

This material is protected by copyright. Except as stated herein, none of the material may be copied, reproduced, distributed, republished, translated, downloaded, displayed, posted, or transmitted in any form or by any means, including, but not limited to, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or otherwise, without the prior written permission and approval of Columbia University Press. Permission is granted to the recipient of this email to display for personal, non-commercial use on a computer screen and to print one copy of individual pages on paper (but not to photocopy them) only, provided you do not modify the materials and that you retain all copyright and other proprietary notices contained in the materials. This permission terminates automatically if you breach any of these terms or conditions.

## GENDER AND PARENTHOOD

# **GENDER AND PARENTHOOD**

**BIOLOGICAL AND SOCIAL SCIENTIFIC PERSPECTIVES**

Edited by  
**W. Bradford Wilcox and Kathy Kovner Kline**

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY PRESS NEW YORK



COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY PRESS

*Publishers Since 1893*

New York Chichester, West Sussex

cup.columbia.edu

Copyright © 2013 Columbia University Press

All rights reserved

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

{to come}



Columbia University Press books are printed on permanent and durable acid-free paper.

This book is printed on paper with recycled content.

Printed in the United States of America

c 10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1

p 10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1

References to Internet Web sites (URLs) were accurate at the time of writing. Neither the author nor Columbia University Press is responsible for URLs that may have expired or changed since the manuscript was prepared.

## CONTENTS

*Acknowledgments* vii

Introduction 1

*W. Bradford Wilcox and Kathy Kovner Kline*

### **PART I HOW AND WHY IS PARENTHOOD GENDERED?**

1. The Dynamic Nature of the Parental Brain 19  
*Kelly G. Lambert and Catherine L. Franssen*
2. Family Life and Infant Care: Lessons from Cooperatively Breeding Primates 40  
*Charles T. Snowdon*
3. Human Parenting from an Evolutionary Perspective 61  
*David F. Bjorklund and Ashley C. Jordan*
4. Parenting  $\times$  Gender  $\times$  Culture  $\times$  Time 91  
*Marc H. Bornstein*
5. Gender Differences and Similarities in Parental Behavior 120  
*Ross D. Parke*
6. Gender and Parenting Across the Family Life Cycle 164  
*Ayelet Talmi*

### **PART II IMPLICATIONS FOR CHILDREN, COUPLES, AND FAMILIES**

7. Essential Elements of the Caretaking Crucible  
*Kathy Kovner Kline and Brian Stafford* 191

8. Gendered Parenting's Implications for Children's Well-Being  
Theory and Research in Applied Perspective 215  
*Rob Palkovitz*
  9. Do Fathers Uniquely Matter for Adolescent Well-Being? 249  
*David J. Eggebeen*
  10. No One Best Way: Work-Family Strategies, the Gendered  
Division of Parenting, and the Contemporary Marriages  
of Mothers and Fathers 271  
*W. Bradley Wilcox and Jeffrey Dew*
  11. The Effect of Gender-Based Parental Influences on Raising Children:  
The Impact on Couples' Relationships 304  
*Scott Haltzman*
  12. Single Mothers Raising Children Without Fathers: Implications  
for Rearing Children with Male-Positive Attitudes 322  
*William Doherty and Shonda Craft*
- List of Contributors* 338
- Index* 341

# 8

## **GENDERED PARENTING'S IMPLICATIONS FOR CHILDREN'S WELL-BEING THEORY AND RESEARCH IN APPLIED PERSPECTIVE**

Rob Palkovitz

**IN THE MOST GENERAL SENSE,** worldwide, mothers and fathers share similar parenting goals of survival, protection, teaching, and fostering self-fulfillment in their offspring.<sup>1</sup> Yet, as parents, men and women approach their shared goals through differentiated roles, styles, and levels of behavior. In addition, mothers and fathers may have unique individual aspirations for their children's development. Parents' hopes and dreams, concerns and fears, may be different for sons and daughters. Consequently, mothers and fathers treat sons and daughters differently. These facets of gendered parenting interact to influence developmental competencies and well-being of children in different ways. This chapter reviews theoretical and empirical literature on the relationships between different patterns of gendered parenting and children's well-being.

A broad-based body of theoretical and empirical literature identifies gendered parenting as a key component in a set of influences in shaping children's welfare. The challenge of concisely reviewing the empirical and theoretical literature on the effects of gendered parenting on child outcomes lies in presenting the material in a manner that cogently summarizes trends in parental influence while avoiding reductionistic parent-effects models<sup>2</sup> and appropriately heeding interactive effects of multiple moderating and mediating variables. In order to elucidate variations in the effects of gendered parenting on children's development, it is also essential to consider the contexts of parent-child interaction and development, including the transactional nature of family influence,<sup>3</sup> and cohort changes in culturally grounded gender values.<sup>4</sup>

Recent fluctuations in American culture include a rapidly transforming family landscape characterized by expanded diversity of family forms<sup>5</sup> and shifting balances of role enactments.<sup>6</sup> Demographic indicators reflect

prevailing conditions that represent challenges to effectively raising children, such as an increase in the number of single parent households.<sup>7</sup> At the same time, economic pressures have yielded a growing number of dual earner couples,<sup>8</sup> and an expanding number of hours that parents spend at work each week.<sup>9</sup> These changes have occurred in the context of ideals that espouse egalitarian sharing of family and work responsibilities for men and women.<sup>10</sup> As parents negotiate this complex array of competing circumstances, demands, and values, what are the implications for the development and well-being of their children?

Theoretical understanding of the intricacies of interactive systems in development and in families has far outpaced the limits of empirical capacity. As in all realms of inquiry in human development and family studies where environments contribute significantly to variations in developmental status, the diversity of contexts within which gendered parenting takes place presents daunting challenges to researchers. Approaches that seriously value systems perspectives of development and transactional models of interpersonal relationships and family systems defy the likelihood of single empirical investigations capturing the complexities of influences of gendered parenting on child outcomes. In any given empirical study, it is not feasible to collect data sufficient to control for the interactions of all variables identified by bodies of empirical and theoretical literature as exerting significant influence. Therefore, emerging pictures of the effects of gendered parenting on child well-being must come from meta-analytic syntheses of theoretical and empirical literature that target facets of developmental influence while understanding that full empirical validation of emergent understandings cannot be accomplished in isolated studies.

This chapter will review theoretical and empirical literature regarding the influences of gendered parenting on child development outcomes, with a particular focus on children's cognitive, emotional, and social welfare. There are literally hundreds of studies that link aspects of gendered parenting to child outcomes across diverse developmental domains. To do a comprehensive review of them is clearly beyond the scope of this chapter. Rather, the primary objectives of this chapter are to expand emerging understandings of developmental processes of gendered parenting, to synthesize convergent trends in the empirical findings linking gendered parenting to children's developmental well-being, and to address limitations and applications of the current professional literature.

## MECHANISMS AND PROCESSES OF INFLUENCE IN GENDERED PARENTING

Gendered parenting is reflected in the theoretical and empirical literature in a number of interrelated, yet distinct ways: sex differences in behaviors of men and women,<sup>11</sup> differential levels of participation in various categories of involvement in child rearing,<sup>12</sup> different parental styles of interaction with children,<sup>13</sup> different meanings of the constellations of sex role orientations in men and women,<sup>14</sup> and interactions of these factors within the contexts of parenting and development over time.

The developmental literature identifies multiple factors that are pertinent to our consideration including: parental gender role modeling, parents' differential treatment of girls and boys, direct instruction of children, gendered expectations, opportunities provided, monitoring and management of children's activities, and emotional communication and regulation. These categories of influence are neither exhaustive nor mutually exclusive. We will now turn attention to understanding how these components of gendered parenting affect child welfare.

### MODELING AND REWORKING

Modeling entails attempts at replicating the attributes or behaviors of others, while reworking involves efforts to modify one's behavior in order to rectify limitations, shortcomings, or absences observed or experienced.<sup>15</sup> There is widespread agreement that mothers and fathers model different gender roles, engagement patterns, and statuses; thereby shaping children's understanding of what it means to be a man or a woman,<sup>16</sup> or a parent of either sex.<sup>17</sup>

In the developmental literature, modeling is presented as a pervasive and effective means of conveying gender expectations to children. As early as 24 months of age, children look longer at adults performing gender inconsistent activities than those engaged in behaviors consistent with gender stereotypes.<sup>18</sup> At the same time, boys and girls are likely to show preference for stereotypically gender appropriate toys.<sup>19</sup> The effects of modeling are not limited to early childhood. As the balance of work and family roles have shifted in contemporary America, corresponding changes have been documented in daughters'<sup>20</sup> and sons'<sup>21</sup> gender attitudes and aspirations.

While gender role modeling is covered in detail in many reviews of the literature, reworking is less frequently discussed. It has been suggested<sup>22</sup> that

as people assume parenting roles, a feature of adult development is the reworking of components of the roles and behavioral involvement of their own parents. This process occurs in virtually all adults, even if they perceive their parents to be “good” parents, because as adults engage in parental roles, they come to new understandings of the parenting they received. As they reflect on their parents’ decisions and behaviors, they recognize components of parenting that could be improved, and thereby rework their parenting and gender roles.

I would posit that for children, modeling is a more central component of gender attitude formation than reworking, but both have important developmental implications for child outcomes, especially in regard to gender identity and role formation. In comparison to reworking, modeling requires less developmental maturity. Modeling allows one to copy what has been seen or encountered, realms of experience available even to sensorimotor infants. In contrast, reworking requires more advanced cognitive maturity: reflection on or envisioning what was *not* seen or experienced, the creation of alternative models absent from one’s experience. Reworking is less sure than modeling because the roles or ideals created, especially if generated during childhood, may not be realistic or practical to implement. While it is possible to assess consequences of modeled behaviors through vicarious reinforcement,<sup>23</sup> creating new, unrealized roles through reworking does not allow observational learning of consequences and it requires more inventiveness and developmental resources than following models who have already successfully forged and modeled a path.

