

Sexism and gender-based discrimination

Campbell Leaper and Brenda C. Gutierrez, University of California, Santa Cruz, CA, United States

© 2024 Elsevier Inc. All rights reserved.

Introduction	3
Factors contributing to sexism during adolescence	3
Attitudes related to sexism	4
Ambivalent sexism theory: Hostile sexism and benevolent sexism	4
Hostile sexism	4
Benevolent sexism	5
Cross-cultural comparisons	5
Developmental trajectory	5
Traditional gender ideologies	5
Traditional masculinity ideology	6
Traditional femininity ideology	6
Feminist identity and attitudes	6
Intersectional and cultural approaches to gender ideologies	6
Objectified sexualization, sexual harassment, and sexual assault	7
Objectified sexualization	7
Sexualization of girls and women	7
Sexualization of boys and men	7
Sexualization in relation to LGBQ and TGNC youth	7
Sexualization and sexism	8
Sexual harassment	8
Teen health and technology survey	8
American Association of University Women survey	8
National school climate survey	9
UK millennium cohort study	9
Pew research center teens and cyberbullying survey	9
Consequences of sexual harassment	9
Sexual violence	9
Youth risk behavior surveillance system (YRBSS) survey	9
Consequences of sexual violence	10
Gender bias in achievement contexts	10
Sexism in Academics	10
Girls' experiences with sexism in STEM	10
Boys' experiences with sexism in academics	11
Gender- and sexual-minoritized youths' experiences with sexism in academics	11
Sexism in sports	11
Girls' experiences with sexism in sports	11
Boys' experiences with sexism in sports	12
Gender- and sexual-minoritized youths' experiences with sexism in sports	12
Awareness of sexism and coping responses	12
Perceiving sexist discrimination	12
Coping with sexism	12
Possible interventions to reduce sexism and promote effective coping	12
Summary and conclusions	13
Acknowledgment	13
References	13
Further reading	19

Key points

- Sexism refers to attitudes and behaviors rooted in cultural practices that affirm and perpetuate male dominance and heteronormativity in society.

- Sexism most negatively affects cisgender, heterosexual girls and women, sexual- and gender-minoritized youths, and gender-nonconforming cisgender boys and men. However, it also has negative consequences for gender-conforming cisgender, heterosexual boys and men.
- Sexualization and objectification of girls and women, hegemonic masculinity, and hegemonic heteronormativity are cultural practices that foster increases in sexual harassment, sexual violence, and other forms of sexism during adolescence.
- Family members, peers, schools, and mass media are interlinking microsystems that can foster cultural practices that maintain and perpetuate sexism during adolescence.
- Psychologists have proposed different models of attitudes related to sexism: ambivalent sexism (comprising hostile sexism and benevolent sexism), traditional masculinity ideologies, traditional femininity ideologies, feminism, as well as intersectional and cultural models.
- Adolescents' endorsements of sexist attitudes and traditional gender ideologies are associated with accepting or perpetrating sexist behaviors toward others as well as lower indices of their own well-being.
- Adolescents commonly experience sexism through sexualization and objectification, sexual harassment and sexual violence, as well as gender-biased experiences in academics and sports.
- Experiences with sexism can seriously undermine adolescents' psychological well-being, opportunities, motivations, successes, and later life trajectories.
- Several interventions in schools and other settings have the potential to reduce sexism and to promote effective coping when it occurs.

Glossary

Benevolent sexism seemingly positive attitudes toward girls and women who conform to traditional gender norms; components include protective paternalism, complementary gender differentiation, and heterosexual intimacy

Cisgender identifying with the gender identity assigned at birth

Discrimination unfairly biased actions toward other persons based on their group membership.

Gender categorization of self or others as "girls"/"women" or "boys"/"men" or possibly nonbinary categories

Gender bias discrimination based on person's gender; included differential encouragement of girls and boys in particular academic subjects, athletics, or other pursuits

Gender ideologies set of beliefs that construct what it means to be of a given gender in contemporary society

Gender Nonbinary identities that reject conventional gender binary identities as girls or boys, which may include the rejection of a gender identity altogether

Gender Nonconforming expressions of gender identity that do not adhere to traditional masculinity/femininity norms in appearance or behavior

Hegemonic heteronormativity cultural expectation of heterosexuality and traditional gender roles

Hegemonic masculinity cultural expectation that boys and men exhibit dominance and hide weakness

Hostile sexism endorsement of male dominance with negative and hostile attitudes toward girls, women, or others who violate traditional gender norms; components includes dominative paternalism, competitive gender differentiation, and heterosexual hostility

Intersectionality an approach to considering societal oppression on the basis of multiple identities that reciprocally construct each another

LGBQ Lesbian, gay, bisexual, or questioning

Minoritized a group in society that is devalued by a dominant group and considered subordinate in status and power

Prejudice positive or negative attitudes to persons based on their group membership

Sexism prejudice and discrimination based on a person's gender that functions to perpetuate and maintain male dominance in society, especially for the dominance of men who adhere to traditional masculinity norms

Sexual harassment unwanted verbal or physical actions that are sexual in nature

Sexual violence any sex act or attempt to obtain sex without the person's consent or through use of coercion

Sexualization/Objectification valuing oneself or others on the basis of one's sexual appeal

Stereotyping using generalized expectations and beliefs regarding appearances, traits, and behaviors to construct views about members of a given group

TGNB Transgender or gender-nonbinary

Traditional femininity norms set of traditional beliefs that construct what it means to be women or feminine in a given society

Traditional masculinity norms set of traditional beliefs regarding what it means to be men or masculine in a given society

Transgender identifying with a gender identity different than assigned at birth

Abstract

We review how sexist ideologies and practices perpetuate male dominance in society during adolescence. Their deleterious impacts on girls, gender- and sexual-minoritized youth, and gender-nonconforming boys are emphasized, although we also describe their negative effects for gender-conforming boys. Conceptual models of sexist attitudes and traditional gender ideologies are explained, and their correlates with adolescents' behaviors are summarized. Next, we document the prevalence and effects of sexualization, sexual harassment, and sexual violence. Also, we address how gender-biased experiences undermine youth in academic and athletic settings. Finally, we review factors related to adolescents' awareness of sexism, coping, and potential strategies for preventing sexism.

Introduction

Across the world, adolescents commonly suffer sexist acts from peers and adults (Brown and Tam, 2022; Lim et al., 2018; Vitrano, 2018). These experiences can have negative impacts on their developing self-concepts, motivation, achievement, relationships, and adjustment (see Brown and Stone, 2016; Leaper and Brown, 2018). Sexism is most often considered in relation to its impact on cisgender girls and women (i.e., those who identify with their birth-assigned gender). More broadly, sexism is also directed at youth who challenge the status quo regarding traditional gender systems that maintain male dominance and heteronormativity (Brandt, 2011; Brown et al., 2020). First, these targets include sexual-minoritized youth—that is, lesbian, gay, bisexual, and questioning (LGBQ) persons—who violate heteronormative expectations (The term *heterosexism* is also used in reference to prejudice and discrimination against LGBQ persons). Second, sexism is aimed at gender-minoritized youth, which include transgender and gender-nonbinary persons (TGNB) who do not identify with their birth-assigned gender. Transgender persons identify with a gender identity different than assigned at birth; and gender-nonbinary persons reject conventional binary identities as either girls or boys (e.g., identifying as both or neither). In addition, sexism is directed at gender-nonconforming boys who identify as cisgender and heterosexual but do not adhere to traditional masculinity norms in appearance and behavioral expression (e.g., unathletic, nerdy boys). Finally, the traditional masculinity norms associated with sexism negatively affect the development of gender-conforming cisgender boys.

In the present chapter, we use the term *gender* to refer to the categorization of others or oneself as a “girl” or a “boy” or a different gender category (e.g., nonbinary, agender). *Gender identity* refers to one's personal sense of their gender whereas *gender expression* refers to the ways a person enacts and presents their gender (e.g., appearance, behaviors). In contrast, *sex* refers to the biological distinctions that commonly occur among those with XX or XY chromosomes (and other possibilities such as XXY, XYY, and XO, among others). Although one's identification as a “girl” or a “boy” commonly coincides with one's biological sex (XX or XY, respectively), this does not always follow—as notably occurs for transgender and nonbinary youth.

Our review is organized into the following five sections. First, we address factors that contribute to the development and maintenance of sexism during adolescence. Second, we explain conceptual models of sexist attitudes and related gender ideologies. In addition, we summarize some of the correlates of these attitudes in adolescents. In the next two sections, we turn to research on sexist behaviors. In our third section, we review sexualization, sexual harassment, and sexual violence. In our fourth section, we address gender-biased behaviors in academic and athletic settings. In our fifth section, we review factors related to adolescents' awareness of sexism, coping with sexist events, and potential strategies for preventing sexism.

Factors contributing to sexism during adolescence

Brown et al. (2020) recently presented a bioecological model that emphasizes several cultural forces in society (i.e., the macrosystem) that pave the way for sexual harassment, sexual violence, and other forms of sexism (also see Brown and Biefeld, 2023). These include the *sexualization and objectification* of girls and women (i.e., primarily valuing self or others for sexual appeal [e.g., American Psychological Association, 2007]), *hegemonic masculinity* (i.e., cultural expectation that boys and men exhibit dominance and hide weakness [e.g., Connell and Messerschmidt, 2005]), and *hegemonic heteronormativity* (i.e., cultural expectation of heterosexuality and traditional gender roles [e.g., Harvey et al., 2020]). Even before they enter adolescence, children are aware of these various cultural norms. However, the salience and impact of these norms increase with physical and sexual maturation during adolescence (see Brown et al., 2020).

Family members, peers, schools, and mass media are interlinking microsystems that establish and maintain practices that perpetuate sexism in children's and adolescents' lives (Brown et al., 2020; Rogers et al., 2021). Because gender categories are regularly used in these contexts to determine people's appearances and actions, individuals are likely to think of others and themselves in terms of gender-stereotypical expectations (Bigler and Liben, 2007; Brown et al., 2020). The salience and functional significance of gender categories in children's and teens' lives occurs through (1) using gender categories to label and to organize particular activities (Bigler and Leaper, 2015; Leaper and Bigler, 2018), (2) the segregation of girls and boys into same-gender friendship groups that enforce conformity (Leaper, 2022), (3) the emphasis on sexualized appearances for girls and women and muscularity and strength in boys and men (American Psychological Association, 2007; Murnen and Karaszia, 2017), (4) the widespread tolerance

of aggressive behaviors in boys (Farkas and Leaper, 2016b), and (5) gender-differentiated career expectations and opportunities (Leaper and Brown, 2018).

Attitudes related to sexism

Sexism is manifested in people's stereotyped beliefs, prejudicial attitudes, and discriminatory behaviors. *Stereotypes* occur when individuals use generalized expectations and beliefs regarding appearances, traits, and behaviors to view members of a given group (e.g., see Bigler and Patterson, 2017). Examples of gender stereotypes include the notions that boys are aggressive or that girls play with dolls. With many stereotyped beliefs, individuals consider these characteristics as inherent essences of being a member of a group—known as *essentialism*. For example, these include beliefs that boys are naturally aggressive (“boys will be boys”) or good at math while girls are naturally nurturing (“sugar and sweet and everything nice”) or good at reading. Whereas some gender stereotypes may generally reflect most members of a group (e.g., “girls play with dolls”), they do not reflect all members of a group. Furthermore, many gender stereotypes do not reflect most members of a group (e.g., “girls are bad at math”).

Prejudice refers to positive or negative attitudes to persons based on their group membership. With regards to gender, sexist prejudicial attitudes can be prescriptive or proscriptive. *Prescriptive sexist attitudes* are based on what people consider others are supposed to do based on their gender (e.g., a girl should wear make-up). *Proscriptive sexist attitudes* refer to what people consider others are supposed to avoid doing based on their gender (e.g., a boy is not supposed to show vulnerable emotions).

Although sexist stereotypes and prejudicial attitudes often coincide, this does not always occur (Bigler and Patterson, 2017). For example, two individuals may hold the same stereotype that girls wear make-up. One of these persons might be indifferent to whether a particular girl does or does not wear make-up. In contrast, the other person might consider it desirable for a girl to wear make-up and troubling if she does not. In the latter case, sexist prejudice is indicated because the person holds biased attitudes against persons who do not conform to traditional gender identities.

Gender-based stereotypes and attitudes also can be either explicit or implicit. *Explicit* stereotypes and attitudes respectively reflect people's consciously expressed beliefs (e.g., girls like dolls) and opinions (e.g., girls should play with dolls). *Implicit* stereotypes and attitudes are automatic (and sometimes unconscious) associations formed through prior experience (e.g., associating pink with girls or associating negative emotions to nontraditional behaviors). Explicit and implicit attitudes can be contradictory. For example, many persons endorse gender-egalitarian explicit attitudes (e.g., believing girls and boys are equal in math talent) while simultaneously holding gender-biased implicit associations (e.g., associating math more strongly with being male than female). Research suggests that some aspects of people's behavior are guided more by implicit than explicit attitudes (see Cvencek et al., 2012).

When people act on their explicit or implicit prejudiced attitudes, discrimination occurs. *Sexist discrimination* refers to unfairly biased actions toward other persons based on their gender (or sexual) identity or expression. As documented later in our chapter, these behaviors can undermine or harm the targets while they affirm male dominance. For example, sexist discrimination would be indicated if a boy made a sexually degrading comment to a girl or if a math teacher provided more encouragement to boys than girls. Sexist discrimination can be overtly hostile as occurs when sexual harassment or physical assaults occur; and it can be more subtle as often enacted in traditional heterosexual relationships (e.g., sexual double-standards for girls and boys). Also, sexist discrimination can be perpetrated by boys to other boys (e.g., teasing a boy who likes theater) or by girls to other girls (e.g., teasing a girl for playing sports).

Psychologists have advanced several complementary theories and models for understanding the attitudes that underlie sexism. In this section, we separately review ambivalent sexism theory, traditional masculinity and femininity ideologies, feminist identity, and intersectional and cultural approaches. These are among of the most influential models guiding recent research on sexist attitudes in adolescents.

Ambivalent sexism theory: Hostile sexism and benevolent sexism

Glick and Fiske's ambivalent sexism theory provides a model for understanding women's and men's interdependence in heterosexual relationships and families within the broader context of male dominance in society (for reviews, see Barreto and Doyle, 2023; Connor et al., 2017; Glick and Fiske, 2012). The seeming paradox between intimacy and dominance in these relationships is explained by two complementary forms of sexism: hostile sexism and benevolent sexism. As reviewed below, each facet of sexism emphasizes paternalism, gender differentiation, and heterosexuality (also see Table 1).

