UC Santa Cruz
UC Santa Cruz Previously Published Works

Title

Research in developmental psychology on gender and relationships: Reflections on the past and looking into the future

Permalink

https://escholarship.org/uc/item/6zm9p3g1

Journal

British Journal of Developmental Psychology, 29(2)

ISSN

Author

Leaper, Campbell

Publication Date

2011-06-01

DOI

Peer reviewed

The
British
Psychological
Society

Review

Research in developmental psychology on gender and relationships: Reflections on the past and looking into the future

Campbell Leaper*

University of California, Santa Cruz, USA

Recent historical trends and current directions in the study of children's gender and relationships are reviewed using Maccoby and Jacklin's (1974) *The Psychology of Sex Differences* as a reference point. Since the publication of Maccoby and Jacklin's review, researchers have questioned the extent and the magnitude of gender differences in social behaviour as well as the degree to which parents play a primary role in gender development. More attention is now paid to the impact of gender-segregated peer groups and other social relationships (e.g., friendships, romantic relationships) as well as cognitive-motivational and biological processes. Furthermore, the role of the larger social-structural context is addressed in studies of sexism and gender bias during childhood and adolescence. Recommendations for future research are offered.

An important turning point in the developmental psychology of gender occurred in the 1970s with the publication of Eleanor Maccoby and Carol Jacklin's (1974) *The Psychology of Sex Differences*. The authors compiled a landmark summary of over 1,600 research studies testing for gender differences in various behaviours and psychological characteristics. Maccoby and Jacklin's (1974) book challenged and inspired developmental psychologists to think about children's gender development in new ways (Blakemore, Berenbaum, & Liben, 2009). The authors' comprehensive review called into question some prevailing assumptions about the extent of average gender differences and the role of parents in gender socialization. At the same time, Maccoby and Jacklin pointed to the potential influences of peer relationships and personal factors on gender development. Many of these ideas were elaborated two decades later in Maccoby's (1998) *The Two Sexes: Growing Up Apart, Coming Together*. In acknowledgement of Eleanor Maccoby's contributions, I shall use her 1974 book with Carol Jacklin as a reference point to review some historical trends and current directions for this special issue of the *British Journal of Developmental Psychology* on children's gender and relationships.

Correspondence should be addressed to Campbell Leaper, Department of Psychology, University of California, Santa Cruz, Room 277 Social Sciences 2, 1156 High Street, Santa Cruz, CA 95064, USA (e-mail: cam@ucsc.edu).

Questioning the extent of gender differences

After reviewing studies testing for average gender differences, Maccoby and Jacklin (1974) found that there were relatively few attributes and behaviours associated with reliable differences. Whereas researchers tended to report consistent differences in a few areas such as aggression (boys higher) and verbal ability (girls higher), there were many areas in which either no differences or contradictory patterns were indicated. The review foreshadowed a recurring refrain in the psychology of gender in the ensuing decades: In many respects, girls and boys are more similar than different (see Hyde, 2005).

At the time of their review, Maccoby and Jacklin's (1974) ability to synthesize findings across studies in a quantitative manner was limited. The advent of meta-analysis in the 1980s led to two key advances in our understanding (e.g., Hyde & Linn, 1986). First, it was possible to compute the average probability value and effect size across all studies while controlling for the sample size of each study. The ability to infer the average effect size (and the overall statistical significance level) led many researchers to rethink some of their assumptions about the degree that girls and boys (and women and men) differ on certain psychological and behavioural characteristics (see Hyde, 2005). Second, meta-analysis allows testing for moderators of gender differences in particular behaviours. Of particular relevance to this special issue on children's gender and relationships, meta-analyses have been able to highlight how certain gender-related patterns may vary depending on the social relationship (e.g., see Leaper & Smith, 2004).