These understandings have profound implications for the gender development of children in single parent or same sex parent families. If children are to develop adequate working models of what it means to be a person who is the gender of the absent parent, they will need to emulate and comprehend less frequently available models, such as parent figures or mentors. Alternatively, they can draw on cognitive capacities that develop later in life, reworking available models to create what was lacking in their earlier experience. With contemporary emphasis on the importance of early learning, the implication is that children who experience parental patterns that require significant reworking are at a disadvantage in comparison to children who can model appropriate relationships and roles.

Formulation of working models of heterosexual interaction is only possible in the presence of both sexes. That is, a child can best learn how men and women relate to one another if they have adequate opportunity to observe such interactions. If their parent is unpartnered or partnered with a

same-sexed individual, there is less opportunity for the child to form expectations (and evaluative models) of heterosexual relationships.

This discussion also informs understandings of why children suffer developmental delays when they have parents who are present and involved, but who do not engage in developmentally facilitative, positive parenting. The need for these children to rework parental roles may contribute further to the developmental deficits. Fortunate is the child whose proportion of reworking to positive modeling is minimal.

## DIFFERENTIAL TREATMENT

It has been suggested that the greatest influence of gendered parenting for children's development is exerted through the differential treatment of sons and daughters.<sup>24</sup> Despite controversies surrounding the size and significance of real sex differences, and ways to operationalize them, differences in behavior can be easily documented in parental involvement with children across time in regard to both amounts of engagement<sup>25</sup> and the nature or style of engagement.<sup>26</sup> These patterns, in turn, can be correlationally, but not causally, linked to child outcome variables.<sup>27</sup> In two-parent households, mothers' enhanced levels of accessibility, engagement, and responsibility may make them more influential than their spouses or partners in shaping child outcomes,<sup>28</sup> though fathers may compensate for their relative absence through increasing the salience of their interactions with their children<sup>29</sup> through rough and tumble, exuberant, or unpredictable play styles.<sup>30</sup>

Parental interactions directed toward sons and daughters have been described as having different cognitive, social, and emotional goals. Specifically, exchanges with daughters are characterized as emphasizing compliance and relational synchrony, while interactions with sons are viewed to involve greater emphasis on cognitive stimulation and encouragement for agency.<sup>31</sup> Parents' interactional styles with sons and daughters may foster distinct understandings of the social roles of males and females.<sup>32</sup> Patricia Kerig, Philip Cowan, and Carolyn Cowan note that "these gender differences are not simply pink or blue but are also colored by the emotional quality of the relationships between marital partners and their children."<sup>33</sup>

The roots of differential treatment of boys and girls begin prenatally or while infants are still in the hospital delivery room or nursery.<sup>34</sup> We have each listened as parents interpret the movements of fetuses known to be boys and girls in different ways, using terms that are gender stereotyped.

Differential gender expectations lead to differential interpretations of child behavior and to differential treatment of boys and girls. Early gender stereotyping continues through infancy as parents use gender-biased adjectives to describe the emotions and behaviors of their children.<sup>35</sup>

Differential treatment of children comes from both mothers and fathers, though mothers and fathers manifest different patterns of treatment toward sons and daughters across different developmental realms. As documented elsewhere in this volume,<sup>36</sup> fathers and mothers spend different proportions of their child-involved time in different activities, and with different behavioral styles. Specifically, mothers and fathers treat sons and daughters differently in everyday interactions that discriminate in styles and amounts of language, problem solving, emotional regulation and expression, and play. Fathers are often, though not always, reported to be significantly more involved with sons than daughters and to concentrate more on instrumental aspects of support.<sup>37</sup> In contrast, mothers have a tendency to be more supportive across genders affectively.<sup>38</sup> Parents use different patterns of touch, talking, use of supportive statements, patterns of questioning, comforting of emotions, choice of peers, and activities with boys and girls.<sup>39</sup> Parents are more likely to encourage rough and tumble play with sons than daughters<sup>40</sup> and may discourage physical play in daughters.<sup>41</sup>

Mothers more frequently respond to sons' emotional displays than daughters in a contingent manner<sup>42</sup> and are more consistent in responses to sons' than daughters' emotions.<sup>43</sup> Affection is differentially encouraged and tolerated from boys and girls.<sup>44</sup> Fathers may be more cognitively demanding than mothers<sup>45</sup> while mothers frequently show more scaffolding of children's learning than fathers.<sup>46</sup> Fathers tend to reward daughters for positive, compliant behaviors and to reward sons for assertiveness.<sup>47</sup> Both mothers and fathers use fewer directives with sons than daughters, encouraging more active problem solving and independence.<sup>48</sup>

Taken together, these findings establish that mothers and fathers interact differently with sons and daughters, thereby necessitating, at minimum, a two by two (sex of parent by sex of child) matrix to more fully understand the effects of gendered parenting on child development outcomes. As will be established later in this review, the number of dimensions and cells in the matrix expands significantly when we consider patterns of interactions in other central variables beyond the sex of the parent and child.

Though both mothers and fathers treat their sons and daughters differently, fathers are more consistently identified as employing different treatment to their children by sex.<sup>49</sup> Even when frequencies of behaviors for

mothers and fathers are reported to be similar, the contexts and responses of sons and daughters may be different, so the same parental treatment may affect sons and daughters differently,<sup>59</sup> yielding different developmental outcomes.

We tend to assume that parents initiate gender differentiated treatment, but it may be the case that children's sex differences elicit and discourage different parental behaviors.<sup>51</sup> Child characteristics are known to influence parent behaviors in a transactional manner.<sup>52</sup> "As highlighted in recent reviews, we need to disentangle child and parent effects (as well as interaction) when explaining children's development."<sup>53</sup> Unfortunately, most empirical findings are not assessed in a manner that allows such disentanglement.

## PROVISION AND PROHIBITION OF OPPORTUNITIES

Parents are likely to assign household chores that align with gender appropriate stereotypes,<sup>54</sup> and to model traditional divisions of labor in their own household work.<sup>55</sup> Adolescent sons receive more permissive parenting than do daughters.<sup>56</sup> Sons are typically granted permission to go further from home and engage in a broader range of activities with peers<sup>57</sup> with less monitoring than daughters.<sup>58</sup> These factors are likely to foster gendered differences in independence, communality, and instrumentality as well as in gendered approaches to household roles.

## PARENTAL SEX AND GENDER DIFFERENCES

In the realm of human development, the term sex differences refers to biologically based physical differences between males and females. In contrast, the term gender differences refers to dissimilarities in patterns of behaviors or traits that define how to act the part of a female or a male in a particular social context or culture. There is general disagreement among social scientists regarding the number and scope of real sex differences in humans.<sup>59</sup> In contrast, there is no doubt that world-wide, there is considerable variation in the magnitude of gender differences observed.<sup>60</sup> Still, the consensus seems to be that there is more similarity than difference in gender expression in humans,<sup>61</sup> but that observed differences may be significant and influential<sup>62</sup> in shaping the behavior and attitudes of subsequent generations. In the grand sense, differences between mothers and fathers are not great: Both parents encourage visual exploration, object manipulation, attention to relations between objects, and cause and effect.<sup>63</sup> However, fathers do so

differently from mothers; that is to say that maternal and paternal styles of achieving these larger goals are distinct from one another. Fathers tend to be more unconventional in their toy and object use than mothers and use objects to engage in physical contact with children to a greater degree than mothers.<sup>64</sup> Fathers also destabilize children during play through the use of teasing to a greater extent than mothers.<sup>65</sup>

Daniel Paquette discusses the fact that father's stimulating play styles with children are effective in helping children to develop strong bonds with their fathers even when fathers are less present than the mother.<sup>66</sup> As far as biological sex goes, men tend to be firmer and more non-directive than women as parents, while women tend to be more responsive, structured, and regimented than men.<sup>67</sup> Fathers are more demanding of children in regard to problem solving than mothers<sup>68</sup> and make more action-related demands for accomplishment of tasks.<sup>69</sup>

Parents of either biological sex can be classified into gender categories; masculine, feminine, androgynous, or undifferentiated.<sup>70</sup> Briefly summarized, sex-typed individuals (masculine or feminine) are those who manifest characteristics consistently associated with one sex or another within a culture's role attributions. For example, feminine individuals (either males or females) demonstrate a higher degree of behaviors or attitudes associated with females, and relatively few associated with males. Masculine individuals would have the converse pattern of attributes. Traditionally gender-typed persons are those whose gender roles are consistent with their biological sex. Nontraditionally, or cross-gender-typed persons manifest characteristics of persons of the opposite sex. Androgynous individuals demonstrate role-stereotypic behaviors and attitudes of both men and women simultaneously. Androgynes demonstrate socially desirable qualities of both sexes: greater instrumentality (dominance, agency) and, at the same time, greater expressivity (warmth, communion).<sup>71</sup> In contrast, undifferentiated individuals are not particularly demonstrative of sex stereotyped behaviors or attitudes of either men or women in a given cultural context.

Diana Baumrind published a landmark analysis of parental gender differences and child outcomes in her 1982 article titled "Are Androgynous Individuals More Effective Persons and Parents?" The Baumrind study used nine year olds and was published in the early 1980s—one cohort! The subjects were well-educated, middle class Caucasian individuals in one geographic locale (from 1972 to 1975). Baumrind found that with sex controlled, gender classification adds predictive power, primarily to child rearing variables assessing responsiveness.<sup>72</sup> Feminine and androgynous parents are highly

responsive and undifferentiated and masculine parents are unresponsive. Yet, she summarized her analyses by stating, “parents’ gender classifications are not highly discriminative of children’s competency ratings.”<sup>73</sup> The measures of well-being (by parental gender type) were children’s social responsibility, social assertiveness, and cognitive competence as well as optimum competence.

