
Am I a Man?: A Literature Review Engaging the Sociohistorical Dynamics of Black Manhood in the United States

LAWSON BUSH, V

CLAREMONT GRADUATE UNIVERSITY

Abstract

The status and meaning of Black manhood in the United States is a subject matter that should constantly be revisited, examined, and defined because it is out of this framework that Black males construct their behavior and relationships with their wives, children, communities, and one another. This literature review outlines the development of Black manhood through various sociohistorical circumstances and sociopolitical movements as it asks the question: Have Black males gained their manhood? Implied in that question is the recognition that hegemonic dynamics in the U.S. deny some males the social ability to be viewed by society as men despite their biological sex.

If the field of Adult Development is in its adolescence, then the study of men is in its infancy beginning in the early 1970s. Men, specifically white males, have always been highlighted in history for their conquests, but not until fairly recently (Kimmel, 1987) have men been examined in regard to their sex-role development, masculinities, and specific male experiences. There are several major contributors to the general study of men (Brod, 1987; Doyle, 1989; Franklin, 1984; Kimmel, 1987; Pleck & Pleck, 1980; Pleck, 1981). Likewise, there are a number of scholars that have made notable contributions to the study of Black men (Akbar, 1994; Gary, 1981; Gibbs, 1984; Grier & Cobbs, 1968; Hare, 1971; Hutchinson, 1994; Kunjufu, 1984; Madhubuti, 1990; Majors & Gordon, 1994; Staples, 1978a, 1978b). These works have either helped produce or were constructed out of various social movements depending on how one views the axioms: art mirrors life or life mirrors art.

Joseph and Elizabeth Pleck (1980) contend that there were three social movements that engendered the study of male sex-roles and altered definitions of manhood: the women's movement, the gay liberation movement, and the men's movement. However, Clyde Franklin (1984) added the moral majority movement as a fourth. I add, specifically in the case of Black men, the Black Power Movement and Civil Rights as a fifth, and the African-centered Movement as a sixth; this review addresses the latter two movements.

Embedded in some of the aforementioned literature is the following question: How does a boy be-

come a man? That may appear to be a simple question because this developmental process is easy to take for granted, especially when there is a paradigm that suggests that being born a biological male automatically categorizes boys as men when they have reached a certain age. However, finding answers to the aforementioned question becomes problematic when manhood is not considered a right of birth but rather an appellation that is given after a boy possesses characteristics and qualities, other than biological, that a certain society and culture determine are the constructs of manhood. Consequently, answering the opening question becomes more obfuscated by the hegemonic dynamics in the United States that deny some men the social ability to be viewed by society as men despite their biological sex.

Along these same lines, scholars historically and more recently argue that Black men have been collectively emasculated because: (1) slavery caused a situation where many Black men could not protect themselves or their families; (2) a "matriarchal system" within Black communities, caused by an absent father or an "overpowering Black woman" emerge within the context of a patriarchal U.S. society that expects men to be the heads of households; and (3) economic oppression rendered Black men unable to provide for their families in a society where manhood and the provider role are inextricable. This literature review traces the development of Black manhood in the United States through those three aforementioned conditions. Towards this end, this review ultimately seeks to examine the current status of Black manhood by engaging the question: Have Black males gained their manhood?

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to: Dr. Lawson Bush, V, 2964 Vanama St. Pomona, CA 91767.

Slavery's Effect upon the Construction of Black Manhood

Scientific work must be subdivided, but conclusions which affect the whole subject must be based on a study of the whole. One cannot study the Negro in freedom and come to general conclusions about his destiny without knowing his history in slavery. (Du Bois, 1898, p. 12)

The brutal and inhumane system of slavery in the U.S. (see Douglass, 1988) left the Black male psychologically, and in some instances physically emasculated (Akbar, 1984; Staples, 1978). Whether Blacks in Africa lived under a patriarchal system as Robert Staples (1978) suggests, (an arguable point in and of itself), I contend it had little impact on how the slaves were treated. What was significant and quintessential to understanding the treatment of Black males during slavery and today, is the fact that the U.S. is a patriarchal society that recognizes males as the inherent leader or head of family and society. Therefore, within the patriarchal framework, the Black man became the natural target for destruction by the white male. I fully recognize, as Del Jones (1992) suggests, that this patriarchal system, guided by the notion of white supremacy, has and will destroy, kill, and mutilate anyone, male or female, who gets in its way of achieving and maintaining white world domination and control. I enter this contention into the dialogue, not with the purpose of contributing to the fruitless debate of who has been oppressed and maltreated the most, the Black man or woman, but with the intent of finding some viable explanation for the condition of Black males in the United States.

