Since the earliest years of the American Psychological Association (APA), psychologists have concerned themselves with the scientific study of both animal and human behavior. For the first 8 of APA’s 12 decades, the latter group of psychologists studied generic human behavior. In the past 4 decades, however, most have recognized the need to shift to a more complex paradigm—the scientific study of the lives of women and the lives of men.

Psychologists have long known that men and women are different—a science so rooted in biology could not miss the obvious physical differences. Furthermore, the more contextually aware psychologists were also quite impressed with the differences between sex, a biological construct, and gender, a culturally derived construct focusing on the myriad ways that gender socialization regulates conduct. Yet, for most of the history of APA, American psychologists acted as though gender did not exist. In part, this neglect was a product of the androcentrism—the use of a male template for all human experience—that dominated psychological (and most other scientific) thought. In 1970, APA appointed the Task Force on the Status of Women in Psychology, chaired by Helen S. Astin, and things began to change. This task force identified serious deficiencies in psychological knowledge about women and posited that neglect of gender considerations causes women’s experiences to be ignored, women’s voices to go unheard, and women to be oppressed by sexist conceptualizations of what is “normal.”

The emergence of women’s studies and contemporary feminism have had an immense, and much needed, impact on APA, most notably illustrated by the appearance of the Association for Women in Psychology in 1969 and the Society for the Psychology of Women (APA Division 35) in 1973. Once feminist psychologists succeeded in getting APA to recognize gender and the social construction of femininity, it became apparent to many that a full analysis of gender could not be accomplished without additional attention to the construct of masculinity. The history of the Society for the Psychological Study of Men and Masculinity (SPSMM; APA Division 51) is very much about how organized psychology has come to pay attention to the lives of people struggling to understand and cope with the psychological challenges of manhood and masculinity.

In the following pages, we describe the broad social context in which the men studies perspective emerged and how that perspective filtered into APA. We describe how many like-minded psychologists moved from nascent awareness of men’s issues into collaborative actions to elevate their profession’s understanding of men’s lives. The chapter chronicles this group’s organizational activities from the initial meetings to the final stages of the push to become an APA division. We highlight some of the most prominent accomplishments of the division, as well as the inevitable struggles with differing ideologies and philosophies. Finally, we draw from the opinions of a field of experts to anticipate the future of the
SETTING THE STAGE: THE BROADER CULTURE LOOKS AT MANHOOD AND MASCULINITY

The late 1960s and early 1970s marked the debut of a number of lines of inquiry into the inner workings of men’s lives. Several men wrote paradigm-shifting books suggesting that men, as well as women, could be hampered by rigid traditional gender role expectations. Brenton (1966), Farrell (1974), Fasteau (1974), Goldberg (1976), Nichols (1975), and Pleck and Sawyer (1974) provided impressive treatises about the “hazards” of traditional masculinity in contemporary times. These books heralded the appearance of a men’s movement that gained considerable momentum and attention over the succeeding decades. Similar to the women’s movement that preceded it, the men’s movement was fueled by a commitment to countering sociocultural forces constraining people’s lives. However, unlike the women’s movement, this men’s movement had no dramatically obvious mandate, no clear theoretical underpinnings, and no central organization. In brief, there was considerable disagreement about what the men’s movement actually was.

For example, in the late 1980s Shiffman (1987) observed,

The men’s movement can be described structurally as consisting of a national profeminist organization, networks of activists engaging issues of violence against women, networks of academics working on issues of masculinity, men’s support groups, an annual national conference on men and masculinity, and various local and regional events. (p. 297)

Clatterbaugh (1990) described a number of theoretically varied men’s organizations, including nonfeminist men–fathers’ rights groups and spiritual–mythopoetic groups. Additionally, leaders of the gay liberation movement vigorously championed the cause of tolerance of gay lifestyles and also became leading critics of the most oppressive aspects of hegemonic masculinity.

Although some men’s movement groups were indifferent, or hostile, to the contemporary women’s movement, a major profeminist men’s group emerged in the mid-1970s in the form of the National Organization of Changing Men. Perhaps the most inclusive of the broad range of men’s movement philosophies, this group adopted a strong profeminist platform, incorporating the antiviolence community, veterans of consciousness-raising groups, mythopoetic men, men’s studies scholars, and gay liberation activists. This group (now the National Organization of Men Against Sexism) has sponsored a National Conference on Men and Masculinity for nearly 40 years and had a major role in the appearance of the breakaway Men’s Studies Association.

THE MEN’S MOVEMENT AND THE AMERICAN PSYCHOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION

From the perspective of gender studies within APA, the 1970s and 1980s were distinguished by concerted efforts to overcome long-standing androcentric biases.¹ The Association of Women in Psychology laid the groundwork for the Society for the Psychology of Women (APA Division 35). These organizations gave a clear signal that organized psychology would be expected to attend to women’s experiences, listen to women’s voices, and acknowledge gender as a powerful organizing variable in human experience. The influence of APA Division 35 became substantial as women’s issues committees and task forces were created across many divisions. Position statements and issue papers were crafted on a wide range of topics to clarify women’s perspectives that had previously been unheard. Convention programs on women’s studies became the most

¹In the following section, space has not allowed for identification of all the individuals who played key roles in the creation and establishment of SPSMM as an APA division. A fuller elucidation of people and their contributions can be found in the Brooks and Levant (2000) chapter on the division’s history.
visible and most popular at the annual meetings. It is not surprising, then, that gender studies became somewhat synonymous with women's studies.

During this time period, the impact of the men's movement seemed minimal in the activities of APA. Three notable exceptions to this absence were psychologists Joseph Pleck, Robert Brannon, and Murray Scher, who were particularly active in the earliest APA discourses about the intersections between the female and male experience. Brannon and Pleck, both active members of the Association of Women in Psychology, organized a symposium, probably the first of its kind at a social sciences conference, for the 1971 APA convention titled “Do Men Need Liberation From the Male Sex Role?” After APA Division 35 was established in 1973, Brannon and Pleck proposed that the division create a special section on men’s issues. This effort was unsuccessful, in part perhaps because of the prevailing view that psychology was already dominated by men’s perspectives and in part because there was not enough interest at the time.