Baumrind went on to explain, however, that where differences are manifested, they tend to support traditional sex role theories. Specifically, sons with masculine fathers tend to be more socially assertive while children of opposite sexed parents with cross-sex gender identity were likely to demonstrate somewhat lower competencies. Baumrind concluded that children of androgynous parents are not more competent than children with parents who are sex typed or undifferentiated. In speculating about mechanisms behind these patterns of outcomes, she reflected that androgynous parents have a tendency to be child-centered, and that may yield somewhat lower competency than having parents who are moderately more directive. This indicates that parenting style may be more central in influencing child outcomes than parental gender roles, though they are related to one another.

More recently, Daniel Paquette asserted that “while a relative lack of differentiation in parental roles would appear to be more socially desirable, the work of researchers in Toulouse, France, suggests that the family structure that is most favorable to the socio-affective development of young children is one in which both parents are involved from the early stages, but with differentiated fields of activity involving clearly polarized maternal and paternal functions.”<sup>74</sup> Such statements may minimize the fact that even in families with egalitarian ideals, parents still have different styles, voices, histories, and connections to their children as well as gendered relationships toward their sons and daughters. Le Camus<sup>75</sup> asserts that children necessarily have different experiences with their mothers and fathers because the psychological and physical differences between the two parents are greater than those between two people of the same sex. Mothers and fathers differ in odor, voice, face, muscle tone, and messages communicated. Thus, children from egalitarian families still have multiple and varied opportunities to develop differential expectations for their parents, and to benefit from discrimination learning in the positive sense, the formulation of and analyses of differences.

Baumrind was astute enough to assess both sex and gender differences as they relate to variables indicative of personal competence in mothers and fathers. She reviewed literature that suggests that in comparison to traditionally-typed and undifferentiated individuals, androgynous people

have higher self-esteem and self-confidence, greater individuation, are more intellectually stimulating, more unconventional, less field dependent, and have greater locus of control. Her empirical work with parents and children found that undifferentiated parents have lower self-esteem and androgynous persons have higher self-esteem than sex-typed parents. Androgynous persons also had more internal locus of control than other individuals of the same sex. She reported that on nine of the 10 personal variables she assessed there were neither sex nor gender differences.<sup>76</sup> Specifically, there were no variables on which androgynous men differed from masculine men. Androgynous men differed from androgynous women, but not from masculine men by being more nondirective with their children. Yet, gender identity predicted significant differences in certain child-rearing and personal variables, with sex controlled, in particular contrasts involving androgynous men on responsiveness variables. This is consistent with my own research showing that androgynous fathers are more involved with their infants than masculine or feminine fathers.<sup>77</sup> Baumrind contends that “there are no personal variables on which androgynous men vary from masculine men . . . androgynous men vary from androgynous women, but not from masculine men, except that they are less directive.”<sup>78</sup>

Baumrind reports that some traditional gender role characteristics in fathers are related to undesirable parental traits. Masculine fathers tend to be less responsive than all other parents and use more coercive power and guilt induction than other fathers. However, on a more positive note, they generally use more positive reinforcement in comparison to other fathers.<sup>79</sup> Feminine mothers generally exhibit traits associated with superior parenting practices. In comparison to other sex and gender combinations, they are the warmest parents, most loving, responsive, and supportive, and the least irascible. To their detriment, however, they are less firm than other parents.<sup>80</sup> Sex-typed couples tend to be very demanding and moderately responsive.

These findings have clear implications for gendered parenting. Several studies have documented that undifferentiated and masculine parents are less responsive than feminine and androgynous parents.<sup>81</sup> These findings suggest that parents with different gender role orientations may manifest different personality types or interaction styles that are associated with different parental styles. Masculine fathers tend to be less responsive than all other fathers and use more coercive power and guilt induction than all other fathers. That is to say, they demonstrate different parenting styles than other parents. Similarly, undifferentiated mothers more often express anger and use punitive parenting styles than other mothers while demonstrating

less love/support. Masculine mothers are less responsive than other types of mothers. Masculine fathers and undifferentiated and masculine mothers have outcomes that reflect lower levels of warmth and higher levels of punitiveness than other parents.<sup>82</sup>

As stated earlier, there are correlations between parental gender types and parenting styles. Overall, androgynous couples tend to be more child-centered than authoritative, responsive, but not firm. In comparison, sex-typed parents tend to be very demanding and moderately responsive: authoritative, traditional, and demanding. Traditional couples cover the bases of positive parenting through specialized roles. Traditionally sex-typed mothers and fathers tend to engage in complementary child-rearing roles, with fathers being firm and mothers being outstandingly warm. Sex typed fathers tend to be firm, demanding, and positively reinforcing. Sex-typed mothers demonstrate loving, responsive, involved styles of child rearing. Cross-sex-identity mothers are less warm, but cross-sex-identity fathers are not less firm than sex-typed fathers.<sup>83</sup>

Such findings would establish that parents with different gender identity constellations interact with their children differently, which should predict different developmental competencies in their children. However, Baumrind concludes that children's competency ratings are not highly predicted by parents' gender classifications. Where results are statistically significant, they tend to support traditional sex role theories, with sons of traditional fathers showing more social assertion, and children of cross-sex gender identities being associated with lower competence scores for children.<sup>84</sup>

## **PARENTAL GENDER TYPES INTERACT WITH SEX OF PARENT AND SEX OF CHILD**

Theoretical literature indicates that there are often sex by gender interaction effects (seldom considered in research designs and analyses).<sup>85</sup> Masculine fathers tend to be firm, demanding and positively reinforcing, while leaving the responsibility of daily interaction to their wives or partners.<sup>86</sup> Feminine mothers show tendencies to be loving, responsive, and engaged in directing children's activities.<sup>87</sup> When masculine fathers parent in conjunction with feminine mothers, they tend to display traditional, authoritative, and demanding styles of parenting more frequently than non-directive, permissive, or punitive styles.<sup>88</sup> Daughters from homes of sex typed couples tend to demonstrate higher levels of competence and assertiveness than daughters from homes characterized by other combinations of parental gender

role pairings.<sup>89</sup> Similarly, sons from sex-typed homes typically demonstrate higher levels of competence than sons of androgynous parents.<sup>90</sup>

Goodness of fit for couples' gender identities is sometimes examined (e.g., androgynous-androgynous partners relate to one another differently than masculine-masculine partners). Although researchers often look at goodness of fit for parent-child dyads in regard to social activity and responsiveness or temperament and parenting style, I am unaware of research looking at the goodness of fit for gender identities of parents and children. The literature reviewed earlier would predict that there are "good" fits between some parent-child gender role pairings as well as some less optimal pairings.

## UNIQUE PARENTAL EFFECTS

Studies that demonstrate unique developmental contributions of either parent would indicate that there are developmental outcome effects of gendered parenting. In reviewing paternal involvement literature, I have found several studies that point toward the unique contributions of fathers in children's developmental well-being.<sup>91</sup>

Fathers' sensitivity and positive regard during play times have been uniquely linked with two- and three-year-olds' social skills; and the quality of fathers' attachment relationships with their children have been relatively more effective than mother-child attachment types in explaining children's self esteem and pro-social behavior.<sup>92</sup>

Greater positive father involvement with young children tends to be associated with overall life satisfaction, happiness, and psychological well-being when offspring reach early adulthood<sup>93</sup> and fewer behavioral problems for children<sup>94</sup> and adolescents.<sup>95</sup> Similarly, positive father involvement in married parent families is associated with lower psychological distress<sup>96</sup> and fewer depressive symptoms<sup>97</sup> in teens. Father support during adolescence plays a greater role than mothers' in explaining pro social outcomes for adolescents<sup>98</sup> as well as in adult sons who report good quality relationships with their fathers.<sup>99</sup>

Fathers may play a particularly important role in stimulating children's openness to the world in exciting, surprising, destabilizing, and encouraging them to take risks and to stand up for themselves.<sup>100</sup> Paquette describes paternal roles as comprising an "activation relationship" that is developed primarily through physical play.<sup>101</sup> Bruce Ellis has documented that the presence of a father in a household is associated with a delayed onset of

puberty in daughters, suggesting that biochemical links exist between paternal involvement and child outcomes. Similarly, positive paternal involvement is associated with lower risk in children and paternal absence has been cited by multiple scholars as the single greatest risk factor in teen pregnancy for girls.

## REALMS OF DEVELOPMENTAL DIFFERENCE ASSOCIATED WITH GENDERED PARENTING

### EMOTIONAL EXPRESSION AND REGULATION

Children have been shown to learn about emotional regulation through observational learning and social referencing, parenting practices, and the emotional climate of the family through parenting styles, attachment relationships, family expressiveness, and marital interactions and quality.<sup>102</sup> Fathers' supportiveness and cognitive stimulation have been associated with children's emotional regulation at 24 months in both sons and daughters.<sup>103</sup> Parents give daughters more opportunity to practice emotion talk than sons by more frequently discussing emotional experiences and by using more varied emotional references.<sup>104</sup> Parents also vary the types of emotion talk with sons and daughters, using more references to sadness with sons than daughters.<sup>105</sup> From early infancy onward, differential treatment of sons and daughters is contingent on the consistency of children's emotional displays with sex stereotypes. By using different frequencies and ranges of expression around emotional discussion, parents may be teaching boys and girls to think about, express, and control emotions differently.

