

2-2017

Masculinity and Disproportionate Risk of Contact with the Criminal Justice System: Findings from a Select Sample of Low-Income Black Males in New York City

Michael G. Pass

The Graduate Center, City University of New York

How does access to this work benefit you? Let us know!

Follow this and additional works at: https://academicworks.cuny.edu/gc_etds

 Part of the [Criminology and Criminal Justice Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Pass, Michael G., "Masculinity and Disproportionate Risk of Contact with the Criminal Justice System: Findings from a Select Sample of Low-Income Black Males in New York City" (2017). *CUNY Academic Works*.
https://academicworks.cuny.edu/gc_etds/1926

This Dissertation is brought to you by CUNY Academic Works. It has been accepted for inclusion in All Dissertations, Theses, and Capstone Projects by an authorized administrator of CUNY Academic Works. For more information, please contact deposit@gc.cuny.edu.

MASCULINITY AND DISPROPORTIONATE
RISK OF CONTACT WITH THE CRIMINAL JUSTICE SYSTEM:
FINDINGS FROM A SELECT SAMPLE OF LOW-INCOME
BLACK MALES IN NEW YORK CITY

by

MICHAEL G. PASS

A dissertation submitted to the Graduate Faculty in Criminal Justice in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy, The City University of New York

2017

© 2017

MICHAEL G. PASS

All Rights Reserved

Masculinity and Disproportionate
Risk of Contact with the Criminal Justice System:
Findings from a Select Sample of Low-Income
Black Males in New York City

by

Michael G. Pass

This manuscript has been read and accepted for the Graduate Faculty in Criminal
Justice in satisfaction of the dissertation requirement for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy.

January 31, 2017

Delores-Jones-Brown

Chair of Examining Committee

January 31, 2017

Deborah Koetzle

Executive Officer

Supervisory Committee:

Richard Curtis

Gail Garfield

THE CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK

Abstract

Masculinity and Disproportionate Risk of Contact with the Criminal Justice System: Findings from a Select Sample of Low-income Black Males in New York City

by

Michael G. Pass

Advisor: Delores Jones-Brown

Official statistics document that Black male's experience disproportionate contact with the criminal justice system (CJS). Existing theory and research suggest that this contact may be attributed to unique attributes of Black masculine behavior. Utilizing a meta-analysis of Black masculinity studies and content analysis of narratives from a select sample of Black males, ages 19-50, the current study examines the similarities and differences between the construction and performance of normative or traditional masculinity, as measured by Mahalik et al's' CMNI and the attributes of Black masculinity as defined in the literature. A goal of the study was to assess whether Black males' risk for disproportionate contact with the CJS is attributable to unique ways in which they construct, define, and engage masculine identities; or whether their risk for disproportionate contact with the CJS is substantially attributable to structural responses and impediments to their fulfillment of typical (normative) rather than atypical masculine roles.

Table of Contents

Copyright Page	ii
Approval Page	iii
Abstract	iv
INTRODUCTION	1
Statement of the Problem	1
Purpose of the Proposed Study	2
Research Questions	3
Significance of the Problem	3
REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	4
Masculine Traits and Characteristics	4
Masculinity and Crime/ Criminal Justice System Processing	8
Black masculinity	10
Black masculinity and Crime/Criminal Justice System Processing	20
METHODS	34
Stage One	34
The CMNI; Oliver's Three-Part Typology, and the Qualitative Meta-Analysis	34
Stage 2	36
Content analysis of Self-Reported Narratives	36
FINDINGS	41

Comparing Masculinity Theory and Black Masculinity	41
Question 1: Do masculinity theory and “Black masculinity” theory explain distinctly different social phenomena?	41
Qualitative meta-analysis	44
Afrocentrism	54
The comparison of the three studies: CMNI; Oliver’s Three-Part Typology; Qualitative Meta-Analysis	56
Low-Income Heterosexual Inner City Black Males Constructing, Defining and Engaging in Masculine Identities	57
Question 2: How do low-income heterosexual inner city Black males from this study construct, define and engage in masculine identities?	57
Self-Reported Masculine Identities	81
Question 3: Do their self-reported masculine identities reflect a unique “Black masculinity”?	81
Black Males Performance of Normative Masculine Roles	94
Question 4: Are Black males performance of normative masculine roles associated with their risk for DMC with the CJS?	94
DISCUSSIONS and CONCLUSIONS	100
Significance of the findings	114
Policy Implications	117
Limitations of the Study	119
APPENDICES	122
REFERENCES	142

List of Tables

1: Conceptualizing Traditional Masculinity and Black Masculinity	41
Comparative Definitions of Masculinity Listed in the Qualitative Meta-Analyzed Studies; the CMNI; and Oliver's Three-Part Typology	43
3: Sample Characteristics	57
4: CJS Contact	66
5: Household Structure, and Relationship with Women	70
6: Respondents Reporting Definitions of Masculinity Paralleling those in the CMNI	81
7: Comparative Definitions and Descriptions of Masculinity	83
8: Relationship with Children	93
9: Comparative Definitions of Masculinity from the Outlier Compared to the Present Study, and the CMNI	95

INTRODUCTION

Statement of the Problem

Compared to other racial/ethnic groups, Blacks¹ experience disproportionate contact with the United States criminal justice system (CJS) at almost every stage (Caudill, et. al., 2013; Rattan, et al., 2012; Hartney & Vuong, 2009; Rios, 2009; Rosich, 2007). The reason for this disproportionality has been the subject of considerable debate perhaps best summarized by Piquero & Brame (2008) in three theoretical explanations: (a) differential criminal involvement, (b) differential criminal justice system selection and processing; and, (c) a combination of differential involvement and differential selection and processing. The differential criminal involvement thesis makes reference to statistics indicating that Blacks commit more types of crime (e.g., violence) that lead to arrest. The differential criminal justice system selection and processing thesis refers to the substantial body of evidence documenting the disparate treatment of Blacks, in comparison to other racial/ethnic groups, by various agents, agencies, and structural components of the CJS. The mixed model attributes the racial disproportionality in CJS contact to the operation of a combination of the first two, and “hypothesizes that all of the differences between the race groups cannot be attributed to differential criminal activity” (Piquero & Brame, 2008: 5).

In 1988, the term disproportionate minority contact or DMC was adopted as a means of describing the over-representation of youth of color in the juvenile justice system (Soler &

¹ The term Black is used in this dissertation with reference to persons of African ancestry whether or not they were born in the United States. This includes African-Americans and other persons of Black racial identity. Throughout the document, the term Black and African-American may be used interchangeably. In referencing particular studies, this author will use the terms used by the authors of those studies. For purposes of this document, the term is intended as a reference to non-Hispanic Blacks. However, this author acknowledges that Latinos who are Black in appearance may experience the U.S. criminal justice system in ways that are similar to that of non-Hispanic Blacks.

Garry, 2009: 1), with Black males' DMC being most substantial (Caudill, et. al., 2013; Rattan, et al., 2012). Initially DMC referred to disproportionate minority "confinement" within correctional facilities, but was later broadened to cover all forms of "contact" with the CJS² (Hsia & Hamparian, 1988) and to describe the experience of adults of color in addition to juveniles. Available statistics document that Black male youth and adults experience DMC substantially more than other groups, including their female counterparts.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of the current study was to assess the usefulness of masculinity theory in helping to understand Black males' DMC. A substantial amount of research and theory suggests that Black males' DMC can be explained by their engagement in criminal behavior that stems from unique attributes of Black masculinity (Cooper, 2013; Gabbidon & Greene, 2013: 20; McFarlen, 2013; Oliver, 2006;). Yet, both statistics and research show that, in comparison to their female counterparts, all males are at a significantly greater risk for CJS contact (Heidensohn, & Gelsthorpe, 2007: 341; Covington & Bloom, 2003; Krienert, 2003: 1); and processing (Uniform Crime Reports, 2011: Table 33). This suggests the need for a more nuanced understanding of how gendered behaviors and traits are associated with Black male disproportionality.

The current study consists of a meta-analysis³ of Black masculinity research, a comparison of that analysis to measures of normative masculinity as developed by Mahalik, et al (2003) in The Conformity of Masculine Norms Inventory (CMNI), and a content analysis of narratives from a sample of low-income Black males, ages 19-50. These analyses were designed

² In some cases the term also covers disproportionate contact with other state agencies such as child welfare or protective services.

³ Timulak & Creamer, 2013.

to tease out the similarities and differences—both theoretical and empirical—between masculinity and “Black masculinity” and determine their relation to the potential for criminal justice system contact.

Research Questions

A two-step process involving both archival and qualitative empirical research was used to answer the following research questions:

1. Do masculinity theory and “Black masculinity” theory explain distinctly different social phenomena?
2. How do low-income heterosexual inner city Black males construct, define and engage with masculine identities?
3. Do their self-reported masculine identities reflect a unique “Black masculinity”?
4. Is there an association between low-income heterosexual inner city Black males’ construction, definition, engagement of masculine identity, and their risk for DMC?

Significance of the Problem

Outlining specific levels, Hartney & Vuong (2009: 5), reported that DMC “can arise at any stage of the CJS, from pre-arrest through formal arrest, pre-trial decisions (the decisions to release the defendant on bail and the amount of bail required, to prosecute, and to seek the death penalty), conviction, sentencing, incarceration, probation, parole, reentry into the community, and return to custody.” See also, Rosich, 2007: 9 and Hartney & Vuong (2009: 5, who further reported that “Disproportion accumulates as one moves deeper into the system.” It starts with stop and frisk: while walking or driving (See also, Jones-Brown, et al., 2013; Harris, 1997). And, Rosich, (2007: 20) reported that “great racial disparities and overrepresentation of minorities

exist at all decision points in criminal justice processing, and have significant social consequences....”

Independent of personal behavior, Rosich, (2007) noted that the type of policing Blacks experience, both individually and within their communities, may explain their risk for DMC . Official statistics show that of all individuals stopped by the New York City police during the first three quarters of 2013, 93% of the stops involved males (Kelly, 2013) and 53 % involved Blacks (Kelly, 2013). When Black Hispanic males are included, the percentage rises to 60% (Kelly, 2013). Of all the stops, roughly 6% resulted in arrest, and 6% resulted in a summons (Jones-Brown, et al., 2013). Consequently, the racial over-representation among stops cannot be justified based on criminal behavior because fewer than 13% of the stops resulted in an arrest or summons. Given these numbers, to some extent, race alone (being Black) seems to be associated with a male’s risk of having contact with the police.

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Masculine Traits and Characteristics

In “Hegemonic Masculinity: Rethinking the Concept”, Connell & Messerschmidt (2005: 832) critiqued the theoretical concept of hegemonic masculinity⁴ and challenged the notion that masculine roles have been traditionally defined as a gendered social construction, defining what is considered appropriate male roles and scripts (Phillips, 2005: 219-220). This social

⁴ Connell & Messerschmidt (2005: 832) conceptualized that “Hegemony did not mean violence, although it could be supported by force; it meant ascendancy achieved through culture, institutions, and persuasion.” Connell & Messerschmidt (2005: 832) further conceptualized that hegemony is attainable by few men because not all men could embody “the currently most honored way of being a man, it required all other men to position themselves in relation to it, and it ideologically legitimated the global subordination of women to men.” Schippers (2007: 87), informs us that “Connell (1995) defines hegemonic masculinity as ‘the configuration of gender practice which embodies the currently accepted answer to the problem of the legitimacy of patriarchy, which guarantees (or is taken to guarantee) the dominant position of men and the subordination of women’ (p. 77).”

construction is based on a set of expected male behaviors (Cooper, 2009: 642; Cockburn 1986), implicitly defined by class [socio-economic-status] (Connell, 1989; 1982), and by race/ethnicity (Garfield, 2010; Archer, et al., 2001: 432). As a continuing socialization process, masculine identification begins at childhood (Franklin, 1984: 44). It includes adopting traits and characteristics, and engaging in behaviors displaying “physical, mental, and social skills that a man needs to survive and to become both a man and a member of society” (Franklin, 1984: 30).

