aggression and prowess gave way to interpersonal skills, rationality, and efficiency.

But, what has masculinity been since 1965? For one thing, contrary to popular opinion, it has not remained static. It is confusing at best to understand what is meant when someone says that he/she longs for the days when "men were men." What kind of man? One who writes to another man "my dear" and "I love you"? On the other hand, could this nostalgic person desire a society where men were in control of the family and granted custody of children in divorce cases? Still yet, could our sentimental yearner be a person who would like to see a proliferation of male-only lodges, clubs, and taverns?

In a very real sense, contemporary society, with its complexity, heterogeneity, and rapid change, has responded to the challenge of living by devising social procedures, establishing social relations, and devising social institutions in adaptive ways heretofore unseen. The need for such unique adaptations surely exists because contemporary society contains in abundance all the basic features of past American societies. In addition, changes in Black males' masculinity along with changes in the masculinities of Hispanic males, Native American males, and Asian-American males, and others have affected contemporary society. Certainly, the modern-day Black male-led movement in the late sixties and early seventies, the gay liberation movement, the modern-day women's movement, and the emerging men's movement (however fragmented)—all contribute to unique features in contemporary society—a society that constantly develops advanced technology, complex organizations, and relationships to meet the needs of its members.

Yet, contemporary society is also an American society that today is beset with social problems: hunger, destructive competition between its members, violent aggression between racial and ethnic groups, sexual exploitation of women, intergroup prejudice and discrimination, child abuse, wife abuse, and in general, dysfunctional living patterns basically promulgated by men.

As we proceed in the following chapters, the nature of this fifth society should become clear. However, we must keep in mind that contemporary society will change—in fact it is entirely possible that a new society will emerge.

4

Becoming "Boys," "Men," "Guys," and "Dudes"

Persons born possessing XY chromosome patterns, male and female hormones, a penis, testicles, seminal vesicles, and prostate glands generally are identified as biological males. These biological males, however, are *not born* "boys," "men," "guys," or "dudes." In order for one of these social beings to come about, a kind of transformation process must occur. Involved in the transformation most generally is a socialization process whereby biological males learn attitudes, motives, values, skills, feelings, knowledge, and behaviors associated with being boys, men, guys, and dudes. The critical point here is that biological males *must learn* to be one of the above social beings; they are *not born* these social beings. Stated differently, a given biological male youth becomes a boy not simply because he has "male biological equipment" but because he learns to feel, think, and act like a boy. While Zane Grey's reputed comment that "every boy likes baseball, and if he doesn't he isn't a boy" might have been insensitive to differences among male youth, it was definitely on target with respect to the social determination of "boyhood" in America during the times of Zane Grey.

To illustrate further the social nature of being a particular type of male, let us consider the term "dude," most commonly used today among certain minority groups males in urban inner-city areas. In such areas, it is a term used frequently by some males to refer somewhat affectionately to a fellow male who is perceived as "cool," who has the "right" attitudes and values (ones similar to the male who is labeling), and who displays behaviors deemed acceptable by the "dude" peer

group. Obviously, not all biological males are seen by those minority group males as falling within the "dude" category despite the fact that they have male biological characteristics. For instance, older males, much younger males, those males who are not seen as "cool," and those who do not behave in ways deemed acceptable by in-group males are not perceived as "dudes." This means that being a "dude," just as being a boy, a man, or a guy, involves much that is "socially constructed" and "socially determined." Yet, to be a boy, man, guy, or dude is not divorced totally from biology. When these social beings are compared with female social beings, girls and women, biological differences are apparent. As stated in chapter 1, males and females both possess estrogen, progesterone, androgen, and testosterone. In males, however, the dominant hormones are androgen and testosterone, while the dominant ones in females are estrogen and progesterone. Other biological differences between males and females relate to the different biological equipment the two sexes bring to the reproduction arena and the different roles assumed by males and females in the reproduction process.

Additional biological differences between the sexes which are proposed relate to physical strength, mental abilities, sexual drive, physical appearance, and bonding behavior. Because males have greater upper-body muscular development than females, they also typically develop greater physical strength related to lifting and throwing. Females, on the other hand, develop greater physical endurance. Males and females also seem to develop differently with respect to mental abilities, with females being superior in verbal development during a particular period of the life course and males in general being superior at tasks requiring spatial perception and mathematical skills. This is discussed in more detail below in a brief review of the now classic Maccoby and Jacklin study (1974).

Males and females generally are also different in physical appearance. Such differences usually are apparent at birth. Newborn males on an average are longer and weigh more than newborn females (at birth, American males average 19.8 inches and 8.4 pounds, while American females average 19.3 inches and 7.5 pounds). Average height and weight differences between males and females continue into adulthood as secondary sex characteristics become apparent (e.g., hip contours, muscular development, body hair, shoulder width, voice tone, etc.).

Lionel Tiger and Robin Fox (1971) offer still another biologically based difference between the sexes. They contend that males and females bond differently. Females are said to bond almost instinctively with their

newborn babies, while males are said to be biologically programmed to bond with other males similar to themselves. Rooted in evolutionary prehistory, according to this line of thought, male bonding behavior occurs because the behavior has been selected and has survived in the course of evolution.

One of the most comprehensive studies related to psychological sex differences and one which has been widely cited was published by Eleanor Maccoby and Carol Jacklin in 1974. The meta-analysis was based on an examination and interpretation of findings from over sixteen hundred studies in the gender literature related to psychological sex differences between males and females. Despite some arguments to the contrary (e.g., Block 1976), Maccoby and Jacklin's conclusions generally are accepted in the field with minor modifications. They found strong support for greater verbal and physical aggression in males than females; greater visual-spatial ability in males than females; greater mathematical skills in males than females beginning around age twelve; and greater verbal ability in females than males between the ages of eleven and eighteen years. Mixed findings were reported by Maccoby and Jacklin on the issues of sex differences with respect to activism in social play, competitive behavior, intersex dominance efforts, and passive behavior. Since sex differences refer to biological differences between males and females, contemporary evidence seemingly offers little support for a biological explanation of the vast behavioral and psychological differences between males and females. Instead, such differences seem to have a sociocultural basis; biology does seem to play some role in psychological sex differences, but the precise nature of this role remains to be determined.

In Samuel Osherson's *Finding Our Fathers* (1986), one easily can get the impression that masculinity in its various forms is innate in persons born male. When Osherson suggests that boys in early childhood (around age three) begin a search for a masculine model on which to build a sense of self, while simultaneously withdrawing from women and femininity, the die is cast. One senses that for Osherson a kind of masculinity with stereotyped and dichotomized thinking is lurking inside of the boy pressing him to identify with his father or a father figure. This rudimentary bit of masculinity which presses the boy to identify with his father or some father figure is seen as crucial for the development of full masculinity as an adult male. Generally this means that boys have to give up "mother" for "father," but who is "father"? Osherson says that "father" often is a shadowy figure at best, difficult to understand. The result is that boys rarely experience fathers as sources of warm, soft nurtur-

ance, and what actually happens is that mother or some other female provider picks up the slack. Discussing the implications of this for young males, Osherson states:

> If father is not there to provide a confident, rich model of manhood, then the boy is left in a vulnerable position: having to distance himself from mother without a clear and understanding model of male gender upon which to base his emerging identity. This situation places great pressure on the growing son, as well as the father. We often misidentify with our fathers, crippling our identities as men. Distortions and myths shape normal men's pictures of their fathers, based on the uneasy peripheral place fathers occupied in their own homes. Boys grow into men with a wounded father within, a conflicted inner sense of masculinity rooted in men's experience of their fathers as rejecting, incompetent, or absent. (P. 4)

Osherson's ideas about how boys become men seem to be firmly ensconced within what psychologist Joseph Pleck calls the Male Sex Role Identity paradigm discussed in chapter 2.

Despite Osherson's acknowledgement of Pleck's *Myth of Masculinity* (1981), he forges ahead and presents an analysis which, in part, is based on a male sex-role identity paradigm. The assumptions underlying this paradigm have been outlined earlier and will not be repeated here. One assumption, however, related directly to a biological determinism view of masculinity should be mentioned. The MSRI paradigm, as outlined and explicated by Pleck, presumes *an innate psychological need in males to develop a male sex role identity* (pp. 3–4). This feature of the MSRI paradigm is an implicit part of Osherson's conception of male psychological and social psychological development. Therefore, it is possible to interpret Osherson's perspective as saying that males become boys, men, guys, and dudes because of their innate need to do so. In this chapter, however, a different position is taken. Males become different kinds of social beings because of a socialization process which is some function of biology and environment.

What Is Male Socialization?

By now it should be fairly clear that becoming a boy, man, and so on from our perspective primarily involves a learning process. The newborn male, for example, typically has transmitted to him all of the manners of a boy and simultaneously learns, through interactions with others, that he is a boy or at least not a girl. We will return to this point a little later. The critical idea is that newborn males become socially defined males and labeled accordingly through a process of learning which involves the inculcation of a culture's definition of masculinity and the development of the male self. This means that male socialization is *a dual process of becoming a male social being which involves (1) the development and awareness of the male self and (2) learning societal prescriptions and proscriptions for males*. Several theoretical approaches have been developed within the social sciences to understand how persons acquire a sense of self and how they learn the ways of a given society. Essentially this is what this chapter is all about. While our concern is restricted to male socialization and only tangentially relates to female socialization, with one or two exceptions, the materials presented easily can be modified to include female socialization.