In studies of emotional expression and regulation in adolescents, multiple research teams have found that children from more emotionally expressive and supportive families demonstrated a greater range of emotions than those associated with traditional stereotypes.<sup>106</sup> These findings have been interpreted to support the notion that better emotional adjustments are associated with androgyny or cross-gendered patterns than those associated with gender role traditionalism.<sup>107</sup>

Male and female respondents in Latino families described differential household activities, socialization of gender-typed behavior, and parental monitoring in parents' relationships with sons versus daughters.<sup>108</sup> Mothers and fathers use different parenting styles for sons and daughters and different combinations of maternal and paternal parenting (e.g., a permissive father parenting with an authoritarian mother) are related to late adolescents'

emotional adjustment. Late adolescents who have at least one authoritative parent show better adjustment than those who do not have such a parent.<sup>109</sup> Congruent authoritative parenting is associated with higher emotional adjustment than congruent authoritarian parenting or incongruent parenting.<sup>110</sup>

## **SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT OUTCOMES**

In regard to child outcomes, externalizing behaviors are linked to lack of disciplinary rules and coercive and abusive parenting practices.<sup>111</sup> Paquette argues that the presence of a father and a mother with differentiated roles fosters the development of children who are competent in cooperation and competition.<sup>112</sup> Bourgeois has shown that, in dual-parent families, children from households with involved and differentiated parents (with distinct functions such as caregiver and playmate) present a more highly developed sociality (are more interactive, more involved and more open with playmates), and are better prepared for both competition and cooperation than those with involved but undifferentiated parents.<sup>113</sup> According to Ricaud, as compared to children of differentiated fathers with little involvement in parenting, and children of two involved, undifferentiated parents, children of involved and differentiated parents have fewer conflicts with peers, fewer aggressive interactions, and more affiliative interactions, primarily exercising mutual agreement to resolve conflicts, and employing dissuasive effects of speech rather than physical violence.<sup>114</sup>

## **EARLY ATTACHMENT RELATIONSHIPS**

Parent-child attachments can have different precursors, consequences, and correlates for boys and girls.<sup>115</sup> Attachments appear to be more closely related to emotional maturity in boys than girls.<sup>116</sup> Boys may be more vulnerable to emotional challenges than girls in early childhood.<sup>117</sup> Consequences of insecure attachments are greater for sons than daughters, predicting greater vulnerability to emotional and social difficulties. Sons and daughters are known to become attached to both mothers and fathers, and at approximately the same time in two-parent households.<sup>118</sup> While attached to both mothers and fathers, infants show a slight preference for mothers when distressed.<sup>119</sup> A vast literature links the quality of early attachment to cognitive and social development, indicating that securely attached children experience learning advantages by using their attachment figures as a secure base for exploration and

as skilled social partners, who teach turn taking, emotional intelligence, and other skills that translate into more effective peer relationships for securely attached children in comparison to insecurely attached children.<sup>120</sup>

## EARLY COGNITIVE DEVELOPMENT

Children form differential expectations for their mothers and fathers as they are treated in a different manner by each parent. Some of those expectations are doubtlessly translated into understandings of the personalities and interaction styles of their parents as persons, but some are also likely interpreted as scripts for how men and women, fathers and mothers, behave. Such experiences are labeled as discrimination learning, the ability to discern differences, and to form differential expectations and contingencies based on the perceived differences. These are adaptive cognitive skills that translate into social cognition, competence, pragmatics, and nuanced interpersonal interaction abilities.

If a child had two parents who had styles and levels of interaction that were indistinguishable, they would not have the same degree of experience of evaluating and making meaning of differences. Experiencing parental differences affords children with the opportunity to develop nuanced understandings of individual differences in personality as well as gender, enhancing social cognition. Two year olds who had highly supportive mothers and fathers were shown to have more advanced cognitive functioning than those who did not.<sup>121</sup>

## LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT

Mothers are often more verbally stimulating than fathers, and more talkative with daughters than with sons.<sup>122</sup> Father supportiveness and cognitive stimulation is related to children's language outcomes at 36 months.<sup>123</sup> Intrusive fathers have a small negative effect on language development prior to kindergarten.<sup>124</sup> Sons generally receive more negative reactions to communication attempts than daughters.<sup>125</sup> When sex differences in language ability are reported, girls generally are more advanced than boys.<sup>126</sup>

## MODERATING EFFECTS

Many of the associations reported between patterns of gendered parenting and child development outcomes are known to be influenced by contexts

of parent-child relationships. Some of the most salient moderating effects are reviewed here.

## **FAMILY STRUCTURE**

Theoretically, all children benefit from having two parents because of the higher probability of being able to model effective behaviors as opposed to reworking ineffective patterns. In addition, children in two-parent families have more opportunity to view different personalities, strengths, and weaknesses, and to model strengths as opposed to reworking weaknesses.

Having two adults in the household also increases the average developmental maturity in comparison to single parent families. Two parent families typically enjoy more per capita income, more potential for adult monitoring, availability, and role specialization and efficiency,<sup>127</sup> so that children can potentially have more child-centered time with parents. Studies employing time-use diaries do not strongly support the notion that children in two parent families experience vastly different amounts of quality time with an adult. Single parents (of both genders) can be found who are doing heroic jobs of provision, nurturance, and all child rearing functions in exemplary ways that are beneficial to their children. The functionality of the family appears to be more important than the form. However, on average, in comparison to single parent families, two parent families have more opportunity to accomplish higher levels of functioning across an array of important parenting tasks.

## **MARITAL HARMONY**

Emerging research evidence has documented that marital conflict affects the parenting behaviors of fathers and mothers differently, and that maritally discordant mothers and fathers change their behaviors toward sons and daughters in a differential manner.<sup>128</sup> Simply stated, gendered parenting is moderated by marital quality.<sup>129</sup> Growing evidence suggests that marital quality is more influential in altering fathering behavior than mothering,<sup>130</sup> and that father-daughter relationships are particularly susceptible to lower quality with marital discord.<sup>131</sup> Though main effects can be demonstrated for child and parent gender, complex interactions exist between parent sex, gender, and marital quality.<sup>132</sup> Maritally less satisfied fathers are reported to be the most globally negative toward their daughters.<sup>133</sup> There is, in essence, “spillover” of negativity from the marital conflict to the father-daughter

relationship to a significantly greater extent than in other dyadic pairings of parents and children. Marital conflict is linked to more overt relational aggression for boys, and maternal coercion in conjunction with less paternal responsiveness has been related to overt relational aggression in a study of Russian children.<sup>134</sup>

## METHODOLOGICAL IMPLICATIONS

Findings reviewed earlier indicate that we need to consider the interactions of two sexes of parents by two sexes of children by four parental sex role orientations by four child sex role orientations, yielding sixty-four combinations of parent-child pairings. When combined with the gender roles of an opposite sexed parent that makes for 256 triad types for each mother-father-child set, and that is before considering other important variables (attachment types, hours of interaction, contexts, etc.). This diversity of interactive factors informs the reasons for less than expected robustness of findings in linking specific aspects of gendered parenting to child development outcome variables.

## CAUTIONS AND LIMITATIONS

Clearly, gender differences in parenting are one conceptually complex part of a diverse array of variables that exert influence on the welfare of children. Parent-child relationships and developmental outcomes represent transactional processes that are embedded in a complex system of interacting variables that change across time.<sup>135</sup> Therefore, discerning patterns of association between conceptually contested and narrowly operationalized indicators of gendered parenting or child well-being is a tenuous enterprise. Interpretations of the same findings by persons with different theoretical lenses would yield different interpretations.<sup>136</sup>

Most empirical studies are not conducted in a manner that allows controls for a broad array of other centrally influential factors or with large representative samples of parents and children.<sup>137</sup> Age and stage interactions of parents and children are not consistently investigated. In most of the literature on gendered parenting, marital quality is not assessed.

Differential linkages depend on the gender-congruence of particular parental variables,<sup>138</sup> seldom studied in detail in empirical studies. For

example, care giving with a young infant may be considered to be a cross-gender behavior for fathers and an on-gender activity for mothers.<sup>139</sup> Further, mother-child and father-child relationships can be conceptualized as differential contexts of development.<sup>140</sup> Different parent-child relationships elicit different behaviors, emotions, and cognitions in the people engaged in the interactions.<sup>141</sup>

Studies often fail to consider differences between dyadic and triadic<sup>142</sup> or larger family systems configurations. It is not just that father-child and mother-child relationships are different, rather, mother-child and father-child dyadic relationships are different than parent-child-parent triadic interactions.<sup>143</sup> Interactions between dyads, triads, and larger groups of people are characterized by differences in parental activity levels, emotional expression, and style. Empirical reports do not generally consider the relative amounts of triadic and dyadic interaction experienced in specific households when examining relationships between gendered parenting and child outcome measures.

The operationalization of sex roles is contested by different researchers and theoreticians.<sup>144</sup> Measures of sex role orientation generally depend on self-report data and in many studies, categorizations of participants are based on median splits<sup>145</sup> of nonrepresentative samples, so people categorized in particular sex-role orientations may, in a different sample, fall into other categories entirely. The belief-behavior interface is not as predictable as we would like, with low predictive ability from one realm to another.<sup>146</sup> "Whereas self-report tests assess attitudes, self-attributions, or values, they do not assess behavior."<sup>147</sup> The consistency of parental behavior is not measured across time, calling into question major timing, dose, and duration issues.<sup>148</sup> Though there are some reported common patterns of association, the interface of parenting style and sex-role orientation is not clear. It is difficult to find and study true co-parenting families. Parents, even those who highly value sharing child rearing, vary in amounts and qualities of accessibility, engagement, and responsibility<sup>149</sup> at least in the short term.

