UC Santa Cruz
UC Santa Cruz Previously Published Works

Title
The psychology of boys.

Permalink
https://escholarship.org/uc/item/0jn6v1k2

Authors
Farkas, Timea

Leaper, Campbell

Publication Date
2016

DOI
10.1037/14594-017

Peer reviewed

eScholarship.org Powered by the California Digital Library University of California

Chapter 17

THE PSYCHOLOGY OF BOYS

Timea Farkas and Campbell Leaper

© 2016 AMERICAN PSYCHOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION. ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

In the past several decades, much research and public discussion in many industrialized societies has centered on ways that girls have been disadvantaged in academics and mental health. Much of the discussion has addressed the stereotypes and gender socialization that may have led to negative consequences for girls. More recently, a similar discussion has begun about the consequences of stereotyping and traditional gender socialization for boys (e.g., Levant, 2005). Historically, masculine-stereotyped traits were seen as desirable and adaptive because males in society generally enjoy higher status. However, recent research has shown that many of the traits associated with a traditional male socialization (e.g., emotional restriction, toughness, self-reliance) tend to have negative consequences for boys in relationships and sometimes in academics (e.g., Levant, 2005; Levant, Graef, Smalley, Williams, & McMillan, 2008; also see Leaper, 2015). In addition, because males have higher status than females in patriarchal societies, boys feel more pressure to conform to gender stereotypes and tend to hold more rigid gender attitudes than do girls (see Leaper, 2015).

In this chapter, we discuss boys' development in childhood and adolescence by focusing on areas in which average trends for boys and girls tend to differ. We consider how variations in boys' social-psychological development may be related to gender socialization pressures as well as to boys' internalization of traditional notions of masculinity. These outcomes include gender self-concepts and attitudes, play, social competence, relationships (with parents, peers, and romantic partners), body image, academic achievement, and aggression. An important caveat to highlight at the outset is that the available research literature on most topics is based on samples collected in Western industrialized societies (see Henrich, Heine, & Norenzayan, 2010). Therefore, many of the described patterns may not generalize to other populations.

GENDER SELF-CONCEPTS AND ATTITUDES

By age 3, a majority of children are familiar with gender labels and use them to categorize themselves and other people (Leinbach & Fagot, 1986). The ability to label individuals' gender has been related to more gender-typed activities and preferences and to greater knowledge of gender stereotypes (Fagot & Leinbach, 1989). Throughout development, most children demonstrate gender-stereotypic traits, preferences, and activities (e.g., McHale, Kim, Dotterer, Crouter, & Booth, 2009). For boys, this includes an emphasis on agentic traits, preferences for physical and competitive activities, and aggressive themes in pretend play.

Most children also develop stereotypic attitudes about desirable (prescriptive) and undesirable (proscriptive) gender role traits and behaviors (Davis, 2007; McHale et al., 2009). For boys, these attitudes have traditionally emphasized the attainment of dominance and strength and the avoidance of emotionality and vulnerability. As reviewed later, masculine- and feminine-stereotyped traits are not mutually exclusive, and many children (and adults) integrate

http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/14594-017
APA Handbook of Men and Masculinities, Y. J. Wong and S. R. Wester (Editors-in-Chief)
Copyright © 2016 by the American Psychological Association. All rights reserved.

both sets of behaviors into their self-concepts and behavioral repertoires.

Cognitions about gender include self-concepts, social identities, stereotypes, and attitudes. In Greenwald et al.'s (2002) unified model, the interrelationship between these factors has been conceptualized in relation to a triangular model. Each corner of the triangle is represented by the self, a group (e.g., boys), and attributes (e.g., competitive, likes football). The self-concept is defined as positive links between the self and particular attributes (e.g., I am competitive; I like baseball). Social identities are defined as positive associations between the self and group identities (e.g., I am a boy). Stereotypes are based on associations between groups and attributes (e.g., boys play football; boys are competitive). Attitudes reflect the positive or negative emotional valence linking a group with an attribute (e.g., boys + football = positive; girls + football = negative). According to Greenwald et al., individuals seek to maintain balance in their self-concepts, social identities, and attitudes. Tobin et al. (2010) built on this model to propose their gender self-socialization model. One postulate of this model is that boys will most likely adopt the characteristics stereotypically associated with their gender if they identify strongly with their gender group (strong social gender identity) and also hold stereotyped attitudes about what it means to be a boy (strong gender attitudes).

As discussed in more detail below, boys, on average, tend to identify more strongly with their gender group than do girls; they tend to adopt more gender-typed attributes and preferences; and they tend to hold more traditional attitudes about gender roles (and these trends continue into adulthood). These average gender differences may be explained by the fact that members of higher status groups have a larger stake in retaining the status quo (see Ridgeway & Bourg, 2004). Thus, on average, boys and men tend to be more concerned than girls and women in supporting the current gender system whereby traditionally masculine traits and activities have higher status than their traditionally feminine counterparts. In the following, we discuss research findings regarding boys' gender identities, self-concepts, and attitudes.

Gender Identity and Gender Self-Concepts

In early childhood, gender identity is conceptualized as knowledge of the gender category to which one belongs (Kohlberg, 1966; Martin, Ruble, & Szkrybalo, 2002). More recently, Perry and his colleagues (Egan & Perry, 2001; Tobin et al., 2010) developed a multidimensional theory to understand gender identity in middle childhood and adolescence. In this model, gender identity is seen as the child's self-perceived gender typicality, gender contentedness, and felt pressure to conform to gender norms. These dimensions are not strongly correlated with one another, but they all predict adjustment for both boys and girls. However, boys tend to score significantly higher than girls on all three dimensions (Egan & Perry, 2001). Thus, boys may be more motivated to adhere to group norms, to view themselves as typical members of their gender group, and to feel content with their group membership. This finding supports the idea that gender roles tend to be more clearly defined for boys than for girls.

Another dimension of gender identity that psychologists have studied is gender centrality—how important membership in a gender group is to an individual. Unlike findings with typicality, contentedness, and felt pressure, research on centrality has indicated that boys—in both childhood and preadolescence—tend to view their gender as less central to their identity than do girls (Turner & Brown, 2007; Verkuyten & Thijs, 2001). This may be explained by the tendency for lower status group members to be more aware of their group membership than higher status group members (Tatum, 1997).

Once children establish a gender identity, they begin to find ways to define what it means to be a girl or a boy. The attributes that they associate with their gender constitute their gender self-concept. Specifically, boys' gender self-concepts include their attribute self-perceptions (i.e., traits) and their activity preferences and interests (see Leaper, 2015).

Psychologists have conceptualized gender-stereotypical traits in relation to two dimensions reflecting the degree to which individuals assert the self (i.e., agency, instrumentality, assertion) or establish connections with others (i.e., communion, expressiveness, affiliation). In earlier theoretical models of gender role self-concepts, these two dimensions

© 2016 AMERICAN PSYCHOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION. ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

were considered to define psychological masculinity and femininity, respectively (e.g., Bem, 1974; Spence & Helmreich, 1978). This work also advanced the possibility that individuals could integrate both dimensions, which was called androgyny. However, some psychologists have moved away from using the terms *femininity* and *masculinity* to describe behaviors that are commonly observed in both girls and boys (e.g., Lott, 1981). Accordingly, we favor using *agency* or *assertion* to refer to the self-oriented ("masculine") dimension and using *communion* or *affiliation* to characterize the other-oriented ("feminine") dimensions.

Research comparing girls' and boys' self-ratings on measures of communion and agency has pointed to some average differences. The most consistent pattern has been for girls to score higher than boys on self-perceived communion. Many studies have found no average gender difference in self-perceived agency, but when significant differences are indicated, they typically point to higher averages among boys than girls (Absi-Semaan, Crombie, & Freeman, 1993; Boldizar, 1991; Hall & Halberstadt, 1980; McHale et al., 2009).

Average gender differences in agency and communion also manifest in boys' and girls' social goals (see Rose & Rudolph, 2006, for a review). In middle childhood and adolescence, boys tend to report more agentic goals (e.g., control) and fewer relationship-supportive goals (e.g., intimacy) than do girls (Jarvinen & Nicholls, 1996; Rose & Asher, 2000; Strough & Berg, 2000). Boys' higher average endorsement of agentic goals may be related to their tendency to use more power-assertive and less affiliative communication strategies (e.g., P. M. Miller, Danaher, & Forbes, 1986; Strough & Berg, 2000). When boys are disproportionately concerned with dominance goals—a pattern normalized by traditional masculinity ideology—their relationships may suffer.

In addition to gender-typed attributes, gender self-concepts include activity preferences and interests. Spence and Hall (1996) found that although both preadolescent boys and girls tended to favor gender-typed activities over cross-gender–typed activities, this tendency was significantly stronger for boys. A more recent longitudinal study found that both boys and girls reported gender-typed interests at age 13. Although all interests declined across adolescence for both genders, boys' interest in feminine-stereotyped activities declined faster than did girls', but girls' interest in masculine-stereotyped activities did not decline faster than boys' (McHale et al., 2009). Katz and Ksansnak (1994) also found that boys in childhood and adolescence tended to report less flexibility in their gender-typed self-perceptions and preferences than did girls. However, self-flexibility tends to increase throughout adolescence for both boys and girls (Bartini, 2006).

Gender Stereotypes and Attitudes

Children and adolescents form stereotypes and attitudes about other people's gender. *Gender stereotypes* refer to the attributes that individuals associate with each gender (e.g., "girls like dolls"), whereas *gender attitudes* refer to any positive or negative valence associated with gender–attribute associations. Gender attitudes can be prescriptive ("Girls should play with dolls") or proscriptive ("Boys should not play with dolls"). Children quickly learn cultural gender stereotypes during early childhood. During both childhood and adolescence, more boys than girls tend to report lower tolerance for counter-stereotypical behavior in others (Katz & Ksansnak, 1994) as well as more traditional attitudes about gender relations (e.g., Crouter, Whiteman, McHale, & Osgood, 2007; Davis, 2007).

Gender attitudes have been conceptualized in various ways. Three approaches reviewed below include the traditional masculinity ideology model, the gender role attitudes model, and the ambivalent sexism model. These models are complementary and reflect somewhat different ways of framing gender attitudes.

The masculinity ideology model specifically focuses on the attitudes that traditionally define many boys' psychological development. A few investigators have advanced models of adolescent masculinity ideology to capture the beliefs and attitudes that many adolescent boys have traditionally associated with their gender role identity. They have built on earlier conceptions of gender-role strain (e.g., Pleck, 1995) and traditional masculinity ideology in adults (e.g., Levant et al., 2012). First, the

© 2016 AMERICAN PSYCHOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION. ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

Adolescent Masculinity Ideology in Relationships Scale (Chu, Porche, & Tolman, 2005) is a single-factor scale that combines items assessing emotional restriction, dominance in dating relationships, homophobia, self-reliance, and importance of sex. Second, Levant and his colleagues formulated the Male Role Norms Inventory for Adolescents. According to a recently revised version of this measure (Levant et al., 2012), traditional masculinity ideology includes three factors: emotionally detached dominance, toughness, and avoidance of femininity. Finally, Oransky and Fisher (2009) proposed a similar model with their Meanings of Adolescent Masculinity Scale. It consists of four factors: constant effort, emotional restriction, heterosexism, and social teasing.

Some work in psychology has shown that ethnic minority boys may endorse a variation on traditional masculinity as described above. For example, African American boys and men may be more likely to endorse a cool pose masculinity (Majors & Billson, 1992). When denied traditional routes to dominance and success, many low-income African American males may endorse a masculinity that emphasizes control, strength, and pride. Other work has shown that Latino males tend to endorse a masculinity that encompasses dimensions of machismo and *caballerismo* (Arciniega, Anderson, Tovar-Blank, & Tracey, 2008). Whereas machismo refers to interpersonal dominance, *caballerismo* emphasizes protective paternalism and family involvement. In a study of Mexican American men (Arciniega et al., 2008), machismo—but not *caballerismo*—was related to some of the negative outcomes associated with traditional masculinity (e.g., aggression). On average, the men in the study tended to endorse *caballerismo* to a much stronger extent than machismo.

As with other gender attitude measures, boys have been found to endorse traditional masculinity ideology more strongly than girls (Levant et al., 2008). In addition, endorsing traditional masculine norms may be related to lower self-esteem and higher anxiety among boys (Chu et al., 2005; Oransky & Fisher, 2009). Interestingly, endorsement of the Social Teasing subscale of the Meanings of Adolescent Masculinity Scale, which normalizes teasing of boys by other boys, tends to be related to lower anxiety. It may be that endorsing the idea that teasing is a normal part of boyhood both leads boys to engage in teasing and normalizes its occurrence. However, it seems that endorsing traditional notions of masculinity has mostly negative consequences for boys' well-being (see Levant, 2005).

In addition to traditional masculinity ideology, psychologists have also measured adolescents' attitudes about gender role equality. One of the most commonly used measures has been the Attitudes Toward Women Scale for Adolescents (Galambos, Petersen, Richards, & Gitelson, 1985). Again, significantly more boys than girls in both childhood and adolescence have been observed to endorse traditional gender role attitudes (Crouter et al., 2007; Davis, 2007; Galambos et al., 1985). Some studies found that boys tended to become more egalitarian with age (Davis, 2007), whereas other research observed that boys' attitudes became more egalitarian in early adolescence but then turned more traditional again in later adolescence (Alfieri, Ruble, & Higgins, 1996). Crouter et al. (2007) found that this pattern may be especially true for boys whose parents hold more traditional gender attitudes; boys whose parents held less traditional attitudes tended to increase in egalitarianism throughout adolescence.

The third approach to studying gender attitudes focuses on the endorsement of sexism. *Sexist attitudes* refer to the favoring of gender inequalities that privilege male status and reinforce traditional gender roles. According to Glick and Fiske's (1996) ambivalent sexism model, sexism is inherently ambivalent because of (a) asymmetries in status and power between men and women and (b) male–female interdependence in family and heterosexual relationships. *Hostile sexism* refers to negative attitudes toward those who violate traditional gender stereotypes. In contrast, *benevolent sexism* includes protective paternalism (i.e., belief that men must protect women) and complementary gender differentiation (i.e., belief that women and men are different and complement one another). Thus, hostile and benevolent sexism work interdependently to perpetuate gender inequality and traditional gender roles (Glick & Fiske, 1996). Because cross-gender contacts and heterosexual interest increase for most

© 2016 AMERICAN PSYCHOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION. ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

youths during adolescence, both hostile and benevolent sexism are seen (see Leaper & Robnett, 2011).

Only a few studies have assessed both hostile and benevolent sexism in adolescent samples. One study conducted in Spain found that adolescent boys scored significantly higher than adolescent girls on both hostile and benevolent sexism (Ferragut, Blanca, & Ortiz-Tallo, 2014). In addition, other studies have considered possible correlates of sexist attitudes. Some reports have suggested that holding benevolently sexist attitudes may have negative and positive consequences among adolescent boys. Other studies with heterosexual adolescents in Spain (Montañés, de Lemus, Moya, Bohner, & Megias, 2013) and late adolescents in the United States (Robnett & Leaper, 2013) found many youths were attracted to traditional dating and marriage scripts (e.g., male pays for date, man proposes marriage, woman takes man's last name). However, in both studies, the participants' personal endorsement of benevolent sexism moderated the likelihood of these preferences. Another study of adolescents in Spain found that hostile and benevolent sexism were positively correlated with tolerant views toward rape and spousal abuse (Durán, Moya, Megias, & Viki, 2010). Finally, an investigation of Brazilian youths observed that benevolent sexism among boys (but not among girls) predicted lower rates of peer bullying (DeSouza & Ribeiro, 2005). The authors of this study speculated that boys who hold more benevolently sexist attitudes may view themselves as "chivalrous knights responsible for protecting others" (DeSouza & Ribeiro, 2005, p. 1031).

