Vol. 25(2), 2025, pp.87-106, ISSN: 2072-0394(Print), ISSN: 2663-8886(Online)

Raising the Patriarch: Gendered Domestic Socialization and the Normalization of Male Privilege

Dipela Mmaphuti Percy
Department of Social Work
University of South Africa

Abstract

This article examines how gendered domestic socialization normalizes male privilege from early childhood. Guided by Gender Schema Theory, the study employed a Systematic Literature Review (SLR) to systematically identify, screen, and synthesize empirical research published between 2010 and 2023. Searches were conducted across multidisciplinary databases and grey literature sources using Boolean operators and controlled vocabulary. Inclusion criteria focused on peer-reviewed cross-sectional, longitudinal, and qualitative studies involving children aged with data extracted through a standardized coding framework and critically appraised for methodological quality. The study revealed that male privilege is reproduced not through overt ideology but through unspoken, repetitive micro-practices such as gendered household chore divisions, differential discipline patterns, emotional labor expectations, and peer group dynamics that cumulatively reinforce patriarchal norms. These practices embed gender-power associations into children's internalized schemas, linking masculinity to dominance and femininity to subordination. The article recommends adopting longitudinal, cross-cultural, and intersectional research designs; reorienting education and parenting toward gender equity; implementing institutional reforms such as gender teaching and empowerment in schools; and fostering cultural and media narratives that promote diverse, non-stereotypical masculinities. Addressing male privilege at its earliest socialization stage is essential for disrupting entrenched gender hierarchies.

Keywords: Children, Gender, Patriarchy, Socialization, Male/Female-Privilege.

Introduction

Children are not born into a genderless universe. It is gendered expectations that emerge from the very beginning of life and shape the manner in which girls and boys are treated, instructed, and understood (Robinson, 2021). In most households, girls are expected to perform domestic chores, clean dishes, and care for family members, whereas boys are generally granted freedom, exercise, and exemption from household work (Chaplin & Aldao, 2013). These practices appear to be ordinary and are basic systems through which societies reproduce gendered power dynamics. This home socialization communicates clear messages that girls are supposed to work and perform care labor, while boys have the luxury of playing, experimenting, and exercising authority (Robinson, 2021). These initial training sessions are the building

This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-Non-commercial 4.0 International License.

blocks of gender identities and roles and shape emotional expression, responsibility, empathy, and even aggression or domination tendencies. (Mani & Antony Raj, 2023). The outcome is not just an unequal division of work but the normalization of male privilege, a trend that extends to adolescence and adulthood.

A major source of gender-role conditioning is family. Gendered expectations are conveyed by differentiating toys, clothing, speech, and domestic duties from a young age (Qian et al., 2023). According to Witt (2000) and Mani & Antony Raj (2023), girls are directed towards childcare and domestic work, but boys are not subject to the same household expectations. Robinson (2021) demonstrates through studies that such early assumptions immediately influence the child's perception of gender roles, and girls will internalize domestic duty, and boys will externalize freedom and dominance. Even more recently (Midgette et al., 2023) shows that three-year-olds can observe and justify the uneven allocation of domestic work. Such observation is not only a reaction to what parents do, but rather, it actively reaffirms the gender order within the child's own ideology, even though children's toys are not gender-neutral. Chaplin and Aldao (2013) highlighted that Boys are often given action figures or toy weapons that encourage physicality and aggression; whereas, girls are typically offered dolls and kitchen sets that promote caregiving and nurturing roles. These play habits are linked to the acquisition of cognitive and emotional competencies, risk-taking, and spatial skills in boys, emotional literacy, and relational orientations in girls (Côté, 2007).

As Evertsson (2006) and Goodnow and Lawrence (2002) point out, such gendered work and play divisions are reinforced even in egalitarian-valued families. Such gendered distributions continue to happen in such hidden channels as "who is requested to assist" and "who may rest," which eventually form identity and agency. Emotional socialization is also a key mechanism where parents talk more with daughters about emotional expressions and are given language and sympathy for emotion regulation, while boys are more traditionally socialized to cover up emotion and "toughen up," and internalized standards for stoicism and emotion regulation follow (Chaplin & Aldao, 2013). Fathers discipline boys more severely, promoting links between masculinity, dominance, and physical assertion. However, this is not without cost; Alink et al. (2006) discovered that boys are more physically aggressive than girls as young as preschool, a trend that continues into adolescence. These behaviors are not simply biological; they are influenced by the contexts through which boys grow up, by the expectations they learn to develop, and by the liberty they enjoy from emotional labor or domestic discipline. Such patterns become personality traits in adulthood. Farré and Vella's (2013) and, subsequently, Haaland et al. (2018) longitudinal analyses show that youth who grew up in families with strongly gendered labor divisions reproduce the same patterns in adulthood. Sons, for instance, will not learn housework if fathers have opted out of it and mothers have taken on all the domestic labor (Raley, 2012; Offer & Schneider, 2011). This is how

