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One of the hypotheses put forth by the Gender Self-Socialization Model (GSSM) is the stereotype emulation hypothesis. This hypothesis states that one role of gender identity is to motivate children to follow gender stereotypes that they have internalized. The GSSM also states that each of the constructs of gender identity, gender stereotypes, and gender typing is product of the cognitive interplay between the other two. Egan and Perry (2001) conceptualized gender identity as multidimensional, and one of these dimensions is felt pressure against other gender behavior. This study found that there was an interaction between one aspect of gender identity (felt pressure) and gender stereotypes, supporting the stereotype emulation hypothesis. This study also found that the interaction between felt pressure and sexism was more powerful in predicting adjustment in children than looking only at the main effect of felt pressure.
GENDER IDENTITY AND GENDER STEREOTYPES AS INTERACTING
INFLUENCES ON CHILDREN’S ADJUSTMENT

List of Tables........................................................................................................................................v
List of Figures ..........................................................................................................................................vi
Introduction ............................................................................................................................................1
  Gender Identity ....................................................................................................................................1
  Stereotypes and Identity ..........................................................................................................................2
The Gender Self-Socialization Model .........................................................................................................3
  Stereotype Emulation Hypothesis ...........................................................................................................7
Hypotheses ................................................................................................................................................8
Method ....................................................................................................................................................9
  Participants ...........................................................................................................................................9
  Procedure ............................................................................................................................................9
Measures ...............................................................................................................................................10
  Dependent Variables Factor Analysis ......................................................................................................12
Results ....................................................................................................................................................13
Discussion ..............................................................................................................................................16
References ..............................................................................................................................................26
TABLES

Table 1. Factor Loadings for Adjustment Variables .......................................................20

Table 2. Means and Standard Deviations of Adjustment Measures by Child Sex...........21

Table 3. Partial Correlations of the Seven Factors by Sex ..............................................22
FIGURES

Figure 1. Interaction of Felt Pressure and Average Sexism on “Agency” for Girls ........23
Figure 2. Interaction of Felt Pressure and Average Sexism on “Masculinity” for Girls...24
Figure 3. Interaction of Felt Pressure and Average Sexism on “Masculinity” for Boys...25
Introduction

Gender Identity

Gender identity is a crucial part of human identity. One’s gender is unchanging and directs many aspects of our lives, including recreation, occupations, relationships, and academics. It follows, then, that during childhood people may ask themselves how well they fit in with their gender or how much they feel they adhere to their own gender stereotypes (Egan & Perry, 2001). The answers to such questions are thought to influence psychosocial adjustment, as well as influencing gender-typed attribute adoption.

Gender identity is conceptualized by Egan & Perry (2001) as a multidimensional construct including: knowledge of membership in a gender category, felt compatibility with one’s gender, satisfaction with one’s gender, felt pressure for gender conformity, and attitudes towards gender groups. The measures created by Egan & Perry (2001) that capture these constructs are: membership knowledge, within-gender typicality, gender contentedness, felt pressure, and intergroup bias. In the present study, the focus was on the measure of felt pressure which Egan and Perry (2001) developed to tap the degree to which children feel compelled to participate in conduct that is fitting to their own gender, and to avoid participating in conduct that is fitting of the opposite gender.

Children who experience strong pressure for gender conformity from parents, peers, the media, and other social entities are likely to internalize prescriptive and
proscriptive messages and anticipate reactions not only from others, but also from themselves for sex-typed behavior. Feeling strong pressure to conform to gender stereotypes should undermine adjustment during preadolescence. Children who feel strong pressure for sex-typing are assumed to be less likely to explore a wide range of options when deciding what interests to pursue and may be less likely to settle on maximally fulfilling options (Egan & Perry, 2001). For example, felt pressure may cause girls to veer away from developing agentic competencies and lead girls to develop internalizing difficulties.