Summary and Suggestions for Future Directions

Boys are more likely than girls to view themselves in gender-typed ways. On average, boys tend to perceive more compatibility between their own attributes and their gender group than do girls (i.e., higher gender typicality and contentedness). At the same time, boys generally feel greater pressure to conform to traditional gender roles than do girls. These phenomena may lead boys to have a harder time on average than girls in successfully combining agentic (traditionally masculine) and communal (traditionally feminine) goals and behaviors.

In a related way, boys are also more likely than girls to endorse traditional gender attitudes. On average, boys tend to hold more traditional views of masculinity, gender role equality, and ambivalent sexist attitudes. These average tendencies may result from the higher status boys hold relative to girls, which may lead many boys to view adhering to traditional gender roles as a means by which to keep this higher status. Although much research has investigated boys' (and girls') gender self-concepts, future research should focus on the antecedents and outcomes of endorsing traditional masculinity ideology and ambivalent sexism among boys. Although these attitudes have been extensively investigated among adults, much less is known about how endorsing the different components of traditional masculinity ideology may be related to boys' relationships, academic achievement, and mental health. Similarly, research should address the link between ambivalent sexism and adolescent boys' romantic relationship behaviors and satisfaction. For example, as with adults (Chapleau, Oswald, & Russell, 2007), endorsing hostile sexism and some components of benevolent sexism may be related to higher rape myth acceptance and potentially higher likelihood of engaging in sexual harassment.

PLAY

Most boys' preferred play styles, games, and toys tend to differ from those of girls from an early age (see Maccoby, 1998). Boys tend to be more likely to engage in rough-and-tumble and competitive play; their pretend play tends to involve more heroic characters and pretend aggression; and they tend to prefer building toys, toy vehicles, and action figures to baby dolls and pretend domestic toys (e.g., kitchen sets). Research has shown that children tend to prefer toys stereotyped for their gender from as early as age 1 (Servin, Bohlin, & Berlin, 1999).

When children engage in play behaviors, they practice certain skills, and different games and toys afford different opportunities for practicing different behaviors (Leaper, 2000). For example, playing with blocks and other building toys may help children develop visual–spatial skills (Caldera et al., 1999). Engaging in pretend play with a domestic theme

© 2016 AMERICAN PSYCHOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION. ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

may help children practice skills of social coordination and cooperation (Leaper, 2000). Research has also found that toys stereotyped for girls may lend themselves to more complex forms of play than toys stereotyped for boys (Cherney, Kelly-Vance, Gill, Ruane, & Ryalls, 2003). Thus, when they engage in mostly gender-typed play, boys may miss practicing important social and cognitive skills. In addition, the toys and games that most boys typically favor may reinforce the formation of masculine-typed social norms and characteristics such as competition and self-assertion unmitigated by affiliation. Conversely, when boys are encouraged to play in a variety of ways, they are given the opportunity to build a more varied repertoire of skills.

Parents are the first socialization agents in most children's lives. From the time children are born, parents make decisions about their child's environment, including what toys to buy. Very often, their choices are gender stereotypical. In a large meta-analysis of studies conducted in Western countries, Lytton and Romney (1991) found that although parents tended to treat their sons and daughters similarly in many ways, one of the most important distinctions parents make on the basis of their child's gender is the types of activities they encourage. Specifically, parents tend to encourage masculine-stereotyped activities more and feminine-stereotyped activities less in sons than in daughters. Even when parents express a desire for their children to be less gender typed in their characteristics, they still tend to want their children to engage in gender-typed activities (Servin & Bohlin, 1999).

Parents' gender socialization may be stricter for boys than for girls. In Lytton and Romney's (1991) meta-analysis, results showed that parents, especially fathers, tended to encourage gender-typed behavior more so in sons than in daughters. More recently, through interviews with parents, Kane (2006) found that whereas many parents have positive feelings about their daughters' counterstereotypical behavior, they were less positive about analogous behavior in their sons. In another study, when parents played in a laboratory with their sons, they spent most of their time playing with masculine-stereotyped toys. In contrast with daughters, they played with a more diverse array of toys (Wood, Desmarais, & Gugula, 2002).

Peers also reinforce children's gender-typed play styles and toy preferences. Starting around the 3rd year of life, children self-segregate by gender (Maccoby, 1998). Thus, for much of childhood, boys play mostly with other boys; and their play styles tend to be more similar to one another than seen among girls. This trend leads to a process whereby boys strengthen each other's preferences and behavioral tendencies. Martin and Fabes (2001) demonstrated what they called the social dosage effect: The more time children spent with same-gender peers, the more they exhibited gender-typed behaviors. More specifically, the more boys spent time playing with other boys in the fall, the more their rough-and-tumble play, aggression, and gender-typed play increased in the following spring.

Television and other forms of mass media can also influence children's play preferences. As with most commercials in general, commercials aimed at children tend to be highly gender stereotypical (Signorielli, 2012). For example, one study of toy commercials in the United States and Great Britain found that boys and girls were never shown playing with counterstereotypical toys (Browne, 1998). Another study found that of all commercials aimed at children, toy commercials were the least likely to depict both boys and girls (Strom Larson, 2001). Thus, children receive the message that toys are either for boys or for girls. And, in fact, research has shown that children tend to draw conclusions about which gender a particular toy is meant for on the basis of the children portrayed in commercials (Pike & Jennings, 2005).

In addition to the various social factors reviewed above, boys' gender-typed play preferences may be partly influenced by temperamental dispositions. On average, boys demonstrate higher levels of physical activity than girls. The magnitude of this difference is small during early childhood and becomes moderate at older ages (Else-Quest, Hyde, Goldsmith, & Van Hulle, 2006). Additional research has suggested that more boys than girls may be attracted to moving objects beginning in infancy (Benenson, Tennyson, & Wrangham, 2011). In contrast, more girls than boys may be attracted to social stimuli as young as age 1 (Alexander & Wilcox, 2012). Finally, another average dispositional difference recently identified is a

© 2016 AMERICAN PSYCHOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION. ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

greater likelihood among boys than girls to demonstrate intense interests in particular play activities (DeLoache, Simcock, & Macari, 2007).

Despite most children's tendency to engage in stereotypical play and pressure from parents, peers, and the media, some children show a strong preference for counterstereotypical activities (see Haldeman, 2000). These children often experience rejection by peers and parents (Rieger, Linsenmeier, Gygax, & Bailey, 2008). Preference for counterstereotypical activities has been pathologized by the diagnostic criteria for gender dysphoria (formerly called gender identity disorder; American Psychiatric Association, 2013). The fact that boys have been twice as likely (or more) as girls to be labeled with gender identity disorder may reflect the stricter societal rules governing masculinity that lead more parents to be more concerned about gender nonconformity in sons than in daughters (Kane, 2006). Furthermore, according to one review (Haldeman, 2000), not much evidence has supported the idea that gender nonconformity in childhood leads most children to be unhappy with their assigned sex later in life.

Summary and Suggestions for Future Directions

Starting at an early age, boys and girls demonstrate average gender differences in toy, game, and play-style preferences. Parents, peers, and the media reinforce these preferences. Parents and peers may be especially likely to encourage gender-typical activities in boys compared with girls. This heightened concern with boys' gender typicality may be at least partially responsible for the higher number of boys being referred to mental health professionals for gender identity–related problems.

For future research, we encourage continued study into the long-term impact of gender-typed play on the development of behavioral preferences and competencies in socioemotional and academic domains (see Leaper, 2000, 2015). To the extent that gender-typed play activities do foster particular competencies, one implication is to encourage a broader range of play activities in boys (Leaper, 2000). It is already common for many girls to participate in both traditionally masculine-stereotyped play (e.g., sports) and traditionally feminine-stereotyped play (e.g., dolls). Given the greater rigidity in gender typing among boys, however, it is relatively rare to see boys participate in an analogous range of play activities.

SOCIAL COMPETENCE

Social competence refers to cognitive, emotional, and communication skills that enable individuals to interact with others in effective and harmonious ways. Social skills are related to peer acceptance and satisfaction in close relationships. Conversely, poor interpersonal skills can lead to aggressive behavior (see Beauchamp & Anderson, 2010; Underwood, 2011). On average, boys are more likely than girls to demonstrate difficulties in some facets of social competence (see Leaper, 2015).

Social-cognitive skills involved in social competence include emotion decoding, empathy, perspective taking, and social problem solving. *Emotion decoding* refers to the ability to accurately recognize other people's emotions, whereas *empathy* refers to the vicarious sharing of another person's feelings. According to two meta-analyses, small average gender differences favor girls in emotion decoding (McClure, 2000) and empathy (Eisenberg & Fabes, 1998) during childhood and adolescence. Evidence has also pointed to a modest trend toward girls scoring higher than boys on perspective taking (or theory of mind) from early childhood into adolescence (e.g., Devine & Hughes, 2013; Smith & Rose, 2011; Walker, 2005). With advances in perspective taking, individuals are able to consider possible ways to reconcile their own needs with those of others (Selman, 1980). That is, prosocial or collaborative strategies (e.g., proposals for compromise, requests for clarification) become more likely than aggression or withdrawal (e.g., Selman, Beardslee, Schultz, Krupa, & Podorefsky, 1986). Although the number of studies is limited, there is some indication of a modest advantage among girls than boys in social problem solving from early childhood into adolescence (e.g., D. C. Miller & Byrnes, 2001; Selman et al., 1986; Walker, Irving, & Berthelsen, 2002).

When examining the social behaviors linked to social competence, there is also evidence of significant average gender differences that are mostly small

© 2016 AMERICAN PSYCHOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION. ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

in magnitude. One average difference is seen in the coordination of self-assertion and affiliation in speech acts. On the basis of a meta-analytic review (Leaper & Smith, 2004), boys were less likely than girls to use collaborative communication (i.e., expressing both self-assertion and affiliation; e.g., proposals for joint activity). In contrast, boys were more likely than girls to use controlling communication (i.e., expressing high self-assertion and low affiliation; e.g., directive statements). These patterns have been observed in samples of White and Black children from middle- and low-income backgrounds (e.g., Leaper, 1991; Leaper, Tenenbaum, & Shaffer, 1999).

Emotion regulation is another facet of social competence that is associated with an average gender difference. When children are aroused by negative emotions or high-intensity positive emotions, controlled cognitive processes typically suffer, and impulsive behavior may predominate (Valiente, Swanson, & Eisenberg, 2012). On the basis of a recent meta-analysis (Else-Quest et al., 2006), moderate to large effect sizes indicated that girls tended to score higher than boys on measures of self-control. In turn, variations in emotion regulation appear to partly mediate some average gender differences in social behavior, such as aggression (e.g., Hay, 2007).

Summary and Future Directions

Small average gender differences in emotional decoding, empathy, perspective taking, and emotion regulation indicate that more boys than girls may have difficulty in these areas of social competence. This small disadvantage may combine with some facets of traditional masculinity (e.g., emphasis of emotional stoicism) to have negative impacts on boys' relationships with parents, peers, and romantic partners. We recommend continued research aimed at understanding the interplay of temperamental, cognitive–motivational, and social factors that may contribute to these average differences in social competence (see Leaper, 2015). Furthermore, it would be helpful to understand whether interventions aimed at reducing boys' concerns with traditional masculinity might better enable the development of positive socioemotional functioning (e.g., Richmond & Levant, 2003).

RELATIONSHIPS WITH PARENTS

Parents are children's first attachment figures. Throughout childhood, and to an extent in adolescence, parents fulfill children's needs for proximity seeking, for a safe haven during times of distress, and for a secure base from which to explore the world (Bowlby, 1969). In infancy and childhood, equal numbers of boys and girls are securely attached to parents (Solomon & George, 2008). By middle childhood, among children with insecure attachment styles, some evidence has shown that proportionally more boys than girls may manifest the insecure–avoidant pattern (DelGiudice, 2008). This pattern is consistent with the emotional withdrawal that often characterizes traditional masculinity among boys (e.g., Levant, 2005).

According to Lytton and Romney's (1991) meta-analysis of studies conducted in Western countries, parents tend to treat boys and girls with similar levels of overall interaction, warmth, and discipline. However, research has identified a few differences in how parents treat boys and girls, which may contribute to children's gender-typed behaviors, cognitions, and characteristics (Lytton & Romney, 1991). In addition, by adolescence, average gender differences emerge in parent–child relationships, with boys tending to show less closeness to parents in some ways than girls (Armsden & Greenberg, 1987); at the same time, however, boys' well-being may be more strongly related to parent relationships than is that of girls (e.g., Piko & Hamvai, 2010). In the following, we discuss differential socialization of boys by parents, changes in parent–son relationships in adolescence, and the possible role of traditional masculinity ideology in parent–son relationships in later adolescence.

Although Lytton and Romney's (1991) meta-analyses suggested that parents treated their sons and daughters similarly on most variables, sons and daughters were treated differently in a few important ways. On average, parents tended to show less verbal interaction with sons than with daughters. In addition, parents tended to engage in more motor stimulation of sons than of daughters. Both of these differences were associated with small effect sizes. Coupled with boys' initial tendencies and later

© 2016 AMERICAN PSYCHOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION. ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

socialization by peers, these parental patterns of social interaction may contribute to boys' later tendency to engage in rougher play and lower levels of self-disclosure in adolescence.

Parent–son relationships remain strong in adolescence. A strong attachment relationship remains important for adolescent boys' well-being; parent attachment is related to lower depression and anxiety and higher self-esteem and life satisfaction among late adolescent boys (Armsden & Greenberg, 1987). Some evidence has indicated that perceived social support from parents and shared activities with parents are positively related to adolescent boys' but not girls' life satisfaction. In this research, girls' life satisfaction was more strongly related to supportive friendships (Piko & Hamvai, 2010). Thus, as boys' friendships become characterized by less intimacy based on self-disclosure across adolescence, parents may prove to be a protective factor for many boys.

Another potential way parents may exert influence over their sons' development is through their monitoring of peer relationships and activities. Parental monitoring involves parents' knowledge of their children's activities when parents are not present (Dishion & McMahon, 1998). Children and adolescents whose parents engage in more monitoring tend to have better adjustment and behavioral outcomes than do others whose parents engage in lower levels of monitoring (e.g., Patterson, Reid, & Dishion, 1992; Svensson, 2003).

Studies have shown that, on average, parents tend to engage in lower monitoring (i.e., knowledge of whereabouts and activities) of boys than of girls (Webb, Bray, Getz, & Adams, 2002; Svensson, 2003). This difference may be related to average gender differences in spontaneous self-disclosure to parents. Stattin and Kerr (2000) have shown that the most common source of parental knowledge of children's activities comes from children's unsolicited self-disclosure. As reviewed in more detail below, boys tend to self-disclose less to parents than do girls (Stattin & Kerr, 2000); in addition, parents of boys tend to receive more of the information they know about their child from other people than do parents of girls (Crouter, Bumpus, Davis, & McHale, 2005).

