



Integrating approaches requires more than a division of labour: Commentary on Wölfer & Hewstone

Journal:	<i>Psychological Science</i>
Manuscript ID	PSCI-15-1544.R2
Manuscript Type:	Commentary
Date Submitted by the Author:	15-Mar-2016
Complete List of Authors:	Cross, Catharine; University of St Andrews, School of Psychology & Neuroscience Campbell, Anne; Durham University, Psychology
Keywords:	Sex Differences, Aggressive Behavior, Evolutionary Psychology, Sex Role Attitudes, Cross Cultural Differences

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

Only

1
2
3
4
5 **Integrating approaches requires more than a division of labour: Comment on Wölfer &**
6

7 **Hewstone (2015)**
8
9

10
11
12
13
14 Catharine Cross

15
16 University of St Andrews

17
18 Anne Campbell

19
20 Durham University
21
22
23
24

25 Address correspondence to: Catharine Cross

26
27 University of St Andrews - School of Psychology & Neuroscience

28
29 St Mary's Quad South Street St Andrews Fife KY16 9JP

30
31 United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

32
33
34 Phone: 01334 467234; Fax: 01334 462004; Email: cpc2@st-andrews.ac.uk
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Keywords: Sex Differences, Aggressive Behavior, Evolutionary Psychology, Sex Role

Attitudes, Cross Cultural Differences

Running head: Integrating social and evolutionary approaches to aggression

Article type: Commentary

Submitted: 09/16/2015

Revision accepted: 05/09/2016

1
2
3 Wölfer and Hewstone (2015; hereafter W&H) argue that evolutionary psychology
4 (EP) is useful for understanding sex differences in same-sex aggression, while social role
5 theory (SRT) is best applied to sex differences in opposite-sex aggression. W&H tested this
6 proposal using a rich dataset on high school students' peer-reported aggression. They
7 regressed classroom-level sex differences in same- and opposite-sex aggression onto five
8 variables drawn from the two theoretical positions. Three variables (gender and masculinity
9 norms, derived from SRT and body dimorphism, derived from EP) did not differ in their
10 association with the two forms of aggression. Another variable (sex ratio: EP) was not
11 interpretable because it was confounded with number of available targets, leaving a fifth
12 (male hierarchy: EP) predicting sex differences in same-sex but not opposite-sex aggression.
13 Our focus is not on the study itself, but on their proposal that theoretical disputes between EP
14 and SRT can be resolved by assigning one form of aggression to EP and another to SRT. We
15 believe that this argument mischaracterises both theories, reinforces the 'evolutionary vs
16 social' divide, and falls short of integration.
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33

34 EP theorists often argue that sex differences in aggression arise because of male-male
35 competition, which in turn happens because variance in reproductive success is greater for
36 males than females (Wilson & Daly, 1985). This does not make EP relevant only to male-
37 male aggression. Selection has acted on morphological and psychological traits that facilitate
38 aggression in men or inhibit aggression in women. The result can be viewed as men having a
39 greater 'taste for risk' (Wilson & Daly, 1985) or women having greater fear (Campbell,
40 1999). Either way, the traits in question are domain-general: they have consequences for sex
41 differences in many forms of risk-taking (Cross, Copping, & Campbell, 2011; Cross,
42 Cyrenne, & Brown, 2013). Consequently, risky physical forms of aggression show robust sex
43 differences, while there is very little sex difference in the use of low-risk indirect aggression
44 (Campbell & Stockely, 2013). (In W&H's study, aggression was operationalized as 'being
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 mean' to someone, which makes interpretation of sex differences difficult.) Aggression arises
4
5 from escalated conflicts of all kinds. Males' greater strength and willingness to take risks is
6
7 relevant in all disputes which could escalate to aggression – not just those with a same-sex
8
9 opponent. EP has examined opposite-sex aggression with reference to men's mate guarding
10
11 and paternal uncertainty, and more broadly in terms of the inherent potential for bilateral
12
13 conflict in long-term pair bonds (see Archer, 2013, for review). W&H's supposition that EP
14
15 is relevant only to same-sex aggression lacks a clear rationale.
16
17