Approaches to Male Socialization

Before exploring male socialization in more detail, it should be pointed out that there is not complete agreement in the gender literature over how we are transformed from biological newborn males and females into boys and girls and men and women. Some feel, for example, that the transformation process occurs primarily via social learning involving reinforcement and modeling, while others contend that cognitive development is the essential ingredient in the process. Beginning with Lawrence Kohlberg's cognitive developmental analysis, four approaches to male socialization as related to the development of the male self are presented below. While the approaches will vary considerably, one thread of continuity will run throughout the perspectives, and that is the interaction of biology and environment in producing the social male, whether he is a boy, a man, a guy, or a dude.

Becoming a Boy: Lawrence Kohlberg's Cognitive Developmental Analysis

Julius Lester (1973) gives a classic account of numerous incidents throughout his childhood, adolescence, and young adulthood related to his process of male association. Consider the following excerpts:

> As boys go, I wasn't much. I mean, I tried to be a boy and spent many childhood hours pummeling my hardly formed ego

> with failure at cowboys and Indians, baseball, football, lying, and sneaking out of the house. . . . I tried to believe my parents when they told me I was boy, but I could find no objective proof for such an assertion. . . . Through no fault of my own I reached adolescence. While the pressure to prove myself on the athletic field lessened, the overall situation got worse—because now I had to prove myself with girls. Just how I was supposed to do that was beyond me, especially because, at the age of fourteen, I was four foot nine and weighed 78 pounds. . . . I tried, but I wasn't good at being a boy. Now, I'm glad, knowing that a man is nothing but the figment of a penis's imagination, any man should want to be something more than that. (Pp. 112–13)

Lester points out in the above account that he was not especially good at acting out the male sex role societal script. From Lester's perspective, his behavior was not sufficiently masculine to enable him to "earn" the label "boy" or "young man." As he moved from childhood to adolescence to adulthood, Lester, by his own account, moved from one stage of difficulty fulfilling the male sex role to another, realizing finally that male sex role requirements indeed were socially constructed rather than biologically determined.

While Lester was terrorized by the societal sex role script he was supposed to follow, and seemed not to be able to follow it, numerous other people we call "boys" and "men" act out the script with minimum difficulty. How do they accomplish this? For an answer, let us examine several basic ideas underlying the cognitive developmental approach to male socialization. Psychologist Lawrence Kohlberg (1966) is the foremost proponent of the cognitive developmental approach to male socialization. He endorses the notion that *sex role attitudes are patterned directly by the child's cognitive organization of its social world along sex role dimensions*. Many aspects of this patterning of sex role attitudes are seen as universal and involve "natural" components. But it is the nature of the patterning of sex role attitudes that gives cognitive developmental theory its uniqueness among male socialization approaches. The patterning of sex role attitudes is essentially "cognitive" and is embedded in the child's conception of physical things which includes his or her own body as well as the bodies of others. Children's conceptions of their bodies and the bodies of others in turn are related to society's use of sex categories. Societies tend to use sex categories in culturally universal ways which contribute to universality in sex role attitudes. The reason universality in sex role attitudes exists rests on two basic principles:

1. The child cognitively organizes social roles around universal physical dimensions.
2. The child actively organizes his/her perceptions and learnings of social roles around his/her basic conception of his/her own body and the world.

What emerges as important in the development of sex role attitudes from Kohlberg's perspective is the observational learning of social roles rather than learning as some function of reinforcement of one's own responses (p. 83). For Kohlberg, learning is cognitive and includes selection and internal organization by relational schemata. These relational schemata bind concepts of the body, the physical world, the social world, and general categories of causality, quantity, time, space, logical inclusions, and so forth. On cognitive organization, Kohlberg writes that the child's "basic modes of cognitive organization change with age," and this involves changes in the child's conceptions of its physical and social worlds (p. 83). These are "natural" changes resulting from experience—linked changes in the child's modes of cognition. Because the child's sex role concepts are defined in universal physical or body terms (e.g., males are bigger, stronger, etc.), they also undergo universal developmental changes.

When considering the role of socializing agents such as caretakers, parents, etc. in male socialization, attitudes from these sources are seen as differentially stimulating or retarding development of sex role concepts rather than directly teaching them. Male sex role development, for Kohlberg (1966, p. 85), is the result of:

1. The male child actively structuring his own experience.
2. The emergence of basic, normal, adult sexual concepts and attitudes from childish attitudes.

Thus, male sex role development involves restructuring childish sexual concepts and attitudes, which occurs because the child uses the experiences of his body and environment in constructing basic sex role concepts and attitudes.

Basic cognitive categorizing of self (gender identity) and others are critical aspects of male sex role development. The process is initiated when the male child hears and learns the verbal labels "boy" and "girl." A male child learning that he is a boy typically occurs between the ages of two and four, with *most young males learning to correctly label themselves in the second and third year*. During the third year, a boy may

begin to generalize sex labels unsystematically to others on the basis of a loose cluster of physical characteristics. He remains, however, uncertain about the constancy of gender and may believe, for instance, that if a boy wears a dress, he changes into a girl, or if a girl wears pants, she changes into a boy. Between the ages of three and five, the boy learns to label others correctly according to conventional cues but still is uncertain about the constancy of gender. *During ages five through seven, the boy comes to realize that gender remains constant*, and this is a part of the general stabilization of constancies of physical objects—the general process of conceptual growth.

Also critical in Kohlberg's analysis of male self development is the boy's development of sex role stereotypes which follows the development of gender-constant categories. Suggesting that culturally universal meanings exist for various objects, including the concepts "man" and "woman," Kohlberg goes on to posit universal meanings of gender roles. He says that boys develop sex role stereotypes not as a direct perception of differences in role models' behaviors but as a consequence of perceived sex differences in bodily structures and capacities together with the general disposition of humans to concrete symbolic thought.

Awareness of generalized genital differences between the sexes and the realization that genitals are the central basis of gender categorization typically occurs between the ages of five and seven. Prior to this, however, there is the development of diffuse masculine-feminine stereotypes based largely on the meanings of nongenital body imagery (Kohlberg 1966, p. 104). By age five or six, males are awarded greater power, strength, competence, and status than females. Females, however, are awarded superior values on nurturance, moral "niceness," and attractiveness. Aside from universal correlations made between bodily structures and symbolic thought, the boy *observes* differences in both familial and extrafamiliar values (e.g., males are more powerful, more competitive, more aggressive, etc.).

The development of these three basic and universal conceptions of gender role in boys between the ages of three and seven are followed by *the development of sex-typed preferences and values*. Before discussing these developments, let us summarize briefly the above three developments (Kohlberg 1966, p. 107):

1. During ages three through five, there is the development of diffuse masculine—feminine stereotypes based largely on nongenital body imagery.

2. During ages five and six, there is the development of constant gender categories.
3. During ages five through seven, an awareness of genial differences develops.

If one remembers that the boy's basic sex role concepts develop from his active interpretation of the social order, which defines the sexes in universal ways, Kohlberg's analysis of the development of masculine values easily can be grasped. He feels that the boy's sex role concepts and sex role identity result in masculine or sex-typed values and behaviors. Why should this occur? From Kohlberg's perspective, the boy spontaneously evaluates self and others. Moreover, the boy also has a natural tendency to ascribe worth to himself, to seek worth, to make comparisons between his own worth and that of others, and to evaluate others' worth (Kohlberg 1966, p. 108). Axiomatically, those who are seen as similar to self (other males) will be evaluated more positively than those who are seen as dissimilar (females). This is so because of the boy's tendency toward egocentric evaluation, which also leads the boy to value that which is identified with self and motivates him to enact or conform to whatever role persons like himself perform (regardless of the rewards associated with the role). Conformity to the male role by a male, from the boy's perspective, is seen as morally right, and deviation from the male role by a male is seen as morally wrong. Thus, aside from the "natural" tendency of the boy to identify with similar others (male models), identification with male models is seen by the boy as morally correct.

In summary, Lawrence Kohlberg views male sex role development as being a direct result of sex role identity. After the boy learns to label himself "a boy" and recognizes constancy in gender categories, sex role learning occurs. Typically, the boy acquires those sex role attitudes, values, and behaviors that society deems appropriate for boys to acquire. The following aspects of sex role development define the typical process for boys according to Kohlberg's cognitive developmental perspective:

1. Infancy to age two: The male child hears the label "boy" and sees it being applied to self and some others. He also hears the label "girl" and sees it being applied to some others but not to himself.
2. Somewhere between the ages of two and three, the boy learns his own gender label ("I am a boy").
3. During the age of three the boy comes to know that some others are also called "boys." However, he may not correctly discriminate the sex of others.

4. Between the ages three and five the boy learns to label others correctly according to conventional cues. (He knows that the person is a boy because a boy wears short hair, trousers, and plays with trucks.)
5. Diffuse masculine-feminine stereotypes also develop during the age three to five period (girls play with dolls and always wear dresses).
6. During the ages five and six the development of constancy in gender categories occurs. (Even though a little boy plays with a doll, he is still a boy.)
7. During the ages five through seven the boy develops an awareness of genital differences between the sexes.
8. Following the development of sex role identity, the typical boy expresses a preference for masculine values and behaviors ascribing worth to himself and similar others.

Becoming a Man: The "Developmental" Work of Daniel Levinson

The biological male develops a male sex role identity and begins to express preferences for masculine values and behaviors. Attention devoted to sex role learning during childhood has given us a pretty good understanding of this formative phase of development, a time during which the individual grows biologically, psychologically, and socially. While there is not complete agreement over the nature and sequence of the periods and transitions in the formative stages, it is generally accepted that "all lives are governed by common developmental principles in childhood and adolescence and go through a common sequence of developmental periods" (Levinson et al. 1978, p. 3). What had been neglected prior to Levinson et al.'s groundbreaking ten-year study was an adequate conception of the life cycle as a whole. In *The Seasons of a Man's Life*, Levinson and colleagues present what they say is a "more detailed picture of development in early and middle adulthood" (p. 4). I would like to add to this that the presentation is a detailed picture of *male* adulthood and therefore is quite appropriate for our concerns here.