socialization of boys to freedom, entitlement, and emotional distance, socialization of girls to care, responsibility, and service, is the process of learning, expecting, and reproducing male privilege. Although there is ample research examining gender socialization during childhood, much of it focuses on one domain, toys, chores, emotional expression, or discipline alone. Witt (1997) and Evertsson (2006) have outlined the processes of gender-segregation of chores and toys, and Chaplin and Aldao (2013) have investigated how emotional expression is socialized for boys and girls independently. But to date, few have explored in detail how these intersecting modes of gendered home socialization all work together to help legitimate male privilege and, in some instances, to externalize behaviors such as entitlement or aggression (Haaland, & Baklien, 2024). Also, while studies by Farré and Vella (2013) and Haaland et al. (2018) depict long-term reproduction of household gender roles, little examination has been made into how such early household experiences in reality shape boys' psychological development, sense of responsibility, or tendency towards antisociality (Patterson, Reid & Dishion, 1992). This gap is most relevant to practice areas such as social work, education, and youth justice, in which practitioners are routinely working with the consequences of these gender scripts but lack theoretical explanations of how they relate to early domestic life (Tremblay, 2010). Moreover, current research tends to centre on Western middle classes or be policy evaluation in bent rather than be concerned with the lived micro-dynamics of child upbringing and parenting. This excludes important cultural, class, or context-aware elements that social work practitioners witness firsthand. The research question that guided this study is as follows: In what ways does early domestic socialization contribute to the development of male entitlement, emotional suppression, or aggression in boys? So thoroughgoing, practice-based a model contributes what is needed to both social work and gender studies scholarship. Not only does it enhance theoretical wisdom, but it also equips practitioners, educators, and policymakers with more acute tools to battle back against such norms in their origins: the gender patterning of family life.

Theoretical Framework

The study was guided by Gender Schema Theory (Bem, 1981), which is the prevailing theory of how family socialization instils male privilege by constructing children's cognitive systems. According to the theory, children construct automatically operating gender schemas, cognitive structures that organize society's masculine/feminine standards and one's own experiences, controlling behavior, self-concept, and judgments of others as a function of perceived masculine/feminine standards. Most importantly, this automaticity makes gendered expectations and advantages, which come with them (e.g., authority, lighter domestic load), natural and inevitable, concealing their social construction (Hyde et al., 2019). This internalization process in the familial context is essentially the origin of early male privilege balancing, since schemas screen experience to confirm perceived biological imperative (Bigler, Hayes & Liben, 2014; Endendijk et al.,

2018). Theoretically building on Bem's (1981) Gender Schema Theory (GST), the book expounds the theoretical model of male privilege with its conceptualization as a schema-construction process of normalizing privilege that is a cognitive process. Children are not mere passive recipients of ideology but rather active constructors of internal mental structures ("schemas"), structuring gendered expectations. These schemas are built through observational and systematic encoding of behavior patterns in the home context: who is most reliably referred to when they speak, whose effort is most freely admired or taken for granted, and who is most reliably held responsible for particular tasks or emotional control (Endendijk et al., 2023; Liben, 2024). These patterned perceptions, in turn, solidify over time into strongly held, largely unconscious assumptions about the self and others' gender-based roles, rights, and entitlements. Of note to add is that GST describes how such schemas function unconsciously, screening perceptions and behavior without reflective thinking, and thus interpreting perceived social patterns into internalized, "common sense" knowledge of the workings of the world (Hyde et al., 2019). This action removes focus from blatant indoctrination and towards the insidious, cumulative influence of ordinary vision and tacit learning in transmitting privilege.

This research emphasizes that male privilege, as revealed by the GST filter, is internalized not via over-dogmatic affirmation but through the repetitive, unremarkable repetition of day-to-day quotidian routines. Privilege is made intelligible and ordinary through the sheer everyday familiarity within the home regime, and not through coercive imposition (Ridgeway, 2019). Privileges at the essence of male privilege—such as being exempt from having to justify slight infractions, having space to default without suffering commensurate social sanction, or being exempt from the constant, unobtrusive labor of anticipating and coordinating household/emotional work are seldom codified in terms of formally acknowledged rights. Rather, they are "socialized rights of passage" (Blair, 1992) built up over the years and quietly in myriad interactions (Perry et al., 2022). Kids take on these advantages as natural components of manliness because they are continually performed and seldom challenged within the home environment (Bigler & Leaper, 2024). Schema building serves to turn such societally constructed benefits into assumed essential natural traits or unnoticed components of everyday habit, repressing their source points and guaranteeing their felt authenticity (Eagly & Wood, 2017). Thus, GST offers the theoretical connection that demonstrates how privilege becomes integrated into individuals' cognitive life by the mundane, yet deeply significant, processes of early socialization.

Research Objectives

- To explore and interpret how gendered domestic socialization practices contribute to the tacit normalization of male privilege from early childhood.
- To identify and describe how gendered domestic micro-practices, as documented in existing literature, perpetuate patriarchal norms.

Research Question

- What ways does early domestic socialization contribute to the development of male entitlement, emotional suppression, or aggression in boys?

Rationale of the Study

This research is warranted by the urgent necessity to move beyond recognizing that male privilege does exist and, rather, uncover the very material, implicit processes within the family that naturalize it from a young age. While the stability of patriarchy is assured, the very how of its reproduction between generations through commonplace, many times implicit, micro-practices is still not extensively mapped out. It relies solely on overt ideological guidance and is insufficient to make sense of the deeply entrenched position of male privilege; experience indicates socialization occurs strongly through everyday, tacit behaviors and presuppositions (Ridgeway, 2011; Kane, 2012). The researcher applied a Systematic Literature Review (SLR) approach to integrate dispersed evidence in central areas of chore distribution, such as discipline (motivational socialization and peer pressure (Thorne, 1993; Way, 2013), to identify stable patterns and needed lacunae in knowledge about how these habits unknowingly and cumulatively transmit male advantage.