Some research has shown that the lower parental monitoring of boys may be related to boys' higher likelihood of engaging in problem behaviors such as substance abuse (e.g., Webb et al., 2002). One study showed that low parental monitoring was related to deviance of peers and substance use among both girls and boys (Svensson, 2003). However, boys tended to be monitored by parents significantly less than were girls; at the same time, boys, on average, had significantly more deviant peers and engaged in more substance use than did girls. Thus, by knowing less about sons' activities than about daughters', parents may contribute to boys' stronger tendency to associate with deviant peers and to engage in problem behaviors.

Some evidence has suggested that ethnic background moderates gender differences in parental monitoring. A study of mostly African American adolescents showed that, on average, parents tended to monitor boys and girls to a similar extent (Griffin, Botvin, Scheier, Diaz, & Miller, 2000). As in other studies, parental monitoring negatively predicted delinquent behavior for adolescents. The finding that African American boys and girls were monitored equally in this sample is in line with other research findings that African American girls and women tend to be less gender typed than girls and women from other cultural groups (e.g., Harris, 1996).

Another area of adolescents' lives that parents tend to monitor is their dating activities. Research has shown that a majority of parents report using dating rules (Madsen, 2008). As with monitoring of general activities and peers, parents tend to monitor sons' dating less than daughters' (Madsen, 2008). This difference may have consequences for both the adolescent and the parent–child relationship. In one study, parental monitoring in preadolescence was related to later first sexual activity in adolescence; in the same study, boys tended to show earlier first sexual activity than girls, a possible outcome of lower parental monitoring (Longmore, Manning, & Giordano, 2001). In addition, although all adolescents who date tend to have higher conflict with parents than adolescents who do not date, girls who date tend to have the highest parent conflict (Dowdy & Kliewer, 1998). Thus, lower dating

© 2016 AMERICAN PSYCHOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION. ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

monitoring may help boys have less conflict with parents but may result in more undesirable outcomes such as earlier sexual activity.

In general, boys tend to report parent relationships that are less deep (Kawaguchi, Welsh, Powers, & Rostosky, 1998) and less warm (Mayseless, Wiseman, & Hai, 1998) than those of girls. Also, on average, adolescent boys report seeking out parents less often than girls when experiencing strong emotions (Armsden & Greenberg, 1987). In addition, boys tend to self-disclose less to their mother (the parent to whom both boys and girls disclose more often) than do girls (Buhrmester & Prager, 1995). Furthermore, mothers' self-disclosure to their children tends to be related to higher depression in boys (but lower depression in girls; Lichtwarck-Aschoff, Finkenauer, van de Vorst, & Engels, 2012). Lichtwarck-Aschoff et al. (2012) speculated that because intimate self-disclosure is not encouraged by traditional masculine socialization, boys may have an especially difficult time with this component of parent relationships.

There is evidence that among late adolescent (college-age) boys, traditional masculinity ideology is related to the quality of relationships with parents (Blazina & Watkins, 2000; DeFranc & Mahalik, 2002). Specifically, boys who report higher gender role conflict (e.g., problem with emotional expression, problems with focusing too much on achievement) tend to report higher perceived psychological separation from parents, lower attachment to parents, and more relationship problems with parents. Future research should examine the role of traditional masculinity ideology in younger adolescent boys' relationships with their parents.

Summary and Suggestions for Future Directions

Most boys tend to experience good relationships with parents from infancy through adolescence. For their part, parents tend to treat sons and daughters similarly in many important ways; however, differential treatment by some parents—especially fathers—may contribute to the masculine socialization of many boys (e.g., less verbal interaction, more motor stimulation). One way that parents may treat boys and girls differently is by monitoring the activities, peer relationships, and dating activities of sons less than those of daughters. This lower monitoring may result in higher problematic behavior for some boys.

For many boys, adolescence is accompanied by changes to the parent–son relationship. In adolescence, boys tend to report less warmth and more problems with self-disclosure to parents than do girls. At the same time, parent relationships seem to be more important to the well-being of boys than girls. These changes may partly come about because of the nature of boys' friendships, whereby closeness based on intimate self-disclosure with same-gender friends declines for boys but not for girls (e.g., Way, 2013). Future research might investigate factors that predict closer, more self-disclosing parent relationships among boys. For example, longitudinal studies may shed light on how parents' talk to children in early and middle childhood may be related to boys' later self-disclosure to parents. Next, we discuss boys' relationships with friends and peers.

RELATIONSHIPS WITH FRIENDS AND PEERS

Children's and adolescents' peer relationships occur in crowds, cliques, and dyadic friendships (Crockett, Losoff, & Petersen, 1984). Peers are important socializing agents for children—as playmates in early childhood and as classmates or close friends in middle childhood and adolescence (Leaper, 1991; Martin & Fabes, 2001; Oransky & Marecek, 2009). When examining peer relationships and gender development, it is relevant to distinguish between group and dyadic contexts (see Leaper, 2000, 2015). In peer groups, children tend to be more susceptible to conformity pressures and concerns about being accepted. In dyadic relationships, such as one-on-one friendships, children usually have more flexibility to explore their personal interests.

Boys' socialization by other boys begins in early childhood. During this period, boys and girls begin to increasingly segregate themselves by gender group (Maccoby, 1998). Young boys tend to engage in more competitive and rough-and-tumble play than girls; their fantasy play also involves more violent and heroic themes (see Leaper, 2015).

© 2016 AMERICAN PSYCHOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION. ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

Furthermore, through what Martin and Fabes (2001) termed the *social dosage effect*, the more time boys spend playing with other boys, the stronger their tendency becomes toward aggressive behavior and gender-typed play. Not surprisingly, then, boys' tendency to engage in similar play styles continues into middle childhood and adolescence (Leaper, 2015).

Another average gender difference has been observed in the form of children's peer relationships. In childhood, boys are more likely on average than girls to interact in large friendship groups (Lever, 1976; Maccoby & Jacklin, 1974). Boys also tend to report being more concerned with their status in the social hierarchy and with group acceptance than girls (Azmitia, Kamprath, & Linnet, 1998; see Rose & Rudolph, 2006). For example, Azmitia et al. (1998) found that when forced to choose between a best friend and group acceptance, elementary school boys were more likely to choose group acceptance. However, by adolescence some of these gender differences in peer relations diminish. Adolescent boys and girls report spending similar amounts of time in both friendship groups and dyads (Crockett et al., 1984; Rose & Rudolph, 2006). In addition, by adolescence, girls and boys are more likely to choose group acceptance over a best friend (Azmitia et al., 1998).

Although the structure of peer relationships and friendships tends to become more similar for boys and girls with age, the content of these relationships remains somewhat different. An important way in which some boys' and girls' friendships differ is in average levels of intimacy and self-disclosure. Self-disclosure is considered adaptive for emotional health and interpersonal closeness. On average, self-disclosure is less common among boys than girls with same-gender friends (see Rose & Rudolph, 2006). Boys also appear less likely than girls to provide supportive listening responses to friends (e.g., Brendgen, Markiewicz, Doyle, & Bukowski, 2001; Burleson, 1982; Leaper & Smith, 2004). There is some evidence that boys' same-gender friendship quality differs by ethnic background. In a sample of ethnic-minority adolescent boys, Asian American boys were more likely to have disengaged friendships (e.g., low intimacy, low affection) than were African American and Latino boys (Way, Cowal, Gingold, Pahl, & Bissessar, 2001). In the same study, however, boys from all ethnic backgrounds were less likely than girls to have friendships characterized by high intimacy, high affection, and low conflict. Such average gender differences in social cognition and behavior are likely reinforced by the traditional peer cultures that many boys and girls experience. That is, the traditional masculinity norms emphasizing toughness, dominance, and emotional restraint may undermine many boys' willingness to disclose personal feelings or to seek accommodation with others during conflict (Levant, 2005).

Observing average gender differences in intimacy may partly depend on the operational definition of intimacy (e.g., Hussong, 2000). Specifically, boys may experience intimacy more through companionship and shared activities than through self-disclosure (McNelles, & Connolly, 1999). In addition, recent research has shown that the Internet may provide a good outlet for boys' self-disclosure. Although instant messaging tends to help many adolescents increase their self-disclosure, some research has suggested it may help more boys than girls (Schouten, Valkenburg, & Peter, 2007).

Whereas many boys tend to value group acceptance and shared activities more than they value dyadic friendships and self-disclosure, best friendships are generally important for boys during adolescence. Way (2013) conducted a longitudinal study of ethnically diverse (i.e., Asian American, African American, Latino, European American) boys' friendships from early to late adolescence. Through interviews, she found that early adolescent boys tended to express a deep appreciation for their best friendships. Furthermore, boys reported that the most important function of these friendships was the confiding of secrets. Thus, contrary to stereotypes and past findings, boys in this study reported valuing close friendships and self-disclosure. However, in later adolescence (age 15 and older), the same boys began reporting talking with their best friends less often and less intimately. The boys cited fears of being labeled gay among the reasons for this decline in their friendship intimacy (see Chapter 26, this handbook).

© 2016 AMERICAN PSYCHOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION. ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

Many boys experience teasing by peers, especially the kind that calls into question their sexual orientation and traditional masculinity (Oransky & Marecek, 2009; Phoenix, Frosh, & Pattman, 2003). Although teasing and bullying can always have negative emotional consequences, research has shown that homophobic bullying can lead to greater distress among boys than other kinds of bullying (Swearer, Turner, Givens, & Pollack, 2008). Fear of bullying serves to socialize boys into the traditional masculine role. Through interviews with high school students, Oransky and Marecek (2009) found that boys reported avoiding expressing emotions to friends because they feared teasing. Also, many boys reported their friends encouraged them to suppress their emotions and to move on. Furthermore, boys saw teasing and encouragement to suppress feelings as helpful in building each other's masculinity. At the same time, many boys acknowledged that expressing their feelings to others could have helped them feel better. Participants in Way's (2013) study also reported apprehension at continuing intimate friendships with boys while also acknowledging that these friendships had helped them cope emotionally. Thus, by adolescence, many boys seem conflicted by close friendships with other boys.

Summary and Suggestions for Future Directions

Boys' friendships in childhood and adolescence are mostly with other boys. These friendships help socialize boys into more gender-traditional ways of playing and behaving. Some characteristics of boys' friendships include the tendency to interact in larger groups and to focus on status within these groups. Although boys also value dyadic best friendships, these relationships may become less close as many boys get older and want to avoid appearing feminine or gay. Of course, there is variability in the extent to which different boys maintain close, intimate friendships. Future research may examine what factors may lead boys to continue to self-disclose in close friendships in adolescence. For example, many adolescents in industrialized countries own cell phones. In one study, both boys and girls indicated they commonly used text messaging, although boys reported feeling less comfortable engaging in this activity than did girls (Pierce, 2009). Future research could examine the content of boys' messages to investigate whether text messaging is allowing boys an alternative outlet for self-disclosure with friends.

Furthermore, past research has shown that as boys become comfortable in a group setting, they willingly discuss the difficulties that traditional notions of masculinity pose for their relationships with other boys (Oransky & Marecek, 2009). Future research may also examine whether certain group interventions may help boys maintain close, helpful friendships in adolescence. Such interventions may engage boys in discussions about the positive role of friendships in their lives and help them challenge the idea that close friendships between boys and masculinity are incompatible.

ROMANTIC RELATIONSHIPS

Although the depth of many boys' friendships may suffer from early to late adolescence (Way, 2013), romantic relationships tend to become more prevalent during this time (Collins, 2003). In the sections that follow, we first discuss trends in boys' heterosexual romantic relationships (see Chapter 26, this handbook). Afterward, we consider boys' gay and bisexual romantic relationships.

Heterosexual Relationships

By age 16, more than half of adolescents reported having been in a romantic relationship during the past year and a half, and this percentage continues to increase with age (Collins, 2003). For adolescent boys, a romantic relationship with a girl may be the one acceptable outlet for intimacy. In fact, whereas girls tend to self-disclose significantly more to friends than to romantic partners, many boys tend to report higher levels of self-disclosure to romantic partners than to friends (e.g., Pagano & Hirsch, 2007). However, the continuing influence of traditionally masculine socialization can create problems related to intimacy and power for boys in heterosexual romantic relationships (Pleck, Sonenstein, & Ku, 1993; Underwood & Rosen, 2009).

© 2016 AMERICAN PSYCHOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION. ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

Although most adolescent boys seek out and value romantic relationships with girls, many boys' experiences in such relationships can be conflicted (Bentley, Galliher, & Ferguson, 2007; Giordano, Longmore, & Manning, 2006). For example, adolescent boys and girls reported similar average levels of emotional engagement in romantic relationships; at the same time, boys tended to report having lower confidence and feeling more awkward communicating in their romantic relationships than did girls (Giordano et al., 2006).

Many boys appear to be most conflicted regarding issues of influence and power in romantic relationships with girls. In one study of heterosexual dating adolescents (Giordano et al., 2006), boys were more likely than girls to experience a power imbalance in their relationships favoring their partner; boys similarly were more likely than girls to feel that their partner had tried to influence them. In other research (Bentley et al., 2007), boys were more likely than girls to experience feeling humiliation in their romantic relationships as well as feeling that they had given in to their partners during a videotaped discussion; interestingly, the same boys reported feeling that they had more decision-making power in the relationship. Both of these reviewed studies were based on boys' perceptions of their relationships, which may not reflect actual behavioral differences; nevertheless, they reveal the conflicted feelings that many boys have in romantic relationships. Future studies need to complement assessments of adolescents' perceptions with observations of decision making in romantic relationships.

One factor that may account for variation among boys' relationship experiences is their endorsement of traditional masculinity ideology. Research with adults has suggested that men's endorsement of traditional masculinity ideology is related to more difficulties with intimacy and lower satisfaction in dating and marital relationships (E. H. Thompson & Pleck, 1995). Similar findings have been shown with adolescents (Pleck et al., 1993). Boys who more strongly endorsed traditional masculinity ideology tended to report lower intimacy with a current romantic partner, more sexual partners in the past year, and viewing romantic relationships as adversarial.

Endorsement of traditional masculinity ideology may also lead some boys to perpetrate violence in romantic relationships. Among adults, traditional masculinity ideology has been linked to higher rape myth acceptance, higher hostility toward women, and higher acceptance of interpersonal violence (Murnen, Wright, & Kaluzny, 2002). Future research should investigate whether similar relationships may be present among adolescent boys.

Statistics on dating violence have shown that adolescent boys and girls tend to report similar levels of overall violence perpetration (Giordano, Soto, Manning, & Longmore, 2010; Halpern, Oslak, Young, Martin, & Kupper, 2001); in some cases, girls tended to report higher average levels of perpetration than did boys (Swahn, Simon, Arias, & Bossarte, 2008). However, girls were more likely than boys to report being seriously injured by a romantic partner, whereas boys were more likely than girls to report being slapped and scratched (Windle & Mrug, 2009). In addition, boys are more likely than girls to perpetrate sexual violence in a dating relationship, and girls are more likely than boys to be victims of sexual violence in a dating relationship (Foshee, 1996; Swahn et al., 2008).

Some reasons for violence perpetration in romantic relationships among boys include higher average perceptions of humiliation (Bentley et al., 2007). Another study found that boys' feelings of having lower relative power in the relationship significantly predicted violence perpetration toward the partner (Giordano et al., 2010). Furthermore, sexual violence perpetration among boys may also be related to rape myth endorsement (Reyes & Foshee, 2013).

