

University of Nebraska - Lincoln

DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln

---

Anthropology Faculty Publications

Anthropology, Department of

---

3-6-2012

## Sex differences in spatial abilities: Methodological problems in Hoffman et al.

Drew A.H. Bailey

*University of Missouri - Columbia*, drewhalbailey@gmail.com

Richard A. Lippa

*California State University - Fullerton*, rlippa@fullerton.edu

Marco Del Giudice

*University of Turin*, marco.delgiudice@unito.it

Raymond Hames

*University of Nebraska - Lincoln*, rhames2@unl.edu

Dave C. Geary

*University of Missouri - Columbia*, GearyD@Missouri.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.unl.edu/anthropologyfacpub>



Part of the [Anthropology Commons](#)

---

Bailey, Drew A.H.; Lippa, Richard A.; Del Giudice, Marco; Hames, Raymond; and Geary, Dave C., "Sex differences in spatial abilities: Methodological problems in Hoffman et al." (2012). *Anthropology Faculty Publications*. 47.

<https://digitalcommons.unl.edu/anthropologyfacpub/47>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Anthropology, Department of at DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln. It has been accepted for inclusion in Anthropology Faculty Publications by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln.

## Sex differences in spatial abilities: Methodological problems in Hoffman et al.

Hoffman et al. (1) claimed to provide evidence that “nurture” (i.e., residing in a patrilineal vs. matrilineal tribe in India) critically affects sex differences in spatial abilities. Unfortunately, their conclusion is undermined by major problems with their measures of spatial ability and sex equality.

The first and biggest problem is with their measure of spatial abilities. “Spatial abilities” are a complex cognitive domain, with facets ranging from location memory (favoring women) to navigation in 3D virtual space (favoring men) (2). The puzzle used by Hoffman et al. (1) is similar to the Object Assembly subtest of the Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale (3); sex differences on this task are extremely small ( $d = 0.10$ ), at least 10-fold smaller than those found for spatial measures showing the largest sex differences. It is odd that Hoffman et al. (1) chose to investigate sex differences with this kind of sex-insensitive task.

The second problem is the lack of a control task. The insensitivity of the task used by Hoffman et al. (1) suggests that their finding that men outperform women in a patrilineal tribe but not a matrilineal tribe is not related to sex differences in spatial abilities per se but to other factors instead. Education, as they noted, is likely one of these. The use of a cognitive control task tapping nonspatial abilities would have allowed for an assessment of the specificity of the effect, but, unfortunately, such a task was not included.

Third, defining sex equality as matrilineality is problematic, because cross-cultural studies generally show that equality (a multidimensional construct) is not systematically correlated

with descent system (4). From the descriptions of Hoffman et al. (1), it appears that women in the matrilineal Khasi have more economic power and better education, but this ignores other sex equality dimensions, such as positions of political and religious leadership, domestic authority, and autonomy. Without such measures, it is unclear whether the Khasi are, in fact, more sex-egalitarian than the Karbi. Furthermore, a recent 53-nation cross-cultural study has shown that sex differences favoring men on validated, reliable, multi-item spatial measures are positively associated with United Nation indices of sex development and empowerment (5), a pattern opposite to that reported by Hoffman et al. (1). For all these reasons, the study by Hoffman et al. (1) failed to support their conclusions.

**Drew H. Bailey<sup>a,1</sup>, Richard A. Lippa<sup>b</sup>, Marco Del Giudice<sup>c</sup>, Raymond Hames<sup>d</sup>, and Dave C. Geary<sup>a,e</sup>**

<sup>a</sup>Department of Psychological Sciences and <sup>c</sup>Interdisciplinary Neuroscience Program, University of Missouri, Columbia, MO 65211; <sup>b</sup>Department of Psychology, California State University, Fullerton, CA 92834; <sup>c</sup>Center for Cognitive Science, Department of Psychology, University of Turin, 10123 Torino, Italy; and <sup>d</sup>Department of Anthropology, University of Nebraska, Lincoln, NE 68588

1. Hoffman M, Gneezy U, List JA (2011) Nurture affects gender differences in spatial abilities. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* 108:14786–14788.
2. Geary DC (2010) *Male, Female: The Evolution of Human Sex Differences* (American Psychological Association, Washington, DC).
3. Wechsler D (1981) *Manual for the Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale-Revised. (WAIS-R)* (Psychological Corporation, San Antonio, TX).
4. Whyte M (1978) *The Status of Women in Preindustrial Societies* (Princeton Univ Press, Princeton).
5. Lippa RA, Collaer ML, Peters M (2010) Sex differences in mental rotation and line angle judgments are positively associated with gender equality and economic development across 53 nations. *Arch Sex Behav* 39:990–997.

Author contributions: D.H.B., R.L., M.D.G., R.H., and D.C.G. wrote the paper.

The authors declare no conflict of interest.

<sup>1</sup>To whom correspondence should be addressed. E-mail: drewhalbailey@gmail.com.