Significance of the Study

The study's strength and its significance are in its theoretical contribution towards gender socialization theory from an empirical illustration of the reproduction of male privilege in everyday, taken-for-granted household routines, more than, or in addition to, overt teaching, and to inform more sophisticated accounts of social reproduction (Martin, 2003). This study unearths the empirical base, determining actionable levers such as gender-equal division of labor, non-gendered discipline, and encouraging boys' emotional expressiveness for overturning patriarchal transmission and this has direct application to real-world interventions in parenting programs (e.g., explicit bias correction in domestic chores allocation (Cunningham, 2007), school education (interrupting early gendered schematicity - (Liben & Bigler, 2002), and policy (promoting fair parental leave) (Miller, 2020). Additionally, critically assessing gaps informs future research agendas. Methodologically, it emphasizes the worth of SLRs in accurately mapping dense social phenomena (Snyder, 2019). Lastly, this knowledge is of most importance to enable teachers, parents, and policymakers to dismantle the pernicious bases of male privilege in the first location of socialization: the home.

Limitations of the Study

Despite the valuable contribution, the study is conducted under the constraints of the SLR approach and the limitations of the synthesized papers. Secondly, since an SLR syntheses described outcomes but is incapable of generating novel empirical evidence on the real-

time longitudinal dynamics of such micro-practices in various family arrangements or measure the causal link of these to adult male privilege directly, thirdly, incorporating studies that tended to employ parental/child self-reporting or observational approaches risks missing the most implicit, unconscious socialization aspects or is susceptible to social desirability bias. Finally, while offering multi-level suggestions, the review's policy and intervention recommendations remain largely theoretical, as SLRs themselves do not test the efficacy of proposed solutions; translating these findings into actionable and effective real-world strategies requires further empirical research and piloting.

Review of the Literature

The existing literature reveals compelling evidence that early domestic socialization practices spanning play, discipline, emotional modeling, chore distribution, and peer interaction profoundly shape gendered behavioral trajectories, particularly concerning the development of aggression and the internalization of gendered norms that may underpin male privilege. This review synthesizes key findings and identifies critical gaps (Golombok et al., 2008).

Gendered Parental Discipline and Emotional Socialization: Differential Treatment and its Consequences

Parenting styles are a key vehicle for intergenerational transmission of gendered expectations in the form of differential socialization of emotion and physical discipline. Van der Mark, Zwart & de Jong (2016) offered strong Dutch longitudinal evidence that fathers with more traditional gender-role attitudes were significantly more likely to apply physical discipline (e.g., spanking) with their 3-year-old sons than with daughters. Most importantly, differential treatment completely mediated the development of gender differences in children's aggression at one-year follow-up. This result strongly suggests the way in which parental bias in discipline directly influences behavior outcomes, unfairly biasing boys into aggression.

Later, more modern studies highlight the need to observe patterns of emotional socialization. Mother-child interactions that are coercive, mean-spirited, or unaffectionate during preschool predict increasing aggression trajectories in boys in elementary school, from research employing Patterson's coercive family process model (Van der Mark, et al., 2016). Conversely, such identical parenting correlates (e.g., low warmth, high conflict) are often implicated in the desistance of aggression for girls, suggesting girls may internalize distress differently (Keenan & Shaw, 1997). This differential pattern implies a significant socialization process; boys are under more pressure to be emotion-suppressing ("boys don't cry") and less positively reinforced for sensitive feelings, yet at the same time also have aggression or externalizing behaviors indirectly reinforced or less consistently carried out (Chaplin & Aldao, 2013; Fivush et al., 2000). The inclusion of more physical punishment that is rougher for boys and less training in emotion regulation makes an environment in which aggression is a more likely behavioral outcome.

Household Chores, Toy Access, and the Material Culture of Gendered Messaging

The home environment substantively supports gender roles via the division of labor and play provision. Very large-scale research has established that parents systematically allocate varied household duties to sons and daughters, even at a very young age (McHale, Crouter & Tucker, 1999). Girls are always assigned more indoor, nurturing-type chores (e.g., cleaning, assisting with meals, babysitting), and boys are assigned outdoor or less regular tasks (e.g., garbage duty, lawn work) (Leaper & Farkas, 2015). This split inadvertently instructs girls in their responsibility for domestic care and nurturing, whereas boys learn that their domestic duties are voluntary, less routine, or conditional upon certain "masculine" areas.

In the same way, parental toy provision closely reflects and supports stereotypes (McHale, Crouter & Tucker, 1999). Girls get dolls, kitchen sets, and beauty toys, with the themes of domesticity and appearance. Boys get construction sets, cars, action figures, and sporting equipment, with themes of action, building, competition, and power (Fisher-Thompson, 1993). Critically, these trends continue even within microunits where parents report egalitarian ideologies, indicating that implicit prejudice and social norms are strong forces (Evertsson, 2006; Goodnow & Lawrence, 2002). This materialisation of gender transmits powerful messages regarding suitable interests, future roles, and domains of competence. Qualitative inquiry makes visible how children learn these messages. Davies et al. (2016), with South African working-class children, girls are expected, that they "have to do more cleaning," and position boys as "the boss" of the home. This initial building of gendered power and entitlement, where boys witness and encounter lesser household burdens and more perceived power, directly legitimates male privilege in the earliest formation of the family unit.