There are a number of social institutions and cultural agents that contribute to the construction of masculinity, and the socialization process (Franklin 1984: 29-48). These include the family as primary socialization agent (Franklin, 1984); peer groups (Boyd-Franklin, et al., 2000); educational institutions (Murrell, 2006); the media, including television, music, film, and written material (Comstock & Paik, 1994), and religion (Jelen & Wilcox, 1998) to name a few.

Attributes associated with traditional or normative masculine roles and behaviors include being emotionally and physically strong, having power and prestige (Smith, 2008: 160; Jamison, 2006), being heterosexual (McClure, 2006), being a “sexual conquistador” (Smith, 2008: 161) and being the breadwinner, or “provider”. The breadwinner role has been described as “the traditional core of male identity” (Brod, 1992: 44), and “central to the definition of masculinity” (Dyke & Murphy, 2006: 357–358). The breadwinner role is defined by economic success (Cooper, 2009), and being financially stable (Smith, 2008: 160; Jamison, 2006). American men are “... not simply to be family providers but also to be *good* family providers through success in a competitive economy” (Pleck, 1992: 22), with success being the operative term (Lemelle, 2002).

In America, success as a breadwinner is the accumulation of wealth accomplished through employment (Dyke & Murphy, 2006; Kimmel, 1996), resulting in economic self-

sufficiency (Cooper, 2009). Thus “success at work becomes the chief mechanism for fulfilling other roles” as it applies to the construction of the masculine adult male (Dyke & Murphy, 2006; 358). The concept of the breadwinner in America is founded on the belief that men are in control of their destinies, independent of any historical, institutional, or structural blocks. Franklin (1984:48) notes that “[T]his means that males ultimately are responsible for all situations—those between males and females, males and other males, and those between males and selves.” ‘Selves’ refers to being in control of the things that you do in your life.

Mahalik, et al., (2003: 6) constructed the Conformity to Masculine Norms Inventory (CMNI), a quantitative measure of masculinity in a two-stage process. The first stage identified traditional masculine roles within the dominant culture in America by examining the existing literature. At the second stage they, conducted two sets of focus group interviews. The groups consisting of both male and female masters and doctoral students studying counseling psychology. The task for each was to identify behavioral norms exclusive to males belonging to the dominant culture.⁵ (Mahalik, et al., 2003: 6). The racial/ethnic demographics of those participating in the construction of the CMNI consisted of an Asian American man, European American men, European women, and a Haitian Canadian woman (identified as the only person of color to participate in the focus groups) (Mahalik, et al., 2003: 6).

Mahalik, et al., (2003: 5) argued that expectations to adopt and conform to the masculine norms is “constructed by Caucasian, middle and upper-class heterosexuals ...”, and all males within American society are expected to conform to these masculine norms; if not, the dominant

⁵ Philogène (2000: 392) wrote that dominate culture or “ mainstream culture is still predominantly shaped by Americans of British descent who\ together with other Americans of European origin continue to occupy key positions of power and control.” See also, Smith & Hattery, 2011: 110.

culture rejects them.⁶ The CMNI (Mahalik, et al., 2003) was designed as a quantitative measure of conformity to normative masculinity, traditional masculine roles by examining existing “... literature on traditional masculine norms in the United States” (p6). Eleven masculine norms were identified for the CMNI:

- Winning,
- Emotional Control,
- Risk-Taking,
- Violence,
- Dominance,
- Playboy,
- Self-Reliance,
- Primacy of Work,
- Power over Women,
- Disdain for Homosexuals,
- Pursuit of Status (See also, Parent & Moradi, 2009).

According to Mahalik, et al., (2003: 6), the masculine norms within the CMNI are distinct messages applicable only to men; and the masculine norm of being “successful” was not included because women reported receiving this message as well.

⁶ This ‘rejection’ can best be explained by the theory of Social distance, a theory that addresses race relations. Smith and Hattery (2011: 110) wrote that “Bogardus (1947) understood that social distance is essentially a measure of how much or little sympathy the members of a group feel for another group.” See also, Pass, 1987. Smith & Hattery (2011: 115) further wrote that “As demonstrated in this essay thus far, elements of the race relation cycle, social distance, symbolic racism, power, and segregation create, perpetuate, and sustain a racial dominance, hierarchy, and thus social (dis)order.”

Negative attributes associated with masculine roles and behaviors include dominating (Smith, 2008; Jamison, 2006: 45-46), oppressing and subordinating others. Others are classified as other males (Connell, 2000); women, children, (Cooper, 2009; Smith, 2008: 160; Jamison, 2006; Connell, 2000), and minorities (Connell & Messerschmidt, 2005). These masculine roles and behaviors are dysfunctional (Franklin, 1984: 4-5) regardless of the racial or ethnic identity of the men who engage in them. Yet, they are among the most common ‘dominant’ masculine roles traditionally played by men—especially men who victimize women in various capacities as they seek to maintain power and exert their dominance over women in their household (Franklin, 1984: 4-5). Kahn, et al., 2011: 31, cites additional masculine traits and characteristics as: “emotional control, homophobia, risk taking, autonomy, power over women, competitiveness, aggression, and a host of other factors”

Masculinity and Crime/CJS Processing

It has been noted that, in general, conforming to and engaging in normative masculine behaviors can be problematic and maladaptive, contributing to many social and health problems (Kahn, et al., 2011: 30-32). The list includes “depression, lack of help-seeking, educational problems, [and] alcohol abuse....”. Conversely, “nonconformity” to traditional or normative masculine traits and characteristics has been associated with “higher motivation for college, higher self-confidence, open-mindedness, lower rates of distress, and healthier relationships” (Kahn, et al., 2011: 32). These findings have significance for understanding the association between masculinity and the potential for crime and criminal justice system contact among males.

Compared to their female counterparts, all males are at a significantly greater risk for CJS contact (Heidensohn, & Gelsthorpe, 2007: 341; Covington & Bloom, 2003; Krienert, 2003: 1);

and processing (Uniform Crime Reports, 2011: Table 33). In an article titled *Masculinity and Criminology*, “*The Social Construction of Criminal Man*”, McFarlen, (2013: 333), concluded that, “The social construction of masculinity can be considered a useful concept to assist in the evaluation of criminal activity.” (See also, Krienert, 2003.). Connell and Messerschmidt (2005: 853) contend that hegemonic masculinity has had an influence in the field of criminology; and after reviewing crime statistics, they observed that males commit more “conventional crimes—and the more serious of these crimes—than do women and girls.”⁷ For example, McFarlen (2013: 324) contends that men who engage in criminal offending, or deviance, as a means to become breadwinners, are engaging in a “subordinate masculinity”, and exhibit “... characteristics of a failed and marginalised masculinity” (McFarlen, 2013: 324).

Mahalik, et al., (2006: 95) also reported that research conducted on “... predominantly White samples have indicated that traditional masculinity is associated with lower self-esteem and higher levels of anxiety and depression, anger and abuse of substances, hostility and irritability, somatic complaints, and general psychological symptomology” Similar findings were reported for Black males (Mahalik et al., 2006. See also, O’Neil, 1981; Harris, et. al., 2011: 50, 57.) And, this psychological distress or strain has been associated with criminal activity as a means of adapting to that strain or psychological distress. (See e.g., Broidy & Angew, 1997).

“Regarding costs and consequences, research in criminology showed how particular patterns of aggression were linked with hegemonic masculinity, not as a mechanical effect for which hegemonic masculinity was a cause, but through the pursuit of hegemony....”⁸ (Connell &

⁷ Conventional crimes are crimes that include violence directly and indirectly. See e.g., Menard et al., 2011.

⁸ “Hegemonic masculinity was understood as the pattern of practice (i.e., things done, not just a set of role expectations or an identity) that allowed men’s dominance over women to continue.

Hegemonic masculinity was distinguished from other masculinities, especially subordinated masculinities. Hegemonic masculinity was not assumed to be normal in the statistical sense; only a minority of men might enact it. But it was certainly normative. It embodied the currently most honored way of being a man, it required all other men

Messerschmidt, 2005: 835). The use of the concept of hegemonic masculinity to account for criminality and violence has been criticized because of its association with negative behaviors and consequences, ignoring the positive attributes associated with masculine roles and behaviors (Connell & Messerschmidt (2005: 840-841). However, Connell & Messerschmidt (2005: 841) posited that “The concept of hegemonic masculinity is not intended as a catchall nor as a prime cause; it is a means of grasping a certain dynamic within the social process.” ‘Prime cause’ meaning that hegemonic masculinity is not an end, it is a practice of behaviors that defines hegemony.

Black Masculinity

An examination of the body of scholarly research reporting on Black males, indicate that the focus of these studies is often on deviance, with theoretical discourse highlighting and explaining this group’s behavior(s) as pathological. My review of the literature revealed that this scholarship and discourse is so prevalent that, in the study of Black males, it shapes research designs and methodological approaches, which, in turn, shape and inform policy decisions for this group (Brown & Donnorb, 2011). With deviance and pathology acting as primary labels describing Black male behavior(s), it is not surprising that Black males are rarely studied to discover how they engage in normative/traditional or positive roles of masculinity such as being the breadwinner, maintaining a stable family, and being contributing members of their communities (Anderson, 1999).

to position themselves in relation to it, and it ideologically legitimated the global subordination of women to men” (Connell & Messerschmidt, 2005: 832).

Methodological designs typically employed to empirically study Black males include qualitative interviews (e.g., attitudes, Parent & Moridi, 2009); qualitative narratives (Brown & Donnorb, 2011); and ethnographic observations (Liebow, 2003; Anderson, 1999). Research and reports of what Black masculinity is, and how it is defined by mainstream analyst, are usually drawn from inferences based on negative perceptions and attitudes toward Blacks in general (see e.g., Crosby, et al., 1980: 560). Moving away from this approach, where inferences about Black masculinity are drawn from studies focusing on Black male pathology and deviance, the current study examined the traits of normative masculinity and compared them to those described as ‘Black masculinity’, seeking similarities and differences through meta-analysis.