Stereotypes and Identity

The fundamental categorization at birth into the groups male and female produces identification with one’s social group and this identification shapes and is shaped by experiences that are expected of that social group. Membership in the groups male or female is associated with different preferences and choices. An individual freely chooses to participate in a system of self-imposed social segregation (Nosek, Banaji, & Greenwald, 2002). Group membership and the expectancies associated with such membership have a subtle effect on personal preference and choice. Cognitive associations between activities and gender (gender stereotypes) as well as between gender and self (gender identity) may influence the more personal associations a person makes between these stereotyped activities and the self (gender typing). Preferences, choices, or even thoughts about one’s own abilities (self-efficacy perceptions) are often assumed to be a product of individual volition, but they may in fact be a reflection of group identity and knowledge about groups (stereotypes). If internal mental constraints linking group identity with preferences remain in tact, then patterns of self-imposed
segregation will most likely continue. Nosek, Banaji, and Greenwald (2002) found a link between group membership and preference for an attribute associated with that group. The stronger one’s gender identity (cognitive associations between self and gender category), the more people are likely to use gender stereotypes (cognitive associations between attributes and gender) as guides for their own conduct (gender typing).

In general, the strength of identification with one’s gender should strengthen or weaken the identification with stereotyped activities. For example, women who are more strongly identified with their gender should show more negative attitudes towards male-typed activities. Specifically, strength in any of the dimensions in Egan and Perry’s (2001) model should strengthen identification with stereotyped activities. Since stereotypes are present in the environment before an individual forms a personal attitude towards stereotyped activities, they may be regarded as a causal force in driving attitude and performance.

While Nosek et al.’s (2002) measures of attitudes were implicit, they found a positive and significant correlation between implicit and explicit attitudes (even though they remained separate factors). It is not necessary for one to consciously endorse gender stereotypes in order for them to have an effect on behavior; knowledge of stereotypes may be sufficient to perpetuate stereotypes.

*The Gender Self-Socialization Model*

Social learning theorists emphasize the influences of the social environment and the cognitive representations of this environment on gender differentiation. Children were believed to emulate same-gender stereotypes, which were acquired by observing certain behaviors being performed more commonly by persons of one sex or the other in
specific situations (Tobin, Menon, Menon, Spatta, & Perry, under review). Bem’s gender schema theory (1981, 1993) focused on “gender schematicity” - a persistent desire to discern and follow gender stereotypes. Bem argued that the stronger a person’s gender identity (schematicity), the more the person will strive to incorporate attributes of one gender rather than the other. Other theorists focused on cognitively generated internal motivation as the inspiration for gender differentiation. Children’s gender identity would motivate them to conform to gender stereotypes, even without external pressure, because pressure was put on them to conform for the sake of cognitive consistency. Thus, gender differentiation has become a matter of self-socialization.

Previous research has tended to focus on a theme where gender identity encourages stereotype acquisition, which in turn promotes sex typing. The gender self-socialization model (GSSM) is an adaptation by Tobin et al. (under review) of Greenwald, Banaji, Rudman, Farnham, Nosek, & Mellott’s (2002) theory of an interplay among cognitions being relevant to social category membership. Greenwald et al. focused on implicit cognitions of adults, whereas Tobin et al. focused on explicit cognitions and gender self-socialization during childhood. The GSSM predicts relations among associations relevant to collective identity. Greenwald et al. (2002) distinguished three kinds of cognitive associations that people form: group-self, self-attribute, and group-attribute. People make mental associations between social groups (e.g. gender or race) and the self (e.g. “I am a boy”), between social groups and various attributes (e.g. “Boys are strong”), and between the self and various attributes (e.g. “I am strong”). Each of these associations can vary along a continuum from very positive (“I am definitely a boy”) to very negative (“I am definitely NOT a boy”). Group-self associations constitute
a person’s *group identity*, group-attribute associations define a person’s *stereotypes*, and self-attribute associations capture a person’s *self-perceptions* about specific attributes. Greenwald et al. (2002) also proposed that each type of association is a multiplicative function of the other two associations (i.e., a particular association will be positive if both of the other associations are positive or negative, but negative if the signs of the other two associations are different from each other).

