

# An Evolutionary Theory for the Variability Hypothesis

Theodore P. Hill

## Abstract

An elementary biostatistical theory based on a “selectivity-variability” principle is proposed to address a question raised by Charles Darwin, namely, how one sex of a sexually dimorphic species might tend to evolve with greater variability than the other sex. Briefly, the theory says that if one sex is relatively selective then from one generation to the next, more variable subpopulations of the opposite sex will generally tend to prevail over those with lesser variability. Moreover, the perhaps less intuitive converse also holds – if a sex is relatively non-selective, then less variable subpopulations of the opposite sex will prevail over those with greater variability. This theory requires certain regularity conditions on the distributions, but makes no assumptions about differences in means between the sexes, nor does it presume that one sex is selective and the other non-selective. Two mathematical models of the selectivity-variability principle are presented: a discrete-time one-step probabilistic model of short-term behavior with an example using normally distributed perceived fitness values; and a continuous-time deterministic model for the long-term asymptotic behavior of the expected sizes of the subpopulations with an example using exponentially distributed fitness levels.

## 1 Introduction

In his research on evolution in the 19th century Charles Darwin observed differences in variability between the sexes, reporting that

throughout the animal kingdom, when the sexes differ in external appearance, it is, with rare exceptions, the male which has been the more modified; for, generally, the female retains a closer resemblance to the young of her own species, and to other adult members of the same group [Darwin, 1875, pp. 221].

Since then evidence of greater male variability, although by no means universal in either traits or species, has been reported in a wide variety of animal species from wasps and adders to salmon and orangutans (cf. Cardini and Elton [2008]). Specifically citing Darwin’s research on animals [Darwin, 1875, pp. 221–27] and Ellis’s research on humans [Ellis, 1894, pp. 358–372] psychologist Stephanie Shields wrote

By the 1890’s several studies had been conducted to demonstrate that variability was indeed more characteristic of males . . . The biological evidence overwhelmingly favored males as the more variable sex [Shields, 1982, pp. 772-73].

The past quarter century has produced much new research on the greater male variability hypothesis in different contexts, most of which refer to humans, and the majority of which support Darwin’s observation (e.g., see Appendix A). After citing specific evidence of greater male variability, Darwin had also raised the question of *why* this might occur, writing

The cause of the greater general variability in the male sex, than in the female is unknown [Darwin, 1875, p. 224].

This question has persisted into the 21st century as noted for example by Hyde et al.: “There is evidence of slightly greater male variability in scores, although the causes remain unexplained” [Hyde et al., 2008, p. 495], and Halpern et al.: “the reasons why males are often more variable remain elusive” [Halpern et al., 2007, p. 1]. As statistician Howard Wainer phrased it,

Why was our genetic structure built to yield greater variation among males than females? And not just among humans, but virtually all mammals [Wainer, 2007, p. 255].

The objective of this paper is to propose an elementary mathematical principle to help explain how one sex in a given species could naturally evolve toward greater or lesser variability depending on the preferences of the opposite sex. Together with two additional standard biological tenets, this principle might help provide an answer to Darwin’s question.

## 2 A Theory for Differences in Variability Between Sexes

In very general terms, the first principle of the theory introduced here is this:

**Selectivity-Variability Principle.** *In a species with two sexes A and B, both of which are needed for reproduction, suppose that sex A is relatively **selective**, i.e., will mate only with a top tier (less than half) of B candidates. Then from one generation to the next, among subpopulations of B with comparable average attributes, those with **greater variability** will tend to prevail over those with lesser variability. Conversely, if A is relatively **non-selective**, accepting all but a bottom fraction (more than half) of the opposite sex, then subpopulations of B with **lesser variability** will tend to prevail over those with comparable means and greater variability.*

Note that this principle does not make any assumptions about inherent differences in means or other attributes between the sexes. For instance, it does not presume that one sex is selective and the other non-selective, or even that one sex is more selective than the other, unlike Bateman’s principle [1948], for example, or other related theories such as “the sex that experiences more intense...vetting by the other sex will tend to show greater within-sex variation on many traits” [Geary, 2007, p. 176]. If both sexes of a species happen to be selective, the selectivity-variability principle here predicts that the best evolutionary strategy for each is to tend toward greater variability.

It is also important to note that this principle alone says nothing about *a priori* or *a posteriori* comparisons of the variabilities across the sexes. For example, if sex A is not selective while sex B is selective, this principle says that subpopulations of A with greater variability will prevail over subpopulations of A with lesser variability, and that subpopulations of B with lesser variability will prevail over subpopulations of sex B with greater variability. It says nothing about comparing the resulting variability of sex A with the variability of sex B. If all the subpopulations of B were initially more variable than all the subpopulations of A, for instance, then the next generation of sex B will still exhibit greater variability than the next generation of sex A whether either sex is selective or non-selective. Only under additional hypotheses, such as “both sexes began with comparable mid-range variability”, as will be done in an illustrative example below to address Darwin’s question, can this theory be useful to draw any conclusions about comparisons of variability between the two sexes.

In order to make this selectivity-variability theory more precise, of course, it is necessary to define formally what is meant by selectivity and variability in this context, and that will be done in the next

section. First, the following simple informal hypothetical example may help convey the intuition behind this principle.




Figure 1: The three cases of Example 2.1: The red blocks represent the distribution of the more variable subpopulation  $B_1$  of sex  $B$ , and the blue represent the less variable subpopulation  $B_2$ .

**Example 2.1.** Sex  $B$  consists of two subpopulations  $B_1$  and  $B_2$ . Sex  $A$  considers half of the individuals in  $B_1$  very desirable and the other half not very desirable, and it considers all of the individuals in subpopulation  $B_2$  of mid-range desirability. Thus  $B_1$  is more variable in desirability to sex  $A$  than  $B_2$ , with  $B_1$  and  $B_2$  having comparable average desirability. (See Figure 1, where larger numbers reflect greater

desirability.)

*Special Case 1.*  $B_1$  and  $B_2$  are of equal size. Then sex  $A$  considers one quarter of sex  $B$  (the lower half of  $B_1$ ) of relatively low desirability, half of  $B$  (all of  $B_2$ ) of medium desirability, and one quarter of  $B$  (the upper half of  $B_1$ ) of above-average desirability (see Figure 1a). If sex  $A$  is relatively selective and will mate only with the top most desirable quarter of sex  $B$ , then all of the next generation will be offspring of the more variable subpopulation  $B_1$  (Figure 1b). On the other hand, if sex  $A$  is relatively non-selective and will mate with any but the lower quarter of  $B$ , then all of the less variable  $B_2$  will mate, but only half of the more variable  $B_1$  will mate (Figure 1c).

Similar conclusions follow if the initial subpopulations are not of equal size.

*Special Case 2.* One third of sex  $B$  is the more variable  $B_1$  and two thirds is the less variable  $B_2$  (Figure 1d). If sex  $A$  only mates with the most desirable quarter of  $B$ , a short calculation shows that two thirds of the next generation will be offspring of  $B_1$  and one third will be offspring of  $B_2$ , so based on the initial distribution, the more variable subpopulation will be overrepresented (Figure 1e). If sex  $A$  will mate with any but the least desirable quarter of  $B$ , then only two ninths of the next generation will be offspring of  $B_1$  and seven ninths will be offspring of  $B_2$ , so the less variable subpopulation of sex  $B$  will be overrepresented (Figure 1f).

*Special Case 3.* Two thirds of sex  $B$  is the more variable  $B_1$  and only one third is the less variable  $B_2$  (Figure 1g). If sex  $A$  only mates with the most desirable quarter of  $B$ , then all of the next generation will be offspring of  $B_1$  (Figure 1h), and if sex  $A$  will mate with any but the least desirable quarter of  $B$ , then only five ninths of the next generation will be offspring of  $B_1$  and the rest will be offspring of  $B_2$ , so again the less variable subpopulation of sex  $B$  will be overrepresented (Figure 1i).

Note the asymmetry in the mating probabilities in this example; some intuition behind why this occurs may perhaps be gained from the observation that the most desirable individuals in the more variable population will always be able to mate, whether the opposite sex is selective or non-selective.

### 3 Desirability and Selectivity

In order to begin to try to interpret these ideas analytically, it is of course necessary to identify concrete definitions of “desirable”, “selective” and “more variable”. There are clearly many different candidates to capture the essence of each of these terms; the following assumptions and definitions are simply intended as a starting point to facilitate proposal of several models and analysis of the above selectivity-variability principle.

To begin with, the informal notion of desirability introduced in Example 2.1 above will be extended as follows.

**Desirability Assumption.** *Each individual (or phenotype) in each sex is assigned a real number which reflects its desirability to the opposite sex, with higher values indicating greater desirability.*

As a concrete example, one interpretation of the desirability value of an individual might be the opposite sex’s perception or estimation of its Darwinian fitness (e.g., Charnov [1979]). The actual magnitudes of these desirability values are not assumed to have intrinsic significance in general, but are used only to make comparisons between individuals. Here and throughout, it will also be assumed that the same desirability value is assigned to each individual by every member of the opposite sex. In real life scenarios, of course, the desirability of an individual varies from one member of the opposite sex to another, and is not quantifiable in a single one-parameter value.

Next, the informal notion of selectivity introduced in Example 2.1 above will be formalized.

**Selectivity Assumption.** *For each sex in a given sexually dimorphic species there is an upper proportion  $p \in (0, 1)$  of the opposite sex that is acceptable for mating.*

For example, if  $p_A$  is that proportion for sex  $A$ , then members of sex  $A$  will mate with individual  $b$  of the opposite sex  $B$  if and only if  $b$  is in the most desirable  $p_A$  fraction of individuals in  $B$ . If  $p_A < 0.5$ , then sex  $A$  is said to be (relatively) *selective*, and if  $p_A > 0.5$ , then  $A$  is said to be *non-selective*. For instance, if  $p_A = 0.25$ , then sex  $A$  is selective, since it will mate only with the most desirable quarter of sex  $B$ , and if  $p_A = 0.75$ , then sex  $A$  is non-selective, since it will mate with any but the least desirable quarter of sex  $B$ .

*N.B.* Of course these assumptions about desirability values and selectivity are clearly not satisfied in most real life scenarios, and are simply intended here as a starting point for discussion of the general ideas. For example, the acceptability fractions  $p_A$  may reflect not only desirability, but also availability or proximity. In this simple model it is therefore assumed that the populations are large and mobile so there are always available potential mates of the opposite sex above the threshold desirability cutoff. Similarly, for simplicity it will be assumed throughout that the offspring of any coupling consist of equal numbers of each sex.

## 4 Variability

The desirability of individuals in one sex by the opposite sex varies from individual to individual, and its normalized distribution is a probability distribution. Thus to address the notion of differences between two subpopulations of the same sex in the variability of their desirability to the opposite sex, the notion of one probability distribution being more (or less) variable than another must be specified. As will be seen in the next example, for instance, if by “more variable” is meant “larger standard deviation” (or statistical variance), then the above selectivity-variability principle is not true without additional assumptions on the underlying distributions.

**Example 4.1.** Sex  $B$  consists of two subpopulations  $B_1$  and  $B_2$ , with six individuals each:  $B_1$  has one individual of desirability value 1 (to sex  $A$ ), one of desirability 5, and four individuals of desirability 3;  $B_2$  has three individuals of desirability value 2 and three of desirability 4. Thus both  $B_1$  and  $B_2$  have mean desirability 3, the variance of  $B_1$  is  $4/3$  and the variance of  $B_2$  is 1.

If sex  $A$  is *selective* with  $p_A = 0.25$ , then two of the three individuals that sex  $A$  selects from sex  $B$  will be from  $B_2$ , the subpopulation with *smaller variance*. Conversely, if sex  $A$  is *non-selective* with  $p_A = 0.75$ , then five of the nine individuals that sex  $A$  selects from sex  $B$  will be from  $B_1$ , the subpopulation with *larger variance*. Thus for these distributions and a standard deviation definition of variability, both directions of the above selectivity-variability principle fail.

