individual variation within genders; differences are replicated across cultures for both college-age and adult samples. and differences are broadly consistent with gender stereotypes: Women reported themselves to be higher in Neuroticism, Agreeableness, Warmth, and Openness to Feelings, whereas men were higher in Assertiveness and Openness to Ideas. Contrary to predictions from evolutionary theory, the magnitude of gender differences varied across cultures. Contrary to predictions from the social role model, gender differences were most pronounced in European and American cultures in which traditional sex roles are minimized. Possible explanations for this surprising finding are discussed, including the attribution of masculine and feminine behaviors to roles rather than traits in traditional cultures.

Paper 7: Takano, Y., & Osaka, E. (1999). An unsupported common view: Comparing Japan and the US on individualism/collectivism. *Asian Journal of Social Psychology*, 2(3), 311-341.

It has long been believed that the Japanese are more collectivistic than the Americans. To assess the validity of this common view, the authors reviewed 15 empirical studies that compared these two nations on individualism/collectivism. Surprisingly, 14 studies did not support the common view; the only study that supported it turned out to bear little relevance to the ordinary definition of individualism/collectivism. An examination of the supportive evidence of the common view disclosed

that this view had been formed on an unexpectedly flimsy ground. It further turned out that the wide acceptance of the common view may have been the result of the fundamental attribution error, which may have led to an underestimation of situational factors in interpreting the past obviously collectivistic behavior of the Japanese.