Cools (2008: 33-34) has noted that the construction of masculine adult roles in America differs across race, and that understanding this difference is necessary when analyzing the structural obstacles impacting the construction of masculinity among low income inner-city Black males. (See also, Phillips, 2005: 219-220.) From a pro-feminist perspective, Cools (2008: 33) argued that “Many African American men’s masculinities are not affirmed, for they are often neither allowed to accomplish nor fulfill traditional male roles”; and they “... have not been privy to the benefits of masculinity in the same way that many white men have been or potentially could be” (2008: 34). Cools (2008: 33) goes on to suggest that, “Black men not only suffer disadvantage because of the ‘hierarchies of masculinity’ but this also has implications for their gender role fulfillment.”⁹ Like Connell and Messerschmidt (2005) who were interested in rethinking the concept of hegemonic masculinity, Cools (2008) contested the ways in which

⁹ “Cultural consent, discursive centrality, institutionalization, and the marginalization or delegitimation of alternatives are widely documented features of socially dominant masculinities” (Connell & Messerschmidt, 2005: 831). From another perspective the hierarchy of masculinities can also be viewed as a position maintained on the social hierarchy.

Black masculinity is researched, noting that structural factors and nuances should be considered more when doing this research. (See also, Bush, 1999). Onwuachi-Willig (2006: 906), in an essay for the California Law Review wrote "... society has constructed categories of race and sexuality in a manner designed to perpetuate hierarchies based on the privileged status of heterosexuals and Whites."

Structural factors or blocks and Black males' responses to those blocks have been cited as explanations for their low rates of employment and low wage paying jobs (Wilson, 1996; 1987; Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2011: Table A-2). For example, compared to White males 20 years of age and older, Black males' rate of unemployment is two times as great (Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2011: Table A-2). Empirical evidence suggests that Black males continue to experience race discrimination in the workplace (Pager, 2007; 2005; 2003); resulting in the lack of promotion (Couch & Fairlie, 2010) and seasonal employment (Terpstra & Larsen, 1980). Their wage earning capacity is further negatively impacted by frequent and continual contact with and involvement in the criminal justice system, even when they are not engaged in criminal behavior (Battle, 2002). Alexander (2010: 179) describes this phenomenon as structural racism. See also, Oliver 1994: 45-46.

Harper, (2004: 94) notes that, "Although most boys attempt to exude toughness and are generally 'naughty by nature,' displays of hyperactivity and roughness among African American males of all ages are perceived as dangerous and disproportionately lead to a harsher set of penalties in schools and society...". In his essay on Black masculinity, Cools (2008: 33), argued that Black maleness, as characterized by the dominant culture in contemporary America, is replete with racial stereotypes that have taken on a life of their own, with Black males being viewed as "... uncivilized and subhuman ... [and] sex obsessed ..." and that black manhood is

closely associated with criminality. These and other stereotypes negatively affect black men's quests for normative manhood” and leads to distorted characterizations of their performance of “normal” male roles.

Cheng (1999) reviewed the literature on masculinities, marginalization, and intergroup relations. In terms of hegemonic masculinity, Cheng (1999) posited that marginalization occurs when the dominant culture treats women, homosexuals, and minorities as outsiders. In a discussion of the social functions of the streets, Oliver (2006: 918) “...describe[s] the social significance of ‘the streets’ as an alternative site of Black male socialization.” “The phrase ‘the streets’ is used here to refer to the network of public and semi-public social settings (e.g., street corners, vacant lots, bars, clubs, after-hours joints, convenience stores, drug houses, pool rooms, parks and public recreational places, etc.) in which primarily lower and working-class Black males tend to congregate” (Oliver, 2006: 919).

Moving beyond the research on marginalized Black men, Harper (2004: 102) examined conceptualizations of masculinity among 32 high-achieving African American men located at six predominantly White universities in the Midwest university campuses, and captured meanings of masculinity. He found that these men held “certain beliefs and aspired to roles that are consistent with traditional, mainstream ¹⁰ White definitions of masculinity (i.e., provider, family man, and executive)”. Also, the men described their masculinity in terms of “... dating and pursuing romantic (oftentimes sexual) relationships with women; any type of athletic activity (organized sports, individual exercise and bodybuilding, etc.); competition, namely through sports and video games; and the accumulation and showing off of material possessions” (Harper’s, 2004: 96).

¹⁰ Beliefs on how to engage in traditional or normative masculine behaviors.

In his study Anderson (1999), argued that low-income Black males as a group are breadwinners, maintaining stable families, and are contributing members of their communities. Oliver (2006: 920) made clear that “Indeed, the majority of lower and working class Black men are resilient and conform to a decency orientation in response to adverse structural conditions that tend to limit their capacity to successfully compete with White men in the arenas of politics, education, economics, and the maintenance of a stable family life.” However, in his study Oliver (2006: 920) also reported that “[T]here is a substantial number of Black males who lack the resiliency and personal and social resources that are necessary to cope effectively with the adverse structural conditions directed against them. Consequently, it is this population of marginalized lower and working-class Black males who are most prone to seek respect and social recognition by constructing their identities as men in the social world of ‘the streets’....”¹¹

Though a substantial body of research confirms that lawful economic opportunities are not evenly distributed (Wilson, 1987), Black males are expected to meet economic standards and earning outcomes set by role expectations associated with American normative masculinity, as defined by the dominant culture and middle-class standards (Connell, 1995; Connell & Messerschmidt, 2005). Franklin (1984: 5-10) argued that definitions of masculinity in America are influenced by social-structural factors and cultural factors, with each impacting the other (Young, 2004: 16-33; Oliver, 1994: 43-44). Franklin (1984: 45) further argued that these factors have polarized meanings of masculinity in America into two roles: The White male role, and the Black male role. The analysis of the narratives in this study allowed these ideas to be explored further.

¹¹ Anderson (1999: 34) adds with, “The hard reality of the world of the street can be traced to the profound sense of alienation from mainstream society and its institutions felt by many poor inner-city [B]lack people, particularly the young.”

In their study titled, *Black Men: The Meaning, Structure, and Complexity of Manhood*, Hunter and Davis (1994), interviewed 32 Black men ranging from the professional to the nonprofessional using a convenience sample. Seeking a cultural construct of masculinity, Hunter and Davis (1994: 26) asked their respondents “What do you think it means to be a man?” Hunter and Davis (1994: 29, 32-36) found that the respondents were cognizant of the unique challenges of being a Black man.¹² They noted that what they expected of themselves, their self-development, and their ability to accomplish life goals and aspirations was guided by expectations from their family, their community, and larger society. The researchers noted that, “[T]he most significant differences were between young men (under 25) and older respondents (30s and older); older men were more comfortable talking about manhood and their views were more expansive¹³ (1994: 32-36).” A central finding reported by Hunter and Davis (1994: 36) was that the findings from their research “counter the notion that viable and adaptive constructs of manhood have failed to develop in Black communities.” See also, Hunter & Davis, 1992: 468-469; Harper, 2004.

Other scholars have argued that a better comparison of masculine characteristics and traits based on ethnicity/race would be to conduct an analysis that compares each group by socio-economic status and other comparable demographic and contextual variables (Anderson, 1999; Wilson, 1996; Franklin, 1984). However, Sampson and Wilson (1995: 39-40), studying Blacks and crime at the community level, as an explanation of their disproportionate CJS contact, alluded to the fact that, studies making comparisons of the social positioning and experiences of Blacks and Whites lead to misleading findings and conclusions, in part because Blacks and

¹² For example, economic depression and social rejection.

¹³ The older men had a better understanding of the social dynamics of the larger society than did the younger men (Hunter & Davis, 1994: 36).

Whites do not live in ecological parity. In their study of data from Chicago, they note that “racial differences in poverty and family disruption are so strong that the ‘worst’ urban contexts in which Whites reside are considerably better than the average context for black communities” (at p. 43, citing Sampson, 1987: 354). They do note remarkably similar behavior patterns across race when various factors, such as male joblessness and single female headed households are present for both Black and White youth. Specifically they found that these factors contribute to higher levels of violence and delinquency for youth regardless of race.

Hunter and Davis (1994) explored the meaning of masculinity for Afro-American men from various community institutions (e.g., churches and barbershops, etc), located in Central New York, and argued that a paradox of crisis and survival exists for Black men. Cooper (2009: 635-639), presented a theory of “bi-polar” masculinity, contending that the dominant society had two images of Black men. There is the good Black man and the bad Black man (2009: 633-636, 644-645; 2006). Cooper (2009: 651) argued that President Obama was viewed as a good Black man in the media during his presidential campaign because he “downplays his race and avoided racial issues.” Cooper (2009: 651) noted that the media viewed Reverend Al Sharpton as a bad Black man, “...because he was race-conscious rather than race-distancing.” At his best, argued Cooper (2009: 645), the media’s image of the bad Black man is considered racially and culturally conscious, or Afrocentric (Akbar, 1990)--i.e. exhibiting an African cultural and spiritual consciousness. See e.g., Pellebon, 2011. At his worst, the perception of the bad Black man and his masculinity is one who engages in pathological behaviors defined as “threatening”, “animalistic, sexually depraved, and crime-prone” (Cooper, 2009: 636, 644-645; Cleaver, 1999).

Franklin (1986: 162-163), reported that Black males attempt to conform to one of three options defining masculine role expectations: adopting the social and cultural masculine norms

of the dominant culture, without conforming to negative aspects of the masculine role (Khan et al., 2011); adopting social and cultural masculine norms of Afrocentrism (Cooper, 2009); or, adopting social and cultural masculine norms suited for survival in street life (Anderson, 1999; Oliver, 2006), wherein the street becomes a significant institution of socialization and socializing, resulting in a substantial risk for contact with the CJS.

There are various labels attributed to and describing American masculine behaviors that fall below the expected standard for traditional or normative masculinity. Descriptions of these masculine labels are theorized as: compulsive (Krienert; 2003: 3; Silverman & Dinitz, 1974); failed (Anderson, 1999; Cheng, 1999); hyper (Wolfe, 2003); marginalized (Hall, 2002); negotiated (Coles, 2009); subordinated (Jefferson, 2002), and protest (McDowell, 2002). In an ethnographic study of lesbian Black women, Lane-Steele (2011: 483) argued that "... protest-hypermasculinity serves as a tool to protect Black men, and the Black community that they are expected to protect, from racism, violence, and discrimination."¹⁴ Lane-Steele (2011:483) further argued that "Black protest masculinities are characterized by hyper-masculinity: taking certain characteristics of hegemonic masculinity (homophobia, misogyny, dominance, and the policing of gender) to more extreme levels."

As noted previously, subordination of woman has been cited as a common consequence of engaging in masculine roles and behaviors (Connell and Messerschmidt, 2005: 844; 846); and Cooper (2006) suggests that Black males' acts of subordination of women, in most cases their significant other, are a consequence of being subordinated by members of the dominant culture.

¹⁴ In contrast to hegemonic masculinity, protest masculinities form under situations of cultural, historical, and economic oppression (Lane-Steele, 2011: 483).

Many of these labels have been attributed to Black males as the construction and expression of their masculinity.