There are many other possibilities for definitions of variability, such as comparisons of ranges or Gini mean differences, but those can be very misleading in this setting since a single outlier can dramatically alter the values of such statistics. On the other hand, basic comparisons of the tails of distributions leads to a natural notion of greater or lesser variability.

To that end, for a real Borel probability measure  $P$  let  $S_P$  denote the complementary cumulative distribution function of  $P$ , i.e.,  $S_P : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow [0, 1]$  is defined by  $S_P(x) = P(x, \infty)$  for all  $x \in \mathbb{R}$ . That is,  $S_P(x)$  is simply the proportion of a population with distribution  $P$  that is above the threshold  $x$ ; see Figure 2 for three examples. For brevity, the term *survival function* will be used here; in this context  $S_P(x)$  may be

thought of as the proportion of a given sex with desirability (by the opposite sex) distribution function  $P$  that “survives” the cut when the opposite sex only accepts individuals with desirability value  $x$  or larger.

**Definition 4.2.**  $P_1 \succ P_2$  if, for all  $x$  with  $0 < S_{P_1}(x) < 1$ ,

$$S_{P_1}(x) > S_{P_2}(x) \text{ for all } x > m \text{ and } S_{P_1}(x) < S_{P_2}(x) \text{ for all } x < m.$$

In other words,  $P_1$  is more variable than  $P_2$  if the proportions of  $P_1$  both above every upper (larger than median) threshold and the proportions below every lower threshold level are greater than those for  $P_2$ . That is, both upper and lower tails of the  $P_1$  distribution are heavier than those of the  $P_2$  distribution, for all thresholds.




Figure 2: The survival functions and comparative variability of three pairs of distributions: (a) the uniform distributions in Example 2.1 above; (b) the normal distributions in Example 5.3 below; and (c) the Laplace distributions in Example 6.2. In each case, the red curves denote the more variable distribution.

In Example 2.1, where the selectivity-variability principle was illustrated informally, the distribution of subpopulation  $B_1$  is more variable than the distribution of subpopulation  $B_2$  both in the sense of standard deviation and in the sense of Definition 4.2 (see Figure 2a), and it is this definition that will be seen below

to lead to settings where the principle is valid. As was seen in Example 4.1, the selectivity-variability principle may fail for arbitrary distributions if variability is defined in terms of standard deviation, but the next proposition identifies several common and important classes of distributions where greater standard deviation or scale factor (when standard deviation is infinite) coincide with the notion of greater variability in Definition 4.2, and thus these distributions are applicable to the models below. The conclusions are perhaps well-known, but as no reference is known to the author, a short proof is included.

**Proposition 4.3.** Let  $P_1$  and  $P_2$  be (real Borel) probability measures with identical medians.

(i) If both  $P_1$  and  $P_2$  are uniform, symmetric triangular, Laplace, or Gaussian, then

$$P_1 \succ P_2 \quad \text{if and only if} \quad \text{variance}(P_1) > \text{variance}(P_2).$$

(ii) If both  $P_1$  and  $P_2$  are Cauchy, then

$$P_1 \succ P_2 \quad \text{if and only if} \quad \text{scale factor of } P_1 > \text{scale factor of } P_2.$$

*Proof.* Since the cumulative distribution functions for uniform, symmetric triangular, Laplace, and Cauchy distributions are known in closed form, the conclusions regarding those distributions follow from Definition 4.2 and routine calculations by comparisons of the respective piecewise linear, quadratic, exponential, and arcsin distribution functions.

To see the conclusion for Gaussian distributions, for which the distribution functions are not known in closed form, suppose  $X_1 \sim N(\mu, \sigma_1^2)$  and  $X_2 \sim N(\mu, \sigma_2^2)$ , where  $N(\mu, \sigma^2)$  denotes a normal distribution with mean  $\mu$  and standard deviation  $\sigma$ . Without loss of generality suppose that  $\sigma_1^2 > \sigma_2^2$ . Then for all  $c > \mu$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} P(X_1 > c) &= P(\sigma_2(X_1 - \mu) > \sigma_2(c - \mu)) \\ &= P(\sigma_1(X_2 - \mu) > \sigma_2(c - \mu)) \\ &> P(\sigma_1(X_2 - \mu) > \sigma_1(c - \mu)) \\ &= P(X_2 > c), \end{aligned}$$

where the second equality follows since, by the rescaling and translation properties of normal distributions,

$$\sigma_2(X_1 - \mu) \text{ and } \sigma_1(X_2 - \mu) \text{ are both } N(0, \sigma_1^2 \sigma_2^2).$$

The case  $c < \mu$  follows similarly, and since the mean of every normal distribution is the same as the median, this completes the proof.  $\square$

It should also be noted that distributions sufficiently close to the distributions in Proposition 4.3 will also obey the same variability conclusions. (E.g., no real-life data is ever exactly Gaussian, but in many applications Gaussian distributions are good approximations and very useful in practice.) Note that the above definition of greater variability does not require finite standard deviations or symmetry of the distributions, although the examples provided below have both. Some assumption on two distributions (of the same sex) having comparable average attributes is clearly necessary to be able to draw any useful conclusions in this selectivity context; the assumption of identical medians used here is one natural candidate. Similar conclusions may be drawn about weak-inequality versions of this definition and about one-sided variability, and these are left to the interested reader. For example, if both the median and upper tails of one distribution are larger than those of another, then that first distribution will also prevail if the opposite sex is selective.

Using the above definitions of variability and selectivity, the main objective of this paper is to present two mathematical models for the selectivity-variability principle above.

## 5 A Discrete-Time Probabilistic Model

Suppose that sex  $B$  of a given hypothetical species consists of two distinct subpopulations  $B_1$  and  $B_2$ , of which a proportion  $\beta \in (0, 1)$  is of type  $B_1$  (and  $1 - \beta$  is of type  $B_2$ ). Let  $P_1$  and  $P_2$  denote the desirability distributions of  $B_1$  and  $B_2$ , respectively, and assume that  $P_1$  is more variable than  $P_2$ , i.e.,  $P_1 \succ P_2$ . It will now be shown that, for all  $\beta$ , if sex  $A$  is selective, then subpopulation  $B_1$  will be overrepresented in the subsequent generation, and if sex  $A$  is non-selective, then subpopulation  $B_2$  will be overrepresented in the subsequent generation. These are direct analogs and extensions of the informal observations in Example 2.1 above.

To that end, note that if  $\beta$  is the proportion of sex  $B$  that is from subpopulation  $B_1$ , then letting  $S_1$  and  $S_2$  denote the survival functions of  $B_1$  and  $B_2$ , respectively, the number

$$\frac{\beta S_1(c)}{\beta S_1(c) + (1 - \beta) S_2(c)}$$

represents the proportion of sex  $B$  that is from subpopulation  $B_1$  when  $A$  accepts only individuals in  $B$  with desirability value above cutoff level  $c$ . This motivates the following definition.

**Definition 5.1.** If sex  $B$  consists of two subpopulations  $B_1$  and  $B_2$  and if  $\beta \in (0, 1)$  is the proportion of sex  $B$  that is  $B_1$ , then *subpopulation  $B_1$  will be overrepresented in the subsequent generation* if and only if

$$\frac{\beta S_1(c^*)}{\beta S_1(c^*) + (1 - \beta) S_2(c^*)} > \beta,$$

where  $S_1$  and  $S_2$  are the survival functions of the desirability distributions of  $B_1$  and  $B_2$ , respectively, and  $c^*$  is the desirability cutoff of sex  $A$  for mating with individuals in sex  $B$ , i.e.,

$$\beta S_1(c^*) + (1 - \beta) S_2(c^*) = p_A.$$

Note that this definition does not assume that the offspring of  $B_1$  will have desirability distributions identical to that of  $B_1$  but simply that a larger proportion of the subsequent generation will be offspring of  $B_1$  than the proportion of  $B_1$  in the original population. With this notion of overrepresentation, an elementary formalized version of the selectivity-variability principle is as follows.

**Theorem 5.2.** *Let sex  $B$  consist of two distinct subpopulations  $B_1$  and  $B_2$  with desirability distributions  $P_1$  and  $P_2$ , respectively, with identical medians  $m$  and with desirability survival functions  $S_1$  and  $S_2$  which are continuous and strictly decreasing. Suppose subpopulation  $B_1$  is more variable than  $B_2$ , i.e.,  $P_1 \succ P_2$ . Then*

- (i) *If  $p_A < 0.5$ , i.e., if sex  $A$  is selective, then the more variable subpopulation  $B_1$  will be overrepresented in the subsequent generation.*
- (ii) *If  $p_A > 0.5$ , i.e., if sex  $A$  is non-selective, then the less variable subpopulation  $B_2$  will be overrepresented in the subsequent generation.*

*Proof.* Let  $\beta \in (0, 1)$  be the proportion of  $B$  that is  $B_1$ , and let  $S_1$  and  $S_2$  denote the desirability survival functions for  $B_1$  and  $B_2$ , respectively. First, it will be shown that there exists a unique “threshold” desirability cutoff  $c^* \in \mathbb{R}$  such that

$$(5.1) \quad \begin{aligned} & \beta S_1(c^*) + (1 - \beta) S_2(c^*) = p_A \\ & \text{and} \\ & c^* > m \text{ if } p_A < 0.5 \text{ and } c^* < m \text{ if } p_A > 0.5. \end{aligned}$$



To see (5.1), let  $g : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow (0, 1)$  be given by  $g(c) = \beta S_1(c) + (1 - \beta)S_2(c)$ . Then  $g$  is continuous and strictly decreasing with  $g(-\infty) = 1$ ,  $g(m) = 0.5$ ,  $g(\infty) = 0$ , so  $c^*$  satisfying (5.1) exists and is unique, and since  $S_1(m) = S_2(m) = 0.5$ ,  $c^* > m$  if  $p_A < 0.5$  and  $c^* < m$  if  $p_A > 0.5$ .

To see (i), first note by (5.1) that  $c^* > m$ , so since  $P_1 \succ P_2$ ,

$$(5.2) \quad S_1(c^*) > S_2(c^*).$$

Thus,

$$\beta(1 - \beta)S_1(c^*) > \beta(1 - \beta)S_2(c^*),$$

which implies

$$\beta^2 S_1(c^*) + \beta(1 - \beta)S_1(c^*) > \beta^2 S_1(c^*) + \beta(1 - \beta)S_2(c^*)$$

so

$$\frac{\beta S_1(c^*)}{\beta S_1(c^*) + (1 - \beta)S_2(c^*)} > \beta.$$

By Definition 5.1, this completes the proof of (i); the proof of (ii) follows similarly.  $\square$

Thus, in this discrete-time setting, if one sex remains non-selective from each generation to the next, for example, then in each successive generation less variable subpopulations of the opposite sex will tend to prevail over more variable subpopulations of comparable average desirability. Although those successive generations and their desirability distributions are evolving over time, if less variable subpopulations in the opposite sex prevail over more variable subpopulations from each generation to the next, that suggests that over time the opposite sex will tend toward lesser variability. A key assumption here, of course, is the inheritability of variability itself.

That variability *per se* may be a heritable trait has recently been established in several different contexts (e.g., De Benedictis et al. [2006], Marjanovič et al. [2018], and Moriyama et al. [2015]). For instance, theories of inherited variability have been developed and applied by animal husbandry scientists and geneticists who are interested in breeding livestock, not only for high averages of desirable traits, but also for uniformity (i.e., low variability; see Marjanovič [2018], Mulder et al. [2007], Mulder et al. [2008]). The above probabilistic model only uses the premise that variability is inheritable; identification of the precise genetic, chromosomal, and epigenetic (including societal) mechanisms for how variability is inherited is beyond the scope of this paper, and is left to the interested reader (cf. Hill and Mulder [2010], Lande [1981], Reinhold and Engqvist [2013], and Shillcock et al. [2018]).

The next example is an application of Theorem 5.2 and Proposition 4.3 in a case where the desirability values have gaussian distributions. Note that the exact magnitudes of over- and underrepresentation, even in this standard setting, are not attainable in closed form, but must be estimated numerically.