Gay and Bisexual Relationships

Research has paid much less attention to same-sex adolescent romantic relationships than to heterosexual ones. However, research with adults has shown that experiences of love and satisfaction in the romantic relationships of gay and lesbian couples tend to be similar to those of heterosexual couples (see Peplau & Fingerhut, 2007). Although this may also be true for younger couples, it is also possible that adolescents may experience more difficulties as they are first learning to navigate a sexual minority identity (i.e., gay, bisexual, or transgender for boys). One study

© 2016 AMERICAN PSYCHOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION. ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

found that sexual minority boys (and girls) were more likely to report fears of not finding a good romantic partner; they also tended to report lower perceived control in their romantic relationships than did heterosexual adolescents (Diamond & Lucas, 2004).

Traditional masculinity ideology may also affect sexual minority boys' romantic relationships. In general, late adolescent boys and young men who identify as gay score significantly lower on traditional masculinity ideology than do their heterosexual counterparts (Wade & Donis, 2007). However, endorsement of traditional masculinity ideology is negatively related to romantic relationship satisfaction among both gay and heterosexual boys and men. This research was conducted with mostly undergraduates and should be replicated with an adolescent sample.

In a retrospective study, gay men and lesbian women were asked to recall their process of becoming aware of same-sex attraction in childhood or preadolescence (Savin-Williams & Diamond, 2000). On average, same-sex sexual contacts tended to occur at earlier ages for boys than girls. In addition, men who identified as gay or bisexual reported experiencing sexual contact before formulating a sexual identity as gay or bisexual, whereas women who identified as lesbian or bisexual reported the reverse pattern. The homophobia commonly associated with traditional masculinity may make it more difficult for sexual minority boys to self-identify as gay or bisexual.

On average, sexual minority boys (and girls) tend to experience higher psychological distress (e.g., depression, anxiety) and worse parent relationships than their heterosexual counterparts (Busseri, Willoughby, Chalmers, & Bogaert, 2008). They also tend to report more fears about losing friends, and in fact, they report having lost more friends than do heterosexual adolescents (Diamond & Lucas, 2004). In addition, sexual minority adolescents tend to be the victims of bullying and homophobic teasing more often than their heterosexual counterparts (American Association of University Women, 2011; Berlan, Corliss, Field, Goodman, & Bryn Austin, 2010). At the same time, adolescent boys of all sexual identities tend to experience more homophobic teasing than adolescent girls (Collier, Bos, & Sandfort, 2013). In the middle school years, adolescents who identify as questioning tend to experience more teasing, victimization, depression, and substance use than heterosexual and gay, lesbian, and bisexual students (Birkett, Espelage, & Koenig, 2009). Thus, the process of first questioning their sexual identities may be most difficult for adolescents.

© 2016 AMERICAN PSYCHOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION. ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

Summary and Suggestions for Future Directions

Heterosexual boys tend to seek out romantic relationships with girls and to value the opportunities for self-disclosure that they provide. At the same time, their experiences in romantic relationships tend to be somewhat conflicted. Many boys report feeling high emotional engagement but lower confidence than girls in heterosexual romantic relationships. Boys also tend to experience some conflict around power issues in relationships.

Many boys who identify as gay or bisexual tend to adopt a nonheterosexual identity only after their first same-sex sexual contact; the homophobia associated with traditional masculinity may make it more difficult for boys than for girls to adopt a gay or bisexual identity. Nonheterosexual boys also tend to experience more psychological distress and more problems in parent and peer relationships. Moreover, they tend to express more fears than their heterosexual counterparts about not finding a romantic partner. At the same time, research with adults has indicated that gay and bisexual adults tend to enjoy romantic relationships that are similar to heterosexual relationships. Future research should investigate all facets of same-sex romantic relationships among adolescents.

Traditional masculinity ideology may be responsible for some of the negative experiences that some boys experience in heterosexual and same-sex romantic relationships; these include problems with intimacy, violence, and relationship satisfaction. However, most of this research has been conducted with adults. Future research should further examine the link between endorsement of traditional masculinity and problems in heterosexual and gay romantic relationships among adolescent boys. For example, research should investigate whether adolescent boys

actually experience lower levels of control in their relationships or whether they just perceive lower control because they expect to have more control than their female partners. If the latter is true, these feelings should be especially prevalent among boys who endorse traditional masculinity ideology.

BODY IMAGE

Throughout their lives, girls and women experience body image problems—such as body dissatisfaction, body objectification, and weight loss concerns—to a greater degree than do boys and men (Cohane & Pope, 2001). However, researchers have begun to focus more attention on the body image problems encountered by many boys. In some ways, these problems are similar to those experienced by girls; however, there are also important differences.

Like many girls, boys tend to express concerns with their weight, and these concerns begin in childhood and continue into adolescence. Results of a study of boys ages 8 to 11 years showed that almost half the boys reported desiring a thinner body, and more than a fifth of them reported engaging in weight-loss strategies (Ricciardelli, McCabe, Lillis, & Thomas, 2006). Another study of adolescent boys ages 11 to 16 showed that almost 40% of participants reported engaging in weight-loss strategies, and around 25% reported engaging in weight-gain strategies (Ricciardelli & McCabe, 2003).

Gaining weight and building muscle also tend to be concerns among boys (Muris, Meesters, van de Blom, & Mayer, 2005). One study found that when asked to rate the attributes of the ideal attractive boy, most boys reported shape and build to be important, followed by height, and finally by weight (Jones, 2001). Thus, it seems that most boys may be concerned with appearing muscular and tall. Ricciardelli and McCabe (2003) found that almost half of their sample of adolescent boys reported frequently using strategies to increase muscles. Furthermore, the extent of muscle-gain strategies was moderately correlated with the use of supplements such as steroids.

Some evidence has suggested that ethnic background moderates the extent to which boys feel dissatisfied with their bodies. For example, African American boys have been shown to prefer a larger ideal body than European American boys (S. H. Thompson, Corwin, & Sargent, 1997). At the same time, African American boys have been found to report more positive body image than boys from other ethnic backgrounds (Siegel, Yancey, Aneshensel, & Schuler, 1999).

Researchers have identified multiple factors that predict boys' desire and use of strategies to change their bodies. Body mass index is one of the strongest predictors of body dissatisfaction and weight-loss strategies (Jones, Vigfusdottir, & Lee, 2004; Muris et al., 2005; Ricciardelli et al., 2006). Thus, boys with higher body mass indexes tend to report more dissatisfaction with their bodies and to engage in more weight-loss strategies.

Parents can influence boys' body-related attitudes and behaviors. Boys who reported more felt pressure from parents to change their bodies tended to be more likely to increase their use of strategies to change their bodies in childhood (Ricciardelli et al., 2006) and in adolescence (Peterson, Paulson, & Williams, 2007; Ricciardelli & McCabe, 2003). More specifically, boys were more likely to report body dissatisfaction when they heard negative comments about their weight from parents or observed their parents model body dissatisfaction and body-change strategies (Phares, Steinberg, & Thompson, 2004; Smolak, Levine, & Schermer, 1999).

Felt pressure from peers has also been linked to boys' body-change strategies (Ricciardelli et al., 2006). In childhood and adolescence, many boys report overt teasing or criticism from peers about their bodies; not surprisingly, such criticism is positively related to body dissatisfaction (Jones et al., 2004; Oliver & Thelen, 1996; Phares et al., 2004). Body dissatisfaction among boys also tends to be related to the extent to which they compare themselves with peers (Jones, 2001) as well as the extent to which they converse with friends about body-related topics (Jones et al., 2004).

Finally, the media can have an influence on boys' body dissatisfaction. The media tend to emphasize idealized portrayals of muscular bodies for boys and men. Adolescent boys who reported more pressure from the media to look a certain way tended to report higher body dissatisfaction than did other

© 2016 AMERICAN PSYCHOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION. ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

boys (see Barlett, Vowels, & Saucier, 2008, for a review; McCabe & Ricciardelli, 2003; Muris et al., 2005). In addition, boys who reported higher concerns with body images in the media (e.g., comparing their bodies with bodies in magazines) tended to report more muscle building than did other boys (Smolak & Stein, 2006).

Summary and Suggestions for Future Directions

In summary, although body dissatisfaction tends to be less prevalent among boys than girls, there is evidence that many boys do worry about the appearance of their bodies and engage in body-change strategies (see Chapter 27, this handbook). Like many girls, boys tend to worry about attaining an ideal weight; however, they also tend to worry about building a muscular body and may engage in steroid use. Parents, peers, and the media can all contribute to boys' body dissatisfaction and use of body-change strategies. Future research should focus on creating and evaluating intervention strategies to help boys with body image concerns. Some interventions that target self-esteem and media literacy have been shown to be effective in reducing girls' body dissatisfaction and drive for thinness (see Littleton & Ollendick, 2003, for a review). Future intervention programs should take into consideration boys' drive for muscularity and steroid use.

ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT

Historically, it has been girls who have been seen as disadvantaged in the academic domain compared with boys; accordingly, much research has focused on girls' academic performance and attitudes, especially in stereotypically male-dominated fields such as math and science. However, recently, in light of what some commentators have called the "boy crisis" (e.g., Hoff Sommers, 2000; Sax, 2009), increasing attention has been paid to boys and academics. These commentators have argued that schools are structured to privilege girls to the detriment of boys. In the following we argue that this interpretation misrepresents the problem (see Chapter 29, this handbook). We review evidence showing that girls are not performing better at a cost to boys. Furthermore, evidence has suggested that traditional gender socialization may hinder boys in some ways in school.

There are several reasons why the term *crisis* may not accurately characterize what is happening regarding boys' academic performance. First, although girls have made some gains in performance, especially in historically masculine-stereotyped subjects, boys' performance on standardized tests has not declined in the past 4 decades (National Center for Education Statistics, 2013). Second, whereas boys are less likely to graduate from high school than are girls, this difference was recorded as early as 1870 and has remained the case for most of the past century. In fact, the gap between male and female graduation rates has narrowed. In 1950, 26.3% of girls and 22.7% of boys graduated from high school; in 2012, the corresponding numbers were 88% for girls and 87.3% for boys. Third, although men are now less likely than women to attend and graduate from college, men are still much more likely than women to receive degrees in fields related to engineering and the physical sciences, which are likely to lead to some of the highest paying jobs (National Science Foundation, 2013). For example, men are awarded 59% of bachelor's degrees in the physical sciences, 82% of degrees in engineering, and 82% of degrees in computer sciences. Thus, although there is certainly some cause for concern for boys and education, the term *boy crisis* may exaggerate the extent of the problem.

Some other trends in boys' academic attitudes and performance may be causes for concern. First, boys in elementary and secondary education tend to report lower levels of engagement in and more negative attitudes toward school than do girls (Orr, 2011; Wang, Willett, & Eccles, 2011). Second, boys, on average, tend to attain lower grades in school than girls (Duckworth & Seligman, 2006; National Center for Education Statistics, 2013). Third, boys, on average, tend to engage in more problematic behaviors in school. For example, in 2012 boys were twice as likely to report having been in a fight at school in the past year than girls; boys were also more likely to report feeling too unsafe to go to school than girls. Finally, men are somewhat less likely than women to attend and graduate from college, with men receiving only 43% of all bachelor's

© 2016 AMERICAN PSYCHOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION. ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

degree (National Science Foundation, 2013). Thus, there are some overall trends that may be problematic for boys as a group in education.

The gender gap regarding many indicators of school success from elementary school into college is even wider among youths from Latino and African American backgrounds (National Center for Education Statistics, 2013). The latter problems can be compounded by possible teacher prejudices and discrimination. For example, evidence has suggested that African American and Latino boys may be subject to disproportionate rates of disciplinary action for school misbehavior (Losen, 2011).

Research has shown that traditional gender socialization may account for some of boys' academic problems. These findings contradict the interpretation of authors who write about the boy crisis. Authors such as Sax (2009) have suggested that school settings should be changed to allow boys to be more stereotypically masculine. However, research has contradicted this argument. For example, in a study of kindergarten children (Orr, 2011), boys' achievement and liking of school were negatively correlated with participation in certain masculine-stereotyped activities (e.g., playing games and sports with parents) and positively related to participation in particular feminine-stereotyped activities (e.g., reading and doing art projects with parents).

Traditional notions of masculinity may actually interfere with boys' school-related attitudes and performance. Jackson and Dempster (2009) have highlighted that boys' ideas of masculinity may be incompatible with academic effort. Furthermore, such attitudes can influence boys' achievement. A recent study with high school students found that adherence to traditionally masculine norms was negatively related to math achievement among boys (Santos, Galligan, Pahlke, & Fabes, 2013). In addition, Van Houtte (2004) found that high school boys tended to experience an academic culture that is less study oriented than that of girls. Thus, traditional gender socialization and ideologies may contribute to boys' school-related attitudes and behaviors, which may have a negative impact on their achievement.

Boys' performance and attitudes tend to vary by subject area, partly depending on the historical gender stereotyping of the subject. As we review boys' performance in language arts, math, and science below, we discuss boys' achievement (e.g., grades, test scores) as well as their expectancy beliefs and valuing of each subject area. Expectancy beliefs and values directly influence students' motivation and may also influence their achievement as well as their likelihood of pursuing further education and occupations in that field (Wigfield & Eccles, 2000).

Language arts (e.g., reading and writing) is a subject area that has been thought of as stereotypically feminine (Guimond & Roussel, 2001). Although boys tend to receive lower average grades than girls in all school subjects, this gender gap is widest in language arts (Duckworth & Seligman, 2006; Pomerantz, Altermatt, & Saxon, 2002). Boys' lower grades in language arts are not paralleled by lower scores on reading and language arts standardized tests. Duckworth and Seligman (2006) suggested that boys' lower average scores on self-control may partly account for the discrepancy between their grades and test scores. In other words, girls may be more self-disciplined than boys, which may help them in the classroom.

Other research has also suggested that traditional gender socialization may contribute to boys' academic achievement. The results of a longitudinal study showed that boys' time spent reading at age 10 correlated significantly with their interest in language arts at age 12 (McHale, Kim, Whiteman, & Crouter, 2004). Alarmingly, boys reported spending little more than half the time girls did on reading during a typical week. Much research has shown that boys tend to show somewhat lower interest in and valuing of reading and writing than do girls (Jacobs, Lanza, Osgood, Eccles, & Wigfield, 2002; Pajares & Valiante, 2001). Boys' and girls' ability beliefs in language arts tend to be similar in elementary school; by middle and high school, boys report lower ability beliefs than do girls (Jacobs et al., 2002; Pajares, Miller, & Johnson, 1999; Pomerantz et al., 2002).

