Is there a bias against men in our culture? Are men stereotyped? Is there such a thing as "male bashing?" There are some excellent books written on this topic by notable authors like Dr Paul Nathanson and Dr Katherine Young, two professors from McGill University who wrote the book *Spreading Misandry: The Teaching of Contempt for Men in Popular Culture*[1]. Spreading Misandry is a convincing volume that observes an anti-male bias through television, movies, and popular culture. While Nathanson and Young make a convincing case for the presence of a a strong anti-male bias in the media the question this article addresses is does the same sort of bias exist outside the media? Could it exist in the mental health professions? I think so.

The bias against men in the mental health profession is something I have seen for many years. I have worked a great deal with men and have specialized in helping men and boys through crisis since the late 1970's. During that time there was much said by my female colleagues about men that could easily be construed as anti-male. I remember numerous comments from women therapists that were less than flattering towards men in general and the way they dealt with emotions. Comments went from "Men don't deal with their feelings" and "Men don't grieve" to "Men are cold and unfeeling" to "How can anyone live with someone like that!" It was comments such as these that prompted me to write a book that honored and cataloged men's paths toward healing. Slowly, through books like mine, brain research and increased knowledge of hormonal differences I think this sort of perception is changing. People are beginning to see that we all have differences in our choice of healing paths. I always found the comments from the female therapists to be largely based on stereotypes and the self-centered assumption that men should have reactions similar to their own. Once these women were educated on the important differences between men and themselves they were very quick to change their stance. With that history I tend to see the source of the problem as one of education and knowledge. The problem though, has shown itself to be considerable and indicates a significant anti-male bias.

A part of the reason for this anti-male bias is that men simply don't speak up. That is starting to change. Lately I am hearing more and more male therapists speaking about the anti-male bias they see both in the stereotyping of men and in the female therapist's lack of understanding of male/female differences. This is not a big surprise since most therapy is based on talking and open emoting and this is harmonious with what we have come to learn to be the nature of the female response to stress and loss but runs counter to the masculine path. It's little surprise the male therapists would be in a position to understand the nature of men and boys and see clearly the bias inherent in the more feminine ways of looking at things. Most therapy with the exception of behavioral techniques and techniques such as EMDR, is based on talking and this is playing directly to the woman's strength and into the man's weakness. Considering this,

it is little wonder that men tend to avoid traditional therapy and that male therapists are starting to speak out.

Other areas where discussion is growing would include the anti-male bias in the family court system and the default solution of having dad pay but having mom be the custodial parent. We see the same sort of stereotyping at work with the media portraying fathers as inept and infrequent caretakers of children and of course the stereotyping of men as deadbeat dads.

The domestic violence industry is yet another area where more and more people are speaking up about an anti-male bias. The domestic violence industry is funded by the billion dollar a year Violence Against Women Act and as the name makes clear men need not apply. The peer reviewed research of the last 30 years[3] shows clearly that men are a sizable percentage of the victims of domestic violence[4] and over a third of the seriously injured victims[5]. This hasn't stopped those running the show from stereotyping men as a tiny fraction of the victims and aver the bogus claim repeatedly that men are the primary source of the domestic violence problem[6]. Male bashing? Yes. Promoting a stereotype of men always being the violent spouse abusers and never the victims. The media of course reinforces this anti-male stereotype by publishing mostly stories about women who are badly beaten by men. These articles promote the popular stereotypes which sell more papers than articles that feature men being abused by women. At the same time television continues to routinely broadcast shows where men are kicked, hit, slapped or otherwise abused by women but rarely the other way around. Stereotyping yet again. Sadly, it continues to be common for shows to use a man being hit in the groin for comic purposes. Does anyone ever laugh when women are injured? Violence against men is all too common and accepted while services for men who are victims of domestic violence are rare or non-existent. This is where the stereotype leads to a double standard and men, having been labeled as perpetrators only, get left out in the cold when it comes to receiving services.

It was these sorts of musings about the stereotyping of men that have made me wonder about an anti-male bias in mental health beyond the clinical setting and how strong it might be. I decided to have a look at some Professional Journals on men's and women's issues and was not surprised to see indications of an anti-male bias. The first thing I did was simply look at the titles. The Women's Studies Quarterly had article after article where the title seemed "woman friendly" and portrayed the feminine in a most positive light. This of course, is fine and is a good thing. The Journal of Men and Masculinities however had numerous articles where the title portrayed the masculine as negative. This is quite a contrast from the women's journal titles. The female articles portrayed women as having been victims of oppression for many years and now deserving to be set free from this bondage. The masculine articles portrayed men as oppressors who needed to learn to be more like women!