**Example 5.3.** Suppose that the desirability values (to sex  $A$ ) of sex  $B$  are normally distributed, i.e., if  $X_1$  and  $X_2$  are the desirability values of two random individuals chosen from  $B_1$  and  $B_2$ , respectively, then  $X_1$  has distribution  $N(\mu, \sigma_1^2)$  and  $X_2$  has distribution  $N(\mu, \sigma_2^2)$ . (The assumption of normality for the underlying distributions of desirability is not essential; this is merely an illustrative example, and chosen because of the ubiquity of the normal distribution in many population studies. Note the key assumption that the average values, i.e. the medians, are the same.) By Proposition 4.3,  $N(\mu, \sigma_1^2)$  is more variable than  $N(\mu, \sigma_2^2)$  if and only if  $\sigma_1^2 > \sigma_2^2$ .

In particular, suppose  $X_1 \sim N(100, 4)$ ,  $X_2 \sim N(100, 1)$ , so  $B_1$  is more variable than  $B_2$ . Suppose that  $B_1$  and  $B_2$  are of equal size, and again consider the two typical cases where sex  $A$  is selective with  $p_A = 0.25$  and where sex  $A$  is non-selective with  $p_A = 0.75$  (see Figure 3).

Suppose first that  $p_A = 0.25$ . Using a special function calculator (since the survival functions of normal distributions are not known in closed form), it can be determined numerically that sex  $A$ 's threshold desirability value cutoff for sex  $B$  is  $c^* \cong 100.92$ ,  $S_1(c^*) \cong 0.323$ , and  $S_2(c^*) \cong 0.179$ . Thus a random individual from subpopulation  $B_1$  has nearly twice the probability of mating than one from the less variable subpopulation  $B_2$ , as is illustrated in Figure 3 with the areas to the right of the green desirability cutoff. Hence  $B_1$  will be overrepresented in the subsequent generation.

Next suppose that  $p_A = 0.75$ . Then it can be determined that the threshold desirability value cutoff is  $c^* \cong 99.08$ ,  $S_1(c^*) \cong 0.677$ , and  $S_2(c^*) \cong 0.821$ , i.e., a random individual from subpopulation  $B_2$  is about one-fifth more likely to be able to mate than one from the more variable subpopulation  $B_1$ . This is illustrated in Figure 3 with the areas to the right of the purple cutoff. Here again, note the asymmetry in that the selective case is more extreme than the non-selective case, as was seen in Example 2.1.




Figure 3: The red curve is the desirability distribution of the more variable normal subpopulation  $B_1$  in Example 5.3 and the blue curve is the desirability distribution of the less variable subpopulation  $B_2$ . The vertical green line is the threshold cutoff for the opposite sex  $A$  so that exactly 25% of the composite  $B$  population has desirability value above (to the right of) that point. The vertical purple line is the value so that exactly 75% of the  $B$  population has desirability value above that point.

## 6 A Continuous-Time Deterministic Model

In this section, comparisons of the long-term asymptotic behavior of the sizes of competing subpopulations of the same sex and species are modeled using the general structure and logic of classical evolutionary game theory as applied to population dynamics (cf. Brown [2016], Weibull [1997], Zeeman [1980]).

Here, sex  $B$  consists of two distinct subpopulations  $B_1$  and  $B_2$ , growing in time, whose sizes at time  $t$  are given by the continuous stochastic processes  $X_1(t)$  and  $X_2(t)$ , respectively. Letting  $x_1(t) = E[X_1(t)]$  and  $x_2(t) = E[X_2(t)]$  denote the expected values of the subpopulation sizes at time  $t$ , the objective here

will be to derive a coupled system of ODE's, directly analogous to the coupled systems of ODE's in classical evolutionary game theory, to model the growth rates of the expected values of the sizes of the two subpopulations (cf. Sandholm [2009]).

In contrast to the discrete-time model above, here there is no clear delineation between generations, and it will be assumed that the pace of evolution is negligible compared to the pace of reproduction, so the two subpopulations remain distinct, with offspring distributed the same way as the parent subpopulation. In this setting, it will now be seen that if one subpopulation is more variable than the other, then the more variable subpopulation will eventually eclipse the less variable subpopulation if the opposite sex is selective, and the less variable subpopulation will eclipse the more variable one if the opposite sex is non-selective.

Assume that the desirability distributions of  $B_1$  and  $B_2$  (to sex  $A$ ) are given by probabilities  $P_1$  and  $P_2$ , respectively, that do not change with the sizes of the subpopulations, i.e., the survival and desirability distribution functions do not change with  $t$ . For further ease of analysis, assume that the expected population sizes  $x_1(t)$  and  $x_2(t)$  are strictly increasing and differentiable and that the survival functions  $S_1$  and  $S_2$  for  $P_1$  and  $P_2$  are both continuous and strictly decreasing, with identical (unique) medians  $m$ . In other words, exactly half of each subpopulation  $B_1$  and  $B_2$  has desirability value above  $m$  to sex  $A$  at all times  $t > 0$ , and exactly half of each has desirability values below  $m$ .

In this deterministic framework, the composite population of sex  $B$  is growing at a rate that is proportional to the fraction  $p_A$  of its members that is acceptable to the opposite sex  $A$ . That is, with the constant of proportionality taken to be 1,

$$(6.1) \quad \frac{d(x_1 + x_2)}{dt} = p_A(x_1 + x_2).$$

Similarly, the expected values of the sizes of both subpopulations  $B_1$  and  $B_2$  are growing at rates proportional to the fractions  $S_i(c^*)$  of each subpopulation that are acceptable to sex  $A$  at that time, i.e., which satisfy the coupled system of ordinary differential equations

$$(6.2) \quad \frac{dx_i}{dt} = x_i S_i(c^*), \quad i = 1, 2,$$

where  $c^* = c^*(x_1, x_2)$  is the cutoff value so that the expected proportion of sex  $B$  that is above desirability level  $c^*$  at time  $t$  is exactly  $p_A$ . Since  $P_1$  and  $P_2$  and hence  $S_1$  and  $S_2$  are assumed to be constant in time,  $c^*$  satisfies

$$(6.3) \quad \frac{x_1 S_1(c^*) + x_2 S_2(c^*)}{x_1 + x_2} = p_A.$$

The coupled system of ODE's (6.2) is very closely related to the classical replicator equation (cf. Bomze [1995], Cressman and Tao [2014]), which also captures the essence of selection via acceptability for mating but through rates proportional to deviation from the mean desirability (or fitness), rather than through rates proportional to fractions above selectivity cutoffs. Analogous to the discrete probabilistic model above, solutions of (6.2) are not generally available in closed form, and must be approximated numerically, as will be seen in Example 6.2 below.

Qualitative comparisons of the rates of growth of competing subpopulations satisfying (4) are possible, however, and the next theorem shows that the selectivity-variability principle above is also valid in this setting, in the following sense. If  $P_1$  is more variable than  $P_2$ , and if  $p_A < 0.5$ , i.e., if sex  $A$  is selective, then the relative instantaneous rate of growth of  $B_1$  exceeds that of  $B_2$ , and the proportion of sex  $B$  that

is from  $B_1$  approaches 1 in the limit as time goes to infinity. Conversely, if  $p_A > 0.5$ , i.e., if sex  $A$  is non-selective, then the relative instantaneous rate of growth of  $B_2$  exceeds that of  $B_1$ , and the less variable subpopulation  $B_2$  prevails in the limit. This same conclusion can be extended to more general settings, such as time-dependent acceptability fractions  $p_A(t)$ , and these generalizations are left to the interested reader.

Recall that  $P_1$  and  $P_2$ , respectively, are the desirability distributions (to sex  $A$ ) of subpopulations  $B_1$  and  $B_2$  of sex  $B$ .

**Theorem 6.1.** *Suppose subpopulation  $B_1$  is more variable than  $B_2$ , i.e.,  $P_1 \succ P_2$ .*

(i) *If  $p_A < 0.5$ , i.e., if sex  $A$  is selective, then the relative rate of growth of  $B_1$  exceeds that of  $B_2$ ,*

$$(6.4) \quad \frac{1}{x_1} \frac{dx_1}{dt} > \frac{1}{x_2} \frac{dx_2}{dt}.$$

Moreover,  $\frac{x_1}{x_1+x_2} \rightarrow 1$  as  $t \rightarrow \infty$ .

(ii) *If  $p_A > 0.5$ , i.e., if sex  $A$  is non-selective, then the relative rate of growth of  $B_2$  exceeds that of  $B_1$ ,*

$$(6.5) \quad \frac{1}{x_2} \frac{dx_2}{dt} > \frac{1}{x_1} \frac{dx_1}{dt}.$$

Moreover,  $\frac{x_1}{x_1+x_2} \rightarrow 0$  as  $t \rightarrow \infty$ .

*Proof of (i).* Analogous to the argument for Theorem 5.2, define  $g : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow (0, 1)$  by

$$g(c) = \frac{x_1 S_1(c) + x_2 S_2(c)}{x_1 + x_2},$$

where  $S_1$  and  $S_2$  are the desirability survival functions for  $P_1$  and  $P_2$ , respectively. Recall that  $S_1$  and  $S_2$  are both continuous and strictly decreasing with identical medians  $m > 0$ , and fix  $t > 0$ . Since  $g$  is continuous and strictly decreasing with  $g(-\infty) = 1$ ,  $g(m) = 0.5$ , and  $g(\infty) = 0$ , there exists a unique threshold desirability cutoff  $c^* = c^*(t)$  satisfying

$$\frac{x_1 S_1(c^*) + x_2 S_2(c^*)}{x_1 + x_2} = p_A,$$

where, as before,  $p_A$  is the most desirable fraction of sex  $B$  that is acceptable to sex  $A$ , and  $c^* = c^*(t)$  is the threshold desirability cutoff for sex  $A$  for the combined populations of sex  $B = B_1 \cup B_2$  at time  $t$ .

Note that  $S_1(m) = S_2(m) = 0.5$ , so since  $p_A < 0.5$ ,  $c^* > m$ . Since  $P_1$  is more variable than  $P_2$  this implies that  $S_1(c^*) > S_2(c^*)$ . Since  $S_1(c^*)$  and  $S_2(c^*)$  are the proportions of  $B_1$  and  $B_2$ , respectively, that are above the threshold cutoff at time  $t > 0$ , (6.2) implies (6.4).

To see that  $\frac{x_1}{x_1+x_2} \rightarrow 1$  as  $t \rightarrow \infty$ , note that since  $P_1$  is more variable than  $P_2$ ,  $m < S_2^{-1}(p_A) < S_1^{-1}(p_A)$  for  $p_A < 0.5$ . Clearly  $c^* \in [S_2^{-1}(p_A), S_1^{-1}(p_A)]$  for all  $t > 0$ , so since  $S_2(x) < S_1(x)$  for all  $x > m$ , the continuity of  $S_1$  and  $S_2$  implies the existence of  $\delta > 0$  so that

$$S_1(c^*) > S_2(c^*) + \delta \text{ for all } c^* \in [S_2^{-1}(p_A), S_1^{-1}(p_A)] \text{ and for all } t > 0.$$

Thus by (6.2),

$$\frac{1}{x_1} \frac{dx_1}{dt} > \frac{1}{x_2} \frac{dx_2}{dt} + \delta \text{ for all } t > 0,$$

so  $\ln x_1 - \ln x_2 \geq \delta t + \alpha$ , which implies that  $\frac{x_1}{x_1+x_2} \rightarrow 1$  as  $t \rightarrow \infty$ , completing the proof of (i).

The proof of (ii) is analogous. □

The next example is a numerical application of Theorem 6.1 and Proposition 4.3 where the desirability values decrease exponentially from the common median. Note that, as was the case in Example 5.3 above, the solution, in this case of the underlying coupled system of ODE's, is not available in closed form, but must be approximated numerically.

**Example 6.2.** Let the survival functions  $S_1$  and  $S_2$  for subpopulations  $B_1$  and  $B_2$  be Laplace distributions with  $S_1(x) = e^{-x}/2$  for  $x \geq 0$  and  $S_2(x) = e^{-2x}/2$  for  $x \geq 0$  (see Figure 4). (For ease of exposition, the common median desirability of both subpopulations here is taken to be 0; translation to a different median value is trivial.) By Proposition 4.3,  $P_1 \succ P_2$ , so subpopulation  $B_1$  is more variable than  $B_2$ .