In a 1984 publication, Franklin raised the question of whether Black men can ever be seen as traditionally masculine from a Western perspective. On pages 6 through 10, Franklin (1984) described five historical periods marking the evolution of masculine roles in the United States. He also, argued that one of these historical periods greatly impacted societal perceptions, reactions, and manifestations of Black masculinity in America. Franklin points out that during the Agrarian Patriarchal period, Black males were property or chattel, owned and sold, and thus not capable of engaging in any dominant American masculine traits or characteristics. See also, Hunter & Davis, 1992: 466-468. Accordingly, Franklin (1984) also posited that Black males' historical conditioning, social perception and reaction, and the social exclusionary consequences have not been easy to escape, thus negatively impairing Black males' ability to provide for their families, and explains their marginalized masculine life styles. See Bush (1999: 51-52), who similarly posited that "In the U.S., manhood and the ability to provide for one's family are inextricable. Because of structural barriers, especially in the 60s, Black males have been denied the role of the provider...."¹⁵

A vast amount of literature attempts to detail the life styles of marginalized Black males living in America, both directly, indirectly, fictionally, and non-fictionally, highlighting their lives as they seek to claim and construct their masculine identities. There is the autobiographical (Beck, 1987; Malcolm X & Haley, 1969); the political (Jackson, 2010; Carson, 2001; Cleaver, 1999); the literary (McMillan, 2004; Ellison, 1989; Baldwin, 1974; Wright, 1945); and the

¹⁵ Culturally and politically described as the radical 60s' of urban America, the voices of Black men were heard, announcing their manhood. However, main stream media, hearing these voices, labeled Black males as the 'angry Black man' a term considered stereotypically racist (See Wingfield, 2007).

scholarly (Alexander, 2010; Garfield, 2010; Oliver, 2006, 2003, 1994; Young, 2004, 2003; DuBois, 2001, 1995; Wilson, 1987). However, McClure (2006: 58), noted that “Much of the research characterizes black masculinity and the black male experience as a deviant, if not pathological, compensatory adaptation to the circumstances of their position in the race and class structure”. (See also Gibbs, 1988; Oliver, 1984).

Duck (2009: 286) notes that “[M]uch has been written about African American men and masculinity, usually in surveys that compare African American men to the European American ‘norm for men’.” Historical characterizations of Black masculinity in America have included labels such as: hyper-sexual (Jamison 2006); hyper-masculine, a masculinity representing everything negatively associated with hegemonic masculinity (Dunlap, et al., 2013; ; Duck, 2009: 284; McClure, 2006), and casting Black males as frightening and ominous (see e.g., Jamison, 2006); pathological (Adams 2007; Archer and Yamashita 2003); and dysfunctional (Franklin, 1984). And, Black male youth have been described as “juvenile super-predator[s]” (DiLulio, 2005: 73).

Peralta (2010: 386-387) notes that “... rendering or constructing persons as ‘different’ is a formidable form of social control (Schur, 1984).” Schur (1984) and Messerschmidt (1993) identified areas where the application of deviant labels based on gender and/or race is an expression of power, shaping social interaction and structural inequalities. The social process of deviance categorization can control behavior and mandate conformity, arguably a power in America that is monopolized at the macro-structural level by White males.

As noted previously, in the process of constructing Black males as different or “the other”, they have been cited as engaging in hyper-masculinity, a negative stereotype defining their masculine roles and behaviors (Beale- Spencer, et al., 2004: 236, 239). Ross (1998) reports

that this stereotype has taken on a global acceptance. Ward (2005: 496) reported that, “Black men’s conceptions of what it is to be a man have been inextricably shaped by enduring racial stereotypes of black men as athletes, criminals and sexual predators – racial stereotypes not merely peculiar to the USA, but also pertaining to black males globally (Pieterse, 1995).” (See also, Anderson, 2011).

Black Masculinity and Crime/CJS Processing

In contrast to traditional masculinity, Black manhood is stereotyped and associated with criminality (Cools, 2008: 33), and violence (Mears et al., 2013: 291). Specifically, marginalized¹⁶ Black males are described as adopting a negative/hostile masculinity as a result of lacking both human capital and social capital (Wilson, 2012; Smith, 2000), and lacking institutional power (Staples, 1979). In addition, their heterosexuality and performance of the role of “sexual conquistador” is characterized as being “hyper-sexual” (Karp, 2010; Cools, 2008; Pleck, 1992).

Behaviors and roles labeled hyper-masculine have been reported as being deviant (Duck, 2009: 284; McClure, 2006) and pathological (Adams, 2007; Peters, et al., 2007; Ward, 2005: 500; Archer & Yamashita 2003). Hyper-masculinity is considered a negative form of masculine expression, and has been used to stereotypically describe the behaviors of Black males as a group (Duck, 2009; Cassidy & Stevenson, 2005; Ward, 2005; Beal-Spencer, et al., 2004; Ross, 1998). Along a similar line Karp (2010) noted that mainstream society stereotypically views Black males as angry, violent, threatening, animalistic, sexually depraved, and crime-prone (see also, Ward, 2005: 496; Wendt, 2007; Cooper, 2009), and as embracing a culture filled with crime-

¹⁶ The term marginalization is used here to highlight society’s systemic use of policy and practice to exclude Blacks from equal access to its political, economic, educational, cultural and social institutions. (See e.g., Loury, 2000).

centered values (Ross, 1998: 601; Khoury, 2009: 57-58). Duck (2009) noted that the stereotyping of Black masculinity as hyper-masculinity resulted more from the labeling of Black masculinity as a form of deviance or abnormal behavior rather than as adaptive responses to structural blocks and limited opportunities.

In presenting and discussing his data, Duck expounds on the background of the Black men, their masculinity, and how American society views them. He notes further that, “African American men are labeled ‘hyper masculine’ compared to European American men specifically to explain their [Black males’] role in crime...” (2009: 286). These labels do not adequately cover the many situations in which Black males have contact with the CJS while engaged in lawful behavior, nor do they necessarily consider the risk of Black males becoming victims rather than perpetrators of crime.

In a study involving 284 undergraduate males, Peters, et al., (2007: 172), reported that the label hyper-masculinity was “...associated with both sexual and physical violence against women” and that “... within the research on attitudinal correlates of rape, hyper- masculinity consistently emerges as one of the strongest predictors” (2007: 171). It is noted that ninety-seven percent of the respondents in Peters, et al’s., (2007) study on rape consisted of White males. Yet, Black males, as a group, have been labeled as hyper-masculine and hypersexual.

In “*Understanding Hypermasculinity in Context: A Theory-Driven Analysis of Urban Adolescent Males’ Coping Responses*”, Beale-Spencer, et al., (2004: 239-240), argued hyper-masculinity in the form of aggression may be a coping strategy or defense mechanism for Black males living and socializing in areas that are high risk for violence and victimization. (See also, Seaton, 2007; Cassidy & Stevenson, 2005: 59, 61-62, 65, 67-70). Beale-Spencer, et al’s, reasoning as to why Black males engage in hyper-masculine behavior can also be applied to

Whites males, for example those in a motorcycle gang, those frequenting bars, and those in White areas that are high risk for violence and victimization.

Data from car stops, pedestrian stops and wrongful convictions demonstrate that even non-criminal behavior increases Black males' risk of DMC. Of note, between January 1989 and February 2012, the National Registry of Exonerations reported that there were 873 individual exonerations for various types of crime. Of those reporting their race, 50% were Black (Gross & Shaffer, 2012: 7, 30-32). The Innocence Project (2014: 1), reported that of the post-conviction DNA exoneration cases nationwide (N=312), 62% (n=194), were reported as being African American.

Suggesting that Black skin color has been criminalized, Fagan and Davies, (2000:477-478) note that, "[T]o police officers, race serves as a marker of where people 'belong'," and racial incongruity as a marker of suspicion". Alexander (2010) contends that the CJS, and its policies, methods of processing, and those who enforce its laws, target and label people of color as criminal, functioning as a means and method of racial control, resulting in social isolation and segregation. In a similar vein, Wacquant, (2001) has argued that DMC for Black males is a means to an end to control and remove this surplus Black population from society. (See also, Roberts, 2004). According to Alexander (2010), when the Black male is labeled as a convicted felon, the result is legalized discrimination in all social institutions that Americans engage to sustain and maintain their livelihoods. These include employment, housing, securing social service benefits, voting, and the right to sit on a jury panel (Alexander, 2010: 148). These collateral consequences of a criminal conviction serve to further inhibit his ability to effectively perform positive masculine traits and behaviors.

Caster (2008) argued that Black males' over-representation in the criminal justice system defines their identity within American society, especially over the last 30 years. Research suggests that Whites' fear of being criminally victimized by Blacks (Skogan, 1995)¹⁷, and their labeling of Black males as 'hyper masculine' is based on racial stereotypes (Russell-Brown, 2009), stemming from historical racism and perpetuated by the media (Welch, 2007; Robinson, 2001) and political agendas (Mears, et al., 2013). Detailing the theoretical elements contributing to the development of Black criminal typification, Welch (2007) argued that this fear and racial stereotyping is used to justify the need for and the rationalization of Blacks' disproportionate contact with the CJS. Known as the racialization of crime, Mears, et al., (2013: 273) notes that "[I]n America, the stereotyping of Blacks as criminals dates back to at least the nineteenth century."

"Street" orientation is among the most written about dimension of Black masculinity. It encompasses many of the negative attributes of hegemonic masculine behavior. For example, the literature indicates that Black masculinity or maleness is associated with criminality; not by social fact, but by social perception and depiction. This point was addressed in the empirical studies of Pauker et al., (2010)¹⁸ and Henderson-King & Nisbett, (1996)¹⁹ and Research suggests that close interaction with Blacks, even "good" Black men, does not remove Whites' perception of a collective Black criminality (Mears et al., 2013).

¹⁷ Statistics on crime and victimization do not support this fear (United States Department of Justice, 2011). Crime trends indicate that the majority of crimes committed against Whites are perpetrated by Whites (Fox & Zawitz, 2010).

¹⁸ Pauker et al., (2010), investigated the development and antecedents of children's racial stereotypes. In their discussion (at p. 1808), they argued that "... children's functional use of race as an important organizing dimension in their world may facilitate racial stereotyping above and beyond children merely noticing perceptual racial differences."

¹⁹ In their, study Henderson-King and Nisbett (1996), found that the negative behavior of a single Black male negatively impacted Whites' perception of Blacks as a group.

An important feature of the cultural context of marginalized black males in terms of explaining their risk for DMC is presented by Oliver (2006). Oliver (2006: 927-928) saw the streets as an alternative institution of socialization for Black males, describing a worldview meaning of 'the streets' (2006: 927-928), that paralleled Anderson's *Code of the Streets* (1999). According to Oliver (2006:927), the 'code' is, "... a set of informal rules governing interpersonal public behavior in underclass communities." And, this behavior, is a normative standard for "marginalized and non-marginalized Black males who adhere to street culture" (at p. 927). He added that emphasis is placed on toughness, sexual conquest, and hustling; shielding low income earning Black males who frequent the 'streets' from being victimized by their peers while engaging in this street culture or code, and serves as a means of earning respect (Oliver, 2006: 928). (See also Anderson (1999).

Although adherence to street culture may result in criminal justice system contact, it has also been cited as an institution of socialization for marginalized Black men seeking respect and esteem in places other than traditional socializing institutions such as places of employment, churches, and schools, where they may not be involved or such needs may not be fully met (Oliver, 2006: 931-934).