Obviously not all of the titles were good examples of the man=oppressor woman =opressed man=bad woman=good dichotomy but it seemed hard to find a women's journal title to be negative toward women or to find a men's journal article that was

positive towards men. Just to give you a sense of the differences in the two I will list some of the article titles I found that serve as examples of this. Here are a few titles from the Women's Journal:

1)Dignity Overdue: Women's Rights Activism in Support of Foreign Domestic Workers in Singapore, 2) The Power of Pottery: Hopi Women Shaping the World, 3)Female Agency and Oppression in Caribbean Bacchanalian Culture: Soca, Carnival, and Dancehall , 4) For Love and Justice: Ovadia's Story, 5) A Planet of Women (poem) 6) 25 Years to Freedom: An Interview with Betty Tyson

And here are a few from the Men and Masculinities Journal:

1) Gender (and) Imperialism: Structures of Masculinity in Tayeb Salih's Season of Migration to the North, 2)The Stain of White: Liaisons, Memories, and White Men as Relatives, 3) Masculinities and Power in New Historical Research 4) School Violence, Peer Discipline, and the (Re)Production of Hegemonic Masculinity, 5) Beyond Machismos: Recent Examinations of Masculinities in Latin America 6) Narrative Therapy as a Counter-Hegemonic Practice (and inspiring men to perform alternative narratives of self that have preferred real effects and counter the practices of hegemonic masculinity.)

The difference between these two groups of titles is noticeable. It seems from the titles that we want femininity to blossom and masculinity to be countered! One is more affirming while the other is more condemning. One is more a blessing and one is more questioning at best. One is uplifting and the other is shaming. We can't make any large conclusions from a selected group of titles but it does give us a sense of how the sexes are seen in very different ways even in our professional journals.   It looked so far that the stereotyping we saw in the media was stretching into the mental health journals. The underlying assumption seems to say that women are worthy and men are in need of change.

As a therapist I have been taught to be very suspicious of situations where people are seeing complexity in black and white terms. This seems to be one of those scenarios. Women are being seen as needing greater opportunity after having been oppressed. The men/masculinity are seen as the evil doers who have caused this oppression and as morally inferior and needing to become more like the women. As you can see this is in some ways the same theme that I noticed with female therapists comments about men. "The men need to be more like the women, then things would be better." Any time you view a group as being globally "negative" stereotypes are close at hand.

Looking at titles will only get us so far and is shaky ground at best. Perhaps looking specifically more at a Journal's content rather than just the titles might tell us a bit more. I was reminded of an inventory I ran across a while back called the CMNI (Conformity to Masculinity Norms Inventory). This is an inventory that claims to show how men either conform to or reject our culture's masculine norms.   Since the inventory claims to focus

on masculine norms it seemed like a good place to examine to see if there might be some anti-male bias. Additionally the existence of a CFNI (Conformity to Femininity Norms Inventory) created by the same researcher seemed to offer a valuable method for comparison.   What I found was a shock. The masculine inventory listed numerous characteristics that it claimed were our culture's masculine norms[7.] Some of them seemed accurate but a good number of them seemed very negative and judgmental. In fact, they reminded me of the female therapists judgements of men prior to learning about their nature. I will list the "norms" here as presented in the journal article so you can get an idea of my experience:

Violence
Winning
Power Over Women
Emotional Control
Risk-Taking
Dominance
Playboy
Self-Reliance
Primacy of Work
Disdain for Homosexuals
Pursuit of Status

This inventory seemed to be trying to say that violence, power over women, disdain for homosexuals and being a playboy are all masculine norms for our culture? This was a surprise for me.   I thought that the masculine norms centered around providing and protecting. The Journal article states:

"Gender role norms, or those rules and standards that guide and constrain our behavior as men and women, are special types of social norms. Similar to how general social norms influence people to engage in specific social behavior, gender norms also operate when we observe what most men or women do in social situations, are told what is approved or disapproved behavior for men or women, and observe how popular or admired men or women act (Mahalik, 2000)."