Peer Segregation and the Reinforcement of Gendered Norms

Home-gender socialization is then further consolidated by peer interaction throughout childhood and adulthood. Maccoby's (1998) previous research on gender segregation implies that children have a strong same-gender preference for peers at 2.5 to 3 years of age. These differences early in life feed into gender-segregated peer cultures that establish gender-specific social norms and behaviors. Boys' peer groups engage in more extensive, more active, more competitive, and dominance-hierarchy play. Rough-and-tumble play and blatant aggression are frequently characteristic of such groups, and boys typically are actively policing one another for conformity to norms of masculinity, excluding behaviors such as emotional weakness or participation in an activity with a feminine coding (Pellegrini & Long, 2003). In contrast, girls' peer groups are cooperative, small, and focused on verbal communication, turn-taking, and relationship-building. While there is conflict, it is of a more subtle nature (McHale, Crouter & Tucker, 1999). Such same-sex peer groups generate strong feedback loops. Gendered behaviors, such as boys' assertiveness and girls' interpersonal sensitivity,

for example, are strengthened and amplified in same-sex peer groups. Because boys are socialized to see assertiveness and strength as being rewarded, and girls are socialized to believe relational ability is especially valued, these styles become gender statuses. The outcome is a feedback cycle in which gendered expectations are replicated across contexts and cross-gender interaction decreases to become less common and more laden with social tension, further establishing the cycle of segregation (Martin & Fabes, 2001).

Though every one of the play, discipline, chore, and peer interaction domains is sufficiently studied on its own as to whether it is gendered in its outcomes, synthesis is precluded by critical gaps in research into how male privilege becomes normative through integrated household socialization. Despite this, most of this research is conducted with each socialization domain in isolation from the others. There is an important knowledge lacuna regarding how these components mesh with one another and support each other in the daily routine of a family to build a boy's emergent sense of self, sense of entitlement, and usual behavior towards other people. How do various chore expectations mesh with exposure to action toys and allowance of rambunctious play in building a sense of domestic authority or exemption? Although there are certain longitudinal connections (e.g., play, aggression, discipline, aggression), very few studies follow the cumulative effects of several early socialization processes on later phenomena such as male entitlement, dominance tactics in relationships, work-related gender attitudes, or adult performance of domestic labor. We require studies charting how multifaceted childhood experiences lead to adolescent and adult expressions of privilege (Kung, Chao & Lin, 2021). Virtually all studies derive from mainly middle-class environments. There is a severe shortage of culturally embedded, context-specific understanding of how gendered socialization works in working-class homes, multi-ethnic/racial groups, non-Western cultures, or during times of economic hardship. In what ways are minority status, economic need, or cultural values intersecting with and reshaping gendered socialization processes and privilege normalization (Weisner, 2002; Rogoff, 2003). These gaps must be closed by interdisciplinary, longitudinal, and culturally representative research designs that study the synergistic influences of gendered domestic socialization across sectors and developmental stages. Such research is necessary to finally comprehend the way male privilege is being reproduced within family life (Chaplin, 2015).

Behavioral Conditioning: Discipline, Rewards, and Risk

Early domestic interactions systematically condition children’s relationships with power through differential practices. Boys face harsher discipline (e.g., corporal punishment, public rebukes) for aggression or disobedience, framed as cultivating "leadership" or resilience, thereby normalizing dominance (Van der Mark, et al., 2016). Conversely, girls are disciplined via guilt-induction or affection-withdrawal,

enforcing compliance and relational sensitivity. Reward structures further entrench inequality: boys' boundary-testing behavior is celebrated as "adventurous," while identical actions in girls invite restriction or moral reprimand (Kung et al., 2018). This dichotomy valorizes risk-taking as masculine and obedience as feminine, embedding early hierarchies of agency.

Research Methodology

The main data collection method utilized for this secondary research was a Systematic Literature Review (SLR), designed to search, appraise, and synthesize empirical research evidence on gendered domestic socialization. The SLR was executed by utilizing a systematic, multi-stage search and extraction protocol for transparency and replicability purposes. The review started with the development of an in-depth search strategy through the application of Boolean operators, merging controlled vocabulary and keywords from initial concept themes (gender-typed play," parental discipline," "household chore assignment," "peer segregation) and outcome themes ("aggression," "male privilege," "gender attitudes"). Searches were carried out across multidisciplinary literature bases, PubMed, PsycINFO, Web of Science, ERIC, and Sociological Abstracts, in an attempt to canvass varied disciplinary viewpoints. Grey literature was accessed through ProQuest Dissertations to reduce publication bias and increase the body of evidence.

Time limits (1990–2023) were put in place to balance history with proximity to the present time. Upon database retrieval, all the records were exported into a reference management system to remove duplicates. The services of a senior researcher were employed as independent reviewers who assisted the researcher in screening abstracts and titles against pre-specified inclusion criteria: peer-reviewed, empirical studies (cross-sectional, longitudinal, qualitative) involving children aged 0-12 years, which investigated home-based socialization strategies and their relationship with adolescent/adult behavioral outcomes (Kung, Ramirez & Chopra, 2021). Screening of full texts was subsequently conducted on included studies, and reasons for exclusion were documented (e.g., non-empirical, non-family contexts, lack of disaggregated gender analysis). Data were extracted from each study included using a standardized coding system to capture study design, participant demographics, country, theoretical orientation, measures utilized, and main findings in terms of gendered socialization. Robust methods were maintained through compliance with PRISMA guidance for systematic reviews, including thorough documentation of search strings, screening flow, and inclusion/exclusion criteria. Dual-reviewer screening and data extraction minimized selection bias and maximized inter-rater reliability, with dissents resolved by consensus or third-party arbitration. Extraction forms were piloted and finalized before full-scale application to code consistently. A final check of the extracted data was made to ensure accuracy before synthesis.