18
19 SRT (like EP) aims to explain a broad range of sex-typed behaviours and traits.
20
21 According to SRT (Wood & Eagly, 2012), gendered division of labour causes gender
22
23 stereotypes about personality to arise via correspondent inference. These stereotypes foster
24
25 prescriptive norms which shape men's and women's behaviour in a range of situations. In
26
27 other words: "[I]nternalized gender roles produce gender identities that act as *trait-like*
28
29 determinants of aggressive behaviours" (Eagly & Wood, 2009, 276; emphasis added). The
30
31 term 'trait-like' implies consistency across targets and, indeed, SRT explicitly encompasses
32
33 same-sex aggression (Wood & Eagly, 2002). The extent to which an individual internalises
34
35 and conforms to gendered norms should predict aggression across contexts. W&H's proposed
36
37 application of SRT to opposite- but not same-sex aggression, therefore, neglects the fact that
38
39 SRT already offers an explanation for sex differences in same-sex aggression. In practice,
40
41 W&H found that 'masculinity norms' (measured as approval of male violence) were
42
43 unconnected with sex differences in either same-sex or opposite-sex aggression.
44
45
46

47
48 EP and SRT are viewed as competing frameworks because, while both theories aim to
49
50 explain sex differences in all forms of aggression (see, e.g. Archer, 2009; Eagly & Wood,
51
52 2009), they use theoretical approaches that have been crudely characterised as 'nature' (EP)
53
54 versus 'nurture' (SRT). Encouragingly, both camps have made attempts at integration over
55
56 the last twenty years. EP has increasingly acknowledged the role of culture, at the micro-level
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 examining its transmission between individuals, and at the macro-level demonstrating
4
5 culturally-driven niche construction as a source of genetic selection (Brown, Dickens, Sear,
6
7 & Laland, 2011). The rigorous investigation of ‘content biases’ (Boyd & Richerson, 1985) –
8
9 the shaping of cultural products by the structure of an evolved mind - represents a powerful
10
11 tool for understanding the creation and transmission of the gender stereotypes so central to
12
13 SRT. Likewise, SRT’s proponents, who initially rejected any role for sexual selection in the
14
15 genesis of psychological sex differences (Wood & Eagly, 2002) now acknowledge possible
16
17 ‘biological differentiation’ in infant temperament, upon which gendered socialisation acts
18
19 (Wood & Eagly, 2012). The goal of integration is to find a satisfactory means of
20
21 incorporating ‘biological’ and ‘cultural’ predictors within a *single* framework. W&H’s
22
23 proposed ‘dual-theory approach’ is the very opposite of this.
24
25
26

27
28 In pursuit of genuine integration, we suggest focusing on the way in which risk
29
30 sensitivity is responsive to social context. Risk sensitivity is a trait that differs between men
31
32 and women (Cross et al., 2011) and one that directly affects aggression levels (Campbell,
33
34 2013; 2015; Eagly & Steffen, 1986). Furthermore, the perceived risk associated with
35
36 aggressive acts depends on social context (sex of target) and cultural prescriptions
37
38 (differential permissibility of aggression as a function of perpetrator’s and target’s sex). For
39
40 example, cultural norms that support male-male fighting as an index of masculinity can make
41
42 refusal to fight a riskier option than fighting for some men (Hochstetler, Copes, & Forsyth,
43
44 2013). Sex differences in intimate partner violence also correlate with cultural acceptance of
45
46 male violence (Archer, 2006). Note that sex (of perpetrator or target) is not treated as a causal
47
48 variable in itself (see Maney, 2016). Instead, sex is a proxy measure for variables that affect
49
50 the risk of aggression (strength, risk sensitivity, internalised beliefs about perpetration and
51
52 victimisation, etc.).
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 In summary, we welcome W&H's use of network-based data to investigate sex
4 differences in aggression as a function of sex of target. However, applying evolutionary and
5 social theories in a piecemeal fashion, rather than furthering integration, reinforces an
6 artificial and counter-productive 'evolutionary vs social' dichotomy.
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

For Review Only

Action Editor

Steven Gangestad served as action editor for this article.

Author Contributions

C.P. Cross and A.C. Campbell co-wrote this commentary.