Figure 4: The red curve is the density of the desirability value of the more variable subpopulation  $B_1$  in Example 6.2, and the blue curve is the density of the less variable subpopulation  $B_2$ . If  $B_1$  and  $B_2$  are of equal size, then the vertical green line is the threshold cutoff for the opposite sex  $A$  so that exactly 25% of the composite  $B$  population has desirability value above that point. The vertical purple line is the value so that exactly 75% of the  $B$  population has desirability value above that point. Note that the desirability values of both drop off exponentially fast from the mean in both directions.

Suppose first that sex  $A$  is selective and accepts only the most desirable quarter of individuals in sex  $B$ , i.e.,  $p_A = 0.25$ . Using (6.1) and (6.2), and noting that  $S_2(x) = 2S_1^2(x)$  for  $x \geq 0$  yields the following coupled system of ordinary differential equations:

$$(6.6) \quad \begin{aligned} \frac{dx_1}{dt} &= x_1 \left( \frac{\sqrt{x_1^2 + 2x_1x_2 + 2x_2^2} - x_1}{4x_2} \right) \\ \frac{dx_2}{dt} &= \left( \frac{x_1 + x_2}{4} \right) - x_1 \left( \frac{\sqrt{x_1^2 + 2x_1x_2 + 2x_2^2} - x_1}{4x_2} \right). \end{aligned}$$

No closed-form solution of (6.6) is known, and Figure 5 illustrates a numerical solution with the initial condition  $x_1(0) = x_2(0) = 1$ . Note that in this case where sex  $A$  is selective, the more variable subpopulation  $B_1$  eventually eclipses the less variable  $B_2$ .




Figure 5: Selective case—Population sizes and ratio. The graphs (a) of the more variable  $x_1(t)$  in red and  $x_2(t)$  in blue, and (b) the ratio  $x_1(t)/(x_1(t) + x_2(t))$  satisfying (6.6).

Suppose next that sex  $A$  is non-selective and accepts only individuals in in the most desirable three-quarters of sex  $B$ , i.e.,  $p_A = 0.75$ . Using (6.1) and (6.2) again, and noting that  $S_2(x) = 4S_1(x) - 2S_1^2(x) - 1$  for  $x \leq 0$  yields the following system:

$$(6.7) \quad \begin{aligned} \frac{dx_1}{dt} &= x_1 \left( \frac{x_1 + 4x_2 - \sqrt{x_1^2 + 2x_1x_2 + 2x_2^2}}{4x_2} \right) \\ \frac{dx_2}{dt} &= \left( \frac{3x_1 + 3x_2}{4} \right) - x_1 \left( \frac{x_1 + 4x_2 - \sqrt{x_1^2 + 2x_1x_2 + 2x_2^2}}{4x_2} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Figure 6 illustrates a numerical solution of the coupled system of ODE's (6.7) with the same initial condition  $x_1(0) = x_2(0) = 1$ . Note that in this situation where sex  $A$  is non-selective, the less variable subpopulation  $B_2$  eventually eclipses the more variable  $B_1$ .

Note also that the birth process model above also implicitly includes simple *birth-death* processes, via the simple observation that a population growing, for example, at a rate of eight per cent and dying at a rate of three per cent, can be viewed as a pure birth process growing at a rate of five per cent.

## 7 Darwin's Question, Selectivity and Parenting

As mentioned above, recent research has generally confirmed Darwin's observation of greater male variability for many species and traits. For example, in the realm of human studies,

The principal finding is that human intrasex variability is significantly higher in males, and consequently constitutes a fundamental sex difference...The data presented here show that human greater male intrasex variability is not limited to intelligence test scores, and suggest that




Figure 6: Non-selective case—Population sizes and ratio. The graphs (a) of the more variable subpopulation size  $x_1(t)$  in red and less variable  $x_2(t)$  in blue, and (b) the ratio  $x_1(t)/(x_1(t) + x_2(t))$  satisfying (6.7).

generally greater intrasex variability among males is a fundamental aspect of the differences between sexes. Birth weight, blood parameters, juvenile physical performance, and university grades are parameters which reflect many aspects of human biology. In particular, the differences in variations in birth weight strongly suggest that social factors cannot account for all of the sex differences in variability [Lehre et al., 2009, pp. 198, 204–205].

The selectivity-variability principle introduced above is neutral with respect to the two sexes, and by itself does not explain any differences in variability between them - either that there should be a difference in variability between the sexes, or which sex might be expected to be more variable. But together with two other basic biological tenets, the selectivity-variability principle can perhaps help provide a theory for Darwin’s observation and the empirical evidence of greater male variability reported in many subsequent studies.

One of these two additional biological tenets is parenting-selectivity, which posits that a “basic cross-species pattern is that the sex with the slower potential rate of reproduction invests more in parenting, [and] is selective in mate choices [and the] sex with the faster potential rate of reproduction invests less in parenting, [and] is less selective in mate choices” [Geary, 2006, p. 273]. For example, “When females invest more in offspring than males, parental investment theory says that selection operates so that females discriminate among males for mates...and males are indiscriminate” [Gowaty et al., 2003, p. 2037]; (see also Edward and Chapman [2011] and Trivers [1972]). Although the genetic mechanisms of pre- and postcopulatory sexual selection are still far from being fully understood, molecular genetic and genomic tools now enable their detailed experimental testing [Andersson and Simmons, 2006, p. 300].

The second additional biological tenet is gender-parenting, which says that “typical species [have] less parental investment by males than females” [Gowaty et al., 2003, p. 2037] which occurs, for example, in more than ninety-five percent of mammalian species [Geary, 2007, p. 175]. Combining these two biological maxims with the selectivity-variability principle suggests an answer to Darwin’s question. By the gender-parenting tenet, females in typical species invest more in parenting than males, so by the parenting-selectivity tenet females will typically be relatively selective and males relatively non-selective. Then the selectivity-variability principle implies that females in such species will tend toward less variability and the males toward greater variability.

If both sexes in a certain species began with comparable mid-range variability, for example, and if either its females were generally selective ( $p_F < 0.5$ ) or its males were generally non-selective ( $p_M > 0.5$ ), or both, this would have led to the relatively greater male variability observed by Darwin. In the constraints of this cross-species model, therefore, this would offer *two independent explanations* for the appearance of greater male variability in many species. Unlike other species, of course, in humans, cultural factors may also play a role in the perceived differences in variability between the sexes.

## 8 Conclusions

The goal here has been neither to challenge nor to confirm Darwin's and other researchers' observations of greater male variability for any given species or any given trait, but rather to propose an elementary mathematical theory based on biological/evolutionary mechanisms that might serve as a starting point to help explain how one sex of a species might tend to evolve with greater variability than the other sex. As such, the contribution here is a general theory intended to open the discussion to further mathematical and statistical modeling and analysis.

## 9 Further research directions

There are many natural generalizations, modifications, and extensions of the basic selectivity-variability theory described above, including the following:

*Time dependence.* Desirability distributions and/or selectivity that vary with time, for example individual desirability decreasing with time and the proportion of acceptable mates increasing with time.

*Desirability.* Desirability that depends on several parameters (e.g., size and intelligence); or desirability that is a random variable (e.g., the perception of an individual's desirability by the opposite sex is not perfect.)

*Selectivity criteria.* Acceptability of potential mates of the opposite sex that depends both on desirability and proximity (e.g., nearby candidates may be more acceptable than distant candidates with higher desirability); desirability thresholds that vary within members of the same subpopulation; or acceptability criterion that is not a step function, but becomes continuously higher with higher desirability levels (similar to replicator equation models).

*Game-theoretic versions.* Subpopulations that compete and may choose their own selectivity cutoff thresholds - e.g., may choose to be less selective to increase their probability of having offspring.

*Non-identical means.* Competing subpopulations with unequal means, and the relative advantages between having a higher mean and lower variance.

*Offspring.* Expected numbers of offspring that depend on desirability levels of both parents; offspring types that are randomly distributed with desirability and selectivity criteria depending on those of the parents, both models where each sex's selectivity and/or variability depend only on that of its parent of the same sex, and models where they depend on the those of both parents.



*Variability.* Alternative notions of variability that are defined via standard deviation after outliers are removed, or are one-sided (e.g., only upper tail comparisons are important).

*Cultural factors.* There are also many cultural aspects of research on the variability hypothesis suggested by empirical evidence of greater male variability in humans and by the selectivity-variability theory above. These include the effects of monogamy, education, religion, social status, etc. on differences in selectivity and variability between the sexes, and the rate at which the disparity in variability between the sexes is disappearing, as predicted by this theory and observed in empirical studies.

*Univariate applications.* The selectivity-variability principle may also be applied to univariate decision-making. For example, the so-called “Texas Top Ten Per Cent Law” guarantees Texas students who graduate in the top ten percent of their high school class automatic admission to all state-funded universities. The selectivity-variability principle implies that if a student has a choice of tutoring options which have similar average success rates, options with greater variability will be superior to those with lesser variability.

*Non-biological applications.* One colleague has suggested that a similar selectivity/variability principle may also apply to some chemical or quantum processes where two reagents interact, and one (or both) may have several different forms that vary in affinity for the other reagent.

## Acknowledgments

The author is grateful to several referees and to Professors Ron Fox, Igor Rivin, Erika Rogers, Marjorie Senechal, Sergei Tabachnikov, and Julius Van Der Werf for very helpful comments.

## Appendix A. Empirical Evidence

Recall that the variability hypothesis pertains to general traits in animal species with male and female sexes, and is a general hypothesis that clearly does not apply to every trait in every sexually dimorphic species. This century has already produced much new empirical evidence on the variability hypothesis in different contexts, and the following are direct excerpts from a representative selection of such studies, most of which refer to humans. These are grouped chronologically first by primary studies with findings that support the variability hypothesis, and then by primary studies that do not support greater male variability. (Note: Readers are welcome to suggest additional references.)

### A.1 Primary Research Studies Supporting the Greater Male Variability Hypothesis

“Greater male than female variability is found in behavioral and morphological traits in animals . . . Variation was significantly greater among men than women in 5 of the 6 former data sets . . . broadly supporting the predictions. A further analysis extends the theory to intellectual abilities” [Archer and Mehdikhani, 2003, p. 219].

“Boys were over-represented at the low and high extremes of cognitive ability” [Deary et al., 2003, p. 533].

“We found greater variance, by Levene’s test of homogeneity of variance, among boys at every age except age two despite the girls’ mean advantage from ages two to seven” [Arden and Plomin, 2006, p. 39].

“for all three tests there were substantial sex differences in the standard deviation of scores, with greater variance among boys. Boys were over represented relative to girls at both the top and the bottom extremes for all tests, with the exception of the top 10% in verbal reasoning . . . In relation to sex differences in variability, the current results support the general finding of greater male variability” [Strand et al., 2006, pp. 463, 475].

“Males have only a marginal advantage in mean levels . . . but substantially greater variance” [Deary et al., 2007, p. 451].

[meta-analysis] “Males are more variable on most measures of quantitative and visuospatial ability, which necessarily results in more males at both high- and low-ability extremes . . . The results from multiple large-scale studies have confirmed greater variability among males than among females in many cognitive domains, including on measures of mathematics, science, and spatial abilities” [Halpern et al., 2007, p. 1, 22].

“within species size variation is significantly larger in males” [Cardini and Elton, 2008, p. 630].

“our analyses show greater male variability, although the discrepancy in variances is not large . . . There is evidence of slightly greater male variability in scores, although the causes remain unexplained” [Hyde et al., 2008, p. 495].

[meta-analysis] “[we] reviewed the history of the hypothesis that general intelligence is more biologically variable in males than in females and presented data . . . which in many ways are the most complete that have ever been compiled, [that] substantially support the [greater male variability] hypothesis” [Johnson

et al., 2008, p. 529].

“Males show greater variability than females in science” [Lynn and Mikk, 2008, p. 122].

“Gender gaps vary but differences in variability are a ROBUST PHENOMENON . . . International testing results show greater variance in boys’ scores than in girls’ . . . These results imply that gender differences in the variance of test scores are an international phenomenon and that they emerge in different institutional settings” [Machin and Pekkarinen, 2008, pp. 1331–1332].