In contrast to the Greenwald et al. (2002) model, the GSSM emphasizes explicit associations rather than implicit associations and stresses that there are multiple ways of conceptualizing each type of association. The GSSM adopts the idea of Greenwald et al. (2002) that each type of association is influenced by the interaction of the other two types of associations. Thus, gender identity is expected to interact with gender stereotypes to affect gender typing. The links between gender stereotypes and gender typing are posited to be especially strong for individuals with stronger gender identity.

Gender typing refers to links between the self and gender differentiated attributes (i.e. a person’s possession of attributes that vary by gender) and is measured using self-reports about interest, importance, and self-efficacy. Gender stereotypes are people’s beliefs about how the sexes differ (descriptive) or should differ (prescriptive). Gender ideologies, in interaction with gender identity, may influence the adoption of patterns of behavior, as well as psychosocial adjustment. Gender ideologies include: the attitude that traditional gender roles should be perpetuated, intergroup bias (i.e. the tendency to see one’s own gender as superior, ambivalent sexism, dating and other relationship scripts, masculine ideology (i.e., the belief that boys and men should be competitive, dominant, and emotionally stoic), and the belief that having a perfect body is vital to fulfilling the
same-gender ideal (Tobin et al., under review). Gender identity is the quality and strength of the connections people make between the self and gender categories. It is important to note that gender identity cannot be inferred from gender typing because in Egan and Perry’s (2001) conception of gender identity, gender typing is only one component of gender identity and in the GSSM gender typing and gender identity are believed to influence and be influenced by one another.

Egan and Perry (2001) argue that feeling strong pressure for gender conformity is generally harmful (rather than beneficial) to mental health because of the limitations that are imposed on possibly fulfilling options, which weakens feelings of autonomy and puts children under stress. Previous studies have found that high felt pressure is associated with lower self-esteem, higher internalizing problems, and peer rejection (Corby, Hodges, & Perry, 2007). Certain processes of the GSSM may mediate the links between aspects of gender identity and mental health. Felt pressure may be negative because it works to activate negative stereotypes. For example, girls who feel strong pressure for gender conformity and who also believe that girls should be subservient to boys may adopt behaviors that lead them to have problems with self-esteem and internalizing problems. Strong felt pressure is normal for very young children (around age 3) because they only have a basic sense of gender category membership and view gender stereotypes as moral imperatives. Once children gain gender constancy (around 6-7 years of age), they usually relax their gender rules and felt pressure decreases.

The three constructs of the GSSM are influenced by many factors, but the GSSM holds that each construct is also a product of a cognitive interplay between the other two constructs. There are three main hypotheses inherent in the GSSM: the stereotype
construction hypothesis, the identity construction hypothesis, and the stereotype emulation hypothesis (Tobin et al., under review). The stereotype construction hypothesis states that children project their own attributes onto a gender collective to the extent that they identify with the collective (“I am strong” and “I am a boy,” therefore “Boys are strong”). The identity construction hypothesis states that children’s gender stereotypes interact with their self-perceived attributes to influence gender identity (“Boys are strong” and “I am strong,” therefore “I am a boy.”). The stereotype emulation hypothesis, which is the main hypothesis I will focus on, states that the more children identify with a gender collective, the more likely they are to display attributes that they personally view as more typical of (or desirable for) persons of that collective (“I am a boy” and “Boys are strong,” so “I must be strong”).