To begin with, "becoming a man" from the perspective of Levinson et al., involves qualitatively different periods in male development which follow sequences. The biological male continues to experience growth, development, and character change following the transition from early childhood to adolescence to early adulthood. In other words, the typical male, from birth to death, experiences a *life course*, which may be defined as "the patterning of specific events, relationships, achievements,

failures, and aspirations that are the stuff of life" (p. 6). The developmental approach proposed by the authors does not suggest a steady, continuous stream of development. Instead, Levinson et al. view the human male life cycle as following an underlying universal pattern with numerous cultural and individual variations which possibly alter and sometimes even stop the developmental process. Nevertheless, if the process goes on, it is seen as following basic sequences which are discussed below.

Another critical aspect of the Levinson et al. approach is that there are "seasons" within the life cycle, and each period of adult male development has its own distinctive character—"every season is different from those that precede and follow it, though it also has much in common with them" (p. 6). Actually, Levinson et al. feel that seasons are relatively stable, yet dynamic. Change occurs from one season to another and transitions are seen as necessary for these shifts. Let us now turn our attention to the seasons in a typical man's life, keeping in mind that we are referring to qualitatively different periods in a male's development. We begin with the analytical tool used by Levinson et al. to explore the sequence of periods in a male's life—life structure. Life structure is viewed as "the basic pattern or design of a person's life at a given time" (p. 14). It connotes the relationship between the individual and society and involves three elements:

1. The man's sociocultural world, which entails placing him within social contexts such as class, race, family economic system, etc.
2. The man's *self*, including his wishes, feelings, cognitions, behavior, values, and ideals (both conscious and nonconscious)
3. The man's participation in his social world, the various roles assumed by him such as father, husband, friend, lover, and the like

In describing this life structure for a man, Levinson, et al. believe that the most useful components are the choices the man makes and their consequences with respect to the above elements. What does it mean for a man to choose a particular profession? If I choose to become a corporate executive, what implications will this have for aspects of my self and for the way I participate in my social world? Marker events signaling the end of a season and/or the beginning of a season certainly may be influenced by choices in the above areas, but often marker events are not due to a man's voluntary effort or choice. Rather, marker events are involuntary, a result of such circumstances as war, depression, death of others, illness of others, etc. Such events cause the man to be *pushed* into a different period in the life cycle. While the man, in this instance, has no choice but

to enter the period, his adaptation to the period will be influenced by how he has developed previously; both will affect his later life. Specifically, the periods in a man's adult development outlined by Levinson et al. are as follows:

1. Early Adulthood—seventeen to forty
   a. Seventeen to twenty-two: Early adult transition (links adolescence to early adulthood)
   b. Twenty-two to twenty-eight: Entering the adult world (creates a first adult-life structure)
   c. Thirty: Transition
   d. Thirty-three to forty: Settling down period (builds second adult structure and reaches end of early adulthood)
2. Middle Adulthood—forty to sixty
   a. Forty to forty-five: The midlife transition (links early and middle adulthood)
   b. Forty-five to fifty: Entering middle adulthood (builds first life structure for middle adulthood)
   c. Fifty to fifty-five: Age fifty transition (works further on tasks of midlife transition)
   d. Fifty-five to sixty: Culmination of middle adulthood (builds second middle adult structure)
3. Late Adulthood—sixty plus
   a. Sixty to sixty-five: Late adult transition (terminates middle adulthood and creates basis for starting late adulthood)

Growing out of an intellectual tradition begun by Sigmund Freud, Carl Jung, Erik Erikson, and others, Levinson et al. set out to gain a deeper understanding of male adulthood through the construction of a systematic conception of the male life cycle. The conception of the male life cycle is facilitated by an intensive exploratory study of the lives of forty men from "diverse sectors of society" (p. 9).

What is the nature of each of the "seasons" of a man's life? The typical male derives much of what he brings to the early-adult-transition period from socialization settings highly supportive of young biological males' assumptions of societally sanctioned male sex roles. In many ways this is quite functional for the first tasks which must be accomplished by the early adult male. For example, traits like "independence" and "decisiveness," which are nurtured especially in young males during childhood, play important roles during the early-adult-transition period. During this period the young male is expected to modify, if not end, his dependent and nurturing relationships with parents and significant others as well as groups and institutions which were supportive during adolescence. He must begin to make choices and preparations for his first adult male life structure. In our society, traditionally this has meant "standing up and being a man."

While the early-adult-transition period may be somewhat unstable for our hypothetical young man, he is expected to resolve all of the anxieties, conflicts, and problems associated with the period and move on to the new period, entering the adult world. During this period, beginning around age twenty-two, the young male is expected to view himself as an adult with all of the traits society ascribes to as "young adult man." Levinson et al. suggest that societal expectations are that the male just entering the adult world should "hang loose," keeping his options open and avoiding strong commitments (p. 79). If explorations were the only societal expectations, a young man entering the adult world easily could resolve conflicts and problems with this period of adult development. However, entering the adult world also means that the young man is expected to create a stable structure. In addition to "explorations," the young adult male is pressured to "grow up," set and define goals, marry, get a job, and, in general, lead a more organized life. Obviously, the crisis that has to be resolved during this period is balancing both exploration and stability in the young adult male's life structure. Traditionally, the conflict has been resolved by young men actually attempting to fulfill the societal expectations of stability as manifested by the proportion of young men who never married.[1] While this cannot be substantiated here, some male instability during the entering-the-adult-world period may be linked to both conflicting societal expectations and early childhood male socialization, stressing male aggression, violence, dominance and so on.

Levinson et al. see the age-thirty-transition period as "a remarkable gift and burden" (p. 84). It is a period for working out plans in the life structure formed during the previous period. Change is characteristic of this period and men are expected to become more serious and stable

1. In 1970, only 19.1 percent of men 25 to 29 had never married. By 1985, this proportion had risen to 38.7 percent. The Bureau of the Census reports that young people, in general, are postponing marriage. During the 1960s, the Bureau reports, the median age at first marriage for men and women rose slowly but has increased dramatically since 1970, with the median age of first marriage for men and women in 1985 being 25.5 years and 23.3 years, respectively (Current Population Reports, Oct. 1985, Population Profile of the U.S., 1984/85, Special Studies Series, p. 23; No. 150, p. 22).

with goals set and the means for attaining the goals fully planned. After all, this is the end of the preparatory phase in early adulthood.

The settling-down period (ages thirty-three to forty) supposedly facilitates stability and life satisfaction for males. Change now is seen as creating much strain and many pressures, because men during this period are expected to anchor their lives more firmly in family, occupation, and community (p. 140). Working to advance, including building a better life, becoming more creative, contributing to society, and in a nutshell, fulfilling a dream also are aspects of the settling-down period fashioned for men by the American social order. Again, stressful aspects of the sex role men are expected to assume loom as important. Building family and community ties can create stability for a man, but simultaneous upward strivings in occupation and society in general may mean that stability in his life is threatened. Resolving this conflict certainly is no easy matter and, perhaps, may only occur with a modification in societal expectations for adult males during this period.

The midlife-transition period is one in which the man focuses both on the past and on the future. Because he has begun to recognize his own mortality, our hypothetical man reappraises his past and feels that the time remaining has to be used wisely. Many men during this period begin to question their values and beliefs, recognizing that aspects of their lives have been illusions. Nevertheless, the typical man gradually shifts his focus to the future, making choices that will modify his existing life structure and "provide the central elements for a new one" (p. 194). When the choices and the commitment are made, middle adulthood begins.

The entering-middle-adulthood period is the time when a man must resolve the polarities of young/old, destruction/creation, masculine-/feminine, and attachment/separateness. Levinson et al. say about these concepts that:

> The four polarities whose resolution is the principal task of mid-life individuation are: (1) Young/Old; (2) Destruction/Creation; (3) Masculine/Feminine; and (4) Attachment/Separateness. Each of these pairs forms a polarity in the sense that the two terms represent opposing tendencies or conditions. Superficially, it would appear that a person has to be one or the other and cannot be both. In actuality, however, the paired tendencies are not mutually exclusive. Both sides of each polarity coexist within every self.

Regarding the polarities, the midlife man must confront the young/old polarity within himself, giving up certain youthful qualities

and retaining and transforming others; he must also recognize and take responsibility for his destructive actions toward others. Often this is followed by creative impulses to bring something into being; to generate; being confronted with the masculine/feminine polarity, an inheritance from early male socialization, the man must recognize and integrate the masculine and feminine in self. Our man must modify his life structures by forming new relationships with maleness and femaleness. He must come to recognize that while the masculine is reduced in some ways (decline in physical prowess, ambition, achievement, toughness, etc.), it may be enhanced in others because of a lesser need to inhibit the feminine (he can care for a younger man without fearing homosexual meanings—combine work and personal relationships), and our man must also solve the problem of finding a balance between the needs of self and society. Solving this problem means paying more attention to self and becoming less tyranized by ambitions, dependencies, and passions. It also means more involvement with others and performing social roles in more responsible ways such as responding more to the developmental needs of offspring and other young adults. What is occurring here is an integration of the attachment/separateness polarity.