Questioning the role of parents in children's gender socialization

Until the 1970s, psychoanalytic theory (e.g., Freud, 1927) and social learning theory (e.g., Mischel, 1966) were the two dominant theories in developmental psychology that were invoked to explain children's gender development. Both theories stressed the importance of children's relationship with their parents with particular emphasis on children's identification with or modelling of same-gender parents (in psychoanalytic theory and social learning theory) and parents' differential treatment of girls and boys (in social learning theory). In contrast, very little research prior to the 1970s considered children's gender development in the context of their peer relationships. Following Maccoby and Jacklin's (1974) review, many developmental psychologists began to rethink their views about the degree and the manner by which parents play a role in children's gender socialization. The studies that the authors reviewed generally did not strongly support the premise that children tend to imitate same-gender parents as suggested by psychoanalytic and social learning theories. In addition, the review also called into question the role of parents' differential treatment of girls and boys in gender socialization as stressed in social learning theory. Maccoby and Jacklin (1974) observed that the existing research literature pointed to a 'surprising degree of similarity in the rearing of boys and girls' (p. 362). Nearly two decades later, Lytton and Romney (1991) reported a similar pattern in a meta-analysis.

Maccoby and Jacklin's (1974) review called into question the primacy of parent–child relationships in gender development. In a similar manner, some reviewers have invoked findings from behaviour genetic studies to argue that parents play little role in the socialization of their children once genetic similarity is controlled (e.g., Harris, 1995). However, other developmental psychologists have rebutted the argument that parents don't matter in children's gender development (e.g., Block, 1983; Leaper, 2002; McHale,

Crouter, & Whiteman , 2003). Once various contextual and methodological factors are taken into account, researchers countered that it is possible to identify some ways that parent–child relationships may shape children's gender development.

To better infer possible causal influences in gender socialization, contemporary models emphasize transactional processes whereby the child and the parent may have reciprocal influences on one another (see Maccoby, 2000, for a review; also see Alanko *et al.*, 2011). To consider reciprocal processes, researchers can employ sequential analysis to test if particular child behaviours increase the subsequent likelihood of particular parent behaviours – or vice-versa (e.g., Tenenbaum & Leaper, 1998). Researchers are also employing the actor–partner interdependence model to test the independent contributions of actor effects, partner effects, and actor × partner interactions in social interactions (e.g., McIsaac, Connolly, McKenney, Pepler, & Craig, 2008). In an analogous manner, longitudinal research can take into account earlier child and parent behaviours to test if parents' expectations and behaviour predict subsequent changes in children's outcomes (e.g., see Eccles, Freedman-Doan, Frome, Jacobs, & Yoon , 2000). In summary, recent research indicates that parents can influence aspects of children's gender development – but not to the degree originally advanced in psychoanalytic and social learning theories. As reviewed next, other relationships are also influential.

Importance of peer relationships

Another key idea emerging from Maccoby and Jacklin's (1974) book is that peer relationships are an important context for gender development. The authors noted that many average gender differences in social behaviour tended to occur during interactions with peers (e.g., rough play, aggression). In subsequent decades, Maccoby highlighted the impact of gender-segregated peer relationships on children's development in her work (e.g., Maccoby, 1990, 1998; Maccoby & Jacklin, 1987). The importance of children's gender-segregated peer interactions in the socialization of gender-typed beliefs and behaviours has been further emphasized in other reviews (e.g., Fabes, Martin, & Hanish, 2004; Leaper, 1994; Mehta & Strough, 2009) and empirical studies (e.g., Martin & Fabes, 2001; Pellegrini, Long, Roseth, Bohn, & Van Ryzin, 2007; Powlishta, Serbin, & Moller, 1993).

The importance of peer relationships in gender development is underscored in the collection of articles included in this special issue. Most of the contributors considered children's gender development in the context of peer relationships. Some of the topics addressed in these studies include gender-related variations in play (Ensor, Hart, Jacobs, & Hughes, 2011; Mathieson & Banerjee, 2011), conflict and aggression (Ensor *et al.*, 2011; Flouri & Panourgia, 2011; Hay *et al.*, 2011; Ewing Lee & Troop-Gordon, 2011; Mathieson & Banerjee, 2011), communication (Psaltis, 2011; Valkenburg, Sumter, & Pete, 2011), and in-group identity (Kurtz-Costes, DeFreitas, Halle, & Kinlaw, 2011; Zosuls *et al.*, 2011).

