

Running head: CONTENT ANALYSIS

Content Analysis of the *Psychology of Men and Masculinity* (2000 to 2008)

Y. Joel Wong, Ph.D.

Jesse A. Steinfeldt, Ph.D.

Quentin L. Speight, M. A.

Sarah J. Hickman, M. A.

Indiana University Bloomington

**Manuscript Accepted for Publication in**  
***Psychology of Men & Masculinity***

## Abstract

In 2010, the *Psychology of Men and Masculinity* (PMM) celebrates the 10<sup>th</sup> anniversary of its inception as the official journal of the Society for the Psychological Study of Men and Masculinity. This article commemorates this significant milestone by examining the journal's current trends and future directions through a content analysis of 154 articles published in PMM from 2000 to 2008. The authors found that PMM scholarship was dominated by theories associated with the gender role strain paradigm, addressed clinically-related topics, relied largely on White male college samples, and had a growing impact on clinically-focused scholarly journals and books. Recommendations for addressing theoretical orientations, topics, and populations underrepresented in PMM scholarship are provided.

Content Analysis of the *Psychology of Men and Masculinity* (2000 to 2008)

In 2010, the *Psychology of Men and Masculinity* (PMM) celebrates the 10<sup>th</sup> anniversary of its inception as the official journal of the Society for the Psychological Study of Men and Masculinity (SPSMM). Founded in 2000 and published by the American Psychological Association, PMM's mission is to disseminate "research, theory, and clinical scholarship that advances the psychology of men and masculinity" (Levant, 2009, p. 1). Although several masculinity and gender-focused journals routinely publish articles on men and masculinity (e.g., *Journal of Men's Studies*, *Men and Masculinities*, and *Sex Roles*), PMM is the only journal to focus *exclusively* on the *psychological* study of men and masculinity. Accordingly, PMM may be an important scholarly prism to assess the state of psychological research on men and masculinity. PMM's 10<sup>th</sup> anniversary provides an opportune occasion to examine the journal's current trends and future directions. The purpose of this study, therefore, was to conduct a content analysis of articles published in PMM from its inception in 2000 to 2008.

Although several literature reviews of men and masculinity psychological research have been conducted (e.g., Betz & Fitzgerald, 1993; Nutt & Brooks, 2008; Smiler, 2004; Whorley & Addis, 2006), to date, only one such review employed a content analysis strategy. Whorley and Addis systematically categorized and reviewed the dominant methodological trends in 178 men and masculinity articles published between 1995 and 2004 in selected U.S. psychology journals. By adopting an explicit methodology for quantifying key aspects of a literature review (e.g., the percentage of research articles that relied on female participants), a content analysis reduces the likelihood that the review of articles reflects the authors' biases.

A content analysis of articles provides PMM's stakeholders -- the editorial board, authors, and readers -- an opportunity to engage in self-reflection. Articles published in a journal offer potential insights into the interests and biases of its authors and editorial board (Buboltz, Miller, & Williams, 1999). A content analysis also provides an overview of what is popular and underrepresented in a journal. In the context of PMM, the current and past editors have each provided recommendations on future PMM scholarship. These recommendations include the need for diverse theoretical perspectives on masculinity (Lisak, 2000), diverse samples (Cochran, 2004), and for men and masculinity researchers to influence a broad range of psychological disciplines (Levant, 2009). Accordingly, a content analysis presents an opportunity to evaluate the extent to which these recommendations have been incorporated.

#### *Goals of the Current Study*

In contrast to Whorley and Addis's (2006) review of methodological trends in men and masculinity research published in a variety of journals, our focus was largely on the *content* of articles published in PMM. Guided by previous content analysis studies on specific journals (e.g., Buboltz et al., 1999; Flores et al., 1999; Southern, 2006), we aimed to achieve the following goals. First, we sought to examine the major gender theoretical orientations on which PMM articles were based. In the first PMM issue in 2000, PMM's founding editor David Lisak expressed his hope that the journal would not be dominated by articles with specific ideological perspectives. In particular, Lisak (p. 3) called for a "healthy debate between those who emphasize 'biological essentialism' and those who emphasize 'social construction.'" The categorization and quantification of

articles according to theoretical orientations allowed us to examine the extent to which diverse theoretical perspectives were represented in PMM scholarship.

Second, we sought to categorize and quantify PMM articles according to a broad range of topics (e.g., violence, emotionality, and sexual behavior) identified in previous reviews of men and masculinity psychological research (e.g., Betz & Fitzgerald, 1993; Good, Sherrod, & Dillon, 2000; Nutt & Brooks, 2008) and in PMM's mission statement (Levant, 2009). For example, Betz and Fitzgerald (p. 11) identified men's violence as "one of the most problematic aspect of the male role" and an understudied topic deserving more research attention. Hence, the examination of topics in PMM articles enabled us to identify the proportion of articles that addressed men's violence as well as other topics relevant to the psychology of men and masculinity.

Third, several scholars have called for more men and masculinity research using diverse samples (Cochran, 2004; Good, Wallace, & Borst, 1994; Whorley & Addis, 2006). There is growing recognition among scholars that masculinity exists in multiple forms, e.g., gay masculinity and African American masculinity (Liu, 2005; Wong & Rochlen, 2008). These scholars emphasize the contextual nature of masculinity and the need to study differences in the way diverse groups experience masculinity. For example, Whorley and Addis (2006) have called for future studies to examine the extent to which sexual minorities are included in men and masculinity research. There is also research evidence indicating that the correlates of masculinity-related constructs are different for diverse groups of men (Good et al., 1994). Hence, studying diverse groups is critical to understanding the varied ways in which masculinity is related to other constructs. Consequently, we sought to examine the extent to which diversity was a focus of PMM

research by analyzing the proportion of PMM research articles involving participants from diverse backgrounds. We focused on categories of sex, age, college versus non-college samples, race/ethnicity/nationality, and sexual orientation due to previous calls for more research on women, boys, older adults, non-college individuals, people of color, and sexual minorities (Good et al., 1994; Smiler, 2004; Whorley & Mahalik, 2006).