Compared to their White counterparts, some Black males, especially those in urban settings, may be at greater risk for adopting negative normative masculine attitudes and behavioral traits and/or for engaging in negative normative masculine behaviors. The Moynihan report (1967), highly contested for its methodological approach (Mumford, 2012: 62; Swan, 1974), and its conclusions (Ross, 1998: 602-604), analyzed the breakdown and social problems of poor inner city Black families and their communities. Moynihan reported that the breakdown of these families was due to the rise of low income single-parent Black female headed

households²⁰ and their dependency on social welfare (see Mumford, 2012: 55). The Moynihan report also suggested that single parent female headed households negatively impacted the construction of masculine identities for Black males living in those households where male role models were absent (Mumford, 2012: 57; Ramaswamy, 2010: 420-421; Frazier, 1932). Mumford (2012: 57), suggested "... that a closer reading of the [Moynihan] report reveals that it was not primarily targeting domineering African American mothers but the problem of diminished black manhood, and that this failure of masculinity was linked not only to the inability to become a breadwinner but to the absence of a manly role model that reinforced a proper heterosexual orientation."²¹

Ignoring the systemic structural racism within American society, and cloaked as a cultural argument, the negative social consequences experienced by poor inner city Black males outlined in the Moynihan report (1967), are not unique to that group when differences in socio-economics-status are considered.

Moynihan's report (1967) stereotypically positioned marginalized inner city Black males as incapable of being providers in normative terms, at least in theory. That is, criminality replaces normality as a means to provide, fueling the stereotype of the Black criminal. That stereotype or perception of Black males as criminally inclined creates risk for DMC based on negative stereotyping, irrespective of actual engagement in criminal behavior. The negative social consequences experienced by poor inner city Black males outlined in the Moynihan report

²⁰ Loprest & Nichols (2011: 5) report that "A low-income single mother is defined as an unmarried woman age 15 to 54 with at least one child under 18 living with her and family income below 200 percent of the federal poverty level."

²¹ Mumford (2012: 57), did not define what he meant by a "... proper heterosexual orientation." However, in the context of what he is writing about one can surmise that he is highlighting the concept of the traditional meaning of masculinity.

(1967), are not unique to Black single female headed households. (See Pruitt, 2106). Three decades later Thomas et al., (1996) conducted a study titled “The effects of single-mother families and nonresident fathers on delinquency and substance abuse in Black and White adolescents.” Thomas et al., (1996) found that when compared to single parented female headed households with a non-resident father, White male adolescents fared much worse (delinquency and drug/alcohol use) than did Black male adolescents under these circumstances.

Empirical research conducted on low-income Black families in New York City, found that young males growing up in households with single mothers often reported two to five residential males (boyfriends) living in the household overtime. Dunlap, et al., (2006) labeled these men as engaging in the *transient male* role. Often these men were economically marginalized, generating income through alternative street employment or hustling, most commonly the sale and distribution of illegal drugs (Dunlap, et al., 2006). In this environment, young Black males “may receive relatively detailed instruction from these transient males living in or frequenting the households about the importance of having several female sex partners, modeling the player script or the drug-seller script (Dunlap, et al., 2006)” (Dunlap, et al., 2013: 3). Previous research indicated that sub-cultural scripts involving “players” and “men as dogs” were especially well known and learned among poorer African Americans while growing up (Beniot, et al., 2014.), and according to Dunlap et al., (2006), became part of their socialization process in terms of constructing their masculinity (Bowleg, et al., 2004; Anderson, 1999; Benjamin, 1983), a masculinity described as a “hypermasculinity” (Dunlap et al., 2013: 3). Yet, sub-cultural scripts are not unique to young Black males. Similar scripts, particularly the player script, were reported across race/ethnicity, gender, and other socio-demographic variables (see e.g., Morrison et al., 2015).

Barnett, et al., (2011: 304) noted that "... researchers have reported that cohabiting can produce negative effects for adolescents". Citing a study by Buchanan et al., (1996), they reported that "the presence of an unmarried new partner in the home was associated with higher levels of several kinds of problems for adolescent boys, including more substance use, more school deviance, more antisocial behavior, lower grades, and lower school effort.

In a *Longitudinal Study of Household Change on African American Adolescents*, Barnett et al., (2011: 305) cited a study by Dunifon & Kowaleski-Jones (2002), who reported that "African American children in their study who were living with a parent and a cohabiting partner reported higher levels of delinquency than their counterparts." However, similar findings were reported for White children in a single female headed household as well (Barnett, et al., 2011: 304).

It bears noting that a myriad of challenges impact more than the individual who is processed through the CJS (Rose & Clear, 2003; Travis & Waul, 2003). Empirical research conducted on Black males living in the United States and CJS contact resulting in their incarceration found that these families faced significant challenges (Wildman & Western, 2010; Western & Wildman, 2009; Oliver & Hairston, 2008: 259), that negatively impacted the relationships with their children and families (Western & Wildeman, 2009; Oliver & Hairston, 2008: 259; King, 1993). Analyzing existing statistical data, Travis and Waul (2003:2) found that "[P]risoners, their children, and their families experience risks and disadvantages experienced by few others in our society." Research has indicated that incarceration can become a predictable life outcome for these children (Mauer et al., 2009; Simmons, 2000: 5). Although Blacks are disproportionately incarcerated, the negative impact (behavioral problems) that incarceration has on the children of those incarcerated is experienced across ethnic/racial lines (Sugie, 2012)

Incarceration has been cited as contributing substantially to the lack of suitable male marriage prospects for Black women, and consequently increases the number of single female-headed households (Lynch & Sabol, 2004: 272-274; Sabol & Lynch, 2003; Sampson & Wilson, 1995) and risk for crime. Lynch & Sabol (2004) alluded to the fact that many of the social ills that incarceration has on the incarcerated, the community, and the family are not exclusive to Blacks. Examining various databases on race, residential variation, and the composition of single female headed households, Snyder, et al., (2006: 599) reported that single parent female headed households are frequently marked by high levels of poverty, especially when children live in the household²². Sources confirm that well over half of low income Black families with children living in inner cities are headed by females who have never married (Dunifon & Kowaleski-Jones, 2002; Pinderhughes, 2002; Mahay, et al., 2001); and these females raise children in households where their biological father or other male role models are absent (Bumpass et al., 1991; SBumpass & Sweet, 1989). For Black male youths, these factors have been found to be substantially correlated with risk for CJS contact and eventual incarceration (Swanson, et al., 2013; Mechoulam, 2011; Western & Wildeman, 2009; Woldoff & Washington, 2008; Western, 2004).

Findings concerning youth being raised in a single female headed household, being correlated with risk for CJS contact, and eventual incarceration, are not unique to Blacks. Under

²² In contrasted to married women with children under the age of 18, Wang, et al., (2013: 1) reported that single mothers were found to be younger, more likely to be minority, and less likely to have graduated from college. Rector (2010: 1) reported that slightly over a third (36.5%) of single female headed households with children experience poverty. Similarly, Wang (2013: 19), reported that the 2011 median family income for single mothers who were separated, or divorced was \$29,000, compared to \$17,400 for mothers who had never married; and the median family income reported for mothers who never married was reported at "... slightly over the poverty threshold of \$15,504 for families with one adult and one child, but below \$18,123, the threshold for families with one adult and two children."

the same household structure, Whites experience the same risk (Sampson & Wilson, 1995: 40-41). More specifically, Sampson & Wilson (1995: 40-44) pointed out that many crime-related social ills (e.g., unemployment, low-income, violence, and crime) are not unique to Black culture; instead these social ills are the results of the marginalized living in poverty stricken communities, where poor Blacks are disproportionately concentrated. Sampson & Wilson (1995: 41) added, “In the nation’s largest city, New York, 70 percent of all poor blacks live in poverty neighborhoods, by contrast, 70 percent of poor whites live in nonpoverty neighborhoods ...”.

The adoption of certain cultural characteristics e.g., norms, values, work ethic, and a crime-conducive subcultural belief system (Young, 2004: 17-18), has been used to explain risk for DMC. However, scholars are moving away from focusing solely on cultural factors to explain Black males’ risk for DMC. Instead, they are focusing on the relationship between cultural factors and structural factors or constraints, and how these men make meaning out of life based on these factors (Case, 2008; Young, 2004: 18; Sampson, 1987; Wilson, 1987; see also, Staples, 2010). Young (2004: 17) posited that “Cultural factors refer to behaviors and attitudes that prevent successful immersion in the world of work and the pursuit of upward mobility.” See also, Anderson, 1999: 110. Franklin (1984: 52-61) explained, there are a number of structural factors that negatively impact the construction of Black masculine roles in the United States. Structural factors or constraints can include “...economic, familial, educational and [the] legal order...” (Oliver, 1994: 4). See also, Garfield, 2010: 1. The negative consequences of these structural factors are evident in the responses to or treatment of Black males in American society, particularly as they reflect the fact that Black males have historically been thought of as criminal predators (Welch, 2007). Empirical research has suggested that greater contact with Blacks by

White America has increased rather than decreased Whites' perception of Black performance of their male roles as criminals or potential criminals (Meers, et al., 2013).

Other than a small number of scholars (e.g., Garfield, 2010; Young, 2004; Sampson & Wilson, 1995; Oliver, 1994), there appears to be insufficient discussion of the complexity of variables that impact and influence the masculine behavior of Black males; or interpreting and reacting to Black males performance of normal masculine behavior rather than as pathological behavior. Explanations that focus on pathological behavioral responses miss important driving forces and demonize behavior thought to be "normal" when engaged in by males from the dominate culture, failing to highlight that males from the dominate culture do indeed engage in the same negative masculine behaviors attributed only to Black males.

Oliver (2006; 2003) and Anderson (1999) outlined how historical and contemporary patterns of racial discrimination, deindustrialization, the exodus of advantaged Blacks from the inner city and globalization have served to provide a context for problematic individual and collective behavioral adaptations for inner city low income Blacks. Oliver (2003), addressing violent crime in, *Structural-Cultural Perspective: A Theory of Black Male Violence*, explained how structural factors and contextual factors experienced by Blacks converge to increase the likelihood of violence among African American males. (See also, Garfield, 2010; Young, 2004, 2003; Anderson, 1999; Mauer, 1999). Despite contradictory evidence pointed out in this review of the literature, some research on White male violence typically suggest that, for this group, violence is the exception rather than the norm. And, little existing literature focuses on Black males' risk for CJS contact as victims or when they are engaged in *lawful* behavior. This study attempted to tap into those under-explored areas.

Commenting on the complexity of the performance of masculine identities for Black males, Young (2004: 17-18) reported that “Structural factors include the transformation occurring in urban economic and employment sectors, and the effects of persistent race-based residential segregation on mobility prospects. Similarly, Alexander (2010), posited that the social ramifications of the ‘New Jim Crow’, or structural racism and responses, are geared to socially isolate and segregate people of color. Marginal or low income Black men have limited control over such external structural factors. Since in the existing literature cultural factors refer to behaviors and attitudes that prevent successful immersion in the world of work and the pursuit of upward mobility, these factors are believed to be alterable by black men themselves, which, in turn, is often taken as evidence that these men cause their own plight. However, the contextual dimension of the crisis of marginalized or low-income Black men must be rethought to include “proper attention to social processes and the implications of these additional aspects of meaning making” (Young, 2006: 18)

Critical Race Theory “[CRT] posited that racial privilege and related oppression are ingrained in both the history and law of the majority white, English-speaking liberal democracies such as the USA, Canada, and England” (Warde: 2013: 463). Consequently, Warde, (2013: 463), argued that. “...young black men from economically disadvantaged urban communities are disproportionately policed, prosecuted, convicted, and imprisoned despite their minority presence in the larger population” (citing Brewer and Heitzeg, 2008).