Related to the increasing attention being paid to gender segregation, another research trend has been the application of intergroup theories to the study of gender development (e.g., Bigler & Liben, 2007; Harris, 1995; Leaper, 2000; Powlishta, 1995). This approach built on earlier work in social psychology documenting how identifying with a group can lead to in-group favouritism, assimilation, and hostility towards out-groups (Tajfel & Turner, 1979). Researchers noted that these processes help to explain the processes by which gender socialization transpires in the context of same-gender peer relationships. That is, children tend to favour characteristics associated with their own gender group

(e.g., Powlishta, 1995; Robnett & Susskind, 2011; also, see Kurtz-Costes *et al.*, 2011; Zosuls *et al.*, 2011). Also, boys and girls tend to enforce conformity to in-group norms (e.g., Fagot, 1977; also see Ewing Lee & Troop-Gordon, 2011). Similar processes occur with regards to children's racial/ethnic group memberships, and examining the intersection of gender and racial/ethnic identities is another recent trend in the study of children's gender and relationships (e.g., Kurtz-Costes *et al.*, 2011).

As children get older, intergroup processes may contribute to gender-based prejudice and discrimination (Bigler & Liben, 2007; Leaper, 2000). Accordingly, studying youths' experiences with sexism in relationships is another recent advance in the field (e.g., Leaper & Brown, 2008; McMaster, Connolly, Pepler, & Craig, 2002). In addition, recent studies have considered the consequences of sexism and restrictive gender roles on girls' academic achievement (e.g., Brown & Leaper, 2011) and boys' socio-emotional development (e.g., Oransky & Fisher, 2009).

Looking beyond parent and peer relationships

The aforementioned research focused primarily on children's interactions in the context of same-gender peer groups, but other relationships are additionally important during children's gender development. First, the gender-typed expectations of *teachers and coaches* can contribute to children's gender attitudes and self-concepts in academic and athletic domains, respectively (e.g., Jussim, Eccles, & Madon, 1996). Second, some studies suggest that having *sisters or brothers* may affect some aspects of children's gender development (e.g., McHale *et al.*, 2003). Third, *same-gender friendships* can differ from peer groups in their impact on gender development (see Leaper, 2000; Leaper & Bigler, 2011). Friendships are generally considered important for the development of conflict-resolution and intimacy-related skills (Rubin, Bukowski, & Parker, 2006; also see Ensor *et al.*, 2011; Valkenburg *et al.*, 2011). Fourth, researchers have been exploring the incidence and correlates of adolescents' affiliations in *mixed-gender cliques and cross-gender friendships* (e.g., Poulin & Pedersen, 2007; Zarbatany, McDougall, & Hymel, 2000). Finally, *romantic relationships* are fundamentally important in gender development (see Leaper & Anderson, 1997). Researchers are examining the construction of gender in heterosexual relationships (e.g., Tolman, Spencer, Rosen-Reynoso, & Porche, 2003) as well as lesbian, gay, and bisexual relationships (e.g., Diamond & Lucas, 2004).

Cognitive–motivational factors as mediators

Around the time of Maccoby and Jacklin's (1974) book, cognitive theories were ascendant in psychology. Accordingly, the authors flagged the importance of cognitive–motivational processes in children's adoption of gender-typed behaviour. In subsequent decades, the role of cognitive–motivational factors in gender and relationships was further articulated in gender schema theory (e.g., Liben & Bigler, 2002; Martin & Halverson, 1981), social cognitive theory (e.g., Bussey & Bandura, 1999; Perry, White, & Perry, 1984), and intergroup theory (e.g., Bigler & Liben, 2007; Harris, 1995; Leaper, 2000). Each of these theories emphasizes the idea that gender development ultimately involves self-socialization. That is, once children form a concept of gender, they use their gender schemas to interpret environmental events. Representations of gender are formed through observing others in real life and the media. These gender schemas guide the kinds of behaviours that children exhibit themselves.

Over the years, developmental researchers have documented ways that children's gender-related self-concepts, stereotypes, and attitudes are formed and shape gender-related variations in behaviour. Accordingly, many of the papers in this special issue addressed cognitive factors in children's gender development. These include studies examining aspects of children's gender-related social identities (Kurtz-Costes *et al.*, 2011; Zosuls *et al.*, 2011), adolescents' expectations about future family roles (Fulcher & Coyle, 2011; Sinno & Killen, 2011), and children's attitudes about gender-related social interactions (Zosuls *et al.*, 2011).