Further, it is not just the amount of behavior that a parent engages in that matters. Role competence, satisfaction, and investment are represented in the interaction<sup>150</sup> and influence the overall atmosphere of the exchange. These variables influence the behavior of divorced and nondivorced fathers differently.<sup>151</sup> Parental identity and considerations of whether particular activities or functions are an appropriate part of the parental role may function differently in mothers and fathers. Role investment tasks indicate that there is no relationship between paternal identity and involvement but

significant associations between maternal identity and involvement patterns.<sup>152</sup> Thus, parental expectations play a significant role in shaping interactions over time.

Serial position of the child matters as well. For example, the transition to first parenthood is associated with increases in the degree of traditional gender role activity in adults,<sup>153</sup> while later adjustments to the birth of subsequent children may not entail so great of a move toward traditionalization.

Few observational studies have been published that would be capable of addressing process issues. Experimental studies systematically manipulating levels or kinds of gendered parenting and measuring outcomes are nonexistent.

It may be more appropriate to focus greater attention on other factors known to influence parent-child relationships and developmental outcomes, such as parenting style,<sup>154</sup> attachment security,<sup>155</sup> marital conflict,<sup>156</sup> divorce,<sup>157</sup> or poverty.<sup>158</sup> None the less, there is substantial theoretical and empirical support for the aforementioned trends reported. However, it must be emphasized that the patterns noted are best viewed as trends that may or may not weather the tests of changing cohorts across time and more robust methodological controls.

A thorough analysis of the effects of gendered parenting on children's well-being would require the ability to distinguish the unique and additive contributions of fathering and mothering over time and in distinction from other developmental influences (including biological predispositions, potential, and reaction ranges) as well as the influences of other socializing agents (e.g., teachers, mentors, peers, mass media, culture, and cohort effects). In addition, thorough understanding of the relative contributions of fathers and mothers would necessitate an accounting of both direct and indirect influences of both parents. Given the current empirical database, it is not possible to draw more than general understandings.

Quantitative reviews of the empirical evidence can sometimes miss or misinterpret effects that are dependent on child age, parental characteristics, and setting for interaction,<sup>159</sup> or demand characteristics of activities. It is important to consider not only the differential frequencies of behaviors, but the different contexts and meanings of behaviors (or their absence). In fact, comparisons of parent-child interaction across contexts seem to indicate that activity is a better predictor of behavior than either the child's or the parent's gender.<sup>160</sup>

Clearly, gendered parenting exerts differential influence for sons' and daughters' social, emotional, and cognitive development. Some of the

effects of gendered parenting may be obscured by personality attributions and recollection of specific events. For example, we may hear a son or a daughter reflect, “I learned assertiveness from my mother (or father) and patience from my father (or mother).” Their perception of learning a particular attribute exclusively or primarily from one parent (and different qualities from the other parent) ignores the contributions of the other parent as well as moderating effects from other family members, peers, teachers, mentors, and media portrayals. Further, if one asserts that they “learned patience” from their father, it is unclear how much of the experience is attributable to the father’s sex (male), gender (androgynous), personality attributes (patient), behavioral history over time (modeling patience- or the lack thereof, which triggered reworking), or specific, salient events or interactions (e.g., the Christmas Day when Dad overlooked persistently inappropriate comments from his brother).

This chapter has adopted a developmental perspective with a decidedly child-centered focus. What may be beneficial for child development may not be the most satisfying or just division of labor for adults. Baumrind’s review<sup>161</sup> makes it clear that there is a need to distinguish between desirability of traits, tendencies, and behaviors, and that roles/functions do matter. However, it is also the case that the ideal spouse may not be the ideal parent or partner. While there may well be significant overlap, there are significant distinctions as well. Integration and differentiation of roles become operative. It becomes crucial to ask what traits are desirable for different roles—and this review focuses on parenting. Those traits that make one an excellent parent may or may not overlap with traits that predispose one for success or failure as a partner, friend, lobster boat captain, or interior decorator. This is important to keep in mind as this review focuses on parental characteristics associated with positive outcomes for children.

## CONCLUSIONS

As demonstrated throughout this chapter, parenting is gendered in many ways. Parental gender interacts with sex of parent and child, parenting styles, and personality attributes to shape children’s development. Moreover, gendered parenting is embedded in a multifaceted matrix of cultural and contextual conditions that also exert influence in shaping children’s well-being. Gender roles are embedded in and confounded with a broad array of other attributes known to influence child outcomes, some of which have been

demonstrated to carry greater amounts of variability in child outcome measures, most notably parental warmth and control or demandingness (parenting style).

The applied value of this review can be stated in an answer to the practical question, “what patterns of gendered parenting present developmental benefits and challenges for children?” Clearly, an appropriate response to this question would be, “it depends.” This review has demonstrated that it depends on the conceptualization and measurement of gendered parenting and child outcomes. It depends on contexts, meanings, and patterns of interaction within the family over time. It depends on family form, family functioning, and on parental style, competence, warmth, connection, and so on. Baumrind’s 1982 study of nine-year-old children used an extensive array of measures and revealed surprisingly few effects for parental gender roles. Significant effects supported positive relationships between traditional parental gender roles and children’s well-being and showed neither striking advantages nor disadvantages of androgynous parenting for children’s outcome measures. This may be because androgynes demonstrate a high degree of traditional traits as well as socially desirable attributes of the opposite sex. Thus, children with both traditional and androgynous parents experience the functioning of sex typed norms in the parenting they receive. This pattern of findings may be interpreted as supporting the notion that it is important for children to see traditional gender role characteristics enacted by parents. On the other hand, androgynous parenting may be seen as supportive, validating, and fulfilling by an adult partner. It is possible that the traditional components of androgynous parental roles carry elements of well-being for children while the demonstration of socially desirable traits of the opposite sex contribute positive elements to adult relationships (thereby potentially positively influencing child well-being through indirect pathways).

Are children from androgynous households better off or worse off than children from traditional families? Better or worse off in regard to what? Evidence can be garnered that would support different answers to the questions, depending on one’s theoretical and values perspectives.

My read is that children with “good parents” from families with either androgynous or traditional parents fare better than those with parents who are undifferentiated or cross-gendered. All parents are challenged to provide parenting characteristics that always facilitate development: positive affective climate, behavioral style, and relational synchrony.<sup>162</sup> My view of the literature and my experience with diverse families over time have convinced

me that many of the factors associated with gendered parenting are secondary to these central characteristics of “good parenting”<sup>163</sup> and positive family functioning. “Children from all parenting types are at risk when they experience parenting that is inadequate in terms of warmth control or monitoring.”<sup>164</sup>

Nonetheless, I am confident that the literature clearly supports the perspective that children from families that have well functioning males and females consistently engaged in parenting roles are advantaged because they can see how men and women perform a similar task similarly and differently. Children who obtain the most varied resources will be those who adapt best.<sup>165</sup> They are provided with a greater range of possibility for modeling. They are exposed to collaborative sharing with a different level of maturity than others. The difference for children in families with well functioning, role sharing couples in comparison to gender traditional families could be likened to the difference between being immersed in cooperative play versus parallel play.

My advice for parents who grapple with issues of gendered parenting in meeting the various developmental and provisional needs of their families would be to communicate with their partners and to work out balances of role specialization and diversification that bring fulfillment to themselves and their partner.<sup>166</sup> Parents who model engagement and proficiency in a range of roles and behaviors as well as interest in expanding abilities, while demonstrating cooperation and justice in sharing work and enjoyment of family roles establish family environments that benefit all members of the family. Families characterized by these ideals afford children more opportunities to model pro-social attitudes and behaviors and to stimulate thinking and discussions regarding the possibilities for their own role attainment in the future. The literature reviewed in this chapter suggests that it is important for families to encourage and support interactions of both parents with each of their children for regular times of engagement in some one-on-one (dyadic) as well as triadic and full family interactions. The evidence would also suggest that it is developmentally facilitative to purposively engage in a range of activities: some that are child-centered, and some more directive and parent structured.

Parents can increase the developmental impact of their interactions by narrating important features regarding choices and challenges in sharing family roles. It is also facilitative for family functioning to be charitable in pointing out differences in styles and levels of family roles, without devaluing the contributions of others, taking opportunities to narrate the strengths

of your partner in parenting, work, relationships, and family roles as well as those of your children in their domains of activity and responsibility.

The primary focus of this chapter has been individual differences in gendered parenting and associated patterns of well-being in children. The literature reviewed has clearly documented that gendered parenting influences family functioning and child well-being. It remains to be seen whether it will prove to be a fruitful intervention to educate parents regarding the relationships between various components of gendered parenting and child outcomes and encourage parents to reflect on and communicate about their gendered roles and values, especially in regard to parenting behaviors as they shape the futures of their children.

## NOTES

1. LeVine 1970.
2. Maccoby 2008.
3. Kuczynski and Parkin 2008.
4. Rossi 1980.
5. Cabrera et al. 2002.
6. Rossi 1984; Jacobs and Gerson 2004.
7. Amato et al. 2007.
8. Bianchi, Robinson, and Milkie 2006.
9. Mischel, Bernstein and Allegretto 2005.
10. Bassett 2005.
11. Rhoades 2004.
12. Pleck and Masciadrelli 2003; Lamb 2004.
13. Darling and Steinberg 1993.
14. Maurer, Pleck and Rane 2001.
15. Snarey 1993; Palkovitz 2002.
16. Bussey and Bandura 1999.
17. Kerig, Cowan and Cowan, 1993.
18. Hill and Flom 2007.
19. Smith and Daghli 1977; Wood, Desmarais and Gugula 2002.
20. Fulcher, Sutfin and Patterson 2001.
21. Turner and Gervai 1995; Sabbatini and Leaper 2004.
22. Snarey 1993; Palkovitz 2002:194.
23. Bandura 2006.
24. Leaper 2002.
25. Pleck and Masciadrelli 2003; Lamb 2004.
26. Parke 2000; Paquette 2004.
27. Parke 2000.