Violence

I was shocked that this inventory seemed to be listing violence as a norm for masculine behavior. Is violence "approved behavior" for men? Is it normative? I simply don't see how it can be thought of in that light. Violence is not a norm for men, rather, violence occurs when the norm for men *breaks down*. It is also not a common behavior of the majority of men in our culture. Yes, some men are violent, but no, violence is not a descriptor of men in general and to imply that violence is a norm for men goes beyond being anti-male and moves into being a hateful attitude towards men and masculinity.

Lumping all members of a birth group into a negative category is never wise and is clearly the domain of stereotyping. Just imagine that we are creating a scale of norms for women. We know it is a fact that women murder their children twice as often as men[8]. We also know that women commit the majority of child abuse and that women initiate violence in intimate relationships more often than men[4]. Knowing this should we put in our norm scale that women are child murderers or child and spouse abusers? Or maybe just that women are violent? Of course not, and anyone who tried to do this would be laughed out of their profession. Although women are the majority of child murderers, child abusers and initiate violence more often in intimate relationship the percentage of women who act this way is a tiny fraction of women in general. It is absurd to try and imply anything about women based on the behavior of such a tiny subset. So why is it that when this is done with men it is not laughed at, not criticized, not even a blink from mental health professionals? This seems to be a good example of misandry.

Disdain for Homosexuals

Some men and some women surely have disdain for gay people but is this even close to being a defining characteristic of masculinity? Again, if this were about women, the offenders would be pied. The idea that most men have disdain for homosexuals is simply nutty. Implying or outright claiming that this sort of characteristic is representative of a birth group is again misandrous.

Power over Women

Can someone explain to me how this is a masculine norm? Where is the data showing that the majority of men have a tendency to want power over women? I emailed Dr Mahalik, the inventory's creator, and asked about these "norms." He wrote back that he had found the norms in the literature and offered me an article that he said showed the sources. When I read the article it was clear that there was very little evidence supporting these four categories as being masculine norms in our culture. The "power over women" category offered a cite of a paper that was over 25 years old. Maybe I missed it but I couldn't find any statistical evidence that supported using these categories as norms for men. While I am sure that some men want power over women I think these investigators would be hard pressed to show that most men in the US seek power over women. Again this is a very negative accusation and is irresponsible to try to accuse a birth group of having such a negative trait. If the same sort of implication were to be made against any other birth group (such as a race of people, just imagine the reaction to a claim that blacks want control over whites) there would be great incredulous consternation and accusations of racism.

Playboy

In the paper which Mahalik sent there was a reference to the "Playboy" category. I tracked down the specific book, which was published over 10 years ago which had made the reference. "Playboy" was one of four roles the books author had listed of

mens ways of loving. The other three were Breadwinner, Faithful Husband, and Nurturer. The book stated that the playboy role in their questionnaire data had only gotten 1% of the votes from the men describing their most dominant role. The data from the book seemed to be gathered from a survey and from interviews. Hardly indicators of global norms for men. This left me wondering why a researcher would choose such a negative characteristic for such a large group. Out of the four possible choices of breadwinner, nurturer, faithful husband and playboy, why would he choose playboy only and bypass the others?

These four categories of violence, playboy, disdain for homosexuals, and power over women are decidedly negative and make a clear statement that the researchers feel that masculinity itself is negative. I realized also that they were encouraging negative stereotypes. By trying to link masculinity to such negative and pathological characteristics the inventory was actually attempting to bolster a stereotype of men as oppressors. In some ways the TV male bashing that used repeated stereotypes was being repeated here but on an academic level. Now the academes were foisting their own stereotypes just as a sitcom might do. Clearly a bias against men and masculinity but this time promoted by what are supposed to be our best and brightest.

I was truly shocked at this point to realize that this inventory was willing to pass judgement onto men and boys so easily. It made me wonder if maybe I was over-reacting and that this sort of thing had been done before? To get a sense of whether this was new or was a continuation of previous research practice we can look at examples of masculine norms that have been used by researchers over the last 40 years.   The chart below offers examples of the terms researchers have used to describe masculine norms. The first column shows the norms used in 1970, the second 1978, then 1984 and 1986 and finally the norms used in this Conformity to Masculine Norms Inventory. Notice the shift in the terms over the years:

1970 (Turner)	**1978** (Cicone and Ruble**)**	**1984** (Brannon**)**	**1986**(Pleck)	**2003** **(**Mahalik)
1) Independent style of achievement	1)active	1) proscriptive norm against anything feminine	1) Independent	Violence
competency	dominant in relationships	acheiving status	Assertive	Power over Women