Fourth, we attempted to examine the scholarly impact of PMM articles. Several scholars (Levant, 2009; Smiler, 2004) have expressed concern that men and masculinity researchers have not been influencing mainstream psychology. Hence, an analysis of the types of scholarly outlets that cite PMM articles may help answer questions about the extent to which PMM has appeal across a broad range of disciplines. Specifically, we identified the top 10 most frequently cited PMM articles and analyzed the types of scholarly journals and books (e.g., counseling/clinical, men and masculinity, personality and social psychology, etc.) that cited these articles.

Fifth, we sought to identify the top 10 most productive scholars who have published in PMM. Scholars who publish frequently in a journal play a role in shaping the direction and priorities of the journal and its discipline (Buboltz et al., 1999). Hence, an analysis of PMM's most productive scholars may provide insight into the individuals who are influencing PMM scholarship and the psychology of men and masculinity.

### Method

The population of interest in our content analysis consisted of articles published in PMM from 2000 to 2008. We included quantitative and qualitative research articles as well as theoretical articles, but excluded three editorials by PMM editors from our analyses. Our final list of articles was comprised of 154 articles published in PMM.

A coding manual was created by the first and second author, both of whom are faculty members of a university counseling psychology program. The first author is an Asian American, heterosexual male, and the second author is a multiracial (European American/Native American), heterosexual male. The coding manual included instructions for coding PMM articles according to these categories: (a) gender theoretical orientations, (b) topics, and (c) demographics as well as instructions for categorizing scholarly journals and books that cited the top 10 PMM articles. First, a list of mutually-exclusive gender theoretical orientations was created based on an examination of previous reviews of gender theoretical orientations (Addis & Cohane, 2005; Addis & Mahalik, 2003; Good et al, 1994; Levant, 1996; Smiler, 2004; Wong & Rochlen, 2008). A description of these theoretical orientations is provided in Table 1. The theoretical orientations were:

- Gender role strain paradigm (generic);
- Gender role conflict theory;
- Masculine gender role stress theory;
- Masculinity ideology theories
- Conformity to masculine norms model;
- Masculinities perspectives;
- Gender traits theories;
- Male reference group identity dependence theory;
- Positive psychological perspectives
- Biological and evolutionary theories;
- Psychodynamic theories;
- Objectification perspectives; and

- Other.

Second, the coders categorized the topics addressed by PMM articles based on a list provided in the coding manual (see Table 2). The creation of this list was based on an examination of previous reviews of topics relevant to masculinity (Betz & Fitzgerald, 1993; R. Gilbert & P. Gilbert, 1998; Good et al., 1994; Liu, 2005; Maples & Robertson, 2001; Messner, 1992; Nutt & Brooks, 2008; Wong & Rochlen, 2005). The coding manual allowed for the possibility that an article might include several theoretical orientations and topics.

Third, PMM research articles that reported the use of human subjects were coded based on whether their research questions included any of the following clusters of demographic categories: (a) sex (b) age, (c) type of sample (college versus non-college); (d) race/ethnicity/nationality; and (e) sexual orientation (see Table 3). If these demographic categories were not part of the research questions, the article was then coded on the basis of the demographics of the majority of its participants. For instance, if an article indicated that 30% of the participants were African Americans and 70% were White Americans, but did not include any research questions involving race/ethnicity-related variables, it was coded under the White American category only and not the African American category. This coding procedure was utilized because our interest was in the extent to which diversity was a *focus* of PMM research studies. The coding procedure also allowed for research articles to be classified in multiple categories. For example, a study that compared differences in the endorsement of masculinity ideology among African Americans, European Americans and Hispanics (Levant et al., 2003) was coded under the White American, African American and Latino/Latina categories.



Fourth, to assess the scholarly impact of PMM, we first computed the top 10 most frequently cited PMM articles using a strategy similar to that used by Flores and colleagues (1999) in their review of Major Contribution articles in *The Counseling Psychologist*. To identify the top 10 most frequently cited PMM articles, we used the online database *PsycInfo* on December 1, 2008 to identify the number of times PMM articles had been cited by scholarly journals and books. Book reviews and unpublished dissertations were not included in this computation. A list of the top 10 PMM articles is provided in Appendix A (an online supplement to this article; <http://dx.doi.org/...>). The top 10 PMM articles had been cited 372 times by scholarly journals and books. We then classified the types of scholarly books and journals that cited these top 10 PMM articles based on the categories listed in Table 4. These categories of scholarly outlets were not mutually exclusive. For example, the *International Journal of Men's Health* was classified under the Men and Masculinity category as well as the Health/Medicine category.

Fifth, to calculate the scholarly productivity of individual authors who published in PMM, we adopted a formula that used a weighted and proportional system of counting (Howard, Cole, & Maxwell, 1987). This formula is commonly used in social science studies that compute the scholarly productivity of individual authors (e.g., Buboltz et al., 1999; Worthington, Soth-McNett, & Moreno, 2007). The formula assigned individual credit based on the total number of authors and authorship position. In establishing this credit, each individual article received 1.0 point. Authors were assigned credit based on their authorship position. Thus, the author of a single-authored article received 1.0 point, an article with two authors provided the first author with 0.6 points and the second author

with 0.4 points. A three-person authored article provided the first author with 0.47 points, the second author with 0.32 points, and the third author with 0.21 points, and so on.