Stereotype Emulation Hypothesis

In the stereotype emulation hypothesis, the role of gender identity is to motivate the child to emulate whatever stereotypes he or she has internalized, but because of individual differences in the content of children’s stereotypes, specific behaviors that are influenced by gender identity will vary from child to child. Nosek, Banaji, and Greenwald (2002) explained the adoption of a single attribute (in their study, math) using implicit assessments and yielded support for the hypothesis that gender typing (relating a gendered attribute to the self) is influenced by the interaction of stereotypes and identity. In previous work with children to examine whether gender identity affects attribute adoption, children’s gender stereotypes were not assessed. Children’s gender identity probably works in conjunction with their ideas of what it means to be male or female to affect attribute adoption. Felt pressure should encourage self-socialization, although it
may not have uniform consequences for all persons of a given sex (Egan & Perry, 2001). Felt pressure should lead people to adopt or avoid whatever attributes they personally view as gender typed. Children with inherently self-limiting attributes (e.g., a girl’s belief that females should not hold a job or should be subservient to males) at the top of their list of same-sex attributes may be at risk for adjustment difficulties, especially if their identity drives them to adopt the attributes in question.

Hypotheses

In this study, I am focusing on the stereotype emulation hypothesis, which states that one role of gender identity is to motivate children to follow stereotypes that they have internalized. There are five dimensions discussed in Egan & Perry’s (2001) multidimensional model of gender identity, but in this study only the dimension of felt pressure was used. Previous studies have not looked at sexist beliefs in children and how they affect adjustment. This study is testing the hypothesis that felt pressure can be negative because it activates sexism, which has different effects for boys and girls. It is also possible that negative sexism and felt pressure are bad for adjustment by themselves. Felt pressure may restrict children from certain activities that they enjoy or from which they could gain self-esteem. When children hold certain sexist beliefs, girls may view the world as an unfair place in which to be a woman, while boys may view it in an opposite way, holding narcissistic beliefs. The main hypothesis of this study was to see if felt pressure and sexist beliefs work in conjunction with each other.

Specifically, boys who are very sexist (e.g., believe boys should be the decision-makers and hold a job) and who have high amounts of felt pressure for gender conformity will have higher masculine behavior self-efficacy, higher self-efficacy regarding their
academic skills, and higher amounts of narcissism. On the other hand, girls who are very sexist and who have high amounts of felt pressure to be unlike the other sex will have less self-efficacy regarding masculine and academic behaviors and may be less narcissistic. Girls with high amounts of pressure and high levels of sexism should also have higher internalizing problems.

Methods

Participants

Participants were 237 4th-8th-grade children from a state university school. One subject was dropped from the study because he answered every question the same way, so the final subject pool consisted of 236 children.

Procedure

The participants were tested in small groups. They were given a packet consisting of eight questionnaires to be filled out about themselves and their peers. The first questionnaire was a 24-item scale created to measure traditional attitudes towards sex roles (What I Believe). The second instrument was a 60-item scale used to measure self-efficacy for sex-typed behaviors (About Me Part I). The third questionnaire was a 6-item test to measure global self-worth (What I Am Like Part I). The fourth questionnaire was a 17-item measure intended to capture body satisfaction and a final (and focal) aspect of gender identity-felt pressure against other-gender behavior (What I Am Like Part II). The fifth questionnaire was a 16-item measure intended to tap perceptions of classmates’ ability in sports, internalizing behaviors, externalizing behaviors, and prosocial behaviors (About My Classmates). The seventh questionnaire was a shortened version of the
Narcissistic Personality Inventory for children adapted from Barry, Frick, & Killian (2003), which included 17 items (About Me Part II). The eighth questionnaire was a shortened version of the Children’s Depression Inventory (Kovacs), which included 10 items (About Me Part III).

Measures

*What I Believe Questionnaire.* This instrument assesses traditional attitudes toward sex roles (24 items, with three subscales of 8 items each). The three subscales were created to capture endorsement of dating sexism, work sexism, and parenting sexism. The Cronbach’s alpha coefficients for the three subscales were .79, .75, and .74, respectively. Dating sexism, work sexism, and parenting sexism were later combined into one measure (average sexism) and the Cronbach’s alpha coefficient for this measure was .90 for the 24 combined items. Children were instructed to read each statement and decide how much they agreed or disagreed with the statement (from “Disagree Strongly!” to “Agree Strongly!”). Items were scored from 1 to 5, with higher scores indicating greater traditional attitudes toward sex roles. A sample item of work sexism is: “Girls usually make a better babysitter than boys do.”