Murray Scher, who had been especially active with the annual Men and Masculinity Conference and the American College Personnel Association, interacted with several others to prepare APA for the men’s studies perspective. He, along with Glenn Good, Mark Stevens, and Jim O’Neil, edited a men’s studies special issue of the Personnel and Guidance Journal that was published 3 years after Thomas Skovholt edited a similarly critical issue of The Counseling Psychologist (Scher, 1981; Skovholt, 1978).

Throughout the 1970s, men’s studies scholarship had yet to appear because virtually all gender research targeted sex differences and the benefits of psychological androgyny. In 1981, however, matters took a dramatic turn when Joseph Pleck published The Myth of Masculinity. In this book, Pleck (1981b) offered the gender role strain paradigm as a substitute for the previously dominant gender role identity model of masculinity. The gender role strain model became the forerunner of what was to become the “new psychology of men” (Levant & Pollack, 1995). Most important, this model introduced the notion that both women and men were constrained by overly rigid gender role constructions and that they were natural allies in reconstructing traditional gender roles.

With the appearance of Pleck’s (1981b) gender role strain paradigm, the stage was set for the fullest emergence of the men’s movement within APA. At last, psychologists were being given the opportunity to consider notions of masculinity and femininity as relational (i.e., masculinity not defined in isolation but defined in comparison to femininity), socially constructed (i.e., primarily not biological or evolved), and subject to change (i.e., gender viewed as an active social process rather than as an internal psychological characteristic). This new paradigm inescapably led to certain conclusions: (a) Men have a significant interest in appreciating how oppression of the less privileged (women, gay men, minorities) negatively affects even the more privileged; (b) the women’s movement alone cannot be expected to fully explicate the complexities of men’s lives; and (c) a culture that narrowly defines acceptable behavior for women and men is not conducive to optimal mental health.

The impact of the 1970s men’s movement and the gender role strain paradigm, though somewhat slow to be felt within APA, was dramatic once underway. In the early 1980s, the APA annual convention offered only a few scattered papers that had even passing reference to the quality of men’s lives. At that time, the APA convention program contained special index terms for programs emphasizing women’s studies, gender studies, and sex roles. Other than gay and lesbian issues, for which gay psychologists continued a long-standing pattern of examining stresses in men’s lives (and continued to be marginalized by most heterosexual men within APA), no special listings were available at that time for men’s studies program offerings. (Of course, there was a chicken–egg problem here because few psychologists even considered offering men’s studies programs.)

There were a few notable exceptions—one men’s studies symposium was presented at each of the APA conventions of 1980, 1986, and 1987 (Brooks & Levant, 2000). Ironically, the APA convention programs of the mid-1980s were distinguished more by the absence of men’s studies perspectives than by their presence. That is, many programs that might have been substantively enriched by men’s participation were organized
without male presenters. For example, a review of the APA programs of that era reveals seven symposia or panel discussions with explicit gender themes that were presented by 37 female psychologists and no male participants (Brooks & Levant, 2000). It seems apparent that although many men in this time period were beginning to become interested in the problematic effects of gender role strain in men’s lives, the majority of the work in the psychology community was being carried out by women and a small number of profeminist men. That situation changed dramatically in the late 1980s.

THE PATH TOWARD FORMING A DIVISION

Although a great many psychologists had previously developed some degree of interest in the study of men and masculinity, most of them remained relatively isolated from each other. As is often the case with new perspectives and the zeitgeist phenomenon, many people work and think separately but ultimately come together to create overwhelming momentum for new ideas or organizations. This was certainly the case for men’s studies, because the momentum came from at least three directions: the Men Treating Men Resource Exchange Network, the APA Division 29 (Society for the Advancement of Psychotherapy) Task Force on Men’s Roles in Psychotherapy, and the APA Division 17 (Society of Counseling Psychology) Special Interest Group on Men’s Issues.

In 1987, Gary Brooks, cochair of the Society for Family Psychology (APA Division 43) Gender Concerns Committee, sought to expand his interest in gender issues in family therapy to a broader outreach effort to collaborate among psychologists interested in men’s issues. After a APA Division 43 hospitality suite program in 1988, Brooks scoured the 1987 and 1988 APA convention programs to identify people with even a remote interest in men’s issues. With very liberal criteria, he developed a mailing list of 150 to 200 psychologists to invite to a planning meeting. Although these organizing efforts initially received a tepid response, they generated the Men Treating Men: Resource Exchange Network. As suggested by Don-David Lusterman, this was a simple, no-cost, one-page bulletin, mailed (this, of course, was several years before electronic communications) to all interested parties to describe men’s studies interests, activities, and needs. Between October 1989 and May 1991, six mailings of the Men Treating Men Bulletin were sent to more than 300 interested parties, the beginnings of a network that would become APA Division 51.

At approximately the same time that Brooks was imagining a network of psychologists interested in men’s issues, several individuals in APA Division 29 (Society for Advancement of Psychotherapy) were forming a group to examine the interplay of masculine socialization and psychotherapy. In April 1988, Ronald Levant and Herbert Freudenberger established the Task Force on Men’s Roles in Psychotherapy to provide a creative outlet for theoretical and applied ideas. From the beginning, the task force energetically executed its principal mission of generating men’s studies papers and symposia to be presented at the APA mid-winter and annual conferences. Only two symposia were presented in 1988, but within 5 years the task force was initiating and coordinating multiple programs that were cosponsored by numerous APA divisions (e.g., the 1993 APA convention program reflected more than 15 symposia and more than 50 individual papers, with cosponsorship across several APA divisions). A special highlight of the task force’s work was the collection of several individual papers into a special series on men and psychotherapy that was published in a 1990 issue of Psychotherapy: Theory, Research, Practice, Training (Levant, 1990).

As noted earlier, counseling psychologists were among the first to develop interests in the psychology of men and masculinity. In the late 1980s, their presence was again felt through the establishment of APA Division 17’s Special Interest Group on Men, Masculinity, and Men’s Studies. Ronald Levant and James O’Neil were principal organizers of the special interest group, which produced two especially noteworthy products. In 1993, O’Neil, Glenn Good, and Sarah Holmes produced a resource manual, networking guide, and membership directory that not only identified psychologists with men’s studies interests but also began the process of pairing potential men’s studies mentors with those people seeking contact with more experienced colleagues. In 1993 and 1994,
the special interest group worked with the APA Education Directorate to produce the first continuing education home study program on men’s issues.