Two coders (an African American, heterosexual male student in a doctoral program in counseling psychology and a White American, heterosexual female student in a master's program in counseling) were trained by the first and second authors on how to use the coding manual. The two coders then independently coded the articles. The coders also met with the first and second authors on a weekly basis to discuss questions about how to apply the coding manual. Minor revisions were made to the coding manual based on feedback from the coders. Both coders then used the revised coding manual to recode previously coded articles. The inter-rater reliabilities for the coding categories were as follows: (a) theoretical orientations: 95.3%; (b) topics: 95.7%; (c) demographics: 96.1%, and (d) scholarly journals/books: 90.3%. The coders met with each other on five occasions to discuss their respective codes. Discrepancies in the codes were discussed and resolved by consensus between both coders.

### Results

As indicated in Table 1, the three most frequently utilized gender theoretical orientations in PMM articles in descending order were (a) gender role conflict theory (29%), (b) masculinity ideology theories (21%), and (c) psychodynamic theories (14%). Although none of the theoretical orientations constituted a majority of PMM articles, the following orientations: gender role conflict theory (O'Neil, 2008), masculine gender role stress theory (Eisler, 1995), and masculinity ideology theories (e.g., Levant et al., 2007) draw their theoretical underpinnings from the gender role strain paradigm (Pleck, 1995). Consequently, we calculated the number and percentage of unique PMM articles that

could be classified under the cluster of theories associated with the gender role strain paradigm -- these included articles coded under the categories of gender role conflict theory, masculine gender role stress theory, masculinity ideology theories, and gender role strain paradigm (generic). Fifty-three percent ( $n = 82$ ) of PMM articles were found to be based on the gender role strain paradigm or one of its associated theories.

As seen in Table 2, the top three most frequently addressed topics in PMM articles were mental health (mental illnesses, stress, well-being, and self-esteem; 29%), relationships (marriage, relationships, friendship, and interpersonal issues; 26%), and violence (violence, abuse, aggression, and sexual harassment; 25%).

To investigate the extent to which diversity was a focus of PMM research, we analyzed the proportion of PMM research articles involving participants from diverse backgrounds. Among PMM articles, 89% ( $n = 137$ ) involved human subjects. As indicated in Table 3, the majority of such articles focused on White American (60%) males (99%) college students (61%) between the ages of 18 and 54 years (86%). It should be noted that the proportion of research articles that focused on White American participants is likely higher because 17% of the articles did not report the race/ethnicity of their participants. Only 18% of research articles focused on female participants. Participants below the age of 18 (7%) as well as 55 years and above (4%) were underrepresented. The range of articles that focused on specific groups of racial/ethnic minority participants varied from 0% (Native American) to 8% (African American). Twelve percent of articles focused on participants recruited from outside the United States. Almost 7 in 10 articles (69%) did not report participants' sexual orientation.

Slightly more than a quarter (28%) focused on heterosexual participants, whereas 7% focused on sexual minorities (i.e., gay, lesbian, and bisexual participants).

As shown in Table 4, the top three categories of scholarly journals and books that cited the top 10 PMM articles were (a) men and masculinity (22%); (b) body image (17%); and (c) counseling/clinical (16%). We also conducted further analyses on the impact of PMM articles on gender-related scholarly journals and books. Seventeen percent of citations from the top 10 PMM articles ( $n = 63$ ) were found in PMM itself. In addition, we summed the total number of citations from three gender-related categories of journals and books that were mutually exclusive: (a) men and masculinity; (b) women; and (c) gender (generic) – gender-related books and journals that do not focus on a specific gender (e.g., *Sex Roles*). Thirty-four percent ( $n = 127$ ) of citations were found in this cluster of gender-related journals and books.

The analysis of individual scholarly productivity produced a total of 311 authors who made contributions to PMM between 2000 and 2008. Although our original intention was to identify the top 10 scholars, our final list included 11 scholars because there was a tie for 9<sup>th</sup> position among three authors (see Table 5). Overall, the top 11 authors' articles accounted for 37% of the total number of articles between 2000 and 2008. Among the top 11 scholars, 10 are male and only 1 (Denise A. Hines) is female. Based on the authors' self-report of their racial backgrounds, 9 of the 11 scholars are White Americans. As of August 1, 2009, 10 of the 11 scholars were faculty members affiliated with either counseling or clinical psychology programs in U.S. universities.

## Discussion

PMM's 10<sup>th</sup> anniversary as SPSMM's official journal provides an opportune occasion to examine the journal's current trends and future directions through a content analysis of 154 articles published from 2000 to 2008. Our first goal was to assess the major gender theoretical orientations on which PMM articles were based. We found that the majority of PMM articles were based on theories associated with the gender role strain paradigm, a perspective that emphasizes social influences on masculine gender roles and the negative consequences of conforming to and violating these gender roles (Pleck, 1995). In addition, we found that gender role conflict theory (O'Neil, 2008) was the most frequently used gender theoretical orientation in PMM. This result dovetails with Whorley and Addis's (2006) finding that the Gender Role Conflict Scale (O'Neil, Helms, Gable, David, & Wrightsman, 1986) was the most frequently used masculinity measure in men and masculinity psychological research from 1995 to 2004. In contrast to theories associated with the gender role strain paradigm, four orientations were underrepresented in PMM scholarship: biological and evolutionary theories, gender traits theories, male reference group identity dependence theory, and positive psychological perspectives. Collectively, these findings suggest that PMM scholarship has not yet achieved PMM's founding editor David Lisak's (2000) vision of a journal with diverse theoretical perspectives on masculinity.