*About Me Part I Questionnaire.* This questionnaire assesses children’s perceptions of self-efficacy for six types of behaviors, which were academic competence (10 items), body image (8 items), Bravado (16 items), communal behavior (10 items), sports (6 items), and self-sacrifice (10 items). The Cronbach’s alpha coefficients were .71, .85, .84, .64, .80, and .61, respectively. The children were instructed to read each question carefully and pretend that what it says is happening to them. Then, they were instructed to circle how hard or easy it would be for them to perform the activity in
question. The responses ranged from “Hard!” to “Easy!” A sample item is: “Being good at sports is _________ for me.”

*What I Am Like Part I Questionnaire.* This questionnaire contains 1 scale that measured global self-worth (6 items). The Cronbach’s alpha coefficient was .76. Children were instructed to read statements that describe things about kids, such as who they are, what they like to do, and how they feel about various things. They were instructed to read statements set up as follows: “Some kids are good at playing cards” **BUT** “Other kids aren’t good at playing cards. Which is more like you?” They were then asked to describe whether they were more like the kids on the right or the left side, and then to decide if that was only “Sort of true” for them or “Very true” for them, only circling one answer on one side.

*What I Am Like Part II Questionnaire.* This questionnaire measures body satisfaction (10 items) and felt pressure to avoid other-gender behavior (7 items). The Cronbach’s alpha coefficients were .75 and .76, respectively. The children were instructed to read statements about how their parents, their friends, or they themselves might feel about some things that concern them. A sample item is: “My parents would be upset if they saw me acting like a girl.” They were then instructed to circle how true that statement was for them out of four choices ranging from “Not true at all for me” to “Very true for me.”

*About My Classmates Questionnaire.* This is the 16-item Peer Nomination Inventory, which assesses peer perceptions of sports behavior (3 items), internalizing behavior (4 items), externalizing behavior (5 items), and prosocial behavior (4 items). The Cronbach’s alpha coefficients were .95, .88, .91, and .89, respectively. Children
were instructed to read the names of boys (girls) in their grade and place an X by the name of every child who agreed with the statement. A sample item is: “He (She) is good at sports.”

*About Me Part II Questionnaire.* This is the short Narcissistic Personality Inventory for children (adapted from Barry, Frick, & Killian, 2003.) The Cronbach’s alpha coefficient for this 17-item scale was .73. The children were instructed to read each of two statements and circle which one was more true of themselves. A sample item is: “I’m not interested in ruling the world.” OR “If I ruled the world, it would be a better place.”

*About Me Part III Questionnaire.* This questionnaire is the short Children’s Depression Inventory (Kovacs). The Cronbach’s alpha coefficient for this 10-item scale was .75. Children were instructed to pick the one statement (out of three) that describes them the best. Each item was scored on a three-point scale, with reverse scoring for some items. A sample item is: “I am sad once in awhile,” “I am sad many times,” “I am sad all the time.”

*Dependent Variable Factor Analysis*

A principal component factor analysis of the 14 dependent variables was run to see if the items loaded onto specific factors. The 14 dependent variables were: global self-worth, body satisfaction, narcissism, depression, sports behavior, internalizing behavior, externalizing behavior, prosocial behavior, and self-efficacies for academic competency, body image, masculine ideology, communal behavior, sports, and self-sacrifice. A rotated component matrix yielded five distinct factors.
Global self-worth, body satisfaction, depression, and body image self-efficacy loaded onto the first factor at levels of .82, .84, -.75, and .64, respectively and this factor was named “Self-Worth.” Sports behavior, internalizing behaviors, and sports self-efficacy loaded onto the second factor at levels of .90, -.79, and .69, respectively and this factor was named “Agency.” Externalizing behavior and prosocial behavior loaded onto the third factor at levels of .82 and -.83, respectively and this factor was named “Antisocial Behavior.” Communal behavior self-efficacy and self-sacrifice loaded onto the fourth factor at levels of .85 and .80, respectively and this factor was named “Communal Behavior.” Academic self-efficacy, Bravado self-efficacy, and narcissism loaded onto the fifth factor at levels of .60, .63, and .55, respectively and this factor was named “Bravado.” The rotated component matrix is shown in Table 1. From this point on, in this study, the dependent variables will be referred to by their factor names.