Harney and Vount (2009: 2)²³, argued that “Disproportionate representation most likely stems from a combination of many different circumstances and decisions. It is difficult to

²³ Wherein, the ecology of a community (e.g., the social disorganize of poor urban communities (Rose & Clear, 1998),) defines/labels the (assumed/stereotype) behavior of all who live in those communities, regardless if they live those communities or not. For example, Cose (1993) reported that regardless of their socio-economic-status, professional Blacks receive negative structural responses within American society. See also, Wright, 1987.

ascertain definitive causes; the nature of offenses, differential policing policies and practices, sentencing laws, or racial bias are just some of the possible contributors to disparities in the system.” Schrantz, et al., (2000: 1) pointed to levels of criminal activity, law enforcement emphasis on particular communities, legislative policies, and/or decision making by criminal justice practitioners who exercise broad discretion in the justice process at one or more stages in the system, and that “Statistics at the community and national level show the cumulative impact of racial disparity through each decision point in the criminal justice system...” (Schrantz, et al., 2000: 2).

Consistent with this reasoning, Fagan and Davies (2000), examined data collected from New York City's aggressive policing practices. They note (at p. 458) that “[T]here is now strong empirical evidence that individuals of color are more likely than white Americans to be stopped, questioned, searched, and arrested by police” (Fagan and Davies, 2000: 458). Other research has similarly found racial bias in the judiciary (New York State Judicial Commission; 1991).

In her empirical study of violence and formerly incarcerated Black men, Garfield (2010) addressed the issues of structural responses and impediments to Black males’ formation and performance of masculine identities. In the introduction to *Through Our Eyes*, Garfield (2010: 1-3) argued that there is a relationship between agency and social constraints, and that for Black men this relationship results in conflict in the development of their masculinity. According to Garfield (2010: 9-10), for Black men “... agency exist within and against the context of social circumstances and cultural practices that are created by structural constraints.” And Black men are “...respon[ding] to [these] social and cultural constraints” in their attempts to construct and perform masculine roles. See also, Young, 2004: 16-24. Additionally, social responses toward

Black men indicate that they are generally viewed as actually or potentially criminal, angry and violent (Garfield, 2010: 15-28). These prejudgments of Black men condition social or structural responses to them, regardless of their actual behavior. When coupled with economic and other challenging social contexts, these multi-layered structural factors impact Black males' quests to fulfill the expectations of masculine socialization in ways that have been untapped by previous work that focus solely on the internal/personal or solely on the external manifestation of their efforts and the social response to them. See Alexander, 2010; Pauker et al., 2010; Henderson-King & Nisbett, 1996; Wilson, 1996, 1987.

Oliver (2006: 928-930) constructed a Three-Part Typology associated with masculine behaviors for marginalized Black males, who seek social recognition in the streets of urban America. Oliver's Three-Part Typology consisted of the following:

- Tough guy/Gangsta: one who engages in physical violence as a means of power and prestige,
- The Player: one who engages in sexual conquest/violation and (sexual, emotional, economic, and physical exploitation of women) (See also, Oliver, 2003) and,
- The Hustler/Balla: one who engages in the aggressive pursuit of economic and material gains via legitimate or illicit means.

Included within Oliver's qualitative methodological approach are ethnographic observations, focus groups, and one-on-one interviews (see also Garfield, 2010; Young, 2004; Anderson, 1999; Oliver, 1994: 50-65).

The current study built on the empirical and the theoretical frameworks of traditional masculinity and Black masculinity for a more sophisticated understanding of the association between masculinity and Black males' risk for disproportionate contact with the CJS—an

understanding that may go beyond placing the cause of their DMC uniquely within either their own control or that of the social structure. The development of this more sophisticated understanding is important for strengthening attempts to improve the life chances and quality of life for Black males, their families and their children.

METHODS

Stage one

The current research was essentially conducted in two primary stages. In stage one, to investigate whether traditional or normative masculinity (TM) and Black masculinity (BM) explained distinctly different social phenomena, this author conducted an extensive review of the literature on both. At the conclusion of the review, the author chose Mahalik, et als (2003) CMNI as the most comprehensive measure of TM and Oliver's Three-Part Typology (2006) as the most comprehensive measure of the concepts most prevalent in the literature on BM. Consequently, the study proceeded by comparing the masculine traits in the CMNI to Oliver's Three-Part Typology and this comparison provided the framework for conducting a meta-analysis of studies on BM. In the second stage of the study, this same framework was used to guide the content analysis of self-reports from a sample of low-income Black males. Based on the literature, this author examined the similarities and differences in TM and BM across four domains: provider role(s); gender relations, risk of criminal justice contact; and homophobia (See Table 1). To deepen the investigation of whether TM and BM explained distinctly different social phenomena, the comparison between the traits in the CNMI were expanded beyond Oliver's Three-Part Typology to a comparison with masculinity as captured in a meta-analysis of qualitative studies of BM conducted over twenty years (1994-2014). (See Table 2 and Appendix A). The internet search engines used to identify the scholarly research articles and other

publications in the literature review, and thus the qualitative meta-analysis, were EBSCO, Google Scholar, and the John Jay College library. Keywords used in the search engines included: masculinity, Black masculinity, males, Black males, and deviance. Adjectives used in conjunction with keywords included crime, marginalization, manhood, inner-city, incarceration, poverty, heterosexuality, and police contact. These terms were used because they are key words used in research related to Black males and their masculinity.²⁴

More than a hundred studies of Black masculinity were reviewed for inclusion in the qualitative meta-analysis; but, as pointed out by Timulak, et al (2013), a qualitative meta-analysis is not an exhaustive review of the literature. Its goal is to capture the subject matter of interest and take into consideration similarities and differences in the methods, demographics, findings and the conclusion/discussion of the studies selected for the analysis. Consequently, the majority of the BM studies discovered through the internet search were ruled out because they did not specifically include self-narratives--personal accounts of Black men discussing or describing their ideas about masculinity. Since stage two of the current study focused on self-reported narratives about masculinity, only studies using self-reports or mixed-methods were included in the meta-analysis. A total of nine such studies were identified.

Unlike the current research, the men in these studies came from varied socio-economic and educational backgrounds, and thus, they are broadly representative of Black men and their social experiences. Since not all of the studies focus on men living in poor neighborhoods, the results from the meta-analysis may offer a broader range of understanding masculinity as performed and experienced by Black men than does research on marginalized Black men alone. (See Appendix A for a matrix that compares and contrasts the various studies).

²⁴ These key words say volumes on what is reported on Black males.

Stage two

Stage two of this study examined Black males' masculinity and potential risk for DMC through a multi-faceted lens as reported in Black males' own words, via content analysis of personal interviews, researcher observations and comparison of those narratives and observations to the framework developed in stage one. Interview responses were also used to help the researcher understand the origins of the respondents' acquisition of their ideas about masculinity; and to capture other relevant themes, roles and behaviors associated with TM and BM in the literature.

The data in stage two were collected for a larger study conducted by National Development Research Institutes, Inc., (NDRI) that included specific questions which sought to capture subjects' definitions of masculinity. The NDRI study sought an understanding of the underlying dynamics, contexts, and social processes of what led low-income heterosexual black males who have multiple sex partners to have high rates of HIV/AIDS. As such, it examined sexual norms and behaviors of those having multiple sex partners in order to document the relationship between sexual norms and "scripts" and actual practices and risks for HIV. The specific aims of the NDRI study (as taken from their grant proposal)²⁵ were:

Aim A (Sexual Socialization): To analyze the sexual norms and scripts observed and learned in the family of orientation and from peers that may result in multiple sexual partners in adulthood among low income heterosexual black males.

Aim B (Sexual Scripts): To document the role of drug use/sales and various sexual scripts associated with multiple sexual partnering among low income heterosexual black males that contribute to HIV/AIDS risk.

Aim C (Practices for Safer Sex): To examine how low income heterosexual black males understand and selectively practice safer sex (condoms) with their multiple and main sexual partners.

²⁵ The NDRI study was funded by the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development (NICHD) (R01HD059706) and the National Institute on Drug Abuse (NIDA) (R03DA024997).

(See Dunlap, & et al., 2010).

Two data collection activities were employed by NDRI over a three-year period. They were: In-depth qualitative interviews (self-reported narratives); ethnographic observations (some more extensive than others); and focus groups. And the study relied heavily on ethnography to contextualize their behavior.

As reflected in its title, the goal of the NDRI study was to gain insight into *Multiple Sexual Partnering and HIV Risks among Low Income Heterosexual African American Men*.

Categories of inquiries within the protocol included:

Section i: Demographic information

- Demographics
- Employment

Section ii: Socialization

- Growing up years
- Childhood sex education

Section iii: Sexual scripts/partnering

- Present living arrangements
- Sexual scripts
- Multiple sexual partners
- Safer sex and condom use/nonuse

Section iv: Drug use/sales

Section v: Parenthood

The criteria for being in the study were: Heterosexuality, living in one of the five boroughs of New York City, being 18 and 50 years old, earning an income of less than \$25,000 per year, having multiple sex partners within the past two years and, using drugs (excluding intravenous drug use) and/or alcohol within the past year of the start of the study. Data collection for this project began in 2009, and ended in 2011, and the data has been entered and coded.

Respondents were paid \$10 for screening; and \$60 for completing the interview in two sessions due to the length of the protocol.

The NDRI field staff identified initial subjects from previous studies and through ethnographic observation in poor, Black neighborhoods where additional subjects were recruited using standard snowball sampling methods (Biernacki & Waldorf, 1981). Out of a goal of 125, a sample of 93 Black men were successfully recruited. They were interviewed and observed them in their communities and homes. A sub-sample (N=24) of those interviews is included in this study.

The NDRI field staff included 2 males and 2 females, all persons of color. All but one (a criminal justice under graduate student) had extensive experience collecting data in urban low-income populated areas. All project staff were systematically trained by the principal investigators in every aspect of their roles as researchers:

- Initiating informal conversations
- Building rapport with potential subjects at community venues
- Making observations and write descriptive field notes
- Conducting screening interviews
- Recruiting persons for the study
- Conducting high quality recorded interviews
- Contributing to the success of the project

All interviews were digitally audio-recorded, downloaded at NDRI in each interviewer's electronic folder, and transcribed by a transcriber who entered the data into FileMaker Pro, a relational database program that the project used. The data were secured under password protection on servers at NDRI. Adhering to the requirements of the Institutional Review Board, subjects were identified on the recordings by code name and number. Respondents were informed of their rights as human subjects. Analyses and conclusions was not strictly limited to the responses to questions in the protocol; ethnographic observations were considered as well.

All information regarding the subjects' formation and performance of masculine identities and their contact with the CJS as suspects, perpetrators, victims and observers (e.g. witnesses) was considered relevant to this study. Responses were elicited from the subjects through the use of in-depth interviews. To guard against "socially desirable responses" and contradictions in the narratives, a series of probes were included in the protocols, and the narratives were compared to this researcher's observations and prior knowledge of the subjects.

