

Age Differences

- Slaby and Frey (1975) – Gender constancy appeared at a younger age than Kohlberg suggested – as young as age five – Not a direct challenge to theory supporting idea thinking does change over time
- Suggests adjustments necessary to find actual age at which gender constancy appears – Over decades since Kohlberg first formulated theory children's lives have become very different
- Exposure to different kinds of gender information in media may cause development of constancy at an earlier age
- Suggests while the evidence still supports the sequence the actual ages may be younger than Kohlberg predicted

Gender Differences

- Huston (1985) – Relatively easy to get girls to take on masculine type activities but same cannot be said for boys who generally resist
- Difference explained in terms of social learning theory – role models boys identify with tend to be more powerful in society and power is factor determining how likely person is to identify with role model
- Girls are less likely to identify with role model as even though role models of gender appropriate behaviours are less powerful – Kohlberg's theory incomplete at social learning processes also involved
- Langlois and Downs (1980) – Boys more likely to be punished for gender inappropriate behaviour than girls – Boys learn gender-appropriate behaviour more rapidly
- Suggests Kohlberg's theory incomplete because social learning theory principles also involved

Gender Constancy May not be Required

- Kohlberg claimed children don't begin to require information about gender appropriate behaviour until they achieve gender constancy
- Martin and Little (1990) – Children under age of four display strong stereotypes about male and female behaviour
- Children had strong beliefs about what boys and girls were permitted to do before they had developed gender stability and gender constancy
- Kohlberg may have been wrong to state gender constancy is required to develop gender appropriate behaviours and this is in line with predictions of gender schema theory

COGNITIVE EXPLANATIONS OF DEVELOPMENT – GENDER SCHEMA THEORY – AO1

- Developed by Martin and Halverson (1987) – Two key factors differentiate theory from Kohlberg's:
 - Process of requiring gender relevant information happens before gender constancy is achieved – Basic gender identity (gender labelling) is sufficient enough for a child to identify him/herself as a boy or girl
 - Development of schemas affects later behaviour especially in terms of memory and attention

Schemas – cognitive framework that helps organise and interpret information in brain

- Schemas help individuals make sense of new information
- Children learn schemas related to gender from their interactions with other children and adults – Also learn from mass media
- Schemas related to cultural norms
- Gender schemas have function of organising and structuring other information presented to children
 - E.g. Learn about what toys appropriate for each gender and what clothes appropriate

Ingroup and Outgroup Schemas**Ingroup – Groups within which a person identifies**

- E.g. Being a girl means you identify with that ingroup
- Once a child has identified with any groups they positively evaluate their own group and negatively evaluate the outgroup

- Evaluation enhances self esteem and motivates child to be like their own group
- According to GST from an early age children focus on behaviours of ingroup schemas and avoid behaviours belonging to outgroup

Resilience of Gender Beliefs

- Gender beliefs lead children to hold very fixed gender attitudes – Ignore any information they encounter that isn't consistent with ingroup information
 - E.g. If a boy sees a film with a male nurse information is ignored because male isn't behaving consistently with boys ingroup schema – Boy doesn't alter existing schema
- Gender schemas have a profound effect on what is remembered and our perception of the world

Peer Relationships

- Play with other children leads children to believe all boys/girls share same interests – Children avoid the of opposite sex because they are 'not like me' therefore less likely to play with
- Children develop knowledge of potential consequences associated with different social relationships
 - E.g. Realise peers will tease them if they play with members of the opposite sex
- Martin (1991) – Gender schemas influence children's likelihood of developing social relationships with same and opposite sex peers

EVALUATION OF GENDER SCHEMA THEORY – AO3

Gender Schemas without Constancy

- Research on GST predicts children begin acquiring information about gender schemas before they reach gender stability around age of 3
- Martin and Little (1990) – Children under age of four showed no signs of gender stability or gender constancy which Kohlberg predicted – Despite this children showed strong gender stereotypes about what boys and girls could do
- Research displays children have acquired information about gender roles before Kohlberg suggested supporting GST