Mathematics is a historically masculine-stereotyped subject in many countries. However, recent research in the United States has indicated that this gender gap has considerably narrowed. In terms of average math grades in elementary and

© 2016 AMERICAN PSYCHOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION. ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

secondary school, girls tend to achieve slightly better than boys (National Center for Education Statistics, 2013). On standardized mathematics tests in the United States, no gender difference is seen in elementary school, and only a small average difference (favoring boys) is seen in high school (Else-Quest, Hyde, & Linn, 2010; Lindberg, Hyde, Petersen, & Linn, 2010). A more consistent pattern of difference continues to be seen when comparing boys' and girls' values and ability beliefs regarding math (see Leaper, 2015). In elementary and secondary school, boys tend to value and expect success in math more than do girls (e.g., Ganley & Vasilyeva, 2011; Herbert & Stipek, 2005; Simpkins, Davis-Kean, & Eccles, 2006; Watt, 2004). Boys may have higher average self-concepts in math because many children still tend to stereotype math as a masculine subject (Steele, 2003). Cultural stereotypes of math being for boys can also help boys to outperform girls in testing situations, where girls may suffer from stereotype threat (Ambady, Shih, Kim, & Pittinsky, 2001). Evidence has suggested that lower test anxiety may partly account for boys' average advantage over girls in standardized math scores (Hannon, 2012).

Science is another historically masculine-stereotyped field that has subfields that are still dominated by boys and men. Although women are now awarded more bachelor's degrees in the United States when all science fields are combined, men are awarded significantly more degrees in the physical and atmospheric and oceanic sciences (National Science Foundation, 2013). As is the case with math, the gender differences in pursuing science careers may be due somewhat to performance but also to attitudes and ability beliefs. Some research has suggested that girls tend to attain higher average grades in science than do boys in the United States (National Center for Education Statistics, 2013). However, performance may also vary by subfield of science. In U.S. high schools, boys tend to attain slightly higher average grades than girls in the physical sciences, but girls tend to do similarly or slightly better than boys in average life science grades (Britner, 2008; National Center for Education Statistics, 2013). In terms of outcome expectations and valuing of science, boys also appear to have an average advantage. On the basis of an analysis of data from 50 countries, boys tended to show higher ability beliefs in science than did girls; boys also tended to show higher interest in engineering and computer sciences (Sikora & Pokropek, 2012).

Summary and Suggestions for Future Directions

The picture of boys and education in the United States (and in other Western industrialized countries) is complicated and depends on the level and subject area of analysis. Overall, boys' secondary school achievement in the United States has not declined in the past several decades. However, boys tend to report lower engagement and more negative attitudes in school than girls; they are also less likely than girls to go on to college. However, in historically masculine-stereotyped subjects (i.e., math and science), men tend to have higher ability beliefs and are more likely to receive college diplomas than women. More research is needed to test the premise that traditional masculine socialization and ideologies contribute to some boys' school-related problems. Future research should consider whether engaging boys in both feminine- and masculine-stereotyped activities fosters better school attitudes and achievement among boys (see Eliot, 2009). One possibility is designing interventions that involve boys and girls working together in groups. The social dosage effect suggests that when boys and girls spend time with cross-gender peers, they are less likely to adopt strong gender-typed behaviors (Martin & Fabes, 2001). Mixed-gender groups in the classroom may reduce some boys' tendency toward problem behaviors that undermine academic achievement. Finally, more cross-cultural comparisons of gender and academic achievement are needed. Average gender differences in achievement may be smaller in countries with greater gender equality in the larger society (see Leaper, 2015).

AGGRESSION

Most average psychological and behavioral gender differences tend to be small or negligible (Hyde, 2005; Leaper, 2015). Aggression is one of the exceptions: Meta-analyses have pointed to a moderate average gender difference in aggression during

© 2016 AMERICAN PSYCHOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION. ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

childhood, adolescence, and adulthood (Archer, 2004; Card, Stucky, Sawalani, & Little, 2008; see Chapter 28, this handbook). However, the type of aggression is a significant moderator. Researchers have differentiated between direct aggression and indirect aggression. Direct aggression can involve physical or verbal hostile behaviors that are overtly expressed to the victim. In contrast, indirect aggression (also known as relational or social aggression) involves covert hostile acts such as negative gossip or social exclusion. According to recent meta-analyses, boys demonstrated significantly higher average levels of direct aggression than girls; the magnitude of the effect sizes was moderate for physical aggression and small for verbal aggression. In contrast, girls were significantly higher than boys in indirect aggression, but the magnitude of the difference was negligible (Card et al., 2008).

There is some evidence that gender differences in aggression may vary by ethnic background, with African American elementary school boys exhibiting higher aggression than European American boys as well as girls of both ethnicities (Putallaz et al., 2007). Other studies have also shown that African American children tend to be rated as more aggressive than their European American counterparts (e.g., Österman et al., 1994). However, these results are often based on teacher or peer ratings, which may be biased by negative racial/ethnic stereotypes or confounded by participants' ethnic and socioeconomic backgrounds. To illustrate, a study of self-reported aggression showed no ethnic group differences between African American and European American adolescents (Prinstein, Boergers, & Vernberg, 2001). The authors stated that their study was conducted in "a city of fairly homogeneous socioeconomic status" (Prinstein et al., 2001, p. 481).

Boys also tend to play a more prominent role in bullying than do girls. One study found that boys were appreciably more likely than girls to play the role of bully or to support others' bullying behavior (Salmivalli, Lagerspetz, Björkquist, Österman, & Kaukiainen, 1996). Boys were also much less likely to defend victims or to stay out of bullying situations than girls. When bullying occurs, boys tend to act more aggressively toward other boys than toward girls (Russell & Owens, 1999). However, during the course of adolescence, many boys become increasingly likely to sexually harass girls (see Leaper & Robnett, 2011). This includes sexually derogatory comments, unwanted sexual attention, and unwelcome sexual contact.

Sexual harassment occurs in both cross-gender and same-gender interactions. According to one major survey of 13- to 18-year-olds in the United States (American Association of University Women, 2011), boys were more likely to harass other boys than were girls. Also, girls sometimes harassed boys. Being called gay in a derogatory manner and unwelcome sexual comments were the most commonly reported forms of sexual harassment experienced by boys. In the survey, students' most commonly cited reason for sexually harassing boys was that they were not considered athletic or masculine. In contrast, girls who were physically developed or especially pretty were more likely mentioned as targets. Thus, sexual harassment of girls and boys may be viewed as functioning to reinforce traditional notions of masculinity and the objectification of females.

Multiple factors contribute to the development of average gender differences in aggression. The biopsychosocial model proposes that biological (e.g., temperament), early experience (e.g., relationships with parents), and sociocultural (e.g., media) factors combine to influence individuals' psychology, which in turn influences their propensity to act aggressively (Dodge & Pettit, 2003). In the following section, we review research on how biological, early experience, sociocultural, and cognitive factors may play a role in boys' aggression.

Some evidence has shown that biological factors may contribute to between- and within-gender differences in aggression. Hormones, especially testosterone and other androgens, have been popularly thought to play a role in male aggression. Evidence has suggested that prenatal exposure to androgens (which is typically higher for genetic males than females) may be partly related to later aggression (see Hines, 2013). However, the link between contemporaneous testosterone levels and aggression in humans is less clear than many laypeople assume (see Archer, 2004). During puberty, boys' testosterone levels increase, whereas their aggression levels do not. In addition, injecting individuals with testosterone does not seem to increase their

© 2016 AMERICAN PSYCHOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION. ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

aggressiveness. However, some evidence has shown that other androgens may be present at higher levels in boys with conduct disorder (van Goozen, Matthys, Cohen-Kettenis, Thijssen, & van Engeland, 1998). Also, in boys and girls, testosterone levels increase in response to perceived threats. Some research has suggested that higher average emotional reactivity among boys may increase the likelihood of perceiving threats and acting in aggressive ways (Hay, 2007).

Early experiences in relationships with parents and peers may also contribute to boys' levels of aggression. Parent-related variables may predict aggression in boys in several ways. First, parents may teach their children aggression through modeling. In one study, boys whose fathers showed aggression toward their romantic partners were more likely to show aggression toward peers; boys whose mothers showed aggression toward their partners were more likely to show aggression toward their own romantic partners (Moretti, Obsuth, Odgers, & Reebye, 2006). Parents may also influence boys' aggression through the ways in which they interact with their sons. Parents who use power-assertive methods such as physical punishment and threats tend to have sons who are more aggressive later (Haapasalo & Tremblay, 1994; Olweus, 1980). Other research has shown that parents, on average, tend to use physical punishment significantly more with sons than with daughters (Lytton & Romney, 1991); thus, this parenting behavior may partly account for average gender differences in aggression.

As described in previous sections, peers are important socialization agents. Starting in early childhood, boys tend to spend most of their time playing with other boys, which tends to intensify preexisting behavioral preferences. In their illustration of the social dosage effect, Martin and Fabes (2001) found that the more time boys spent with other boys in the fall, the more their aggressive behavior increased by the following spring. Results of another study showed that when boys were brought together for an experimental playgroup, their aggressive behavior increased over just the 5 weeks spent together (Dodge, Coie, Pettit, & Price, 1990). Thus, smaller average gender differences in aggression may grow into larger ones through peer socialization (e.g., Archer, 2004; Chang, 2004).

Peer rejection is also related to boys' aggression. Boys who are rejected by peers tend to be more aggressive (e.g., Dodge et al., 1990). In addition, boys who are rejected are more likely to be bullies as well as victims of bullying among their peers (Salmivalli et al., 1996). Because gender socialization processes teach many boys that anger and aggression are more acceptable than other types of emotional expression, more boys than girls may use aggression to deal with the pain of rejection (Brody, 2000).

In addition to biological and social-relational factors, cultural factors may also influence boys' aggression. Two such factors that may be especially important predictors of boys' aggression are media depictions of violence and a traditional masculinity ideology that emphasizes characteristics that may facilitate aggression. Much research has shown that children can learn aggressive behaviors from observing models (see Bussey & Bandura, 1999), including models depicted in the media (see Anderson et al., 2003). A meta-analysis of experimental and survey studies found small to medium effect sizes of watching violent television on boys' later aggressive behavior (Paik & Comstock, 1994). Furthermore, the effect was somewhat stronger for boys than for girls. This may not be surprising, considering that males are more often depicted as aggressive in the media (Signorielli, 2012), and children are more likely to learn from a model who is similar to themselves (see Anderson et al., 2003). More recent longitudinal research has shown that males' TV viewing in childhood did not predict their TV viewing in adulthood, but did predict their aggressive behavior in adulthood (Huesmann, Moise-Titus, Podolski, & Eron, 2003). In addition, this effect was magnified for those males who believed that the media depicted the world as it really is.

Parents, peers, and the media partly influence boys' gender development by communicating traditional expectations for masculine-stereotyped behavior. Traditional masculinity ideology prescribes qualities such as toughness, self-reliance, and emotional stoicism as ideals for boys and men (Levant et al., 2007). A recent study found that in a sample of high school football players, the

© 2016 AMERICAN PSYCHOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION. ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

endorsement of traditional notions of masculinity was positively related to bullying behavior (Steinfeldt, Vaughan, LaFollette, & Steinfeldt, 2012). In another study of college students, endorsement of traditional masculinity mediated the relationship between video-game playing and aggression (Thomas & Levant, 2012). Finally, boys referred to group therapy for aggressive behavior expressed that they engaged in such behavior to avoid looking weak in front of other boys (Richmond & Levant, 2003). Thus, traditional masculinity ideology is a sociocultural variable that is communicated to boys by the media and peers, and it serves to promote aggressive behavior in those boys who most strongly endorse it.

The combination of biological, early relationship experience, and sociocultural factors may lead to some average gender differences in psychological factors that may play a role in aggression. For example, research has shown that boys, on average, tend to score lower on empathy and perspective taking than girls, and both of these variables have been negatively linked to aggression (e.g., Carlo, Raffaelli, Laible, & Meyer, 1999). In fact, Carlo et al. (1999) found that among adolescents the relationship between gender and aggression was partly explained by average gender differences in empathy.

In addition, the results of a meta-analysis showed that the gender difference in aggression tends to be most pronounced under conditions of small to moderate arousal (Knight, Guthrie, Page, & Fabes, 2002). When individuals were not aroused above baseline, the gender difference was small; when individuals were very highly aroused, the gender difference was negligible. Knight et al. (2002) argued that because boys and men tend to have a more difficult time regulating their emotions, arousal level may account for the gender difference at small to moderate levels of arousal (at high arousal, all participants are likely to have more difficulty with emotion regulation). Thus, socializing boys into a gender role that emphasizes understanding and considering the emotions of others and of oneself over that of toughness and emotional stoicism may be beneficial to reducing the average gender difference in aggression.

Summary and Suggestions for Future Directions

Biological, parental, peer, and media variables may all contribute to higher average aggression rates in boys than in girls. The evidence for hormonal influences is complicated, but there is some reason to believe that androgens may play a role in aggression. Parents' modeling of aggression and physical punishment (which tends to be more likely with boys than with girls) can also contribute to boys' aggressiveness. In addition, boys may socialize each other to be more aggressive. Watching violence on mass media has been shown to have a stronger effect on boys' aggression than on that of girls. Finally, traditional notions of masculinity that include ideals such as emotional stoicism and toughness may contribute to boys' lower levels of empathy and prosocial behavior toward others and their higher levels of aggression. Encouraging perspective taking, emotional openness, and a more balanced combination of assertive and affiliative goals may help narrow the gender gap in aggression (see Leaper, 2015).

CONCLUSION

In many ways, the psychological development of boys is very similar to that of girls. Most boys and girls highly value their relationships with their parents, peers, and romantic partners. Conversely, many boys and girls experience insecurities regarding their body image and encounter problems getting along with their peers. Furthermore, boys as well as girls face difficulties in academic domains.

At the same time, the higher status of males and the socialization of traditional masculinity lead to some important average gender differences during development. Because of the high status associated with the dominant male role, boys are often pressured to embrace attitudes and behaviors emphasizing personal agency and dominance and to downplay concerns with affiliation or emotional vulnerability. Hence, the socialization of gender tends to be more rigid for boys than girls. Correspondingly, boys tend to hold more rigid and sexist gender attitudes than do girls. These patterns may be related to higher rates of academic difficulty among boys than girls. As a group, boys also tend to

© 2016 AMERICAN PSYCHOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION. ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

experience some difficulties with social competence skills, which may lead to problems in their close relationships. Traditional notions of masculinity emphasize the importance of toughness, which may lead some boys to experience concerns with muscularity and to engage in aggression. We propose that boys as well as girls will benefit if greater balance is attained during development. Many aspects associated with traditional masculinity (e.g., personal agency) can be complemented with some of the strengths associated with traditional femininity (e.g., communion with others). We encourage researchers and policymakers to explore possible interventions in schools, homes, and the media that may mitigate the more negative components of a traditional masculine socialization. Our goal should be to find ways to help all children attain their potential and to contribute positively to society.

References

Absi-Semaan, N., Crombie, G., & Freeman, C. (1993). Masculinity and femininity in middle childhood: Developmental and factor analyses. *Sex Roles*, *28*, 187–206. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/BF00299280

Alexander, G. M., & Wilcox, T. (2012). Sex differences in early infancy. *Child Development Perspectives*, *6*, 400–406.

Alfieri, T., Ruble, D. N., & Higgins, E. T. (1996). Gender stereotypes during adolescence: Developmental changes and the transition to junior high school. *Developmental Psychology*, *32*, 1129–1137. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0012-1649.32.6.1129

Ambady, N., Shih, M., Kim, A., & Pittinsky, T. L. (2001). Stereotype susceptibility in children: Effects of identity activation on quantitative performance. *Psychological Science*, *12*, 385–390. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/1467-9280.00371

American Association of University Women. (2011). *Crossing the line: Sexual harassment at school*. Washington, DC: Author.