Middle adulthood is followed by the age-fifty-transition period. This period (ages fifty to fifty-five) is a time when the man continues his midlife transition. He can experience crises about the character of his life if this has not been worked out in the midlife-transition period. If our hypothetical man has not altered the nature of his familial relationships or work life, changes in both may be forthcoming during this time. Levinson et al. feel that "it is not possible for the man to get through middle adulthood without having at least a moderate crisis in either the midlife transition or the age fifty transition.

The age-fifty-transition period is followed by the culmination-of-middle adulthood period (ages fifty-five to sixty), a time when the man builds a second middle adult structure which allows him to complete middle adulthood. This is a stabler period and often is characterized by self-rejuvenation and life enrichment. Many men during this time experience great fulfillment, and if a man has survived the crises which can occur in the age-fifty-transition period, he can look forward to this rather pleasant experience.

The late-adult-transition period (ages sixty to sixty-five) comes immediately after the culmination of middle adulthood. During this time a man finishes all the tasks associated with the previous period and creates a basis for starting late adulthood. The major tasks to be accomplished are ending middle adulthood and preparing for late adulthood. Levinson

et al. feel that this is a significant time for most men, since it is a major turning point in the life cycle. The man during this period must be prepared to move from center stage and thus receive less recognition because he has assumed less responsibility. This can be a traumatic time if the man does not wisely step aside, allowing his adult offspring and others to assume major responsibility and authority in the family. Obviously, similar steps must be followed in the man's work life lest he becomes "out of phase" with his own generation and in conflict with the new middle-adulthood generation. The man now must find a proper balance between involvement with society and with self.

If our man can concentrate more on self now, becoming wiser and using his own inner resources, this season can be full and rich. This is evidenced by the great works of men like Picasso, Verdi, Freud, and Jung who entered late adulthood and made lasting "wise" contributions to society during this time. Near the end of this period, the polarity *integrity vs. despair* must be reckoned with. A man must appraise his life and if at all possible find meaning and value—gain a sense of integrity. If he does, our man will live his last years without bitterness or despair.

If our man survives various infirmities and chronic illnesses, he will enter late late adulthood. The chief task of this period is to come to terms with the process of dying and prepare for his own death. Peace *must* be made with dying by the man of this period in order for him to get on with his life in late late adulthood, a life where he reaches his ultimate involvement with self—"knowing it and loving it reasonably well, and being ready to give it up" (Levinson et al. 1978, p. 39).

In sum, male socialization, from Levinson et al.'s perspective, involves the development of the self and the acquisition of knowledge, skills, and so on throughout the entire life of a man. Male socialization means that a given biological male develops numerous selves (even core ones) which undergo transitions from one self to another. Male socialization also refers to the fact that the acquisition of skills and knowledge is an ongoing process with various periods in the male life cycle dictating that men acquire certain kinds of skills and knowledge which can be used to construct an appropriate life structure. This process continues until the man reaches the time for which he prepares in late adulthood—death.

Becoming a "Guy": Albert Bandura's Social Learning Perspective

One of the most important periods in the lives of many males is adolescence. It is a time when most young males experience at least rudimentary development of many "masculine" traits which will undergo refinement later during early adulthood. Traits such as dominance, aggression, competitiveness, and even violence often begin to appear in the behaviors of many male adolescents. While these traits may have been present unsystematically in early and late male childhood behavior, it is in adolescence that they become systematic and purposive. While these qualities may not be readily apparent, frequently they are manifested by adolescent males' overconforming "masculine" behaviors. Why do adolescent males behave in ways which frequently are thought to be dysfunctional for society and for themselves? Why is such destructive behavior so pervasive among male adolescents?

A popular view of adolescence in Western societies is that it is a period of stress and strain, and this is the cause of much inappropriate male adolescent behavior. This may be true; however, the social learning perspective offers us a more systematic way of viewing how males going through adolescence become guys. To begin with, in the view of the chief proponent of social learning theory, Albert Bandura, "except for elementary reflexes, people are not equipped with inborn repertoires of behaviors" (1977, p. 16). Bandura does recognize, however, that the biological is important. He says, "Genetics and hormones affect physical development which in turn can influence behavioral potentialities" (p. 16). Accordingly, while the biological male is born with behavioral potentialities, these alone do not explain behavior. It is through their interaction with experiential influences that male social behavior is determined.

Cognition is a critical element in the determination of behavior. While some approaches to *learning by response consequences* suggest responses are shaped automatically by their consequences (Bijou and Baer 1978; Skinner 1974; Burgess and Akers 1966), Bandura's social learning approach emphasizes cognition as important in most social learning. While it may be possible that some relatively simple actions are modified by their consequences without awareness of the response-stimulus consequences connection, Bandura feels that the cognitive capacities of humans enable them to profit significantly from experience. Because humans are cognitive, response consequences serve two other functions in addition to automatic strengthening of responses: (1) they impart information, and (2) they motivate through incentive.

In learning by response consequences during early childhood, the male child learns to respond in various ways to his environment (which includes others). At the same time he is learning to respond, the male child

also becomes aware of the effects his responses produce. When he observes these effects, he then develops hypotheses about the ''appropriateness'' of his responses which serve as information used to guide his future behavior. If his hypotheses are accurate, this leads to successful performances, but if they are inaccurate, this leads to unsuccessful performances. When the male child's performances are successful, cognitions leading to them are strengthened; when his performances are unsuccessful, his cognitions leading to them are weakened. Thus, our male child learns to be a boy/guy when he behaves as a boy/guy, because he learns that the consequences of behaving as a boy/guy for him are rewarding. This informative function of response consequences operates for the boy when his peer group during adolescence withholds the ''regular guy'' status from him until his behaviors conform to peer group expectations.

Aside from learning that conforming with American societal sex role expectations leads to positive outcomes (an informative function of response consequences), the typical male child also comes to *expect* certain benefits from behaving in a sex-typed way (a motivation function of response consequences). He foresees the future symbolically by converting future consequences into current motivators of his behavior (Bandura 1977, p. 18). In a given situation, our potential ''guy'' behaves in a way that he ''knows'' will bring him rewards. If he is with his friends, this can mean that he lies about his conquest of girls, because he knows the ''guys'' will hold him in high esteem.

In addition to the automatic strengthening and information functions of response consequences, a third function, reinforcement, also is associated with learning by response consequences. This function is not, however, of the variety that psychologist B. F. Skinner speaks. Reinforcement for Albert Bandura does not mean consequences which increase behaviors automatically without conscious and/or cognitive involvement. Moreover, Bandura feels that the concept ''response strengthening'' is appropriate to use in describing the effects on a response of reinforcement. Once responses are learned, the likelihood that they will be given in a certain situation can be varied by altering the outcomes they produce. The response itself, however, is not strengthened; rather, the probability of giving the response is altered. This means that the outcome of a response (benefits, rewards, etc.) *regulates some behaviors rather than reinforces these behaviors*. For example, the adolescent boy's peer group *does not strengthen* his hubcap stealing behavior by heaping praise on him, but instead, *regulates his behavior* by increasing the likelihood that he will steal hubcaps.

Learning by response consequences is only one aspect of Bandura's social learning approach to male socialization. A second aspect of social learning theory is *learning through modeling*. Bandura feels that this is the process through which *most* human behavior is learned. By observing others the young male gets ideas about how new behaviors are performed, which later serve to guide his behaviors. The boy is socialized by this process because modeling has a direct influence on learning due to its *information function*. The symbolic representations of the modeled activities acquired by the boy during exposure to the model serve to inform him as to what performances society or significant others deem appropriate. Bandura conceptualizes observational learning as being governed by four processes: attentional processes, retention processes, motor reproduction processes, and motivational processes. It should be pointed out that the processes involved in observational learning are quite complex and involve response information conveyed in a variety of ways. Yet, the basic modeling process is the same regardless of whether behavior is conveyed through words, pictures, or live action.

Bandura's most impressive discussion of the social learning process is learning through modeling. People do not learn only from the consequences of their own behavior. In fact, *most* of our behavior is learned by observing the behaviors of others and the consequences of those behaviors for others. We do not have to make needless error or engage in tremendous amounts of trial-and-error behaviors; instead, we learn observationally via modeling, which is governed by attentional processes, retention processes, motor reproduction processes, and motivational processes.

Following social learning theory, then, young males learn much of their social behavior by paying attention to or observing the behaviors of older male models—thus, *attentional processes*. While much of this observation is casual and direct observation of older males' behaviors in everyday social interaction, symbolic modeling is another source of social learning. Young males acquire many attitudes, emotional responses, and behaviors through television, films, and a variety of visual media.

One does not have to believe that there is a ''natural tendency'' toward male egocentric (as in cognitive developmental theory) preference in sex role identity to understand why young males learn to engage in sex-typed behavior. From Bandura's social learning perspective, young males come to differentially value older males' behavior primarily because they see male behaviors as engaging, influential, and appropriate. This differential valuation of male and female behavior is both promoted

and supported by formal and informal support systems in the society (Block 1983). In addition, young males are instructed both formally and informally that these are the precise behaviors (e.g., behaviors which are independent, self-reliant, strong willed) which society says are appropriate for them to adopt. Given this information, coupled with society's differential valuation of adult male/female behaviors, almost axiomatically young males give greater attention to the behaviors of adult male models—both *direct* behaviors and *symbolic* behaviors.

If the young male is to adequately learn the male sex role, not only must he selectively observe older male models' behaviors, and therefore give them greater attention, but he also must selectively retain the older male models' behaviors. In other words, it is important for the young male not only to pay attention to male behaviors that "guys" engage in, but he must also remember these behaviors—thus, the importance of *retention processes*. This implies that young males in all likelihood develop male-oriented representational systems.