The question of whether PMM scholarship ought to be more diverse in terms of gender theoretical orientations is somewhat complex and mirrors a broader debate among members of SPSMM about how best to conceptualize masculinity (see Levant, 2009). On the one hand, it can be argued that the dominance of the gender role strain paradigm is appropriate because it is consistent with the SPSMM's pro-feminist values and mission to

study how restrictive gender roles limit men's lives (Rabinowitz, n.d.). On the other hand, PMM's mission statement explicitly states that the psychology of men and masculinity is broadly defined and "encompasses both the study of *biological sex* differences and similarities as well as the social construction of gender" (emphasis added; Editorial Statement, 2000). Consequently, it can be argued that PMM scholarship ought to reflect diverse gender theoretical orientations, including biological and evolutionary theories.

Our second goal was to categorize PMM scholarship according to type of topics addressed in the articles. The three most frequently addressed topics in PMM -- mental health, relationships, and violence -- tend to be of interest to helping professionals such as counselors, psychologists, and social workers. The emergence of violence as the third most commonly addressed topic in PMM is noteworthy in light of Betz and Fitzgerald's (1993) call for men and masculinity researchers to pay more attention to this topic. Nevertheless, there were other topics with an applied focus that received relatively little attention in PMM. For example, sports and education were only addressed in 1% and 2% of PMM articles respectively. The underrepresentation of educational issues in PMM scholarship is of particular concern, given that the issue of boys' educational challenges has garnered significant attention in popular U.S. culture (e.g., Tyre, 2008).

Third, we examined the extent to which diversity was a focus of PMM research by analyzing the proportion of PMM research articles involving participants from diverse backgrounds. Consistent with Whorley and Addis's (2006) findings, our content analysis indicated that PMM research between 2000 and 2008 focused largely on White American male college students between the ages of 18 and 54. The lack of PMM research on boys and older adults is problematic. Because the role of masculinity in individuals' lives may

change over time, research findings on younger adults may not be generalizable to boys and older adults (Whorley & Addis). In addition, the proportion of PMM articles focusing on specific groups of racial/ethnic minority individuals was relatively low. Of particular concern is the fact that not a single PMM research study focused on Native Americans. With regard to sexual orientation, almost 7 in 10 PMM research articles did not report participants' sexual orientation. By not reporting and not analyzing the intersection of sexual orientation and masculinity, such studies might not be addressing important ways in which masculinity is experienced differently across diverse groups of individuals (Whorley & Addis).

Fourth, we assessed the scholarly impact of PMM by analyzing the types of scholarly journals and books that referenced the top 10 most frequently cited PMM articles. The largest number of citations was found in scholarly journals and books on men and masculinity. It appears that PMM scholarship is being used to generate further scholarship on men and masculinity. On the other hand, only 22% of the citations were found in men and masculinity journals and books, suggesting that PMM also had an impact in disciplines outside the psychology of men and masculinity. As a comparison, Flores and colleagues' (1999) analysis of the scholarly impact of *The Counseling Psychologist* found that across an 11-year span, 58.5% of the citations of Major Contribution articles were found within the same field (i.e., in counseling journals). Our findings indicate that in addition to influencing masculinity scholarship, the top 10 PMM articles seem to have the greatest impact on disciplines related to mental and physical health (e.g., counseling/clinical psychology and health/medicine). For example, the second highest number of citations was found in journals and books specializing in body

image issues. Some scholars have observed that men's struggles with body image have been relatively neglected compared to the struggles of women in this regard (Cafri & Thompson, 2004). PMM scholarship has the potential to be a leading force in illuminating this area of concern for men. In contrast to PMM's influence on clinically-related disciplines, PMM's impact on other disciplines appear to be limited. Indeed, over half of the categories of books and journals (e.g., education, sports, and gerontology) had less than 10 citations from PMM's top 10 articles. Collectively, these findings suggest that with the exception of clinically-oriented fields, PMM's influence on mainstream psychology is somewhat modest (Smiler, 2004).

Fifth, we identified PMM's top 11 most productive scholars. The identification of these scholars provides recognition for their contributions to PMM scholarship and the psychology of men and masculinity. Additionally, prospective graduate students who are interested in exploring this area of research can use our findings to augment their search for graduate programs. Similarly, established researchers in other fields can use our findings to identify scholars with whom to collaborate in interdisciplinary research involving men and masculinity. The majority of the top 11 scholars were White American male faculty members in counseling and clinical psychology programs in U.S. universities. The underrepresentation of women and people of color among the top 11 scholars raises questions about whether the perspectives of female and racial/ethnic minority scholars are adequately represented in PMM scholarship.

### *Limitations*

The findings of our study should be interpreted in light of several limitations. First, we acknowledge that our coding method was merely one of several ways to



categorize PMM articles. For example, we did not examine the extent to which PMM research included samples of individuals from diverse socioeconomic, disability, and religious backgrounds. Wherever possible, we tried to address potential bias by exploring alternative ways of categorizing the PMM articles. For example, because several gender theoretical orientations were associated with the gender role strain paradigm (Pleck, 1995), we computed the percentage of unique PMM articles classified under a larger cluster of gender role strain paradigm theories. The creation of this cluster allowed for a more nuanced view of how theories are applied to the study of masculinity.