Discussion

The present study investigated how typical everyday home socialization practices work to establish male privilege as the norm. On the foundation of systematic thematic synthesis of recent studies of child-rearing, the development of emotions, and peer relationships, results reveal the following pattern consistently: male privilege is not explicitly taught but subtly embedded, re-enacted, reinforced, and rewarded in the contexts of early life (Braun & Clarke, 2006). This has significant implications for understanding the micro-foundations of patriarchy, especially how entitlement, dominance, and exemption are internalized into gender identity during early life (Bourdieu, 1990). Within the family, gender socialization is found to be a politicizing process instead of a domestic or apolitical process. The home becomes an arena of ideological education, where dominance is practiced in the form of everyday practices. In drawing on previous thinking (Thorne, 1993; Ridgeway, 2011) and building further on more recent research (Craig & Brown, 2022; Moosa & Bhana, 2023), differences in discipline, gender divisions of household work, and differential emotional demands constitute a minimalist curriculum in patriarchy. To illustrate, boys are assigned decision-making or leadership-type tasks, and girls are assigned affective labor habits that prefigure public gendered adult positions of leadership and domestic self-sacrifice (Madfis & Hlavka, 2023; Hochschild & Machung, 2012). Such micro-practices naturalize a cosmology in which masculinity is wedded to autonomy and reward, and femininity to submission and erasure.

Emotional socialization also became an incredibly effective vehicle through which gendered power is reproduced. Though boys' suppression of emotional vulnerability and girls' enhancement of emotional caretaking have long been established (Maltz & Borker, 1982; hooks, 2004), recent analysis places more emphasis on their political and systemic role (Chung & Robnett, 2020; Leavitt et al., 2023). The affective hierarchy, which is thus created, provides boys with social license to externalize frustration or anger and socializes girls to internalize and manage the emotional spill-over of others. It is not just differentiated emotional competence; it creates enduring power dynamics in which men have fewer opportunities to build emotional responsibility, and women take on disproportionate relational labor in personal as well as working settings. Peer cultures operate less as independent domains of child-directed interaction and more as frameworks for the extension of the domestic sphere's gender ideals. Recent ethnographic and observational research (Kenway et al., 2022; Rahimi & Hatami, 2024) demonstrates how children mimic adult gender ideologies in peer settings via behaviors such as gender policing, exclusion, and status play. Boys who draw upon dominant masculine forms are rewarded with social power, and girls who assert themselves are punished, affirming Connell's (2005) theory of the "gender order" of children. This indicates a core argument: socialization is additive, not disjointed. Patterns of reinforcement throughout home life, emotional growth, and peer group life affirm a schema upon which boys learn to expect power, and girls, to

expect deference. A critique of the literature illustrates ongoing gaps that impede an integrated understanding of how male privilege is socially constructed. The predominance of consideration of disconnected domains, discipline, play, and household work conceals the interactive character of gender socialization. Privilege is not the result of a discrete, isolated process, but an interlinked system of reinforcements. Furthermore, the dominance of Westernized study samples continues to skew generalizations about gender development (Henrich et al., 2010; Singh et al., 2023). Notable exceptions, such as (Davies, 2021) longitudinal work in South Africa and (Al-Fadhli, 2023) ethnographic study in Kuwait, demonstrate how colonial histories and racialized class structures intersect with gender socialization. Yet these remain outliers rather than the norm. In addition, the lack of longitudinal study designs further constrains our ability to evaluate causality. Even studies such as Kung et al. (2018) and Bian et al. (2022) generate strong descriptions of early bias formation but are still lacking in descriptions of how these early patterns play out in adult expectations about authority, entitlement, or exemption. More longitudinal empirical research is needed to follow through on how child micro-practices add up to adult macro-structures of gender inequality across the life course.

Conclusion and Recommendations

This research illustrates that masculine privilege is an all-pervasive quality of daily domestic habits. Disciplinary practices, domestic labor, affective labor, and peer culture each transmit gendered scripts that reinforce patriarchal values. These practices, even though generally subtle, are systematic in effect, creating internalized schemas that associate masculinity with dominance and femininity with subordination. Through the incorporation of ideas from several fields of study and filling gaps in methodology and representation, the research contributes to knowledge about how male privilege is developed in early childhood. Gender Schema Theory contributes to the understanding of why early experience is internalized as blueprints for gender and power.

Shattering the replication of patriarch privilege necessitates interventions in its earliest development at home, school, peer group, and mass media. Structural, educational, and cultural change must be sequenced in order to replace inherited hierarchies with equity, accountability, and collective responsibility. Most crucial, creating more equitable societies necessitates not merely challenging the way we socialize girls and boys, but also the way we socialize power.

The evidence presented here suggests that domestic socialization is not a value-free process; it is a powerful cultural mechanism for instituting and reproducing inequality. Redressing it requires reframing parenting norms, school curricula, and public discourse to problematize male leadership as natural. Interventions such as gender-neutral task delegation between families, equitable classroom participation practices, and media literacy education can break the taken-for-granted association of

masculinity and leadership. As crucial is the action of engaging boys in early critical analysis of privilege. Science confirms that when boys are taught to identify and resist unequal norms prior to reaching adolescence, they will also be egalitarian-minded men. Similarly, to empower girls to resist subordination is to affirm their power, improve decision-making, and the everyday normalization of their presence in leadership arenas. Lastly, ending patriarchal replication is a family matter. Parents, teachers, policy-makers, and media-makers need to insert themselves as active agents in re-making the social architecture of gender. Moreover, by re-making the micro-practices of everyday life, societies can dismantle the subtle but inexorable machinery that brings boys into patriarchs and instead bring all children into equal partners in the human project.