Hostile sexism

Hostile sexism reflects overtly negative or misogynistic attitudes toward girls or women. More specifically, hostile sexism is manifested through *dominative paternalism* (men deserve greater power than women), *competitive gender differentiation* (only men are suitable for powerful positions), and *heterosexual hostility* (men maintain power through controlling women's sexuality). The ambivalent sexism model focuses on hostile sexism primarily directed toward heterosexual women. However, hostile sexism is also aimed at other groups that challenge the status quo and legitimacy of male dominance in society (e.g., LGBQ and TGNB persons).

Table 1 Model of ambivalent sexism.

	<i>Paternalism</i>	<i>Gender differentiation</i>	<i>Heterosexuality</i>
Hostile sexism	<i>Dominative paternalism</i>	<i>Competitive gender differentiation</i>	<i>Heterosexual hostility</i>
Example	Justifying men's power over women	Belief that high-power attributes are unique to men	Belief that women are manipulative
Benevolent sexism	<i>Protective paternalism</i>	<i>Complementary gender differentiation</i>	<i>Heterosexual intimacy</i>
Example	Restricting women to protect them	Belief that positive yet low-power attributes are unique to women	Idealizing women

Table is based on Barreto and Doyle (2023) and Connor et al. (2017).

Benevolent sexism

Operating in conjunction with hostile sexism, benevolent sexism is a set of patronizing attitudes that are seemingly positive yet reinforce women's subordinate status. Components of benevolent sexism include *protective paternalism* (chivalrous expectations that men provide safety for women), *complementary gender differentiation* (women and men have complementary traits and roles, yet those associated with women are generally lower in status and power [e.g., nurturing caregivers] than those associated with men [e.g., assertive leaders]), and *heterosexual intimacy* (women complete men in heterosexual relationships).

Cross-cultural comparisons

In surveys of adults conducted across diverse countries and cultures, men and women commonly endorsed hostile and benevolent sexist attitudes (e.g., Glick et al., 2000, 2004). Men's endorsement of these sexist attitudes was somewhat less likely in relatively gender-egalitarian countries (Glick et al., 2000). Also, endorsements of hostile sexism and benevolent sexism were moderately correlated (Glick and Fiske, 2012). However, some individuals endorse the norms associated with benevolent sexism (e.g., chivalry) while disavowing hostile sexism (e.g., misogyny) (Connor et al., 2017).

Developmental trajectory

Two studies suggest some forms of hostile or benevolent sexist attitudes may occur as young as early childhood (Gutiérrez et al., 2020; Hammond and Cimpian, 2021); however, most research suggests ambivalent sexism becomes crystalized during adolescence with the onset of puberty and sexual interest among heterosexual youth (e.g., de Lemus et al., 2010; Glick and Hilt, 2000; Montañés et al., 2013). Researchers have documented the endorsement of hostile and benevolent sexist attitudes among adolescents across the world, including countries in Europe (e.g., de Lemus et al., 2010), North America (e.g., Dickman-Burnett et al., 2021), South America (e.g., DeSouza and Ribeiro, 2005), Africa (e.g., de Puiseau and Roessel, 2013), and Asia (e.g., Chu, 2014); notably, these sexist attitudes are apparent even in countries ranked high in gender equality such as Sweden (e.g., Zakrisson et al., 2012). In most reports, boys scored higher than girls in average levels of ambivalent sexism. These studies typically did not take into account the adolescents' sexual identities (LGBQ or heterosexual) or gender identities (cisgender or TGNC). Research with adults suggests even persons from minoritized sexual or gender identities can internalize some ambivalent sexist attitudes (e.g., Cowie et al., 2019; Schiralli et al., 2022).

Adolescents' endorsement of ambivalent sexist attitudes is related to multiple negative outcomes. In various studies with adolescents or emerging adults, hostile or benevolent sexist attitudes predicted acceptance or perpetration of sexual harassment and sexual violence (e.g., Bendixen and Ottesen Kennair, 2017; Cava et al., 2020; de Puiseau and Roessel, 2013; Dickman-Burnett et al., 2021; Dosil et al., 2019; Durán et al., 2010; Fasanelli et al., 2020; Lee et al., 2016; Morelli et al., 2016; Nava-Reyes et al., 2018), prejudicial attitudes toward gays and lesbians (Carrera-Fernández et al., 2019), sexual risk taking (Ramiro-Sánchez et al., 2018), support of heterosexual dating double standards or marriage traditions (Paynter and Leaper, 2016; Robnett and Leaper, 2013b), and endorsement of unrealistic romantic beliefs (Fernández et al., 2023). In addition, adolescent girls' benevolent sexist attitudes were correlated with restricted academic or career aspirations (Farkas and Leaper, 2016a; Montañés et al., 2012; Sáinz and Gallego, 2022) and greater involvement in housework (Malonda et al., 2017; Silvan-Ferrero and Lopez, 2007).

Traditional gender ideologies

Underlying and complementing hostile and benevolent sexist attitudes are a set of ideologies regarding what it means to be men and women in contemporary society. One set of beliefs are traditional masculinity ideology or masculine role norms. A parallel set of beliefs are traditional femininity ideology or feminine role norms. Each set of ideologies reflect and affirm hegemonic masculinity in society. By contrast, feminist identities reflect gender-egalitarian attitudes. We review these constructs below. Keep in mind, however, that most of the research has been conducted with Western samples (see Thompson and Bennett, 2015) and only a few studies have examined intersections of gender either with race/ethnicity (see Wong et al., 2017) or with LGBQT identities (see Parent and Bradstreet, 2017). Whereas gender inequalities and male dominance occur to varying degrees in cultures across the world, there are variations in degrees of inequality (World Economic Forum, 2022); and there are nuances in some of the specific ideologies that might be emphasized in particular cultural settings that we later review.

Traditional masculinity ideology

Psychologists have identified several components of traditional masculinity ideology (e.g., [Chu et al., 2005](#); [Levant et al., 2016](#); [Oransky and Fisher, 2009](#); also see [Thompson and Bennett, 2015](#), for a review). Summing across the various models, some of the key ideologies underlying traditional masculinity comprise appearing strong and tough, hiding vulnerable emotions, and avoiding appearances of being feminine or gay. These norms function to maintain hegemonic masculinity, which include the dominance of heterosexual males with the corresponding devaluing of feminine-stereotyped qualities and nonconforming males ([Connell and Messerschmidt, 2005](#)). At the same time, because boys and men must continually assert their masculinity with one another while also avoiding appearances of femininity, psychologists have characterized it as a precarious and perpetually threatened social status ([Vandello and Bosson, 2013](#)).

Two meta-analytic reviews examined traditional masculinity ideologies based on studies of adolescent and adult males from predominantly Western cultures. In one meta-analysis based on 78 samples of adolescents and adults (who were predominantly White males in the US), [Wong et al. \(2017\)](#) discovered endorsement of traditional masculinity ideologies predicted lower indices of mental health (e.g., self-esteem, depression, body image). Neither participants' age, gender, race/ethnicity, nor sexual orientation moderated these links. In another meta-analysis based on 57 samples, boys' and men's endorsements of traditional masculinity predicted greater acceptance of sexual harassment and violence against women ([Krivoshchekov et al., 2023](#)).

Individual studies have additionally reported that facets of traditional masculinity ideologies among adolescent boys were significantly related to the following: higher acceptance or commission of bullying, sexual harassment or sexual violence, homophobic language, and other aggressive behaviors ([Leemis et al., 2019](#); [Poteat et al., 2011](#); [Reigeluth and Addis, 2021](#); [Slaatten et al., 2014](#); [Steinfeldt et al., 2012](#); [Tolman et al., 2016](#)); enforcement of gender conformity ([Reigeluth and Addis, 2021](#)); lower satisfaction in interpersonal relationships ([Exner-Cortens et al., 2022](#); [Rogers et al., 2020](#); [Shepard et al., 2011](#)); and lower school engagement and success ([Leaper et al., 2019](#); [Rogers et al., 2017](#)). Furthermore, in studies with undergraduate samples, traditional masculinity ideology was associated with higher endorsements of hostile and benevolent sexist attitudes ([Danube et al., 2014](#); [McDermott et al., 2020](#); [Wong et al., 2017](#)). These studies underscore the potential negative impact of traditional masculinity on boys themselves and their peers (see [Rogers et al., 2021](#)).

Traditional femininity ideology

Complementing traditional masculinity, models of traditional femininity ideology have been advanced (e.g., [Levant et al., 2017](#); [Mahalik et al., 2005](#); [Tolman and Porche, 2000](#)). Some of the key norms identified in these models include deference to and dependence on men, investing in one's appearance, modesty about one's talents or abilities, avoiding activities and behaviors associated with boys or men, and sexual fidelity in the context of a heterosexual relationship. Many of the norms associated with traditional femininity are the obverse of those tied to traditional masculinity (e.g., deference vs. dominance, modesty vs. self-promotion, avoiding appearances of being masculine vs. feminine, etc.).

Only a few studies have tested the correlates of traditional feminine ideology in samples of adolescent girls. All of them were conducted in the US, and they indicated girls' endorsement of traditional femininity ideology or feminine norms was associated with lower indices of mental health, such as self-esteem and depression ([Impett et al., 2008](#); [Pearson et al., 2012](#)). Also, girls' endorsement of traditional feminine norms predicted higher body self-objectification and endorsement of traditional roles in heterosexual relationships ([Tolman et al., 2006, 2016](#)).

Feminist identity and attitudes

Feminism is based on a commitment to gender equality and a recognition that gender discrimination occurs at personal and social-structural levels in society ([Anderson, 2018](#); [Signorella, 2020](#)). However, many women who support gender equality do not identify as feminists. This is partly due to a lack of understanding of the larger social structures that perpetuate sexism. Furthermore, many false stereotypes about feminists are perpetuated that dissuade some adolescent women (and men or TGNB persons) from otherwise embracing this identity (e.g., [Carrino et al., 2022](#); [Leaper and Arias, 2011](#); [Robnett et al., 2018](#)). Also, individuals may express support for gender equality while disavowing that gender discrimination is a problem (e.g., [Robnett and Anderson, 2017](#)) or falsely equating feminism with hostility toward men (e.g., [Carrino et al., 2022](#); [Manago et al., 2009](#); [Robnett and Anderson, 2017](#)). Lastly, some women of color have resisted the feminist label because they viewed mainstream feminism as focusing on the needs of White middle-class women (e.g., [Hurtado, 2003](#); [Signorella, 2020](#)).

Research suggests that a feminist identity can be an asset when coping with sexist events—even after taking into account gender-egalitarian attitudes (e.g., [Ayres et al., 2009](#); [Leaper and Arias, 2011](#); [Leaper et al., 2013](#)). Although most of this research has been conducted with adults, studies with adolescent girls who self-identified as feminists were more likely to endorse proactive strategies (e.g., seeking social support) following sexual harassment ([Leaper et al., 2013](#); [Martin, 2015](#)).

Intersectional and cultural approaches to gender ideologies

Traditional gender ideologies are present within all patriarchal cultures. Although cultures vary in their degrees of patriarchy, no country has yet attained full gender equality ([World Economic Forum, 2022](#)). To maintain male dominance, components of traditional gender ideologies are shared across cultures. Further, colonization histories and increasing globalization contribute to shared gender ideologies ([Acker, 2004](#); [Mirandé, 1997](#); [Rochelle and Yim, 2015](#)). At the same time, traditional gender ideologies are rooted in specific cultural histories that can contribute to nuances in how they are constructed and expressed in particular communities.

As with much psychological research (see [Henrich et al., 2010](#)), the earlier work on traditional gender ideologies was mostly based on the experiences of White and Western samples (see [Thompson and Bennett, 2015](#); [Wong et al., 2017](#)). The specific ways that gender ideologies were constructed among families and communities of persons from other racial and cultural backgrounds were often ignored. As a result, White Western standards were sometimes used to interpret individuals from other backgrounds.

More recent research suggests potential variations in some aspects of traditional gender ideologies. For instance, hegemonic masculinities enacted in many White-majority communities in Western countries stress values related to individuality, whereas the gender ideologies of minoritized individuals in these countries more likely incorporate communal values (e.g., [Cuddy et al., 2015](#)). To illustrate a few examples, cultural emphases on family and community closeness and respect for authority are embedded in the gender ideologies that are traditionally associated with families in the US from Mexican and other Latiné cultures (e.g., [Arciniega et al., 2008](#); [Castillo et al., 2021](#); [Gutierrez and Leaper, 2022](#)), Chinese and other East Asian backgrounds (e.g., [Tang et al., 2010](#)), and Black communities (e.g., [Cole and Zucker, 2007](#); [Jones et al., 2018](#); [Skinner et al., 2016](#)). A related research direction has been to consider how religious beliefs may shape gender ideologies. Sexist attitudes and practices toward women and gender-nonconforming (e.g., LGBTQ and TGNB) persons are associated with the world's dominant religions, including Christianity, Judaism, Islam, Hinduism, and Confucianism ([Etengoff and Lefevor, 2021](#); [Tang et al., 2010](#)).

Objectified sexualization, sexual harassment, and sexual assault

As noted earlier, sexism is manifested through prejudice (sexist attitudes) and discrimination (sexist behaviors). Below, we address objectified sexualization, sexual harassment, and sexual violence. In a later section, we review gender-biased treatment in academics and athletics.

Objectified sexualization

Popular culture perpetuates and maintains the sexual objectification of girls and women. Conversely, men can be objectified for their muscularity. At the same time, there is a sexual double standard (see [Endendijk et al., 2020](#); [Sagebin Bordini and Sperb, 2013](#) for reviews). Although girls and women are encouraged to maintain sexualized appearances, they are traditionally viewed negatively if they are sexually active. Adolescent boys and young men are often glorified for their sexual prowess as “studs” while girls and women are commonly disparaged as “sluts” if they demonstrate sexual agency. These sexual double standards privilege the sexual agency of boys and men over girls and women (e.g., [Kreager et al., 2016](#)).