Bandura feels that observational learning relies mainly on imaginal and verbal representational systems related to retention. First of all, imaginal systems emerge because exposure to and emphases on male model behaviors eventually lead to enduring and retrievable images of modeled performances (Bandura 1977, p. 25). The young males' images of certain situations can be mentally called up later, when the situations are not physically present. The second representational system identified by Bandura is *verbal*. According to him, most of the cognitive processes that regulate behavior are primarily verbal rather than visual. Labels are given for behaviors, and this facilitates the retention of behaviors. Moreover, the boy can mentally rehearse adult male behaviors, thus visualizing himself performing the sex role appropriate behavior.

A third component that Bandura feels is critical in social learning through modeling is *motor reproduction processes*. This component recognizes the necessity for the boy to be able to organize his responses spatially and temporarily with the modeled behavior. In addition to cognitively organizing his response, the boy must be able to *physically initiate* the behavior, *monitor it*, and *refine it* from information feedback. If any of these response components are lacking, the boy's behavioral reproduction will be faulty. Such faulty behavioral reproductions are quite frequent, for example, in boys' early efforts to be regular "guys" in boys' peer groups. Through self-correction adjustments from peer group informational feedback, the boy refines his performance of the male/guys role in social interaction. Moreover, he may begin to focus more on the segments of the role that he has learned only partially, which may also enhance his performance.

If learning is to occur through modeling it is also important that the modeled behavior is favored over other forms of behavior. People tend to adopt those behaviors which result in outcomes valuable to them. If the outcomes of models' behaviors are valuable to a boy, he will be much more likely to adopt the behaviors than if the outcomes are perceived as unrewarding or punishing. Thus, *motivational processes* are critical components of the social learning process in male socialization. If a male model is seen as repeatedly obtaining desired responses from behaving as a "guy" should, the young male observer is taught to reproduce that behavior. When he tries, he is "prompted when he fails and rewarded when he succeeds." Bandura concludes that all of this quite likely leads observers to match models' responses. Finally, failure to learn by modeling, as manifested by matching behavior, may result from "not observing the relevant activities, inadequately coding modeled events for memory representalism, failing to retain what was learned, physical inability to perform, experiencing insufficient incentives" (Bandura 1977, p. 29).

Becoming a "Dude": George H. Mead's Symbolic Interaction Perspective

"Mind can never find expression and could never have come into existence at all, except in terms of a social environment" (Mead 1934, p. 223). Symbolic interactionists like George H. Mead, Herbert Blumer, John Hewitt, Gregory Stone, and others feel that there are fundamental socio-physiological impulses or needs basic to social behavior and social organization. Examples, according to Mead (p. 228), include the sex or reproductive and parental impulses. But *the nature and the origin of the self are essentially "social."* On the nature of the self, Mead states:

> Self-consciousness involves the individual becoming an object to himself by taking the attitudes of other individuals toward himself within an organized setting of social relationships, and that unless the individual had thus become an object to himself he would not be self-conscious or have a self at all. Apart from his social interactions with other individuals, he would not relate the private or "subjective" contents of his experience to himself, and he could not become aware of himself as such, that is, as an individual, a person, merely by means or in terms of these contents of his experience. (Pp. 225–26)

With this point of departure, it should be easy to grasp the symbolic interaction perspective's basic dictum that the self is not present at birth, but arises in the process of social experiences and activity, in essence, *social interaction*. Symbolic interactionism suggests, as the perspectives discussed earlier, the social environment plays a critical role in male socialization. What is the nature of male socialization from a symbolic interaction perspective? How do biological males become "dudes"?

The process by which a biological male becomes a dude is no different from the process by which biological males become other social males. To be sure, the outcome of the defining characteristic of a "dude" may describe a male person who behaves in strikingly different ways from many other males, yet the social processes producing the "dude' are the same as the ones producing other social males, for example, the typical traditional middle-class American man. The dude's socially constructed and refined form of self-expression, which may consist of postures manifesting emotionlessness, fearlessness, aloofness, secureness, toughness, and detachment, is built using the same mechanisms as the upper-middle-class corporate executive's, whose behavior follows all of the tenets of the Protestant ethic.[2] Let us consider mechanisms in male socialization designated by the symbolic interaction perspective beginning with an early contribution by sociologist Charles H. Cooley.

Charles H. Cooley (1886–1929) was one of the first scholars to challenge scientific and lay circles on the issue of biological primacy in human nature. Consciousness and self-awareness arise out of social interaction, according to Cooley. Moreover, from this perspective, human nature as manifested in the self develops through social interaction with a primary group. Primary groups such as the family, the play group, and the neighbors are thought to be responsible for the individual's social unity and social nature, both of which are reflected in what Cooley called the "looking-glass self." The looking-glass self consists of the imagined appraisal of others and has three aspects which can be used to describe the male self in the following way:

1. Through imagination a given male perceives how he appears to others (both female and male).
2. The male also imagines how others judge his appearance.
3. The male experiences feelings of pride or mortification depending upon how others judge his appearance.

2. This definition of "cool dude" is adapted from Richard Major's paper entitled "Cool Pose as a Cultural Signature."

From Cooley's point of view, the nature of this self consists of feelings toward the self. To be sure, self development is accompanied by reflexive affective experiences (e.g., feelings of pride or mortification), but Mead feels such experiences do not explain the origins of the self (1934, p. 173). Instead, the self is lodged in the cognitive. According to Mead, the self "lies in the internalized conversation of gestures which constitutes thinking, or in terms of which thought or reflection proceeds. And hence the origin and foundation of the self, like those of thinking, are social" (p. 173). The nature of the self from this perspective is explored below, but first let us review a concept developed by sociologist W. I. Thomas which also plays an important role in a symbolic interaction approach to male socialization—"definition of the situation."

W. I. Thomas (1863–1947), another early proponent of symbolic interactionism, felt that the individual and society were in constant conflict because individuals were pleasure-seeking while society constrained the individual. A main goal of the society is to resolve conflicts between it and persons who pursue their own selfish interests. From this perspective, society (consisting of such agencies as the family, the church, the community) exists "to define situations" for individuals. On an individual level, Thomas felt that "definition of the situation" is *a phase of examination and deliberation prior to self-determined acts*. Using subjective facts of experience, the individual arrives at a decision to act or not to act along a given line. Analysis of male behavior from this point of view must take into account the definition of the situation as it exists objectively (in terms of societal constraints regarding male behavior) and as it exists subjectively (as defined by the male involved).

Both Cooley's and Thomas' ideas have contributed much to the symbolic interactionist perspective on socialization and are very much evident in contemporary discussions of the topic. Their contributions as well as those of George H. Mead (1863–1931) will be discussed as a symbolic interaction approach to male socialization.

Because the biological male's self is derived from his interaction with others, it is important to examine precisely how such interaction results in male self-development. To begin with, gaining a sense of male selfhood occurs only when the individual male is capable of *carrying on a conversation of significant gestures with himself using individual others in the beginning, and later, the generalized other*. "Conversation of significant gestures" refers to participation in communication whereby the gestures an individual makes to others are also indicated to himself resulting in the same response being called out in self as is called out in

others. For Mead, the ability to carry on this conversation of significant gestures is distinctively human as evidenced by the development of language. Language is felt to constitute significant gestures which have the same effect on those making them as they have on those to whom they are addressed or who respond. For example, in some circles when a young male refers to another young male as a "dude," he experiences the same feelings of coolness, toughness, confidence, and so on that his label brings out in the "dude." On the concept of language, Mead states:

> Language in its significant sense is that vocal gesture which tends to arouse in the individual the attitude which it arouses in others and it is this perfecting of the self by the gestures which mediates the social activities that give rise to the process of taking the role of the other. (Pp. 160–61)

Conceivably, through others' use of the word "boy" to describe a male child, and with the child's gradual ability to use "boy" and words others associate with his being a boy, he begins to describe himself in the same way as others describe him. Because such descriptions have meanings, the young male gradually comes to respond to self just as others respond to self. This response process is aided by the young male's ability to engage in "role taking," which Mead says is refined by the perfecting of the self because gestures arouse in self the attitude which they arouse in others (Mead 1934, p. 161). As the boy gradually begins to use language associated with boys to describe himself that he learns from interacting with caregivers and significant others, his role taking ability allows him to assume the attitudes of others toward himself as well as behave toward himself as he perceives others behave. To be sure, this is a complicated process which involves several phases of development before a full sense of selfhood is attained. The path to full selfhood is described below.

Male socialization is facilitated by a long period of male infant dependence during which his attention is focused on the social environment that provides support, nourishment, warmth, and protection. The infant male quite early begins to seek through gestures, especially vocal ones, those comforts which his environment (usually his family) can provide. Eventually, the child's gestures must call out in him the responses, including corresponding vocal ones, made to him by the caregivers in his environment. Once he has this ability, the male infant stimulates himself to vocalize the sounds the caregivers make. This reaction in a given situation is determined by the social environment, which means that the male

infant's social environment determines what responses the infant stimulates in himself and in others. It should be remembered that such responses and stimulations are quite incomplete and immature. Nevertheless, it is this rudimentary process involving interaction with others out of which the child gradually develops a self and thus becomes a social being. In describing much of what goes on during this period, Mead writes:

> Its earliest function, in the instance of the infant, is effective adjustment to the little society upon which it has so long to depend. The child is for a long time dependent upon moods and emotional attitudes. How quickly he adjusts himself to this is a continual surprise. He responds to facial expressions earlier than to most stimuli and answers with appropriate expressions of his own before he makes responses that we consider significant. He comes into the world highly sensitive to this so-called "mimic gesture," and he exercises his earliest intelligence in his adaptation to his social environment. . . . In the normal child, the vocal gesture arouses in himself the responses of his elders through their stimulation of his own parental impulse and later of other impulses, which in their childish form are beginning to ripen in his central nervous system. These impulses find their expression first of all in tones of voice and later in combinations of phonetic elements which become articulate speech as they do in the vocal gesture of the talking birds. The child has become, through his own impulses, a parent to himself. (1934, pp. 368–69)

I and me: Phases of the male self. Once the male child has developed some facility with language, socialization proceeds quite rapidly. As a part of male socialization, male self development is dependent on the young male's ability to carry on a conversation of significant gestures. This ability enables him to become an object unto himself.