Results

Partial Correlations

Partial correlations (controlling for age) among the measures of felt pressure against other gender behavior, average sexism, and the five factors were run separately by sex. For boys, the correlation between Bravado and felt pressure against other gender behavior was statistically significant, \( pr (104) = .30, p < .05 \). Also for boys, the correlation between average sexism and felt pressure against other gender behavior was statistically significant, \( pr (104) = .25, p < .05 \). For girls, the correlation between felt pressure against other gender behavior and average sexism was statistically significant, \( pr (126) = .29, p = .001 \). The correlation between felt pressure against other gender behavior was also correlated significantly with Self-Worth, \( pr (126) = -.28, p < .05 \) as
well as Antisocial Behavior, $pr (126) = .21$, $p < .05$. Average sexism was found to be correlated significantly with Self-Worth, $pr (126) = -.20$, $p < .05$, as well as with Antisocial Behavior, $pr (126) = .24$, $p < .05$.

Age and Sex Differences

To investigate significant age and sex differences, I treated each measure as a dependent variable in a multiple regression analysis with sex and age entered as simultaneous predictors. With age controlled, the effect of sex was significant for four measures, as indicated in the $F$ column of Table 2. Boys and girls differed significantly on the factors of Agency and Communal Behavior, as well as for felt pressure against other gender behavior and average sexism: Boys scored higher on Agency, felt pressure, and average sexism, while girls scored higher on the factor of Communal Behavior. When sex was controlled, the effect of age was significant for three measures. With increasing age, children scored higher the factors of Self-Worth and Antisocial Behavior and scored lower on the measure of average sexism.

Multiple Regressions

In order to determine whether there was an interaction between felt pressure against other gender behavior and sexism, I conducted multiple regression analyses, treating the five factors as the dependent variables. To simplify presentation of results, analyses were run separately for each sex. Participant age was entered on step one, average sexism and felt pressure against other gender behavior were entered on step two, and the interaction between felt pressure against other gender behavior and average sexism was entered on step three.
Main Effects

For girls, felt pressure against other gender behavior was found to have a significant main effect on Self-Worth, $\beta = -.24$ (p < .01). Also for girls, average sexism was found to have a significant main effect on Antisocial Behavior, $\beta = .20$ (p < .05).

For boys, one would predict that average sexism would have a main effect on Antisocial Behavior, and the analysis showed this expected trend, $\beta = .18$ (p < .05 on a one-tailed test).

Interactions

An interaction of felt pressure against other gender behavior and average sexism was significant in predicting Agency for girls (p < .05). Specifically, as the level of sexism increased from low (-1 SD) to medium (0 SD) to high (+1 SD), the effect of felt pressure against other gender behavior became increasingly negative, respective $\beta$s = .11, ns; -.11, ns; -.33 (p < .05, one-tailed test F = 5.61). Also, as felt pressure increased from low (-1 SD) to medium (0 SD) to high (+1 SD), the effect of average sexism became increasingly negative, respective $\beta$s = .30, ns; .08, ns; -.14, ns.