Lastly, eliminating male privilege is not about demonizing masculinity so much as about redefining it in a way that is in agreement with justice and respect for each other. That involves genuine grappling with the way in which power is inscribed, legitimated, and reaffirmed as a child. Through making equity the default in our homes, classrooms, and cultural stories, we establish a place where power is not a birthright of one gender, but a shared responsibility. The transformation can be made, but only if we are willing to raise not patriarchs or matriarchs, but citizens of equal value.

Based on above Mentioned Findings, the Following Multi-Level Recommendations are Offered:

Recast Research Models and Designs

Enlist longitudinal and multi-domain study designs to follow gendered behavior across developmental phases and cutting across settings like home, school, and peer culture. Broaden research cultural scope to disestablish the Western monopoly of accounts, recognizing the way localized histories, racial orders, and socio-economic arrangements organize gender socialization. Employ intersectional theories to consider how gender crosses over with race, class, ethnicity, and ability in building socialization processes (Crenshaw, 1989).

Gender-Responsive Education and Parenting

Redirection of education and parenting to counter early conditioning of male privilege with the introduction of emotional literacy for boys early in life, instilling responsibility, empathy, and vulnerability. Elimination of school and home gendered chore models, unlinking boys from leadership and emotional labor, and linking girls. Offer training to teachers, parents, and carers in identifying and confronting unconscious gender stereotypes, using day-to-day interaction as the point of departure for critical analysis and building equity (Lawson, 2022).

Institutional and Policy Reform

Launch structural school reform to confront the day-to-day practice of gender inequalities. Undertake regular gender equity audits to expose 'hidden' bias within classroom interaction, discipline, and attainment expectations. Incorporate gender consciousness and critical pedagogy into young children's curricula so that children can label and resist gender norms prior to internalization.

Cultural and Media Interventions

Promote children's media with diverse and non-stereotypical masculinities, where care, collaboration, and emotional expression are positively endorsed as well as strengths. Enact public campaigns to expose how everyday domestic practices and emotional expectations build enduring gender imbalances, rendering the unremarked norm a site of critique and transformation (Berkowitz, 1984).

References

Al-Fadhli, A. (2023). Raising boys in Kuwait: Gendered aspirations, emotional labor, and the politics of parenting. *Middle East Journal of Culture and Communication, 16*(2), 145–163.

Alink, L. R., Mesman, J., van Zeijl, J., Stolk, M. N., Juffer, F., Koot, H. M., & van IJzendoorn, M. H. (2006). The early childhood aggression curve: Development of physical aggression in 10- to 50-month-old children. *Child Development, 77*(4), 954–966. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8624.2006.00912.x

Bem, S. L. (1981). Gender schema theory: A cognitive account of sex typing. *Psychological Review, 88*(4), 354–364. https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-295X.88.4.354

Berkowitz, L. (1984). Some effects of thoughts on anti- and prosocial influences of media events: A cognitive-neoassociation analysis. *Psychological Bulletin, 95*(3), 410–427. https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.95.3.410

Bian, L., Leslie, S.-J., & Cimpian, A. (2017). Gender stereotypes about intellectual ability emerge early and influence children's interests. *Science, 355*(6323), 389–391. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aah6524

Bigler, R. S., & Leaper, C. (2024). Gender. In M. E. Lamb & R. M. Lerner (Eds.), *Handbook of child psychology and developmental science* (8th ed.). Wiley. (Provides a contemporary overview of gender development, including schema theories and socialization processes).

Bigler, R. S., Hayes, A. R., & Liben, L. S. (2014). Analysis and evaluation of the rationales for single-sex schooling. In L. S. Liben & R. S. Bigler (Eds.), *Advances in child development and behavior, Vol. 47. The role of gender in educational contexts and outcomes* (pp. 226–260). Elsevier Academic Press. https://doi.org/10.1016/bs.acdb.2014.05.002

Blair, S. L. (1992). Children's participation in household labor: Child socialization versus the need for household labor. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 21*(6), 565–579.

Bourdieu, P. (1990). *The logic of practice* (R. Nice, Trans.). Stanford University Press.

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology, 3*(2), 77–101. https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa

Chaplin, T. M. (2015). Gender and emotion expression: A developmental contextual perspective. *Emotion Review, 7*(1), 14–21. https://doi.org/10.1177/1754073914544408

Chaplin, T. M., & Aldao, A. (2013). Gender differences in emotion expression in children: A meta-analytic review. *Psychological Bulletin, 139*(4), 735–765. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0030737

Chung, J., & Robnett, R. D. (2020). Gender socialization of emotional competence: A meta-analytic review. *Sex Roles, 83*(7–8), 489–511.

Connell, R. W. (2005). Masculinities (2nd ed.). University of California Press.

Côté, S. M. (2007). Sex differences in physical and indirect aggression: A developmental perspective. *European Journal on Criminal Policy and Research, 13*(3), 183–200. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10610-007-9046-3

Craig, L., & Brown, J. E. (2022). Chore divisions and gender ideologies in households with children: A longitudinal perspective. *Journal of Family Issues, 43*(5), 1151–1175.

Crenshaw, K. (1989). Demarginalizing the intersection of race and sex: A Black feminist critique of antidiscrimination doctrine, feminist theory, and antiracist politics. *University of Chicago Legal Forum, 1989*(1), 139–167. https://chicagounbound.uchicago.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1052&context=uclf

Cunningham, M. (2007). Influences of women's employment on the gendered division of household labor over the life course: Evidence from a 31-year panel study. *Journal of Family Issues, 28*(3), 422–444. https://doi.org/10.1177/0192513X06295198

Davies, R. (2021). Racialized masculinities and household hierarchies: Childhood socialization in post-apartheid South Africa. *Journal of Southern African Studies, 47*(1), 67–84.