Sexualization of girls and women

Sexism occurs in the sexualized depictions of girls and women in media (see [American Psychological Association \[APA\], 2007](#); [Daniels et al., 2020](#); [Lamb and Koven, 2019](#), for reviews). Popular media generally depicts women in sexualized manners (e.g., sexual objects, hyperfeminine) and reinforces unrealistic body expectations for women and girls ([APA, 2007](#); [Daniels et al., 2020](#); [Lamb and Koven, 2019](#)). These representations are concerning as youth increasingly seek out media as an important source of knowledge about sexuality, gender, and relationships (see [Daniels et al., 2020](#)). Evidence suggests that girls may internalize these representations and view themselves in an objectified way (i.e., self-sexualization) that links their esteem to their sexual desirability ([APA, 2007](#); [Choi and DeLong, 2019](#); [Daniels et al., 2020](#); [Farkas and Leaper, 2016b](#); [Lamb and Koven, 2019](#)). Girls may surveil their bodies more and place a strong valuing on adhering to unrealistic beauty standards—and experience increased body shame when they cannot meet those unrealistic standards ([Daniels et al., 2020](#); [Grabe and Hyde, 2009](#); [Tiggemann and Slater, 2015](#)). Furthermore, girls' body image concerns are negatively related to academic motivation and achievement (e.g., [Brown, 2019](#); [McKenney and Bigler, 2014](#)).

Sexualization of boys and men

Popular media portray men and boys in sexualized manners via emphases on muscular appearances that demonstrate strength as well as glorifying men's sexual experiences and objectification of women (see [Farkas and Leaper, 2016b](#)). Like girls, adolescent boys may internalize these cultural messages and engage in self-sexualization and body surveillance (e.g., [Baker et al., 2019](#); also see [Farkas and Leaper, 2016b](#), for a review).

Sexualization in relation to LGBTQ and TGNB youth

Although less research has explored the potential unique experiences of sexualization among gender-nonconforming youth, research with adults suggests that objectification and self-sexualization may be particularly impactful among LGBTQ youth ([Engeln-Maddox et al., 2011](#); [Hill and Fischer, 2008](#); [Watson et al., 2015](#)). Lesbian and bisexual women have been stereotyped as hypersexual and sexually irresponsible ([Annati and Ramsey, 2022](#); [Bostwick and Hequembourg, 2014](#); [Dyar and Feinstein, 2018](#); [Serpe et al., 2020](#)). Many gay men demonstrate a heightened focus on appearance that may lead to greater self-sexualization and sexualization of other gay men ([Martins et al., 2007](#); [Szymanski et al., 2019](#)). Also, TGNB youth must navigate their gender identity exploration while negotiating unique challenges of sexualization ([Hammack et al., 2022](#)).

Sexualization and sexism

Through exposure to sexualized depictions, youth may come to accept traditional gender scripts that perpetuate gender inequalities and consequences ranging from low body esteem to sexual violence (Bègue et al., 2017; Lamb and Koven, 2019; Rousseau and Eggermont, 2018; Ward et al., 2015, 2022). For instance, traditional heterosexual scripts are reproduced through stereotypes that reify women as sexual objects and to affirm men's dominance (Kim et al., 2007; Peter and Valkenburg, 2007; Rousseau et al., 2019). Particularly troubling is evidence suggesting exposure to objectified sexualization in popular media and other sources contributes to acceptance and perpetration of sexual harassment and sexual violence for many adolescents (Driesmans et al., 2015; Jewell et al., 2015; Maes et al., 2019; Ward and Friedman, 2006).

Sexual harassment

Sexual harassment is a manifestation of hostile sexism that includes unwanted verbal, nonverbal, or physical actions that are sexual and typically demeaning in nature (Hill and Kearl, 2011). Verbal sexual harassment includes sexually demeaning comments, anti-gay insults, and spreading sexual rumors (e.g., Hill and Kearl, 2011). In addition, sexual harassment can be communicated electronically, for example, through social media, online video games, and text messaging (e.g., Maes et al., 2019). Physical and nonverbal sexual harassment may occur through unwanted touching and sexual gestures. Some researchers additionally include sexual coercion or sexual assault in their definitions of sexual harassment. Although these behaviors were included as forms of sexual harassment in some of the cited studies below, we specifically address them in a subsequent section on sexual violence.

Experiences with sexual harassment are common for girls and young women across the world (Lim et al., 2018; Vitrano, 2018)—including Scandinavian countries ranking among the most gender-egalitarian in the world (e.g., Bendixen et al., 2018). Other youth that are likely targets of sexual harassment include LGBTQ and TGNB youth (Kosciw et al., 2022; Norris and Orchowski, 2020). Furthermore, cisgender heterosexual boys who do not conform to traditional masculinity norms are at risk of harassment. Youth that do not conform with norms for their gender or sexual identities may also experience a broader form of gender-based harassment such as bullying, threats, physical violence, and other forms of non-sexual victimization (Brown et al., 2020; Collier et al., 2013; D'Augelli et al., 2002, 2006; Kosciw et al., 2022; Toomey et al., 2012). Given the characteristics of youth who are at the greatest risk as targets, sexual harassment is a means to enforce and maintain traditional heteronormative male dominance (Brown et al., 2020). As described next, these processes have been documented in five especially comprehensive national surveys of adolescents' experiences with sexual harassment in the US or UK.

Teen health and technology survey

The Teen Health and Technology Survey was conducted with nearly 5907 adolescents from diverse ethnic-racial and socioeconomic backgrounds in the United States (Mitchell et al., 2014). The survey took into account adolescents' sexual orientations and gender identities. When sexual orientation was considered, sexual-minoritized youth (lesbian, gay, bisexual, or questioning) were substantially more likely than heterosexual girls or boys to report sexual harassment. The prevalence rates ranged from 47% to 72% among sexual-minoritized youth compared to 43% and 23% among heterosexual girls and boys, respectively. Among heterosexual youth, however, sexual harassment was nearly twice as likely for girls than boys. When adolescents' rates of sexual harassment were compared based on their gender identities (cisgender, transgender, gender-nonconforming), these experiences were much more common among transgender and gender-nonconforming youth (69%–81%) than cisgender youth (34%–52%). Across both sexual and gender identities, heterosexual cisgender boys were least likely to report experiences with sexual harassment. When asked whether their experiences with sexual harassment were distressing, the most negative impacts were indicated for transgender, nonconforming, and sexual-minoritized youths. The lowest reported distress rate occurred for cisgender and heterosexual boys.

American Association of University Women survey

The American Association of University Women (AAUW) commissioned a national survey in the United States of 1965 adolescents' experiences with sexual harassment (Hill and Kearl, 2011). Although adolescents reported incidents of sexual harassment from a variety of sources, peers were the most likely perpetrators. Also, cross-sectional comparisons of youth from school grades 7 to 12 indicated sexual harassment increased with grade among girls but tended to decrease with grade among boys. Both boys and girls were identified as perpetrators and targets of sexual harassment; however, boys were the most common perpetrators of sexual harassment toward either girls or boys. This pattern is consistent with the greater investment among boys in maintaining hegemonic and heteronormative masculinity (see Brown et al., 2020). Some of the most commonly experienced types of sexual harassment among girls in the survey included unwanted sexual comments and gestures, unwanted touching, being called lesbian in a pejorative way, unwelcome sexual rumors, and sexual intimidation or sexual coercion. Among boys, the most commonly cited experiences of sexual harassment were unwanted sexual comments or gestures, being called gay in a pejorative manner, and unwanted sexual comments.

The same survey asked adolescents to identify the attributes of students most likely to be targeted for sexual harassment. Girls were considered more prone to being sexually harassed if they were physically developed, pretty or not pretty (vs. average), not feminine, or overweight. Boys were seen at greater risk if they were either overweight, not athletic, or not masculine—and also if they were good looking. These reports suggest that sexual harassment was used to sexually objectify others viewed as sexually attractive and to enforce gender conformity in those judged as not fitting stereotypical gender ideals (see Brown et al., 2020; Mumen and Smolak, 2000).

National school climate survey

The 2021 GLSEN National School Climate Survey (Kosciw et al., 2022) sampled 22,298 LGBTQ and TGNC youth between 13 and 21 years of age across the entire United States. One striking finding was the high number of LGBTQ/TGNC students who felt unsafe at school: 51% due to their sexual orientation, 43% due to their gender expression, and 40% because of their gender identity. Large majorities of the surveyed students heard negative remarks based on people's sexual or gender identities or gender expression. Also, most students had experienced in-person harassment or assault based on their sexual orientation (61%), gender expression (57%), or gender identity (51%).

UK millennium cohort study

The UK Millennium Cohort Study is a nationally representative prospective study of youth born in the UK (Kelly et al., 2019). Based on surveys of 10,904 14-year-olds, the researchers tested associations between social media use and mental health. Girls were twice as likely as boys to report experiencing online harassment (23% vs. 12%). Additionally, the association between social media use and depressive symptoms were stronger for girls than boys. Also, the link between social media use and depressive symptoms was partially mediated by online harassment. Furthermore, online harassment was linked to poor self-esteem and poor body image, which in turn predicted depressive symptoms. These associations were indicated for girls and boys, although girls were at greater risk of online harassment.

Pew research center teens and cyberbullying survey

The Pew Research Center surveyed 1316 U S teens between 13 and 17 years old regarding their experiences with cyberbullying (Pew Research Center, 2022). Nearly half (46%) of teens had experienced cyberbullying (e.g., offensive name calling, spreading false rumors, receiving unsolicited explicit images, physical threats, intrusive monitoring of activities). Cyberbullying was more common among older (15–17) than younger (13–14) teens. Also, among older teens, girls were more likely than boys to experience overall cyberbullying (54% vs. 44%), false rumors (33% vs. 16%), receiving unsolicited explicit images (25% vs. 18%), and intrusive monitoring (20% vs. 13%).

Consequences of sexual harassment

Sexual harassment can negatively impact youths' subsequent adjustment. For example, researchers have documented how experiences with sexual harassment predicted increased emotional distress, suicidal thoughts, substance abuse, and externalizing behaviors in both girls and boys as well as increased negative body image and self-harm in girls (e.g., Chiodo et al., 2009; Goldstein et al., 2007; Kosciw et al., 2022). Sexual harassment can also lead to lower feelings of safety in school, perceived support in school, and school satisfaction, as well as greater academic disengagement and lower grades (Chiodo et al., 2009; Gruber and Fineran, 2016; Hill and Kearl, 2011; Poteat and Espelage, 2007). Furthermore, girls who reported being sexually harassed within the context of a romantic relationship were at risk for lower self-esteem and dating violence (Chiodo et al., 2009; Goldstein et al., 2007).

The negative impact of sexual harassment on adjustment appears to be compounded when youth are LGBTQ, TGNC, or gender-nonconforming (Hatchel et al., 2018; Kosciw et al., 2022; Marx et al., 2021; Mitchell et al., 2014; Toomey, 2021). Relatedly, higher levels of distress were indicated for adolescents from racial-ethnic minoritized backgrounds who experienced both sexual harassment and racism (Hill and Kearl, 2011; Mitchell et al., 2014).

Sexual violence

Sexual violence is defined as any sex act or attempt to obtain sex without the person's consent or through use of coercion (World Health Organization [WHO], 2021). According to WHO, the estimated incidence of sexual violence is nearly 1 in 3 for women between ages 15 and 46 throughout all of the world. The estimated lifetime prevalence of physical or sexual intimate partner violence for different regions of the world range from approximately 20% to 50% (WHO, 2021). Research in the US indicated youth were most likely to experience sexual violence by a person known to them, such as a peer or an intimate dating partner (National Sexual Violence Resource Center [NSVRC], 2018). Sexual violence experienced by intimate dating partners were often experienced alongside other forms of dating violence, such as physical or emotional abuse (NSVRC, 2018).

Men are more likely the perpetrators of sexual violence, whereas women and gender-nonconforming individuals are more likely the victims of sexual violence based on samples in the US of adolescents (Edwards, 2018; Kann et al., 2018; Ngo et al., 2018; Semprevivo, 2021) and college students (de Heer and Jones, 2017; Eisenberg et al., 2021; Palmer et al., 2021). Compared to their cisgender peers, transgender and nonbinary adolescents reported experiencing sexual violence at higher rates (Murchison et al., 2019) and were at greater risk of sexual violence (Atteberry-Ash et al., 2020). Like sexual harassment, sexual violence functions to reproduce patriarchal norms, such as heteronormative male dominance (Hackman et al., 2022).

Youth risk behavior surveillance system (YRBSS) survey

The YRBSS Survey conducted through the US Center for Disease Control was based on 12,642 diverse youth in grades 9–12 across four US states (Semprevivo, 2021). Sexual violence was operationalized as having ever experienced physical force to have unwanted sexual intercourse or having being forced to engage in unwanted sexual acts by a dating partner specifically over the past year. Dating violence was operationalized as having experienced physical violence from a dating partner over the past year. Adolescent girls were twice as likely to report experiencing sexual violence than adolescent boys (11% vs. 5%, respectively). Adolescent girls were slightly

more likely than boys to report dating violence (8% vs. 6%, respectively). Sexual-minoritized youth (lesbian, gay, bisexual, or questioning) were over two times more likely than heterosexual youth to report experiencing both sexual and dating violence (16% vs. 7%, respectively). LGBQ adolescent girls were most likely to report experiencing both sexual and dating violence, followed by heterosexual girls, LGBQ boys, and heterosexual boys. In sum, those that violated expected heteronormative patriarchal standards were most at risk for violence. This study further revealed that the likelihood of experiencing dating violence increased as grade level increased, which suggests these experiences may become more pervasive as youth get older.

Consequences of sexual violence

Sexual violence violates human rights and upholds patriarchal gender systems (World Health Organization, 2021). It typically has harmful effects on the victims. Adolescent victims of sexual violence commonly have indicated increases in negative mental health outcomes as well as declines in academic engagement and performance (Basile et al., 2014; Bentivegna and Patalay, 2022; Clarke et al., 2021; Clasen et al., 2018; Kilpatrick et al., 2003). These consequences are especially notable among youth that experienced sexual assault committed by a peer attending their school, which accounts for a large percentage of sexual assault among adolescents (Clasen et al., 2018). While sexual assault survivors more generally may suffer these consequences, the impact of sexual assault may be compounded by stressors associated with holding a stigmatized identity, such as gender and sexual minoritized youth (Edwards, 2018; Marx et al., 2021; Meyer, 2013; Rimes et al., 2019).

Gender bias in achievement contexts

Traditional gender stereotypes, attitudes, and practices in society can undermine adolescents' motivations and competencies. We next review the potential impacts of sexist experiences on their developing academic competencies and interest as well as their participation in athletics. To the extent that individuals are limited in their participation or pursuit of academic or athletic success, there may be corresponding limitations on their later career options and happiness.