SHARPENING FOCUS: BECOMING AN APA DIVISION

To become truly influential within the broader psychology community, there needed to be movement from comfortable affinity among like-minded individuals to the development of an organizational structure that would allow for the fullest acceptance of men’s studies as a legitimate and viable area of scholarship and practice. This critical step began with the 1990 APA convention in Boston, which resulted in the Committee for the Psychological Study of Men and Masculinity (CPSMM), cochaired by Ron Levant and Gary Brooks. Although this meeting generated considerable enthusiasm among its 25 participants, it would be nearly 7 years (February 1997) before SPSMM would become confirmed as APA Division 51.

Between 1990 and 1997, CPSMM members worked assiduously to overcome the three primary obstacles to achieving APA divisional status. First, through publications and presentations, they continued to demonstrate the need for and relevance of men’s studies scholarship. The second challenge, demonstration of broad interest in a new division, was met through presentation of programs and symposia at the APA convention relying on established relationships in APA practice divisions (Society of Counseling Psychology, Psychotherapy, Society for Family Psychology, and Psychologists in Independent Practice [APA Division 42]). The CPSMM program committee took the lead, acting as an informal networking, mentoring, and facilitating body to help interested parties assemble panels and symposia. Eventually, a sufficient number of APA members signed cards affirming interest in the new division so that the final, and somewhat more sensitive, hurdle could be faced, that is, overcoming resistance to a new men’s division.

CPSMM leadership was aware that many members of APA Division 35 (Society for the Psychology of Women) were skeptical about the need for a men’s division and concerned that such a division not become antagonistic to women’s issues (this matter is also reflected in APA policy that makes it clear that no new division can be established that could be considered inimical to the purposes of existing divisions). To promote its acceptance, SPSMM leaders worked diligently to clarify its mission and purposes with other divisional leaders. Because of the essential importance of collaboration with APA Division 35, SPSMM leaders, many of whom were also members of APA Division 35, worked closely with that division’s leadership to clarify the commonality of mission and interests. Not insignificant in this process, CPSMM adopted a mission statement that expressly acknowledged “its historical debt to feminist-inspired scholarship on gender, and commits itself to the support of groups such as women, gays, lesbians and people of color that have been uniquely oppressed by the gender/class/race system” (APA Division 51, 2013, para. 5).

Ultimately, the APA Division 35 board voted to support CPSMM, markedly enhancing its process of becoming a division. The subsequent vote by the APA Council of Representatives to approve SPSMM as a candidate division took place in February 1995. Although there was no official roll call, unofficial count revealed more than 100 votes for approval, 1 vote to oppose, and 2 abstentions. After a 2-year vestibule period, the APA Council of Representatives in February 1997 unanimously approved SPSMM as a permanent APA division.

VISIONS INTO ACTION: SPSMM HITS ITS STRIDE

Once APA divisional status was achieved, it became possible for SPSMM members to shift focus from exclusive emphasis on membership recruitment and organizational challenges to developing and nurturing projects that had previously been only aspirations. Of the many noteworthy activities nurtured by SPSMM leaders (see Exhibit 1.1), several are particularly noteworthy.

Psychology of Men & Masculinity
In establishing men’s studies as a worthy topic of psychological scholarship, no step has been
Brooks and Elder

more significant than the development of the division’s widely read and highly respected journal, *Psychology of Men & Masculinity* (PMM). From the 1st-year publication of two issues in 2000, the journal has experienced extraordinary growth from its nascent status at that time to its current status in the top one third of social psychological journals and the top 20% of all Journal Citation Reports social science journals (Levant, 2015). Credit for this remarkable maturity goes to many, but especially to its three editors—David Lisak (2000–2003), Sam Cochran (2004–2007), and Ron Levant (2008–2015). As we describe in the Evolving Trends in Men and Masculinity Research section of this chapter, PMM has become the vanguard journal for research into the breadth of men and masculinity topics.

Publishing and the Routledge Book Series
The astounding growth of resources for understanding the lives of boys and men is nicely illustrated by clicking on the Publications and Resources section of the SPSMM website (http://www.division51.org/publications/publications.htm). In early 2014, that site identified 67 books authored by SPSMM members, books addressing a multitude of issues, populations, and treatment approaches. A most significant aspect of this publishing enterprise has been the Routledge Series on Counseling and Psychotherapy With Boys and Men. Mark Kiselica, the series editor, described its purpose as an effort to develop a comprehensive set of specialized books for helping professionals in counseling and psychotherapy with males. As of this writing, 10 books in that series have been published, with several others forthcoming (http://www.routledgementalhealth.com/series/boys-and-men).

National Psychotherapy With Men Conference
Since the emergence of men’s studies scholarship in the 1970s and 1980s, SPSMM members have been at the forefront of elucidating the clinical implications of the new psychology of men (Levant & Pollack, 1995). Although an abundance of books had been written and symposia had been presented, this educational process reached a new level with the 2007 appearance of the first National Psychotherapy With Men Conference. Organized by Mark Stevens at California State University, Northridge, the conference aimed to “bring our vast clinical and research resources to mental health practitioners interested in increasing their skills in working with men” (Stevens, 2007, para. 1). That conference was filled to capacity and so successful that it has been succeeded by two other equally well-attended conferences at the University of Texas (2010) and Fordham University (2012), with a fourth conference scheduled at California State University, Fullerton, for 2014 (see Exhibit 1.2 for a list of the organizers of and keynote presenters at those conferences).

Featuring scholarly presentations, case illustrations, and live therapy demonstrations, these conferences have been attended by several hundred practicing clinicians, as well as graduate students in a variety of mental health programs.

### EXHIBIT 1.1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>President</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>Ronald Levant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Gary Brooks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>Glenn Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Mark Kiselica a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Michael Andronico</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>James Dean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Samuel Cochran</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Corey Habben</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>John Robertson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Frederic Rabinowitz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Larry Beer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Mark Stevens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Chris Kilmartin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Michael Addis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Aaron Rochlen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Andrew Smiler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Jay Wade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Chris Liang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Jonathan Schwartz</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

aAppointed to serve after the illness of Neil Massoth.
Guidelines for Psychological Practice With Men and Boys
Over the past 2 decades, APA has encouraged and subsequently approved the development of a range of practice guidelines to educate practitioners and provide recommendations about professional conduct in a wide range of contexts and with a range of clinical populations. A major forerunner in the process of development of guidelines relevant to the psychology of men was the previous development of the guidelines for practice with girls and women (http://www.apa.org/practice/guidelines/girls-and-women.aspx). Extending this effort, SPSMM, with considerable support from the APA Board of Directors, has dedicated major resources to the development of a set of guidelines for professional practice with boys and men. According to Frederic Rabinowitz (personal communication, February 18, 2014), chair of the project, the lengthy process of developing these guidelines should culminate in approval by APA in the near future.