A second limitation is that our content analysis only included articles from PMM. Although PMM is the official journal of SPSMM, there are several other masculinity journals that were not included in our content analysis (e.g. *Sex Roles*, *Journal of Men's Studies*, and *Men and Masculinities*). A third limitation is that we only assessed the scholarly impact of the top 10 PMM articles. Consequently, our results might have been more comprehensive if we had examined the impact of all 154 PMM articles from 2000 to 2008. A fourth limitation is that our assessment of PMM's scholarly impact was based on citation analyses. However, we do not know the context in which these PMM articles were cited. For example, cited articles may have been the subjects of criticism by other scholars (Flores et al., 1999). Finally, we did not address methodological issues (e.g., types of masculinity measures and research design) in our content analysis. Nonetheless, we note that methodological issues in men and masculinity psychological research have already been addressed in another study conducted by Whorley and Addis (2006).

*Recommendations and Conclusions*

To summarize, our findings suggest that PMM scholarship from 2000 – 2008 was dominated by theories associated with the gender role strain paradigm, addressed clinically-related topics, relied largely on White American male college samples, and had a growing impact on clinically-focused scholarly journals and books. We speculate on several possible reasons for the dominance of the gender role strain paradigm and clinically-focused scholarship in PMM. For one, PMM's scholarship might reflect SPSMM's historical roots; SPSMM was founded by a group of pro-feminist male, clinically-focused psychologists who were interested in exploring the ways in which gender roles restricted men's lives (Brooks & Levant, 1999). Based on the program affiliations of the top 11 most productive PMM scholars, we speculate that PMM scholars tend to be counseling or clinical psychologists who may have less interest or expertise in topics outside their fields. In contrast, scholars from other fields such as school, educational, developmental, evolutionary, personality, and social psychology may be deterred from publishing in PMM if they perceive that topics in their fields are underrepresented in PMM scholarship.

Our findings suggest that more research is needed to address topics (e.g., sports; Steinfeldt, Steinfeldt, England, & Speight, 2009), theoretical orientations, and populations (e.g., Native Americans, boys, and older adults) currently underrepresented in PMM scholarship. To this end, we offer several practical suggestions to increase the diversity of PMM scholarship. First, to deal with the problem of disciplinary homogeneity, seasoned PMM scholars should collaborate with scholars from other fields to address diverse topics and theoretical orientations that are underrepresented in PMM scholarship. Second, PMM special sections can be used to highlight underrepresented

theoretical orientations, topics, and populations. For example, a special section can be created to address the intersection of masculinity and K-12 education through a call for manuscript submissions, the appointment of a guest editor, and invited review articles on this topic. Third, the editorial board of a journal plays an important gate-keeping role in determining the types of articles that are published in a journal (Buboltz et al., 1999). Hence, it might be helpful for PMM to recruit editorial board members from a variety of theoretical and disciplinary backgrounds. The presence of such scholars on PMM's editorial board might reinforce the message that PMM is open to manuscripts from diverse theoretical and disciplinary perspectives. Finally, we encourage seasoned PMM scholars to seek out and mentor emerging scholars from diverse backgrounds who may have an interest in the psychology of men and masculinity. To the extent that a scholar's research interests partly reflects her or his cultural background (cf., Bacigalupe, 2001), we speculate that an increase in the number of masculinity scholars from diverse backgrounds will lead to a corresponding growth in the number of PMM studies examining diverse populations.

## References

- Abreu, J. M., Goodyear, R. K., Campos, A. & Newcomb, M. D. (2000). Ethnic belonging and traditional masculinity ideology among African Americans, European Americans, and Latinos. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity, 1*, 75–86.
- Addis, M. E., & Cohane, G. H. (2005). Social scientific paradigms of masculinity and their implications for research and practice in men's mental health. *Journal of Clinical Psychology, 61*, 1-15.
- Addis, M. E., & Mahalik, J. R. (2003). Men, masculinity, and the contexts of help-seeking. *American Psychologist, 58*, 5-14.
- Bacigalupe, G. (2001). Is positive psychology only White psychology? *American Psychologist, 46*, 82-83.
- Becker, J. B., Berkley, K. J., Geary, N., Hampson, E., Herman, J. P. & Young, E. A. (Eds.) (2008.) *Sex differences in the brain: From genes to behavior*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Bem, S. L., (1974). The measurement of psychological androgyny. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 42*, 155-162.
- Betz, N. E., & Fitzgerald, L. F. (1993). Individuality and diversity: Theory and research in counseling psychology. *Annual Review of Psychology, 44*, 343-381.
- Brooks, G. R., & Levant, R. F. (1999). A history of division 51 (the society for the psychological study of men and masculinity). In D. A. Dewsbury (Ed.). *Unification through division: Histories of the divisions of the American Psychological Association* (pp. 197-220). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

- Buboltz, W. C., Miller, M. & Williams, D. J. (1999). *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 46, 496-503.
- Cochran, S. A. (2004). Editorial. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity*, 5, 3.
- Editorial statement. (2000). *Psychology of Men and Masculinity*, 1, inside cover.
- Eisler, R. M. (1995). The relationship between masculine gender role stress and men's health risk: The validation of a construct. In R. F. Levant & W. S. Pollack (Eds.), *A new psychology of men* (pp. 207–228). New York: Basic Books.
- Flores, L. Y., Rooney, S. C., Heppner, P. P., Douglas, L. & Wei, M. F. (1999). Trend analyses of major contributions in *The Counseling Psychologist* cited from 1986 to 1996: Impact and implications. *Counseling Psychologist*, 27, 73-95.
- Geary, D. C. (2009). *Male, female: The evolution of human sex differences*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Gilbert, R. & Gilbert, P. (1998). *Masculinity goes to school*. New York: Routledge.
- Good, G. E., Sherrod, N. B., & Dillon, M. C. (2000). Masculine gender role stressors and men's health. In R. Eisler & M. Hersen (Eds.), *Handbook of gender, culture, and health* (pp. 63-81). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Good, G. E., Wallace, D. L., & Borst, T. S. (1994). Masculinity research: A review and critique. *Applied and Preventive Psychology*, 3, 3-14.
- Howard, G. S., Cole, D. A. & Maxwell, S. E. (1987). Research productivity in psychology based on publication in the journals of the American Psychological Association. *American Psychologist*, 42, 975-986.
- Kiselica, M. S., Englar-Carlson, M., & Horne, A. M. (2008). A positive psychology