For Review Only

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

References

- 1
2
3
4
5 Archer, J. (2006). Cross-cultural differences in physical aggression between partners: a social-
6
7 role analysis. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, *10*(2), 133–53.
8
9 doi:10.1207/s15327957pspr1002_3
10
11
12 Archer, J. (2013) Can evolutionary principles explain patterns of family violence?
13
14 *Psychological Bulletin*, *139*, 403-440. doi:10.1037/a0029114
15
16 Brown, G. R., Cross, C. P., Street, S. E., & Brand, C. O. (2014). Comment: Beyond
17
18 “evolutionary versus social”: Moving the cycle shift debate forward. *Emotion Review*, *6*,
19
20 250–251. doi:10.1177/1754073914523050
21
22
23 Brown, G.R., Dickins, T.E., Sear, R., & Laland, K.N. (2011). Evolutionary accounts of human
24
25 behavioural diversity. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society, Series B*, *366*,
26
27 313-324; DOI: 10.1098/rstb.2010.0267.
28
29
30 Campbell, A. (2013). *A Mind of Her Own: The Evolutionary Psychology of Women*. Second
31
32 Edition. OUP. doi:10.1093/acprof:oso/9780198504986.001.0001
33
34 Campbell, A. (2015). Women’s competition and aggression. In D.M. Buss (Ed.) *Handbook of*
35
36 *Evolutionary Psychology Volume 2* (Second Edition). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley. doi:
37
38 10.1002/9781119125563
39
40
41 Campbell, A. & Stockley, P. (2013). Female competition and aggression. *Royal Society*
42
43 *Philosophical Transactions Biological Sciences*, *368*, 1631.
44
45
46 Cross, C. P., & Campbell, A. (2011). Women’s aggression. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*,
47
48 *16*(5), 390–398. doi:10.1016/j.avb.2011.02.012
49
50
51 Cross, C. P., & Campbell, A. (2014). Violence and aggression in women. In T.K. Shackelford
52
53 & R.D. Hansen (Eds.) *The Evolution of Violence* (pp. 211–232). doi:10.1007/978-1-
54
55 4614-9314-3
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Cross, C. P., Copping, L. T., & Campbell, A. (2011). Sex differences in impulsivity: a meta-
4 analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, *137*(1), 97–130. doi: 10.1037/a0021591
5
6
7 Cross, C. P., Cyrenne, D.-L. M., & Brown, G. R. (2013). Sex differences in sensation-seeking: a
8 meta-analysis. *Scientific Reports*, *3*. doi: 10.1038/srep02486
9
10
11 Eagly, A.H., & Steffen, V.J. (1986). Gender and aggressive behaviour: A meta-analytic review
12 of the social psychological literature. *Psychological Bulletin*, *100*(3), 309-330.
13
14
15 Eagly, A. H., & Wood, W. (2009). Sexual selection does not provide an adequate theory of sex
16 differences in aggression. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, *32*, 276-277.
17
18
19
20
21 doi:10.1017/S0140525X09990264
22
23 Hochstetler, A., Copes, H., & Forsyth, C.J. (2013). The fight: Symbolic expression and
24 validation of masculinity in working class tavern culture. *American Journal of Criminal*
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
- Kokko, H., & Jennions, M.D. (2008). Parental investment, sexual selection and sex ratios.
Journal of Evolutionary Biology, *21*, 919-948. doi:10.1111/j.1420-9101.2008.01540.x
- Maney, D. L. (2016). Perils and pitfalls of reporting sex differences. *Philosophical Transactions
of the Royal Society, Series B*, *371*, 20150119. doi:10.1098/rstb.2015.0119
- Wilson, M., & Daly, M. (1985). Competitiveness, risk taking, and violence: the young male
syndrome. *Ethology and Sociobiology*, *6*(1), 59–73. doi:10.1016/0162-3095(85)90041-X
- Wölfer, R., & Hewstone, M. (2015). Intra- versus intersex aggression: Testing theories of sex
differences using aggression networks. *Psychological Science*, *26*, 1285–1294.
doi:10.1177/0956797615586979
- Wood, W., & Eagly, A. H. (2002). A cross-cultural analysis of the behavior of women and men:
Implications for the origins of sex differences. *Psychological Bulletin*, *128*(5), 699–727.
doi: 10.1037//0033-2909.128.5.699

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Wood, W., & Eagly, A. H. (2012). Biosocial construction of sex differences and similarities in behavior. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, 46, 55–123. doi: 10.1016/B978-0-12-394281-4.00002-7

For Review Only