American Psychiatric Association. (2013). *Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders* (5th ed.). Washington, DC: Author.

Anderson, C. A., Berkowitz, L., Donnerstein, E., Huesmann, L. R., Johnson, J., Linz, D., . . . Wartella, E. (2003). The influence of media violence on youth. *Psychological Science in the Public Interest*, *4*, 81–110.

Archer, J. (2004). Sex differences in aggression in real-world settings: A meta-analytic review. *Review of General Psychology*, *8*, 291–322. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/1089-2680.8.4.291

Arciniega, G. M., Anderson, T. C., Tovar-Blank, Z. G., & Tracey, T. J. (2008). Toward a fuller conception of machismo: Development of a traditional Machismo and Caballerismo Scale. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, *55*, 19–33. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0022-0167.55.1.19

Armsden, G. C., & Greenberg, M. T. (1987). The Inventory of Parent and Peer Attachment: Individual differences and their relationship to psychological well-being in adolescence. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, *16*, 427–454. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/BF02202939

Azmitia, M., Kamprath, N., & Linnet, J. (1998). Intimacy and conflict: The dynamics of boys' and girls' friendships during middle childhood and early adolescence. In L. Meyer, H. Park, M. Grnot-Scheyer, I. Schwartz, & B. Harry (Eds.), *Making friends: The influences of culture and development* (pp. 171–189). Baltimore, MD: Paul H. Brookes.

Barlett, C. P., Vowels, C. L., & Saucier, D. A. (2008). Meta-analyses of the effects of media images on men's body-image concerns. *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology*, *27*, 279–310. http://dx.doi.org/10.1521/jscp.2008.27.3.279

Bartini, M. (2006). Gender role flexibility in early adolescence: Developmental change in attitudes, self-perceptions and behaviors. *Sex Roles*, *55*, 233–245. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11199-006-9076-1

Beauchamp, M. H., & Anderson, V. (2010). SOCIAL: An integrative framework for the development of social skills. *Psychological Bulletin*, *136*, 39–64. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0017768

Bem, S. L. (1974). The measurement of psychological androgyny. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, *42*, 155–162. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/h0036215

Benenson, J. F., Tennyson, R., & Wrangham, R. W. (2011). Male more than female infants imitate propulsive motion. *Cognition*, *121*, 262–267. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.cognition.2011.07.006

Bentley, C. G., Galliher, R. V., & Ferguson, T. J. (2007). Associations among aspects of interpersonal power and relationship functioning in adolescent romantic couples. *Sex Roles*, *57*, 483–495. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11199-007-9280-7

Berlan, E. D., Corliss, H. L., Field, A. E., Goodman, E., & Bryn Austin, S. (2010). Sexual orientation and bullying among adolescents in the Growing Up Today study. *Journal of Adolescent Health*, *46*, 366–371. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jadohealth.2009.10.015

Birkett, M., Espelage, D. L., & Koenig, B. (2009). LGB and questioning students in schools: The moderating effects of homophobic bullying and school climate on negative outcomes. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, *38*, 989–1000. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10964-008-9389-1

© 2016 AMERICAN PSYCHOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION. ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

Blazina, C., & Watkins, E. C. (2000). Separation/individuation, parental attachment, and male gender role conflict: Attitudes toward the feminine and the fragile masculine self. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity*, *1*, 126–132. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/1524-9220.1.2.126

Boldizar, J. P. (1991). Assessing sex typing and androgyny in children: The Children's Sex Role Inventory. *Developmental Psychology*, *27*, 505–515. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0012-1649.27.3.505

Bowlby, J. (1969). *Attachment and loss: Vol. 1. Attachment*. New York, NY: Basic Books.

Brendgen, M., Markiewicz, D., Doyle, A. B., & Bukowski, W. M. (2001). The relations between friendship quality, ranked-friendship preference, and adolescents' behavior with their friends. *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly*, *47*, 395–415. http://dx.doi.org/10.1353/mpq.2001.0013

Britner, S. L. (2008). Motivation in high school science students: A comparison of gender differences in life, physical, and earth science classes. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching*, *45*, 955–970. http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/tea.20249

Brody, L. R. (2000). The socialization of gender differences in emotional expression: Display rules, infant temperament, and differentiation. In A. Fischer (Ed.), *Gender and emotion: Social psychological perspectives* (pp. 24–47). New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Browne, B. (1998). Gender stereotypes in advertising on children's television in the 1990s. *Journal of Advertising*, *27*, 83–96. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00913367.1998.10673544

Buhrmester, D., & Prager, K. (1995). Patterns and functions of self-disclosure during childhood and adolescence. In K. J. Rotenberg (Ed.), *Disclosure processes in children and adolescents* (pp. 10–56). Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press. http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511527746.002

Burleson, B. R. (1982). The development of comforting communication skills in childhood and adolescence. *Child Development*, *53*, 1578–1588. http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/1130086

Busseri, M. A., Willoughby, T., Chalmers, H., & Bogaert, A. F. (2008). On the association between sexual attraction and adolescent risk behavior involvement: Examining mediation and moderation. *Developmental Psychology*, *44*, 69–80. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0012-1649.44.1.69

Bussey, K., & Bandura, A. (1999). Social cognitive theory of gender development and differentiation. *Psychological Review*, *106*, 676–713. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0033-295X.106.4.676

Caldera, Y. M., Culp, A. M., O'Brien, M., Truglio, R. T., Alvarez, M., & Huston, A. C. (1999). Children's play preferences, construction play with blocks, and visual-spatial skills: Are they related? *International Journal of Behavioral Development*, *23*, 855–872. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/016502599383577

Card, N. A., Stucky, B. D., Sawalani, G. M., & Little, T. D. (2008). Direct and indirect aggression during childhood and adolescence: A meta-analytic review of gender differences, intercorrelations, and relations to maladjustment. *Child Development*, *79*, 1185–1229. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8624.2008.01184.x

Carlo, G., Raffaelli, M., Laible, D., & Meyer, K. (1999). Why are females less aggressive than males? Personality and parenting mediators of aggression. *Sex Roles*, *40*, 711–729. http://dx.doi.org/10.1023/A:1018856601513

Chang, L. (2004). The role of classroom norms in contextualizing the relations of children's social behaviors to peer acceptance. *Developmental Psychology*, *40*, 691–702. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0012-1649.40.5.691

Chapleau, K. M., Oswald, D. L., & Russell, B. L. (2007). How ambivalent sexism toward women and men support rape myth acceptance. *Sex Roles*, *57*, 131–136. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11199-007-9196-2

Cherney, I. D., Kelly-Vance, L., Gill, K., Ruane, A., & Ryalls, B. O. (2003). The effects of stereotyped toys and gender on play assessment in children aged 18–47 months. *Educational Psychology*, *23*, 95–106. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/01443410303222

Chu, J. Y., Porche, M. V., & Tolman, D. L. (2005). The Adolescent Masculinity Ideology in Relationships Scale: Development and validation of a new measure for boys. *Men and Masculinities*, *8*, 93–115. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1097184X03257453

Cohane, G. H., & Pope, H. G., Jr. (2001). Body image in boys: A review of the literature. *International Journal of Eating Disorders*, *29*, 373–379. http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/eat.1033

Collier, K. L., Bos, H. M., & Sandfort, T. G. M. (2013). Homophobic name-calling among secondary school students and its implications for mental health. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, *42*, 363–375. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10964-012-9823-2

Collins, W. A. (2003). More than myth: The developmental significance of romantic relationships during adolescence. *Journal of Research on Adolescence*, *13*, 1–24. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/1532-7795.1301001

Crockett, L., Losoff, M., & Petersen, A. (1984). Perceptions of the peer group and friendship in early adolescence. *Journal of Early Adolescence*, *4*, 155–181. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0272431684042004

Crouter, A. C., Bumpus, M. F., Davis, K. D., & McHale, S. M. (2005). How do parents learn about adolescents' experiences? Implications for parental knowledge and adolescent risky behavior. *Child Development*,

© 2016 AMERICAN PSYCHOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION. ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

76, 869–882. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8624.2005.00883.x

Crouter, A. C., Whiteman, S. D., McHale, S. M., & Osgood, D. W. (2007). Development of gender attitude traditionality across middle childhood and adolescence. *Child Development*, *78*, 911–926. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8624.2007.01040.x

Davis, S. N. (2007). Gender ideology construction from adolescence to young adulthood. *Social Science Research*, *36*, 1021–1041. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ssresearch.2006.08.001

DeFranc, J. R., & Mahalik, G. E. (2002). Masculine gender role conflict and stress in relation to parental attachment and separation. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity*, *3*, 51–60. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/1524-9220.3.1.51

Del Giudice, M. (2008). Sex-biased ratio of avoidant/ambivalent attachment in middle childhood. *British Journal of Developmental Psychology*, *26*, 367–379.

DeLoache, J. S., Simcock, G., & Macari, S. (2007). Planes, trains, automobiles—And tea sets: Extremely intense interests in very young children. *Developmental Psychology*, *43*, 1579–1586. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0012-1649.43.6.1579

DeSouza, E. R., & Ribeiro, J. (2005). Bullying and sexual harassment among Brazilian high school students. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, *20*, 1018–1038. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0886260505277731

Devine, R. T., & Hughes, C. (2013). Silent films and strange stories: Theory of mind, gender, and social experiences in middle childhood. *Child Development*, *84*, 989–1003. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/cdev.12017

Diamond, L. M., & Lucas, S. (2004). Sexual-minority and heterosexual youths' peer relationships: Experiences, expectations, and implications for well-being. *Journal of Research on Adolescence*, *14*, 313–340. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1532-7795.2004.00077.x

Dishion, T. J., & McMahon, R. J. (1998). Parental monitoring and the prevention of child and adolescent problem behavior: A conceptual and empirical formulation. *Clinical Child and Family Psychology Review*, *1*, 61–75. http://dx.doi.org/10.1023/A:1021800432380

Dodge, K. A., Coie, J. D., Pettit, G. S., & Price, J. M. (1990). Peer status and aggression in boys' groups: Developmental and contextual analyses. *Child Development*, *61*, 1289–1309. http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/1130743

Dodge, K. A., & Pettit, G. S. (2003). A biopsychosocial model of the development of chronic conduct problems in adolescence. *Developmental Psychology*, *39*, 349–371. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0012-1649.39.2.349

Dowdy, B. B., & Kliewer, W. (1998). Dating, parent-adolescent conflict, and behavioral autonomy. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, *27*, 473–492. http://dx.doi.org/10.1023/A:1022852102847

Duckworth, A. L., & Seligman, M. E. P. (2006). Self-discipline gives girls the edge: Gender in self-discipline, grades, and achievement. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, *98*, 198–208. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0022-0663.98.1.198

Durán, M., Moya, M., Megías, J. L., & Viki, G. T. (2010). Social perception of rape victims in dating and married relationships: The role of perpetrator's benevolent sexism. *Sex Roles*, *62*, 505–519. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11199-009-9676-7

Egan, S. K., & Perry, D. G. (2001). Gender identity: A multidimensional analysis with implications for psychosocial adjustment. *Developmental Psychology*, *37*, 451–463. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0012-1649.37.4.451

Eisenberg, N., & Fabes, R. A. (1998). Prosocial development. In W. Damon (Series Ed.) & N. Eisenberg (Ed.), *Handbook of child psychology: Vol. 3. Social, emotional, and personality development* (5th ed., pp. 701–778). New York, NY: Wiley.

Eliot, L. (2009). *Pink brain, blue brain*. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin.

Else-Quest, N. M., Hyde, J. S., Goldsmith, H. H., & Van Hulle, C. A. (2006). Gender differences in temperament: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, *132*, 33–72. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.132.1.33

Else-Quest, N. M., Hyde, J. S., & Linn, M. C. (2010). Cross-national patterns of gender differences in mathematics: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, *136*, 103–127. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0018053

Fagot, B. I., & Leinbach, M. D. (1989). The young child's gender schema: Environmental input, internal organization. *Child Development*, *60*, 663–672. http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/1130731

Ferragut, M., Blanca, M. J., & Ortiz-Tallo, M. (2014). Psychological virtues during adolescence: A longitudinal study of gender differences. *European Journal of Developmental Psychology*, *11*, 1–11.

Foshee, V. A. (1996). Gender differences in adolescent dating abuse prevalence, types and injuries. *Health Education Research*, *11*, 275–286. http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/her/11.3.275-a

Galambos, N. L., Petersen, A. C., Richards, M., & Gitelson, I. B. (1985). The Attitudes Toward Women Scale for Adolescents (AWSA): A study of reliability and validity. *Sex Roles*, *13*, 343–356. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/BF00288090

Ganley, C. M., & Vasilyeva, M. (2011). Sex differences in the relation between math performance, spatial skills, and attitudes. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology*, *32*, 235–242. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.appdev.2011.04.001

© 2016 AMERICAN PSYCHOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION. ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

Giordano, P. C., Longmore, M. A., & Manning, W. D. (2006). Gender and the meanings of adolescent romantic relationships: A focus on boys. *American Sociological Review*, *71*, 260–287. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/000312240607100205

Giordano, P. C., Soto, D. A., Manning, W. D., & Longmore, M. A. (2010). The characteristics of romantic relationships associated with teen dating violence. *Social Science Research*, *39*, 863–874. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ssresearch.2010.03.009

Glick, P., & Fiske, S. T. (1996). The Ambivalent Sexism Inventory: Differentiating hostile and benevolent sexism. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *70*, 491–512. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.70.3.491

Greenwald, A. G., Banaji, M. R., Rudman, L. A., Farnham, S. D., Nosek, B. A., & Mellott, D. S. (2002). A unified theory of implicit attitudes, stereotypes, self-esteem, and self-concept. *Psychological Review*, *109*, 3–25. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0033-295X.109.1.3

Griffin, K. W., Botvin, G. J., Scheier, L. M., Diaz, T., & Miller, N. L. (2000). Parenting practices as predictors of substance use, delinquency, and aggression among urban minority youth: Moderating effects of family structure and gender. *Psychology of Addictive Behaviors*, *14*, 174–184. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0893-164X.14.2.174

Guimond, S., & Roussel, L. (2001). Bragging about one's school grades: Gender stereotyping and students' perception of their abilities in science, mathematics, and language. *Social Psychology of Education*, *4*, 275–293. http://dx.doi.org/10.1023/A:1011332704215

Haapasalo, J., & Tremblay, R. E. (1994). Physically aggressive boys from ages 6 to 12: Family background, parenting behavior, and prediction of delinquency. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, *62*, 1044–1052. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0022-006X.62.5.1044

Haldeman, D. C. (2000). Gender atypical youth: Clinical and social issues. *School Psychology Review*, *29*, 192–200.