Actually, these components are considered to be distinguishable phases of the self as "I" and "me" and are seen as separate but belonging together (Mead 1934, p. 178). The "I" is that with which we identify ourselves. "I" am a man who is attempting to communicate with a reader at this particular time. The "I" is the subject aspect of the self as process, while the "me" is the object aspect of the self. The "I" aspect of self responds to the "me" aspect of self. "I talk to myself, and I remember what I said. . . . The 'I' of this moment is present in the 'me' of

the next moment. . . . 'I' becomes a 'me' in so far as I remember what I said . . ." (p. 174).

According to Mead, the "I" is spontaneous and we are never fully aware of what we are—thus surprising ourselves by our own action. "It is as we act that we are aware of ourselves" (p. 174). The "I" is present in our memories.

As the young male performs what he feels is an appropriate masculine role, he arouses in himself the attitude of others toward his performance. The young male responds to this attitude, and his response constitutes his "I." When the boy takes the attitudes of others he constructs the "me" aspect of self. When significant others call upon a boy to give an appropriate masculine response, the boy takes the attitudes of those others ("me" in process) and gives a response to the demand, constructing that response with knowledge of what is wanted and what the consequences will be—all aspects of the "me." It is within this context that the boy's "I" responds. Yet, the boy has not known what the response will be. It may be appropriate or it may not be appropriate. The boy's response as it is in his immediate experience constitutes his "I." When the boy reflects on his actions concluding that, indeed, he was "cool," "calm," and "collected," the way a "dude" would be, his "me" has arisen. The "I" then has entered into the boy's experience and become a part of the boy's "me." The "I" is what the boy was when he responded. This really means that the "I" is "free"; it initiates, and it is uncertain. The "me," in contrast, "represents a definite organization of the community there in our own attitudes and calling for a response, but the response ("I") that takes place is something that just happens (p. 178).

Stages of male self development. From Mead's perspective, the biological male goes through three stages of self development, each stage denoting an ability to engage in a progressively more complex form of role taking. A typical male goes through a *preparatory stage* which can be called a presymbolic period because the interactions which occur seem to lack meaning. The male infant or toddler during this stage does not really separate himself from others because he does not define objects with words and lacks any understanding of the meaning of his behavior and its relationship to others. Behaviors coming from the child during this stage are simply copies of others' behaviors. Yet, near the end of this stage, the child is on the verge of role taking and thus *prepared* to enter the *play stage*.

During the *play stage*, which Mead distinguishes as one of two in the full development of the self, the young male's self is made up of an organization of specific attitudes held by others toward himself and toward each other in specific social acts in which he participates. For example, a boy in the play stage of self development who interacts with other members during a family celebration is capable of assuming the attitude toward himself of each with whom he comes in contact. He can take the role of each specific other, and he can organize the specific attitudes toward himself and the ones of the others toward each other in the specific acts in which he and the others participate. Still, however, full development of the self has not occurred and awaits the *game stage*.

Self development for the social male reaches a peak when he enters the *game stage*. This third stage in the full development of the male self consists not only of the male's organization of specific attitudes of others toward self, but also the male's organization of the social attitudes of the generalized other or the group as a whole of which he is a member. "Only insofar as he takes the attitudes of the organized social group to which he belongs toward the organized cooperative social activity or set of such activities in which that group as such is engaged does he develop a complete self or possess the sort of complex self he has developed" (Mead 1934, p. 155).

If we want to understand how social groups, communities, and the like exert control over the individual male, it is important to recognize that it is in the social process, *generalized other*, that the group influences male behavior. Let us look at an example as it relates to the late adolescent and young adult male becoming, in popular parlance, a "dude."

The influence of the peer group on male socialization during adolescence is well documented. While this influence often runs counter to prevailing cultural norms and values (as was pervasive in America in the 1960s and 1970s), most peer-group influence is decidedly congruent with cultural values and norms (Reich 1970). Astin et al. (1984) have noted the distinctive cultural influence of peer groups in the 1980s toward conformity and tenets of the Protestant ethic with its emphasis on capitalism.

Developing alongside these peer influences embracing cultural attitudes and beliefs fostering conformity are those peer groups that embrace "cool" postures mentioned earlier. How is this possible? It is possible because of typical adolescent and early adult males' abilities to reflect on themselves from the roles of generalized others as well as take the roles of generalized others toward peer groups as a whole, their individual

members, and the activities of the peer groups. Without such abilities to become objects unto themselves from the point of view of generalized others, the adolescent and early adult males could not become "dudes." Obviously, from a symbolic interaction perspective, when the biological male develops a fully functioning self, the process of becoming a "dude" is not a mystery. It involves no more and no less than the process of becoming a man or a guy.

Agents of Male Socialization

The human male undergoes a long socialization process whereby he becomes aware of himself as a male and develops sex role skills necessary for full functioning as a social male in society. Much of the emphasis in earlier sections of this chapter has been on self development. Just as important, however, is the sex role which the biological male must learn if he is to fulfill self and others' expectations of himself as a boy, a man, a guy, or dude. What is the nature of this sex role which must be performed if the biological male is to function fully as a social male? Two general male sex roles exist in American society: the *White male sex role* and the *Black male sex role*. These are general masculine roles assumed by American men which are ideal types subject to some deviation. On these two roles, I have stated:

> The two general roles assumed by American males are the *White masculine role* and the *Black masculine role*. I maintain that while subcultural, ethnic, racial and socioeconomic factors may modify the specific masculine role assumed by a specific male, the role that he makes and plays is derived either from the White masculine model or the Black masculine model. These models, I contend, have developed through a long historical process involving social, demographic, and socioeconomic factors. What this means is that masculine role assumptions *may* or *may not* be race-specific, although a race-specific pattern of masculine role assumptions is usually the case. Possible exceptions include those *few* Black males and white males who are exposed early to opposite-race socialization influences and live most, if not all, of their lives in opposite-race social and physical environments. . . .
>
> Undoubtedly, as many of you think about some of the above statements, questions about Native American men, Chicano men, Chinese-American men, Japanese-American men, Cuban-American men, and others arise. What about these men, and what roles do they assume? My response to your probable question is that these men have not made the impact on American society that Black males have made, nor has society constructed specific strategies for meting out resources to these men. Men in the above ethnic groups usually find themselves assuming either the White masculine role or the Black masculine role. For these men, socioeconomic variables usually determine which masculine role model is assumed. (Franklin 1984, p. 45)

Based on societal expectations for Black males and white males in American society, the Black male sex role and the white male sex role are defined as follows: the Black male sex role refers to *a set of expectations and behaviors which emphasize physical strength, submission and dominance of women, angry and impulsive behavior, functional relationships between women and men, antifemininity, and strong male bonding*; the white male sex role is defined as *a set of expectations and behaviors which emphasize male dominance, male competition, male violence, the work ethic, and antifemininity*. Let us examine how one of these two sex roles becomes a constantly constructed feature of most American men's lives. A glance at some of the agents responsible for the development and maintenance of male socialization should contribute to an understanding of this process. The agents of socialization to be discussed are divided into those formally charged with the responsibility for male sex role socialization and those that have informal (and often latent) responsibility.

Purposeful Agents of Male Socialization

Each newborn male in society is expected to undergo a lengthy learning process to acquire appropriate male behaviors. Responsibility for this process historically lay with such societal agents as the family, religious institutions, educational institutions, the mass media, and adolescent and young adult male peer groups. A discussion of the roles of these agents in male socialization is presented in this section. Let us begin with the family.

The family. The family is a vital agent involved in teaching males appropriate attitudes and behaviors. From the moment the newborn is identified as male, a set of cultural expectations unfolds dictating what behaviors may and may not be displayed. The agent charged with initial responsibility for insuring sex role conformity with societal expectations is the family. Studies have suggested (e.g., Schau et al. 1980, and Fu and Leach 1980) that if the newborn is male, rather rigid cultural expecta-

tions exist for him to learn to give "male performances" in social interactions. This means that the socialization process for males is likely to be especially constraining, allowing little deviation.

Even more critical for many young males learning male sex role requirements is the presence of older males within the family who serve as role models. Often such males are the fathers of these young males, although all that seems necessary for partial male socialization is that older males are seen by the younger males performing certain roles within the family setting. Seeing older males' role performances within the family provides younger males with the opportunity to learn vicariously cultural expectations for their own behaviors.