Nevertheless, I maintain that while the patriarchal system in the U.S. recognizes males as the leaders, it has, nonetheless, in many cases made the Black male the focus of its oppression and simple deduction maintains that if you destroy the head, you destroy the body. Na'im Akbar (1984) clarifies:

The allegory is seen throughout nature that the most certain way to destroy life is to cut off the head. From the turkey to the cow, to the man, the most immediate way to bring death to the body is to remove its head. This is especially true as a social principle. One of the things that was systematically done during slavery was the elimination of control of any emerging head or leader. Slave narratives and historical accounts are full of descriptions of atrocities brought against anyone who exemplified real leadership capability. The slave-holders realized that their power and control over the slaves was dependent upon the absence of any indigenous leadership among the slaves. (p. 15)

Any Black male who wanted to stand up and be a man—according to the Western patriarchal definition, meaning leadership—was isolated, killed, beaten, or ridiculed. It is here, a point made clear in the literature, that the Black male lost his manhood. Moreover, out of survival some Black parents began to rear their sons

in a manner that would prevent the exhibition of boldness, outspokenness, and leadership, which is part of some parental practices today (Akbar, 1984, 1991; Grier & Cobbs, 1968).

This notion that Black males were emasculated during slavery in the U.S. is pervasive in the literature; however, there is opposition to this perspective. Bell Hooks (1981) contends that slavery, especially during the early period in the U.S., had little effect on African men's masculinity. She confronts Staples' (1973) argument that suggests that the masculinization of African men was undermined by his inability to protect his woman. Hooks (1981) writes:

Staples' argument is based on the assumption that enslaved black men felt responsible for all black women and were demoralized because of their inability to act as protector—an assumption that has not been substantiated by historical evidence. An examination of many African societies' attitudes toward women reveals that African men were not taught to see themselves as the protectors of all black women. They were taught to assume responsibility for the particular women of their tribe or community. The socialization of African men to see themselves as the "owners" of all black women and to regard them as property they should protect occurred after the long years of slavery and as the result of bonding on the basis of color rather than shared tribal connection or language.

According to Hooks (1981) there were no cultural, social, or historical reasons for enslaved African males to feel or act responsible for enslaved African females prior to their adoption of white sexist attitudes concerning women.

What does Hooks' perspective bring to the literature concerning the issue of the emasculation of African men during slavery? Hooks' (1981) contribution to this literature primarily rests in her questioning whether African men came to the Americas predetermined to serve as the natural protectors for all African women. However, she contradicts her original assertion, arguing that Black men were not emasculated during slavery because they did not come to the Americas feeling responsible for all Black women, by writing that African male slaves began to accept the sexist Western paradigm. Therefore, at some arguable point, African men during slavery felt responsible for African women, thus, leading to their emasculation (Akbar, 1984; Staples, 1973).

Black Males Under a Matriarchal Structure

The reported consequence of a matriarchy, i.e., Black female-headed households, is a source of tension in the literature. The literature reports that there are three sides to this issue, but I conclude that there is a fourth side that is omitted in the literature when discussing the evolution of how scholars view the impact of a matriarchy.

The first view of the impact of a matriarchal system posits that the absence of Black fathers from the household, conjoined with exceptionally powerful Black women, caused the social ills plaguing Black males and their communities (Frazier, 1939; Moynihan, 1965; Pettigrew, 1964). The advocates of this position, as Andrea Hunter and James Davis (1992, 1994) report, contend that Black males fail to learn how to become men in the absence of their fathers; therefore, they are eternal boys. Keep in mind when examining this position that one of the aims of white supremacy is to present an image of a weak Black male.

The second view of this issue does not accept that under the matriarchal system Black males cannot learn to be men (Hare, 1971; Liebow, 1967, Staples, 1971, 1978a, 1978b). Staples (1978a) asserts:

Those who argue that male children can not learn the content of their masculine role make the erroneous supposition that there are no male role models available from whom those children can learn. (p. 171)

Therefore, some (Hare, 1971; Liebow, 1967; Staples, 1971, 1978a, 1978b) argue that it is economic oppression that deprives Black males of their manhood and causes social ills (economic oppression will be discussed in the next section), not the absence of father figures from the home. Nonetheless, it appears from the literature, that Black males, whether it be from the absence of the father, as presented in the first side of the issue of the matriarchy, or from economic oppression presented in this second side, still emerge without their manhood intact.

The third view concerning the issue of the matriarchy is found in Black feminist literature. Black feminists, such as Patricia Collins (1990, 1994) and Bell Hooks (1981), argue that racist scholars created the myth of the Black female matriarch to foster division within African families. Hooks (1981) maintains that there has never been at any time in the U.S. the existence of a matriarchal system because women have never held power.

The term matriarch implies the existence of a social order in which women exercise social and political power, a state which in no way resembles the condition of black women or all women in American society. (p. 71)

The fourth and final view of the impact of a matriarchal system is absent in the literature, and is almost identical to the first view, except for the political reasons that drive their position. Current Black scholars (Akbar, 1991; Holland, 1991; Wright, 1991), like those who subscribe to this view, point to the absence of the fathers from the home along with (to deal with the contention in the second stage argument that there are plenty

of other role models around including the mother) the belief that there are not enough appropriate role models around to show Black males how to become men. Moreover, female-headed households, whether they are by choice or circumstance, represent a type of power, or perhaps better stated as influence rather than power, held by Black women because they have a major role in the socialization process of Black males. The following statements by Willie Wright (1991) capture the sentiment of the scholars who take the fourth view of the matriarchy issue:

Their teachers in the first five years of school, from kindergarten to the 4th grade are usually women. If they get in trouble, a female teacher will send them to a principal - often a woman - who will report their behavior to a female head of household... Is it no wonder that these young boys begin early either to develop an attitude of hating women or else to emulate women even to adopting their mannerisms? Neither result is desirable or acceptable.

...try as they may, and well-meaning as they may be, women cannot teach black boys to be men. The boys need close association of legitimated Black role models, and the earlier this becomes a reality, the better adjusted the child will become. (p. 22)

Wright's (1991) statements, although they have been subsequently challenged by research that suggests that female-headed households are not the cause of deleterious conditions confronting Black males (Bush, 1998), stand as the basis for some arguments for all-Black male schools and rites-of-passage programs led by all-Black male adults. The fundamental purpose of these schools and programs is to show Black males how to become Black men.

Economic Oppression and Black Males

In the U.S., manhood and the ability to provide for one's family are inextricable. Because of structural barriers, especially in the 1960s, Black males have been denied the role of provider (Franklin, 1984; Grier & Cobbs, 1968; Hare, 1971; Hunter & Davis, 1984; Roberts, 1984). Consequently, Black males were not viewed as men by the larger society according to the literature.

This denial of manhood combined with the Black Power movement created, according to some in the literature, (Franklin, 1984; Hunter & Davis, 1992, 1994; Poussaint, 1982) a Black male with a new psyche. Alvin Poussaint (1982) speaks to this assertion:

A fundamental change in the Afro-American male psyche occurred with the advent of the Black Power Movement in the late 1960s. A fresh, virile, sexually potent image appeared, bolstered by an assertive, more confident Black man. The Negro male became the Black male—a transformation that henceforth would never be completely safe for White society (p. 39).

Poussaint's statement represents a turning point in the literature because some scholars say that it is during the Malcolm X and Black Power era that Black males asserted their manhood and were now viewed by

most of society as Black men for the first time (Franklin, 1984; Grier & Cobbs, 1968; Hunter & Davis, 1992, 1994).

This newly assertive, highly frustrated, economically disenfranchised, and angry Black male, due to the denial of his manhood, began to express a type of masculinity that led to urban revolts in the 1960s (Grier & Cobbs, 1968; Hunter & Davis, 1992, 1994). This expression of rage by urban Black males that was once viewed as a political vehicle for achieving social justice, is now seen as pointless, dangerous, and maladaptive (Hunter & Davis, 1994; Kunjufu, 1984). Continued structural barriers after the 1960s conjoined with the acquisition of the traditional male sex-role paradigm (i.e., aggressiveness, competitiveness, adventurer, provider, and superiority to females notion) led to hypermasculinity (i.e., hyperaggressiveness, hypersexuality, obsession with materialism, and an absence of accountability) especially among poor inner-city males (Hunter & Davis, 1992, 1994; Oliver, 1984). Hence, Black males have become both victims of and participants in their own destruction by embracing a traditional notion of manhood (see Table 1). Therefore, the question for Black males, after slavery, matriarchal circumstances, and economic oppression, is not only how, but if and when have they become men?

Defining Black Manhood Under a Shifting Paradigm

Recent studies overwhelmingly suggest that Black males perceive themselves as not fitting the traditional or Western paradigm of manhood (Hunter & Davis, 1992, 1994; Roberts, 1994; Watts, 1993). George Roberts (1994) concludes from his interviews that Black males are not comfortable with the societal defined traditional masculine ideal.

Andrea Hunter and James Davis' (1994) study of 32 adult New York Black males with a range in age, occupation, and class produced data that clearly suggest that Black males have a different notion of the male sex-role than what is understood by Western thought. Four major domains emerged out of this study concerning how Black males conceptualize manhood that are vastly distinctive from traditional notions noted in Table 1 concerning stereotypical manhood: (1) self-determination and accountability, (2) family, (3) pride, and (4) spirituality and humanism.

Roderick Watts (1993) identifies key themes in manhood development as understood by the Black men who work within organizations designed to guide boys into manhood. Data was collected from 40 leaders of

manhood development organizations using participatory research methods—interviews and quantitative analysis—allowing respondents to speak and define concerns for themselves. Similar to the results of Hunter and Davis (1994), Watts (1993) found that these community leaders wanted to inculcate and cultivate in young Black males spirituality, a desire to give back, and an understanding of themselves through an appreciation of African culture. In addition, Watts (1993) compared these findings to African scholars' notions about manhood and found symmetry in what the scholars believe to be characteristics of African manhood and what the community activists wish to develop in Black males.

It is important to note that in all of the studies in this section, the data were reported not observed; therefore, the results have a potential to be "idealized" notions of manhood. While it is very much significant that the Black men chose to convey a nontraditional concept of manhood and sex-roles over a Western paradigm, because this suggests, at the very least, an ideological difference in manhood, with a possible behavioral difference, we must consider this information in the context of political correctness concerning all men's statements about what is manhood in the 1990s.

Interestingly enough, the results of the studies discussed in the previous section are similar to what some scholars say should be the model for Black men. And, it is not by coincidence, according to Roberts (1994) that the results of these studies conducted on Black men in the U.S. are symmetrical to the African notions of men and women which recognize the "duality or the interrelationship of masculine and feminine experiences in both men and women. African American males are expected to contain in their sex-role identities a masculine and feminine self" (p. 385). This model for Black men that some scholars are proposing (Akbar, 1991; Baker-Fletcher, 1996; Karenga, 1980; Nobles, 1980; Roberts, 1994) is defined in the literature as an African-centered paradigm or world view.

Building on the Marcus Garvey Movement, the Harlem Renaissance, the Black Power Movement and the Nation of Islam, the Civil Rights Movement, and the Pan-African Movement, Blacks throughout the diaspora are engaged in the African-centered Movement. The term Afrocentricity (I prefer the prefix "Afri-" rather than "Afro-" in terms of describing African-centered concepts because the former prefix is a more literal reference to Africa) was coined by Molefi Asante in the late 1970's, becoming popular in early 1980's (El-Amin, 1993). Although the term or word Africentric is rela-

tively new, its philosophies are rooted in the oldest African cultural traditions (Dei, 1994). Africentricity denotes the phrase Africa at the center (Asante, 1991; Wieder, 1992; Dei, 1993; El-Amin, 1993; Akoto, 1994). The word literally means Africa (Afro) or (Afri) at the center (centricity); thus, we also have the term African-centered.

One of the criticisms of Africentricity is that there is not a single document on which it stands. Thus, there are disagreements and variations on what and who is Africentric. However, those who propose to be Africentric in their writings find solidarity and cohesion in the belief that one of the major goals of Africentricity is to tell the world the history and "herstory" of Africans from the expressions, teachings and stories of African people (Dei, 1993; Murrell, 1993).

Deborah Hunter (1983) and George Dei (1993) argue that Africentricity can be used as a tool to achieve social justice by transforming the minds of African people. Africentricity encourages Africans to have a strong sense of self, history and culture (Dei, 1993; Murrell, 1993) in order to thrive and transform an oppressive society.

Africentricity can be explained further in terms of world view because it affects and determines how one interacts and perceives or views the world. Hence, that perception manifests in behaviors such as sharing a common orientation; living in harmony with nature; demonstrating cooperativeness and avoiding competitiveness and control; and using spiritual faith in daily activities (Jackson & Sears, 1992). Dei (1994) argues that this worldview is Africentric, because historically and culturally Africans and Africans of the Diaspora as well, engage and interact in this manner. While African-centered individuals acknowledge that this world view is not unique to Africans, they abruptly distinguish this particular world view from a European world view. However, it must be emphasized (Asante, 1991; Dei, 1994) that Africentricity is not a reactionary response to Euro-American cultural domination. Instead, it focuses on Africans as subjects, rather than as objects of white experiences.

I interpret Maulana Karenga (1980) as clearly calling for an African-centered manhood that resembles more androgynous sex-roles for Black men and women. He writes that, given the struggle Africans face, there cannot be naturally determined sex-roles. The woman's and man's role is the same—"shared responsibility in love and struggle" (p. 50). Karenga (1980) contends that African men and women must possess these following seven core qualities and characteristics: to be

knowledgeable, principled, committed, strong, disciplined, achievement-oriented and audacious. Along these same lines, Garth Baker-Fletcher (1996) credits the African-centered Movement for engendering a "new male" or an Xodus male similar to the description of the characteristics presented by Karenga although further emphasizing Black men's relations with Black women:

Xodus males are not afraid to operate out of their Blackness or to go to the eye of Horus to embrace the spiritual energy of their Blackness. An Xodus man is one who closely contributes educational, spiritual, and material resources to the community. He values the outer community he lives in because he is so attuned to the inner Community of Self. As a person who values the community first, he is powerful because he is intimate, willing to listen, imbued with spiritual power, and able to "hear" the inner citizens as well as the women with whom he journeys. Taking himself, his Afrikan self, and his Blackness seriously, he is able to take the concerns, criticisms and pain of the sisters seriously also. (p. 25)

The African-centered Movement that continues to help create a more culturally and politically aware Black man, coupled with the frightful conditions confronting them, that has caused some to call Black males an "endangered species" (see Bush, 1998; Gibbs, 1984; Hutchinson, 1994; Kunjufu, 1984; Madhubuti, 1990), are the buttresses for a new wave of Black male studies, programs, and events in the late 1980's and 1990's. Richard Majors and Jacob Gordon (1994) list many of these paramount happenings and the new awareness of Black male issues in their book *American Black Male: His Present Status and His Future*. However, because of when the book was published, they were not able to discuss one of the most significant single occurrences in the history of African men in the Americas, the Million Man March held in Washington, DC on October 16, 1995.

In recent years, according to Majors and Gordon (1994), commissions, committees, task forces, and forums have been convened across the U.S. to address Black males issues. Likewise, several all-Black male academies and classes have begun in the late 1980's and 1990's. Centered mostly in Detroit, Milwaukee, and New Orleans these educational facilities employ an African-centered curriculum using mostly all-Black male instructors (Holland, 1991; Wright, 1991). Recently, however, these programs have been challenged by parents wanting to enroll their Black female children. To clarify where I stand on this issue, all-Black male academies are acceptable if the same effort is put forth in erecting all-Black female institutions. There is some merit in separating males and females in educational settings (Sadker & Sadker, 1994a, 1994b), however to develop young Black males on a long-term basis without developing young Black females is anti-

dialogical and supportive of the current political hegemony and status quo. Similarly, as we move to engage the Million Man March held October 16, 1995, some opponents of this historical event echo my sentiments about all-Black male academics. Yet, somewhat paradoxically, I empathize with those who disagreed with the march for those stated reasons. Nonetheless, I participated and remain a supporter of this event.

Black feminists (Davis, 1981; hooks, 1994) (Angela Davis spoke publicly against the "all-male" march) and womanists (see Cannon, 1988) essentially put forward this question: How can African people achieve liberation without the collective participation of all of its members? I acknowledge and agree with the premise stated in this question in the context of the historical Black struggle in the U.S. that has put race concerns over sex issues. Yet, in respect to the Million Man March that did not exclude Black women, (Black women were general participants, organizers, nurses, speakers, security guards, and supporters through prayer, fasting, fund raising, and rallying) the aforementioned question should not be applicable.

Towards this end, Spike Lee's movie about the Million Man March, "Get on the Bus" (1996) engaged this issue when one of the male participants on his way to the march was confronted by a Black woman for what she said was the exclusion of Black women. His response, paraphrased here, echoes my sentiment and underscores the rationale for men studies (see Brod, 1987): there are some issues that are specific to manhood that Black men need to address as fathers, grandfathers, sons, brothers, husbands, and lovers. Ultimately, that was what that day was about.

Have Black Males Gained Their Manhood?

We have returned here to engage the unanswered and complicated question of this review: Have Black males gained their manhood? Comprehending the different lenses through which the question is approached is quintessential to understanding the varying responses. Franklin (1984) and Poussaint (1982) propose that Black males became men in the 1960s as they began to assert themselves under the impetus of the Black Power Movement. Clearly this assertion is judging manhood through the lens of a Western paradigm. It ignores African notions of manhood—the synthesis of male and female roles, which were and are a part of Black men's characteristics (Roberts, 1994)—and essentially posits that Black males did not become men until they exhibited characteristics of Western manhood. Therefore,

through this lens some Black males have become men because they have acquired the traditional concept of male sex-roles.

Those who propose an African paradigm of manhood, I thought at first glance, were guilty like Franklin and Poussaint of concluding that Black males had not become Black men, especially before 1965. Those who look at the question, have Black men gained their manhood, through the lens of an African framework readily posit that Black males have not become men (Akbar, 1991; Nobles, 1980). It had appeared that these scholars had omitted the recognition of men like Nat Turner, Marcus Garvey and Paul Robeson who I believe are excellent examples of African manhood. However, further investigation and reflection of this perspective revealed that these scholars are not talking about the individual, because there are millions of Black males who represent fine examples of African manhood; they are referring to the collective. They contend that collectively we have not gained our manhood, and that we will only obtain a significant portion of it through freedom and independence that Lawson Bush (1995) contends Africans in America have yet to achieve.

Conclusion

It is paramount that Black males continue to have dialogue concerning the sociohistorical development and the current status and meaning of Black manhood because it is out of this framework that Black males construct their behavior and relationships with their wives, children, communities, and one another. Therefore, deleterious and maladaptive forms of manhood influenced by the experiences of Black males in the U.S., should constantly be under examination and refinement by both Black men and women. Ultimately, it would be beneficial to work towards and embrace a manhood that is a synthesis of masculinity and femininity that some call African-centered because maladaptive forms of manhood such as hyperfemininity and hypermasculinity are equally deleterious to Black communities irrespective of sexual orientation. For example, males, and even females in this case, that are too masculine to hold their babies or are too feminine to protect them are equally detrimental to their families and communities. Nevertheless, whatever parameters for manhood Black men set, it should be a choice like in the case of the Million Man March, rather than one that is dictated to them solely by sociohistorical conditions.

Table 1

Masculine and Feminine Stereotypes

Masculine pole is more desirable

<u>Feminine</u>	<u>Masculine</u>
Not at all aggressive	Very aggressive
Not at all independent	Very independent
Very emotional	Not at all emotional
Does not hide emotions at all	Almost always hides emotions
Very subjective	Very objective
Very easily influenced	Not at all easily influenced
Very submissive	Very dominant
Dislikes math and science very much	Likes math and science very much
Very excitable in a minor crisis	Not at all excitable in minor crisis
Very passive	Very active
Not at all competitive	Very competitive
Very illogical	Very logical
Very home oriented	Very worldly
Not at all skilled in business	Very skilled in business
Very sneaky	Very direct
Does not know the way of the world	Knows the way of the world
Feelings easily hurt	Feelings not easily hurt
Not at all adventurous	Very adventurous
Has difficulty making decisions	Can make decisions easily
Cries very easily	Never cries
Almost never acts a leader	Almost always acts as a leader
Not at all self-confident	Very self-confident
Very uncomfortable about being aggressive	Not at all uncomfortable about being aggressive
Not at all ambitious	Very ambitious
Unable to separate feeling from ideas	Easily able to separate feelings from ideas
Very dependent	Not at all dependent
Very conceited about appearance	Never conceited about appearance
Thinks women are always superior to men	Thinks men are always superior to women
Does not talk freely about sex with men	Talks freely about sex with men

(Broverman, Vogel, Broverman, Clarkson & Rosenkrantz, 1972, p. 63)

References

- Akbar, N. (1984). Chains and images of psychological slavery. Jersey City, NJ: Mind Productions & Associates, Inc.
- Akbar, N. (1991). Visions for Black men. Tallahassee, FL: Mind Productions & Associates, Inc.
- Akoto, A. (1994). Notes on a Afrikan-centered pedagogy. In M. Shujaa (Ed.), Too Much schooling too little education: A paradox of Black life in white societies. (pp. 319-337). Trenton, NJ: Africa World Press.
- Asante, M. (1991). The Afrocentric idea in education. Journal of Negro Education, 60, 170 - 180.
- Baker-Fletcher, G. (1996). Xodus: African American male journey. Minneapolis: Fortress Press.
- Brod, H. (Ed.). (1987). The making of masculinities. Boston: Allan & Anwin.
- Broverman, K., Vogel, S., Broverman, D., Clarkson, R., & Rosenkrantz, P. (1972). Sex role stereotypes: A current appraisal. Journal of Social Issues, 28, 59-78.
- Bush, L. (1995). Africentric Independent Black Institutions: A means to social justice? In A. Darder (Ed.), Bicultural Studies in Education: Transgressive discourses of resistance and possibility (pp. 91-105). The Institute for Education in Transformation, Claremont, CA.
- Bush, L. (1998). Manhood, masculinity, and Black men: Toward an understanding of how Black mothers raise their sons to become men. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Claremont Graduate University, Claremont.
- Cannon, K. (1988). Black womanist ethics. Atlanta: Scholars Press.
- Collins, P. (1994). The meaning of motherhood in Black culture. In R. Staples (Ed.), The Black family: Essays and studies (5th ed.) (pp. 165-173).
- Collins, P. (1990). Black feminist thought: Knowledge, consciousness, and the politics of empowerment (vol. 2) Boston: Unwin Hyman.
- Davis, A. (1981). Women, race, & class. New York: Random House.
- Dei, G. (1994). Afrocentricity: A cornerstone of pedagogy. Anthropology & Education Quarterly 25, 3-28.
- Douglass, F. (1988). Narrative of the life of Frederick Douglass: An American slave. Cambridge, Massachusetts: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.
- Doyle, J. (1989). The male experience (2nd edition). Dubuque, IA: W.C. Brown.
- Du Bois, W.E.B. (1898). The study of the Negro problem. Annals, AAPSS, 1, 1-23.
- El-Amin, M. (1993). Afrocentricity: Malcolm X and Al-Islam. Newark, NJ: El-Amin Productions.
- Franklin, C. (1984). The changing definition of masculinity. New York: Plenum.
- Frazier, F. (1966). The Negro family in the United States. Chicago University of Chicago Press.
- Gary, L. (1981). Black men. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.
- Gibbs, J. (1984). Black adolescents and youth: An endangered species. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 54, 8-20.
- Grier, W., & Cobbs, P. (1968). Black rage. New York: Basic Books, Inc., Publishers.
- Hare, N. (1971). The frustrated masculinity of Negro male. In R. Staples (Ed.), The Black family. Belmont, California: Wadsworth Publishing Company.
- Holland, S. (1991). Positive role models for primary-grade Black inner-city males. Equity and Excellence, 25, 40-44.
- Hooks, B. (1981). Ain't I a woman: Black women and feminism. Boston: South End Press.
- Hooks, B. (1994). Teaching to transgress: Education as the practice of freedom. New York: Routledge.
- Hunter, A., & Davis, J. (1992). Constructing gender: An exploration of Afro-American men's conceptualization of manhood. Gender and Society, 6, 464-479.
- Hunter, A., & Davis, J. (1994). Hidden voices of Black men: The meaning, structure and complexity of manhood. Journal of Black Studies, 25, 20-40.
- Hunter, D. (1983). The rhetorical challenge of Afro-centricity. Western Journal of Black Studies, 7, 239-243.
- Hutchinson, E. (1994). The assassination of the Black male image. Los Angeles, CA: Middle Passage Press.
- Jackson, A., & Sears, S. (1992). Implications of an Africentric worldview in reducing stress for African American women. Journal of Counseling Development, 71, 184-191.

- Jones, D. (1992). The black holocaust. Philadelphia: Hikeka Press, Inc.
- Karenga, M. (1980). Kawaida theory: An introductory outline. Inglewood, CA: Kawaida Publications.
- Kimmel, M. (Ed.). (1987). Changing men. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications, Inc., pp. 232-243.
- Kunjuifu, J. (1984). Countering the conspiracy to destroy Black boys (Vol. 2). Chicago: African American Images.
- Lee, S. (Producer & Director) (1996). Get on the bus. Columbia Pictures Industries, Inc.
- Liebow, E. (1967). Tally's corner. Boston: Little Brown.
- Madhubuti, H. (1990). Black men: Obsolete, single, dangerous. Chicago: Third World Press.
- Majors, R. & Gordon, J. (Eds.). (1994). The American black male: His present status and future. Chicago: Nelson-Hall Publishers.
- Moynihan, D. P. (1965). The Negro family: The case for national action. U.S. Department of Labor: Office of Planning and Research.
- Murrell, P. (1993). Afrocentric immersion: Academic and personal development of African American males in public schools. In T. Perry & J. Fraser (Eds.), Freedom's plow (pp. 231-259). New York: Routledge.
- Nobles, W. (1980). African philosophy: Foundations for the Black psychology. In R. Jones (Ed.), Black Psychology (pp. 23-36). New York: Harper & Row.
- Oliver, W. (1984). Black males and the tough guy image: A dysfunctional compensatory adaptation. The Western Journal of Black Studies, 8, 199-203.
- Pettigrew, T. (1964). A profile of the Negro American. Princeton, NJ: Van Nostrand.
- Pleck, J., & Pleck E. (1980). The American man. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall.
- Pleck, J. (1981). The myth of masculinity. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Poussaint, A. (1982, August). What every black woman should know about a black man. Ebony, pp. 36-40.
- Roberts, G. (1994). Brother to brother: African American modes of relating among men. Journal of Black Studies, 24, 379-390.
- Sadker, D. & Sadker, M. (1994, February 4). Why schools must tell girls: You're smarter, you can do it. USA weekend, pp. 4-5.
- Staples, R. (1973). The black woman in America. Chicago: Nelson Hill.
- Staples, R. (1978a). Masculinity and race: The dual dilemma of Black men. Journal of Social Issues, 34, 169-183.
- Staples, R. (1978b). The myth of the impotent Black male. R. Staples, (Ed.). The Black family. (pp. 98-104). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing Company, Inc.
- Staples, R. (1994). The black family: Essay and studies. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing Company.
- Watts, R. (1993). Community action through manhood development: A look at concepts and concerns from the front line. American Journal of Community Psychology, 21, 333-359.
- Wieder, A. (1992). Afrocentrisms: Capitalist, democratic, and liberationist. Educational Foundations, 6, 33-43.
- Wright, W. (1991). The Black male child: A threatened resource. Are all-Black male classes the answer to one of urban school's most pressing problems? Principal, 70, 22-23.