[meta-analysis] “Despite the modest differences at the center of the distribution, the greater variability of male scores resulted in large asymmetries at the tails, with males out-numbering females by a ratio of 7 to 1 in the top 1% on tests of mathematics and spatial reasoning . . . greater male variance is observed even prior to the onset of preschool” [Ceci et al., 2009, pp. 220–221].

“Boys had greater variability in these IQ scores.” [Dykiert et al., 2009, p. 42].

“The principal finding is that human intrasex variability is significantly higher in males, and consequently constitutes a fundamental sex difference . . . The data presented here show that human greater male intrasex variability is not limited to intelligence test scores, and suggest that generally greater intrasex variability among males is a fundamental aspect of the differences between sexes. Birth weight, blood parameters, juvenile physical performance, and university grades are parameters which reflect many aspects of human biology. In particular, the differences in variations in birth weight strongly suggest that social factors cannot account for all of the sex differences in variability” [Lehre et al., 2009, pp. 198, 204–205].

“With one exception...all variance ratios were greater than 1.0” [Lohman and Lakin, 2009, p. 395].

“We found sex differences in the variance of reading achievement in all three studies analysed. The biggest variance ratio 1.20 was in the PISA 2003 study and it was 1.08 in both PIRLS studies. In the PISA study, boys showed greater variance in reading comprehension than the girls in all countries, and in the PIRLS studies, the boys’ variance was larger in most countries” [Lynn and Mikk, 2009, p. 11].

“By age 10 the boys have a higher mean, greater variance and are over-represented in the high tail. Sex differences in variance emerge early – even before pre-school – suggesting that they are not determined by educational influences” [Arden, 2010, p. 26].

“The hypothesis of ‘greater male variability’ was supported in most domains” [Chen et al., 2010, p. 475].

[meta-analysis] “we meta-analyzed data from 242 studies published between 1990 and 2007, representing the testing of 1,286,350 people. Overall,  $d = .05$ , indicating no gender difference, and  $VR = 1.08$  [i.e., males have 8% more variance than females]” [Lindberg et al., 2010, p. 1123].

“the variability analyses tended to support the Greater Male Variability Hypothesis” [He and Wong, 2011, p. 807].

“We find that male students exhibit greater residual as well as raw variability for this data set” [Mendez and Lohr, 2011, p. 2947].

“Our data show non-existent or trivial gender difference in mean scores. However, the tails of the distributions show differences between the males and females, with greater variability among males in the upper half of the distribution ” [Vista and Care, 2011, p. 292]

“Seven international tests revealed that on average the variance for males was 12% larger than that for females” [Mikk et al., 2012, p. 132].

“the variances in the personality descriptions by informants were higher for male than for female targets” [Borkenau et al., 2013, p. 142].

“In sum, the data largely supported the greater male variability hypothesis for mathematics achievement and general student achievement . . . In most countries, boys demonstrated larger variability than girls in (manifest) performance scores” [Brunner et al., 2013, pp. 390–391].

“Results using the boy/girl variance ratio (VR) generally supported the hypothesis that boys have greater variability than girls in creativity test performance . . . there was more variability among males in some countries” [He et al., 2013, pp. 882, 883].

“Overall, the results were consistent with previous research, showing small mean differences in the three domains, but considerably greater variability for males” [Lakin, 2013, p. 263].

“our research team [New Paltz Evolutionary Psychology Lab] has recently uncovered that in humans, sex differences in variability across many behavioral and physical domains ends up being the rule . . . for a large number of variables, males demonstrate[d] greater variability” Dawson and Geher [2014].

[meta-analysis] “For mathematics performance, across three meta-analyses and a wide variety of samples, variance ratios consistently range between 1.05 and 1.20 [i.e., males consistently have between five and twenty percent higher variance than females] . . . Similarly, for verbal performance, variance ratios range between 1.03 and 1.16” [Hyde, 2014, p. 390].

“This study weighs in on a number of hypotheses related to the nature of sex differences in broad and narrow/specific cognitive abilities . . . This research also shows, quite compellingly, that the variability hypothesis is plausible and impacts both manifest and latent analyses of general ability” [Lakin and Gambrell, 2014, p. 50].

“Analysis of 5,772,811 examinations from 1990 to 2009 revealed a switch in average performance, from men performing equally well or better than women to women performing better than men. However, greater male than female variability in performance did not change” [Lehre et al., 2014, p. 315].

[meta-analysis] “The larger score variance of boys in general knowledge and most domains observed in the current study is consistent with prior evidence regarding general intelligence” [Tran et al., 2014, p. 10].

“Levene’s test indicated that high school male students had greater variability in general knowledge. This is in accordance with all previous Croatian studies of gender differences in general knowledge” [Zarevski et al., 2014, p. 132].

“the gender difference for Russian high school students in mean mathematical test scores is negligible ( $d=0.05$ ). However, boys show a greater variance of test scores than girls ( $VR=1.12$ ). Both findings are consistent with the results previously reported in the studies based on US and international data ... greater male variability in mathematical test scores that we find with the Russian data is a more robust phenomenon reported in many other studies” [Bessudnov and Makarov, 2015, p. 14].

“The results of F tests of equality of variance revealed greater male variance in the adolescent and the emerging adult groups” [He et al., 2015, pp. 92–93].

“this study showed that the Greater Male Variability Hypothesis had supportive evidence from responses to figural stimuli” [Lau and Cheung, 2015, p. 87].

“the results of the study supported the greater male variability hypothesis in urban and rural samples ... the results of the present study found that the greater male variability hypothesis in creativity was consistent across different samples” [Ju et al., 2015, pp. 85, 88].

“Consistent with previous research, the variability of boys’ performance in science was larger than that of girls’ ... Variance ratios across all grades exceeded Feingold’s (1994) criterion for greater male variability and were comparable to that found for mathematics. These variance ratios were also stable across the time period examined, with no association with year of assessment or interaction with grade” [Reilly et al., 2015, p. 651].

“Twelve databases from IEA [International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement] and PISA [Program for International Student Assessment] were used to analyze gender differences within an international perspective from 1995 to 2015 ... The ‘greater male variability hypothesis’ is confirmed” [Baye and Monseur, 2016, p. 1].

“The distribution of general intelligence is broader in men than in women while neither is smarter on average” [Bolenz, 2016, p. iii].

“Although mean scores of men and women did not differ ... a significant difference in variability of scores was observed ... The effect size was large ( $VR = 1.82$ ) and statistically significant” [Karwowski et al., 2016a, p. 468].

“Study 1 demonstrated not only that greater male variability replicates among young children, but also that the general effect size of this ratio should be considered large ( $VR > 2$ ) ... Study 2 has confirmed these expectations: Not only were males characterized by a higher variability of original thinking and unconventionality, but also their mean originality scores were higher than those of females” [Karwowski et al., 2016b, p. 164].

“One unexpected observation is that the excess variability of males relative to females tends to be greater at higher levels of socio-economic development ... Also, greater male variability is a near-universal finding. The similarities of sex differences in this world-wide sample of countries are difficult to explain with cultural or economic causes alone. They are more compatible with biologically based differences that show little variation between human populations” [Meisenberg, 2016, p. 247].

“Our analysis suggests that plastic traits, such as size, and especially those under strong sexual selection, may indeed show more variation in males, when males are the bigger sex” [Cardini and Elton, 2017, p. 9].

“The literature is converging on a consensus that there are only small gender differences in mathematics tests scores at early ages, but the gender gap widens by middle and high school. In addition, more boys perform in both tails of the mathematics distribution with significantly more in the right tail than girls” [Kahn and Ginther, 2017, p. 25].

“There was generally greater male variance across structural measures [in the human brain]” [Ritchie et al., 2017, p. 2].

“In absolute and percentage terms, males are more represented in the upper and lower score ranges . . . The percentage of female students in the top score ranges has decreased on the new SAT. . . proportionally 45% more males are in the 1400–1600 [SAT] score range than females” [Sawyer, 2017, p. 7].

[meta-analysis] “On average, male variability is greater than female variability on a variety of measures of cognitive ability, personality traits, and interests . . . This finding is consistent across decades . . . There is good evidence that men are more variable on a variety of traits, meaning that they are over-represented at both tails of the distribution (i.e., more men at the very bottom, and at the very top), even though there is no gender difference on average” Stevens and Haidt [2017].

“We observed significantly greater male than female variance for several key brain structures, including cerebral white matter and cortex, hippocampus, pallidum, putamen, and cerebellar cortex volumes” [Wierenga et al., 2017, p. 1].

“greater male variability [was] found based on mean and variability analyses, respectively” [He, 2018, p. 1].

“this study concluded that males’ variance was much larger than females” [Li et al., 2018, p. 579].

[meta-analysis] “Here, we use recent meta-analytic advances to compare gender differences in academic grades from over 1.6 million students. In line with previous studies we find strong evidence for lower variation among girls than boys” [O’Dea et al., 2018, p. 1].

“our results and conclusions provide strong evidence for the variability hypothesis in humans . . . males appear to be more variable in the great majority of physical, cognitive, behavioral traits that have been investigated” [Geher et al., 2019, pp. 44, 53].

“boys were found to have more variability in mathematics achievement than girls” [Ghasemi et al., 2019, p. 27].

[meta-analysis] “Our analysis seems to suggest that greater male variability is currently universal in internationally comparable assessments implemented over the past decade” [Gray et al., 2019, p. 27].

“In most countries, male students indeed have greater variance in math performance ( $VR > 1.0$ ), but the size of the gender difference in variances is small and varies by country, ranging from  $VR = 1.009$  in

Argentina to  $VR = 1.092$  in Colombia” [Liu et al., 2019, p. 16].

“the performance of boys was more variable than that of girls in most nations, consistent with the greater male variability hypothesis . . . the performance of males showed greater variability than for females, which leads to a higher proportion of high-achieving male students in STEM” [Reilly et al., 2019, p. 25].

“Greater male variability was observed in Botswana, Japan, Lithuania, Singapore and United States” [Askin and Öz, 2020, p. 194].

“To date, there is little work investigating sex differences in spatial cognitive abilities outside of mammals, and none that has investigated the greater male variability phenomenon in non-human animals . . . Overall, we show that male and female mountain chickadees exhibit similar mean performance on both the spatial and reversal cognitive tasks and provide some of the first support for the greater male variability phenomenon in a non-human system” [Branch et al., 2020, pp. 5,6].

“These results provide evidence that greater male neuroanatomical variability extends beyond humans, and suggest both evolutionary and developmental explanations for this phenomenon” [DeCasien et al., 2020, p. 1].

“In  $n = 3069$  participants, from 8 to 95 years of age, we found widespread greater variability in males compared with females in cortical surface area and global and subcortical volumes for discrete brain regions . . . In conclusion, we demonstrated that males are more variable compared with females in individual brain regions with regard to surface area and volume measures” [Forde et al., 2020, pp. 5420, 5428].

“Our study also highlighted that boys were likely to outperform in the higher score ranges, as well as lower score ranges. Finally, we also found that the boys had significantly greater variabilities in science achievement and interest (variance ratio  $[VR] > 1.1$ )” [Jia et al., 2020, p. 195].

[meta-analysis] “Our meta-analysis of social-dilemma studies based on 40 samples with 8,123 participants strongly supports our hypotheses and provides empirical evidence of greater male variability in cooperation” [Thöni et al., 2020, p. 9].

[mega-analysis] “the largest-ever mega-analysis of sex differences in variability of brain structure, based on international data spanning nine decades of life . . . The present study included a large lifespan sample and robustly confirmed previous findings of greater male variance in brain structure in humans. We found greater male variance in all brain measures, including subcortical volumes and regional cortical surface area and thickness, at both the upper and the lower end of the distributions” [Wierenga et al., 2020, pp. 6, 23].

“greater male variability was found in morphological traits” [Zajitschek et al., 2020, p. 1].

## A.2 Primary Research Studies Not Supporting the Greater Male Variability Hypothesis

“Variation was . . . similar for men and women in the latter 2 data sets” [Archer and Mehdikhani, 2003, p. 219].