An interaction of felt pressure against other gender behavior and average sexism was significant in predicting Bravado for girls (p < .05). Specifically, as levels of sexism increased from low (-1 SD) to medium (0 SD) to high (+1 SD), the effect of felt pressure against other gender behavior became increasingly negative, respective $\beta$s = .16, ns; -.05, ns; -.27, ns. Also, as felt pressure increased from low (-1 SD) to medium (0 SD) to high (+1 SD), the effect of average sexism became increasingly negative, respective $\beta$s = .28, ns; .06, ns; -.15, ns.
An interaction of felt pressure against other gender behavior and average sexism was significant in predicting Bravado for boys (p < .001). Specifically, as levels of sexism increased from low (-1 SD) to medium (0 SD) to high (+1 SD), the effect of felt pressure against other gender behavior became increasingly positive, respective $\beta$s = .03, ns; .30 (p < .01, one-tailed test $F = 10.69$); .56 (p < .001, one-tailed test $F = 23.37$). Also, as levels of sexism increased from low (-1 SD) to medium (0 SD) to high (+1 SD), the effect of felt pressure against other gender behavior became increasingly positive, respective $\beta$s = -.27 (p < .05, one-tailed test $F = 5.39$); -.01, ns; .26 (p < .05, one-tailed test $F = 4.41$).

**Discussion**

The results of this study are moderately consistent with the predictions of the stereotype emulation hypothesis put forth by Tobin et al. (under review). This hypothesis states that the more children identify with a gender collective, the more likely they are to display the attributes that they personally view as more typical of, or desirable for, persons of that collective. The specific hypothesis of this study was that felt pressure for gender differentiation interacts with sexism to predict children’s adjustment. Limited support for the stereotype emulation hypothesis was found for one factor-Bravado.

Gender identity has been posited as a multidimensional construct by Egan and Perry (2001). This study focused on one aspect of this construct- felt pressure against other-gender behavior. In this study, I investigated the interaction between felt pressure against other gender behavior and sexism in predicting adjustment variables and perceptions of self-efficacy. The main effect of felt pressure on the Self-Worth factor in a negative direction for girls in this study provides support for previous research.
regarding the generally harmful (rather than beneficial) effect of felt pressure on girls (Corby, Hodges, & Perry, 2007). The pattern for the Agency factor for girls does not provide support for the stereotype emulation hypothesis and is not readily interpretable.

The other two interactions between felt pressure and sexism were for the factor of Bravado, but in opposite directions for boys and girls. This fact alone seems to indicate that boys and girls hold sex-typed beliefs and use these to determine their behavior. What is most important for girls, again, is that the combination of both high felt pressure and high amounts of sexism is what generally leads to more unfavorable outcomes (e.g., less Bravado). When felt pressure is high and sexism is low, girls score lower on the Bravado factor. It is important to note here that the interaction for girls was significant, but these findings need to be replicated. For boys in this situation, this effect was reversed and even stronger. When sexism in boys is low, whether or not they have high felt pressure is relatively unimportant because their levels of Bravado remain stable. However, when boys have high amounts of sexism as well as high felt pressure, they have very high scores on the Bravado factor.

Although garnering support for the stereotype emulation hypothesis was the main goal of this study, there were also some interesting age and sex differences that are in accordance with previous research and thus are worth noting. When age was controlled, sex was found to be significant for the factors of Agency and Communal Behavior, as well as for felt pressure and average sexism. The fact that girls scored higher on Communal behavior than boys and that boys scored higher than girls on the factor of Agency children are not only learning gender stereotypes, but are also acting in accordance with them. What is interesting in this analysis, however, was the fact that
boys actually had higher levels of both sexism and felt pressure than girls. From previous research speculating that felt pressure itself had a negative effect, one would expect an opposite finding; the fact that boys had more felt pressure than girls adds additional support to the fact that pressure is not inherently negative for girls, but only becomes detrimental when paired with sexist beliefs.

When sex was controlled for, age was found to be significant on the factors of Self-Worth and Antisocial Behavior, as well as sexism. As children’s age increased, they had higher scores on the factors of Self-Worth and Antisocial Behavior and lower scores on the measure of sexism. Much previous research has found that sexism tends to decrease as children age. At age 3, with the attainment of basic gender identity, children develop rigid gender stereotypes and tend to cling to the adamantly (Maccoby, 1998). As children grow up, however, different children may form different profiles of felt pressure or form differentiated gender stereotypes. The decrease in sexism follows along this line of evidence.