The respondents who are included in this sub-sample were interviewed by this author. The author spent considerable amounts of time in the field with some of them, observing and talking with them about a variety of topics, especially those that shed light on their ideas about masculinity. The author spent time in the homes and social settings of these men, meeting parents, siblings, significant others, children, relatives, and friends. There were instances where socializing with the men also involved sharing meals, both home cooked and store bought, with these respondents and their families. It was during these meetings that much of the ethnographic data was gathered. The in-depth interviews were transcribed weekly from the onset of the data collection. At weekly meetings, the field team would discuss various findings, and issues that arose concerning the protocol and the respondents.

The self-reported narratives were content analyzed on sample descriptive characteristics (Table 3); CJS contact (Table 4); household structure and the relationship with women (Table 5); and the respondent's definition(s)/meaning(s) of masculine behaviors (Table 6). The narratives from the present study were compared to the analyses in stage one, the meta-analysis, CMNI, and Oliver Three Part Typology (Table 7). Lastly, the relationship(s) respondents had with their was reported (Tables 8); and a respondent labeled the Outlier's definition of masculinity was compared to the remainder of the respondents, and those described in the CMNI.

An inter-rater reliability strategy was used to develop and validate the researcher's assessment of the data in relation to the constructs in stage one. One of the NDRI researchers from the original study assisted in the validation of the analysis of the data for the current study. As part of the content analysis, the data were independently coded from the transcribed self-reported narratives, and the analysis was done multiple times. The NDRI researcher and the author compared each of their coded themes, to assess their consistency.

Code sheets were constructed using the transcribed questions that were of interest to this researcher (See Appendixes B and C). Questions related to risk for DMC and meanings/definitions of masculinity were extracted from the NDRI protocol, as noted, and compared with the stage one analyses. The narratives were searched for stories and traits that clustered around themes that were coded and listed in an Excel file. Close agreement on the coding was produced on the masculinity themes (Armstrong et al., 1997). Specific questions extracted from the NDRI protocol included:

- a) "What did you learn about manhood/womanhood while growing up? Who did you learn this from? And,
- b) What does the word masculinity mean to you? Where did you learn about it? Are you living this definition of masculinity?

The content analysis allowed for the determination of whether these Black men's expressions of masculinity were consistent with those cited and identified in the literature, including any indications of hyper-sexuality, hyper-aggression, etc. The content analysis of their self-reports included a search for stories or quotes consistent with both TM and BM literature.

In the current study, the existing data were searched for correlating themes. The goals of the analysis were to: 1) capture their self-reported descriptions of their masculine

identities; 2) compare and contrast their self-reports against theoretical constructs of normative “versus” Black masculinity; and 3) assess how their masculine identities may be associated with their risk for Criminal Justice System contact.

The discovery of relevant contextual factors emerged when the data were content analyzed. These contextual factors were extracted from the self-reported narratives and subcategorized into patterns or content areas. The data from the transcribed self-narratives were indexed, sorted, coded and categorized into themes, attributes, constructions and definitions of masculinity/manhood, and processes that may impact those meanings and definitions.

The content analysis of the data, along with ethnographic observations, allowed for an assessment of whether the respondents were engaging in normative masculine behaviors (as defined in the literature) or something unique. And these findings were used along with respondents’ self-reports and both deductive and inductive reasoning by the researcher to assess whether their masculine identities were associated with risk for CJS contact.

FINDINGS

Comparing Masculinity Theory and Black Masculinity

Question 1: Do masculinity theory and “Black masculinity” theory explain distinctly different social phenomena? No and yes.

Table 1: Conceptualizing Traditional Masculinity and Black Masculinity

Mahalik, et al’s., CMNI (2003)	Oliver’s Three Part Typology (2006)
Provider Role(s)	
Winning Primacy of work Pursuit of status Self-Reliance	The Hustler/Balla:
Gender Relations	
Power over women Playboy Emotional control	The Player

Risk for CJS Contact	
Risk-taking Violence Dominance	Tough guy/Gangsta
Homophobia	
Disdain for homosexuals	Not reported

Definitions of masculinity reported in the CMNI and Oliver's Three-Part Typology, were placed in four categories or domains for analysis: Provider Role(s); Gender Relations, Risk of criminal justice Contact; and Homophobia. These categories were selected by the researcher as a basis to compare conceptualized normative or traditional masculine normative behaviors to those typically attributed to definitions of Black masculinity. (See Table 1). The comparative analysis did not reveal that masculinity theory based on the CMNI and Black masculinity theory, based on Oliver's Three-Part Typology explain distinctly different social phenomena.

The CMNI defined the Provider Role(s) as winning, primacy of work, pursuit of status and, self-reliance. Oliver's Three-Part Typology defined the Provider Role(s) as the Hustler/Balla. The comparison also revealed that Gender relations were defined in the CMNI as power over women, the playboy, and having emotional control; and Oliver defined gender relations as the player in his Three -Part Typology. It was revealed that Risk for CJS Contact was defined in the CMNI as risk-taking, violence, and dominance; and was defined as the Tough guy/Gangster in Oliver's Three -Part Typology. Homophobia, consistent within definitions of normative masculinity, was only revealed in the CMNI, defined as disdain for homosexuals. (See Table 1). Oliver's study did not report on homosexuality.

Further comparative analysis of the CMNI with Oliver's Three -Part Typology, suggests that these two studies identified the same masculine behaviors, differing only in their descriptive names or labels. However, the definitions of Black masculinity cited in Oliver's Three -Part

Typology are described and associated with negative behavioral outcomes, as typically reported in mainstream scholarship researching Black masculinity (Karp, 2010). For example, using Risk for CJS Contact suggest that engaging in violence or dominating someone (CMNI) equates to being a Tough guy/Gangster (Oliver's Three -Part Typology). The same could be said for Gender Relations. Men who express power over women and men who label themselves as Playboys (CMNI), engage in the same behaviors as does the player (Oliver's Three-Part Typology). Lastly, in both studies, the descriptions or labels cited as the Provider Role(s) all describe one who seeks to generate income, to be a breadwinner. (See Table 1). However, the label Hustler/Balla implies criminality or deviance, even though this may not be the case when considering activities conducted in gray market economies. For example, someone selling cooked food or merchandise without a peddler's or merchant's license could put someone at risk for CJS contact.

Table 2: Comparative Definitions of Masculinity Listed in the Qualitative Meta-Analyzed Studies; the CMNI; and Oliver's Three-Part Typology

Mahalik, et al's., CMNI (2003):	Oliver's Three part Typology (2006)	Qualitative Meta-Analyzed Studies on Black Masculinity (2014-1994)
Provider Role(s)		
Winning Primacy of Work Pursuit of status Self-Reliance	The Hustler/Balla	<p>Responsibility to care for family and being independent (Mincey, 2014: 174-175)</p> <p>Academic success, accumulation of wealth (Roberts-Douglass & Curtis-Boles, 2013: 11)</p> <p>Marriage, children, economic security, aspired to normative values, competence, intellectual skill, emotional self-containment, self-control, prestige, success, individualism (Adams, 2007)</p> <p>Autonomy (Adams, 2007: 167)</p> <p>Taking care of business, working hard, securing a future, succeeding in school, family betterment Family, provider, successful problem solver, autonomy/independence (Harper, 2004: 98-99)</p> <p>Illegitimate means to an economic end (Adams, 2007: 167)</p>
Gender Relations		

Power over Women Playboy Emotional Control	The Player	Emotional control (Mincy, 2014: 174) Sexism (Harris, et al., 2011: 56-57) Love (Adams, 2007: 167)
Risk for CJS Contact		
Risk-Taking Violence Dominance	Tough guy/Gangsta	Physical dominance and the Subordination of others (Duck, 2009: 298)
Homophobia		
Disdain for Homosexuals	Not reported	Fear of being perceived as feminine (Harris et al., (2011: 56-57)
Afrocentrism		
Not reported	Not reported	Financial, emotional, or spiritual care of others (Chaney, 2009: 116-117) Social responsibility (Duck, 2009: 293) Community cooperation (McClure, 2006: 62) Leadership, Afro American community advancement Broader worldview (Harper, 2004: 97) Humanism, a connectedness, the “I” and “We”, equality, faith, caring, unselfishness, respect (Hunter & Davis, 1994: 35) Community and spirituality (Hunter & Davis, 1994: 29)

Qualitative meta-analysis

To further investigate whether traditional or normative masculinity and Black masculinity explained distinctly different social phenomena, a comparison seeking consistencies and/or inconsistencies with Black masculine behaviors was captured using nine qualitative meta-analyzed studies (2014-1994) (See Appendix A). Findings from the qualitative meta-analysis when compared to the CMNI and Oliver’s Three-Part Typology did not explain a distinctly different masculine social phenomenon. Conversely, it was also discovered that masculinity theory and Black masculinity theory does explain a distinctly different social phenomenon. And this social phenomenon is known as Afrocentrism. (See Table 2).

Nine qualitative studies on definitions, meanings, and the construction of Black masculinity were meta-analyzed. These studies were selected because this researcher wanted to

challenge the stereotyped hyper-masculine labels associated with Black males and their masculinity; and also challenge the stereotype that Black masculinity and criminality are one and the same. Data were extracted from the qualitative meta-analyzed studies that related to: 1) research topics, 2) methodology, 3) demographics, and 4) findings/conclusions, definitions of masculinity. One of the first findings revealed from the meta-analysis was: Afrocentrism, which was added as another category for a further comparative analysis. (See Table 2).

These nine qualitative Black masculinity studies sought an understanding of the lives and complexities of Black males' world, as opposed to studying their behavior(s) or lifestyles and labelling them deviant or criminal, or a failed masculinity (Anderson, 1999). Research topics varied, as did the findings/conclusion(s). There were narratives of normative masculinity behaviors (e.g., subordination of others) captured in the meta-analyzed studies that could put the men at risk for CJS contact. However, these were masculine behaviors described as typical and expected normative or traditional male behavior. However, one study (Adams, 2007) did report on the risk for DMC, attributing that risk to being young and foolish, and more significantly, lack of a strong support system, and not Black masculinity or Black maleness. We turn now to the analysis of the nine meta-analyzed studies:

1) Mincey et al., (2014) researched the existence of masculine ideals opinioned by undergraduate college students. They reported that there are Black males who engage in manhood differently than defined as normative; and that the continued use of normative masculine measures on Black males to determine their masculine identities fails to capture their specific meanings of masculinity as it is played out and explained as contextual, reflecting an uniqueness of being Black as it relates to the American society (2014: 170).

Conducting a factor analysis from the data collected from the Masculinity Inventory Scale (MIS) for Black men, listed below are some examples of the abbreviated items cited by Mincey et al., (2014: 174-175):

A man takes care of business and does what needs to be done

A man provides for his family, children, or other family

A man thinks about how he can influence younger people

As a Black man, you're up against a lot from birth

I have to deal with a lot of negative stereotypes

White men have more opportunities than Black men

White and Black men have the same opportunities

My mother showed me how to work hard

It's easier to go through my day when I have someone to talk to

Although an abbreviated list, none of the above items included narratives on masculine behavior that could explain, create, or identify risk for DMC or criminality for a group of college educated Black males.