Biological factors as mediators

Maccoby and Jacklin (1974) noted that biological factors were implicated in the aetiology of some psychological gender differences. In the subsequent decades, biologically based dispositions in gender development have been postulated in evolutionary psychology (e.g., Bjorklund & Pellegrini, 2002) and behaviour genetics (e.g., Iervolino, Hines, Golombok, Rust, & Plomin, 2005). Neuroscience research has sought to identify specific physiological mechanisms that may affect gender development (e.g., Berenbaum & Hines, 1992). In addition, research on average gender differences in temperament suggests that biologically based dispositions, such as activity level or emotion regulation, may be linked to some gender-related variations in behaviour (e.g., Pellegrini *et al.*, 2007; also see Ensor *et al.*, 2011).

Social-structural factors as moderators

At the time that Maccoby and Jacklin's (1974) book was published, American society was undergoing dramatic social change. The civil rights, anti-poverty, and women's movements were changing society as well as the field of developmental psychology. Researchers have become more conscientious about variations in the ways that gender is expressed in different socio-cultural communities (e.g., Best & Thomas, 2004; also see Kurtz-Costes *et al.*, 2011). This work has helped to highlight some of the ways that social structures shape the form and the function of gender-typed behaviours. Also, feminism has filtered into developmental psychology. Cross-national comparisons reveal that the level of gender equality in a society is associated with the degree of gender typing in its children (see Wood & Eagly, 2002, for a review). As noted earlier, developmental researchers are also studying factors related to sexism in childhood. Furthermore, as gender roles have become more flexible, researchers have examined girls' and boys' achievement in non-traditional academic domains (e.g., Brown & Leaper, 2011; Eccles *et al.*, 2000) and youths' attitudes towards egalitarian family roles (e.g., Fulcher & Coyle, 2011; Sinno & Killen, 2011).

Looking ahead: Bridging theories and applying our knowledge

In reviewing the trends over the last few decades, we see that researchers have gained a better appreciation of the multiple forces that shape children's gender development. Although parents can have an influential role in children's gender development, their impact is not considered as singular as previously emphasized in psychoanalytic and

social learning theories. Peer groups, friends, teachers, and the media are among other social agents that affect children's gender development.

Most developmental psychologists today acknowledge that gender development involves a complex interplay among biological, cognitive–motivational, interpersonal, and social-structural processes (see Blakemore *et al.*, 2009; Leaper & Bigler, 2011). One critical challenge ahead is to gain a better understanding of how these different levels are interrelated. It is a daunting task to keep abreast of the numerous studies that are published within our own specialty areas (e.g., gender and peer relationships). At the same time, we should strive to incorporate ideas and findings from related areas (e.g., neuroscience, social psychology, anthropology). A related task is to seek greater synthesis among some of our theoretical models of gender development (see Leaper, in press). There have recently been some efforts at theory bridging that are promising and may help advance our understanding (e.g., Bigler & Liben, 2007; Ostrov & Godleski, 2011; Tobin *et al.*, 2011).

An additional challenge is to apply our understanding of children's gender development to the betterment of children. According to feminist and gender-egalitarian perspectives, traditional gender roles have limited the opportunities for girls and boys. Whereas girls and women obviously suffer, these practices also harm many boys' psychological adjustment. Sexual harassment and other forms of sexism perpetuate gender inequities in status and power in society. Traditional masculinity norms emphasizing emotional control limit both girls' and boys' capacities to enjoy satisfying relationships together. Gender-biased views of particular academic subjects and occupations (e.g., engineering as masculine or reading as feminine) can block potential pathways where girls and boys might find success. Fortunately, developmental researchers have begun to consider ways to address some of these problems through various interventions (e.g., see Bigler & Liben, 2007).

References

Alanko, K., Santtila, P., Salo, B., Jern, P., Johansson, A., & Sandnabba, N. K. (2011). Testing causal models of the relationship between childhood gender atypical behaviour and parent–child relationship. *British Journal of Developmental Psychology*, *29*, 214–233. doi:10.1348/2044-835X.002004

Berenbaum, S. A., & Hines, M. (1992). Early androgens are related to childhood sex-typed toy preferences. *Psychological Science*, *3*, 203–206. doi:10.1111/j.1467-9280.1992.tb00028.x

Best, D. L., & Thomas, J. J. (2004). Cultural diversity and cross-cultural perspectives. In A. H. Eagly, A. E. Beall, & R. J. Sternberg (Eds.), *The psychology of gender* (2nd ed., pp. 296–327). New York: Guilford.