Sexism in Academics

Girls' experiences with sexism in STEM

Careers related to science, technology, engineering, and math (STEM) are among the fastest growing, highest paying, and prestigious in the world (Pew Research Center, 2018). Jobs in these fields are also predominantly held by men in most countries (United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization [UNESCO], 2022). Therefore, gender gaps in these occupations contribute to inequalities in wealth and status in a society. Moreover, given the increasing impact of technology and science on people's lives, it is important for diverse voices to inform and guide advances in these fields (e.g., Fine et al., 2020).

Gender gaps in most STEM fields have persisted for decades; however, differences have dramatically narrowed in some STEM subjects. For example, girls and boys now demonstrate comparable rates of achievement in high school math and life sciences; and there are similar representations of women in men in most jobs related to life and health sciences (National Science Foundation, 2021; UNESCO, 2022). However, large gender gaps in occupations related to physical sciences, computers, and engineering persist in most countries (UNESCO, 2022). For example, in the US, women comprised only 25% of computer and mathematical jobs in 2020 (National Science Foundation, 2021).

Research has identified several potential sources that undermine girls' STEM motivation (see Cheryan et al., 2017; Leaper, 2015a). These include gender differences in available role models, parental encouragement, and gender-biased comments from peers and adults. First, boys are more likely than girls to see their gender ingroup represented as physicists, astronomers, computer scientists, or engineers in classrooms and popular media (e.g., Wang et al., 2022). Second, research suggests that many parents may encourage activities related to math, science, and technology more likely for their sons than daughters from childhood into adolescence (e.g., Eccles, 2015). Third, adolescent girls may hear negative attitudes communicated about girls' or women's competencies in many STEM-related subjects from peers, family members, and teachers (Leaper and Brown, 2008; Robnett, 2016). Even after controlling for girls' math or science grades, hearing these gender-biased comments was negatively related to girls' achievement motivation and self-concepts in these subjects (Leaper et al., 2012; Robnett, 2016).

For many youth, hearing gender-biased comments about girls in STEM may be especially detrimental when they come from peers. Heterosexual adolescent girls are commonly concerned with appearing attractive to boys and being accepted by other girls (see Leaper, 2015b). In some peer group cultures, girls may view excelling in math and science as incompatible with their romantic appeal and popularity, which may detract from their interest in these subjects. In contrast, researchers found when girls belonged to a peer group that supported math and science achievement, they were more likely to maintain their achievement in these domains (e.g., Crosnoe et al., 2008; Robnett, 2013; Robnett and Leaper, 2013a; Stake and Nickens, 2005). However, having same-gender peer groups that were supportive of math and science appeared more likely for boys than girls (Robnett and Leaper, 2013a).

Parents' and teachers' sexist comments about girls' abilities can also play a critical role in shaping the interests, confidence, and success of those girls. Some parents hold gender-stereotyped expectations regarding their daughters' academic abilities and potential in math, science, and computers (Starr et al., 2022; Tenenbaum and Leaper, 2003). In longitudinal studies, parents' attitudes and beliefs predicted later gender-related variations in their adolescents' academic self-concepts and achievement (Eccles et al., 2000; Simpkins et al., 2015). When parents held low expectations for their daughters, the girls increasingly lost confidence in math

and subsequently spent less time studying math in high school. Research similarly shows teachers' negative comments about girls' and young women's capabilities in math, science, or computers may have unfavorable effects on their performance in these subjects (Gunderson et al., 2012).

Boys' experiences with sexism in academics

Whereas traditional masculinity generally benefits boys and men with higher status and power, rigid conformity to traditional masculinity norms can undermine boys' academic success (see Farkas and Leaper, 2016b). Several studies conducted in industrialized nations have documented that adolescent boys who endorsed traditional masculinity norms were less engaged in their classes, were less willing to seek help with their academic work, showed less interest in language arts (e.g., literature), had more negative attitudes toward school, and were more prone to antisocial behavior (Heyder et al., 2021; Jackson and Dempster, 2009; Kiefer and Ryan, 2008; Leaper et al., 2019; Rogers et al., 2017; Van Houtte, 2004; Wang et al., 2011). These trends may lead to gender differences in academic achievement. On average, boys have tended to attain lower grades and are less likely to graduate high school compared to girls in most industrialized countries (see United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, 2011; Voyer and Voyers, 2014). Also, men are less likely than women to attend and to graduate from college.

Gender- and sexual-minoritized youths' experiences with sexism in academics

As previously noted, LGBQ and TGNB youth are commonly subjected to bullying and other forms of victimization. These experiences can lead to school avoidance and declines in academic performance (Poteat et al., 2014). Relatedly, these youths are at greater risk for poor mental and physical health, which further undermines their academic success (Poteat et al., 2014).

Sexism in sports

Girls' experiences with sexism in sports

Sports have long been viewed in much of the world as a masculine pursuit in which boys and men primarily participated. However, over the past 60 years, the gender gap in athletic participation has significantly narrowed in most countries (e.g., International Olympic Committee, 2021). Cross-culturally, girls' and young women's athletic participation may be partly related to the society's level of gender equality, with higher gender equality indices being linked to greater female sports participation (Deaner and Smith, 2013; Lowen et al., 2016). Despite these dramatic increases in adolescent girls' involvement in sports over the decades in the US and other countries, full gender equity in participation is not yet realized.

In the US, many of the same sports are popular for girls and boys (National Federation of State High School Associations, 2022). These include track and field, basketball, soccer, and softball/baseball. Two notable gender differences in participation are American football (#1 in popularity among boys and 99.6% male) and competitive spirit squads (#9 in popularity among girls and 97% female). American football is a highly violent sport (i.e., reflecting traditional masculinity norms) whereas spirit squads are designed to support the team and cheer the audience (i.e., reflecting traditional femininity norms). Given the strong ties between sport and masculinity, societal barriers to girls' and young women's athletic involvement may be especially challenging to overcome.

Despite girls' and women's dramatic increases across the world in sport participation, sexist prejudices and discrimination against female athletes persist. These prejudices can stem from benevolent sexism (e.g., belief that girls should be protected from rough and competitive sports) as well as hostile sexism (e.g., view that female athletes are romantically unattractive). In one survey of adolescent girls in the US, over three-quarters of them reported hearing at least one sexist comment about their athletic abilities (Leaper and Brown, 2008). In a systematic review of qualitative studies examining girls' perceptions of physical activity (Corr et al., 2019), gender bias in sports emerged as a key theme that many girls identified as barriers to participating in sports or other physical activities. Also, a recent meta-analysis identified peer support among the most reliable predictors of youths' persistent participation in sport (Zhang et al., 2022). One commonly cited problem were social pressures to adhere to stereotypical notions of femininity and heterosexual attractiveness viewed as incompatible with athletic participation (Corr et al., 2019). Researchers have observed both boys and girls were complicit in establishing norms for heterosexual attractiveness and femininity that may undermine girls' participation in athletics (Slater and Tiggemann, 2011). Thus, many girls must overcome traditional gender stereotypes and prejudices if they pursue athletic participation into adolescence.

In addition to peers, gender-biased and unsupportive attitudes from parents and coaches (or physical education teachers) are related to adolescent girls' persistence in sports (Heinze et al., 2017; Zhang et al., 2022). Conversely, support from parents or coaches can bolster girls' motivation (e.g., Atkins et al., 2013; Zhang et al., 2022). Longitudinal research suggests when parents have positive views of their sports ability that girls demonstrate greater confidence in their athletic competence in later years (Fredricks and Eccles, 2002).

Reflecting the higher status accorded to men's sports in society, funding and media coverage is highly skewed toward men's over women's athletics. Schools typically fund and promote sport teams disproportionately more for boys than girls in the US (Women's Sports Foundation, 2020) and European Union (European Commission, 2022). Similarly, although girls and women constitute 40% of sports participation in the US, one analysis found 95% of television coverage was for men's sports (Cooky et al., 2021). Moreover, when female athletes are presented in print and electronic media, they are often sexualized in their appearance (Daniels and Lavoie, 2013). Observing these images may heighten adolescent girls' own objectified appraisals of female athletes and themselves versus viewing athletes for their physical competence (Daniels, 2012). Also, adolescent boys who view sexualized

(vs. non-sexualized) images of female athletes were less likely to view them as competent and more likely to sexually objectify them (Daniels and Linder, 2021).

Boys' experiences with sexism in sports

In the sports programs of many high schools, the traditional "locker room" culture can foster misogynistic attitudes toward women as well as hostility toward LGBQ, TGNB, and other gender-nonconformity persons (Messner, 2007). Many boys who do not adhere to these and other traditional masculinity norms are subjected to ridicule from coaches and teammates (Messner, 2007; Schissel, 2000). Traditional masculinity norms may be especially pernicious among those involved in violent sports, such as American football, in which violence is often glorified. Researchers observed that adolescent boys who played in aggressive contact (vs. non-contact) sports were at greater risk for tolerating and committing sexual violence (Forbes et al., 2006; Kreager, 2007; McCauley et al., 2014).

Gender- and sexual-minoritized youths' experiences with sexism in sports

Athletic programs are often contexts for the enactment of traditional masculinity and they are also sites wherein sexist teasing and bullying are directed toward LGB and TGNB youths (e.g., Greenspan et al., 2019; Hartmann-Tews et al., 2021). Among studies conducted in the US, prejudice in sport was greater toward TGNB than LGB students (Clark et al., 2021; Cunningham and Pickett, 2018). Many schools in the US do not allow transgender youth to participate in sports for their self-identified gender (Flores et al., 2020). Opposition to transgender sports participation is generally greater among those with traditional gender attitudes (Flores et al., 2020).

Awareness of sexism and coping responses

Given the negative impact of sexism on many adolescents' development, researchers and policymakers have sought to identify ways to help them cope effectively with sexist events. This includes, first, recognizing sexist discrimination when it occurs and, second, facilitating proactive responses to sexist events.

Perceiving sexist discrimination

Brown and Bigler (2005) highlighted cognitive, individual, and situational factors that influence people's awareness of sexism. Cognitive moderators include perspective-taking and reasoning about social conventions (e.g., Salomon and Brown, 2021). Individual moderators include having learned about gender bias or holding gender-egalitarian attitudes (see Bigler and Pahlke, 2019; Leaper and Brown, 2014). Some situational moderators include whether the perpetrator is known to be sexist or the discrimination occurs in a situation where gender is salient (e.g., Brown and Bigler, 2004).

Coping with sexism

A distinction is made between proactive and avoidance coping strategies (Compas et al., 2001). Proactive strategies include confronting the source of threat or seeking support. In contrast, avoidance strategies include downplaying the event or avoiding the perpetrator. Approach strategies generally help individuals cope most effectively with stress (Compas et al., 2001). However, research indicates that avoidance strategies are most commonly invoked in response to sexism. For example, in the AAUW survey of adolescents' experiences with sexual harassment, approximately half of girls and boys reported they ignored the incident and did nothing afterward (Hill and Kearn, 2011). Only about one-third of girls and one-sixth of boys reported confronting the perpetrator or talking to a family member or a friend. Even fewer reported the incident to a school official. When adolescents recognize that schools, family, and peers are available as supports, they are more likely to approach them for help following sexist events (e.g., Gruber and Fineran, 2016; Leaper et al., 2013).

Possible interventions to reduce sexism and promote effective coping

Some promising strategies have been identified for reducing gender-based prejudice and discrimination in schools (see Bigler and Wright, 2014; Brown and Salomon, 2019; Leaper and Brown, 2014). First, it is helpful to avoid the routine use of gender to label persons and organize activities. These practices increase the likelihood of forming and eliciting teachers' and students' gender stereotypes and prejudices (see Bigler and Liben, 2007). Second, teachers can instruct students about gender discrimination, which can help students later recognize when it occurs (e.g., Pahlke et al., 2014; also see Bigler and Wright, 2014; Brown and Salomon, 2019). Third, fostering students' mixed-gender contacts in cooperative group activities can reduce prejudice (see Fabes et al., 2019). Conversely, single-sex schools do not appear to benefit girls' academic achievement or self-esteem (see Leaper and Brown, 2014; Pahlke and Hyde, 2016). Fourth, intervention programs in schools can foster children's and adolescents' use of approach coping responses to sexist events (see Bigler and Wright, 2014). Fifth, student organizations for sexual- and gender-minoritized youth and their allies provide readily available sources for social support (Kosciw et al., 2022; Poteat et al., 2014). Sixth, interventions that target the school climate and policies that tolerate sexist behaviors (e.g., classroom practices, peer cultures, and teacher

attitudes) may help both to reduce sexist victimization (e.g., Brown et al., 2022; Crowley et al., 2021; Rinehart and Espelage, 2016) and to increase the likelihood that students will view sexual harassment as wrong (Horn and Poteat, 2022). Finally, creating and enforcement of laws against forms of sexism can create institutional changes that lead to greater gender equality—as seen in the US after the enactment of the Title IX Education Amendment in 1972 when girls' sport participation dramatically increased over the subsequent decades (Women's Sports Foundation, 2020).

Summary and conclusions

Sexism includes holding prejudiced attitudes and discriminatory behaviors toward others based on their gender identity, gender expression, or sexual orientation. Whereas sexism is manifested in everyday experiences, it reflects patriarchal structures in society that maintain and perpetuate male dominance—including binary gender differentiation based on heterosexism. The targets of sexism are most often girls and women, sexual-minoritized (LGBQ) persons, gender-minoritized (TGNB) persons, and gender-nonconforming cisgender, heterosexual boys and men. However, sexism also negatively affect gender-conforming boys and men.

Patriarchy dictates that women and men should form bonds in heterosexual relationships wherein men have higher status and power than women. This seeming paradox of forming intimate yet unequal relationships is explained by ambivalent sexism theory. This model posits hostile sexism and benevolent sexism as complementary. Hostile sexism reflects antipathy toward women and belief in male superiority; and benevolent sexism reflects an idealization of women's traditional gender roles and a patronizing view of women's need to be protected. Besides identifying the components of sexist attitudes, psychologists have sought to identify the key features of traditional masculinity norms (e.g., toughness, emotional restriction) and traditional femininity norms (e.g., nurturance, concerns with appearance). Although basic similarities in gender ideologies are indicated across racial, ethnic, and cultural groups, some variations in specific facets have been noted. The significance of sexist attitudes and gender ideologies has been documented in studies finding endorsement of these views predict greater likelihoods of perpetrating or tolerating sexist behaviors (e.g., sexual harassment) or enacting traditional roles in heterosexual relationships. Moreover, endorsement of traditional gender ideologies is negatively correlated with indices of psychological adjustment among adolescent girls and boys. In contrast, feminist identification is related to proactive coping with sexist discrimination.

