Essay on nature versus nurture

[Technology](#), [Development](#)

The Influence of Socialization Factors on Gender Differences

The Influence of Socialization Factors on Gender Differences

Introduction

The nurturing or socialization factors influencing gender difference encompasses a variety of drivers. Today, psychological theorists of the 21st century continue debating nature versus nurture individual influence on gender differences. Review of literature in preparing this academic inquiring, produced interesting variables connected to the publishing date of the research. Assessing the literature focusing on the socialization factors influencing gender-based behaviour proved insightful with the changes in scientific research attitude particularly from the latter part of the 20th century well into the current decade of the 21st century. Warin (2000) offers how both, quantitative as well as qualitative data provides the existence of " an association between the higher levels of gender constancy and children's preferences for gender-consistent" characteristics of environmental factors prove especially apparent connected with " those concerned with the social environment (p. 228-229)."

A better understanding of this evolution in both the focus of research combined with specific methodology changes leads to where the field views nature and nurture and behaviour characteristics of gender. This impels presenting the focus of this academic inquiry as a discussion of the socialization factors influencing gender differences him humans with a brief review of some of the biological theories influencing gender behaviour.

Early Findings Lead to Separation of Nature and Nurture

Maccoby and Jacklin (1974) report on early literature findings revealing, " relatively few attributes and behaviours associated with reliable differences" in gender. At the same time, these findings revealed consistencies in higher levels of aggression in boys and higher verbal abilities in girls (as cited by Lippa, 2002, p. 128). Consequently, the ensuing decades " foreshadowed a recurring refrain in the psychology of gender" and therefore, as reported proved boys and girls " more similar than different (Maccoby & Jacklin; Hyde, 2005, as cited by Lippa, 2002, p. 128)."

Lippa (2002) describes the limitations of " ability" in synthesizing quantitative findings " across studies" by Maccoby and Jacklin (1974). Therefore, by the 1980s application of meta-analysis of the field " led to two key advances in our understanding (e. g., Hyde & Linn, 1986)." Consequently, the primary finding showed the ability for comparing " the average probability value and effect size across all studies while controlling for the sample size of each study." Further, according to Hyde (2005) with researcher now inferring both " the average effect

size (and the overall statistical significance level)" this directed increased numbers of researchers in rethinking existing assumption around the extent of male and female variations in both physiological and distinct behavioural traits (as cited by Lippa, 2002, p. 128).

Describing the second finding emerging, Lippa (2001) writes how research led to discovery of how testing arose from meta-analysis, looking for gender difference moderators (socialization) with specific emphasis on behaviour connected to " particular relevance to this special issue on children's gender

and relationships ". With the advent of meta-analysis research, studies such as Leaper and Smith (2004), revealed how such methodology " have been able to highlight how certain gender-related patterns may vary depending on the social relationship." Further, with the findings of Lippa and Herberger (1999) Mitchell, Baker, and Jacklin (1989), as well as Rowe (1982) providing " expressive personality traits (e. g., nurturance), and sex-typed occupational preferences and interests—indicate that all these traits show significant heritability (as cited by Lippa, 2002, p. 128)." This explanation of the process leading to the understanding of the differences of nature versus nurture provides how socialization exists as a moderator influencing gender behaviour.

Socialization Theories

Social-structural Factors as Moderators

Leaper (2011) refers to the changes taking place in American society at the time the Maccoby and Jacklin (1974) book published. Due to the varied movements including Civil Rights, women, and anti-poverty invoking the public's consciousness, these put particular changes in the field of developmental psychology with researchers conducting studies such as Best and Thomas (2004) as well as Kurtz-Costes et al (2011) describe. These look at how studies took on " more conscientious about variations in the ways that gender is expressed in different socio-cultural communities." The work accomplished features variations of social structures shaping both function and form of gender-related behaviours. The work of developmental scientific research such as Brown and Leaper (2011), Eccles et al (2000) focused " studying factors related to sexism in childhood" as well as how " gender roles

have become more flexible, researchers have examined girls' and boys' achievement in non-traditional academic domains. In addition, work conducted by Fulcher and Coyle (2011), as well as Sinno and Killen (2011) studied how and youths' attitudes towards egalitarian family roles (p. 351)." Poulin-Dubois, Serbin, Eichstedt, Sen, and Baissel (2002) describe finding as shedding " new light on the development of gender schemas during the first two years of life" as connected to socialization interactions. These outcomes feature how " common household activities to which children are exposed early in life are among the first gender-typed activities included in children's gender schemas." Poulin-Dubois et al (2002) look at the importance of current research findings providing further confirmations aligned with the existence of preferences and stereotypes connected to stereotyped gender-based activities during human behaviour development (p. 179).