Bigler, R. S., & Liben, L. S. (2007). Developmental intergroup theory: Explaining and reducing children's social stereotyping and prejudice. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, *16*, 162–166. doi:10.1111/j.1467-8721.2007.00496.x

Bjorklund, D. F., & Pellegrini, A. D. (2002). *The origins of human nature: Evolutionary developmental psychology*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association. doi:10.1037/10425-000

Blakemore, J. E. O., Berenbaum, S. A., & Liben, L. S. (2009). *Gender development*. New York: Taylor & Francis.

Block, J. H. (1983). Differential premises arising from differential socialization of the sexes: Some conjectures. *Child Development*, *54*, 1335–1354. doi:10.2307/1129799

Brown, C. S., & Leaper, C. (2011). Latina and European American girls' experiences with academic sexism and their self-concepts in mathematics and science during adolescence. *Sex Roles*, *63*, 860–870. doi:10.1007/s11199-010-9856-5

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

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. doi:10.1111/j.1532-7795.2004.00077.x

Eccles, J. S., Freedman-Doan, C., Frome, P., Jacobs, J., & Yoon, K. S. (2000). Gender-role socialization in the family: A longitudinal approach. In T. Eckes & H. M. Trautner (Eds.), *The developmental social psychology of gender* (pp. 333–360). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

Ensor, R., Hart, M., Jacobs, L., & Hughes, C. (2011). Gender differences in children's problem behaviours in competitive play with friends. *British Journal of Developmental Psychology*, *29*, 176–187. doi:10.1111/j.2044-835X.2010.02016.x

Ewing Lee, E. A., & Troop-Gordon, W. (2011). Peer socialization of masculinity and femininity: Differential effects of overt and relational forms of peer victimization. *British Journal of Developmental Psychology*, *29*, 197–213. doi:10.1111/j.2044-835X.2010.02022.x

Fabes, R. A., Martin, C. L., & Hanish, L. D. (2004). The next 50 years: Considering gender as a context for understanding young children's peer relationships. *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly*, *50*, 260–273. doi:10.1353/mpq.2004.0017

Fagot, B. I. (1977). Consequences of moderate cross-gender behavior in preschool children. *Child Development*, *48*, 902–907. doi:10.2307/1128339

Flouri, E., & Panourgia, C. (2011). Gender differences in the pathway from adverse life events to adolescent emotional and behavioural problems via negative cognitive errors. *British Journal of Developmental Psychology*, *29*, 234–252. doi:10.1348/0261-501X.002002

Freud, S. (1927). Some psychological consequences of the anatomical distinction between the sexes. *International Journal of Psychoanalysis*, *8*, 133–142.

Fulcher, M., & Coyle, E. F. (2011). Breadwinner and caregiver: A cross-sectional analysis of children's and emerging adults' visions of their future family roles. *British Journal of Developmental Psychology*, *29*, 330–346. doi:10.1111/j.2044-835X.2011.02026.x

Harris, J. R. (1995). Where is the child's environment?: A group socialization theory of development. *Psychological Review*, *102*, 458–489. doi:10.1037/0033-295X.102.3.458

Hay, D. F., Nash, A., Caplan, M., Swartzentruber, J., Ishikawa, F., & Vespo, J. E. (2011). The emergence of gender differences in physical aggression in the context of conflict between young peers. *British Journal of Developmental Psychology*, *29*, 158–175. doi:10.1111/j.2044-835X.2011.02028.x

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

Hyde, J. S., & Linn, M. C. (1986). *The psychology of gender: Advances through meta-analysis*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Iervolino, A. C., Hines, M., Golombok, S. E., Rust, J., & Plomin, R. (2005). Genetic and environmental influences on sex-typed behavior during the preschool years. *Child Development*, *76*, 826–840. doi:10.1111/j.1467-8624.2005.00880.x

Jussim, L., Eccles, J., & Madon, S. (1996). Social perception, social stereotypes, and teacher expectations: Accuracy and the quest for the powerful self-fulfilling prophecy. In M. Zanna (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (Vol. 28, pp. 281–388). San Diego, CA: Academic. doi:10.1016/S0065-2601(08)60240-3

Kurtz-Costes, B., DeFreitas, S. C., Halle, T. G., & Kinlaw, C. R. (2011). Gender and racial favouritism in Black and White preschool girls. *British Journal of Developmental Psychology*, *29*, 270–287. doi:10.1111/j.2044-835X.2010.02018.x

Leaper, C. (Ed.) (1994). *Childhood gender segregation: Causes and consequences*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

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

Leaper, C. (2002). Parenting girls and boys. In M. H. Bornstein (Ed.), *Handbook of parenting: Children and parenting* (2nd ed., Vol. 1, pp. 189–225). Mahwah, NJ, USA: Erlbaum.