Sexism generally affects the trajectory of individuals' lives from their moment of birth when gender-differentiated treatment and opportunities begin. However, adolescence is a period when many forms of sexism dramatically increase. This is apparent in the manifestations of hostile sexism in the forms of increasing rates of sexual harassment or sexual violence toward girls, LGBQ and TGNB youth, and other gender-nonconforming persons. Also, benevolent sexism becomes enacted in the context of traditional heterosexual scripts and roles whereby boys are expected to be chivalrous (e.g., paying for the date) and girls are expected to appear sexually appealing yet modest.

Adolescence is also a period when sexism can undermine youths' motivations in academics and athletics. Notably, many girls experience gender-biased comments that diminish their confidence and interest in STEM subjects. Also, traditional masculinity norms lead many boys to devalue academic success and to avoid seeking help. Traditional femininity norms regarding sexual attractiveness can lead girls to leave athletics. Whereas the sports culture associated with many aggressive team sports may reinforce and exaggerate traditional masculinity norms emphasizing toughness, hiding vulnerable feelings, misogyny, and homophobia.

Researchers have documented how proactive coping strategies, such as seeking support or confronting perpetrators, can mitigate the negative impacts of sexist events on individuals' mental health. Conversely, avoidance strategies usually do not help. Whereas interventions aimed to promote proactive coping can be helpful, prevention of sexist attitudes and behaviors in individuals and changing sexist practices in institutions are preferable. When the latter occur, the culture itself can become less sexist and more egalitarian—which ultimately benefits all persons.

Acknowledgment

The authors thank Rebecca Bigler for her helpful suggestions.

References

- Acker, J., 2004. Gender, capitalism, and globalization. *Crit. Sociol.* 30 (1), 17–41.
- American Psychological Association, 2007. Report of the APA Task Force on the Sexualization of Girls. <https://www.apa.org/pi/women/programs/girls/report>.
- Anderson, K.J., 2018. Modern misogyny and backlash. In: Travis, C.B., White, J.W., Rutherford, A., Williams, W.S., Cook, S.L., Wyche, K.F. (Eds.), *APA Handbook of the Psychology of Women: History, Theory, and Battlegrounds*, vol. 1. American Psychological Association, pp. 27–46.
- Annati, A., Ramsey, L.R., 2022. Lesbian perceptions of stereotypical and sexualized media portrayals. *Sex. Cult.* 26, 312–338.
- Arciniega, G.M., Anderson, T.C., Tovar-Blank, Z., Tracey, T.J.G., 2008. Toward a fuller conception of machismo: development of a traditional Machismo and Caballerismo scale. *J. Counsel. Psychol.* 55 (1), 19–33.
- Atkins, M.R., Johnson, D.M., Force, E.C., Petrie, T.A., 2013. "Do I still want to play?" Parents' and peers' influences on girls' continuation in sport. *J. Sport Behav.* 36, 329–345.
- Atteberry-Ash, B., Walls, N.E., Kattari, S.K., Peitzmeier, S.M., Kattari, L., Langenderfer-Magruder, L., 2020. Forced sex among youth: accrual of risk by gender identity, sexual orientation, mental health and bullying. *J. LGBT Youth* 17 (2), 193–213.

- Ayres, M.M., Friedman, C.K., Leaper, C., 2009. Individual and situational factors related to young women's likelihood of confronting sexism in their everyday lives. *Sex. Roles* 61 (7–8), 449–460.
- Baker, J.H., Neyland, H., Thornton, L.M., Runfola, C.D., Larsson, H., Lichtenstein, P., Bulik, C., 2019. Body dissatisfaction in adolescent boys. *Dev. Psychol.* 55 (7), 1566–1578.
- Barreto, M., Doyle, D.M., 2023. Benevolent and hostile sexism in a shifting global context. *Nat. Rev. Psychol.* 2, 98–111.
- Basile, K.C., Smith, S.G., Breiding, M., Black, M.C., Mahendra, R.R., 2014. Sexual violence surveillance: uniform definitions and recommended data elements. *Center Dis. Contr.* https://www.cdc.gov/violenceprevention/pdf/sv_surveillance_definitions-2009-a.pdf.
- Bègue, L., Sarda, E., Gentile, D.A., Bry, C., Roché, S., 2017. Video games exposure and sexism in a representative sample of adolescents. *Front. Psychol.* 8, 7.
- Bendixen, M., Daveronis, J., Ottesen Kennair, L.E., 2018. The effects of non-physical peer sexual harassment on high school students' psychological well-being in Norway: consistent and stable findings across studies. *Int. J. Publ. Health* 63 (1), 3–11.
- Bendixen, M., Ottesen Kennair, L.E., 2017. When less is more: psychometric properties of Norwegian short-forms of the ambivalent sexism scales (ASI and AMI) and the Illinois rape myth acceptance (IRMA) scale. *Scand. J. Psychol.* 58 (6), 541–550.
- Bentivegna, F., Patalay, P., 2022. The impact of sexual violence in mid-adolescence on mental health: a UK population-based longitudinal study. *Lancet Psychiatr.* 9 (11), 874–883.
- Bigler, R.S., Leaper, C., 2015. Gendered language: psychological principles, evolving practices, and inclusive policies. *Pol. Insights Behav. Brain Sci.* 2, 187–194.
- Bigler, R.S., Liben, L.S., 2007. Developmental intergroup theory: explaining and reducing children's social stereotyping and prejudice. *Curr. Dir. Psychol. Sci.* 16, 162–166.
- Bigler, R.S., Pahlke, E., 2019. "I disagree! sexism is silly to me!" teaching children to recognize and confront gender biases. In: Mallett, R.K., Monteith, M.J. (Eds.), *Confronting Prejudice and Discrimination: The Science of Changing Minds and Behaviors*. Elsevier Academic Press, pp. 299–317.
- Bigler, R.S., Patterson, M.M., 2017. Social stereotyping and prejudice in children: insights from novel group studies. In: Rutland, A., Nesdale, D., Brown, C.S. (Eds.), *The Wiley Handbook of Group Processes in Children and Adolescents*. Wiley, pp. 184–202.
- Bigler, R.S., Wright, Y.F., 2014. Reading, writing, arithmetic, and racism? Risks and benefits of teaching children about intergroup biases. *Child Dev. Perspect.* 8, 18–23.
- Bostwick, W., Hequembourg, A., 2014. "Just a little hint": bisexual-specific microaggressions and their connection to epistemic injustices. *Cult. Health Sex.* 16 (5), 488–503.
- Brandt, M.J., 2011. Sexism and gender inequality across 57 societies. *Psychol. Sci.* 22 (11), 1413–1418.
- Brown, C.S., 2019. Sexualized gender stereotypes predict academic self-efficacy and motivation across middle school. *IJBD (Int. J. Behav. Dev.)* 43 (6), 523–529.
- Brown, C.S., Biefeld, S., 2023. The development and perpetration and tolerance of sexual harassment. *Curr. Dir. Psychol. Sci.* 32 (1), 10–17.
- Brown, C.S., Biefeld, S.D., Bulin, J., 2022. High school policies about sexual harassment: what's on the books and what students think. *J. Soc. Issues.* <https://doi.org/10.1111/josi.12505>.
- Brown, C.S., Biefeld, S.D., Elpers, N., 2020. A bioecological theory of sexual harassment of girls: research synthesis and proposed model. *Rev. Gen. Psychol.* 24 (4), 299–320.
- Brown, C.S., Bigler, R.S., 2004. Children's perceptions of gender discrimination. *Dev. Psychol.* 40, 714–726.
- Brown, C.S., Bigler, R.S., 2005. Children's perceptions of discrimination: a developmental model. *Child Dev.* 76, 533–553.
- Brown, C.S., Salomon, I., 2019. Adolescents' responses to gendered harassment and discrimination: effective strategies within a school context. In: Mallett, R.K., Monteith, M.J. (Eds.), *Confronting Prejudice and Discrimination: The Science of Changing Minds and Behaviors*. Elsevier Academic Press, pp. 159–177.
- Brown, C.S., Tam, M.J., 2022. Gender-based discrimination in childhood and adolescence. In: VanderLaan, D.P., Wong, W.I. (Eds.), *Gender and Sexuality Development: Contemporary Theory and Research*. Springer Nature, Switzerland AG, pp. 277–299.
- Brown, C.S., Stone, E.A., 2016. Gender stereotypes and discrimination: how sexism impacts development. In: Horn, S.S., Ruck, M.D., Liben, L.S. (Eds.), *Equity and Justice in Developmental Science: Theoretical and Methodological Issues*. Elsevier Academic Press, pp. 105–133.
- Carrera-Fernández, M., Lameiras-Fernández, M., Rodríguez-Castro, Y., Vallejo-Medina, P., 2013. Bullying among Spanish secondary education students: the role of gender traits, sexism, and homophobia. *J. Interpers. Violence* 28, 2915–2940.
- Carrino, E.A., Bryen, C.P., Maheux, A.J., Stewart, J.L., Roberts, S.R., Widman, L., Choukas-Bradley, S., 2022. Are feminists empowered activists or entitled whiners? A thematic analysis of U.S. adolescents' definitions of "feminist" in a diverse, mixed-gender sample. *Sex. Roles* 86 (7–8), 395–414.
- Castillo, L.G., González, P., Merz, E.L., Nuñez, A., Castañeda, S.F., Buelna, C., et al., 2021. Factorial invariance of the Marianismo beliefs scale among Latinos in the Hispanic community health study/study of Latinos sociocultural ancillary study. *J. Clin. Psychol.* 77 (1), 312–328.
- Cava, M., Martínez-Ferrer, B., Buelga, S., Carrascosa, L., 2020. Sexist attitudes, romantic myths, and offline dating violence as predictors of cyber dating violence perpetration in adolescents. *Comput. Hum. Behav.* 111, 11.
- Cheryan, S., Ziegler, S.A., Montoya, A.K., Jiang, L., 2017. Why are some STEM fields more gender balanced than others? *Psychol. Bull.* 143 (1), 1–35.
- Chiodo, D., Wolfe, D.A., Croosk, C., Hughes, R., Jaffe, P., 2009. Impact of sexual harassment victimization by peers on subsequent adolescent victimization and adjustment: a longitudinal study. *J. Adolesc. Health* 45, 246–252.
- Choi, D., DeLong, M., 2019. Defining female self sexualization for the twenty-first century. *Sex. Cult.* 23, 1350–1371.
- Chu, D., 2014. Kong girls and Lang Mo: teen perceptions of emergent gender stereotypes in Hong Kong. *J. Youth Stud.* 17 (1), 130–147.
- Chu, J.Y., Porche, M.V., Tolman, D.L., 2005. The adolescent masculinity ideology in relationships scale: development and validation of a new measure for boys. *Men Masculin.* 8, 93–115.
- Clark, C.M., Kosciw, J.G., Chin, J., 2021. LGBTQ Students and School Sports Participation: Research Brief. GLSEN, New York. <https://www.glsen.org>.
- Clarke, V., Goddard, A., Wellings, K., Hirve, R., Casanovas, M., Bewley, S., Viner, R., Kramer, T., Khadr, S., 2021. Medium-term health and social outcomes in adolescents following sexual assault: a prospective mixed-methods cohort study. *Soc. Psychiatr. Psychiatr. Epidemiol.*
- Clasen, L.E., Blauert, A.B., Madsen, S.A., 2018. "What will my friends think?" Social consequences for Danish victims of sexual assaults in peer groups. *J. Child Sex. Abuse* 27 (3), 217–236.
- Cole, E.R., Zucker, A.N., 2007. Black and white women's perspectives on femininity. *Cult. Divers. Ethnic Minor. Psychol.* 13 (1), 1–9.
- Collier, K.L., van Beurden, G., Bos, H.M.W., Sandfort, T.G.M., 2013. Sexual orientation and gender identity/expression related peer victimization in adolescence: a systematic review of associated psychosocial and health outcomes. *J. Sex. Res.* 50 (3–4), 299–317.
- Compas, B.E., Connor-Smith, J.K., Saltzman, H., Thomsen, A.H., Wadsworth, M.E., 2001. Coping with stress during childhood and adolescence: problems, progress, and potential in theory and research. *Psychol. Bull.* 127, 87–127.
- Connell, R.W., Messerschmidt, J.W., 2005. Hegemonic masculinity: rethinking the concept. *Gend. Soc.* 19 (6), 829–859.
- Connor, R.A., Glick, P., Fiske, S.T., 2017. Ambivalent sexism in the twenty-first century. In: Sibley, C., Barlow, F. (Eds.), *Cambridge Handbook of the Psychology of Prejudice*. Cambridge University Press, pp. 295–320.
- Cooley, C., Council, L.D., Mears, M.A., Messner, M.A., 2021. One and done: the long eclipse of women's televised sports, 1989–2019. *Commun. Sport* 9 (3), 347–371.
- Corr, M., McSharry, J., Murtagh, E.M., 2019. Adolescent girls' perceptions of physical activity: a systematic review of qualitative studies. *Am. J. Health Promot.* 33 (5), 806–819.
- Cowie, L.J., Greaves, L.M., Sibley, C.G., 2019. Sexuality and sexism: differences in ambivalent sexism across gender and sexual identity. *Pers. Individ. Differ.* 148, 85–89.
- Crosnoe, R., Riegler-Crumb, C., Field, S., Frank, K., Muller, C., 2008. Peer group contexts of girls' and boys' academic experiences. *Child Dev.* 79, 139–155.
- Crowley, B.Z., Cornell, D., Konold, T., 2021. School climate moderates the association between sexual harassment and student well-being. *Sch. Ment. Health* 13 (4), 695–706.
- Cuddy, A.J.C., Wolf, E.B., Glick, P., Crotty, S., Chong, J., Norton, M.I., 2015. Men as cultural ideals: cultural values moderate gender stereotype content. *J. Pers. Soc. Psychol.* 109 (4), 622–635.
- Cunningham, G.B., Pickett, A.C., 2018. Trans prejudice in sport: differences from LGB prejudice, the influence of gender, and changes over time. *Sex. Roles* 78 (3–4), 220–227.
- Ovencek, D., Greenwald, A.G., Meltzoff, A.N., 2012. Balanced identity theory: review of evidence for implicit consistency in social cognition. In: Gawronski, B., Strack, F. (Eds.), *Cognitive Consistency: A Fundamental Principle in Social Cognition*. Guilford Press, pp. 157–177.