[meta-analysis] “the finding in this meta-analysis [is] that there is no sex difference in variance on the Advanced Progressive Matrices and that females show greater variance on the Standard Progressive Matrices” [Irwing and Lynn, 2005, p. 520].

“the common assumption that males have greater variance in mathematics achievement is not universally true” [Penner, 2008, p. S152].

“data from several studies indicate that greater male variability with respect to mathematics is not ubiquitous...[and] is largely an artifact of changeable sociocultural factors, not immutable, innate biological differences between the sexes . . . Our finding . . . [is] inconsistent with the Greater Male Variability Hypothesis” [Hyde and Mertz, 2009, pp. 8801, 8806].

“Our data show non-existent or trivial gender difference in mean scores. However, the tails of the distributions show differences between the males and females, with . . . greater variability among females in the lower half of the distribution” [Vista and Care, 2011, p. 292]

“Boys were not found to be more variable than girls” [Eriksson et al., 2012, p. 326].

“Therefore, we conclude that both variance and VR [variance ratio - ratio of male to female variance] in mathematics performance vary greatly among countries . . . These findings are inconsistent with the greater male variability hypothesis” [Kane and Mertz, 2012, p. 14].

“females were more variable in other countries . . . These findings suggest that greater male variability is not a ubiquitous phenomenon across cultures” [He et al., 2013, p. 883].

“The results of F tests of equality of variance revealed a statistically significant difference regarding the greater female variance in the children group” [He et al., 2015, pp. 92–93].

“this study showed that the Greater Male Variability Hypothesis had supportive evidence from responses to figural stimuli but not responses to verbal stimuli of the WKCT” [Lau and Cheung, 2015, p. 87].

“When differences in variance are considered, the data again shows little support for any sex differences, in either general or specific ability scores” [Iliescu et al., 2016, p. 59].

“females were characterized by a higher mean level and variability of adaptiveness” [Karwowski et al., 2016b, p. 164].

“Data for a sample of 18-year-old Applied Science and Social Science students in Libya are reported for intelligence (IQ), emotional intelligence (EQ) and educational achievement . . . females had greater variability of intelligence than males . . . In our study there were no clear sex differences in the variability of



academic performance (Table 3), and only emotional intelligence showed greater male variability (Table 1)” [Al-Shahomee et al., 2017, pp. 448, 453].

“Levene’s test of homogeneity of variances (Table 2) showed that the variance was homogeneous between boys and girls” [Bakker et al., 2019, p. 5].

“the ‘greater male variability hypothesis’ is not supported by our data” [Booth and Lee, 2019, p. 13].

“women appear to show higher levels of variability compared to men in some emotional traits, such as emotionality, anger, discomfort, fear, negative affectivity, and soothability” [Geher et al., 2019, p. 53].

“in Brazil and Peru, female students actually have greater variances than male students ( $VR < 1.0$ ), which shows that the greater male variability hypothesis does not hold across the board and offers evidence of cross-country differences” [Liu et al., 2019, p. 16].

“in the surrounding areas of Bangkok ... females consistently outperformed their male counterparts in both English language and science related subjects, and also outnumbered their male peers in the top-100 achievers in both domains” [Rudd, 2019, p. 17].

“girls were more variable in their science success in Bahrain, Kuwait, Norway, Oman and Turkey” [Askin and Öz, 2020, p. 194].

“girls had slight greater variability in creativity” [Jia et al., 2020, p. 195].

“females were much more variable in immunological traits” [Zajitschek et al., 2020, p. 1].

## References

- Alsedig Abdalgadr Al-Shahomee, Adrian Furnham, and Richard Lynn. Sex differences in intelligence, emotional intelligence and educational attainment in Libya. *Mankind Quarterly*, 57(3):448–455, 2017.
- Malte Andersson and Leigh W. Simmons. Sexual selection and mate choice. *Trends in Ecology and Evolution*, 21(6):296–302, 2006. doi:10.1016/j.tree.2006.03.015. URL [http://www.reed.edu/biology/professors/srenn/pages/teaching/2010\\_syllabus/2010\\_readings/Anderson-Simmons\\_2006.pdf](http://www.reed.edu/biology/professors/srenn/pages/teaching/2010_syllabus/2010_readings/Anderson-Simmons_2006.pdf).
- John Archer and Mani Mehdikhani. Variability among males in sexually selected attributes. *Review of General Psychology*, 7(3):210–236, 2003. doi:10.1037/1089-2680.7.3.219.
- Rosalind Arden. *Using evolutionary theory to investigate Spearman’s g and its relationship to fitness*. Thesis (Ph.D.), King’s College London, London, 2010. Chapter 2.
- Rosalind Arden and Robert Plomin. Sex differences in variance of intelligence across childhood. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 41:39–48, 2006. doi:10.1016/j.paid.2005.11.027.
- Öyküm Esra Askin and Ersoy Öz. Cross-national comparisons of students’ science success based on gender variability: Evidence from TIMSS. *Journal of Baltic Science Education*, 19(2):186–200, 2020. doi:10.33225/jbse/20.19.186. URL <http://www.scientiasocialis.lt/jbse/?q=node/837>.
- Merel Bakker, Joke Torbeyns, Nore Wijns, Lieven Verschaffel, and Bert De Smedt. Gender equality in 4- to 5-year-old preschoolers’ early numerical competencies. *Developmental Science*, 22(1):e12718, 2019. doi:10.1111/desc.12718. URL <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1111/desc.12718>.
- A. J. Bateman. Intra-sexual selection in *Drosophila*. *Heredity*, 2:349–368, 1948. doi:10.1038/hdy.1948.21.
- Ariane Baye and Christian Monseur. Gender differences in variability and extreme scores in an international context. *Large Scale Assessments in Education*, 4(1):1–16, 2016. doi:10.1186/s40536-015-0015-x.
- Alexey Bessudnov and Alexey Makarov. School context and gender differences in mathematical performance among school graduates in Russia. *International Studies in Sociology of Education*, 2015. doi:10.1080/09620214.2014.1000937. URL <http://hdl.handle.net/10871/16638>.
- Florian Bolenz. *Modelling hemispheric interaction: Can connectivity explain differences in variability in general intelligence?* Thesis (Masters), School of Informatics, University of Edinburgh, 2016. URL [https://project-archive.inf.ed.ac.uk/msc/20161799/msc\\_proj.pdf](https://project-archive.inf.ed.ac.uk/msc/20161799/msc_proj.pdf).
- Immanuel M. Bomze. Lotka-Volterra equation and replicator dynamics: New issues in classification. *Biological Cybernetics.*, 72(5):447–453, 1995. ISSN 0340-1200. doi:10.1007/BF00201420. URL <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/BF00201420>.
- Alison Booth and Jungmin Lee. Girls’ and boys’ performance in competitions: What we can learn from a Korean quiz show. Discussion Paper IZA DP No. 12182, IAZ Institute of Labor Economics, 2019.
- Peter Borkenau, Robert R. McCrae, and Antonio Terracciano. Do men vary more than women in personality? A study in 51 cultures. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 47(2):135–144, 2013. doi:10.1016/j.jrp.2012.12.001.

- Carrie L. Branch, Benjamin R. Sonnenberg, Angela M. Pitera, Lauren M. Benedict, Dovid Y. Kozlovsky, Eli S. Bridge, and Vladimir V. Pravosudov. Testing the greater male variability phenomenon: male mountain chickadees exhibit larger variation in reversal learning performance compared with females. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B*, 287:20200895, 2020. doi:10.1098/rspb.2020.0895. URL <https://royalsocietypublishing.org/doi/full/10.1098/rspb.2020.0895>.
- Joel S Brown. Why Darwin would have loved evolutionary game theory. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B*, 283(1838):20160847, 2016. ISSN 0962-8452. doi:10.1098/rspb.2016.0847. URL <https://royalsocietypublishing.org/doi/pdf/10.1098/rspb.2016.0847>.
- Martin Brunner, Katarzyna Marta Gogol, Philipp Sonnleitner, Ulrich Keller, Stefan Krauss, and Franzis Preckel. Gender differences in the mean level, variability, and profile shape of student achievement: Results from 41 countries. *Intelligence*, 41(5):378–395, 2013. ISSN 0160-2896. doi:10.1016/j.intell.2013.05.009. URL <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0160289613000718>.
- Andrea Cardini and Sarah Elton. Variation in guenon skulls (I): species divergence, ecological and genetic differences. *Journal of Human Evolution*, 54:615–637, 2008. doi:10.1016/j.jhevol.2007.09.022.
- Andrea Cardini and Sarah Elton. Is there a “Wainer’s rule”? Testing which sex varies most as an example analysis using GueSDat, the free Guenon Skull Database. *Hystrix, the Italian Journal of Mammalogy*, 28(2), 2017. doi:10.4404/hystrix-28.2-12139. URL <http://dro.dur.ac.uk/21269/3/24167.pdf>.
- Stephen J. Ceci, Wendy M. Williams, and Susan M. Barnett. Women’s underrepresentation in science: Sociocultural and biological considerations. *Psychological Bulletin*, 135(2):218–261, 2009. doi:10.1037/a0014412.
- Eric L. Charnov. The genetical evolution of patterns of sexuality: Darwinian fitness. *The American Naturalist*, 113(4):465–480, 1979. doi:10.1086/283407.
- Hsinyi Chen, Mei-Fang Chen, Te-Sheng Chang, Yuan-Shun Lee, and Hsin-Ping Chen. Gender reality on multi-domains of school-age children in Taiwan: A developmental approach. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 48(4):475–480, 2010. ISSN 0191-8869. doi:10.1016/j.paid.2009.11.027. URL <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0191886909004905>.
- Ross Cressman and Yi Tao. The replicator equation and other game dynamics. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 111(Supplement 3):10810–10817, 2014. ISSN 0027-8424. doi:10.1073/pnas.1400823111. URL [https://www.pnas.org/content/111/Supplement\\_3/10810](https://www.pnas.org/content/111/Supplement_3/10810).
- Charles Darwin. *The Descent of Man and Selection in Relation to Sex*. D. Appleton and Company, New York, 1875. URL [https://en.wikisource.org/wiki/The\\_Descent\\_of\\_Man\\_\(Darwin\)](https://en.wikisource.org/wiki/The_Descent_of_Man_(Darwin)).
- Blair Dawson and Glenn Geher. Male/female differences in variability itself. *Psychology Today*, 2014. URL <https://www.psychologytoday.com/blog/darwins-subterranean-world/201410/malefemale-differences-in-variability-itself>.
- G. De Benedictis, G. Carrieri, O. Varcasia, M. Bonafè, and C. Franceschi. Inherited variability of the mitochondrial genome and successful aging in humans. *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences*, 908(1):208–218, 2006. doi:10.1111/j.1749-6632.2000.tb06648.x. URL <https://nyaspubs.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1111/j.1749-6632.2000.tb06648.x>.