- perspective on helping boys. In M. S. Kiselica, M. Englar-Carlson, & A. M. Horne (Eds.), *Counseling troubled boys: A guidebook for practitioners* (pp. 31-48). New York: Routledge.
- Krugman, S. (1995). Male development and the transformation of shame. In R. F. Levant & W. S. Pollack (Eds.), *A new psychology of men* (pp. 91-126). New York: Basic Books.
- Lazarus, R. S., & Folkman, S. (1984). *Stress, Appraisal, and Coping*. New York: Springer.
- Levant, R. F. (1996). The new psychology of men. *Professional Psychology, 27*, 259-265.
- Levant, R. F. (2009). Editorial. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity, 10*, 3.
- Levant, R. F., Richmond, K., Majors, R. G., Inclan, J. E., Rosello, J. M., Rowan, G., et al. (2003). A multicultural investigation of masculinity ideology and alexithymia. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity, 4*, 91–99.
- Lisak, D. (2000). Editorial. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity, 1*, 3.
- Liu, W. M. (2005). The study of men and masculinity as an important multicultural competency consideration. *Journal of Clinical Psychology, 61*, 685-697.
- Maples, M. R., & Robertson, J. M. (2001). Counseling men with religious affiliations. In G. Brooks & G. Good (Eds.), *The new handbook of psychotherapy and counseling with men* (pp. 816-843). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Messner, M. A. (1992). *Power at Play: Sports and the Problem of Masculinity*. Boston, MA: Beacon Press.
- Nutt, R. L., and Brooks, G. R. (2008). Psychology of Gender. In S. Brown & R. Lent

- (Eds.), *Handbook of Counseling Psychology* (4<sup>th</sup> ed.) (pp. 267-283). New York: Wiley.
- O'Neil, J. M., Good, G. E., & Holmes, S. (1995). Fifteen years of theory and research on men's gender role conflict: New paradigms for empirical research. In R. Levant & W. Pollack (Eds.), *The new psychology of men* (pp. 164-206). New York: Basic Books.
- O'Neil, J. M., Helms, B. J., Gable, R. K., David, L., & Wrightsman, L. S. (1986). Gender-role conflict scale: College men's fear of femininity. *Sex Roles, 14*, 335-350.
- O'Neil, J. M. (2008). Summarizing 25 years of research on men's gender role conflict using the Gender Role Conflict Scale: New research paradigms and clinical implications. *The Counseling Psychologist, 36*, 358-445.
- Oehlhof, M. E., Musher-Eizenman, D. R., Neufeld, J. M., and Hauser, J. C. (2009). Self-objectification and ideal body shape for men and women. *Body Image*.
- Pleck, J. H. (1995). The gender role strain paradigm: An update. In R. F. Levant & W. S. Pollack (Eds.), *A new psychology of men* (pp. 11-32). New York: Basic Books.
- Pollack, W. S. (1995). No man is an island: Toward a new psychoanalytic psychology of men. In R. F. Levant & W. S. Pollack (Eds.), *A new psychology of men* (pp. 33-67). New York: Basic Books.
- Rabinowitz, F. E. (n.d.). *SPSMM: Ten Years of History*. Retrieved July 31, 2009, from American Psychological Association, The Society for the Psychology of Men and Masculinity (SPSMM) Web site: <http://www.apa.org/divisions/div51/history.html>
- Smiler, A. P. (2004). Thirty years after the discovery of gender: Psychological concepts and measures of masculinity. *Sex Roles, 50*, 15-26.

- Southern, S. (2006). Themes in marriage and family counseling: A content analysis of The Family Journal. *The Family Journal, 14*, 114-122.
- Spence, J. T., & Helmreich, R. L. (1978). *Masculinity and femininity: Their psychological dimensions, correlates and antecedents*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Steinfeldt, J. A., Steinfeldt, M. C., England, B., & Speight, Q. (2009). Gender role conflict and stigma toward help-seeking among college football players. *Psychology of Men and Masculinity, 10*, 260-270.
- Thompson, E. H., & Pleck, J. H. (1995). Masculinity ideologies: A review of research instrumentation on men and masculinities. In R.F. Levant & W.S. Pollack (Eds.), *A new psychology of men* (pp. 129–163). New York: Basic Books.
- Tyre, P. (2008, September 8). Struggling school-age boys. *Newsweek*. Retrieved July 31, 2009, from <http://www.newsweek.com/id/157898>
- Wade, J. C. (1998), Male reference group identity dependence: A theory of male identity. *The Counseling Psychologist, 26*, 349-383.
- Whorley, M., & Addis, M. E. (2006). Ten years of research on the psychology of men and masculinity in the United States: Methodological trends and critique. *Sex Roles, 55*, 649-658.
- Wong, Y. J., & Rochlen, A. B. (2005). Demystifying men's emotional behavior: New directions and implications for counseling. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity, 6*, 62-72.
- Wong, Y. J., & Rochlen, A. B. (2008). Men's emotional lives: Stereotypes, struggles, and strengths. In S. J. Lopez (Eds.), *Positive psychology: Exploring the best in people* (pp. 149-165). Westport, CT: Greenwood Publishing Company.