- D'Augelli, A.R., Grossman, A.H., Starks, M.T., 2006. Childhood gender atypicality, victimization, and PTSD among lesbian, gay, and bisexual youth. *J. Interpers Violence* 21 (11), 1462–1482.
- D'Augelli, A.R., Pilkington, N.W., Hershberger, S.L., 2002. Incidence and mental health impact of sexual orientation victimization of lesbian, gay, and bisexual youths in high school. *Sch. Psychol. Q.* 17 (2), 148–167.
- Daniels, E.A., 2012. Sexy versus strong: what girls and women think of female athletes. *J. Appl. Dev. Psychol.* 33, 79–90.
- Daniels, E.A., Lavoie, N.M., 2013. Athletics as solution and problem: sport participation for girls and the sexualization of female athletes. In: Zurbriggen, E.L., Roberts, T. (Eds.), *The Sexualization of Girls and Girlhood: Causes, Consequences, and Resistance*. Oxford University Press, pp. 63–83.
- Daniels, E.A., Zurbriggen, E.L., Monique Ward, L., 2020. Becoming an object: a review of self-objectification in girls. *Body Image* 33, 278–299.
- Daniels, E.A., Linder, J.R., 2021. Sex object vs. athlete: boys' and men's responses toward sexualized male athletes. *Sex. Roles* 85 (9–10), 528–541.
- Danube, C.L., Vescio, T.K., Davis, K.C., 2014. Male role norm endorsement and sexism predict heterosexual college men's attitudes toward casual sex, intoxicated sexual contact, and casual sex. *Sex. Roles* 71 (5–8), 219–232.
- Deaner, R.O., Smith, B.A., 2013. Sex differences in sports across 50 societies. *Cross Cult. Res.* 47 (3), 268–309.
- de Heer, B., Jones, L., 2017. Measuring sexual violence on campus: climate surveys and vulnerable groups. *J. Sch. Violence* 16 (2), 207–221.
- de Lemus, S., Moya, M., Glick, P., 2010. When contact correlates with prejudice: adolescents' romantic relationship experience predicts greater benevolent sexism in boys and hostile sexism in girls. *Sex. Roles* 63, 214–225.
- de Puisseau, B.W., Roessel, J., 2013. Exploring sexual harassment and related attitudes in Beninese high schools: a field study. *Psychol. Crime Law* 19 (8), 707–726.
- DeSouza, E.R., Ribeiro, J., 2005. Bullying and sexual harassment among Brazilian high school students. *J. Interpers Violence* 20, 1018–1038.
- Dickman-Burnett, V., Fisher, B.S., Dariotis, J.K., Geaman, M., 2021. Secondary school student attitudes toward sexual violence: identifying clusters and their implications for prevention programs. *J. Sch. Violence* 20, 389–401.
- Dosil, M., Jaureguizar, J., Bermaras, E., 2019. Variables related to victimization and perpetration of dating violence in adolescents in residential care settings. *Spanish J. Psychol.* 22, 10.
- Driesmans, K., Vandenbosch, L., Eggermont, S., 2015. Playing a videogame with a sexualized female character increases adolescents' rape myth acceptance and tolerance toward sexual harassment. *Games Health* 4 (2), 91–94.
- Durán, M., Moya, M., Megias, J.L., Viki, G.T., 2010. Social perception of rape victims in dating and married relationships: the role of perpetrator's benevolent sexism. *Sex. Roles* 62 (7–8), 505–519.
- Dyar, C., Feinstein, B.A., 2018. 6 Binegativity: attitudes toward and stereotypes about bisexual individuals. In: Joye Swan, D., Habibi, S. (Eds.), *Bisexuality: Theories, Research, and Recommendations for the Invisible Sexuality*. Springer, pp. 95–111.
- Eccles, J.S., 2015. Gendered socialization of STEM interests in the family. *Int. J. Gend. Sci. Technol.* 7 (2), 116–132.
- Eccles, J.S., Freedman-Doan, C., Frome, P., Jacobs, J., Yoon, K.S., 2000. Gender-role socialization in the family: a longitudinal approach. In: Eckes, T., Trautner, H.M. (Eds.), *The Developmental Social Psychology of Gender*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc, pp. 333–360.
- Edwards, K.M., 2018. Incidence and outcomes of dating violence victimization among high school youth: the role of gender and sexual orientation. *J. Interpers Violence* 33 (9), 1472–1490.
- Eisenberg, M.E., Lust, K., Mathiason, M.A., Porta, C.M., 2021. Sexual assault, sexual orientation, and reporting among college students. *J. Interpers Violence* 36 (1–2), 62–82.
- Endendijk, J.J., van Baar, A.L., Deković, M., 2020. He is a stud, she is a slut! A meta-analysis on the continued existence of sexual double standards. *Pers. Soc. Psychol. Rev.* 24 (2), 163–190.
- Engeln-Maddox, R., Miller, S.A., Doyle, D.M., 2011. Tests of objectification theory in gay, lesbian, and heterosexual community samples: mixed evidence for proposed pathways. *Sex. Roles* 65 (7–8), 518–532.
- Etengoff, C., Lefevor, T.G., 2021. Sexual prejudice, sexism, and religion. *Curr. Opin. Psychol.* 40, 45–50.
- European Commission, 2022. Towards more gender equality in sport: recommendations and action plan from the High Level Group on Gender Equality in sport (2022). In: Directorate-General for Education, Youth, Sport and Culture. Publications Office of the European Union. <https://data.europa.eu/doi/10.2766/10036>.
- Exner-Cortens, D., Claussen, C., Lewis, S., Orukpe, A.M., Coupland, K., 2022. Friendship quality and ethnocultural boys: an exploratory evaluation of the WiseGuyz program. *Psychol. Sch.* 59 (10), 2106–2121.
- Fabes, R.A., Martin, C.L., Hanish, L.D., 2019. Gender integration and the promotion of inclusive classroom climates. *Educ. Psychol.* 54 (4), 271–285.
- Farkas, T., Leaper, C., 2016a. Chivalry's double-edged sword: how girls' and boys' paternalistic attitudes relate to their possible family and work selves. *Sex. Roles* 74, 220–230.
- Farkas, T., Leaper, C., 2016b. The psychology of boys. In: Wong, Y.J., Wester, S.R. (Eds.), *APA Handbook of Men and Masculinities*. American Psychological Association, pp. 357–387.
- Fasanelli, R., Galli, I., Grassia, M.G., Marino, M., Cataldo, R., Lauro, C.N., Castiello, C., Grassia, F., Arcidiacono, C., Procentese, F., 2020. The use of partial least squares—path modelling to understand the impact of ambivalent sexism on violence-justification among adolescents. *Int. J. Environ. Res. Publ. Health* 17, 4991.
- Fernández, I., Navarro-Pérez, J.J., Carbonell, Á., Oliver, A., 2023. Psychometric properties on a romantic love myths scale: the case of the myths, fallacies and erroneous beliefs about the ideal of romantic love scale. *Curr. Psychol.* 42 (3), 1665–1675.
- Fine, C., Sojo, V., Lawford-Smith, H., 2020. Why does workplace gender diversity matter? Justice, organizational benefits, and policy. *Soc. Issues Pol. Rev.* 14, 36–72.
- Flores, A.R., Haider-Markel, D., Lewis, D.C., Miller, P.R., Tadlock, B.L., Taylor, J.K., 2020. Public attitudes about transgender participation in sports: the roles of gender, gender identity conformity, and sports fandom. *Sex. Roles* 83 (5–6), 382–398.
- Forbes, G.B., Adams-Curtis, L.E., Pakalak, A.H., White, K.B., 2006. Dating aggression, sexual coercion, and aggression-supporting attitudes among college men as a function of participation in aggressive high school sports. *Viol. Against Women* 12, 441–455.
- Fredricks, J.A., Eccles, J.S., 2002. Children's competence and value beliefs from childhood through adolescence: growth trajectories in two male-sex-typed domains. *Dev. Psychol.* 38, 519–533.
- Glick, P., Fiske, S.T., 2012. An ambivalent alliance: hostile and benevolent sexism as complementary justifications for gender inequality. In: Dixon, J., Levine, M. (Eds.), *Beyond Prejudice: Extending the Social Psychology of Conflict, Inequality and Social Change*. Cambridge University Press, pp. 70–88.
- Glick, P., Fiske, S.T., Mladinic, A., Saiz, J.L., Abrams, D., Masser, B., Adetoun, B., Osagie, J.E., Akande, A., Alao, A., Annetje, B., Willemsen, T.M., Chipeta, K., Dardenne, B., Dijksterhuis, A., Wigboldus, D., Eckes, T., Six-Materna, I., Expósito, F., et al., 2000. Beyond prejudice as simple antipathy: hostile and benevolent sexism across cultures. *J. Pers. Soc. Psychol.* 79 (5), 763–775.
- Glick, P., Hill, L., 2000. Combative children to ambivalent adults: the development of gender prejudice. In: Eckes, T., Trautner, H.N. (Eds.), *The Developmental Social Psychology of Gender*. Erlbaum, pp. 243–272.
- Glick, P., Lameiras, M., Fiske, S.T., Eckes, T., Masser, B., Volpato, C., Manganelli, A.M., Pek, J.C.X., Huang, L., Sakalli-Uğurlu, N., Castro, Y.R., D'Ávila Pereira, M.L., Willemsen, T.M., Brunner, A., Six-Materna, I., Wells, R., 2004. Bad but bold: ambivalent attitudes toward men predict gender inequality in 16 nations. *J. Pers. Soc. Psychol.* 86 (5), 713–728.
- Goldstein, S.E., Malanchuk, O., Davis-Kean, P.E., Eccles, J.S., 2007. Risk factors of sexual harassment by peers: a longitudinal investigation of African American and European American adolescents. *J. Res. Adolesc.* 17, 285–300.
- Grabe, S., Hyde, J.S., 2009. Body objectification, MTV, and psychological outcomes among female adolescents. *J. Appl. Soc. Psychol.* 39 (12), 2840–2858.
- Greenspan, S.B., Griffith, C., Watson, R.J., 2019. LGBTQ+ youth's experiences and engagement in physical activity: a comprehensive content analysis. *Adolesc. Res. Rev.* 4 (2), 169–185.
- Gruber, J., Fineran, S., 2016. Sexual harassment, bullying, and school outcomes for high school girls and boys. *Viol. Against Women* 22, 112–133.

- Gunderson, E.A., Ramirez, G., Levine, S.C., Beilock, S.L., 2012. The role of parents and teachers in the development of gender-related math attitudes. *Sex. Roles* 66 (3–4), 153–166.
- Gutierrez, B.C., Halim, M.L.D., Martinez, M.A., Arredondo, M., 2020. The heroes and the helpless: the development of benevolent sexism in children. *Sex. Roles* 82 (9–10), 558–569.
- Gutierrez, B.C., Leaper, C., 2022. Reconstructing culture: a latent profile analysis of Mexican-heritage young women's cultural practices, gender values, and ethnic identity. *Cult. Divers Ethnic Minor. Psychol.* 28 (2), 259–270.
- Hackman, C.L., Bettergarcia, J.N., Wedell, E., Simmons, A., 2022. Qualitative exploration of perceptions of sexual assault and associated consequences among LGBTQ+ college students. *Psychol. Sex. Orientat. Gender Divers.* 9 (1), 81–91.
- Hammack, P.L., Hughes, S.D., Atwood, J.M., Cohen, E.M., Clark, R.C., 2022. Gender and sexual identity in adolescence: a mixed-methods study of labeling in diverse community settings. *J. Adolesc. Res.* 37 (2), 167–220.
- Hammond, M.D., Cimpian, A., 2021. "Wonderful but weak": children's ambivalent attitudes toward women. *Sex. Roles* 84 (1–2), 76–90.
- Hartmann-Tews, I., Menzel, T., Braumüller, B., 2021. Homo- and transnegativity in sport in Europe: experiences of LGBTQ+ individuals in various sport settings. *Int. Rev. Sociol. Sport* 56 (7), 997–1016.
- Harvey, R., Stone Fish, L., Levatino, P., 2020. Sexual identity development and heteronormativity. In: Wampler, K.S., McWey, L.M. (Eds.), *The Handbook of Systemic Family Therapy: Systemic Family Therapy With Children and Adolescents*, vol. 2. Wiley Blackwell, pp. 541–569.
- Hatchel, T., Espelage, D.L., Huang, Y., 2018. Sexual harassment victimization, school belonging, and depressive symptoms among LGBTQ adolescents: temporal insights. *Am. J. Orthopsychiat.* 88 (4), 422–430.
- Heinze, J.E., Heinze, K.L., Davis, M.M., Butchart, A.T., Singer, D.C., Clark, S.J., 2017. Gender role beliefs and parents' support for athletic participation. *Youth Soc.* 49 (5), 634–657.
- Henrich, J., Heine, S.J., Norenzayan, A., 2010. The weirdest people in the world? *Behav. Brain Sci.* 33 (2–3), 61–83.
- Heyder, A., van Hek, M., Van Houtte, M., 2021. When gender stereotypes get male adolescents into trouble: a longitudinal study on gender conformity pressure as a predictor of school misconduct. *Sex. Roles* 84 (1–2), 61–75.
- Hill, M.S., Fischer, A.R., 2008. Examining objectification theory: lesbian and heterosexual women's experiences with sexual- and self-objectification. *Counsel. Psychol.* 36 (5), 745–776.
- Hill, C., Kearn, H., 2011. *Crossing the Line: Sexual Harassment at School*. American Association of University Women (AAUW), Washington, DC. <https://www.aauw.org>.
- Horn, S.S., Poteat, V.P., 2022. Developmental changes in young people's evaluations of sexual harassment. *J. Soc. Issues.* <https://doi.org/10.1111/josi.12516>.
- Hurtado, A., 2003. *Voicing Chicana Feminisms*. University Press.
- Impett, E.A., Sorsoli, L., Schooler, D., Henson, J.M., Tolman, D.L., 2008. Girls' relationship authenticity and self-esteem across adolescence. *Dev. Psychol.* 44 (3), 722–733.
- International Olympic Committee, 2021. *Gender Equality Through Time: At the Olympic Games*. International Olympic Committee. <https://olympics.com/ioc/gender-equality/gender-equality-through-time/at-the-olympic-games>.
- Jackson, C., Dempster, S., 2009. "I sat back on my computer... with a bottle of whisky next to me": constructing "cool" masculinity through "effortless" achievement in secondary and higher education. *J. Gen. Stud.* 18, 341–356.
- Jewell, J., Brown, C.S., Perry, B., 2015. All my friends are doing it: potentially offensive sexual behavior perpetration within adolescent social networks. *J. Res. Adolesc.* 25 (3), 592–604.
- Jones, M.K., Buque, M., Miville, M.L., 2018. African American gender roles: a content analysis of empirical research from 1981 to 2017. *J. Black Psychol.* 44 (5), 450–486.
- Kann, L., McManus, T., Harris, W.A., Shanklin, S.L., Flint, K.H., Queen, B., Lowry, R., Chyen, D., Whittle, L., Thornton, J.L., Lim, C., Bradford, D., Yamakawa, Y., Leon, M., Brener, N., Ethier, K.A., 2018. Youth risk behavior surveillance—United States, 2017 (Surveillance Summary No. 8). *Center Dis. Contr. Prevent.* <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC6002027/pdf/ss6708a1.pdf>.
- Kelly, Y., Zilanawala, A., Booker, C., Sacker, A., 2019. Social media use and adolescent mental health: findings from the UK Millennium Cohort Study. *EClinicalMedicine* 6, 59–68.
- Kiefer, S.M., Ryan, A.M., 2008. Striving for social dominance over peers: the implications for academic adjustment during early adolescence. *J. Educ. Psychol.* 100, 417–428.
- Kilpatrick, D.G., Ruggiero, K.J., Acierno, R., Saunders, B.E., Resnick, H.S., Best, C.L., 2003. Violence and risk of PTSD, major depression, substance abuse/dependence, and comorbidity: results from the National Survey of Adolescents. *J. Consult. Clin. Psychol.* 71 (4), 692–700.
- Kim, J.L., Sorsoli, C.L., Collins, K., Zylbergold, B.A., Schooler, D., Tolman, D.L., 2007. From sex to sexuality: exposing the heterosexual script on primetime network television. *J. Sex. Res.* 44 (2), 145–157.
- Kosciw, J.G., Clark, C.M., Menard, L., 2022. The 2021 National Climate Survey: The Experiences of LGBTQ+ Youth in Our Nation's School. GLSEN. <https://www.glsen.org/research/2021-national-school-climate-survey>.
- Kreager, D.A., 2007. Unnecessary roughness? School sports, peer networks, and male adolescent violence. *Am. Socio. Rev.* 72 (6), 1019.
- Kreager, D.A., Staff, J., Gauthier, R., Lefkowitz, E.S., Feinberg, M.E., 2016. The double standard at sexual debut: gender, sexual behavior and adolescent peer acceptance. *Sex. Roles* 75 (7–8), 377–392.
- Krivoshchekov, V., Gulevich, O., Blagov, I., 2023. Traditional masculinity and male violence against women: a meta-analytic examination. *Psychol. Men Masculinit.* <https://doi.org/10.1037/men0000426>.
- Lamb, S., Koven, J., 2019. Sexualization of girls: addressing criticism of the APA report, presenting new evidence. *Sage Open* 9 (4), 1–15.
- Leaper, C., 2015a. Do I belong? Gender, peer groups, and STEM achievement. *Int. J. Gen. Sci. Technol.* 7, 166–179.
- Leaper, C., 2015b. Gender and social-cognitive development. In: Lerner, R.M., Liben, L.S., Muller, U. (Eds.), *Handbook of Child Psychology and Developmental Science, Cognitive Processes*, seventh ed., vol. 2. Wiley, pp. 806–853.
- Leaper, C., 2022. Origins and consequences of childhood gender segregation: toward an integrative developmental systems model. In: VanderLaan, D.P., Wong, W.I. (Eds.), *Gender and Sexuality Development: Contemporary Theory and Research*. Springer Nature, Switzerland AG, pp. 159–205.
- Leaper, C., Arias, D.M., 2011. College women's feminist identity: a multidimensional analysis with implications for coping with sexism. *Sex. Roles* 64 (7–8), 475–490.
- Leaper, C., Bigler, R.S., 2018. Societal causes and consequences of gender typing of children's toys. In: Weisgram, E.S., Dinella, L.M. (Eds.), *Gender Typing of Children's Toys: How Early Play Experiences Impact Development*. American Psychological Association, pp. 287–308.
- Leaper, C., Brown, C.S., 2008. Perceive experiences with sexism among adolescent girls. *Child Dev.* 79, 685–704.
- Leaper, C., Brown, C.S., 2014. Sexism in Schools. In: Liben, L.S., Bigler, R.S. (Eds.), *Advances in Child Development and Behavior, The Role of Gender in Educational Contexts and Outcomes*, vol. 47. Elsevier Academic Press, pp. 189–223.
- Leaper, C., Brown, C.S., 2018. Sexism in childhood and adolescence: recent trends and advances in research. *Child Dev. Perspect.* 12 (1), 10–15.
- Leaper, C., Brown, C.S., Ayres, M.M., 2013. Adolescent girls' cognitive appraisals of coping responses to sexual harassment. *Psychol. Sch.* 50, 969–986.
- Leaper, C., Farkas, T., Brown, C.S., 2012. Adolescent girls' experiences and gender-related beliefs in relation to their motivation in Math/Science and English. *J. Youth Adolesc.* 41, 268–282.
- Leaper, C., Farkas, T., Starr, C.R., 2019. Traditional masculinity, help avoidance, and intrinsic interest in relation to high school students' English and Math performance. *Psychol. Men Masculinit.* 20 (4), 603–611.
- Lee, M.S., Begun, S., DePrince, A.P., Chu, A.T., 2016. Acceptability of dating violence and expectations of relationship harm among adolescent girls exposed to intimate partner violence. *Psychol. Trauma* 8 (4), 487–494.
- Leemis, R.W., Espelage, D.L., Basile, K.C., Kollar, L.M.M., Davis, J.P., 2019. Traditional and cyber bullying and sexual harassment: a longitudinal assessment of risk and protective factors. *Aggress. Behav.* 45 (2), 181–192.

- Levant, R.F., Alto, K.M., McKelvey, D.K., Richmond, K.A., McDermott, R.C., 2017. Variance composition, measurement invariance by gender, and construct validity of the femininity ideology scale-short form. *J. Counsel. Psychol.* 64 (6), 708–723.
- Levant, R.F., McDermott, R.C., Hewitt, A.A., Alto, K.M., Harris, K.T., 2016. Confirmatory factor analytic investigation of variance composition, gender invariance, and validity of the Male Role Norms Inventory-Adolescent-Revised (MRNI-A-r). *J. Counsel. Psychol.* 63 (5), 543–556.
- Lim, S.C., Ghani, F., Remme, M., 2018. Sexual Harassment: A Global Problem. United Nations University, International Institute for Global Health. https://collections.unu.edu/eserv/UNU:7881/n2019-11-22_PB_SH_A_Global_Problem.pdf.
- Lowen, A., Deaner, R.O., Schmitt, E., 2016. Guys and gals going for gold: the role of women's empowerment in Olympic success. *J. Sports Econ.* 17 (3), 260–285.
- Maes, C., Schreurs, L., van Oosten, J.M.F., Vandenbosch, L., 2019. #(Me)too much? The role of sexualizing media in adolescents' resistance towards the Metoo-movement and acceptance of rape myths. *J. Adolesc.* 77, 69.
- Mahalik, J.R., Morray, E.B., Coonerty-Femiano, A., Ludlow, L.H., Slattery, S.M., Smiler, A., 2005. Development of the conformity to feminine norms inventory. *Sex. Roles* 52 (7–8), 417–435.
- Malonda, E., Tur-Porcar, A., Llorca, A., 2017. Sexism in adolescence: parenting styles, division of housework, prosocial behaviour and aggressive behaviour. *Revista De Psicología Social* 32 (2), 333–361.
- Manago, A.M., Brown, C.S., Leaper, C., 2009. Feminist identity among Latina adolescents. *J. Adolesc. Res.* 24 (6), 750–776.
- Martin, J.L., 2015. Resistance to sexual harassment: inspiring girls through feminism. In: Paludi, M.A., Martin, J.L., Gruber, J.E., Fineran, S. (Eds.), *Sexual Harassment in Education and Work Settings: Current Research and Best Practices for Prevention*. Praeger/ABC-CLIO, pp. 211–227, 347 Pages.
- Martins, Y., Tiggemann, M., Kirkbride, A., 2007. Those speedos become them: the role of self-objectification in gay and heterosexual men's body image. *Pers. Soc. Psychol. Bull.* 33 (5), 634–647.
- Marx, R.A., Hatchel, T., Mehning, C.B., Espelage, D.L., 2021. Predictors of sexual victimisation and suicidal ideation among transgender and gender-nonconforming adolescents. *Psychol. Sexual.* 12 (1–2), 79–95.
- McCauley, H.L., Jaime, M.C.D., Tancredi, D.J., Silverman, J.G., Decker, M.R., Austin, S.B., Jones, K., Miller, E., 2014. Differences in adolescent relationship abuse perpetration and gender-inequitable attitudes by sport among male high school athletes. *J. Adolesc. Health* 54 (6), 742–744.
- McDermott, R.C., Borgogna, N.C., Hammer, J.H., Berry, A.T., Levant, R.F., 2020. More similar than different? Testing the construct validity of men's and women's traditional masculinity ideology using the male role norms inventory-very brief. *Psychol. Men Masculinit.* 21 (4), 523–532.
- McKenney, S.J., Bigler, R.S., 2014. High heels, low grades: internalized sexualization and academic orientation among adolescent girls. *J. Res. Adolesc.* 26 (1), 30–36.
- Messner, M.A., 2007. *Out of Play: Critical Essays on Gender and Sport*. State University of New York Press.
- Meyer, I.H., 2013. Prejudice, social stress, and mental health in lesbian, gay, and bisexual populations: conceptual issues and research evidence. *Psychol. Sex. Orientat. Gender Divers.* 1, 3–26.
- Mirandé, A., 1997. *Hombres y Machos: Masculinity and Latino Culture*. Routledge.
- Mitchell, K.J., Ybarra, M.L., Korchmaros, J.D., 2014. Sexual harassment among adolescents of different sexual orientations and gender identities. *Child Abuse Negl.* 38, 280–295.
- Montañés, P., de Lemus, S., Bohner, G., Megías, J.L., Moya, M., Garcia-Retamero, R., 2012. Intergenerational transmission of benevolent sexism from mothers to daughters and its relation to daughters' academic performance and goals. *Sex. Roles* 66 (7–8), 468–478.
- Montañés, P., de Lemus, S., Moya, M., Bohner, G., Megías, J.L., 2013. How attractive are sexist intimates to adolescents? The influence of sexist beliefs and relationship experience. *Psychol. Women Q.* 37, 494–506.
- Morelli, M., Bianchi, D., Baiocco, R., Pezzuti, L., Chirumbolo, A., 2016. Not-allowed sharing of sexts and dating violence from the perpetrator's perspective: the moderation role of sexism. *Comput. Hum. Behav.* 56, 163–169.
- Murchison, G.R., Agénor, M., Reisner, S.L., Watson, R.J., 2019. School restroom and locker room restrictions and sexual assault risk among transgender youth. *Pediatrics* 143 (6), 12.
- Murnen, S.K., Karazsia, B.T., 2017. A review of research on men's body image and drive for muscularity. In: Levant, R.F., Wong, Y.J. (Eds.), *The Psychology of Men and Masculinities*. American Psychological Association, pp. 229–257.
- Murnen, S.K., Smolak, L., 2000. The experience of sexual harassment among grade-school students: early socialization of female subordination? *Sex. Roles* 43, 1–17.
- National Federation of State High School Associations (NFHS), 2022. High School Athletics Participation Survey. NFHS. <https://www.nfhs.org/>.
- National Science Foundation, 2021. Women, Minorities, and Persons With Disabilities in Science and Engineering. National Center for Science and Engineering Statistics (NCSES). <https://ncses.nsf.gov>.
- National Sexual Violence Resource Center (NSVRC), 2018. Teenagers & Sexual Violence. NSVRC. https://www.nsvrc.org/sites/default/files/publications/2019-02/Teenagers_508.pdf.
- Nava-Reyes, M., Rojas-Solis, J.L., Greathouse Amador, L.M., Morales Quintero, L.A., 2018. Gender roles, sexism and myths of romantic love in Mexican adolescents. *Rev. Interam. Psicolog.* 52 (1), 102–111.
- Ngo, Q.M., Veltz, P.T., Kusunoki, Y., Stein, S.F., Boyd, C.J., 2018. Adolescent sexual violence: prevalence, adolescent risks, and violence characteristics. *Prev. Med.* 116, 68–74.
- Norris, A.L., Orchowski, L.M., 2020. Peer victimization of sexual minority and transgender youth: a cross-sectional study of high school students. *Psychol. Viol.* 10 (2), 201–211.
- Oransky, M., Fisher, C., 2009. The development and validation of the meanings of adolescent masculinity scale. *Psychol. Men Masc.* 10 (1), 57–72.
- Pahlke, E., Hyde, J.S., 2016. The debate over single-sex schooling. *Child Dev. Perspect.* 10 (2), 81–86.
- Pahlke, E., Bigler, R.S., Martin, C.L., 2014. Can fostering children's ability to challenge sexism improve critical analysis, internalization, and enactment of inclusive, egalitarian peer relationships? *J. Soc. Issues* 70 (1), 115–133.
- Palmer, J.E., Williams, E., Mennicke, A., 2021. Interpersonal violence experiences and disclosure patterns for lesbian, gay, bisexual, queer+, and heterosexual university students. *J. Fam. Violence* 37, 505–519.
- Parent, M.C., Bradstreet, T.C., 2017. Gay, bisexual, and transgender masculinities. In: Levant, R.F., Wong, Y.J. (Eds.), *The Psychology of Men and Masculinities*. American Psychological Association, pp. 289–314.
- Paynter, A., Leaper, C., 2016. Heterosexual dating double standards in undergraduate women and men. *Sex. Roles* 75 (7–8), 393–406.
- Pearson, M.R., Kholodkov, T., Henson, J.M., Impett, E.A., 2012. Pathways to early coital debut for adolescent girls: a recursive partitioning analysis. *J. Sex. Res.* 49 (1), 13–26.
- Peter, J., Valkenburg, P.M., 2007. Adolescents' exposure to a sexualized media environment and their notions of women as sex objects. *Sex. Roles* 56 (5–6), 381–395.
- Pew Research Center, 2018. Women and Men in STEM Often at Odds Over Workplace Equity. Pew Research Center. <https://www.pewresearch.org>.
- Pew Research Center, 2022. Teens and Cyberbullying 2022. Pew Research Center. <https://www.pewresearch.org>.
- Poteat, V.P., Espelage, D.L., 2007. Predicting psychosocial consequences of homophobic victimization in middle school students. *J. Early Adolesc.* 27, 175–191. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0272431606294839>.
- Poteat, V.P., Kimmel, M.S., Wilchins, R., 2011. The moderating effects of support for violence beliefs on masculine norms, aggression, and homophobic behavior during adolescence. *J. Res. Adolesc.* 21 (2), 434–447.
- Poteat, V.P., Scheer, J.R., Mereish, E.H., 2014. Factors affecting academic achievement among sexual minority and gender-variant youth. In: Liben, L.S., Bigler, R.S. (Eds.), *Advances in Child Development and Behavior, The Role of Gender in Educational Contexts and Outcomes*, vol. 47. Elsevier Academic Press, pp. 261–300.
- Ramiro-Sánchez, T., Ramiro, M.T., Bermúdez, M.P., Buéla-Casal, G., 2018. Sexism and sexual risk behavior in adolescents: gender differences. *Int. J. Clin. Health Psychol.* 18 (3), 245–253.
- Reigeluth, C.S., Addis, M.E., 2021. Policing of masculinity scale (POMS) and pressures boys experience to prove and defend their "manhood". *Psychol. Men Masculinit.* 22 (2), 306–320.

- Rinehart, S.J., Espelage, D.L., 2016. A multilevel analysis of school climate, homophobic name-calling, and sexual harassment victimization/perpetration among middle school youth. *Psychol. Viol.* 6, 213–222.
- Rimes, K.A., Goodship, N., Ussher, G., Baker, D., West, E., 2019. Non-binary and binary transgender youth: comparison of mental health, self-harm, suicidality, substance use and victimization experiences. *Int. J. Transgenderism* 20 (2–3), 230–240.
- Robnett, R.D., 2013. The role of peer support for girls and women in STEM: implications for identity and anticipated retention in STEM. *Int. J. Gen. Sci. Technol.* 5, 232–253.
- Robnett, R.D., 2016. Gender bias in STEM fields: variation in prevalence and links to STEM self-concept. *Psychol. Women Q.* 40, 65–79.
- Robnett, R.D., Anderson, K.J., 2017. Feminist identity among women and men from four ethnic groups. *Cult. Divers. Ethnic Minor. Psychol.* 23 (1), 134–142.
- Robnett, R.D., Daniels, E.A., Leaper, C., 2018. Growing up gendered: feminist perspectives on development. In: Travis, C.B., White, J.W., Rutherford, A., Williams, W.S., Cook, S.L., Wyche, K.F. (Eds.), *APA Handbook of the Psychology of Women: History, Theory, and Battlegrounds*, vol. 1. American Psychological Association, pp. 437–454.
- Robnett, R.D., Leaper, C., 2013a. Friendship groups, personal motivation, and gender in relation to high school students' STEM career interest. *J. Res. Adolesc.* 23, 652–664.
- Robnett, R.D., Leaper, C., 2013b. "Girls don't propose! Ew.": a mixed-methods examination of marriage tradition preferences and benevolent sexism in emerging adults. *J. Adolesc. Res.* 28 (1), 96–121.
- Rochelle, T.L., Yim, K.H., 2015. Assessing the factor structure of the Chinese conformity to masculine norms inventory. *J. Psychol.* 149 (1), 29–41.
- Rogers, A.A., Ha, T., Byon, J., Thomas, C., 2020. Masculine gender-role adherence indicates conflict resolution patterns in heterosexual adolescent couples: a dyadic, observational study. *J. Adolesc.* 79, 112–121.
- Rogers, A.A., Nielson, M.G., Santos, C.E., 2021. Manning up while growing up: a developmental-contextual perspective on masculine gender-role socialization in adolescence. *Psychol. Men Masculin.* 22 (2), 354–364.
- Rogers, A.A., Updegraff, K.A., Santos, C.E., Martin, C.L., 2017. Masculinity and school adjustment in middle school. *Psychol. Men Masc.* 18 (1), 50–61.
- Rogers, L.O., Niwa, E.Y., Chung, K., Yip, T., Chae, D., 2021. M(a)cro: centering the macrosystem in human development. *Hum. Dev.* 65 (5–6), 270–292.
- Rousseau, A., Eggermont, S., 2018. Television and preadolescents' objectified dating script: consequences for self- and interpersonal objectification. *Mass Commun. Soc.* 21 (1), 71–93.
- Rousseau, A., Rodgers, R.F., Eggermont, S., 2019. A short-term longitudinal exploration of the impact of TV exposure on objectifying attitudes toward women in early adolescent boys. *Sex. Roles* 80 (3–4), 186–199.
- Sáinz, M., Gallego, M., 2022. High school students' sexist beliefs about academic abilities and women's roles: the influence of school specialization. *Int. J. Soc. Psychol.* 37 (2), 383–411.
- Sagebin Bordini, G., Sperb, T.M., 2013. Sexual double standard: a review of the literature between 2001 and 2010. *Sex. Cult.* 17 (4), 686–704.
- Salomon, I., Brown, C.S., 2021. Engage, ignore, stand up: exploring how (and why) early adolescents respond to sexual harassment. *J. Adolesc. Res.* 36 (3), 219–246.
- Schiralli, J.E., Peragine, D.E., Chasteen, A.L., Einstein, G., 2022. Explicit and implicit gender-related stereotyping in transgender, gender expansive, and cisgender adults. *Arch. Sex. Behav.* 51, 2065–2076.
- Schissel, B., 2000. Boys against girls: the structural and interpersonal dimensions of violent patriarchal culture in the lives of young men. *Viol. Against Women* 6, 960–986.
- Semprevivo, L.K., 2021. Dating and sexual violence victimization among lesbian, gay, bisexual, and questioning youth: considering the importance of gender and sexual orientation. *J. Aggress. Maltreat. Trauma* 30 (5), 662–678.
- Serpe, C., Brown, C., Criss, S., Lamkins, K., Watson, L., 2020. Bisexual women: experiencing and coping with objectification, prejudice, and erasure. *J. Bisex.* 20 (4), 456–492.
- Shepard, S.J., Nicpon, M.F., Haley, J.T., Lind, M., Liu, W.M., 2011. Masculine norms, school attitudes, and psychosocial adjustment among gifted boys. *Psychol. Men Masc.* 12 (2), 181–187.
- Signorella, M.L., 2020. Toward a more just feminism. *Psychol. Women Q.* 44 (2), 256–265.
- Silvan-Ferrero, M.D., Lopez, A.B., 2007. Benevolent sexism toward men and women: justification of the traditional system and conventional gender roles in Spain. *Sex. Roles* 57, 607–614.
- Simpkins, S.D., Fredricks, J.A., Eccles, J.S., 2015. The role of parents in the ontogeny of achievement-related motivation and behavioral choices: I. Introduction. *Monogr. Soc. Res. Child Dev.* 80, 1–151.
- Skinner, O.D., Perkins, K., Wood, D., Kurtz-Costes, B., 2016. Gender development in African American youth. *J. Black Psychol.* 42 (5), 394–423.
- Slater, A., Tiggemann, M., 2011. Is teasing partly to blame for dropout in sport and physical activity? *J. Sport Exerc. Psychol.* 33, 742–743.
- Slaatten, H., Anderssen, N., Hetland, J., 2014. Endorsement of male role norms and gay-related name-calling. *Psychol. Men Masc.* 15 (3), 335–345.
- Starr, C.R., Gao, Y., Lee, G., Safavian, N., Rubach, C., Dicke, A., Eccles, J.S., Simpkins, S.D., 2022. Parents' math gender stereotypes and their correlates: an examination of the similarities and differences over the past 25 years. *Sex. Roles* 87, 603–619.
- Stake, J.E., Nickens, S.D., 2005. Adolescent girls' and boys' science peer relationships and perceptions of the possible self as a scientist. *Sex. Roles* 52, 1–11.
- Steinfeldt, J.A., Vaughan, E.L., LaFollette, J.R., Steinfeldt, M.C., 2012. Bullying among adolescent football players: role of masculinity and moral atmosphere. *Psychol. Men Masc.* 13 (4), 340–353.
- Szymanski, D.M., Mikorski, R., Dunn, T.L., 2019. Predictors of sexual minority men's sexual objectification of other men. *J. Soc. Pers. Relat.* 36 (11–12), 3631–3650.
- Tang, C.S., Chua, Z., O, J., 2010. A gender perspective on Chinese social relationships and behavior. In: Bond, M.H. (Ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of Chinese Psychology*. Oxford University Press, pp. 533–553.
- Tenenbaum, H.R., Leaper, C., 2003. Parent-child conversations about science: the socialization of gender inequities? *J. Appl. Dev. Psychol.* 26, 1–19.
- Thompson Jr., E.H., Bennett, K.M., 2015. Measurement of masculinity ideologies: a (critical) review. *Psychol. Men Masc.* 16 (2), 115–133.
- Tiggemann, M., Slater, A., 2015. The role of self-objectification in the mental health of early adolescent girls: predictors and consequences. *J. Pediatr. Psychol.* 40 (7), 704–711.
- Tolman, D.L., Impett, E.A., Tracy, A.J., Michael, A., 2006. Looking good, sounding good: femininity ideology and adolescent girls' mental health. *Psychol. Women Q.* 30 (1), 85–95.
- Tolman, D.L., Davis, B.R., Bowman, C.P., 2016. "That's just how it is": a gendered analysis of masculinity and femininity ideologies in adolescent girls' and boys' heterosexual relationships. *J. Adolesc. Res.* 31 (1), 3–31.
- Tolman, D.L., Porche, M.V., 2000. The adolescent femininity ideology scale: development and validation of a new measure for girls. *Psychol. Women Q.* 24 (4), 365–376.
- Toomey, R.B., 2021. Advancing research on minority stress and resilience in trans children and adolescents in the 21st century. *Child Dev. Perspect.* 15 (2), 96–102.
- Toomey, R.B., McGuire, J.K., Russell, S.T., 2012. Heteronormativity, school climates, and perceived safety for gender nonconforming peers. *J. Adolesc.* 35 (1), 187–196.
- United Nations Educational Scientific and Cultural Organization, 2011. *Global Education Digest 2010: Comparing Education Statistics Across the World*. United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization. <http://www.uis.unesco.org>.
- United Nations Educational Scientific and Cultural Organization, 2022. *Gender Report: Deepening the Debate on Those Still Left Behind*. United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization. www.unesco.org/gemreport.
- Vandello, J.A., Bosson, J.K., 2013. Hard won and easily lost: a review and synthesis of theory and research on precarious manhood. *Psychol. Men Masc.* 14 (2), 101.
- Van Houtte, M., 2004. Why boys achieve less at school than girls: the difference between boys' and girls' academic culture. *Educ. Stud.* 30, 159–173.
- Vitrano, S., 2018. *WIN World Survey Ranks 40 Countries on Gender Equality, Sexual Harassment and Violence*. Worldwide Independent Network of Market Research. https://www.winmr.com/wp-content/uploads/2019/03/WIN_2018_Gender-Equality.pdf.
- Voyer, D., Voyers, S., 2014. Gender differences in scholastic achievement: a meta-analysis. *Psychol. Bull.* 140, 1174–1204.
- Wang, M.M., Cardarelli, A., Leslie, S., Rhodes, M., 2022. How children's media and teachers communicate exclusive and essentialist views of science and scientists. *Dev. Psychol.* 58 (8), 1455–1471.
- Wang, M., Willett, J.B., Eccles, J.S., 2011. The assessment of school engagement: examining dimensionality and measurement invariance by gender and race/ethnicity. *J. Sch. Psychol.* 49, 465–480.

- Ward, L.M., Friedman, K., 2006. Using TV as a guide: associations between television viewing and adolescents' sexual attitudes and behavior. *J. Res. Adolesc.* 16 (1), 133–156.
- Ward, L.M., Grower, P., Reed, L.A., 2022. Living life as the bachelor/ette: contributions of diverse television genres to adolescents' acceptance of gendered sexual scripts. *J. Sex. Res.* 59 (1), 13–25.
- Ward, L.M., Vandenbosch, L., Eggermont, S., 2015. The impact of men's magazines on adolescent boys' objectification and courtship beliefs. *J. Adolesc.* 39, 49–58.
- Watson, L.B., Grotewiel, M., Farrell, M., Marshik, J., Schneider, M., 2015. Experiences of sexual objectification, minority stress, and disordered eating among sexual minority women. *Psychol. Women Q.* 39 (4), 458–470.
- Women's Sports Foundation, 2020. Chasing Equity: The Triumphs, Challenges, and Opportunities in Sports for Girls and Women. Women's Sports Foundation. <https://www.womenssportsfoundation.org/>.
- Wong, Y.J., Burkley, M., Bell, A.C., Wang, S., Klann, E.M., 2017. Manly to the core: measuring men's implicit masculine self-concept via the semantic misattribution procedure. *Pers. Individ. Differ.* 104, 320–325.
- Wong, Y.J., Ho, M.R., Wang, S., Miller, I.S.K., 2017. Meta-analyses of the relationship between conformity to masculine norms and mental health-related outcomes. *J. Counsel. Psychol.* 64 (1), 80–93.
- World Economic Forum, 2022. Global Gender Gap Report 2022. <https://www.weforum.org/reports/global-gender-gap-report-2022/>.
- World Health Organization (WHO), 2021. Violence Against Women Prevalence Estimates, 2018. WHO. www.who.int.
- Zakrisson, I., Anderzén, M., Lenell, F., Sandelin, H., 2012. Ambivalent sexism: a tool for understanding and improving gender relations in organizations. *Scand. J. Psychol.* 53, 64–70.
- Zhang, M., Wang, X.C., Shao, B., 2022. Predictors of persistent participation in youth sport: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Front. Psychol.* 13, 871936.

Further reading

- Brown, C.S., Tam, M.J., 2022. Gender-based discrimination in childhood and adolescence. In: VanderLaan, D.P., Wong, W.I. (Eds.), *Gender and Sexuality Development: Contemporary Theory and Research*. Springer Nature, Switzerland AG, pp. 277–299.
- Leaper, C., Brown, C.S., 2018. Sexism in childhood and adolescence: recent trends and advances in research. *Child Dev. Perspect.* 12 (1), 10–15.
- Robnett, R.D., Daniels, E.A., Leaper, C., 2018. Growing up gendered: feminist perspectives on development. In: Travis, C.B., White, J.W., Rutherford, A., Williams, W.S., Cook, S.L., Wyche, K.F. (Eds.), *APA Handbook of the Psychology of Women: History, Theory, and Battlegrounds*, vol. 1. American Psychological Association, pp. 437–454.
- Toomey, R.B., 2021. Advancing research on minority stress and resilience in trans children and adolescents in the 21st century. *Child Dev. Perspect.* 15 (2), 96–102.