28. Lamb and Lewis 2004.
29. Palkovitz 2002.
30. Lamb and Lewis 2004.
31. Block 1973; Weitzman, Birns and Friend 1985; Dunn, Bretherton and Munn, 1987.
32. Block 1973; Tronick and Cohn 1989.
33. Kerig, Cowan and Cowan, 1993.
34. Maccoby 1980.
35. Condry and Condry 1976; Benenson, Philippoussis and Leeb 1999.
36. Parke 2000.
37. Starrels 1994.
38. Ibid.
39. Leaper 2002.
40. Paquette 2004.
41. Fagot 1978.
42. Malatesta and Haviland 1982; Tronick and Cohn 1985.
43. Biringen et al. 1999.
44. Leaper 2002.
45. Ibid.
46. McLaughlin et al. 1983; Gleason 1987.
47. Kerig, Cowan and Cowan, 1993.
48. Frankel and Rollins Jr. 1983; Weitzman, Birns, and Friend 1985.
49. Siegel 1987; Lytton and Romney 1991.
50. Lytton and Romney 1991.
51. Snow, Jacklin and Maccoby 1983.
52. Kuczynski 2003.
53. Leaper 2002.
54. Burns and Homel 1989; Antill et al. 1996.
55. Hilton and Haldeman 1991.
56. McKinney and Renk 2007.
57. Ibid.
58. Leaper 2002.
59. Rossi 1984; Hyde 2005:590.
60. Hyde 2005.
61. Hyde and Plant 1995:159.
62. Rhoades 2004.
63. Power 1985; Teti, Bond and Gibbs 1998.
64. Labrell 1997.
65. Labrell 1996.
66. Paquette 2004.
67. Baumrind 1982.
68. Labrell 1992.

69. Marcos 1995.
70. Bem 1981.
71. Baumrind 1982:48.
72. Baumrind 1982:54-55.
73. Baumrind 1982:68.
74. Paquette 2004:203.
75. As cited in Paquette 2004.
76. Baumrind 1982:54-55.
77. Palkovitz 1984.
78. Baumrind 1982:55
79. Baumrind 1982:63-64.
80. Baumrind 1982:64-65.
81. Baumrind 1982; Palkovitz 1984.
82. Baumrind 1982:68.
83. Baumrind 1982:65.
84. Baumrind 1982:68.
85. Baumrind 1982.
86. Ibid.
87. Ibid.
88. Ibid.
89. Ibid.
90. Ibid.
91. I am less familiar with "unique contributions" literature for mothers.
92. Verschueren and Marcoen 1999:183-201.
93. Amato 1994:375-384.
94. Amato and Rivera 1999:1031-1042; Kosterman et al. 2004:762-778.
95. Williams and Kelley 2005:168-196.
96. Flouri and Buchanan 2003:399-406; Carlson 2006:137-154.
97. Cookston and Finlay 2006: 37-158.
98. Stolz, Barber and Olsen 2005:1076-1092.
99. Barnett, Marshall and Pleck 1992:505-525.
100. Paquette 2004.
101. Paquette 2004.
102. Morris et al 2007:361.
103. Cabrera, Shannon and Tamis-LeMonda 2007:208-215.
104. Eisenberg 1999:267-284.
105. Fivush 1989:675-691.
106. Block 1973; Eccles 1987; Leaper et al. 1989.
107. Leaper 2002.
108. Raffaelli and Ontai 2004:287.
109. McKinney and Renk 2007.
110. Ibid.

111. Greenberg, Speltz and DeKlyen 1993:191–213; Rubin, Stewart and Chen 1995.
112. Paquette 2004:210.
113. V. Bourçois (1997) as cited in Paquette 2004.
114. Paquette 2004.
115. Biringen et al. 1999; van IJzendoorn et al. 2000:1086–1098.
116. Lewis et al. 1984:123–136.
117. Leaper 2002.
118. Lamb and Lewis 2004.
119. Lamb 1976:435–443.
120. Sigelman and Rider 2009:419.
121. Ryan, Martin, and Brooks-Gunn 2006.
122. Leaper 2002.
123. Cabrera, Shannon and Tamis-LeMonda 2007:208–215.
124. Ibid.
125. Fagot and Hagan 1991.
126. Hyde 1988.
127. Palkovitz 1987.
128. Cox et al. 1989.
129. Kerig, Cowan and Cowan 1993.
130. Easterbrooks and Emde 1988; Belsky, Rovine and Fish 1989; Howes and Markman 1989.
131. Goldberg and Easterbrooks 1984; Belsky et al. 1989.
132. Kerig, Cowan and Cowan 1993.
133. Ibid.
134. Hart et al. 1998.
135. Palkovitz 2002.
136. Baumrind 1982.
137. Parke 2004.
138. Mauer, Pleck and Rane 2001.
139. Ibid.
140. McBride, Schoppe and Rane 2002.
141. Morris et al 2007:361.
142. Lindsey and Caldera 2006.
143. Ibid.
144. Baumrind 1982; Spence 1982.
145. Bem 1974.
146. Bem 1968.
147. Baumrind 1982:46.
148. Palkovitz and Daly 2004.
149. Pleck and Masciadrelli 2003.
150. Minton and Pasley 1996.
151. Mauer, Pleck and Rane 2001.

152. McBride and Rane 1997.
153. Entwistle and Doering 1981; Palkovitz and Copes 1988; Burke and Cast 1997.
154. Baumrind 1974.
155. Lamb and Lewis 2004.
156. Cummings, Goeke-Morey and Raymond 2004.
157. Amato and Sobolewski 2004.
158. McLanahan and Carlson 2004.
159. Fagot and Hagan 1991.
160. Lewis and Gregory 1987; Caldera, Huston and O'Brien 1989; Leaper et al 1995; Leaper 2000.
161. Baumrind 1982.
162. For an expanded discussion of these attributes, see Palkovitz 2007.
163. Palkovitz 2008.
164. Website on Single Parent Families and Child Well-being, retrieved June 13, 2011 from <http://social.jrank.org/pages/580/Single-Parent-Families-Well-Being-Children-Raised-in-Single-Parent-Homes.html>. "Single-Parent Families—The Well-being Of Children Raised In Single-parent Homes."
165. Paquette 2004:212.
166. R. Palkovitz 1987.

## REFERENCES

- Amato, Paul. 1994. "Father-Child Relations, Mother-Child Relations, and Offspring Psychological Well-Being in Early Adulthood." *Journal of Marriage and Family* 56(4):1031–1042.
- Amato, Paul. 1999. "Paternal Involvement and Children's Behavior Problems." *Journal of Marriage and Family* 61(2):375–384.
- Amato, Paul R., Alan Booth, David Johnson, and Stacy Rogers. 2007. *Alone Together: How Marriage in America is Changing*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University.
- Amato, Paul R. and Julie M. Sobolewski. 2004. "The Effects of Divorce on Fathers and Children: Nonresidential Fathers and Stepfathers." In *The Role of the Father in Child Development*, 4th ed., ed. Michael E. Lamb, 341–367. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley.
- Antill, J. K, J. J. Goodnow, G. Russell and S. Cotton. 2000. "The Influence of Parents and Family Context on Children's Involvement in Household Tasks." *Sex Roles* 34:215–236;
- Baumrind, Diana. 1982. "Are Androgynous Individuals More Effective Persons and Parents?" *Child Development* 53:44–75.
- Bandura, Albert. 2006. "Analysis of Modeling Processes." In *Psychological Modeling: Conflicting Theories*, ed. Albert Bandura, 1–62. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction.
- Barnett, Rosiland C., Marshall and Joseph Pleck. 1992. "Adult-Son-Parent Relationships and Their Associations with Sons' Psychological Distress." *Journal of Family Issues* 13(4):505–525.