- Ian J. Deary, Graham Thorpe, Valerie Wilson, John M. Starr, and Lawrence J. Whalley. Population sex differences in IQ at age 11: The Scottish mental survey 1932. *Intelligence*, 31(6):533–542, 2003. doi:10.1016/S0160-2896(03)00053-9.
- Ian J. Deary, Paul Irwing, Geoff Der, and Timothy C. Bates. Brother-sister differences in the g factor in intelligence: Analysis of full, opposite-sex siblings from the NLSY 1979. *Intelligence*, 35(5):451–456, 2007. doi:10.1016/j.intell.2006.09.003.
- Alex R. DeCasien, Chet C. Sherwood, Steven J. Schapiro, and James P. Higham. Greater variability in chimpanzee (pan troglodytes) brain structure among males. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B*, 287:20192858, 2020. doi:10.1098/rspb.2019.2858. URL <https://royalsocietypublishing.org/doi/pdf/10.1098/rspb.2019.2858>.
- Dominika Dykiert, Catharine R. Gale, and Ian J. Deary. Are apparent sex differences in mean IQ scores created in part by sample restriction and increased male variance? *Intelligence*, 37(1):42–47, 2009. doi:10.1016/j.intell.2008.06.002.
- Dominic A. Edward and Tracey Chapman. The evolution and significance of male mate choice. *Trends in Ecology and Evolution*, 26(12):647–654, 2011. doi:10.1016/j.tree.2011.07.012. URL [http://rattlesnakesofarizona.org/files/PDFs/TREE\\_26\\_647-654\\_2011.pdf](http://rattlesnakesofarizona.org/files/PDFs/TREE_26_647-654_2011.pdf).
- Havelock Ellis. *Man and woman: A study of human secondary sexual characters*. Scribner’s, New York, 1894.
- Mårten Eriksson, Peter Marschik, Tiia Tulviste, Margareta Almgren, Miguel Pérez Pereira, Sonja Wehberg, Ljubica Marjanović-Umek, Frederique Gayraud, Melita Kovacevic, and Carlos Gallego. Differences between girls and boys in emerging language skills: Evidence from 10 language communities. *British Journal of Developmental Psychology*, 30:326–343, 2012. doi:10.1111/j.2044-835X.2011.02042.x.
- Natalie J Forde, Jerrold Jeyachandra, Michael Joseph, Grace R Jacobs, Erin Dickie, Theodore D Satterthwaite, Russell T Shinohara, Stephanie H Ameis, and Aristotle N Voineskos. Sex differences in variability of brain structure across the lifespan. *Cerebral Cortex*, 30(10):5420–5430, 06 2020. ISSN 1047-3211. doi:10.1093/cercor/bhaa123. URL <https://doi.org/10.1093/cercor/bhaa123>.
- David C. Geary. Sex differences in social behavior and cognition: Utility of sexual selection for hypothesis generation. *Hormones and Behavior*, 49:273–275, 2006. doi:10.1016/j.yhbeh.2005.07.014.
- David C. Geary. An evolutionary perspective on sex differences in mathematics and the sciences. In S. Ceci and W. Williams, editors, *Why aren’t more women in science?*, pages 173–188. American Psychological Association, Washington, DC, 2007. ISBN 978-1-59147-485-2.
- Glen Geher, G. Aydin, A. Baroni, D. Chapleau, B. Dawson, J. Eisenberg, M. Gleason, J. Montgomery, N. Postol, A. Shimkus, C. Tripoli, and N. Wedberg. Do males vary more across the board? The Extended Bateman’s Principle Hypothesis. *EvoS Journal: The Journal of the Evolutionary Studies Consortium*, 8(1):44–58, 2019. ISSN 1944-1932. URL [http://evostudies.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/01/Geher-et-al\\_Vol8Iss1.pdf](http://evostudies.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/01/Geher-et-al_Vol8Iss1.pdf).
- Ehsan Ghasemi, Hansel Burley, and Parviz Safadel. Gender differences in general achievement in mathematics: An international study. *New Waves Educational Research & Development*, 22(1):27–54, 2019. URL <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1229446.pdf>.

- Patricia A. Gowaty, Rebecca Steinichen, and Wyatt W. Anderson. Indiscriminate females and choosy males: Within- and between-species variation in *Drosophila*. *Evolution*, 57(9):2037–45, 2003. URL <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/14575325>.
- Helen Gray, Andrew Lyth, Catherine McKenna, Susan Stothard, Peter Tymms, and Lee Copping. Sex differences in variability across nations in reading, mathematics and science: A meta-analytic extension of Baye and Monseur (2016). *Large-scale Assessments in Education*, 7(1):2, Feb 2019. ISSN 2196-0739. doi:10.1186/s40536-019-0070-9. URL <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40536-019-0070-9>.
- Diane F. Halpern, Camilla P. Benbow, David C. Geary, Ruben C. Gur, Janet S. Hyde, and Morton Ann Gernsbacher. The science of sex differences in science and mathematics. *Psychological Science in the Public Interest*, 8(1):1–51, 2007. doi:10.1111/j.1529-1006.2007.00032.x.
- Mavis Wu-Jing He, Wan-Chi Wong, and Anna Na-Na Hui. Gender differences in means and variability on creative thinking: Patterns in childhood, adolescence, and emerging adulthood. In Ai-Girl Tan and Christoph Perleth, editors, *Creativity, Culture, and Development*, pages 85–98. Springer Singapore, Singapore, 2015. ISBN 978-981-287-636-2. doi:10.1007/978-981-287-636-2\_6. URL [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-287-636-2\\_6](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-287-636-2_6).
- Wu-Jing He. A 4-year longitudinal study of the sex-creativity relationship in childhood, adolescence, and emerging adulthood: Findings of mean and variability analyses. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 9(2331):1–14, 2018. ISSN 1664-1078. doi:10.3389/fpsyg.2018.02331. URL <https://www.frontiersin.org/article/10.3389/fpsyg.2018.02331>.
- Wu-jing He and Wan-chi Wong. Gender differences in creative thinking revisited: Findings from analysis of variability. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 51:807–811, 2011. doi:10.1016/j.paid.2011.06.027.
- Wu-jing He, Wan-chi Wong, Yin Li, and Huanu Xu. A study of the greater male variability hypothesis in creative thinking in Mainland China: Male superiority exists. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 55:882–886, 2013. doi:10.1016/j.paid.2013.07.017.
- William Hill and Han Mulder. Genetic analysis of environmental variation. *Genetics Research*, 92:381–395, 2010. doi:10.1017/S0016672310000546. URL <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/21429270>.
- Janet S. Hyde. Gender similarities and differences. *The Annual Review of Psychology*, 65:3.1–3.26, 2014. doi:10.1146/annurev-psych-010213-115057. URL <https://www.gwern.net/docs/iq/2014-hyde.pdf>.
- Janet S. Hyde and Janet E. Mertz. Gender, culture, and mathematics performance. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 106(22):8801–8807, 2009. doi:10.1073/pnas.0901265106.
- Janet S. Hyde, Sara M. Lindberg, Marcia C. Linn, Amy B. Ellis, and Caroline C. Williams. Gender similarities characterize math performance. *Science*, 321:494–495, 2008. doi:10.1126/science.1160364.
- Dragos Iliescu, Alexandra Ilie, Dan Ispas, Anca Doborean, and Aurel Ion Clinciu. Sex differences in intelligence: A multi-measure approach using nationally representative samples from Romania. *Intelligence*, 58:54–61, 2016. ISSN 0160-2896. doi:10.1016/j.intell.2016.06.007. URL <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0160289616301003>.
- Paul Irwing and Richard Lynn. Sex differences in means and variability on the progressive matrices in university students: A meta-analysis. *British Journal of Psychology*, 96:505–524, 2005. doi:10.1348/000712605X53542.

- Chaochao Jia, Tao Yang, Yu Qian, and Xinye Wu. The gender differences in science achievement, interest, habit, and creativity. *Science Education International*, 31(2):195–202, 2020. doi:10.33828/sei.v31.i2.9.
- Wendy Johnson, Andrew Carothers, and Ian Deary. Sex differences in variability in general intelligence: A new look at the old question. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 3(6):518–531, 2008. doi:10.1111/j.1745-6924.2008.00096.x.
- Chengting Ju, Yuxi Duan, and Xuqun You. Retesting the greater male variability hypothesis in Mainland China: A cross-regional study. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 72:85–89, 2015. doi:10.1016/j.paid.2014.07.021.
- Shulamit Kahn and Donna Ginther. Women and STEM. Technical Report 23525, National Bureau of Economic Research, 2017. URL <http://www.nber.org/papers/w23525>.
- Jonathan M. Kane and Janet E. Mertz. Debunking myths about gender and mathematics performance. *Notices of the AMS*, 59(1):10–21, 2012. URL <https://advance.uncc.edu/sites/advance.uncc.edu/files/media/debunking-myths-about-gender-and-math.pdf>.
- Maciej Karwowski, Dorota M. Jankowska, Aleksandra Gajda, Michalina Marczak, Agata Groyecka, and Piotr Sorokowski. Greater male variability in creativity outside the WEIRD world. *Creativity Research Journal*, 28(4):467–470, 2016a. doi:10.1080/10400419.2016.1229978. URL <https://doi.org/10.1080/10400419.2016.1229978>.
- Maciej Karwowski, Dorota M. Jankowska, Jacek Gralewski, Aleksandra Gajda, Ewa Wiśniewska, and Izabela Lebuda. Greater male variability in creativity: A latent variables approach. *Thinking Skills and Creativity*, 22:159–166, 2016b. ISSN 1871-1871. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tsc.2016.10.005>. URL <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1871187116301407>.
- Joni M. Lakin. Sex differences in reasoning abilities: Surprising evidence that male-female ratios in the tails of the quantitative reasoning distribution have increased. *Intelligence*, 41:263–274, 2013. doi:10.1016/j.intell.2013.04.004.
- Joni M. Lakin and James L. Gambrell. Sex differences in fluid reasoning: Manifest and latent estimates from the cognitive abilities test. *Journal of Intelligence*, 2:36–55, 2014. doi:10.3390/jintelligence2020036.
- Russell Lande. Models of speciation by sexual selection on polygenic traits. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 78(6):3721–3725, 1981. doi:10.1073/pnas.78.6.3721. URL <http://www.pnas.org/content/78/6/3721>.
- Sing Lau and Ping Chung Cheung. A gender-fair look at variability in creativity: Growth in variability over a period versus gender comparison at a time point. *Creativity Research Journal*, 27(1):87–95, 2015. doi:10.1080/10400419.2015.992685. URL <https://doi.org/10.1080/10400419.2015.992685>.
- Anne-Catherine Lehre, Knut Lehre, Petter Laake, and Niels Danbolt. Greater intrasex phenotype variability in males than in females is a fundamental aspect of the gender differences in humans. *Developmental Psychobiology*, 51:198–206, 2009. doi:10.1002/dev.20358.
- Anne-Catherine Lehre, Arvid Hansen, Knut Petter Lehre, and Petter Laake. Effects of the 2003 quality reform on gender gaps in student learning outcomes in Norwegian higher education. *Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research*, 58(3):315–336, 2014. doi:10.1080/00313831.2012.732602.

- Meijuan Li, Yongmei Zhang, Hongyun Liu, and Yi Hao. Gender differences in mathematics achievement in Beijing: A meta-analysis. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 88(4):566–583, 2018. doi:10.1111/bjep.12203. URL <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1111/bjep.12203>.
- Sara M. Lindberg, Janet S. Hyde, and Jennifer L. Petersen. New trends in gender and mathematics performance: A meta-analysis. *Psychol Bull.*, 136(6):1123–1135, 2010. doi:10.1037/a0021276.
- Ran Liu, Andrea Alvarado-Urbina, and Emily Hannum. Differences at the extremes? Gender, national contexts, and math performance in Latin America. *American Educational Research Journal*, 0(0):0002831219876236, 2019. doi:10.3102/0002831219876236. URL <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.3102/0002831219876236>.
- David F. Lohman and Joni M. Lakin. Consistencies in sex differences on the Cognitive Abilities Test across countries, grades, test forms, and cohorts. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 79:389–407, 2009. doi:10.1348/000709908X354609.
- Richard Lynn and Jaan Mikk. Science: Sex differences in attainment. *The Journal of Social, Political, and Economic Studies*, 33(1):101–124, 2008. URL <http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.680.5262&rep=rep1&type=pdf>.
- Richard Lynn and Jaan Mikk. Sex differences in reading achievement. *TRAMES*, 13(63/58(1)):3–13, 2009. doi:10.3176/tr.2009.1.01.
- Stephen Machin and Tuomas Pekkarinen. Global sex differences in test score variability. *Science*, 322:1331–1332, 2008. doi:10.1126/science.1162573.
- Jovana Marjanovič. *Genetics of inherited variability: increasing uniformity by reducing competition*. Thesis (Ph.D.), Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences and Wageningen Institute of Animal Sciences of Wageningen University & Research, 2018. URL <https://pub.epsilon.slu.se/15427/>.
- Jovana Marjanovič, Han A. Mulder, Lars Rönnegård, and Piter Bijma. Modelling the co-evolution of indirect genetic effects and inherited variability. *Heredity*, 121:631–647, 2018. doi:10.1038/s41437-018-0068-z. URL <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/29588510>.
- Gerhard Meisenberg. Gender differences in school achievement across cultures: An analysis of results from PISA 2000–2012. *Mankind Quarterly*, 57(2):227–251, 2016.
- Guillermo Mendez and Sharon Lohr. Estimating residual variance in random forest regression. *Computational Statistics & Data Analysis*, 55(11):2937–2950, 2011. ISSN 0167-9473. doi:10.1016/j.csda.2011.04.022. URL <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0167947311001514>.
- Jaan Mikk, Karin Täht, and Olev Must. Sex differences in educational attainment. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 53:132–136, 2012. doi:10.1016/j.paid.2011.06.003.
- Takaya Moriyama, Mary V. Relling, and Jun J. Yang. Inherited genetic variation in childhood acute lymphoblastic leukemia. *Blood*, 125(26):3988–3995, 2015. ISSN 0006-4971. doi:10.1182/blood-2014-12-580001. URL <http://www.bloodjournal.org/content/125/26/3988>.