Gender Schemas Organising Memory

- If gender schemas are important in organising information about ingroup gender stereotypes we would expect children to pay greater attention to information consistent with gender schemas and remember information better
- Martin and Halverson (1987) – When children asked to recall pictures of people children under six recalled more gender consistent ones than gender inconsistent ones – Children pay greater attention to ingroup rather than outgroup schemas
 - E.g. Consistent image is male firefighter and inconsistent image male nurse
- Bruner et. Al. (1978) – Told 4-9 year olds certain gender neutral items (i.e. pizza cutters) were either boy or girl items – Participants took greater interest in toys labelled as ingroup – One week later remembered more information about ingroup
- Gender schemas related to organisation of information in memory

Gender Schemas Impact Information

- Gender schemas lead children to distort inconsistent information
- Martin and Halverson (1983) – When children shown a boy holding a gun and a boy holding a doll children described seeing a girl holding a doll
- Distorted memories serve to maintain ingroup schemas – Support GST as findings display behaviour can be explained in terms of schemas

Gender Identity Even Earlier

- There is evidence children can label gender group earlier than indicated in previous studies
- Zosuls Et. Al. (2009) – Recorded samples of children's language and observed them playing in order to identify when they first started labelling themselves as boy/girl – Concluded children using gender labels by age of 19 months
- Bandura and Bussey (2004) – Children show gender type preferences before gender identity challenging GST
- Evidence displays age related predictions of GST may be incorrect

PSYCHODYNAMIC EXPLANATION OF GENDER DEVELOPMENT – AO1

Oedipus Complex

- Proposed by Freud (1905) – Occurs in phallic stage
 - Young boy becomes aware of his sexuality and desires his mother wanting her sole attention
Around age three or four
 - Boys see their fathers as a rival for their mothers love and wish their father dead which creates castration anxiety which is repressed
 - Complex resolved when boy identifies with father – Through identification with father boy internalises fathers gender identity as his own

Electra Complex

- Proposed by Jung (1913) – Neo-Freudian
 - Young girl is initially attracted to her mother but then shifts when she discovers mother doesn't have a penis believing she was castrated – Girl experiences penis envy
 - Girls sexual desires transferred to father
 - Complex resolved when girl converts penis envy into wish to have a baby – Reduced anger towards mother
 - Girl identifies with mother and takes on female gender behaviour
- Freud believed girls identification with same sex parent less strong than boys because the reason for anyone to identify with women because she had lower status
- According to Freud because threats of castration not present for girls in phallic stage they aren't under same pressure as boys to identify with same sex-parent
- Boys are more reluctant than girls to engage in counter-stereotypical behaviour that may be considered feminine implies boys develop strong masculine identity at early stage therefore Freud was correct

Unresolved Phallic Stage

- Frustration and overindulgence in phallic stage may lead to fixation
- Fixation in phallic stage leads to person who is not capable of close love – Freud believed fixation may be root cause of immoral behaviours and homosexuality

Importance of Identification

- Identification with same-sex parent develops superego – Allows child to adopt same sex parents gender identity
- Boys may begin to follow same like dad and girl may help mother with chores

EVALUATION OF PSYCHODYNAMIC EXPLANATION TO GENDER DEVELOPMENT – AO3

Supportive Case Studies – Little Hans

- Hans developed a fear of horses which Freud believed was a result for repressing his desires for his mother
- Hans developed a love for his mother and wished his father dead – Castration anxiety because Hans mother told him he would have his penis chopped off because he asked her to touch it
- Hans associated touching with touching a horse – Hans displayed his repressed fear of castration as a fear of horses
- Resolution came when Hans identified with his father and no longer feared castration

Freud (1921)

- Reported cases of 32 mental patients who were diagnosed with manic depression (bipolar) – Psychoanalysis revealed 22 appeared to be suffering from unresolved Electra complex's and 12 regressed to earlier stages of psychosexual development
- Supports link between unresolved stages of gender development and later mental health