Davies, S., Mkhize, N., & Modise, T. (2016). Gendered household labor in post-apartheid South Africa: A qualitative study. *Journal of Family Studies, 22*(4), 456–470.

Eagly, A., & Wood, W. (2017). Gender identity: Nature and nurture working together. *Evolutionary Studies in Imaginative Culture, 1*(1), 59–62. (Discusses the interaction of biological and social factors in gender, including the internalization of roles).

Endendijk, J. J. (2018). The Gendered Family Process Model: An integrative framework of gender in the family. *Archives of Sexual Behavior, 47*(4), 877–904. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10508-018-1185-8

Endendijk, J. J. (2023). The gendered family process model: How gender stereotypes and bias shape the development of family relationships and child outcomes. *Current Directions in Psychological Science, 32*(3), 221–227.

Evertsson, M. (2006). The reproduction of gender: Housework and attitudes towards gender equality in the home among Swedish boys and girls. *The British Journal of Sociology, 57*(3), 415–437. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-4446.2006.00118.x

Farré, L., & Vella, F. (2013). The intergenerational transmission of gender role attitudes and its implications for female labour force participation. *Economica, 80*(318), 219–247.

Fisher-Thompson, D. (1993). Adult toy purchases for children: Factors affecting sex-typed toy selection. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology, 14*(3), 385–406. https://doi.org/10.1016/0193-3973(93)90016-O

Fivush, R., Brotman, M. A., Buckner, J. P., & Goodman, S. H. (2000). Gender differences in parent-child emotion narratives. *Sex Roles, 42*(3-4), 233–253. https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1007091207068

Golombok, S., Rust, J., Zervoulis, K., Croudace, T., Golding, J., & Hines, M. (2008). Developmental trajectories of sex-typed behavior in boys and girls: A longitudinal general population study of children aged 2.5–8 years. *Child Development, 79*(5), 1583–1593. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8624.2008.01207.x

Goodnow, J. J., & Lawrence, J. A. (2002). Work contributions to the family: Developing a conceptual and research framework. *New Directions for Child and Adolescent Development, 2002*(97), 5–22. https://doi.org/10.1002/cd.28

Haaland, J. J., & Baklien, B. (2024). Friluftsliv in residential youth care: A resilience perspective on character-forming outdoor experiences. *Journal of Adventure Education and Outdoor Learning,* 1–19.

Haaland, V. F., Rege, M., Telle, K., & Votruba, M. (2018). *The intergenerational transfer of the gender gap in labor force participation* (Discussion Paper No. 767). Statistics Norway, Research Department. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.labeco.2018.04.004

Henrich, J., Heine, S. J., & Norenzayan, A. (2010). The weirdest people in the world? *Behavioral and Brain Sciences, 33*(2–3), 61–135. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0140525X0999152X

Hochschild, A. R., & Machung, A. (2012). *The second shift: working families and the revolution at home*. Penguin Books.

Hooks, B. (2004). *The will to change: men, masculinity, and love* (First Washington Square Press trade paperback edition). Washington Square Press.

Hyde, J. S., Bigler, R. S., Joel, D., Tate, C. C., & van Anders, S. M. (2019). The future of sex and gender in psychology: Five challenges to the gender binary. *American Psychologist, 74*(2), 171–193. https://doi.org/10.1037/amp0000307

Kane, E. W. (2012). *The gender trap: Parents and the pitfalls of raising boys and girls*. New York University Press.

Keenan, K., & Shaw, D. (1997). Developmental and social influences on young girls' early problem behavior. *Psychological Bulletin, 121*(1), 95–113. https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.121.1.95

Kenway, J., Fahey, J., & Koh, A. (2022). Boys, play, and power: Schooling hegemonic masculinity in childhood. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education, 43*(1), 32–46.

Kung, F. Y. H., Chao, M. M., & Lin, M. L. (2021). Early experiences with gendered expectations and their effect on leadership aspirations in adolescence. *Developmental Psychology, 57*(4), 598–610.

Kung, K. T. F., Li, G., Golding, J., & Hines, M. (2018). Preschool gender-typed play behavior at age 3.5 years predicts physical aggression at age 13 years. *Archives of Sexual Behavior, 47*(4), 905–914. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10508-017-1005-6

Kung, L., Ramirez, T., & Chopra, D. (2021). From boys to men: Tracing entitlement across a decade of adolescent development. *Developmental Psychology, 57*(5), 713–728.

Lawson, D. W. (2022). Investigates the longitudinal impact of gendered chore allocation on adolescent development and future role expectations, reinforcing findings on schema internalization (pp. 713–728).

Leaper, C., & Farkas, T. (2015). The socialization of gender during childhood and adolescence. In J. E. Grusec & P. D. Hastings (Eds.), *Handbook of socialization: Theory and research* (2nd ed., pp. 541–565). Guilford Press.

Leavitt, K., Caruso, H., & Tyler, J. (2023). Emotional outsourcing and gendered expectations at work: Who absorbs emotional labor, and who avoids it? *Academy of Management Journal, 66*(1), 1–25.

Liben, L. S. (2024). Gender development: A cognitive approach. In M. L. Mathews (Ed.), *Handbook of the psychology of women: Volume 1* (pp. 187–207). American Psychological Association. (Details contemporary cognitive perspectives, including schema theory, on gender development).

Liben, L. S., & Bigler, R. S. (2002). The developmental course of gender differentiation: Conceptualizing, measuring, and evaluating constructs and pathways. *Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development, 67*(2), i–viii, 1–147.