- Han Mulder, Piter Bijma, and William Hill. Prediction of breeding values and selection responses with genetic heterogeneity of environmental variance. *Genetics*, 175:1895–1910, 2007. doi:10.1534/genetics.106.063743. URL <http://www.genetics.org/content/genetics/175/4/1895.full.pdf>.
- Han Mulder, Piter Bijma, and William Hill. Selection for uniformity in livestock by exploiting genetic heterogeneity of residual variance. *Genetics, Selection, Evolution*, 40:37–59, 2008. doi:10.1186/1297-9686-40-1-37. URL <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/18096114>.
- Rose E. O’Dea, M. Lagisz, Michael D. Jennions, and Shinichi Nakagawa. Gender differences in individual variation in academic grades fail to fit expected patterns for STEM. *Nature Communications*, 9(1), 2018. doi:10.1038/s41467-018-06292-0. URL <https://www.nature.com/articles/s41467-018-06292-0.pdf>.
- Andrew M. Penner. Gender differences in extreme mathematical achievement: An international perspective on biological and social factors. *American Journal of Sociology*, 114(S1):S128–S170, 2008. URL <http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.1086/589252>.
- David Reilly, David L. Neumann, and Glenda Andrews. Sex differences in mathematics and science achievement: A meta-analysis of national assessment of educational progress assessments. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 107(3):645–662, 2015. doi:10.1037/edu0000012.
- David Reilly, David L. Neumann, and Glenda Andrews. Investigating gender differences in mathematics and science: Results from the 2011 Trends in Mathematics and Science Survey. *Research in Science Education*, 49(1):25–50, Feb 2019. ISSN 1573-1898. doi:10.1007/s11165-017-9630-6. URL <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11165-017-9630-6>.
- Klaus Reinhold and Leif Engqvist. The variability is in the sex chromosomes. *Evolution*, 67(12):3662–3668, 2013. doi:10.1111/evo.12224. URL <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/evo.12224/full>.
- Stuart J. Ritchie, Simon R. Cox, Xueyi Shen, Michael V. Lombardo, Lianne Maria Reus, Clara Alloza, Matthew A. Harris, Helen Alderson, Stuart Hunter, Emma Neilson, David C.M. Liewald, Bonnie Auyeung, Heather C. Whalley, Stephen M. Lawrie, Catharine R. Gale, Mark E. Bastin, McIntosh Andrew M, and Ian J. Deary. Sex differences in the adult human brain: Evidence from 5,216 UK Biobank participants. *bioRxiv*, 2017. URL <https://www.biorxiv.org/content/early/2017/04/04/123729>.
- Matthew Rudd. Gender differences in English language and science related subjects in the context of higher education in Thailand. *British Journal of Education*, 7(7):17–27, 2019.
- William Sandholm. Evolutionary game theory. In R. Meyers, editor, *Encyclopedia of Complexity and Systems Science*, pages 3176–3205. Springer, Heidelberg, 2009. doi:10.1007/978-0-387-30440-3\_188.
- Art Sawyer. How the new SAT has disadvantaged female testers. <https://www.compassprep.com/new-sat-has-disadvantaged-female-testers/>, 2017. Accessed January 15, 2021.
- Stephanie A. Shields. The variability hypothesis: The history of a biological model of sex differences in intelligence. *Signs*, 7(4):769–797, 1982. URL <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3173639>.



- Richard Shillcock, Florian Bolenz, Sarnali Basak, Alasdair Morgan, and Oliver Fincham. Understanding greater male variability in general intelligence: The role of hemispheric independence and lateralization, Nov 2018. URL [psyarxiv.com/gpfm3](https://psyarxiv.com/gpfm3).
- Sean Stevens and Jonathan Haidt. The Greater Male Variability Hypothesis – an Addendum to our post on the Google Memo. <https://heterodoxacademy.org/2017/09/04/the-greater-male-variability-hypothesis>, 2017. Accessed Nov 12, 2017.
- Steve Strand, Ian J. Deary, and Pauline Smith. Sex differences in Cognitive Abilities Test scores: A UK national picture. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 76:463–480, 2006. doi:10.1348/000709905X50906.
- Christian Thöni, Stefan Volk, and Jose M. Cortina. Greater male variability in cooperation: Meta-analytic evidence for an evolutionary perspective. *Psychological Science*, 2020. doi:10.1177/0956797620956632. URL <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/0956797620956632#articleCitationDownloadContainer>.
- Ulrich S. Tran, Agnes A. Hofer, and Martin Voracek. Sex differences in general knowledge: Meta-analysis and new data on the contribution of school-related moderators among high-school students. *PLoS ONE*, 9(10), 2014. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0110391. URL <http://journals.plos.org/plosone/article?id=10.1371/journal.pone.0110391>.
- Robert L. Trivers. Parental investment and sexual selection. In *Sexual Selection and the Descent of Man*, chapter 7. Aldine Publishing Company, Chicago, 1972. ISBN 0-202-02005-3.
- Alvin Vista and Esther Care. Gender differences in variance and means on the Naglieri Non-verbal Ability Test: Data from the Philippines. *British Journal of Educational Psychology.*, 81(2):292–308, 2011. ISSN 0007-0998. doi:10.1348/000709910X514004. URL <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/pdf/10.1348/000709910X514004>.
- Howard Wainer. The most dangerous equation. *American Scientist*, 95:249–256, May/June 2007. URL [http://nexthumanproject.com/references/Y\\_Variant\\_Of\\_XYChromosome.pdf](http://nexthumanproject.com/references/Y_Variant_Of_XYChromosome.pdf).
- Jörgen W. Weibull. *Evolutionary Game Theory*. MIT Press, Cambridge, MA, 1997. ISBN 9780262731218.
- Lara M. Wierenga, Joseph A. Sexton, Petter Laake, Jay N. Giedd, and Christian K. Tamnes. A key characteristic of sex differences in the developing brain: Greater variability in brain structure of boys than girls. *Cerebral Cortex*, pages 1–11, 2017. doi:10.1093/cercor/bhx154. URL <https://academic.oup.com/cercor/article-abstract/doi/10.1093/cercor/bhx154/3872365?redirectedFrom=fulltext>.
- Lara M. Wierenga, Gaëlle E. Doucet, Danai Dima, Ingrid Agartz, Moji Aghajani, Theophilus N. Akudjedu, Anton Albajes-Eizagirre, Dag Alnas, Kathryn Alpert, Ole A Andreassen, Alan Anticevic, Philip Asherson, Tobias Banaschewski, Nuria Bargallo, Sarah Baumeister, Ramona Baur-Streubel, Alessandro Bertolino, Aurora Bonvino, Dorret Boomsma, Stefan Borgwardt, Josiane Bourque, Anouk den Braber, Daniel Brandeis and Alan Breier, Henry Brodaty, Rachel M Brouwer, Jan K Buitelaar, Geraldo F Busatto, Vince D Calhoun, Erick J Canales-Rodriguez, Dara Cannon, Xavier Caseras, Francisco X Castellanos, Tiffany M Chaim-Avancini, Christopher RK Ching, Vincent P Clark, Patricia J Conrod, Annette Conzelmann, Fabrice Crivello, Christopher G Davey, Erin W Dickie, Stefan Ehrlich, Dennis vant Ent, Simon E Fisher, Jean-Paul Fouche, Barbara Franke, Paola Fuentes-Claramonte, Eco JC de Geus, Annabella Di Giorgio, David C Glahn, Ian H Gotlib, Hans J Grabe, Oliver Gruber, Patricia Gruner, Raquel E Gur,

- Ruben C Gur, Tiril P Gurholt, Lieuwe de Haan, Beathe Haatveit, Ben J Harrison, Catharina A Hartman, Sean N Hatton, Dirk J Heslenfeld, Odile A van den Heuvel, Ian B Hickie, Pieter J Hoekstra, Sarah Hohmann, Avram J Holmes, Martine Hoogman, Norbert Hosten, Fleur M Howells, Hilleke E Hulshoff Pol, Chaim Huyser, Neda Jahanshad, Anthony C James, Jiyang Jiang, Erik G Jönsson, John A Joska, Andrew J Kalnin, Karolinska Schizophrenia Project (KaSP) Consortium, Marieke Klein, Laura Koenders, Knut K Kolskår, Bernd Krämer, Jonna Kuntsi, Jim Lagopoulos, Luisa Lazaro, Irina S Lebedeva, Phil H Lee, Christine Lochner, Marise WJ Machielsen, Sophie Maingault, Nicholas G Martin, Ignacio Martínez-Zalacaín, David Mataix-Cols, Bernard Mazoyer, Brenna C McDonald, Colm McDonald, Andrew M McIntosh, Katie L McMahan, Genevieve McPhilemy, Dennis van der Meer, Jos M Menchön, Jilly Naaijen, Lars Nyberg, Jaap Oosterlaan, Yannis Paloyelis, Paul Pauli, Giulio Pergola, Edith Pomarol-Clotet, Maria J Portella, Joaquim Radua, Andreas Reif, Geneviève Richard, Joshua L Roffman, Pedro GP Rosa, Matthew D Sacchet, Perminder S Sachdev, Raymond Salvador, Salvador Sarró, Theodore D Satterthwaite, Andrew J Saykin, Mauricio H Serpa, Kang Sim, Andrew Simmons, Jordan W Smoller, Iris E Sommer, Carles Soriano-Mas, Dan J Stein, Lachlan T Strike, Philip R Szeszko, Henk S Temmingh, Sophia Thomopoulos, Alexander S Tomyshev, Julian N Trollor, Anne Uhlmann, Ilya M Veer, Dick J Veltman, Aristotle Voineskos, Henry Völzke, Henrik Walter, Lei Wang, Yang Wang, Bernd Weber, Wei Wen, John D West, Lars T Westlye, Heather C Whalley, Steven CR Williams, Katharina Wittfeld, Daniel H Wolf, Margaret J Wright, Yuliya N Yoncheva, Marcus V Zanetti, Georg C Ziegler, Greig I de Zubicaray, Paul M Thompson, Eveline A Crone, Sophia Frangou, and Christian K Tamnes. Greater male than female variability in regional brain structure across the lifespan. *Human Brain Mapping*, pages 1–30, 2020. doi:10.1002/hbm.25204.
- Susanne R.K. Zajitschek, Felix Zajitschek, Russell Bonduriansky, Robert C. Brooks, Will Cornwell, Daniel S. Falster, Malgorzata Lagisz, Jeremy Mason, Alistair M. Senior, Daniel W.A. Noble, and Shinichi Nakagawa. Sexual dimorphism in trait variability and its eco-evolutionary and statistical implications. *eLife*, page e63170, 2020. doi:10.7554/eLife.63170. URL <https://elifesciences.org/articles/63170>.
- Predrag Zarevski, Marijana Kovač, and Jr. Krunoslav Matesić. Gender differences in general knowledge: Do residential status and the type of school matter? *Review of Psychology*, 21(2):131–135, 2014.
- E. C. Zeeman. Population dynamics from game theory. In Zbigniew Nitecki and Clark Robinson, editors, *Global Theory of Dynamical Systems*, pages 471–497, Berlin, Heidelberg, 1980. Springer Berlin Heidelberg. ISBN 978-3-540-38312-3.