Hall, J. A., & Halberstadt, A. G. (1980). Masculinity and femininity in children: Development of the Children's Personal Attributes Questionnaire. *Developmental Psychology*, *16*, 270–280. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0012-1649.16.4.270

Halpern, C. T., Oslak, S. G., Young, M. L., Martin, S. L., & Kupper, L. L. (2001). Partner violence among adolescents in opposite-sex romantic relationships: Findings from the National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent Health. *American Journal of Public Health*, *91*, 1679–1685. http://dx.doi.org/10.2105/AJPH.91.10.1679

Hannon, B. (2012). Test anxiety and performance-avoidance goals explain gender differences in SAT-V, SAT-M, and overall SAT scores. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *53*, 816–820. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2012.06.003

Harris, A. C. (1996). African American and Anglo-American gender identities: An empirical study. *Journal of Black Psychology*, *22*, 182–194. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/00957984960222004

Hay, D. F. (2007). The gradual emergence of sex differences in aggression: Alternative hypotheses. *Psychological Medicine*, *37*, 1527–1537. http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S0033291707000165

Henrich, J., Heine, S. J., & Norenzayan, A. (2010). The weirdest people in the world? *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, *33*, 61–83. http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S0140525X0999152X

Herbert, J., & Stipek, D. (2005). The emergence of gender differences in children's perceptions of their academic competence. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology*, *26*, 276–295. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.appdev.2005.02.007

Hines, M. (2013). Sex and sex differences. In P. D. Zelazo (Ed.), *Oxford handbook of developmental psychology* (Vol. 1, pp. 164–201). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Hoff Sommers, C. (2000). *The war against boys: How misguided feminism is harming young men*. New York, NY: Touchstone.

Huesmann, L. R., Moise-Titus, J., Podolski, C. L., & Eron, L. D. (2003). Longitudinal relations between children's exposure to TV violence and their aggressive and violent behavior in young adulthood: 1977–1992. *Developmental Psychology*, *39*, 201–221. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0012-1649.39.2.201

Hussong, A. M. (2000). Distinguishing mean and structural sex differences in adolescent friendship quality. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, *17*, 223–243. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0265407500172004

Hyde, J. S. (2005). The gender similarities hypothesis. *American Psychologist*, *60*, 581–592. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.60.6.581

Jackson, C., & Dempster, S. (2009). "I sat back on my computer . . . with a bottle of whisky next to me": Constructing "cool" masculinity through "effortless" achievement in secondary and higher education. *Journal of Gender Studies*, *18*, 341–356. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/09589230903260019

Jacobs, J. E., Lanza, S., Osgood, D. W., Eccles, J. S., & Wigfield, A. (2002). Changes in children's self-competence and values: Gender and domain differences across grades one through twelve. *Child Development*, *73*, 509–527. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/1467-8624.00421

Jarvinen, D. W., & Nicholls, J. G. (1996). Adolescents' social goals, beliefs about the causes of social

© 2016 AMERICAN PSYCHOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION. ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

success, and satisfaction in peer relations. *Developmental Psychology*, *32*, 435–441. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0012-1649.32.3.435

Jones, D. C. (2001). Social comparison and body image: Attractiveness comparisons to models and peers among adolescent girls and boys. *Sex Roles*, *45*, 645–664. http://dx.doi.org/10.1023/A:1014815725852

Jones, D. C., Vigfusdottir, T. H., & Lee, Y. (2004). Body image and the appearance culture among adolescent girls and boys: An examination of friend conversations, peer criticism, appearance magazines, and the internalization of appearance ideals. *Journal of Adolescent Research*, *19*, 323–339. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0743558403258847

Kane, E. W. (2006). "No way my boys are going to be like that!" Parents' responses to children's gender nonconformity. *Gender and Society*, *20*, 149–176. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0891243205284276

Katz, P. A., & Ksansnak, K. R. (1994). Developmental aspects of gender role flexibility and traditionality in middle childhood and adolescence. *Developmental Psychology*, *30*, 272–282. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0012-1649.30.2.272

Kawaguchi, M. C., Welsh, D. P., Powers, S. I., & Rostosky, S. S. (1998). Mothers, fathers, sons, and daughters: Temperament, gender, and adolescent-parent relationships. *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly*, *44*, 77–96.

Knight, G. P., Guthrie, I. K., Page, M. C., & Fabes, R. A. (2002). Emotional arousal and gender differences in aggression: A meta-analysis. *Aggressive Behavior*, *28*, 366–393. http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/ab.80011

Kohlberg, L. A. (1966). A cognitive-developmental analysis of children's sex role concepts and attitudes. In E. E. Maccoby (Ed.), *The development of sex differences* (pp. 82–173). Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Leaper, C. (1991). Influence and involvement in children's discourse: Age, gender, and partner effects. *Child Development*, *62*, 797–811. http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/1131178

Leaper, C. (2000). The social construction and socialization of gender. In P. H. Miller & E. K. Scholnick (Eds.), *Toward a feminist developmental psychology* (pp. 127–152). New York, NY: Routledge Press.

Leaper, C. (2015). Gender and social–cognitive development. In R. M. Lerner (Series Ed.), L. Liben, & U. Mueller (Vol. Eds.), *Handbook of child psychology and developmental science: Vol. 2. Cognitive processes* (7th ed., pp. 806–853). New York, NY: Wiley.

Leaper, C., & Robnett, R. D. (2011). Sexism. In R. J. R. Levesque (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of adolescence* (pp. 2641–2648). New York, NY: Springer. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4419-1695-2_226

Leaper, C., & Smith, T. E. (2004). A meta-analytic review of gender variations in children's language use: Talkativeness, affiliative speech, and assertive speech. *Developmental Psychology*, *40*, 993–1027. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0012-1649.40.6.993

Leaper, C., Tenenbaum, H. R., & Shaffer, T. G. (1999). Communication patterns of African American girls and boys from low-income, urban backgrounds. *Child Development*, *70*, 1489–1503. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/1467-8624.00108

Leinbach, M. D., & Fagot, B. I. (1986). Acquisition of gender labels: A test for toddlers. *Sex Roles*, *15*, 655–666. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/BF00288221

Levant, R. F. (2005). The crises of boyhood. In G. E. Good & G. R. Brooks (Eds.), *The new handbook of psychotherapy and counseling with men: A comprehensive guide to settings, problems, and treatment approaches* (2nd ed., pp. 161–171). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Levant, R. F., Graef, S. T., Smalley, K. B., Williams, C., & McMillan, N. (2008). Evaluation of the psychometric properties of the Male Role Norms Inventory—Adolescent (MRNI–A). *Thymos: Journal of Boyhood Studies*, *2*, 46–59.

Levant, R. F., Rogers, B. K., Cruickshank, B., Rankin, T. J., Kurtz, B. A., Rummell, C. M., . . . Colbow, A. J. (2012). Exploratory factor analysis and construct validity of the Male Role Norms Inventory—Adolescent—revised (MRNI–A–r). *Psychology of Men & Masculinity*, *13*, 354–366. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0029102

Levant, R. F., Smalley, K. B., Aupont, M., House, A. T., Richmond, K., & Noronha, D. (2007). Initial validation of the Male Role Norms Inventory—Revised (MRNI–R). *Journal of Men's Studies*, *15*, 83–100. http://dx.doi.org/10.3149/jms.1501.83

Lever, J. (1976). Sex differences in the games children play. *Social Problems*, *23*, 478–487. http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/799857

Lichtwarck-Aschoff, A., Finkenauer, C., van de Vorst, H., & Engels, R. C. (2012). Being mum's confidant, a boon or bane? Examining gender differences in the association of maternal disclosure with adolescents' depressive feelings. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, *41*, 449–459. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10964-011-9661-7

Lindberg, S. M., Hyde, J. S., Petersen, J. L., & Linn, M. C. (2010). New trends in gender and mathematics performance: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, *136*, 1123–1135. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0021276

Littleton, H. L., & Ollendick, T. (2003). Negative body image and disordered eating behavior in children and adolescents: What places youth at risk and how can these problems be prevented? *Clinical Child and Family Psychology Review*, *6*, 51–66. http://dx.doi.org/10.1023/A:1022266017046

© 2016 AMERICAN PSYCHOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION. ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

Longmore, M. A., Manning, W. D., & Giordano, P. C. (2001). Preadolescent parenting strategies and teens' dating and sexual initiation: A longitudinal analysis. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, *63*, 322–335. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1741-3737.2001.00322.x

Losen, D. J. (2011). *Discipline policies, successful schools, and racial justice*. Boulder, CO: National Education Policy Center. Retrieved from http://nepc.colorado.edu/publication/discipline-policies

Lott, B. (1981). A feminist critique of androgyny: Toward the elimination of gender attributions for learned behavior. In C. Mayo & N. N. Henley (Eds.), *Gender and nonverbal behavior* (pp. 171–180). New York, NY: Springer. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4612-5953-4_9

Lytton, H., & Romney, D. M. (1991). Parents' differential socialization of boys and girls: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, *109*, 267–296. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.109.2.267

Maccoby, E. E. (1998). *The two sexes: Growing up apart, coming together*. Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press/Harvard University Press.

Maccoby, E. E., & Jacklin, C. N. (Eds.). (1974). *The psychology of sex differences*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Madsen, S. D. (2008). Parents' management of adolescents' romantic relationships through dating rules: Gender variations and correlates of relationship qualities. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, *37*, 1044–1058. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10964-008-9313-8

Majors, R., & Billson, J. M. (1992). *Cool pose*. New York, NY: Lexington Books.

Martin, C. L., & Fabes, R. A. (2001). The stability and consequences of young children's same-sex peer interactions. *Developmental Psychology*, *37*, 431–446. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0012-1649.37.3.431

Martin, C. L., Ruble, D. N., & Szkrybalo, J. (2002). Cognitive theories of early gender development. *Psychological Bulletin*, *128*, 903–933. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.128.6.903

Mayseless, O., Wiseman, H., & Hai, I. (1998). Adolescents' relationships with father, mother, and same-gender friend. *Journal of Adolescent Research*, *13*, 101–123. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0743554898131006

McCabe, M. P., & Ricciardelli, L. A. (2003). Sociocultural influences on body image and body changes among adolescent boys and girls. *Journal of Social Psychology*, *143*, 5–26. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00224540309598428

McClure, E. B. (2000). A meta-analytic review of sex differences in facial expression processing and their development in infants, children, and adolescents. *Psychological Bulletin*, *126*, 424–453. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.126.3.424

McHale, S. M., Kim, J.-Y., Dotterer, A. M., Crouter, A. C., & Booth, A. (2009). The development of gendered interests and personality qualities from middle childhood through adolescence: A biosocial analysis. *Child Development*, *80*, 482–495. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8624.2009.01273.x

McHale, S. M., Kim, J.-Y., Whiteman, S., & Crouter, A. C. (2004). Links between sex-typed time use in middle childhood and gender development in early adolescence. *Developmental Psychology*, *40*, 868–881. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0012-1649.40.5.868

McNelles, L. R., & Connolly, J. A. (1999). Intimacy between adolescent friends: Age and gender differences in intimate affect and intimate behaviors. *Journal of Research on Adolescence*, *9*, 143–159. http://dx.doi.org/10.1207/s15327795jra0902_2

Miller, D. C., & Byrnes, J. P. (2001). Adolescents' decision making in social situations: A self-regulation perspective. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology*, *22*, 237–256. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0193-3973(01)00082-X

Miller, P. M., Danaher, D. L., & Forbes, D. (1986). Sex-related strategies for coping with interpersonal conflict in children aged five and seven. *Developmental Psychology*, *22*, 543–548. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0012-1649.22.4.543

Montañés, P., de Lemus, S., Moya, M., Bohner, G., & Megias, J. L. (2013). How attractive are sexist intimates to adolescents? The influence of sexist beliefs and relationship experience. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, *37*, 494–506. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0361684313475998

Moretti, M. M., Obsuth, I., Odgers, C. L., & Reebye, P. (2006). Exposure to maternal vs. paternal partner violence, PTSD, and aggression in adolescent girls and boys. *Aggressive Behavior*, *32*, 385–395. http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/ab.20137

Muris, P., Meesters, C., van de Blom, W., & Mayer, B. (2005). Biological, psychological, and sociocultural correlates of body change strategies and eating problems in adolescent boys and girls. *Eating Behaviors*, *6*, 11–22. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.eatbeh.2004.03.002

Murnen, S. K., Wright, C., & Kaluzny, G. (2002). If "boys will be boys," then girls will be victims? A meta-analytic review of the research that relates masculine ideology to sexual aggression. *Sex Roles*, *46*, 359–375. http://dx.doi.org/10.1023/A:1020488928736

National Center for Education Statistics. (2013). *Digest of education statistics*. Washington, DC: Author. Retrieved from http://nces.ed.gov

National Science Foundation. (2013). *Women, minorities, and persons with disabilities in science and engineering*. Washington, DC: Author. Retrieved from http://www.nsf.gov/statistics/wmpd

© 2016 AMERICAN PSYCHOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION. ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

Oliver, K. K., & Thelen, M. H. (1996). Children's perceptions of peer influence on eating concerns. *Behavior Therapy*, *27*, 25–39. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0005-7894(96)80033-5

Olweus, D. (1980). Familial and temperamental determinants of aggressive behavior in adolescent boys: A causal analysis. *Developmental Psychology*, *16*, 644–660. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0012-1649.16.6.644

Oransky, M., & Fisher, C. (2009). The development and validation of the Meanings of Adolescent Masculinity Scale. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity*, *10*, 57–72. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0013612

Oransky, M., & Marecek, J. (2009). "I'm not going to be a girl": Masculinity and emotions in boys' friendships and peer groups. *Journal of Adolescent Research*, *24*, 218–241. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0743558408329951

Orr, A. J. (2011). Gendered capital: Childhood socialization and the "boy crisis" in education. *Sex Roles*, *65*, 271–284. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11199-011-0016-3

Österman, K., Björkqvist, K., Lagerspetz, K. M. J., Kaukiainen, A., Huesmann, L. R., & Frączek, A. (1994). Peer and self-estimated aggression and victimization in 8-year-old children from five ethnic groups. *Aggressive Behavior*, *20*, 411–428. http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/1098-2337(1994)20:6<411::AID-AB2480200602>3.0.CO;2-4

Pagano, M. E., & Hirsch, B. J. (2007). Friendships and romantic relationships of Black and White adolescents. *Journal of Child and Family Studies*, *16*, 347–357. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10826-006-9090-5

Paik, H., & Comstock, G. (1994). The effects of television violence on antisocial behavior: A meta-analysis. *Communication Research*, *21*, 516–546. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/009365094021004004

Pajares, F., Miller, M. D., & Johnson, M. J. (1999). Gender differences in writing self-beliefs of elementary school students. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, *91*, 50–61. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0022-0663.91.1.50

Pajares, F., & Valiante, G. (2001). Gender differences in writing motivation and achievement of middle school students: A function of gender orientation? *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, *26*, 366–381. http://dx.doi.org/10.1006/ceps.2000.1069

Patterson, G. R., Reid, J. B., & Dishion, T. J. (1992). *Antisocial boys*. Eugene, OR: Castalia.