Teaching the Psychology of Men Workshops
For the 2004 APA convention in Honolulu, Jim O’Neil organized the Teaching the Psychology of Men continuing education workshop as an opportunity for mentoring and interacting with educators wanting to develop and refine their proficiencies in this new academic area. That workshop has since been offered annually at the APA convention, with O’Neil, Michael Addis, Christopher Kilmartin, Jim Mahalik, and Fred Rabinowitz serving as primary workshop faculty. The workshop has provided ideas and inspiration to more than 150 people, many of whom who were early career professionals receiving financial support from SPSMM.

Men’s Retreats
One of the earliest and most representative SPSMM activities has been the Men’s Retreat held at the annual mid-winter meeting since 1991. Designed as an opportunity for men to meet and share personal hopes and struggles, the retreat has been a major factor in shaping the division as one not only promoting men’s studies scholarship but also fostering more fulfilling relationships among men. (In 2010, a mixed-gender retreat was included in the mid-winter agenda in acknowledgment of the critical role of women in SPSMM.)

GROWING PAINS
The psychology of men and masculinity, as embodied by SPSMM, has experienced developmental struggles rooted in both ideological and theoretical forms.

Ideological Controversies
As noted earlier, SPSMM was created in an environment somewhat skeptical of the need for and benefit of a men’s division within a larger APA organization historically dominated by men’s perspectives. Furthermore, concerns were raised and assurances were needed that the new division would not be adversarial and antagonistic to mission of APA Division 35, the Society for the Psychology of Women (Brooks & Levant, 2000). The initial anxiety over this matter was overcome through demonstration that the study of men’s issues was more than an adjunct to the study of women’s issues and worthy of consideration as separate and necessary complement to women’s studies (Brod, 1987; Levant & Pollack, 1995). The concerns about possible discord between SPSMM and APA Division 35 had been largely assuaged with the
SPSMM mission statement affirming its recognition of its debt to feminism (and the profeminist philosophies of divisional leaders). However, 14 years after permanent divisional status was attained, an intense ideological controversy arose, with the division’s mission statement as one primary area of discussion.

Like most divisions of APA, Division 51 experienced a slow but steady decline in its membership in the early part of the 21st century. Some division leaders felt SPSMM was ideologically too narrow and could counter the APA-wide downward trend in membership by making the division more appealing to a wider range of members. Supporting this position was the observation that the great majority of SPSMM members were from clinical and counseling backgrounds, with very few developmental or social psychologists. Proponents of this position contended that scholars from concentrations other than clinical and counseling psychology might shy away from participating in the division if they perceived it to be slanted toward a specific worldview. This would be unfortunate, they reasoned, because differing theoretical perspectives could benefit psychology of men scholarship while also creating a “bigger tent” under which a variety of perspectives applicable to the psychology of men would be represented.

The principal articulation of this perspective was Andrew Smiler’s 2011 Division 51 presidential address, in which he called for SPSMM to take on the challenge of finding ways to have a greater impact on the entire psychology field and the public at large. In his presentation, Smiler pointedly criticized what he viewed as a lack of diversity of thought and overrepresentation of social constructionist and feminist perspectives. As one of his presidential initiatives, Smiler solicited volunteers and subsequently appointed a Task Force on Theoretical Orientations to study the issue and ultimately make recommendations to the SPSMM board.

A primary charge of this task force was to explore the possibility that the lack of theoretical diversity within the division could be contributing to the drop in membership. The task force worked together for some time and engaged in spirited as well as healthy debate. Because some in the group wondered whether the underrepresentation of other concentrations within psychology might be sending an unintended message to the broader profession that APA Division 51 welcomed only specific theoretical orientations, publication trends in PMM were reviewed to see whether this was the case. The results of this review determined that the journal welcomed scholarship from a multitude of sources, provided that it was indeed solid scholarship. Membership roles were also reviewed, and it was confirmed that the division was populated primarily by counseling and clinical psychologists and that it might benefit by forming collaborative relationships with many other APA divisions.

Over the many months of its work, the task force discussed many topics, with much of the discussion focused on the wording of the division’s mission statement. Those desiring change wanted to omit the reference to feminist scholarship consistent with the bigger tent perspective. Those opposing such a change contended that it would represent a breach of the division’s original commitments and could be interpreted as an undesirable distancing from feminist ideology. Ultimately, the SPSMM Board of Directors voted in 2013 that the task force would not make any recommendations to change the mission statement.

Theoretical Issues: Comprehending Masculinity

During the past 40 years, the psychology of men and masculinity literature has been dramatically reconceptualized. Innovative work from across social science disciplines has generated insight into how gender shapes people individually, relationally, and socioculturally, resulting in two primary distinctions related to how psychology has historically viewed masculinity. First, masculinity is no longer viewed as the “essentially” programmed result of biology or evolution. Manhood has come to be understood as the set of prescriptions that each culture attaches to the male biological sex (Kimmel, 2012), the meaning men make of their life experiences as organized around cultural norms for men. Research examining the psychology of men has generally concluded that the majority of behaviors and traits attributed to the male biological sex are the result of the way culture has taught men to behave.
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(Brooks & Good, 2001a, 2001b; Levant & Pollack, 1995). The second shift in contemporary understanding of masculinity has been to place men within a dual patriarchal context of social and political oppression in which men oppress women, but men also oppress other men. This leads men to constantly fear being attacked, victimized, and exploited (Pleck, 1981a). The view that mentally healthy men should be active, rational, strong, and community oriented (Constantinople, 1973; Terman & Miles, 1936) gave way, in the late 1970s and early 1980s, to the acknowledgment that restrictive roles experienced by men in various contexts can privilege men with power but can lead to negative outcomes (Pleck, 1981a; Sattel, 1976).

What has followed from these pioneering scholars is a significant body of research that has primarily identified the main elements of masculinity among various populations and then quantified the extent to which these elements are present in an individual man (Smiler, 2004). Addis and Cohane (2005), Smiler (2004), and Wester and Vogel (2012) have outlined the major theoretical perspectives, movements, and research findings of men and masculinity research, discussing how the psychology of men literature has extended introductory explorations of gender (e.g., Bem, 1974, 1979; Spence & Helmreich, 1978; Spence, Helmreich, & Stapp, 1974) to eliminate the assumption that masculinity and femininity are bipolar constructs and documenting how masculinity can have an impact on mental health. Findings continue to underline how sociocultural settings teach boys standards of hegemonic masculine behavior, how adherence to those standards is rewarded, and how deviance from those standards is punished (Levant, 1996, 2001a, 2001b; Wester & Vogel, 2012).

Four primary theoretical perspectives have been outlined as forming the basis of the study of socialized masculinity (Addis & Cohane, 2005). Before examining these four perspectives, some clarification is likely to be useful regarding terminology and the progression of language in this area. In the earliest efforts to differentiate sociocultural views of masculinity (“nurture”) from biological views (“nature”), it was common to label the latter perspective as essentialism and the former as social constructionist.

For example, in the introduction to his men’s studies textbook, Kilmartin (2010) used the subheading “Essentialism Versus Social Constructionism.” As theory development progressed, views from a nonessentialist perspective became more nuanced with efforts to explicate a social learning perspective from a social constructionist perspective. The tendency for some to conflate these two perspectives is understandable. As Addis and Cohane (2005) noted, “Although social constructionist paradigms are often confused with social learning frameworks, there are some critical differences” (p. 639). The social constructionist advocates, as described below, have differentiated themselves from Pleck’s (1981a) gender role strain paradigm, which they consider to be a social learning perspective (a view contested by Pleck, 1995). Although Wester and Vogel (2012) referred to the Addis, Mansfield, and Syzdek (2010) perspective as social constructionist, Addis et al. came to label it gendered social learning. Therefore, the Addis et al. gendered social learning paradigm should not be confused with the previous social learning paradigm because it is actually more of a social constructionist paradigm.

The principal categorizations in theorizing regarding masculinity, as described by Addis and Cohane (2005), are psychodynamic, social learning, social construction, and feminist. Each of these paradigms provides a unique framework for how masculinity can be theorized and studied, how men make meaning of their experiences, and how this meaning affects mental health. Although this list is not exhaustive, these theories are the most widely used, and each provides a degree of insight into the experience of men in relationship to masculinity. Commonly, these perspectives emphasize the diversity of masculinities according to the intersections of identity, including race, social class, ethnicity, and sexual orientation identity.

Psychodynamic approaches to masculinity tend to make use of the early years of men’s lives and formative interactions with caregivers as the primary forces in shaping men’s emotional and interpersonal capacities (see Chapter 5, this handbook). Contemporary psychodynamic theorists are based in object relationship and self-psychological approaches (Chodorow, 1978; Edley & Wetherell, 1995;
Diamond (2004), for example, proposed that a young boy identifies as a boy for the first time when his mother relates to him as a male person of another sex and that this maternal identification is the beginning of a man’s development of a more conscious role as a man. As the boy develops, a nurturing, holding, and protective father can act against a hegemonic masculinity that is active, penetrating, and potent (Diamond, 1997) and help integrate many maternal, feminine characteristics into the boy’s identity.

Similarly, Blazina (2001a, 2001b, 2004; Blazina, Eddins, Burridge, & Settle, 2007) has proposed that the “masculine self” is constructed through positive self-object experiences and merging with an idealized other to evolve a cohesive sense of oneself as masculine, and Krugman (1995) has argued that young boys avoid feelings of shame that originate in failure to live up to male gender role ideals. Authors of psychoanalytic theoretical perspectives present various points of view to understand the male gender role. However, these points of view have not been tested empirically, and few of them appear to be guided by theoretical frameworks specific to the psychology of men and masculinity (Addis & Cohane, 2005; Wester & Vogel, 2012).

Social learning is the paradigm most taken by researchers and theorists in the psychology of men. Although social learning frameworks are varied, they commonly describe men as learning the male gender role through watching other men and replicating what they observe, being reinforced for successfully replicating socially defined behavior, or being punished for deviating through society’s use of consequences. Gender role strain (Pleck, 1981a, 1995) was one of the first of these social learning theories and asserts that men learn a set of societally based proscriptions regarding appropriate masculine behaviors that are maladaptive, problematic, and impractical (see Chapter 2, this handbook). From this perspective, O’Neil (2008) developed the Gender Role Conflict Scale to assess the concrete outcomes of gender role strain. He defined gender role conflict as a psychological state in which socialized masculinity norms have negative outcomes for the person and others (O’Neil, Helms, Gable, David, & Wrightsman, 1986; see Chapter 3, this handbook). The gender role strain theory inspired several other masculinility measures, among them the Male Role Norms Inventory (Levant et al., 1992) and the Conformity to Masculine Norms Inventory (Mahalik et al., 2003). Addis et al. (2010) critiqued these social learning instruments as primarily focused on the pathological symptoms of adherence to masculine roles and less focused on the more theoretically driven questions of how men learn to be men and how these roles vary across situational contexts. Nevertheless, research from the social learning perspective has greatly increased the psychology of men’s understanding of the negative consequences associated with the hegemonic male gender role.

Social construction emphasizes the role of socialization but also how social context, including historic, economic, political, linguistic, interpersonal, and psychological constructs, affect masculine identity (Falmagne, 2000). Rather than observational learning, social construction posits that men actively develop masculinity, which includes a set of dynamic ideology norms that may be modified by individuals according to the demands of the social and situational circumstances (Addis & Cohane, 2005; Addis et al., 2010; Wester & Vogel, 2012; see Chapter 4, this handbook). For example, unique sets of cultural practices have been examined among football players, whose unique masculinity norms are influenced by socialization context, including year in school, on-field position plays, and athletic identity (Steinfeldt & Steinfeldt, 2012). A central assumption of social constructionist viewpoints is that masculinity behaviors are functional, depending on the setting and the positive and negative consequences of gendered activity, as well as pragmatic, or adaptive (Addis et al., 2010; Connell, 1995). Men from various backgrounds may share some masculinity ideologies, but they also have unique elements that are their own. For example, older men may experience depression as they age and feel disconnected from a cultural masculinity that emphasizes employment, accumulation of wealth, and the physical body, experiencing their own sense of masculine identity differently (Oliffe et al., 2013).

Because social constructionist approaches to research focus on the variability in the meaning of
masculinity depending on social context, social constructionist research findings are difficult to generalize to the larger population. Variations in data, and the interpretative power of the data, are typically best suited to qualitative methods within a nonpositivist epistemology (Addis & Cohane, 2005). Because existing social constructionist research samples are typically small and homogeneous, social constructionist research may benefit from replicating findings, including using quantitative methods, observational, anthropological, or medical techniques (Wester & Vogel, 2012) to do justice to the complexity of masculinity constructs.

Feminist thinkers were among the first to endorse actively building knowledge through environmental and interpersonal interactions, and both feminism and constructionism assert that context is central to any analysis. For example, the feminist concept of the personal as political implies that personal experiences are always entrenched in a social and political context. Of special concern to feminists is identifying issues of power between men of different groups and how social position affects power (Kaufman, 1994). Because traditional masculine norms establish power and dominance, masculinity cannot be understood when abstracted from men’s privilege. Power is also discovered through examining structural relationships within and between races, classes, and social order (Nicholson, 1997), underlining that a man’s power exists in relation to his socioeconomic class, ethnicity, sexual orientation, and gender role performance, and White, upper class, heterosexual men have the greatest social resources.

Feminist researchers have emphasized the ways that these variables, and their proximity to power, play a central role in shaping all aspects of individual experience, including mental health problems (e.g., Acker, 1999; Liu, Stinson, Hernandez, Shepard, & Haag, 2009; Nakano Glenn, 1999; Sussman, Robins, & Earls, 1987; Zylstra & Steitz, 1999). For example, the current cohort of young Black men has been described as being in crisis as a result of managing the tremendous pressure to establish white-collar employment and eschew ideologies of Black masculinity linked to the working class, including violence, incarceration, unemployment, and nonresidential fathering, which are issues presented as affecting Black men in general (Grundy, 2012). Because feminist perspectives emphasize giving voice to those outside the dominant patriarchal mainstream, who have been defined as “other” by the dominant culture, this lens may not seem fitting to examine men’s lives. Feminist psychotherapies and research methods have historically been targeted toward women. However, theory and research from a politically informed model may provide additional insight into how men are disempowered by the social reality of masculinity ideologies and how powerlessness can be transformed to move through mental health challenges (Brown, 2010; see Chapter 7 this handbook).

Positive Versus Negative Views of Men
One of the more complex and nuanced controversies within men’s studies has been one that is simultaneously supportive of feminism yet critical of what is viewed by Kiselica and Englar-Carlson (2010) as deficit models of male development that they see as implicit in Levant and Pollack’s (1995) new psychology of men. Kiselica and Englar-Carlson believe that their model—the positive psychology–positive masculinity model—represents an effort to integrate the literature on human strengths (Aspinwall & Staudinger, 2003) and positive psychology (Seligman & Csikszentmihalyi, 2000) with the new psychology of men model (see Chapter 6, this handbook). They view their model as a radical shift from a deficit model of male development to one that “accentuates positive aspects of masculinity, male development, and the male socialization process” (Kiselica & Englar-Carlson, 2010, p. 277). Among the 10 representative examples of male strengths identified by these authors are “male relational styles, male ways of caring, and male heroism.”

Several men’s studies theorists have responded critically to the positive psychology–positive masculinity model. Addis et al. (2010), Brooks (2012), and Levant (2008) have voiced similar objections to the model as assigning basic human capacities to the respective genders, thereby risking essentialist views of women and men. Addis et al. took the argument against the model further by noting that acceptance of
their contextual view of masculinity eliminates the need to see gendered behavior as characteristic of men or women but rather views it as a product of contingent and contextual factors. From this perspective, “the model also renders unnecessary debates about whether gendered social learning is ‘good’ or ‘bad’” (Addis et al., 2010, p. 84).

**Multicultural Masculinities**

Much of the psychology of men and masculinities literature is rooted in European American, White, and Western masculinity ideologies; however, more recently there has been an effort to examine how additional, intersecting identities, such as race, class, sexual orientation, and age, shift understandings of masculinity. For example, older men may evolve and expand their ideas of what it means to be a man, increasing positive social participation and communication about emotions (Thompson & Whearty, 2004). In terms of social class, some studies have examined how those in poverty conceptualize masculinity in terms of taking responsibility for their decisions and resolving barriers to resources (Liu et al., 2009). Yet, little research has investigated how absence of opportunities to fulfill masculinity roles (such as expectations tied to success and competition) affects masculinity identity. In addition, some initial research has demonstrated that portraying an image associated with traditional masculinity ideology may be important to sexual minority men, contributing to restrictive emotional expression in romantic relationships, questioned self-worth, and placing significant importance on one’s partner’s appearance (Sánchez, Greenberg, Liu, & Vilain, 2009). These findings suggest further areas of exploration, including the ways in which traditional masculine ideals and gender role socialization adversely affect gay men, elements that are beneficial for gay men and their relationships, unique elements of sexual minority masculinities, how masculinities change over the course of sexual minority men’s lifetimes, and how sexual prejudice and sociopolitical changes across time shift masculinity variables.

In terms of racial and cultural background, a growing literature is investigating how intersecting cultural identities and hegemonic masculinity identities collide. For example, many African American men appear to face unique challenges because they define themselves by traditional masculinity role demands while also struggling with racial identity development, culture, and gender-related racism (e.g., Bowleg, Teti, Malebranche, & Tschan, 2013). Nevertheless, masculinity and masculinity measures are concepts that have primarily been defined from a White perspective (Schwing, Wong, & Fann, 2013). Although measures of adherence to traditional masculinity have been used with men from many different races, classes, sexual orientations, and nationalities, psychometric support and factor structure examinations have not been included in these analyses. This opens up the interpretations of these data to the impact of racism, sexual prejudice, classism, ageism, and gender identity as defined by the dominant culture that could create negative self-evaluations of minority men as a result of a failure to live up to these expectations (Wester & Vogel, 2012). Some have argued that within the framework of hegemonic masculinity, or one that ignores the situational and cultural variables that may affect varying definitions of masculinity, minority masculinities are subordinated (Shek, 2006), suggesting the need for ground-up efforts to conceptualize, articulate, and operationalize culturally specific definitions of masculinity (Wester & Vogel, 2012).

**Evolving Trends in Men and Masculinity Research**

PMM, which is the only journal to focus exclusively on the psychological study of men and masculinity, is an important guide to understanding the history of psychological research on men and masculinity.² A content analysis of articles published in the journal (Wong, Steinfeldt, Speight, & Hickman, 2010) from its inception in 2000 through 2008 identified major gender theoretical orientations and primary

²The fact that this chapter focuses primarily on the history of men and masculinity in the United States should not be interpreted as a desire to ignore the important developments in men’s studies across the globe. For example, in his Masculinities in a Global Era, Gelfer (2014) noted, “The study of masculinity and globalization exists as one of the more recent waves of the broader study of masculinities” (p. 2). Notable contributions to this exciting new area of study include Blazina and Shen-Miller (2011), Connell (1998), and Gelfer (2014).
topics relevant to the psychology of men and masculinity. The major gender theoretical orientation was gender role conflict theory, which constituted 29% of the journal articles published. This was followed by masculinity ideology theories (21%), which examined individuals' endorsement of beliefs about what men ought to be or do (Thompson & Pleck, 1995); psychodynamic theories (14%); and objectification perspectives (13%).

The three most frequently addressed topics in PMM articles were mental health (29%), relationships (26%), and violence (25%). Most articles were associated with the social learning perspective, emphasizing social influence on masculine gender roles and the negative consequences of conforming to and violating these gender roles (Pleck, 1995). Wong et al. (2010) pointed out that although the gender role strain paradigm is appropriate because it is consistent with the profeminist values and the mission of SPSMM, one can argue that PMM scholarship does not reflect diverse gender theoretical orientations, including biological and evolutionary theories. The topics most represented reflect the interests of those in helping professions, mirroring the specialty training and background of the SPSMM membership.

An additional analysis of substantive PMM content would consider coverage of articles from 2009 through 2014 to plot the most recent gender theoretical orientations of psychology of men and masculinity studies. Using 2009 as the starting point in a Google Scholar search, because Wong et al. (2010) covered the literature up until that point, we found 155 entries. The two most commonly used theoretical orientations among the 20 most cited articles in PMM were masculinities perspectives (50%), which Wong et al. designated as the theoretical orientation associated with social constructionism (as described by Addis & Mahalik, 2003), and gender role conflict theory (30%). Masculinities perspectives, representing the sixth most frequently used theoretical orientation (8%) of articles published from 2000 through 2008, have significantly increased in recent publications, which might suggest a growing concern with the situational context in which masculinity is enacted, variations in masculinity by culture, and how adhering to the socialized male gender role might be adaptive for some men in some settings (Addis et al., 2010). The top three most frequently addressed topics during this period were emotion (20%), body image (15%), and sexual orientation (15%). This represents a doubling of articles about sexual orientation and masculinity (up from 7% of publications during the first 8 years). In our analysis, it appears that a wider variety of topics were represented than in previous years, with the most representative topics capturing less of the overall percentage than in the previous analysis.

FORECASTING THE FUTURE

Despite the establishment of a division within APA, organization of PMM, and the formation of a substantial body of research, many areas in the psychology of men and masculinity need further research, educational and training attention, division focus, and social activism. In this section, we describe the results of a survey of experts in the field regarding important areas for future development in the psychology of men and masculinity.

Method

For this investigation, we used the Delphi polling method, a procedure designed to obtain consensus about future developments that are likely to occur within a field over a specific period of time (Dalkey & Helmer, 1963). The basis of the method is the repeated administration of a questionnaire to the identified expert panel in a way that preserves the advantages of group decision making and shared information, free from personal pressures or persuasion (Neimeyer & Diamond, 2001). For our pool of experts, we randomly chose APA Division 51 fellows, who were given the option of responding to the interview questions in writing or in a phone interview. All respondents were asked their opinion regarding the future of the psychology of men and masculinity, including the field’s progress in important research topics, education and training of psychologists, division-wide focus, and social justice activities. Notes from these interviews were used for later analyses.

Item content for the Delphi poll consisted of estimates of the next 10 years in the area of the
psychology of men. Items were generated during initial interviews, resulting in a four-part questionnaire. Panelists were instructed, “What do you think will happen, regardless of what you hope will happen?” to recruit interviewees’ predictions rather than their preferences. Part 1 (35 items) asked the experts’ predictions regarding the field’s progress in the next 10 years in various areas pertaining to research. For example, “Within the next 10 years, what topics will grow most in areas of theory, research, and practice?” Part 2 (six items) asked the experts about their thoughts regarding the field’s progress in areas pertaining to training, for example, “Within the next 10 years, how will the field progress in areas pertaining to training psychologists?”

Part 3 (12 items) asked about interviewees’ thoughts regarding APA Division 51’s progress and interest in the next 10 years in various topics, for example, “Within the next 10 years, what will be the areas of concern for Division 51?” In Part 4, panelists were instructed to indicate what issues in the psychology of men would be targeted by social justice activism, for example, “Within the next 10 years, which areas of public policy will be targeted by social justice work?” Respondents were asked to choose, from among the items listed, those items that were most likely to progress (selecting five items from Section 1, two items from Section 2, three items from Section 3, and three items from Section 4). Respondents also were given the opportunity to indicate additional areas not mentioned. To identify the aggregate rankings of all the topics the experts believed will progress in the field, we counted each vote as 1 point for each prediction. We used this coding system to determine which areas and issues were most likely to experience significant growth.

Results and Discussion

In all, 26 fellows were invited to serve on the expert panel; 20 of them participated in the poll, which led to a 77% participation rate. Of the respondents, 85% were White, 10% were Black, and 5% were Latino; the sample included two women and 18 men (although disproportionately White and male, this sample approximates the composition of division fellows, 16% of whom are women and 11% of whom are from minority racial/ethnic backgrounds). Fourteen were interviewed by telephone, and six responded with completed questionnaires by email. After collecting initial responses and developing the questionnaire, we sent the questionnaire to the randomly selected fellows. After analysis of the results, we identified the following areas as most likely to progress in the next 10 years.

Theory, research, and practice. The topics participants predicted will most grow in the next 10 years were the areas of violence, physical health, and mental health. Sixty percent of the panel believed that research about violence, including masculinity variables as predictive factors of violence, will continue to grow. Fellows believed this was related to the significant media attention given to studies of male populations at risk for perpetrating violence, including boys, adolescents, college-aged men, and men in the criminal justice system. In addition, violence is increasingly understood as a significantly destructive force in the lives of men and boys that should be targeted for prevention work. Of our panel members, 40% identified physical health as an area that will experience growth, as well as discussions of how masculinity is associated with men’s bodies, diet, exercise, aging, morbidity and mortality rates, cancer, heart disease, sexually transmitted diseases, and risky behavior. Thirty-five percent of the experts believed that studies of the psychology of men and masculinity aimed at the delivery of mental health services to men would experience significant interest and activity.

Training and education. In areas of training and education, the panel predicted that the number of doctoral students specializing in the psychology of men and masculinity will increase in the next 10 years (40%). Many panelists believed that growth in the field of psychology of men and masculinity will primarily be the result of increased student activity. They also predicted that the number of doctoral programs with faculty specializing in the psychology of men and masculinity will increase (35%).

Organizational. In terms of division concerns in the next 10 years, participants indicated that the
division will attract new members, be inclusive of additional masculinities, and bring the psychology of men into mainstream psychology. In the division's efforts to attract new members into the organization (mentioned by 50% of the experts), respondents indicated that these members will primarily include nonclinicians (including social and developmental psychologists), as well as women, students, early career psychologists, and military psychologists. The division will also experience significant growth in its inclusion of additional masculinities (40%), indicating that these additional masculinities will represent members (and masculinity perspectives) from minority racial/cultural groups, sexual orientations, and religious backgrounds who will be drawn to the division's emphasis on context. Completing the top three division developments was bringing psychology of men into mainstream psychology (40%), with an emphasis on clinically applicable research published in diverse psychological journals. Fellows also suggested that the division will make statements about topics in mainstream psychology that will produce a division reputation for specific, insightful suggestions.

Social justice work. The areas most mentioned as being targeted for social justice work included influencing policies surrounding men and violence, decreasing stigma surrounding help seeking, and clarifying gender injustice concerns and commitments. Of the respondents, 45% explained that because masculinity is increasingly seen as associated with violence and power (including in sanctioned violence in sports and in video games), advocacy for victims and work directed toward preventing violence will progress. Respondents indicated that efforts to decrease the stigma surrounding help seeking will evolve (40%), and fellows suggested helping men be more open to mental health services in new formats for service (such as coaching and leadership training, services in the primary care setting, or positive masculinity approaches). Finally, division fellows reported that the field will clarify concerns about issues of gender injustice and commitments to addressing them (30%). Many participants believed this would mean addressing issues in the current sociopolitical context with specific action guidelines, including bullying and safe school environments, addressing the effect of the changing economy on men, the impact of absent fathers on families, and the shifting sociocultural bases of contemporary masculinity.

Three major themes arose from these results: (a) increased discussion of men and violence, (b) increased division visibility and impact, and (c) further exploration of diverse masculinities. A central role of APA Division 51 in the next 10 years will be to have significant discussion surrounding issues of violence, both in research and in social justice work. Members described this as an emotionally charged topic that has historically not been frequently discussed in the division, and for many men, and often even division members themselves, discussions of men and violence elicit difficult emotions and defensiveness. Participants described a changing trend, however, as frequent media coverage of the military, sports, public shootings, and sexual assault explore how male power is related to violence and the tremendous cost to men’s physical and mental health.

APA Division 51 will work to solidify its visibility and impact through practical avenues to build the discipline and promote further activism. This includes suggestions for contributing to APA-wide dialogues, involvement in medical settings and research on masculinity and physical health, positive or strengths-based approaches to build rapport, and increased research productivity. Fellows also emphasized building on topics that have already been well publicized in the media and were readily accessible to the public.

The division will also give increased consideration to the diversity of masculinities. Respondents explained that the future of masculinity research, education, division activity, and social justice will emphasize the social construction of masculinities and the ways in which masculinity is flexible, functional, and adaptive. Division members should become more attuned to how masculinity is affected by identity (e.g., sexual orientation, ethnic/racial identity, class, age), situational context (e.g., men as fathers, military masculinities, men in relationships, treating men in the medical setting, and sociocultural factors), and diversity of research perspectives (e.g., research on mental and physical health intervention, social or experimental psychological research, research methodology, and researcher theoretical orientation).
SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The psychology of men and masculinity, once invisible in a discipline constrained by androcentric theories and practices, has emerged as a necessary complement to the discovery of the gendered nature of human experience. Feminist activism and women’s studies scholarship demanded attention to the unique aspects of women’s lives, provoking corollary attention to men’s experiences as well. A somewhat amorphous men’s movement of the 1970s produced breakthrough volumes illustrating the many paradoxical aspects of masculinity and stimulated many psychologists to incorporate these perspectives into the fabric of APA. Initially slow to achieve relevance, this process gained significant momentum in the late 1980s with the creation of a committee to promote the psychological study of men and masculinity. With formal acceptance of SPSMM as APA Division 51, an organizational structure was put into place for an exponential increase in writing, research, and practice innovations for enhancing the lives of men and fostering the new psychology of men and masculinity.

Over the past 2 decades, SPSMM has launched many major initiatives, with PMM as perhaps the most significant. As the only journal focusing exclusively on the psychology of men and masculinity, it has been at the forefront of empirical and qualitative trends in the field. Its pages have offered a platform for accumulation of scientific findings as well as debate over several critical theoretical controversies.

In looking to the future, an expert panel of SPSMM fellows has contended that SPSMM will make the most significant contributions to the psychology of men and masculinity if it promotes increased discussion of men and violence, increased division visibility and impact, and further exploration of diverse masculinities. Given the extraordinary contributions of SPSMM to research on men’s lives and professional practices to ameliorate their distress, it seems realistic to anticipate that SPSMM will continue as a major force in advancing the psychology of men and masculinity.
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