Leaper, C. (in press). More similarities than differences in contemporary theories of social development? A plea for theory bridging. To appear in J. Benson (Ed.), *Advances in child development and behavior*. San Diego, CA: Elsevier Publishers.

Leaper, C., & Anderson, K. J. (1997). Gender development and heterosexual romantic relationships during adolescence. In W. Damon (Series Ed.) & S. Shulman & W. A. Collins (Issue Eds.), *Romantic relationships in adolescence: Developmental perspectives (new directions for child development* (No. 78, pp. 85–103). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Leaper, C., & Bigler, R. S. (2011). Gender. In M. Underwood & L. H. Rosen (Eds.), *Social development: Relationships in infancy, childhood, and adolescence* (pp. 289–315). New York: Guilford.

Leaper, C., & Brown, C. S. (2008). Perceived experiences with sexism among adolescent girls. *Child Development*, *79*, 685–704. doi:10.1111/j.1467-8624.2008.01151.x

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. doi:10.1037/0012-1649.40.6.993

Liben, L. S., & Bigler, R. S. (2002). The developmental course of gender differentiation: Conceptualizing, measuring, and evaluating constructs and pathways. *Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development*, *67*(2), vii–147. doi:10.1111/1540-5834.t01-1-00187

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

Maccoby, E. E. (1990). Gender and relationships: A developmental account. *American Psychologist*, *45*, 513–520. doi:10.1037/0003-066X.45.4.513

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

Maccoby, E. E. (2000). Parenting and its effects on children: On reading and misreading behavior genetics. *Annual Review of Psychology*, *51*, 1–27. doi:10.1146/annurev.psych.51.1.1

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

Maccoby, E. E., & Jacklin, C. N. (1987). Gender segregation in childhood. In H. W. Reese (Ed.), *Advances in child development and behavior* (Vol. 20, pp. 239–288). New York: Academic Press.

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

Martin, C. L., & Halverson, C. F. (1981). A schematic processing model of sex typing and stereotyping in children. *Child Development*, *52*, 1119–1134. doi:10.2307/1129498

Mathieson, K., & Banerjee, R. (2011). Peer play, emotion understanding, and socio-moral explanation: The role of gender. *British Journal of Developmental Psychology*, *29*, 188–196. doi:10.1111/j.2044-835X.02020.x

McHale, S. M., Crouter, A. C., & Whiteman, S. D. (2003). The family contexts of gender development during childhood and adolescence. *Social Development*, *12*, 125–148. doi:10.1111/1467-9507.00225

McIsaac, C., Connolly, J., McKenney, K. S., Pepler, D., & Craig, W. (2008). Conflict negotiation and autonomy processes in adolescent romantic relationships: An observational study of interdependency in boyfriend and girlfriend effects. *Journal of Adolescence*, *31*, 691–707. doi:10.1016/j.adolescence.2008.08.005

McMaster, L. E., Connolly, J., Pepler, D., & Craig, W. M. (2002). Peer to peer sexual harassment in early adolescence: A developmental perspective. *Development and Psychopathology*, *14*, 91–105. doi:10.1017/S0954579402001050

Mehta, C. M., & Strough, J. (2009). Sex segregation in friendships and normative contexts across the life span. *Developmental Review*, *29*, 201–220. doi:10.1016/j.dr.2009.06.001

Mischel, W. (1966). A social learning view of sex differences in behavior. In E. E. Maccoby (Ed.), *The development of sex differences* (pp. 56–81). Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Oransky, M., & Fisher, C. (2009). The development and validation of the meanings of adolescent masculinity scale. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity*, *10*, 57–72. doi:10.1037/a0013612

Ostrov, J. M., & Godleski, S. A. (2011). Toward an integrated gender-linked model of aggression subtypes in early and middle childhood. *Psychological Review*, *117*, 233–242. doi:10.1037/a0018070