Some studies have found that parents treat children differently depending on the sex of the child (Schau et al. 1980). Differential treatment of children according to gender has been observed in fathers who are much more likely to "rough it up" with boys than with girls (Parke and Suomi 1980; Power and Parke 1983). These differences in fathers' behaviors toward their children depending on gender often follows stereotypical directions. Interestingly, fathers' stereotypical behaviors in interaction with their children follow parents' stereotypical descriptions of their newborns. Despite the lack of significant differences in birth length, weight, and APGAR scores, parents of daughters are more likely than parents of sons to give descriptions of their babies as "dainty," "pretty," "beautiful," and "cute" (Rubin et al. 1974). Certainly such differences in descriptions of children by gender may foretell parental behavioral differences by gender in parent-child interaction. We already know, for example, that parents of boys are much *less* directing of their offsprings' play than parents of girls. Such interferences by parents in the behaviors of girls may well affect girls' creativity and interests in ways inimical to their later independence and assertiveness. In the same vein, when parents of boys are less directing of their play, this begins to prepare boys for the independent and active male sex role many expect them to assume when they become adult males.

Other studies of parents' behaviors during the socialization of their children have produced mixed findings with respect to differential treatment of children by gender. Snow et al. (1983) found that parents responded differentially to some types of sex-typed behaviors in toddlers, but not others. In another study, fathers punished boys' cross-sex play behavior while mothers were found to punish and reward boys' cross-sex behaviors (Langlois and Downs 1980). These findings regarding fathers' lack of tolerance for boys' cross-sex behaviors are

consistent with our contention that male sex role socialization tends to be more restrictive than female sex role socialization, especially early in life. A final study which is instructive on this point is one by Eisenberg et al. (1985). In this study of mothers' and fathers' socialization of one- and two-year-olds' sex-typed play behaviors, several findings are notable. On the variables "parental choice of toys" and "parental reinforcement," parents of boys tended to choose neutral and masculine toys more than feminine toys, while parents of girls chose neutral toys more than the other two types. However, once parents had chosen toys for their children, they did not differentially reinforce them or neutrally respond to them for sex-typed or other-sex play. Eisenberg et al. concluded that "apparently, in the home, parents exert influence over their young children's play primarily via their selection of available toys" (p. 1512). Thus, parental opportunity to select and influence behavior may be a preferred method of socializing children's sex-typed behavior. Another finding from Eisenberg et al.'s study of interest is that parents reduced positive feedback for children's toy play with age. "Parents provided less positive feedback (and thus more neutral feedback) at age 26 to 33 months than at 19 to 26 months" (p. 1512). The reduction in parental reinforcement of play with age of the child occurred only for other-sex play activities, not neutral or sex-typed behaviors. This means that boys in all likelihood are aided in the development of gender constancy by continued parental reinforcement of sex-type play throughout childhood.

Findings regarding differential parental treatment by sex of child seem to be mixed at this point. Definite conclusions about differential parental behaviors by sex of child await further research. However, differentiated parental reinforcement may not be necessary for the development of sex differentiated behavior in children. Simply attending to behavior differentially may be enough. Consider a study by Fagot and Hagan et al. (1985). This study of thirty-four children in infant play groups revealed no sex differences in assertive acts and attempts to communicate verbally with adults at ages 13 to 14 months. However, the authors observed learning center teachers attending more to boys' assertive behaviors and more to girls *less intense* communication attempts. The result was that eleven months later twenty-nine of the same children exhibited sex differentiated behavior: boys were more assertive and girls talked more with adults. Thus, caregivers seemed to be responsible, in part, for the development of boys' and girls' sex differentiated behavior by guiding infant behaviors in stereotypical directions.

Educational institutions. It is well documented that there is a significant difference in what adults observe depending on whether the persons being observed are described as males or females (Condry and Ross 1985). Purported reasons for adult differential perceptions of children's behavior by sex vary. Some feel that adults may be differentially responsive to certain types of behaviors by girls and boys. For example, because girls are expected to be more verbal than boys, are teachers more attentive to girls' verbal behaviors than boys'? By the same token, because boys are expected to have more assertive interchanges in peer activities than girls, do adults attend more to boys' assertive behaviors than girls' assertive behaviors? If the answers to both questions are yes, then differential attention to certain behaviors of boys and girls result in adults' differential perception of boys' and girls' behaviors.

Another common assumption stemming from social learning theory is that adults directly socialize children to behave in sex-typed ways through differential reinforcement and punishment. This assumption is supported by Beverly Fagot's (1981) findings that teachers differentially reinforce boys and girls for high activity levels. Even the large school context seems to be more supportive of males than females. Males continue to hold the more prestigious positions in the school system, schoolyards remain sex segregated, and in general gender differences remain in confidence, self-concept, and problem solving behaviors. Certainly such differences are related to the educational system's reinforcement of gender differences and traditional sex role behaviors. For example, findings from Phillips' playground study (1982) were quite consistent with those of Janet Lever (1976), who had found in her analysis of boys' and girls' spontaneous games on playgrounds that the games were sex differentiated. Lever concluded that boys' games were less structured than girls' games, with less emphasis on "turn-taking" and invariable procedural rules. Moreover, girls played with fewer participants while boys' games emphasized more initiative, improvisation, and extemporaneity, encouraging within-group cooperation and between-group competition. Phillips also found in her study of school playground activities that school spaces provided for boys and girls encouraged sex-differentiated play activities. Boys had large play spaces supportive of large competitive groups for competitive games. Girls' play spaces were small and generally supportive of cooperative, dyadic, and/or triadic activities. The major play space for girls in Phillips' study was on the playground apparatus, which could be easily invaded by boys and on occasion *was* invaded by boys, with the girls submissively leaving the equipment until

the boys no longer used it. Phillips concluded: "Boys' play was preparing them for future work roles that would consist of the networks of competitively based groups necessary for success and achievement in the work place" (Franklin 1984, p. 43).

Jeanne Block's (1981) summary of the effects of sex-differentiated socialization in educational institutions suggests that male socialization in the education institution (which encourages curiosity, independence, initiative, etc.) extends male experiences, while female socialization in the educational institution (which discourages exploration, emphasizes class supervision, stresses proprieties, etc.) restricts the experiences of females. While some changes in the educational institution have occurred in recent years, males and females still have sex-differentiated experiences throughout their tenures in educational institutions.

Religious institutions. Almost as influential in teaching males to assume the male sex role is another agent, the religious institution. The only reason the religious institution does not assume a more critical role in male socialization is that the typical child does not spend an inordinate amount of time in religious settings. The time that is spent, however, generally is time when gender distinctions are emphasized. Such distinctions, within Christianity for example, are seen as divinely inspired in that they support the ideal relationship between husband and wife. On this point, Patricia M. Lengermann and Ruth A. Wallace (1985, p. 239) state that calling for sex role equality, questioning patriarchy, and critiquing traditional male dominance and female submissiveness in marriage and family life are antithetical to the divine plan as visualized by many Christians. Such a posture on the part of religious agents supports traditional sex roles against gender equality. In the 1980s with the rise of evangelical Christian movements and retrenchment in Roman Catholicism, we can only conclude that the religious institutions in the United States remain staunchly supportive of traditional female and male sex roles.

Support for the above position is seen in "God Goes Back to College," an article appearing in *Newsweek*'s "On Campus" edition, November 1986. Noting the fervor with which college students on campuses across the nation (those mentioned included Brown University, Arizona State University, University of Illinois—Champaign-Urbana, University of Texas, Duke University, Washington University, and Northwestern University) are embracing fundamentalist religious beliefs. Two striking implications for sex role changes are discussed. These implications center around a great deal of sentiment among religious

groups in these settings to deny gays equal rights and to thwart women's attempts to pursue careers. Increased religious proselytizing on college campuses in the 1980s frequently has resulted in support for homophobia and traditional sex roles for females and males.

Peer groups. A consistent finding in the literature on children is that American children show a preference for same sex peers by the beginning of their sixth year. This tendency toward peer-group sex segregation increases during middle childhood and reaches its peak right before adolescence (Hartup 1983). In addition, as Thompson (1985) found in his study, males in pre-adolescence are more peer oriented than females. Part of the reason for greater peer orientation among males undoubtedly is linked to greater encouragement of independence in males at an earlier age. What this means for male socialization is that boys at a relatively early age are more subject to peer-group influence than girls. Just as important is that such influence may be perceived positively and supported by parents as indicative of boys' independence.

If boys are susceptible to early peer-group influence, this also means that males' early-age peer groups may be responsible for a great deal of those sex role performances by boys. This is to be expected if Fagot's (1981) findings that boys who exhibit feminine behaviors receive negative feedback from peers are generalizable. Some support for peer-group influence on boys' sex role performances derive also from Eisenberg et al.'s (1985) study of a stronger match for males than females between same-sex peer interactions and neutral or sex-typed toy play for fifty-one four-year-olds. When boys play with boys they prefer sex-typed toy play. Eisenberg et al. (1985) felt that this is consistent with the notion that there is more pressure for males than females to avoid sex-inappropriate activities:

> Although initiation of and/or continuation of interaction per se may not be used consciously as a positive reinforcer by children, it could function as one. Thus, unintentionally as well as intentionally (Lamb et al., 1980), children, especially boys, may socialize peers into sex-stereotypic play behaviors. They may do so not only by initiating play with others in possession of sex appropriate toys, but also by inducing other children to engage in same sex play. (P. 1049)

There seems to be a logical relationship between children's play behavior and their everyday role performances. Indeed, when boys' play behaviors are channeled in a decidedly stereotypical masculine direction, certainly they learn that these same behaviors are expected of them by significant others in everyday situations. After all, parental brokering, approval, support, and reinforcement by early age peer groups function to inform the boy of the importance of this early socialization agent.