- Bassett, Rachel Hile. 2005. *Parenting and Professing: Balancing Family Work with an Academic Career*. Nashville, TN: Vanderbilt University.
- Belsky, Jay, M. Rovine and M. Fish. 1989. "The Developing Family System." In *Systems and Development: Minnesota Symposia on Child Psychology*, vol. 22, ed. M. Gunnar and E. Thelen. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Bem, Daryl J. 1968. "Attitudes as self descriptions: Another look at the attitude-behavior link." In *Psychological Foundations of Attitudes*, eds. A.G. Greenwald, T.C. Brock and T.M. Ostrum. New York: Academic Press.
- Bem, S. L. 1974. "The Measurement of Psychological Androgyny." *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology* 42:155-162.
- Bem, Sandra L. 1981. *Bem Sex-Role Inventory: Professional Manual*. Palo Alto: Consulting Psychologists.
- Benenson, J. F., M. Philippoussis and R. Leeb. 1999. "Sex Differences in Neonates' Cuddliness." *Journal of Genetic Psychology* 160:332-342.
- Bianchi, Suzanne M., John P. Robinson, and Melissa A. Milkie. 2006. *Changing Rhythms of American Family Life Publication*. New York, NY: Russell Sage Foundation Publications.
- Biringen, Z, R. N. Emde, D. Brown, L. Lowe, S. Myers, and D. Nelson. 1999. "Emotional Availability and Emotion Communication in Naturalistic Mother-Infant Interactions: Evidence for Gender Relations." *Journal of Social Behavior and Personality* 14:463-478.
- Block, Jack H. 1973. "Conceptions of Sex Roles: Some Cross-Cultural and Longitudinal Perspectives." *American Psychologist* 28:512-526.
- Bourçois, V. 1997. "Modalités de présence du père et développement social de l'enfant d'âge préscolaire." ["Modalities of Father's Presence and Social Development of Preschoolers."] *Enfance* 3:389-399.
- Burke, P. J. and A. D. Cast. 1997. "Stability and Change in the Gender Identities of Newly Married Couples." *Social Psychology Quarterly* 60:277-290.
- Burns, A. and R. Homel. 1989. "Gender Division of Tasks by Parents and Their Children." *Psychology of Women Quarterly* 13:113-125.
- Bussey, K and Albert Bandura. 1999. "Social Cognitive Theory of Gender Development and Differentiation." *Psychological Review* 106:676-713.
- Cabrera, Natasha, J. Brooks-Gunn, K. Moore, J. West, K. Boller and C.S. Tamis-LeMonda. 2002. "Bridging research and policy: Including fathers of young children in national studies." In *Handbook of Father Involvement: Multidisciplinary Perspectives*, ed. C.S. Tamis-LeMonda and N. Cabrera. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Caldera, Y. M., A. C. Huston and M. O'Brien. 1989. "Social Interactions and Play Patterns of Parents and Toddlers With Feminine, Masculine, and Neutral Toys." *Child Development* 60:70-76.
- Cabrera, Natasha J., Jacqueline D. Shannon and Catherine Tamis-LeMonda. 2007. "Fathers' Influence on Their Children's Cognitive and Emotional Development: From Toddlers to Pre-K." *Journal of Applied Developmental Science* 11(4):208-215.

- Carlson, M. J. 2006. "Family Structure, Father Involvement, and Adolescent Behavioral Outcomes." *Journal of Marriage and Family* 68(1):137-154.
- Collins, W. A., E. E. Maccoby, L. Steinberg, E.M. Hetherington and M. H. Bornstein. 2000. "Contemporary Research on Parenting: The Case For Nature and Nurture." *American Psychologist* 55:218-232.
- Condry, J. and S. Condry. 1976. "Sex Differences: A Study in the Eye of the Beholder." *Child Development* 47:812-819.
- Cookston, Jeffrey T. and Andrea K. Finlay. 2006. "Father Involvement and Adolescent Adjustment: Longitudinal Findings From Add Health." *Fathering* 4(2):137-158.
- Cox, Martha J, M. T. Owen, Michael J. Lewis and V. K. Henderson. 1989. "Marriage, Adult Adjustment, and Early Parenting." *Child Development* 60:1015-1024.
- Cummings, E. M., M. C. Goeke-Morey and J. Raymond. 2004. "Fathers in Family Context: Effects of Marital Quality and Marital Conflict." In *The Role of the Father in Child Development*, 4th ed., ed. Michael E. Lamb, 196-221. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley.
- Darling, N, L Steinberg. 1993. "Parenting Style as Context: An Integrative Model." *Psychological Bulletin* 113(3):487-496.
- Dunn, J., I. Bretherton and P. Munn. 1987. "Conversations About Feelings Between Mothers and Their Young Children," *Developmental Psychology* 23:132-139.
- Easterbrooks, A. M., and Robert N. Emde. 1988. "Marital and Parent-Child Relationships: The Role of Affect in the Family System." In *Relationships Within Families: Mutual Influences*, ed. Robert A. Hinde, 83-103. Oxford, England: Clarendon.
- Eccles, J. S. 1989. "Adolescence: Gateway to Gender-Role Transcendence," in *Current Conceptions of Sex Roles and Sex Typing: Theory and Research*, ed. D.B. Carter. New York: Praeger.
- Eisenberg, A. R. 1999. "Emotion-Talk Among Mexican-American and Anglo American Mothers and Children from Two Social Classes." *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly* 45:267-284.
- Entwistle, D. R. and S. G. Doering. 1981. *The First Birth: A Family Turning Point*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins.
- Fagot, B. I. 1978. "The Influence of Child Sex on Parental Reactions to Toddler Children." *Child Development* 49:459-465.
- Fagot, B.I., and R. Hagan. 1991. "Observations of Parent Reactions to Sex-Stereotyped Behaviors: Age and Sex Differences." *Child Development* 62:617-628.
- Fivush, R. 1989. "Exploring Sex Differences in the Emotional Content of Mother-Child Conversations About the Past." *Sex Roles* 20:675-691.
- Flouri, Eirini and A. Buchanan. 2003 "The Role of Father Involvement and Mother Involvement in Adolescents' Psychological Well-Being." *British Journal of Social Work* 33:399-406.
- Frankel, M. T. and H. A. Rollins Jr. 1983. "Does Mother Know Best? Mothers and Fathers Interacting With Preschool Sons and Daughters." *Developmental Psychology* 19:649-702.

- Fulcher, M., E. L. Sutfin and C. J. Patterson. 2001. "Parental Sexual Orientation, Division of Labor, and Sex-Role Stereotyping in Children's Occupational Choices." Paper presented at the meeting of the Society for Research on Child Development, Minneapolis, MN, (April 2001).
- Gleason, J. B. 1987. "Sex Differences in Parent-Child Interaction." In *Language, Gender and Sex in Comparative Perspective*, ed. S.U. Philips, S. Steele and C. Tanz, 189–199. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University.
- Goldberg, Wendy A., and M. A. Easterbrooks. 1984. "Role of Marital Quality in Toddler Development." *Developmental Psychology* 20:504–514.
- Greenberg, Mark T., M. L. Speltz and M. DeKlyen. 1993. "The Role of Attachment in the Early Development of Disruptive Behavior Problems." *Development and Psychopathology* 5:191–213.
- Harris, J. R. 2000. "Socialization, Personality Development, and the Child's Environments: Comment on Vendell (2000)." *Developmental Psychology* 36:711–723.
- Hill, S. E. and R. Flom. 2007. "18- and 24-month old's discrimination of gender-consistent and inconsistent activities," *Infant Behavior and Development* 30:168–173.
- Hilton, J. M. and V. A. Haldeman. 1991. "Gender Differences and Performance of Household Tasks by Adults and Children in Single-Parent and Two-Parent, Two-Earner Families," *Journal of Family Issues* 12:114–130.
- Howes, P., and H. J. Markman. 1989. "Marital Quality and Child Functioning: A Longitudinal Investigation." *Child Development* 60:1044–1051.
- Hyde, Janet Shelby. 2005. "The Gender Similarities Hypothesis." *American Psychologist* 60:581–592.
- Hyde, Janet Shelby and Elizabeth Ashley Plant. 1995. "Magnitude of Psychological Gender Differences: Another Side to the Story," *American Psychologist* 50(3):159.
- Hyde, J. S. and M. C. Linn. 1998. "Gender differences in verbal ability: A meta-analysis." *Psychological Bulletin* 104:53–69.
- Jacobs, Jerry A. and Kathleen Gerson. 2004. *The Time Divide: Work, Family, and Gender Inequality*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University.
- Kerig, Patricia K., Philip A. Cowan and Carolyn Pape Cowan. 1993. "Marital Quality and Gender Differences in Parent-Child Interaction," *Developmental Psychology*, 29(6):931–939.
- Kosterman, Rick, Kevin P. Haggerty and Richard Spoth. 2004. "Unique Influence of Mothers and Fathers on Their Children's Antisocial Behavior." *Journal of Marriage and Family* 66(3):762–778.
- Kuczynski, L., ed. 2003. *Dynamics in Parent-Child Relations*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Kuczynski, Leon and C. M. Parkin. 2008. "Agency and Bidirectionality in Socialization." In *Handbook of Socialization: Theory and Research*, ed. Joan E. Grusec and P. D. Hastings. New York: Guilford.

- Labrell, F. 1992. *Contributions paternelles au développement cognitif de l'enfant dans la deuxième année de vie*. [Paternal Contributions to Cognitive Development of Children in the Second Year of Life.] Ph.D. thesis, Nouveau Régime, Paris-V.
- Labrell, F. 1996. "Paternal play with toddlers: Recreation and creation." *European Journal of Psychology of Education*, 11(1):43-54.
- Labrell, F. 1997. "L'apport spécifique du père au développement cognitif du jeune enfant." ["The Specific Contribution of the Father of Cognitive Development in Young Children."] *Enfance* 3:361-369.]
- Lamb, Michael E. 1976. "Effects of Stress and Cohort on Mother- and Father-Infant Interaction." *Developmental Psychology* 12:435-443.
- Lamb, Michael E. and Charlie Lewis. 2004. "The Development and Significance of Father-Child Relationships in Two-Parent Families." In *The Role of the Father in Child Development*, 4th ed., ed. Michael E. Lamb, 272-306. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley.
- Leaper, C. 2000. "Gender, Affiliation, Assertion, and the Integrative Context of Parent-Child Play." *Developmental Psychology* 36:381-393.
- Leaper, C., S. T. Hauser, A. Kremen, S. I. Powers, A. M. Jacobsen, G. G. Noam, B. Weiss-Perry and D. Follansbee. 1989. "Parent-Adolescent Interactions in Relation to Adolescents' Gender and Ego Development Pathway: A Longitudinal Study." *Journal of Early Adolescence* 9:335-361.
- Leaper, C., L. Leve, T. Strasser and R. Schwartz. 1995. "Mother-Child Communications Sequences: Play Activity, Child Gender and Marital Status Effects." *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly* 41:307-327.
- Leaper, Campbell. 2002. "Parenting Boys and Girls." In *Handbook of Parenting*, vol. 1, 2nd ed., ed. Marc H. Bornstein, 189-225. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- LeVine, R. A. 1970. "Cross-cultural study in child psychology." In *Charmichael's Manual of Child Psychology*, vol. II, 3rd ed., ed., P. H. Mussen, 559-612. New York: John Wiley.
- Lewis, C. and S. Gregory. 1987. "Parents' Talk to Their Infants: The Importance of Context." *First Language* 7:201-216.
- Lewis, Michael, C. Feiring, C. McGuffog and J. Jaskir. 1984. "Predicting Psychopathology in Six-Year-Olds from Early Social Relations." *Child Development* 55:123-136.
- Lindsey, Eric W., and Yvonne M. Caldera. 2006. "Mother-Father-Child Triadic Interaction: Gender Differences Within and Between Contexts." *Sex Roles* 55:511.
- Lytton, H. and D.M. Romney. 1991. "Parents' Differential Socialization of Boys and Girls: A Meta-Analysis." *Psychological Bulletin* 109:267-296.
- Maccoby, E. E. 1980. *Social Development*. New York: Harcourt Brace Janovich.
- Maccoby, Eleanor E. 2008. "Historical overview of socialization research and theory." In *Handbook of Socialization: Theory and Research*, ed. Joan E. Grusec and P.D. Hastings. New York: Guilford.