Studies by O'Brien and Houston (1985) and Roopnarine (1986) show " gender-typed activities and toys can be observed in natural and laboratory settings by the middle of the second year." Serbin et al (2001) indicates the same timeframe of age in their findings. Poulin-Dubois et al (1994, 1998) report " evidence of knowledge of gender categories, and gender labels respectively (as cited by Poulin-Dubois et al, 2002, p. 179)

Poulin-Dubois et al (2002) explain, this " has been reported by the middle of the second year as well, this suggests that some form of gender schema is already in place by the end of the second year." With the successful " use of innovative research methods borrowed from the field of child cognition is clearly a promising approach to uncovering children's early awareness of such critical social categories as ' female' and ' male'." The future holds the

answers through research connected with variant aspects connected with gender knowledge for inclusion in these earlier " schemas (p. 179)."

It remains according to the findings of Chick, Heilman-Houser, and Hunter (2002) how the types of " interactions affect gender socialization and gender-role development in childcare setting." With cognition apparent according to the literature for socialization influences on human behaviour development as early as two years of age, the Chick et al (2002) findings make the implications clear as to the importance of these interactions.

Raag (1999), findings explains, " Gender-typed information unrelated to toys may signal the importance of gender in a situation." According to the Raag (1999) findings, the outcomes suggest how sensitivity to indirect information connected to gender boundaries especially, boys, reveals they " may be more sensitive to varied types of situational cues about the importance of gender" than girls. In other words, these findings connected to the influence of socialization on gender-based behavior shows, such sensitivity exhibited by boys could lead to behaviour such as " avoiding cross-gender-typed toys and activities (allowing how) how boys can avoid potential negative social consequences for their behavior (p. 819).

According to Scarr (1993) social views societal influences have social issues looks at how " acknowledging diversity does not signal tolerance of race, gender, or any other kind of discrimination." Scarr (1993) posits:

" All children should have opportunities to become species-normal, culturally appropriate, and uniquely themselves--their own versions of Georges Sand, Ghengis Khan, and Martin Luther King, Jr. Today many children in the world lack those opportunities. Their needs should be addressed. But humanitarian

concerns should not drive developmental theory (p. 1350)."

On this same note, Forrester (2012) explains how early in life how girls lean " not to appear too smart or too ambitious" all due to gender-based barriers about alienating " other girls or potential mates." Today, Western women continue represented unequally in various professions. The combination of the convergence of chance, physical variations, vocational focuses, cognitive abilities, personal values, priorities, and cultural expectations lead to influencing the " level of success in a field" among women. This socialization effect on gender-based behaviour of females, then reveals, " As adults, they will experience what's called the minority bias - that is, they have to work harder to be viewed as equal (p. A7." Contrary to this, Wood and Eagley (2002) take a biosocial perspective that human behaviour by both genders remains " sufficiently malleable that both sexes are potentially capable of effectively carrying out organizational roles at all levels (p. 722)."

Poulin-Dubois et al (1998) look at the expanding range of gender knowledge among children looks at the indirect " manner in which gender stereotypes can be acquired" connected to social environments creating gender metaphors within the collective cognitive acquisitions during behavioural development (as cited by Eichstedt & Serbin et al, 2002, p. 308). In other words according to Eichstedt, Serbin, Poulin-Dubois, and Sen (2002), " Knowledge of gender metaphors may serve as an " engine" that facilitates and enhances the acquisition of gender-stereotypes, such as occupational roles and personality traits, during the preschool period (p. 308)."