1970 (Turner)	**1978** (Cicone and Ruble**)**	**1984** (Brannon**)**	**1986**(Pleck)	**2003** **(**Mahalik**)**
incompetency in feminine activities	achievement oriented	independence	Strong personality	Disdain for Homosexuals
suppressing emotion	level headed	self-confidence	Forceful	Risk-Taking
	self-contained	aggressiveness	Has leader abilities	Pursuit of Status
			Willing to take risks	Emotional Control
			Willing to take a stand	Dominance
			Aggressive	Playboy
				Self-Reliance
				Primacy of Work
				Winning

Notice that in the above examples prior to 2003 the focus is on characteristics and almost none of them seems negative or insulting. Then look at the 2003 CMNI variables and note the difference. Suddenly masculinity has been cast into a negative light. What could have happened between 1970 and 2003 to bring about such a drastic change?   Suddenly there is an implication that there is something wrong with masculinity. Violent, Power over women, Disdain for homosexuals, and Playboy are all descriptors that are obviously negative and condemning.

My shock at the harsh judgements and apparently ill-suited variables in this inventory left me wondering just how this researcher came up with these categories? There seems to be a large jump from the relatively neutral examples of the 1970's and later and then the more male bashing examples of the CMNI. Were the variables such as Playboy and Violence pulled out of thin air or was there some research behind these choices? Was there an attempt made to choose norms that fit with men of all ages

across the US?   The Journal article states that the researcher first did a review of the literature for masculine norms and then started two focus groups to discuss and refine the masculine norms. It is stated that:

"The construct was chosen because Mahalik posited the gender role norms from the most dominant or powerful group in a society affect the experiences of persons in that group, as well as persons in all other groups. Thus, the expectations of masculinity as constructed by Caucasian, middle- and upper-class heterosexuals should affect members of that group and every other male in U.S. society who is held up to those standards and experiences acceptance or rejection from the majority, in part, based on adherence to the powerful group's masculinity norms."

This clearly states that they sought the gender norms of white middle to upper class males and believes that these norms impact not just the white males but all people in the society since this group is the most "dominant."   The purpose of the inventory seems to be somewhat different from simply noting when men conform or don't conform to our culture's masculine norms. The purpose according to this quote seems to be to label middle and upper class white males as having norms that "affect the experiences of persons in that group *as well as persons in all other groups.*" That the norms of "white males" are portrayed so negatively we can only assume that the author believes that the actions of white males are at the root of our cultures problems with masculinity.

 We begin to see that the negative stereotyping is less about men in general or men of color and is specifically about white males. Even the search for "masculine" norms was specifically focused on white men. This too is a shock. How could anyone title an inventory with the global term "Masculine" but intend it to be about a sub-set of that group. We also see that the norms the researcher seeks and portrays as masculine are not about all men, not even all white men, they are about middle and upper class white men. This parallels the media male-bashing patterns of primarily making fun of white men and very rarely bashing men of color.

Let's be clear. White people comprise about 70% of the U.S. population. Of that 70% upper class men are about 10% while middle class is difficult to assess but for our purposes we can assume that another 50% below the top 10% might be considered "middle class." When we crunch those numbers we find that even with these very conservative numbers that leaves us with a male population of 42% of the total. Clearly a minority. So what we have in this inventory is a scale that tries to identify the norms of a minority of the men in the US and gauges how other men conform to that? This is a very different message and intent than the title " Conformity to Masculine Norms Inventory" seems to claim.

The stated goal was to map out the norms of middle and upper class white males. To do this the investigators created two focus groups to refine the norms the researcher had identified in his literature search. The groups meet for 90 minutes each week for 8

months with the researcher. The curious part of this is that of the nine people that comprised these two focus groups only 3 of the 9 are white males! Five of the nine are females. Here is the composition of the focus groups:

Group 1: 1 Asian American man, 1 European American man, 2 European American women;

Group 2: 2 European American men, 2 European American women, 1 Haitian Canadian woman

Notice that men are in the minority and that white men make up only 1/3 of the total persons in the focus groups. Importantly, they are also in the minority in both focus groups. This seems odd considering the overt claimed objective was to develop norms of european american males. Why include so many women? Why have the group you are seeking to understand be the minority? I started to wonder if the researcher had some pre-conceived ideas that he wanted to propagate and having too many men, especially too many white men, might foil his attempt to plant the seeds of his favored ideology.