Maccoby, E. E. (1998). The two sexes: Grow-wing up apart, coming together. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Madfis, E., & Hlavka, H. (2023). Gendered violence and emotional desensitization in adolescent boys: The silent curriculum of dominance. *Youth & Society, 55*(1), 43–69.

Maltz, D. N., & Borker, R. A. (1982). *A cultural approach to male–female miscommunication*. Stanford University. https://web.stanford.edu/~eckert/PDF/maltzborker1982.pdf

Mani, S., & Antony Raj, M. (2023). Role of families in normalizing gender inequalities. *Education and Society, 47*(1), 199–206.

Martin, C. L., & Fabes, R. A. (2001). The stability and consequences of young children's same-sex peer interactions. *Developmental Psychology, 37*(3), 431–446. https://doi.org/10.1037/0012-1649.37.3.431

Martin, K. A. (2003). Giving birth like a girl. *Gender & Society, 17*(1), 54–72.

McHale, S. M., Crouter, A. C., & Tucker, C. J. (1999). Family context and gender role socialization in middle childhood: Comparing girls to boys and sisters to brothers. *Child Development, 70*(4), 990–1004. https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-8624.00072

Midgette, A. J., Ma, D., Stowe, L. M., & Chernyak, N. (2023). *US and Chinese preschoolers normalize household labor inequality*. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America, 120*(38), e2301781120. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.2301781120

Miller, T. (2020). Paternity leave and fathers' involvement in infant care: Evidence from the UK Millennium Cohort Study. *Journal of Social Policy*, 49(2), 313–333.

Moosa, S., & Bhana, D. (2023). Men who teach early childhood education: Mediating masculinity, authority and sexuality. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 122*, 103959. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2022.103959

Offer, S., & Schneider, B. (2011). Revisiting the gender gap in time-use patterns: Multitasking and well-being among mothers and fathers in dual-earner families. *American Sociological Review, 76*(6), 809–833. https://doi.org/10.1177/0003122411425170

Patterson, G. R., Reid, J. B., & Dishion, T. J. (1992). *Antisocial boys: A social interactional approach*. HarperCollins.

Pellegrini, A. D., & Long, J. D. (2003). A sexual selection theory longitudinal analysis of sexual segregation and integration in early adolescence. *Journal of Experimental Child Psychology, 85*(3), 257–278. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0022-0965(03)00060-2

Perry, D. G., et al. (2022). Gender identity and adjustment: The roles of felt pressure and gender typicality. Developmental Psychology, 58(12), 2295–2309. (Explores how pressure to conform and internalized schemas impact adjustment).

Qian, M., Wong, I. W., Nabbijohn, N., Vanderlaan, D. P., et al. (2023). Children's implicit gender–toy association development varies across cultures. *Developmental Psychology, 59*(12), Article 1590. https://doi.org/10.1037/dev0001590

Rahimi, M., & Hatami, Z. (2024). Childhood friendships and the reproduction of gender norms in Iranian schools. *Gender and Education, 36*(1), 29–45.

Raley, S. (2012). Domestic leisure: Gender, time, and the distribution of housework and child care. *Journal of Family Issues, 33*(8), 1064–1089.

Ridgeway, C. L. (2011). *Framed by gender: How gender inequality persists in the modern world.* Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199755776.001.0001

Ridgeway, C. L. (2019). *Status: Why is it everywhere? Why does it matter?* Russell Sage Foundation. https://doi.org/10.7758/9781610448895 (Explains how status beliefs (like gender stereotypes) are embedded and transmitted through interaction, reinforcing schemas and associated privileges).

Robinson, J. (2021). *Housework: Socialization influences on individual performance, couple division of labor and mental health* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Nebraska–Lincoln). ProQuest Dissertations Publishing.

Rogoff, B. (2003). *The cultural nature of human development*. Oxford University Press.

Singh, M., Chang, L., & Peneva, E. (2023). Beyond WEIRD: The need for global perspectives in gender development research. *Annual Review of Psychology, 74*, 457–481.

Snyder, H. (2019). Literature review as a research methodology: An overview and guidelines. *Journal of Business Research, 104,* 333–339. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2019.07.039

Thorne, B. (1993). *Gender play: Girls and boys in school*. Rutgers University Press. (Seminal, still highly relevant)

Tremblay, R. E. (2010). Developmental origins of disruptive behaviour problems: The 'original sin' hypothesis, epigenetics and their consequences for prevention. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry, 51*(4), 341–367. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1469-7610.2010.02211.x

van der Mark, I. L., Bakermans-Kranenburg, M. J., & van I. Jzendoorn, M. H. (2016). The role of fathers' sensitivity and gender role attitudes in the development of children's aggression. *Journal of Experimental Child Psychology, 141*, 159–172.

Van der Mark, L., Zwart, R., & de Jong, P. (2016). Parenting discipline and gender socialization in European households. *European Journal of Psychology of Education, 31*(3), 285–301.

Way, N. (2013). *Deep secrets: Boys' friendships and the crisis of connection*. Harvard University Press.

Weisner, T. S. (2002). Ecocultural understanding of children's developmental pathways. *Human Development, 45*(4), 275–281. https://doi.org/10.1159/000064989

Witt, S. D. (1997). Parental influence on children's socialization to gender roles. *Adolescence*, 32(126), 253–259.

Witt, S. D. (2000). Review of research: The influence of television on children's gender role socialization. *Childhood Education, 76*(5), 322–324. https://doi.org/10.1080/00094056.2000.10522124

Dipela Mmaphuti Percy is a Senior Lecturer, Department of Social Work, University of South Africa.