Worthington, R. L., Soth-McNett, A. M., & Moreno, M. V. (2007). Multicultural counseling competencies research: A 20-year content analysis. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 54*, 351-361.

Table 1  
*Gender Theoretical Orientations in PMM Articles (N = 154)*

Rank	Theoretical Orientation	Description	<i>n</i>	%
1	Gender Role Conflict Theory	Highlights the negative consequences of restrictive gender role socialization, e.g., devaluation of others and self (O'Neil, 2008; O'Neil, Good & Holmes, 1995).	45	29%
2	Masculinity Ideology Theories	Examine individuals' endorsement of beliefs about what men ought to be or do (Thompson & Pleck, 1995).	33	21%
3	Psychodynamic Theories	Explain how childhood experiences, especially interactions with caregivers, influence men's psychosocial development (Krugman, 1995; Pollack, 1995).	21	14%
4	Objectification Perspectives	Highlight the valuing of women's and men's bodies for appearance rather than performance (Oehlhof, Musher-Eizenman, Neufeld, & Hauser, 2009).	20	13%
5	Masculine Gender Role Stress Theory	Focuses on the extent to which specific gender-role situations are stressful for men (Eisler, 1995); based on Lazarus and Folkman's (1984) model of stress and coping.	13	8%
6	Masculinities Perspectives*	Emphasize different manifestations of masculinity across diverse social groups as well as the contextual nature of masculinity across social situations (Addis & Mahalik, 2003; Liu, 2005).	12	8%
7	Conformity to Masculine Norms Model	Examines individuals' conformity to masculine norms, i.e., social norms that prescribe and constrain masculine behavior (Mahalik et al., 2003).	11	7%
8	Gender Role Strain Paradigm (Generic)*	Focuses on the negative consequences of conforming to and violating gender roles (Pleck, 1995).	8	5%
9	Biological and Evolutionary Theories	Attribute sex differences to biological processes and/or natural selection processes that result in differences in gene pools (Becker et al., 2008; Geary, 2009).	6	4%
10	Gender Traits Theories	Conceptualize masculinity and femininity as attributes that describe the psychological essence of male and female personalities (Bem, 1974; Spencer & Helmreich, 1978).	4	3%
11	Male Reference Group Identity Dependence Theory	Examines men's dependence on a reference group (e.g., an internal representation of men similar to oneself) for their gender role self-concept (Wade, 1998).	2	1%
12	Positive Psychological Perspectives	Emphasize boys and men's strengths and resilience (Kiselica, Englar-Carlson, & Horne, 2008; Wong & Rochlen, 2008).	1	1%
13	Other	Gender theoretical orientations not listed in the coding manual or no gender theoretical orientation.	25	16%

\* Excludes other gender theoretical orientations listed in the coding manual (e.g., masculinity ideology theories).

Table 2  
*Topics Addressed in PMM Articles (N = 154)*

Rank	Topic	Number	Percentage
1	Mental Health	45	29%
2	Relationships	40	26%
3	Violence	38	25%
4	Emotions	29	19%
5	Body Image	24	16%
6	Attitudes Toward Women	23	15%
7	Sexual Orientation	21	14%
8	Physical Health	18	12%
9	Racial/Ethnic Minority Issues	18	12%
10	Psychometrics	15	10%
11	Fatherhood	14	9%
12	Help-seeking	14	9%
13	Media	14	9%
14	Sexual Behavior	11	7%
15	Substance Use	11	7%
16	Career	10	6%
17	Counseling	7	5%
18	Education	3	2%
19	Religion/Spirituality	3	2%
20	Counselor Education	2	1%
21	Sports	2	1%

*Note:* Mental health = mental illnesses, stress, well-being, and self-esteem. Relationships = relationships, marriage, friendship, and interpersonal issues. Violence = violence, abuse, aggression, and sexual harassment. Measurement = focus on scale construction or psychometrics. Racial/ethnic minority issues = racism, racial/ethnic identity, acculturation, enculturation, etc. Help-seeking = diverse forms of help-seeking, including seeking help from counselors and physicians.

Table 3  
*Demographic Diversity of Participants in PMM Research Articles (N = 137)*

Demographic Category	Number	Percentage
<b>Sex</b>		
Male	136	99%
Female	24	18%
<b>Age</b>		
<18 years	9	7%
≥55 years	6	4 %
18-54 years	118	86%
Age not reported	9	7%
<b>Type of Sample</b>		
College	83	61%
Non-college	49	36%
College/Non-college	5	4%
<b>Race/Ethnicity/Nationality</b>		
White American	82	60%
African American	11	8%
Asian American	6	4%
Latino/Latina	9	7%
Native American	0	0%
International	17	12%
Multiracial/Multinational	2	1%
Race/ethnicity not reported	23	17%
<b>Sexual Orientation</b>		
Heterosexual	39	28%
Sexual minority	10	7%
Not reported	94	69%

*Note:* Each research articles could be classified in multiple categories. College/Non-college = sample consisted of college students and non-college participants, but the percentage of college students was not reported. International = participants recruited from outside the United States. Multiracial/Multinational = no single racial/ethnic/national group constituted the majority of the sample and race/ethnicity/nationality was not included in the article's research questions.