It's also important to note that the focus groups for the masculine inventory were populated solely by grad students in counseling psychology.   According to the email from the researcher these groups were comprised of young people in their mid-20's. In a nutshell, the groups lacked diversity in age. Hardly the sort of group one would want to make decisions about the norms of such a large birth group encompassing the entire lifespan for men.

What we seem to have with the CMNI inventory is a group of young men and women making judgements about masculine norms which would be used in the inventory to apply to middle aged and older males as well as adolescents. I am beginning to think that a better name for this inventory would be the Conformity to Adolescent Masculine Norms Inventory. It is built and geared for that population and some of the conclusions it draws make a great deal more sense when applied to an immature and adolescent masculinity.   Perhaps the authors are simply unaware of and have little experience with the mature masculine? We simply don't know that at this point but it is clear to me that this inventory is anti-male and misandrous.

CFNI Female Conformity to Norms Inventory

When I first saw this inventory I was a shocked at the anti-male content but wondered if maybe this was simply a shift with the turn of the century to have a more willing look at the shadow side of things and bring those more unconscious aspects of life out in the open. That thought was dashed when I saw the companion inventory for this the CFNI (Conformity to Femininity Norms Inventory) created by the same researcher.   I wondered if maybe this other version for women would contain similarly negative and judgmental "norms" for women. I thought maybe gossip or the queen bee passive

aggression sorts of things might be listed or possibly some form of characteristic about gold-digging. What I found was that the norms for the feminine side were almost completely positive/sweet and nice. Here is a list of them:

Nice in Relationships
Thinness
Modesty
Domestic
Care for Children
Romantic Relationship
Sexual Fidelity
Invest in Appearance

All of these "norms" are either flattering or neutral. There is not a hint of judgement towards the feminine norms. All of them could be manifested robustly without causing harsh judgments. A woman could invest greatly in her appearance and be very concerned about her sexual fidelity or children or her modesty and she would be considered fine and dandy by our cultures standards. Contrast this with the men's "norms" such as violence where even a little of that "norm" is a horrible thing that deserves scorn and harsh judgement.

To me the feminine norms seemed pollyanna and overly flattering as if the researchers were reluctant to make any negative claims about the nature of feminine norms. It was readily apparent to note the contrast between the masculine and the feminine. One is harsh and judging and the other is sweet and nice. This reminded me of the titles in the two journals. Women = Good Men = Bad

Even more interesting was the manner that these norms in the CFNI were constructed. The author created focus groups, not unlike for the masculine, *but the women's focus groups were only women. No men.* Also the age of the participants was considerably older. The mean age was 32 with a standard deviation of 10 years. This means that most of the group members were likely between 18-46 years of age. Indeed the women were placed into one of five different focus groups. Several of the groups were largely young women and two of the groups were adult women from the community. Unlike the masculine groups this seems to have represented more than just the adolescent population.

Comparing the CMNI and CFNI

Let's take a minute to contrast the two inventories. Both used focus groups to refine the norms that would be used. In the masculine version (CMNI) the focus groups were predominantly women while in the feminine (CFNI) the groups were comprised *only* of women. One would think that if you wanted to get a clear idea of the norms of a group you would want members of the group being studied to make those assessments. To

intentionally create a group with the majority of members outside the group being studied defies explanation. I emailed the researcher asking about this and the reasons for this and he didn't respond directly to the question.

Another factor that is worth noting is the age of the focus group participants. The groups for the female CFNI had a greater range likely between 18-46 with a mean of 32 years old and a standard deviation of 10 years. This gave these groups a much broader range of ages than the focus groups for the masculine CMNI which were exclusively young people in their mid 20's.   It is easy to assume that the older group of women would have a markedly different view on life and on the feminine norms. The younger group in their mid-20's doing the masculine norms would be much more likely to have a view closer to that of an adolescent.