- Malatesta, Carol Z, and Jeanette M. Haviland. 1982. "Learning Display Rules: The Socialization of Emotion Expression in Infancy." *Child Development* 53:991–1003.
- Marcos, H. 1995. "Mother-child and father-child communication in the second year: A functional approach." *Early Development and Parenting* 2:49–61.
- Mauer, Trent W., Joseph H. Pleck and Thomas R. Rane. 2001. "Parental Identity and Reflected-Appraisals: Measurement and Gender Dynamics." *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 63(2):309–321.
- McBride, Brent A., Sarah J. Schoppe and Thomas R. Rane. 2002. "Child Characteristics, Parenting Stress and Parental Involvement: Fathers Versus Mothers." *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 64(4):998–1011.
- McKinney, Cliff and Kimberly Renk. 2008. "Differential Parenting Between Mothers and Fathers: Implications for Late Adolescents." *Journal of Family Issues* 29(6):806–827.
- McLanahan, Sara and Marcia S. Carlson. 2004. "Fathers in Fragile Families" in *The Role of the Father in Child Development*, 4th ed., ed. Michael E. Lamb, 368–396. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley.
- McLaughlin, B., D. White, T. McDevitt and R. Raskin. 1983. "Mothers' and Fathers' Speech to Their Young Children: Similar or Different?" *Journal of Child Language* 10:245–252.
- Minton, C. and K. Pasley. 1996. "Fathers' Parenting Role Identity and Father Involvement: A Comparison of Nondivorced and Divorced, Nonresident Fathers." *Journal of Family Issues* 17:26–45.
- Mischel, Lawrence, Jared Bernstein and Sylvia Allegretto. 2004. *The State of Working America 2004/2005*. Washington DC: Economic Policy Institute.
- Morris, Amanda S., Jennifer S. Silk, Laurence Steinberg, Sonya S. Myers, and Lara R. Robinson. 2007. "The Role of Family Context in the Development of Emotion Regulation." *Social Development* 16(2):361.
- Palkovitz, R. 2007. "Challenges to Modeling Dynamics in Developing a Developmental Understanding of Father-Child Relationships." *Applied Developmental Science* 11:190–195.
- Palkovitz, Rob. 1984. "Parental Attitudes and Fathers' Interactions with Their Five-Month-Old Infants." *Developmental Psychology* 20:1054–1060.
- Palkovitz, Rob. 1987. "Consistency and Stability in the Family Microsystem Environment." In *Annual Advances in Applied Developmental Psychology*, vol. II, ed. Donald L. Peters and Susan Kontos, 40–67. New York: Ablex.
- Palkovitz, Rob. 2002. *Involved Fathering and Men's Adult Development: Provisional Balances*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Palkovitz, Rob and Marcella A. Copes. 1988. "Changes in Attitudes, Beliefs and Expectations Associated With the Transition to Parenthood." *Marriage and Family Review* 12:183–199.
- Palkovitz, Rob and Kerry Daly. 2004. "Eyeing the Edges: Theoretical Considerations of Work and Family for Fathers in Midlife Development." *Fathering* 2:215–233.

- Paquette, Daniel. 2004. "Theorizing the Father-Child Relationship: Mechanisms and Developmental Outcomes." *Human Development* 47:193–219.
- Parke, Ross D. 2000. "Father Involvement: A Developmental Psychological Perspective." *Marriage and Family Review* 29(2/3):43–58.
- Pleck, Joseph H. and Brian P. Masciadrelli. 2004. "Paternal involvement by U.S. Residential Fathers: Levels, Sources, and Consequences." In *The Role of the Father in Child Development*, 4th ed., ed. Michael E. Lamb, 222–271. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley.
- Power, T.G. 1985. "Mother- and Father-Infant Play: A Developmental Analysis." *Child Development* 56:1514–1524.
- Raffaelli, Marcella, and Lenna L. Ontai. 2004. "Gender Socialization in Latino/a Families: Results From Two Retrospective Studies." *Sex Roles* 50(5/6):287.
- Rhoades, Steven. 2005. *Taking Sex Differences Seriously*. San Francisco, CA: Encounter.
- Rossi, Alice S. 1980. "Gender and Parenthood." *American Sociological Review* 49(1):1–19.
- Rubin, R.H., S. L. Stewart and X. Chen. 1995. "Parents of Aggressive and Withdrawn Children." In *Handbook of Parenting*, vol. 1, ed. Marc H. Bornstein. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Ryan, Martin, and Brooks-Gunn. 2006. "Is One Parent Good Enough? Patterns of Mother and Father Parenting and Child Cognitive Outcomes at 24 and 36 Months." *Parenting: Science and Practice* 6(2/3):211–228.
- Sabbatini, L. and C. Leaper. 2004. "The Relation Between Mothers' and Fathers' Parenting Styles and Their Division of Labor in the Home: Young Adults' Retrospective Reports." *Sex Roles* 50:217–250.
- Siegel, M. 1987. "Are Sons and Daughters Treated More Differently by Fathers Than by Mothers?" *Developmental Review* 7:183–209.
- Sigelman, Carol K., and Elizabeth A. Rider. 2009. *Life-Span Human Development*, 6th ed. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- "Single-Parent Families—The Well-being Of Children Raised In Single-parent Homes. Accessed on June 13, 2011, <http://social.jrank.org/pages/580/Single-Parent-Families-Well-Being-Children-Raised-in-Single-Parent-Homes.html>.
- Smith, P. K. and L. Daghli. 1977. "Sex Differences in Parent and Infant Behavior in the Home," *Child Development* 48:1250–1254.
- Snarey, John. 1993. *How Fathers Care for the Next Generation: A Four-Decade Study*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University.
- Snow, M. E., C. N. Jacklin and E. E. Maccoby. 1983. "Sex-of-Child Differences in Father-Child Interaction at One Year of Age." *Child Development* 54:227–232.
- Spence, Janet T. 1982. "Comments on Baumrind's 'Are Androgynous Individuals More Effective Persons and Parents?'" *Child Development* 53:76–82.
- Starrels, Marjorie E. 1994. "Gender Differences in Parent-Child Relations." *Journal of Family Issues* 15(1):148.

- Stolz, Heidi E., Brian K. Barber and Joseph A. Olsen. 2005. "Toward Disentangling Fathering and Mothering: An Assessment of Relative Importance." *Journal of Marriage and Family* 67(4):1076–1092.
- Tamis-LeMonda, Catherine, Jacqueline D. Shannon, Natasha J. Cabrera and Michael E. Lamb. 2004. "Fathers and Mothers at Play with Their 2- and 3-Year-Olds: Contributions to Language and Cognitive Development." *Child Development* 75(6):1806–1820.
- Teti, D. M., L. A. Bond and E. D. Gibbs. 1998. "Mothers, Fathers, and Siblings: A Comparison of Play Styles and Their Influence upon Infant Cognitive Level." *International Journal of Behavioral Development* 11:415–432.
- Tronick, E. Z. and J. F. Cohn. 1989. "Infant-Mother Face-To-Face Interaction: Age and Gender Differences in Coordination and the Occurrence of Miscoordination." *Child Development* 60:85–92.
- Turner, P. J. and J. Gervai. 1995. "A Multidimensional Study of Gender Typing in Preschool Children and Their Parents: Personality, Attitudes, Preferences, Behavior, and Cultural Differences." *Developmental Psychology* 31:759–772.
- Van Ijzendoorn, M. H., G. Moran, J. Belsky, D. Pederson, M. J. Bakersman-Kranenberg and K. Kneppers. 2000. "The Similarity of Siblings' Attachments to Their Mother." *Child Development* 71:1086–1098.
- Verschueren, Karine and Alfons Marcoen. 1999. "Representation of Self and Socio-Emotional Competence in Kindergartners: Differential and Combined Effects of Attachment to Mother and Father." *Child Development* 70(1):183–201.
- Weitzman, N., B. Birns and R. Friend. 1985. "Traditional and Nontraditional Mothers' Communication With Their Daughters and Sons." *Child Development* 56:894–898.
- Williams, Susan K. and Donald F. Kelley. 2005. "Relationships Among Involvement, Attachment, and Behavioral Problems in Adolescence: Examining Fathers' Influence." *Journal of Early Adolescence* 25(2):168–196.
- Wood, E., S. Desmarais and S. Gugula. 2002. "The Impact of Parenting Experience on Gender Stereotyped Toy Play of Children." *Sex Roles* 47:39–49.