Although this study did provide some support for an interactive influence of felt pressure and sexism, there was more evidence for an additive effect (versus a multiplicative effect). Both felt pressure and sexism seem to contribute to children’s adjustment, and high scores in both areas may be more detrimental for children than high scores in one or the other. While this study provides some unique evidence, much more work can be done not only to verify different aspects of the stereotype emulation hypothesis, but also to provide evidence for the other hypotheses stated in the GSSM. Investigating the two other hypotheses stated in the GSSM should also be of importance to examining the different ways that the three constructs interact with each other, but
Tobin et al. (under review) emphasize the importance of the stereotype emulation hypothesis in behavioral gender differentiation.

It is important to note that the limitation in this study was that it examined a very small part of the stereotype emulation hypothesis. While this study yielded some interesting results, in order to bolster more support for the stereotype emulation hypothesis, researchers should look at the variables that were left unexamined in this study but may still be crucial to understanding attribute adoption in children. In this study, the only gender identity dimension explored was that of felt pressure against other gender behavior; additional studies should explore the interaction of sexist beliefs with other dimensions of gender identity, such as felt compatibility or satisfaction with one’s gender. One could also look at the interaction between felt pressure and other dimensions of gender stereotypes, such as importance ratings of specific behavior (i.e., how important girls or boys think it is for their own gender to exhibit certain behaviors); this would help to disentangle individual differences in gender stereotypes that children hold. These two areas of research would give more support to the stereotype emulation hypothesis.
Table 1

**Factor Loadings for Adjustment Variables**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Self-Worth</th>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Antisocial</th>
<th>Communal</th>
<th>Bravado</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self-Worth</td>
<td>.816</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Body Sat.</td>
<td>.843</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depression</td>
<td>-.745</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Body Im. SE</td>
<td>.639</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports</td>
<td></td>
<td>.895</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports SE</td>
<td></td>
<td>.689</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internalizing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.790</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Externalizing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.824</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prosocial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.831</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comm. SE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.854</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Sac. SE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.799</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narcissism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.549</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AComp SE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.598</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macho SE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.629</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Component loadings < .5 not shown. SE = Self-Efficacy, Acomp = Academic Competency
Table 2

*Means and Standard Deviations of Adjustment Measures by Child Sex*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Boys M</th>
<th>Boys SD</th>
<th>Girls M</th>
<th>Girls SD</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self-Worth</td>
<td>.072</td>
<td>.787</td>
<td>-.059</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency</td>
<td>.246</td>
<td>.989</td>
<td>-.204</td>
<td>.966</td>
<td>12.065*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antisocial</td>
<td>-.078</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>.065</td>
<td>.976</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communal</td>
<td>-.211</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>.175</td>
<td>.951</td>
<td>8.657*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bravado</td>
<td>-.073</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>.061</td>
<td>.993</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FPOG</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>.789</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>.608</td>
<td>102.41**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg. Sexism</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>.619</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>.381</td>
<td>105.325**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* FPOG = Felt Pressure Against Other Gender Behavior. **p < .001, *p < .01.
Table 3

*Partial Correlations of the Seven Factors by Sex*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FPOG</th>
<th>AvgSex</th>
<th>SW</th>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Antisocial</th>
<th>Communal</th>
<th>Bravado</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FPOG</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.29*</td>
<td>- .28*</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.21*</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>- .04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AvgSex</td>
<td>.25*</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-.20*</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.24*</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>- .01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>- .02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antisocial</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>- .15</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communal</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>- .10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bravado</td>
<td>.30*</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Scores for Girls are above the diagonal, scores for Boys are below.  FPOG = Felt Pressure Against Other Gender Behavior, SW = Self-Worth **p < .001, *p < .05.
Figure 1. Interaction between Felt Pressure and Sexism Predicting Agency in Girls
Figure 2. Interaction between Felt Pressure and Sexism Predicting Bravado in Girls
Figure 3. Interaction between Felt Pressure and Sexism Predicting Bravado in Boys
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