The two inventories contained remarkably different "norms" with the male norms including some that were quite negative and judgmental while the female list seemed much more neutral and complimentary. It is an interesting question to wonder why the female norms didn't include any negative stereotypes similar to those included in the masculine inventory. We do get a hint about the reasons behind this from a section of the Journal article about the CFNI where the author states:

"In addition, because the CFNI is intended to measure conformity to traditional norms of femininity in the U.S., we thought it should also relate to women's development of a feminist identity. In describing women's feminist identity development, Downing and Roush (1985) proposed a five-stage model in which the first stage, passive acceptance, reflects acceptance of traditional European American, North American, gender roles, beliefs that men are superior to women, and that these roles are advantageous. The second stage, revelation, is in response to a crisis or crises that lead women to question traditional gender roles and to have concomitant feelings of anger toward men. Sometimes women in this stage also feel guilty because of how they may have contributed to their own and other women's oppression in the past. The third stage, embeddedness- emanation, reflects feelings of connection to other women, cautious interactions with men, and development of a more relativistic frame of life. The fourth stage, synthesis, is when women develop a positive feminist identity and are able to transcend traditional gender roles."

This quote is very different from the earlier quote regarding the culpability of white males. The women are seen as developing a "feminiist identity" and learning that they have been living in a world that oppresses them. Men are the ones who have been holding them back with ideas that women were inferior. It is clear that the researchers frame women as "good" and in need of space to grow while at the same time framing men as "not good" and needing to change. This sort of thinking is the same thing we see with the application of negative stereotypes to men, it is a huge generalization that sorely lacking in evidence. It is exactly what we see in male bashing stereotypes in the

media. Sadly these two inventories boil down to women=good man=bad. Cartoons have successfully made their way into academia.

If women were seen as so inferior to men why would the majority of men on the titanic give their lives for them? Does a slave owner consider himself superior to his slaves? Yes. Would a slave owner give his life for his slaves? No. Men gave their lives because they held women in high esteem! America, mom and apple pie doesn't describe someone who is seen as inferior. It describes someone who is cherished. Women and men were both under the rule of rigid sex roles which limited both in their choices. It did not pronounce that one was superior and the other a lackey. Saying such as that is propagating a bigoted mythology that only makes things worse.

Conclusion

It seems clear from our observations of this inventory that male-bashing is alive and well in the mental health professional journals. I simply can't see any other explanation for the willingness to lump an entire birth group into such negative categories. If this sort of thing was done with any other group there would be a revolution on our hands. How can we blame our television and media for their male-bashing if our research scientists have the same tendencies? The sad fact is that male-bashing resides in most areas of our lives and most of us are not even slightly aware.   Police, the judicial system, our politicians and of course entertainment and academia. All of these are areas where stereotypes of men are held as truth.   How can we start to root out this sort of hatred? We need to move to a point where we can see both men and women, masculine and feminine as having positive and negative qualities and learn to value each individual. We have a long way to go. You can help things along by speaking out.

   1. Nathanson, Paul & Young, Katherine R. (2001), Spreading Misandry: The Teaching of Contempt for Men in Popular Culture, Harper Paperbacks, Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, ISBN 9780773530997
2.   Nathanson, Paul & Young, Katherine R. (2006), Legalizing Misandry: From Public Shame to Systemic Discrimination against Men, Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, ISBN 9780773528628
3.   Fiebert Bibliography which contains abstracts of over 150 studies many of which show that women initiate domestic violence at a greater rate than men http://www.csulb.edu/~mfiebert/assault.htm
4. August 3, 2007 American Psychiatric Association article pointing out that among violents couples women were more often the aggressos than men. http://pn.psychiatryonline.org/cgi/content/full/42/15/31-a
5. Archer, J. (2000). Sex differences in aggression between heterosexual partners: A meta-analytic review. Psychological Bulletin, 126, 651-680. (Meta-analyses of sex differences in physical aggression indicate that women were more likely than men to

   "use one or more acts of physical aggression and to use such acts more frequently." In terms of injuries, women were somewhat more likely to be injured, and analyses reveal that 62% of those injured were women.)

6. This page is a Montgomery County sponsored page which falsely claims that men are over 95% of the perpetrators of domestic violence http://www.montgomerycountymd.gov/hhstmpl.asp?url=/content/hhs/bhcs/mfadv.asp

7.Mahalik, J.R., Locke, B., Ludlow, L., Diemer, M., Scott, R.P.J., Gottfreid, M., Freitas, G. (2003). Development of the Conformity to Masculine Norms Inventory. Psychology of Men and Masculinity, 4, 3-25.

8. U.S. Department of Health and Human Services statistics on child murder, http://www.acf.hhs.gov/programs/cb/pubs/cm05/figure4_2.htm

9. Harris, Ian. Messages Men Hear: Constructing Masculinities (Gender, Change and Society)Taylor and Francis, 1995.