An early study by Fling and Manosevitz (1972) on male socialization found that young males are encouraged to participate in activities that teach and reinforce male stereotyped roles. There is little reason to think that such participation has declined in the 1980s. Interestingly, peer-group influence over males tends to decline as the young male approaches late adolescence. While in late childhood and early adolescence, male peer groups are quite influential in boys learning competitiveness, aggression, violence, and antifemininity, young males also learn that they must become independent, self-reliant, and detached from the peer group. This latter socialization, in a sense, prepares young males for the role which must be assumed in adulthood, a role which minimizes male-male relationships. Yet, adolescent peer groups, for most males, are kinds of references groups providing information which the sixteen- or seventeen-year-old male actively filters, alters, and modifies to fit his own perspective. Typically, peer group information, standards, and values are some variant of those from other socialization agents, including nonpurposive ones discussed in the next section. Most young males experience a kind of socialization which teaches them societally approved sex roles, dysfunctional ones as well as functional ones.

The mass media. Mass media influences on sex role socialization are thought by many to be critical in the development and support of sex role stereotypes specifically and sex role inequality generally. The link between sex role stereotypes and sex role inequality is a direct one. Sex role stereotypes (expectations about and attitudes toward the sexes) lead to sex role inequality (inequitable actions toward a person based on the sex of that person). This linkage is consistent with findings in social psychological literature suggesting that stereotypes are better predictors of behavior than of attitudes.

Yet, how do sex role stereotypes relate to male socialization? Recalling that male socialization is a dual process, involving male self development and the learning of societal "shoulds" and "should nots" for males, one can see that much male socialization actually involves learning conceptions of males' "make-up" and "places" and females' "make-up" and "places." Undoubtedly, the mass media play critical roles in this process. When females in television commercials usually

perform household duties and pamper men while males typically perform active roles outside the home and do not perform domestic duties, a message is given to viewers that housework is women's work and work outside the home is men's work (Mamay and Simpson 1981).

That television may play a powerful role in gender socialization is suggested by Drabman et al. (1979) since their findings indicate that young children (first graders), when shown videotaped presentations of males and females in counter-stereotyped occupations (such as male nurse and female doctor), tended to reverse sex role information in the stereotyped direction. For Drabman et al. this finding meant that television should be used in a specific way to modify sex role socialization in a more equitable manner for boys and girls. They state: "Television programming which directly informs the child nearly all life roles are available to both sexes might prove more fruitful in attempts to alter traditional gender stereotypes" (p. 388).

Not only is television a potentially powerful agent in the sex role socialization of males and females, but newspapers, comics, movies, and popular songs may also influence conceptions of gender roles. Lengermann and Wallace (1985) feel that such mass media are "a forum where critical views on gender equality are heard and aired, can affect the thinking and beliefs of men as well as women, and can be for both a resource for new meanings" (p. 222). To the extent that men and women are affected by such mass media changes and also participate in the teaching of males, the effects on male socialization are obvious.

To be sure, there have been some changes in the mass media toward presenting male and female images in a manner more consistent with sex role equality. Lengermann and Wallace point to the inclusion of women columnists like Ellen Goodman and Mary McGary in daily newspapers as evidence of changes in newspapers which can modify a man's thinking about a woman's place. They note also the emergence of Alan Alda, a popular television entertainer and self-described feminist, as a role model in the media for nontraditional men in contrast to more conventional male images like Bob Hope and John Wayne. Men's magazines, too, are thought to be sources of sex role changes in the mass media. Magazines such as *Esquire* and *Sports Illustrated* are thought by Lengermann and Wallace to reflect "new meanings." They cite the November 1982 issue of *Esquire* with a feature article entitled "Father Love" by Anthony Brandt and *Sports Illustrated*'s (Feb. 28, 1983) coverage of Louisiana Tech women's basketball team (a sign that women's sports are making strides toward parity) as evidence of further change in sex role meanings.

Yet, all is not progress in the 1980s on the issue of sex role equality in the mass media in America. For example, in an analysis of sex role stereotyping in the Sunday comics, Sarah Brabant (1976) found that males and females were overwhelmingly portrayed in stereotypical roles. Ten years later, Brabant, along with colleague Linda Mooney, finds minimal change in the portrayal of males and females in the Sunday comics. In fact, the authors are moved to state:

> Given that a cultural analysis of sex roles focuses on the shared meanings individuals use in their interactions, and that development of these symbolic meanings are, in part, dependent upon the mass media, it is especially disappointing to empirically document the continued depiction of a male-dominated society and the devaluation of women in everyday life. How far have women come? If Blondie, Gladys, and Alice are indicators, not very far at all. (P. 148)

Brabant and Mooney's findings are especially important in light of those from Sanik and Stafford's (1985) study of adolescents' contributions to household production. They found significant differences between females and males in the amount of time spent on household work in two-parent, two-child families; adolescent females clearly spent more time doing household work. Because first- and second-born boys and girls did not differ on any of the exploratory variables and their responses to independent variables were similar, Sanik and Stafford concluded that the higher participation in household work by females was due to the expectation placed on adolescents. A final statement by Sanik and Stafford on their findings underscores the necessity for media progress on the issue of sex role equality: "Until we witness equality in the sharing of work in the home during adolescence, we are not likely to witness it in the lives of husbands and wives of tomorrow" (p. 214).

Still, it is difficult to imagine significant changes in the mass media regarding the issue of sex role equality beyond employing token women in middle level positions, with minimal change in policy and philosophy on gender issues. Even when gender issues reach masses of people, often they take on an extremely negative tone. *New York* magazine senior editor Rhoda Koenig's September 1986 article in *Vogue* magazine entitled "How to Change a Man" is a case in point. Koenig begins her article with an acknowledgment of the existence of Men's Studies courses in what she says is "about a hundred colleges." Having some contact (it is not clear if all or some is face-to-face) with Robert Brannon (*The Forty-*

Nine Percent Majority), Michael Kimmel (who was then an assistant professor of sociology at Rutgers University), Steven Goldberg (*The Inevitability of Patriarchy*), Marvin Bressler (Chair[man] of Princeton University's Sociology Department), and Harry Brod (who was then assistant professor, University of Southern California), Koenig makes a great point of noting that most Men's Studies instructors (that she talked with?) belong to the National Organization for Changing Men and suggests that this group sounds as if "it, too, had something to do with diapers" (p. 370). From this point, Koenig's attack on Men's Studies moves on to the subject matter and topics taught in a Men's Studies class, class texts, class activities, the naiveté of the students taking a Men's Studies class at Rutgers, the professor's "patronizing, distorted view of the world," and finally Rutgers University itself for babying students.

Diane Petzke's "Men's Studies Catches On at Colleges, Setting Off Controversy and Infighting" in the February 1986 issue of the *Wall Street Journal* is hardly more positive than Koenig's. Petzke also zeroes in on Kimmel's class, emphasizing, with seeming amusement, a class activity which involved male students attempting to diaper a doll. Her major points, however, center on the controversial status of Men's Studies because of a *perceived conflict* with Women's Studies and a perception among some feminists that "men's courses aren't legitimate or are marginally useful at best" (p. 37).

In summary, some mass media changes in the last decade or so have been in the direction of sex role equality which would eventually lessen male dominance, male violence, male destruction, competition, and so on. Simultaneously, however, forces have arisen in the mass media which either support traditional sex role distinctions or at least suggest that change in men's behavior cannot occur or is trivial and of dubious value for society when it does occur. As we approach the end of the 1980s and move into the 1990s, it is hoped that the mass media will come to portray and reflect gender, especially the valued male sex role, in a realistic manner, that is, as sets of cultural expectations that are socially constructed.

Nonpurposive Agents of Male Socialization

Families, boys' groups, educational institutions, churches, newspapers, magazines, television, and radio are not the only socializing agents teaching males to be dominant, aggressive, violent, competitive, nonintimate, and non-nurturant. There are other agents in American society which are not charged with a learning function but which, nevertheless,

teach males conceptions of themselves, other males, and what males should and should not do. Some of these agents are male-centered barbershops, sports events, taverns, and business meetings, where primarily males engage in social interaction. These are the same agents forming the core of men's culture which were discussed in chapter 2. In this chapter, two latent socialization consequences of the above agents are emphasized: (1) indirect socialization of young males and (2) reinforcement and support of traditional conceptions of the male sex role.

With some exceptions (e.g., unisex hair salons), male barbershops, topless taverns, male-dominated business meetings, sports events, and the like function as social settings/negotiation contexts where men negotiate masculinity. While the negotiation of masculinity is a complex process involving numerous contextual and social psychological variables, the emphasis here is on the process used by men in certain settings to arrive at conceptions of who men are and how men should and should not behave. At the same time, they also form conceptions about persons who are not men and masculine—women and others perceived as feminine.

The "particulars" of masculinity negotiations in various social settings will not be discussed here; however, a broad description of such processes includes verbal and nonverbal behavior by male participants in social settings which define appropriate male attitudes and behaviors. In such settings as barbershops and male-centered sports events, frequently young, impressionable males are present during the negotiation process. The young males learn not only what behaviors are expected from the primary male participants, but also the attitudes that they should hold about the negotiation process and what outcomes from the negotiation process are most desirable. For example, a young male attending a professional football game learns not only that the more "manly" team wins—the team that is more competitive, more aggressive subdues—but also how he is to respond to such characteristics. The young boy leaves the stadium *knowing* that dominance is a desirable trait for men to have. After all, an entire group of men have just been rewarded by a host of other men for displaying the dominance trait. Just as important, too, for the young boy is the low esteem many others hold for the losing team—the one that has been subdued.

Young boys generally do not go to topless taverns where women are seen in various stages of undress. Nevertheless, masculinity negotiations and male socialization are features of such settings. Men receive support and reinforcement from other men for certain behaviors they display. The swaggers, the yells, the obscenities, the sexual references all be-