Pellegrini, A. D., Long, J. D., Roseth, C., Bohn, K., & Van Ryzin, M. (2007). A short-term longitudinal study of preschool children's sex segregation: The role of physical activity, sex, and time. *Journal of Comparative Psychology*, *121*, 282–289. doi:10.1037/0735-7036.121.3.282

Perry, D. G., White, A. J., & Perry, L. C. (1984). Does early sex typing result from children's attempts to match their behavior to sex role stereotypes? *Child Development*, *55*, 2114–2121. doi:10.2307/1129784

Poulin, F., & Pedersen, S. (2007). Developmental changes in gender composition of friendship networks in adolescent girls and boys. *Developmental Psychology*, *43*, 1484–1496. doi:10.1037/0012-1649.43.6.1484

Powlishta, K. K. (1995). Intergroup processes in childhood: Social categorization and sex role development. *Developmental Psychology*, *31*, 781–788. doi:10.1037/0012-1649.31.5.781

Powlishta, K., Serbin, L., & Moller, L. (1993). The stability of individual differences in gender typing: Implications for understanding gender segregation. *Sex Roles*, *29*, 723–737. doi:10.1007/BF00289214

Psaltis, C. (2011). The constructive role of gender asymmetry in social interaction: Further evidence. *British Journal of Developmental Psychology*, *29*, 305–312. doi:10.1111/j.2044-835X.2011.02029.x

Robnett, R. D., & Susskind, J. E. (2011). Who cares about being gentle? The impact of social identity and the gender of one's friends on children's display of same-gender favoritism. *Sex Roles*, *63*, 820–832. doi:10.1007/s11199-010-9843-x

Rubin, K. H., Bukowski, W., & Parker, J. G. (2006). Peer interactions, relationships, and groups. In W. Damon & R. M. Lerner (Eds. in Chief) & N. Eisenberg, (Vol. Ed.), *Handbook of child psychology: Social, emotional and personality development* (6th ed., Vol. 3, pp. 571–645). New York: Wiley and Sons.

Sinno, S. M., & Killen, M. (2011). Social reasoning about 'second-shift' parenting. *British Journal of Developmental Psychology*, *29*, 313–329. doi:10.1111/j.2044-835X.2010.02021.x

Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. (1979). An integrative theory of intergroup conflict. In W. G. Austin, & S. Worchel (Eds.), *The social psychology of intergroup relations* (pp. 94–109). Monterey, CA: Brooks-Cole.

Tenenbaum, H. R., & Leaper, C. (1998). Gender effects on Mexican-descent parents' questions and scaffolding during toy play: A sequential analysis. *First Language*, *18*, 129–147. doi:10.1177/014272379801805301

Tobin, D. D., Menon, M., Menon, M., Spatta, B. C., Hodges, E. V. E., & Perry, D. G. (2011). The intrapsychics of gender: A model of self-socialization. *Psychological Review*, *117*, 601–622. doi:10.1037/a0018936

Tolman, D. L., Spencer, R., Rosen-Reynoso, M., & Porche, M. V. (2003). Sowing the seeds of violence in heterosexual relationships: Early adolescents narrate compulsory heterosexuality. *Journal of Social Issues*, *59*, 159–178. doi:10.1111/1540-4560.t01-1-00010

Valkenburg, P. M., Sumter, S. R., & Pete, J. (2011). Gender differences in online and offline self-disclosure in pre-adolescence and adolescence. *British Journal of Developmental Psychology*, *29*, 253–269. doi:10.1348/2044-835X.002001

Wood, W., & Eagly, A. H. (2002). A cross-cultural analysis of the behavior of women and men: Implications for the origins of sex differences. *Psychological Bulletin*, *128*, 699–727. doi:10.1037/0033-2909.128.5.699

Zarbatany, L., McDougall, P., & Hymel, S. (2000). Gender-differentiated experience in the peer culture: Links to intimacy in preadolescence. *Social Development*, *9*, 62–79. doi:10.1111/1467-9507.00111

Zosuls, K. M., Martin, C. L., Ruble, D. N., Miller, C. F., Gaertner, B. M., England, D. E., & Hill, A. P. (2011). 'It's not that we hate you': Understanding children's gender attitudes and expectancies about peer relationships. *British Journal of Developmental Psychology*, *29*, 288–304. doi:10.1111/j.2044-835X.2010.02023.x