Biological Gender Differences

According to Cronin (2008), innate tastes prove gender based. " Men are more interested in things, women in people." Cronin (2008) explains studies continue showing less than day old baby girls' preference for the human face over bay boys' mechanically run mobiles shows the difference from the beginning of birth. (p. 11). Maccoby and Jacklin (1974) noted implications connected to biological factors concurs the " aetiology of some psychological gender differences." Further, Maccoby and Jacklin (1974) point out how " subsequent decades (proved), biologically based dispositions in gender development has been postulated in evolutionary psychology (e. g., Bjorklund & Pellegrini, 2002) and behaviour genetics (e. g., Iervolino, Hines, Golombok, Rust, & Plomin, 2005) (as cited by Leaper, 2011, p. 352)." Research, according to Maccoby and Jacklin (1974) focused on neuroscience studies by Berenbaum and Hines (1992) looked to identifying explicit physiological systems proving affecting gender development. Other research by Pellegrini et al (2007) as well as Ensor et al (2011) as described by these authors focused on determining " average gender differences in temperament" suggesting how " biologically based dispositions, such as activity level or emotion regulation, may be linked to some gender-related variations in behaviour (as cited by Leaper, 2011, p. 352)."

Conclusion

As posited in the introduction to this academic investigation, the nurturing or socialization factors influencing gender difference encompasses a variety of drivers. The preponderance of literature on psychological developmental factors of behaviour within human males and females connected to

socialization influence includes documentation of this cognitive process beginning as early as two years of age. The interaction of children with toys, with other children, in childcare settings, and in the home all contribute to gender-based behavioural development.

Studies of infants as young as two days showing gender-based preferences for visual preferences also gives credence to biological underpinnings influencing gender-based behavioural development. Clearly, however, as the literature used in this academic exploration of gender differences in interests and abilities are influenced by socialized interactions and observations proves valid. At the same time, as Martin and Ruble (2004) determine, there remains the fact, " Researchers also do not know what processes underlie the waxing and waning of rigidity and flexibility in gender beliefs and behaviors (p. 67-68)." Clearly, the ongoing research and further need for addressing this and other areas of the gender-based factors influencing behavioural development in humans may answer this question as well as others remaining a mystery in this field of human development connected to gender,

References

Chick, K. A., Heilman-Houser, R. A., & Hunter, M. W. (2002 Spring). The Impact of Childcare on Gender Role Development and Gender Stereotypes. Early Childhood Education Journal, 29(3)

Cronin, H. (2008, Aug 29). Science of the Sexes Reveals Differences. Cape Times (South Africa), p. 11

Eichstedt, J. A., Serbin, L., Poulin-Dubois, D., & Sen, M. G. (2002). Of Bears and Men: Infants' Understanding of Metaphorical Gender Stereotypes. Infant

Behavior & Development 25: p. 296–310

Forrester, T. (2012). Vive la Diffrence: Genders Are Mentally Equal but

Unalike. (2012, February 20). The Register Guard (Eugene, OR), p. A7.

Leaper. C. (2011). Research in Developmental on Gender and Relationships:

Reflections on the Past and Looking into the Future. British Journal of

Developmental Psychology 29: p. 347–356

Lippa, R. A. (2002). Gender, Nature, and Nurture. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence

Erlbaum Associates

Martin, C. L. & Ruble, D. (2004). Children's Search for Gender Cues: Cognitive

Perspectives on Gender Development Current Directions in Psychological

Science 13(67)

Poulin-Dubois, D., Serbin, L. A., Eichstedt, J. A., Sen, M. G., & Baissel, C. L.

(2002). Men Don't Put on Make-up: Toddlers' Knowledge of the Gender

Stereotyping of Household Activities. Social Development. © Blackwell

Publishers Ltd. 2002

Raag, T. (1999). Influences of Social Expectations of Gender, Gender

Stereotypes, and Situational Constraints on Children Toy Choices. Sex Roles,

41(11): p. 809

Scaar, S. (1993 Oct). Biological and Cultural Diversity: The Legacy of Darwin

for Development

Child Development 64(5): p. 1333-1353

Warin, J. (2000). The Attainment of Self-Consistency through Gender in

Young Children Sex Roles. 42(3/4)

Wood, W. & Eagley, A. H. (2002). A Cross-Cultural Analysis of the Behavior of

Women and Men: Implications for the Origins of Sex Differences

Psychological Bulletin Copyright 2002 by the American Psychological

Association, Inc. 2002, 128(5): p 699–727

:

: