FA-04 Raising boys and raising girls

The question of how boys and girls develop differently—and what these developmental trajectories mean for raising them—has long been one of the most rigorously debated domains in developmental psychology, neuroscience, sociology, and education. For decades, the discourse has oscillated between biological essentialism, which views sex differences as hardwired and immutable, and social constructivism, which posits that such differences are almost entirely the product of cultural conditioning and patriarchal structures.

Rigorous contemporary scholarship demands the discarding of this reductive binary. Understanding sex-differentiated development from birth to adulthood necessitates analyzing human growth through three distinct but continuously interacting layers: physiology (measurable, sexually dimorphic biological processes and timelines), behaviour (statistical averages represented by overlapping normal distributions), and culture (highly variable norms, educational interventions, and environmental contexts).

Crucially, any sophisticated analysis of sex differences must distinguish what is known about group averages from what can be said about individuals. In the behavioral and physiological sciences, sex differences are typically quantified using effect sizes, such as Cohen's d or Hedges' g. An effect size of 0.20 is considered small, 0.50 is moderate, and 0.80 is large. However, even a moderate effect size of 0.50 indicates that the distributions of boys and girls overlap by approximately 80%. Therefore, while group-level differences possess profound explanatory power for macroeconomic and societal trends—such as the widening gender gap in higher education or occupational sorting—they hold virtually no predictive power for the specific aptitudes, temperament, or trajectory of an individual child. The failure to distinguish between overlapping population distributions and individual determinism frequently leads to both poor educational policy and sub-optimal parenting strategies.

This report provides an exhaustive review of sex-differentiated development. It synthesizes the highest-quality peer-reviewed primary literature, systematic reviews, and meta-analyses to explore physiological timelines, temperament, the widening education gap, the efficacy of single-sex schooling, the role of mentorship, the emotional needs of adolescents, and the function of cultural rites of passage.

Layer 1: Physiology (Measurable Development)

The foundational layer of sex-differentiated development lies in human physiology. While the human brain is not strictly dimorphic in a binary sense, robust, replicated statistical differences exist in developmental timelines, overall structural volumes, and the profound organizational effects of fetal endocrinology.

Brain Maturation and Volume Trajectories

Longitudinal neuroimaging has consistently demonstrated that the trajectory of brain development differs between the sexes from early childhood through adulthood. Research by Raznahan, Lenroot, and Giedd (2012), alongside findings from numerous large-scale structural magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) studies, indicates that male total brain volume is, on

average, 9% to 12% larger than female total brain volume[1]. This volumetric difference is present from early childhood, scales with overall body size differences, and persists into late adulthood[2].

However, gross structural size does not equate to developmental maturity. Longitudinal studies reveal a critical dimorphism in the pace of neurodevelopment: female brains reach peak gray matter volume significantly earlier than male brains. The developmental trajectory of gray matter involves rapid increases in early life—reflecting neural proliferation, dendritic spine arborization, and synaptogenesis—followed by gradual, targeted decreases associated with synaptic pruning and network maturation[1]. The earlier onset of synaptic pruning in girls mirrors their earlier onset of physical puberty.

Consequently, during the critical years of middle school and early high school, male and female brains of the exact same chronological age are often at vastly different stages of cortical maturation[4]. This physiological timing of maturation has significant downstream effects on academic performance, as the prefrontal cortex—implicated in executive function, planning, and impulse control—matures at different rates, leaving adolescent boys temporarily disadvantaged in environments requiring sustained sedentary focus. Despite these group-level differences, it is critical to note that while machine learning models trained on structural MRI data can classify brain scans by sex with approximately 80.4% accuracy across age groups, individual brains exhibit a highly complex mosaic of male-typical and female-typical features rather than a uniform "male" or "female" architecture[3].

Prenatal Androgens and the Origins of Toy Preferences

One of the most persistent controversies in developmental psychology is the origin of childhood play and toy preferences. The debate centers on whether boys are inherently drawn to mechanical, spatial toys and girls to nurturing toys, or if this phenomenon is entirely an artifact of relentless cultural socialization and marketing.

The strongest physiological evidence addressing this controversy is derived from "natural experiments" involving individuals with Congenital Adrenal Hyperplasia (CAH). CAH is a genetic condition characterized by a deficiency in the 21-hydroxylase enzyme, which leads to abnormally high concentrations of adrenal androgens beginning roughly in the seventh week of gestation[5]. Females with CAH are exposed to prenatal testosterone levels far exceeding the typical female range, placing their early neuro-endocrine exposure closer to the male typical range[7].

Decades of independently replicated studies by researchers such as Sheri Berenbaum and Melissa Hines demonstrate that girls with CAH exhibit significantly increased male-typical play behavior. This includes a robust preference for male-typical toys (e.g., vehicles, building blocks, weapons) and male playmates, compared to their unaffected female relatives[6]. Furthermore, a dose-response relationship has been heavily documented: girls with more severe, salt-wasting forms of CAH (who experience higher fetal androgen exposure) exhibit proportionally greater interest in male-typical toys[5].

The controversy surrounding these findings is intense. The leading critics of the biological model argue that postnatal socialization explains these outcomes. They hypothesize that parents, consciously or unconsciously reacting to the slightly masculinized physical traits or the

explicit medical diagnosis of girls with CAH, socialize them differently than neurotypical girls, encouraging masculine play.

However, empirical observations of parent-child interactions actively contradict this socialization critique. Research by Pasterski et al. (2005) published in the *Archives of Sexual Behavior* directly observed play sessions and found that parents of girls with CAH actually provided significantly *more* encouragement for female-typical toy play than parents of unaffected girls[5]. Despite this compensatory parental socialization, the girls with CAH maintained their robust preference for male-typical toys, even when playing entirely alone[5]. While prenatal androgens exert a powerful organizational effect on the developing brain—shaping baseline interests and visual attention preferences—these physiological predispositions interact continuously with cultural affordances[5].

Layer 2: Behaviour (Statistical, Overlapping Distributions)

Behavioral differences between boys and girls are most accurately viewed as overlapping normal distributions. These differences manifest early in life across domains of language acquisition, temperamental self-regulation, and play dynamics.

Language Acquisition and Use

Girls possess a well-documented advantage in early language acquisition and verbal fluency. A systematic review of sex differences in early communication confirms that during the first three years of life, girls acquire language faster and possess larger vocabularies than boys. At 16 months of age, the average girl commands an expressive vocabulary of 95 words compared to the average boy's 25 words[11]. Boys are systematically overrepresented in populations of "late talkers" (constituting over 70% of this group) and are significantly more prone to developmental language and speech disorders[11].

A meta-analysis of Slovenian studies by Marjanovic-Umek et al. (2017), published in the *Center for Educational Policy Studies Journal* ($N = 3,657$), confirmed that all significant statistical effects in childhood language ability favor girls, with effect sizes actually increasing with age throughout childhood[12]. This female advantage extends beyond early developmental milestones. Cole's (1997) massive meta-analysis of over 4 million students demonstrated a persistent female advantage in reading comprehension, writing, and language use that remains stable across decades[13].

Adult language use also exhibits modest statistical divergence, though it is heavily mediated by context. A meta-analysis by Newman et al. (2008) analyzing a database of over 14,000 text samples found that women generally use more words related to psychological and social processes, whereas men use more words referring to object properties and impersonal topics[14]. However, these differences are highly sensitive to situational constraints, highlighting the complex interplay between physiological predispositions and cultural expectations regarding communication.

Temperament and Self-Regulation

Temperament encompasses the biologically based consistencies in emotion, reactivity, and behavior that appear early in life. The most exhaustive investigation into childhood sex differences in temperament is the 2006 meta-analysis by Else-Quest, Hyde, Goldsmith, and Van Hulle, published in *Psychological Bulletin*. Synthesizing data from children aged 3 months to 13 years, the researchers mapped three broad temperamental factors: Effortful Control, Surgency, and Negative Affectivity[15].

Temperamental Factor	Sub-Dimension	Effect Size (d)	Direction of Advantage
Effortful Control	Overall	-1.01 (in specific older cohorts)	Strong Female Advantage
	Inhibitory Control	-0.41	Moderate Female Advantage
	Perceptual Sensitivity	-0.38	Moderate Female Advantage
Surgency	Overall	$+0.55$ (in specific older cohorts)	Strong Male Advantage
	Activity Level	$+0.33$	Moderate Male Advantage
	High-Intensity Pleasure	$+0.30$	Moderate Male Advantage
Negative Affectivity	Overall	-0.06	Negligible / No Difference

Note: In this specific dataset, negative d values indicate higher mean scores for girls; positive values indicate higher mean scores for boys[15].

The starkest developmental difference lies in the domain of Effortful Control—defined as the ability to voluntarily regulate attention and behavior, delay gratification, inhibit prepotent impulses, and modulate emotional expression. Girls exhibit a substantial, widely replicated advantage in this domain. Conversely, boys consistently score higher in Surgency, a cluster of traits that encompasses impulsivity, high activity levels, and a desire for high-intensity,

rough-and-tumble play[15]. Importantly, there is no significant difference in Negative Affectivity; boys and girls experience sadness, distress, and general negative emotionality at virtually identical baseline rates[15].

Evolutionary psychologists, such as Bjorklund and Kipp (1996), hypothesize that human females evolved enhanced inhibitory control due to the intense selective pressures of prolonged infant care and the necessity of navigating complex social networks to ensure offspring survival[17]. Regardless of the ultimate evolutionary origin, the female advantage in effortful control and the male propensity for surgency have profound consequences when children enter the highly structured, sedentary environment of modern schooling, where behavioral regulation is directly tied to academic assessment.

Toy Preferences and Play Dynamics

Behavioral differences in unstructured play are among the largest psychological sex differences documented in the scientific literature. A comprehensive systematic review and meta-analysis by Todd et al. (2018), encompassing 113 effect sizes from 75 independent studies, definitively established the magnitude of gender-related toy preferences. The researchers found that boys preferred boy-related toys more than girls did, and girls preferred girl-related toys more than boys did[18].

The magnitude of these differences is massive. Boys' preference for male-typical toys yielded an effect size of $d = 1.83$, while girls' preference for female-typical toys yielded an effect size of $d = 1.60$ [5]. These preferences are detectable by 12 months of age, long before children possess the cognitive capacity to formulate a conscious understanding of gender identity[20]. While cultural marketing, peer reinforcement, and parental modeling undeniably amplify these divides, the robust evidence from the CAH physiological data, combined with cross-cultural consistency, heavily supports the conclusion that play preferences stem from an initial biological predisposition that dictates visual and mechanical engagement styles, which the environment then reinforces[5].

Layer 3: Culture (Variable Contexts and Interventions)

The third layer of analysis encompasses how human cultures respond to, manage, and frequently exacerbate the physiological and behavioral baselines of boys and girls. Cultural structures—particularly educational systems and peer socialization norms—can turn slight developmental mismatches into widening societal crises.

The Widening Education Gap

Modern educational systems heavily reward effortful control, fine motor skills, and verbal fluency—areas where girls hold distinct early developmental advantages. Consequently, a vast and historically persistent gap has opened in educational achievement, with boys falling severely behind in almost all advanced economies.

Voyer and Voyer's (2014) landmark meta-analysis in *Psychological Bulletin*, which analyzed 502 effect sizes from 369 samples, evaluated teacher-assigned school marks from elementary school through university[21]. They found a ubiquitous, cross-cultural female advantage in

teacher-assigned grades across all subjects (mean $d = 0.225$). The female advantage was largest in language courses ($d = 0.374$) and smallest, but still statistically significant, in mathematics courses ($d = 0.069$)[21]. Crucially, Voyer and Voyer demonstrated that this grading advantage is historically stable and is not a sudden artifact of a recent "boy crisis"; rather, girls have always outperformed boys in teacher-assigned grades, which measure compliance, self-regulation, and continuous effort over time[21].

While girls outperform boys in teacher-assigned grades, standardized tests have historically shown a slight male advantage in mathematics and science. However, recent international data reveal a troubling collapse in overall male performance. The OECD PISA 2025 results, covering over 33 million 15-year-olds globally, recorded the steepest educational declines in history[23]. While both sexes suffered post-pandemic drops, the OECD-average reading scores for boys fell by 17 points compared to 12 points for girls, widening the already massive reading gap[24]. In 89 out of 90 participating education systems, 15-year-old girls vastly outperformed boys in reading[24]. Globally, 37% of boys now fail to reach baseline reading proficiency, compared to 25% of girls[24]. In mathematics, boys maintained a slight overall advantage, but this is largely driven by a small cohort of high-performing boys at the extreme right tail of the distribution, while the median boy struggles[24].

Richard V. Reeves, a scholar at the Brookings Institution, argues in his influential 2022 book *Of Boys and Men* that the modern male is struggling due to a profound structural mismatch between the developmental timeline of boys and the rigid demands of the modern education system[27]. Because boys' prefrontal cortices mature later, expecting adolescent boys to exhibit the same effortful control, planning, and focus as adolescent girls of the exact same chronological age is a recipe for behavioral reprimands, academic disengagement, and eventual dropout.

Reeves proposes several structural interventions. Foremost among these is "redshirting" boys—a policy wherein boys would routinely start school a year later than girls, aligning their biological maturity with classroom demands. Furthermore, Reeves advocates for aggressive vocational training, apprenticeships, and the targeted recruitment of male teachers to provide same-sex models in highly feminized educational environments, ensuring that boys do not view academic success as a strictly feminine pursuit[27].

Single-Sex vs. Co-educational Schooling

A frequent cultural response to the widening education gap is the proposal of single-sex schooling, championed on the premise that boys and girls have fundamentally different learning styles and brain architectures that require separate pedagogical strategies. The empirical data emphatically refute this approach.

The definitive meta-analysis on the subject was conducted by Pahlke, Hyde, and Allison (2014) and published in *Psychological Bulletin*[29]. Analyzing 184 studies representing 1.66 million students across 21 nations, the researchers accounted for the severe selection bias that historically plagues this research (i.e., the fact that single-sex schools are often elite private

institutions where students possess higher baseline socioeconomic status and prior academic achievements).

When statistically controlling for prior performance and socioeconomic status, the academic benefits of single-sex schooling completely vanished. The differences between single-sex and co-educational schooling were entirely trivial for mathematics performance ($g = 0.10$ for girls, 0.06 for boys) and science performance ($g = 0.06$ for girls, 0.04 for boys)[29].

The controversy here remains public and highly publicized. Proponents of single-sex education, such as Leonard Sax and Michael Gurian, argue that boys and girls possess differently wired brains requiring distinct techniques—such as different classroom temperatures, lighting, or confrontational vs. collaborative teaching styles[32]. Leading critics, however, including researchers such as Janet Shibley Hyde and Diane Halpern, point out that the neural overlap between the sexes is vast. They argue that separating children by sex not only fails to yield academic benefits but can actively cause harm by inadvertently increasing gender stereotyping, reinforcing sexism, and failing to prepare students for mixed-gender workplaces[33]. The robust scientific consensus favors well-managed co-educational environments.

The Role of Mentors and Same-Sex Models

If physically separating boys and girls is ineffective, does the presence of same-sex adult models matter within mixed environments? The evidence suggests that it matters deeply, particularly for boys lacking engaged fathers.

A systematic meta-analysis of youth mentoring programs (such as Big Brothers Big Sisters) by DuBois et al. (2011), published in *Psychological Science in the Public Interest*, examined 55 to 70 evaluations encompassing over 25,000 youths[34]. The overall effect sizes of mentorship on academic, social, and behavioral outcomes are modest ($d = 0.18$ to 0.21)[36]. However, the efficacy of mentoring is highly contingent on the duration and consistency of the relationship. Matches that last over 12 months yield significant reductions in behavioral problems and increases in self-worth. Conversely, mentoring relationships that terminate prematurely (under six months) can actually harm the youth, resulting in decreased perceived self-worth and feelings of abandonment[36].

The gender of the mentor or teacher also plays a structural role in outcomes. Thomas Dee's (2007) research in the *Journal of Human Resources* utilized a matched-pairs longitudinal design to evaluate teacher-student gender dynamics[38]. Dee found that assigning a boy to a male teacher significantly improved the boy's achievement, teacher perceptions of his performance, and his overall engagement, closing up to a third of the English/Language Arts gender gap[38]. Similar effects were found for girls in STEM subjects when assigned to female teachers. Mentorship and same-sex modeling appear to work not through altered pedagogy, but through identity modeling, relationship building, and mitigating stereotype threat.

Adolescent Intimacy and Psychological Crises

Culturally, adolescence is the crucible where biological puberty meets intense gender

socialization. For both boys and girls, this period is characterized by acute psychological crises, though they manifest differently based on cultural demands. What boys and girls report needing most from adults during this time is an environment that tolerates authentic emotional expression without imposing rigid gendered expectations.

Girls and the "Loss of Voice" In her seminal 1982 book *In a Different Voice*, and its 2023 revision *In a Human Voice*, developmental psychologist Carol Gilligan documented how adolescent girls experience a profound "loss of voice"[40]. As girls transition into young adulthood, they encounter cultural pressures that demand compliance and devalue female agency. To maintain relationships and avoid conflict, many girls suppress their authentic thoughts and feelings, prioritizing an "ethic of care" at the expense of their own psychological boundaries and integrity[41]. Empirical tests of Gilligan's theories (e.g., Theran, 2003, $N = 108$) confirmed that this loss of authentic voice correlates heavily with the spike in female adolescent depression and eating disorders[43]. In her 2023 revision, Gilligan clarifies that this ethic of care is not a biologically female trait, but rather a universal human voice that is culturally coded as feminine and subsequently suppressed by patriarchal structures[41].

Boys and the "Crisis of Connection" Conversely, the primary psychological crisis for adolescent boys is one of enforced emotional isolation. Developmental psychologist Niobe Way, in her 2011 book *Deep Secrets*, utilized hundreds of longitudinal interviews to systematically dismantle the stereotype of the stoic, emotionally illiterate boy[46]. Way found that in early and middle adolescence, boys experience intense, emotionally intimate friendships. They openly declare their love for their male friends, share their deepest secrets, and explicitly state they would "go wacko" or "go crazy" without them[46]. Way notes that boys' descriptions of their friendships sound more like *Love Story* than *Lord of the Flies*[46].

However, as boys enter late adolescence, cultural mandates of traditional masculinity—requiring physical toughness, emotional stoicism, and aggressive autonomy—force them to abandon these intimacies. Fearing being labeled as feminine or gay (exemplified by the mantra "no homo"), boys don a "mask of masculinity"[47]. Way argues this is not an innate "boy crisis" of biological defectiveness, but a culturally induced "crisis of connection." The loss of intimate male friendships correlates directly with rising rates of depression, anxiety, social isolation, and suicide among young men[46].

Rites of Passage in Traditional vs. Modern Societies

How did human cultures historically manage the turbulent transition of adolescence and the socialization of gender roles? Anthropologists Alice Schlegel and Herbert Barry (1991), in their extensive cross-cultural inquiry analyzing 186 nonindustrial societies, found that almost all human cultures demarcate adolescence through explicit rites of passage[49].

Traditional rites of passage serve to psychologically transition the child into adult responsibilities, but they differ markedly by sex[50]:

- **Boys' rites** typically involve cohorts of initiates, the deliberate infliction of pain or endurance trials, and tests of physical prowess, aggressiveness, and self-reliance[49]. Anthropologist David Gilmore (1990) notes in *Manhood in the Making* that "manhood" in traditional societies is rarely granted innately; it must be *earned* through perilous trials

that forcibly separate the boy from the maternal sphere and bind him to the male collective[52].

- **Girls' rites** are generally highly individualized, closely tied to the biological onset of menarche, and focus on fertility, sexual attractiveness, and readiness for marriage. Chastity or restricted sexual access is frequently emphasized[49].

In modern industrialized societies, these formal rites of passage have largely vanished. While this has liberated youth from physically dangerous or heavily restrictive practices, it has left the psychological transition unbounded and ambiguous[53]. Without culturally sanctioned rites to affirm their maturation and value to the community, modern adolescents—particularly boys—often turn to peer-driven, high-risk behaviors or antisocial delinquency to establish adult status and demand respect[49].

10-Line Summary of Robust Findings

The synthesis of developmental research yields several highly robust, replicated findings regarding sex-differentiated development. First, male brains are structurally 9-12% larger, but female brains reach peak cortical maturation earlier, directly aligning with their earlier onset of puberty and providing a temporary neurodevelopmental advantage in adolescence. Second, prenatal androgens profoundly organize the brain, evidenced by CAH girls who exhibit massive, biologically driven preferences for male-typical toys. Third, girls consistently demonstrate an early advantage in language acquisition and maintain a massive developmental advantage in "effortful control" (self-regulation), whereas boys score significantly higher in "surgency" (physical activity and impulsivity). Fourth, a universal and historically stable female advantage exists in teacher-assigned school grades across all subjects, while recent standardized testing (PISA 2025) reveals a severe, widening deficit in boys' reading capabilities globally. Fifth, single-sex schooling provides zero statistically significant academic benefits over co-educational schooling for either sex when controlling for baseline factors. Finally, while adolescent boys deeply desire emotional intimacy in friendships, they are forced into stoic isolation by cultural masculine norms, leading to a crisis of connection that modern societies fail to address due to the abandonment of structured adolescent rites of passage.

Contested or Open Questions

Despite robust data on physiological baselines and behavioral averages, several critical questions remain highly contested in the literature. The most prominent debate centers on the exact limits of socialization in overriding biology: to what degree do subtle parental and peer reactions to slightly masculinized behaviors in CAH girls compound, mitigate, or independently drive the observed behavioral differences attributed to fetal testosterone? In the realm of education, the remediation of the boy crisis remains an open question. If single-sex schooling is ineffective, and the grading gap is driven by biologically influenced developmental delays in male effortful control, is age-staggered schooling ("redshirting" boys to start a year later) an ethically, legally, and economically viable public policy? Furthermore, researchers are currently debating the impact of modern digital environments; specifically, to what extent are algorithmic digital leisure and prolonged screen time responsible for the precipitous drop in male reading scores and the simultaneous collapse in female mental health indicators seen in recent PISA data? Finally, it remains an open psychological question whether the "ethic of care" (as

theorized by Gilligan) can be successfully integrated into the socialization of adolescent boys without triggering severe resistance from traditional masculine peer norms.

The 5 to 10 Most Important Sources to Read in Full

For practitioners, policymakers, and researchers seeking to understand the granular methodologies and expansive datasets underlying this report, the following sources represent the foundational literature in the field. **Else-Quest, Hyde, Goldsmith, and Van Hulle (2006)** published the definitive meta-analysis on temperament in *Psychological Bulletin*, which is essential reading for understanding the behavioral baselines of effortful control and surgency. To understand the reality of the education gap, **Voyer and Voyer (2014)** provides the most exhaustive statistical review of teacher-assigned grades across decades, also published in *Psychological Bulletin*. The efficacy (or lack thereof) of educational segregation is best understood through **Pahlke, Hyde, and Allison (2014)**, whose meta-analysis refutes the benefits of single-sex schooling. For qualitative, narrative insights into the emotional lives of adolescents, **Niobe Way's *Deep Secrets* (2011)** and **Carol Gilligan's *In a Human Voice* (2023)** are indispensable texts that dismantle the stereotypes of the unfeeling boy and the naturally accommodating girl. In the realm of policy, **Richard V. Reeves' *Of Boys and Men* (2022)** offers the most comprehensive modern framework for addressing male structural disadvantages in education and the workforce. Finally, to contextualize modern adolescence against human history, **Schlegel and Barry's *Adolescence: An Anthropological Inquiry* (1991)** provides vital cross-cultural data on rites of passage and the transition to adulthood.

Implications for Living Together

Note: Identifying evolutionary, physiological, or statistical differences between the sexes does not imply that these differences are morally "good" or culturally optimal. To assume so is to commit the naturalistic fallacy. Biology provides a baseline of predispositions; it does not dictate human destiny or limit moral progress.

For couples and families raising children, recognizing that boys and girls exhibit overlapping but distinctly paced developmental timelines is vital for fostering a healthy home environment. Because boys generally mature later in their capacity for "effortful control" and executive function, parents and educators must avoid viewing a young boy's impulsivity or inability to sit still purely as willful misbehavior or pathological defiance; it is frequently a structural developmental mismatch. Conversely, parents must actively monitor for the "loss of voice" in adolescent girls. Families must prioritize cultivating environments where girls are explicitly encouraged to express authentic dissent, anger, and boundaries without the fear of relational abandonment or being labeled "difficult."

For schools, small groups, and organizations, the data demand a structural adaptation of environments rather than the simplistic segregation of the sexes. Because single-sex schooling is not supported by empirical evidence, co-educational environments must adapt to accommodate the higher "surgency" and delayed self-regulation of boys. This involves incorporating movement, healthy competition, and hands-on vocational learning into daily routines, while simultaneously recruiting male teachers and mentors to serve as engaged role models, proving to boys that academic and emotional intelligence are not exclusively feminine domains.

For societies at large, the crisis of connection must be confronted directly. The stoic, hyper-independent masculine ideal actively damages the mental health and social integration of boys and men. Societies must culturally sanction emotional intimacy and vulnerability for men—fostering a universal "ethic of care"—while simultaneously providing modern, constructive "rites of passage." These modern rites should safely channel adolescent risk-taking, honor the transition to adulthood, and bind young men and women to the broader community. Only by acknowledging both the biological realities of developmental sex differences and the immense power of cultural shaping can men and women build institutions where both sexes thrive together.

Works cited

1. Few sex differences in regional gray matter volume growth, https://direct.mit.edu/imag/article/doi/10.1162/imag_a_00154/120597/Few-sex-differences-in-regional-gray-matter-volume
2. Sex differences in the developing brain: insights from multimodal, https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC6235840/
3. Development of sex differences in the human brain - PMC - NIH, https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC8510853/
4. Sex differences in the adolescent brain | Request PDF - ResearchGate, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/38089944_Sex_differences_in_the_adolescent_brain
5. Prenatal testosterone and sexually differentiated childhood play, https://d-nb.info/1256507040/34
6. Evidence and Implications from a Natural Experiment of Prenatal, https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC9186536/
7. Androgens and child behavior: Color and toy preferences in children, https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC9976950/
8. Early Androgens Are Related to Childhood Sex-Typed Toy, https://pure.psu.edu/en/publications/early-androgens-are-related-to-childhood-sex-typed-toy-preference/
9. Personality and Congenital Adrenal Hyperplasia: Possible effects of, https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC3296092/
10. Author Queries - University of Cambridge, https://www.repository.cam.ac.uk/bitstreams/83dfc6d8-f291-48de-b419-ebff73b722ba/download
11. Sex differences in early communication development - PMC, https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC6509633/
12. Gender Differences in Children's Language: A Meta-Analysis of, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/318275287_Gender_Differences_in_Children's_Language_A_Meta-Analysis_of_Slovenian_Studies
13. The Gender Gap in Second Language Acquisition, https://journals.plos.org/plosone/article?id=10.1371/journal.pone.0142056
14. Gender Differences in Language Use: An Analysis of 14000 Text, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/253291274_Gender_Differences_in_Lan

guage_Use_An_Analysis_of_14000_Text_Samples
15. Gender Differences in Temperament: A Meta-Analysis - ResearchGate, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/7337588_Gender_Differences_in_Temperament_A_Meta-Analysis
16. Gender differences in young children's temperament traits - PMC - NIH, https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC3532859/
17. Sex differences in self-regulation: an evolutionary perspective, https://www.frontiersin.org/journals/neuroscience/articles/10.3389/fnins.2014.00233/full
18. Sex differences in 1-, 3-, and 5-year-olds' toy-choice in a structured, https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/Sex-differences-in-1-%2C-3-%2C-and-5-year-olds%27-in-a-Servin-Bohlin/c343366f0a934706c3d04ecd836a4ea2b2442304
19. How Large Are Gender Differences in Toy Preferences?, https://www.repository.cam.ac.uk/bitstreams/bf422517-944c-42d7-8e49-1a85da731af9/download
20. Systematic review and meta-analysis of MRI-based sex differences, https://direct.mit.edu/imag/article/doi/10.1162/IMAG.a.1295/137285/Systematic-review-and-meta-analysis-of-MRI-based
21. Gender Differences in Scholastic Achievement: A Meta-Analysis, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/261953087_Gender_Differences_in_Scholastic_Achievement_A_Meta-Analysis
22. Gender Differences in Scholastic Achievement: A Meta-Analysis, https://boysmeneducation.com/wp-content/uploads/2014/05/Gender-Differences-in-Scholastic-Achievement-a-Meta-Analysis-by-Daniel-and-Susan-Voyer.pdf
23. PISA 2025 Results (Volume I) - OECD, https://www.oecd.org/en/publications/pisa-2025-results-volume-i_73451bc5-en.html
24. Girls Outscore Boys in Reading in 89 of 90 Education Systems, https://www.visualcapitalist.com/girls-outscore-boys-in-reading-89-of-90-education-systems/
25. PISA 2025 Results (Volume I) (EN), https://table.media/assets/briefings/bildung/pisa-2025-englisch.pdf
26. The Exam That Decides: What PISA 2025 Gets Right and Wrong, https://www.ie.edu/insights/articles/the-exam-that-decides-what-pisa-2025-gets-right-and-wrong-about-girls-and-mathematics/
27. Why men and boys are falling behind, with Richard V. Reeves, https://www.niskanencenter.org/why-men-and-boys-are-falling-behind-with-richard-v-reeves/
28. Men are struggling. A new book explores why and what to do about it, https://www.reddit.com/r/books/comments/yms0ag/men_are_struggling_a_new_book_explores_why_and/
29. Is Single-Sex Education Beneficial for Child Learning? - Consensus AI, https://consensus.app/home/blog/is-single-sex-education-beneficial-for-child-learning/

30. The Effects of Single-Sex Compared With Coeducational Schooling, https://www.apa.org/pubs/journals/releases/bul-a0035740.pdf
31. The Effects of Single-Sex Compared With Coeducational Schooling, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/260089187_The_Effects_of_Single-Sex_Compared_With_Coeducational_Schooling_on_Students'_Performance_and_Attitudes_A_Meta-Analysis
32. Gender stereotypes: implicit threat to performance or boost for, https://nbn-resolving.org/urn:nbn:de:101:1-202208202059514783369 6
33. U.S. Principals' Attitudes About and Experiences with Single-Sex, https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC4500932/
34. Effectiveness of Mentoring Programs for Youth: A MetaAnalytic Review, https://dukespace.lib.duke.edu/bitstreams/3521ecbb-2783-4f5b-b412-c235681c9e92/download
35. The Effects of Youth Mentoring Programs: A Meta-analysis of, https://pure.uva.nl/ws/files/52287310/Raposa2019_Article_TheEffectsOfYouthMentoringProg.pdf
36. Unpacking Community-Based Youth Mentoring Relationships - PMC, https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC8198211/
37. Effects of the Big Brothers Big Sisters of America Community-Based, https://www.mediapoweryouth.org/wp-content/uploads/2023/06/Effects-Big-Brother-Big-Sister.pdf
38. Teachers and the Gender Gap in Reading Achievement, https://jcfruehwirth.web.unc.edu/wp-content/uploads/sites/23058/2020/06/draft_jun2020.pdf
39. Teachers and the Gender Gaps in Student Achievement - NBER, https://www.nber.org/papers/w11660
40. In a Different Voice - Wikipedia, https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/In_a_Different_Voice
41. Women's psychology according to Carol Gilligan | Research Starters, https://www.ebsco.com/research-starters/psychology/womens-psychology-according-carol-gilligan/
42. In a Different Voice: Psychological Theory and Women's Development, https://syllabus.pirate.care/library/Carol%20Gilligan/In%20a%20Different%20Voice%20(418)/In%20a%20Different%20Voice%20-%20Carol%20Gilligan.pdf
43. The Relationship of Gender and Voice to Depression and Eating, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/227894289_The_Relationship_Of_Gender_And_Voice_To_Depression_And_Eating_Disorders
44. Ethnicity, attachment, and gender role socialization as predictors of, https://d.lib.msu.edu/etd/32769?q=Education%20Men
45. Pack 1: Attentiveness — Caring About - Civic AI, https://civic.ai/1/
46. Deep Secrets by Niobe Way | Paper Plus, https://www.paperplus.co.nz/shop/books/deep-secrets
47. Niobe Way - Deep Secrets - Boys' Friendships and The Crisis of, https://www.scribd.com/document/643173435/Niobe-Way-Deep-Secrets-Boys-Friendships-and-the-Crisis-of-Connection-Harvard-University-Press-2011-1-pdf
48. The Crisis of Connection: Roots, Consequences, and Solutions,

https://dokumen.pub/the-crisis-of-connection-roots-consequences-and-solutions-9781479880171.html
49. Adolescence - Human Relations Area Files, https://hraf.yale.edu/ehc/assets/summaries/pdfs/adolescence.pdf
50. Adolescence - Human Relations Area Files - Yale University, https://hraf.yale.edu/ehc/summaries/adolescence
51. (PDF) Culture and Adolescent Development - Academia.edu, https://www.academia.edu/36265956/Culture_and_Adolescent_Development
52. Manhood in the Making: Cultural Concepts of Masculinity - Goodreads, https://www.goodreads.com/book/show/4730248
53. Adolescence - Encyclopedia.com, https://www.encyclopedia.com/medicine/psychology/psychology-and-psychiatry/adolescence