Peplau, L. A., & Fingerhut, A. W. (2007). The close relationships of lesbians and gay men. *Annual Review of Psychology*, *58*, 405–424. http://dx.doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.58.110405.085701

Peterson, K. A., Paulson, S. E., & Williams, K. K. (2007). Relations of eating disorder symptomatology with perceptions of pressures from mothers, peers, and media in adolescent boys and girls. *Sex Roles*, *57*, 629–639. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11199-007-9296-z

Phares, V., Steinberg, A. R., & Thompson, J. K. (2004). Gender differences in peer and parental influences: Body image disturbance, self-worth, and psychological functioning in preadolescent children. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, *33*, 421–429. http://dx.doi.org/10.1023/B:JOYO.0000037634.18749.20

Phoenix, A., Frosh, S., & Pattman, R. (2003). Producing contradictory masculine subject positions: Narratives of threat, homophobia and bullying in 11–14 year old boys. *Journal of Social Issues*, *59*, 179–195. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/1540-4560.t01-1-00011

Pierce, T. (2009). Social anxiety and technology: Face-to-face communication versus technological communication among teens. *Computers in Human Behavior*, *25*, 1367–1372. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2009.06.003

Pike, J. J., & Jennings, N. A. (2005). The effects of commercials on children's perceptions of gender appropriate toy use. *Sex Roles*, *52*, 83–91. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11199-005-1195-6

Piko, B. F., & Hamvai, C. (2010). Parent, school and peer-related correlates of adolescents' life satisfaction. *Children and Youth Services Review*, *32*, 1479–1482. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.childyouth.2010.07.007

Pleck, J. (1995). The gender role strain paradigm. An update. In R. F. Levant & W. S. Pollack (Eds.), *A new psychology of men* (pp. 11–32). New York, NY: Basic Books.

Pleck, J. H., Sonenstein, F. L., & Ku, L. C. (1993). Masculinity ideology: Its impact on adolescent males' heterosexual relationships. *Journal of Social Issues*, *49*, 11–29. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4560.1993.tb01166.x

Pomerantz, E. M., Altermatt, E. R., & Saxon, J. L. (2002). Making the grade but feeling distressed: Gender differences in academic performance and internal distress. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, *94*, 396–404. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0022-0663.94.2.396

Prinstein, M. J., Boergers, J., & Vernberg, E. M. (2001). Overt and relational aggression in adolescents: Social-psychological adjustment of aggressors and victims. *Journal of Clinical Child Psychology*, *30*, 479–491. http://dx.doi.org/10.1207/S15374424JCCP3004_05

Putallaz, M., Grimes, C. L., Foster, K. J., Kupersmidt, J. B., Coie, J. D., & Dearing, K. (2007). Overt and relational aggression and victimization: Multiple perspectives within the school setting. *Journal of School Psychology*, *45*, 523–547. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jsp.2007.05.003

© 2016 AMERICAN PSYCHOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION. ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

Reyes, H. L. M., & Foshee, V. A. (2013). Sexual dating aggression across grades 8 through 12: Timing and predictors of onset. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, *42*, 581–595. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10964-012-9864-6

Ricciardelli, L. A., & McCabe, M. P. (2003). A longitudinal analysis of the role of biopsychosocial factors in predicting body change strategies among adolescent boys. *Sex Roles*, *48*, 349–359. http://dx.doi.org/10.1023/A:1022942614727

Ricciardelli, L. A., McCabe, M. P., Lillis, J., & Thomas, K. (2006). A longitudinal investigation of the development of weight and muscle concerns among preadolescent boys. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, *35*, 168–178. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10964-005-9004-7

Richmond, K., & Levant, R. (2003). Clinical application of the gender role strain paradigm: Group treatment for adolescent boys. *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, *59*, 1237–1245. http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/jclp.10214

Ridgeway, C. L., & Bourg, C. (2004). Gender as status: An expectation states theory approach. In A. H. Eagly, A. E. Beall, & R. J. Sternberg (Eds.), *The psychology of gender* (pp. 217–241). New York, NY: Guilford Press.

Rieger, G., Linsenmeier, J. A., Gygax, L., & Bailey, J. M. (2008). Sexual orientation and childhood gender nonconformity: Evidence from home videos. *Developmental Psychology*, *44*, 46–58. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0012-1649.44.1.46

Robnett, R. D., & Leaper, C. (2013). “Girls don’t propose! Ew.”: A mixed-methods examination of marriage tradition preferences and benevolent sexism in emerging adults. *Journal of Adolescent Research*, *28*, 96–121. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0743558412447871

Rose, A. J., & Asher, S. R. (2000). Children’s friendships. In C. Hendrick & S. S. Hendrick (Eds.), *Close relationships: A sourcebook* (pp. 47–57). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Rose, A. J., & Rudolph, K. D. (2006). A review of sex differences in peer relationship processes: Potential trade-offs for the emotional and behavioral development of girls and boys. *Psychological Bulletin*, *132*, 98–131. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.132.1.98

Russell, A., & Owens, L. (1999). Peer estimates of school-aged boys’ and girls’ aggression to same- and cross-sex targets. *Social Development*, *8*, 364–379. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/1467-9507.00101

Salmivalli, C., Lagerspetz, K., Björkqvist, K., Österman, K., & Kaukiainen, A. (1996). Bullying as a group process: Participant roles and their relations to social status within the group. *Aggressive Behavior*, *22*, 1–15. http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/(SICI)1098-2337(1996)22:1<1::AID-AB1>3.0.CO;2-T

Santos, C. E., Galligan, K., Pahlke, E., & Fabes, R. A. (2013). Gender-typed behaviors, achievement, and adjustment among racially and ethnically diverse boys during early adolescence. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, *83*, 252–264. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/ajop.12036

Savin-Williams, R. C., & Diamond, L. M. (2000). Sexual identity trajectories among sexual-minority youths: Gender comparisons. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, *29*, 607–627. http://dx.doi.org/10.1023/A:1002058505138

Sax, L. (2009). *Boys adrift: The five factors driving the growing epidemic of unmotivated boys and underachieving young men*. New York, NY: Basic Books.

Schouten, A. P., Valkenburg, P. M., & Peter, J. (2007). Precursors and underlying processes of adolescents’ online self-disclosure: Developing and testing an “Internet-attribute-perception” model. *Media Psychology*, *10*, 292–315. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/15213260701375686

Selman, R. L. (1980). *The growth of interpersonal understanding*. New York, NY: Academic Press.

Selman, R. L., Beardslee, W., Schultz, L. H., Krupa, M., & Podorefsky, D. (1986). Assessing adolescent interpersonal negotiation strategies: Toward the integration of structural and functional models. *Developmental Psychology*, *22*, 450–459. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0012-1649.22.4.450

Servin, A., & Bohlin, G. (1999). Do Swedish mothers have sex-stereotyped expectations and wishes regarding their own children? *Infant and Child Development*, *8*, 197–210. http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/(SICI)1522-7219(199912)8:4<197::AID-ICD198>3.0.CO;2-H

Servin, A., Bohlin, G., & Berlin, L. (1999). Sex differences in 1-, 3-, and 5-year-olds’ toy-choice in a structured play-session. *Scandinavian Journal of Psychology*, *40*, 43–48. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/1467-9450.00096

Siegel, J. M., Yancey, A. K., Aneshensel, C. S., & Schuler, R. (1999). Body image, perceived pubertal timing, and adolescent mental health. *Journal of Adolescent Health*, *25*, 155–165. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S1054-139X(98)00160-8

Signorielli, N. (2012). Television’s gender-role images and contribution to stereotyping: Past, present, future. In D. G. Singer & J. L. Singer (Eds.), *Handbook of children and the media* (2nd ed., pp. 321–339). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Sikora, J., & Pokropek, A. (2012). Gender segregation of adolescent science career plans in 50 countries. *Science Education*, *96*, 234–264. http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/sce.20479

Simpkins, S. D., Davis-Kean, P. E., & Eccles, J. S. (2006). Math and science motivation: A longitudinal examination of the links between choices and beliefs. *Developmental Psychology*, *42*, 70–83. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0012-1649.42.1.70

© 2016 AMERICAN PSYCHOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION. ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

Smith, R. L., & Rose, A. J. (2011). The "cost of caring" in youths' friendships: Considering associations among social perspective taking, co-rumination, and empathetic distress. *Developmental Psychology*, *47*, 1792–1803. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0025309

Smolak, L., Levine, M. P., & Schermer, F. (1999). Parental input and weight concerns among elementary school children. *International Journal of Eating Disorders*, *25*, 263–271. http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/(SICI)1098-108X(199904)25:3<263::AID-EAT3>3.0.CO;2-V

Smolak, L., & Stein, J. A. (2006). The relationship of drive for muscularity to sociocultural factors, self-esteem, physical attributes gender role, and social comparison in middle school boys. *Body Image*, *3*, 121–129. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.bodyim.2006.03.002

Solomon, J., & George, C. (2008). The measurement of attachment security and related constructs in infancy and early childhood. In J. Cassidy & P. R. Shaver (Eds.), *Handbook of attachment: Theory, research, and clinical applications* (2nd ed., pp. 383–418). New York, NY: Guilford Press.

Spence, J. T., & Hall, S. K. (1996). Children's gender-related self-perceptions, activity preferences, and occupational stereotypes: A test of three models of gender constructs. *Sex Roles*, *35*, 659–691. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/BF01544086

Spence, J. T., & Helmreich, R. L. (1978). *Masculinity and femininity: Their psychological dimensions, correlates, and antecedents*. Austin: University of Texas Press.

Stattin, H., & Kerr, M. (2000). Parental monitoring: A reinterpretation. *Child Development*, *71*, 1072–1085. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/1467-8624.00210

Steele, J. (2003). Children's gender stereotypes about math: The role of stereotype stratification. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, *33*, 2587–2606. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1559-1816.2003.tb02782.x

Steinfeldt, J. A., Vaughan, E. L., LaFollette, J. R., & Steinfeldt, M. C. (2012). Bullying among adolescent football players: Role of masculinity and moral atmosphere. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity*, *13*, 340–353. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0026645

Strom Larson, M. (2001). Interactions, activities and gender in children's television commercials: A content analysis. *Journal of Broadcasting and Electronic Media*, *45*, 41–56. http://dx.doi.org/10.1207/s15506878jobem4501_4

Strough, J., & Berg, C. A. (2000). Goals as a mediator of gender differences in high-affiliation dyadic conversations. *Developmental Psychology*, *36*, 117–125. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0012-1649.36.1.117

Svensson, R. (2003). Gender differences in adolescent drug use: The impact of parental monitoring and peer deviance. *Youth and Society*, *34*, 300–329. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0044118X02250095

Swahn, M. H., Simon, T. R., Arias, I., & Bossarte, R. M. (2008). Measuring sex differences in violence victimization and perpetration within date and same-sex peer relationships. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, *23*, 1120–1138. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0886260508314086

Swearer, S. M., Turner, R. K., Givens, J. E., & Pollack, W. S. (2008). "You're so gay!": Do different forms of bullying matter for adolescent males? *School Psychology Review*, *37*, 160–173.

Tatum, B. D. (1997). *Why are all the Black kids sitting together in the cafeteria?* New York, NY: Basic Books.

Thomas, K. D., & Levant, R. F. (2012). Does the endorsement of traditional masculinity ideology moderate the relationship between exposure to violent video games and aggression? *Journal of Men's Studies*, *20*, 47–56. http://dx.doi.org/10.3149/jms.2001.47

Thompson, E. H., & Pleck, J. H. (1995). Masculinity ideologies: A review of research instrumentation on men and masculinities. In R. F. Levant & W. S. Pollack (Eds.), *A new psychology of men* (pp. 129–163). New York, NY: Basic Books.

Thompson, S. H., Corwin, S. J., & Sargent, R. G. (1997). Ideal body size beliefs and weight concerns of fourth-grade children. *International Journal of Eating Disorders*, *21*, 279–284. http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/(SICI)1098-108X(199704)21:3<279::AID-EAT8>3.0.CO;2-H

Tobin, D. D., Menon, M., Menon, M., Spatta, B. C., Hodges, E. V. E., & Perry, D. G. (2010). The intrapsychics of gender: A model of self-socialization. *Psychological Review*, *117*, 601–622. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0018936

Turner, K. L., & Brown, C. S. (2007). The centrality of gender and ethnic identities across individuals and contexts. *Social Development*, *16*, 700–719. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9507.2007.00403.x

Underwood, M. K. (2011). Aggression. In M. K. Underwood & L. H. Rosen (Eds.), *Social development: Relationships in infancy, childhood, and adolescence* (pp. 207–234). New York, NY: Guilford Press.

Underwood, M. K., & Rosen, L. H. (2009). Gender, peer relations, and challenges for girlfriends and boyfriends coming together in adolescence. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, *33*, 16–20. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1471-6402.2008.01468.x

Valiente, C., Swanson, J., & Eisenberg, N. (2012). Linking students' emotions and academic achievement: When and why emotions matter. *Child Development Perspectives*, *6*, 129–135. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1750-8606.2011.00192.x

© 2016 AMERICAN PSYCHOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION. ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

van Goozen, S. H., Matthys, W., Cohen-Kettenis, P. T., Thijssen, J. H., & van Engeland, H. (1998). Adrenal androgens and aggression in conduct disorder prepubertal boys and normal controls. *Biological Psychiatry*, *43*, 156–158. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0006-3223(98)00360-6

Van Houtte, M. (2004). Why boys achieve less at school than girls: The difference between boys' and girls' academic culture. *Educational Studies*, *30*, 159–173. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/0305569032000159804

Verkuyten, M., & Thijs, J. (2001). Peer victimization and self-esteem of ethnic minority group children. *Journal of Community and Applied Social Psychology*, *11*, 227–234. http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/casp.628

Wade, J. C., & Donis, E. (2007). Masculinity ideology, male identity, and romantic relationship quality among heterosexual and gay men. *Sex Roles*, *57*, 775–786. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11199-007-9303-4

Walker, S. (2005). Gender differences in the relationship between young children's peer-related social competence and individual differences in theory of mind. *Journal of Genetic Psychology: Research and Theory on Human Development*, *166*, 297–312. http://dx.doi.org/10.3200/GNTP.166.3.297-312

Walker, S., Irving, K., & Berthelsen, D. (2002). Gender influences on preschool children's social problem-solving strategies. *Journal of Genetic Psychology: Research and Theory on Human Development*, *163*, 197–209. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00221320209598677

Wang, M. T., Willett, J. B., & Eccles, J. S. (2011). The assessment of school engagement: Examining dimensionality and measurement invariance by gender and race/ethnicity. *Journal of School Psychology*, *49*, 465–480. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jsp.2011.04.001

Watt, H. M. G. (2004). Development of adolescents' self-perceptions, values, and task perceptions according to gender and domain in 7th- through 11th-grade Australian students. *Child Development*, *75*, 1556–1574. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8624.2004.00757.x

Way, N. (2013). Boys' friendships during adolescence: Intimacy, desire, and loss. *Journal of Research on Adolescence*, *23*, 201–213. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/jora.12047

Way, N., Cowal, K., Gingold, R., Pahl, K., & Bissessar, N. (2001). Friendship patterns among African American, Asian American, and Latino adolescents from low-income families. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, *18*, 29–53. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0265407501181002

Webb, J. A., Bray, J. H., Getz, J. G., & Adams, G. (2002). Gender, perceived parental monitoring, and behavioral adjustment: Influences on adolescent alcohol use. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, *72*, 392–400. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0002-9432.72.3.392

Wigfield, A., & Eccles, J. S. (2000). Expectancy–value theory of achievement motivation. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, *25*, 68–81. http://dx.doi.org/10.1006/ceps.1999.1015

Windle, M., & Mrug, S. (2009). Cross-gender violence perpetration and victimization among early adolescents and associations with attitudes toward dating conflict. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, *38*, 429–439. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10964-008-9328-1

Wood, E., Desmarais, S., & Gugula, S. (2002). The impact of parenting experience on gender stereotyped toy play of children. *Sex Roles*, *47*, 39–49. http://dx.doi.org/10.1023/A:1020679619728

© 2016 AMERICAN PSYCHOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION. ALL RIGHTS RESERVED