Table 4  
*Categories of Scholarly Journals and Books that Cited the Top 10 PMM Articles*

Rank	Categories	Citations	Percentage
1	Men and Masculinity	81	22%
2	Body Image	62	17%
3	Counseling/Clinical	58	16%
4	Health/Medicine	55	15%
5	Gender (generic)	41	11%
6	Child/Adolescent	20	5%
7	Violence/Abuse	15	4%
8	Race/Culture/Ethnicity	14	4%
9	Personality/Social Psychology	13	3%
10	General Psychology	10	3%
11	Sexual Behavior	7	2%
12	Assessment/Measurement	6	2%
13	Women	5	1%
14	Career/Vocation	5	1%
15	Psychiatry	4	1%
16	Disability/Rehabilitation	3	1%
17	Sexual Orientation	3	1%
18	Education	3	1%
19	Sports	3	1%
20	Neuroscience/Brain	2	1%
21	Gerontology	1	0%
22	Addiction	1	0%

*Note.* Top 10 PMM articles = top 10 most frequently-cited articles published in the *Psychology of Men and Masculinity*. Citations = number of times the top 10 PMM articles were cited. Percentages are based on the total number of times the top 10 PMM articles were cited ( $N = 372$ ).

Table 5  
*Top 11 Most Productive PMM Scholars*

Rank	Name	Weighted Contribution	No. of publications	Sex	Race	Institution/Program*
1	Aaron B. Rochlen	5.57	13	Male	White American	University of Texas at Austin /Counseling Psychology
2	James R. Mahalik	4.19	9	Male	White American	Boston College /Counseling Psychology
3	William Ming Liu	2.67	4	Male	Asian American	University of Iowa /Counseling Psychology
4	Jonathan P. Schwartz	2.36	5	Male	White American	New Mexico State University /Counseling Psychology
5	Glenn E. Good	2.03	6	Male	White American	University of Missouri - Columbia /Counseling Psychology
6	Todd M. Moore	1.95	5	Male	White American	University of Tennessee - Knoxville/ Clinical Psychology
7	Michael E. Addis	1.63	5	Male	White American	Clark University /Clinical Psychology
8	Dominic J. Parrott	1.62	3	Male	White American	Georgia State University /Clinical Psychology
9	Jay C. Wade	1.60	3	Male	African American	Fordham University /Clinical Psychology
9	Denise A. Hines	1.60	2	Female	White American	Clark University /Clinical Psychology
9	Wade C. Mackey	1.60	2	Male	White American	Retired**

\* Institution and program that the scholar was affiliated with on August 1, 2009.

\*\* Former institution/program: Jacksonville State University/Criminal Justice.

## Online Supplement: Appendix A

*Top 10 Most Frequently-Cited PMM Articles*

Rank	Authors	Article Name	Year	Times cited*
1	Mahalik et al.	Development of the conformity to masculine norms inventory.	2003	70
2	Olivardia, Pope, Borowiecki, & Cohane	Biceps and body image: The relationship between muscularity and self-esteem, depression, and eating disorder symptoms.	2004	51
3	Cafri & Thompson	Measuring male body image: A review of the current methodology.	2004	47
4	Courtenay	Engendering health: A social constructionist examination of men's health beliefs and behaviors.	2000	35
5	Abreu, Goodyear, Campos, & Newcomb	Ethnic belonging and traditional masculinity ideology among African Americans, European Americans, and Latinos.	2000	34
6	Hayes & Mahalik	Gender role conflict and psychological distress in male counseling center clients.	2000	30
7	Levant et al.	A multicultural investigation of masculinity ideology and alexithymia.	2003	27
8	McCreary, Sasse, Saucier, & Dorsch	Measuring the drive for muscularity: Factorial validity of the drive for muscularity scale in men and women.	2004	27
9	Hines & Malley-Morrison	Psychological effects of partner abuse against men: A neglected research area.	2001	26
10	Morrison, Morrison, & Hopkins	Striving for bodily perfection? An exploration of the drive for muscularity in Canadian men.	2003	25

\* Number of times the article had been cited by scholarly journals and books on December 1, 2008, according to *PsycInfo*.



## References

- Abreu, J. M., Goodyear, R. K., Campos, A. & Newcomb, M. D. (2000). Ethnic belonging and traditional masculinity ideology among African Americans, European Americans, and Latinos. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity, 1*, 75–86.
- Cafri, G. & Thompson, J. K. (2004). Measuring male body image: A review of the current methodology. *Psychology of Men and Masculinity, 5*, 18-29.
- Courtenay, W. H. (2000). Engendering health: A social constructionist examination of men's health beliefs and behaviors. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity, 1*, 4-15.
- Hayes, J. A. & Mahalik, J. R. (2000). Gender role conflict and psychological distress in male counseling center clients. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity, 1*, 116-125.
- Hines, D. A. & Malley-Morrison, K. (2001). Psychological effects of partner abuse against men: a neglected research area. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity, 2*, 75-85.
- Levant, R. F., Richmond, K., Majors, R. G., Inclan, J. E., Rosello, J. M., Rowan, G., et al. (2003). A multicultural investigation of masculinity ideology and alexithymia. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity, 4*, 91–99.
- Mahalik, J. R., Locke, B., Ludlow, L., Diemer, M., Scott, R. P., Gottfried, M. & Freitas, G. (2003). Development of the Conformity to Masculine Norms Inventory. *Psychology of Men and Masculinity, 4*, 3-25.
- McCreary, D. R., Sasse, D. K., Saucier, D. M. & Dorsch, K. D. (2004). Measuring the drive for muscularity: Factorial validity of the drive for muscularity scale in men and women. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity, 5*, 49-58.

Morrison, T. G., Morrison, M. A., & Hopkins, C. (2003). Striving for bodily perfection?

An exploration of the drive for muscularity in Canadian men. *Psychology of Men and Masculinity*, 4, 111-120.

Olivardia, R., Pope, H. G., Borowiecki, J. J. & Cohane, G. H. (2004). Biceps and body

image: The relationship between muscularity and self-esteem, depression, and eating disorder symptoms. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity*, 5, 112-120.