In contradiction to the Moynihan report (1967), which posited that the lack of a male presence (role model-father figure) in the household explained young Black male deviance, Mincey, (2014: 175) found that his respondents learned how to be a man, and what and expectations were involved from nontraditional gendered sources:

My mom informed me about how to be a man

My mother showed me how to work

My female cousin(s) informed me about how to be a man

My sister(s) informed me how to be a man

My grandmother showed me how to work hard

My aunt(s) showed me how to work hard

My mother gave me the confidence and strength to keep moving

The above narratives suggest that female influences on the development of their manhood and what the expectations are, is rarely researched.

2) Roberts-Douglass & Curtis-Boles (2013) studied the contributions to the development of positive masculine identity for young Blacks males, aged 18-22, from varying socio-economic backgrounds, ranging from upper class to lower class. Overall their findings suggested that the men in their study engaged in positive masculine behavior, and took exception to being stereotyped. Roberts-Douglass & Curtis-Boles (2013:10) found that, “African American males in this study, while frequently exposed to traditional masculinity norms, can and do form definitions of masculinity and self-perception with intentional inclusion of positive schemas (provider, education) and resilience against negative schemas (violence, misogyny).”

Roberts-Douglass & Curtis-Boles (2013: 13) argued that “The results suggests that Black males can defy negative portrayals of Black masculinity that they learned to follow during adolescence.” These men also narrated that their fathers and immediate families were important to their development as men.

Roberts-Douglass & Curtis-Boles (2013) extracted nine themes their data. These themes were connected to their principal research questions regarding “the development process of masculine identity of African American males” (2013: 10-12). They were:

Hypermasculinity prevalent as an expectation among African American males

Father as support figure and model to support individuated definitions of masculinity

Being around other African Americans during adolescence informs masculine identity

Involvement in sports perceived and encouraged as a masculine activity

Academic success viewed as an expression of masculinity

Male teachers serve as role models

Pressures to conform with peer groups

Diverse family images of masculinity

Acceptance versus rejection of traditional expectations perceived as an act of Masculinity

These findings suggest that the development of these men's masculine identities appear to be based on positive influences.

Roberts-Douglass & Curtis-Boles (2013: 14) also reported that their respondents described being "exposure[d] to multiple images or representations of Black masculinity during adolescence." They (2013: 12) go on to highlight "... seven main cultural images ..." With some paralleling those listed in Oliver's Three-Part Typology, these cultural images are: (1) "tough guys," (2) "gangsters/thugs," (3) "players of women," (4) "flashy/flamboyant," (5) "athletes," (6) "providers," and (7) "role models." These cultural images are what is typically reported in the Black masculinity literature (2013: 12). These findings also suggest that these men did not embrace the negative images of masculinity, possibly being influenced by family and positive role models. What is important is here are the influences on their masculine images. Roberts-Douglass & Curtis-Boles (2013: 14) point out that family, father figures, and continued education impacted and influenced the development of these men's masculine identities.

3) Harris, et al., (2011) researched the conceptualizations of masculinity and behavior from undergraduate college students from varying socio-economic backgrounds, who were members of college fraternities. Harris, et al., (2011) reported that these men engaged in positive

masculine behaviors consistent with those described as normative; and they also reported that as these men got older their conception and expressions of masculine behaviors moved closer to the normative in positive ways. This finding suggests that with age comes an understanding of one's cultural and social standing. What is clear here is that risk for criminality or DMC was not reported in the Harris, et al., (2011) study.

4) Chaney (2009) sought definitions of manhood, and how these definitions were played out for Black males from various socio-economic and educational backgrounds. Chaney (2009: 111-112) suggested that the hegemonic model, when focusing on the positive roles (e.g., provider), was insufficient to understand how marginalized low income Black men engage their masculinity. This critique has more to do with comparing well educated Whites and their social standings to marginalized Black males, expecting similar social outcomes for each group.

Making this distinction also addresses the stereotypical portrayal this marginalized group as the representation of all Black males. The marginalized in general have significantly different levels human capital and social capital; as well as significantly different access to quality educational institutions and access to employment opportunities coinciding with the quality of their lives.

Chaney (2009) identified four themes relating to the development of manhood. They were: Maturity; responsibility for self, reflecting a need for autonomy; responsibility for family; provider role, including, "financial, emotional, or spiritual care of others" and Self-Awareness of "... one's abilities to perform in the world stage, and also how one is perceived in deed and in physical appearance" (Chaney, 2009: 115-118).

Chaney (2009: 119) would go on to conclude that "What is also clear from these narratives is the triangulation of self, family, and community among these Black men. In particular, manhood as responsibility for family parallels the African collectivist paradigm (e.g.,

the African traditional value of regarding the needs of the individual as the needs of the group)...” This finding is also known as Afrocentrism.

Chaney, (2009: 118) goes on to report that “Manhood and womanhood are each character descriptors. Manhood, in essence, reflects being a man (a provider for the family and the community, a protector of the family and the community, *able to accept constructive criticism and to use it to make the necessary adaptations*, being a source of leadership and guidance for others, one who is supportive of others, *someone who has goals and aspirations and works towards their realization*, someone who *perseveres in times of hardship*, a well grounded and spiritual person, one whose pursuits are typically just and most often selfless).”

5) Duck (2009) challenged to the hyper-masculine approach of studying defining Black masculinity by studying a sample of working class, college students, middle class workers and/or professional Black males. Duck (2009) confirmed that hegemonic masculinity is the standard by which the African American men of his sample evaluated themselves, even though they may be excluded from it. African American men may support hegemonic beliefs because they benefit from the advantages men in general gain from the overall subordination of women and other men (2009: 301). For example, heterosexuality was implied by the desire to be married; and dominance was implied when acknowledging the duties associated with being the head of household.

However, Duck (2009: 293) found that “Two-thirds of the men in the study, an overwhelming majority, discussed masculinity in terms of family and social responsibility.” A respondent from his Duck’s (2009: 295) study narrated that “... a man is one who takes a leadership role in dealing with his friends, his family, and society.” Duck (2009) also found that the overwhelming majority of the respondents expressed masculinity in terms of family and

social responsibility; and that manhood includes marriage, children, and being employed. These respondents' narratives expressed concepts relating to hegemonic masculinity.

Elaborating on multiple sexual partnering, one of Duck's (2009: 295) respondent's reported that: "I would get respect for having sex with a lot of fine women. Some of my boys wanted to be me, but now it's different. Now as a man my priorities have changed. I know who and what I am responsible for. I am not looking for, you know, praises from anyone else."

Although Duck (2009: 299) disagrees, it is suggested this author that James engaged in multiple sexual partnering for the esteem he received from his friends, contradicting the notion that Black men engage in multiple sexual partnering to prove or demonstrate their masculinity. Lastly, Duck (2009: 298) reported that there were respondents who expressed dominance and the subordination of others was a part of being masculine. However, he gave no indication that those who did so would be at risk for CJS contact, or criminality.

6) Adams (2007) researched support networks that impact models of masculinity for a group of low income men living in New York City. This sample of men fell into one of two groups. The first group described by Adams (2007) as "respectable men" this group of men adhered to normative masculinity, expressing "self-control, acquisition of skills, mastery of rules—at the expense of its self-assertive and expressive side rules—at the expense of its self-assertive and expressive side" (2007: 167). The second group "... defined themselves by a reputation heavily influenced by street culture" (2007: 167). And this group "... pursued self-assertion, agency, and physicality, often at the expense of their safety ...", putting them at risk for CJS contact.

Adams (2007: 167) opined that the young men in his study "subscribed to normative mainstream ideals of the type of man they aspired to become." In their inability to fulfill that

subscription, he added that “Poor African American men in this study had few safe arenas in which they could expansively explore the potentials of their developing masculinity” (2007: 171). Adams study suggests that risk for criminality may result from inability to fulfill the provider role in traditional means, resulting in risk for criminality. Further explaining the possibility of risk for CJS contact for a young cohort of respondents, Adams (2007: 160) suggested that “The men who were forced too early into independence, therefore, often found themselves committed willy-nilly to illegal pursuits; most of them had lacked support and guidance around the skills of interdependence and self-control that academic and occupational education require.”

7) McClure, (2006) researched how a historically Black fraternity helped its members to develop a masculine identity in contradiction to the negative stereotypes from college students from middle to upper class-middleclass backgrounds. “The findings show evidence of the influence of two different types of masculinity, first a hegemonic model ... Secondly, an Afrocentric model (2006: 62).

McClure’s (2006: 62-63) respondents expressed frustration because of the stereotypes associated with being a Black male, placing “... the responsibility for this continuing negative image of black men on both the media and the general public.” A respondent’s narrative raises a number of suggestions, when he added, “But right now I feel that, while black males have come a long way in this society that really we haven’t gone anywhere. And by that what I mean is that stereotypes are so strong that when a black male is successful, when he is doing what he is supposed to do, when he is a leader in his field, his business or whatever, he’s looked at as an exception” (2006: 62-63). This narrative suggests that society’s reacts toward Black males based on stereotypes, which further suggests that the stereotyping of Black males places them at risk

for DMC, which has nothing to do with Black males actions or behavior. It is a matter of perception, and society (CJS agents in this case) reacting off that perception.

8) Harper (2004) examined within-group alternative conceptualizations of masculinity from a group of college students whose mean GPA was 3.32 from six campuses. “Second to women, competition influenced many of their peers’ perceptions of masculinity. Specifically, defeating opponents at video games and on the basketball court were two key ways in which ‘real men’ could flaunt their manhood” (2004: 97-98). Harper’s report on the significance of multiple sexual partnering seems to suggest that it is a means of peer recognition, versus a means to prove one masculinity. Which, is different from sexual relations being a masculine activity.

Afrocentric viewpoints were reported by Harper (2004) in this study. He reported that the men of his study assumed responsibly for the advancement of the Afro-American community and campus life for this group (2004: 101). One student noted, “Look at Dr. Martin Luther King, Malcolm X, Jesse Jackson, Louis Farrakhan... they’re masculine; they weren’t athletes, but they were out in the streets fighting for the rights of Black folks. To me, that’s masculine” (2004: 99).

9) Hunter & Davis (1994) researched Black men’s conceptualizations on manhood from a group who was either employed or attending college. Three themes conceptualizing manhood were reported here: Identity and the development of self, connections to family; and spirituality and humanism. Central to these findings is the counter to the belief that “... viable and adaptive constructs of manhood have failed to develop in Black communities” (1994: 36). These findings also suggests that the practice of Afrocentrism is important in defining these men’s manhood.

Overall, the findings listed in Table 2, did not indicate or support the notion that traditional or normative masculinity explains a distinctively different social phenomena when compared to Black males engaging in masculine behavior. Put another way, these findings do not

suggest or indicate that Black males conceptualized or engage in traditional or normative masculinity differently than their racial counterparts. These findings did indicate that Black males varying in socio-economic-status, educational attainment, and family support do engage in positive forms of traditional or normative masculinity. Conversely, Table 2, also revealed that some of these men engaged in a distinctly different social phenomenon: Afrocentrism, a distinctly different masculine behavior when compared to normative masculinity.

Afrocentrism

Findings of Black men engaging in Afrocentrism appear to be rarely reported in main stream literature when reporting on their masculinity. (See Table 2). Afrocentric behavior and concepts focuses on caring for the wellbeing of the family, as well as others within the community (Oliver, 1989). “The cultural emphasis of Afrocentricity is in contrast to the Eurocentric world view which encourages; controlling nature; materialism and individualism (Mbiti, 1969)” (Oliver, 1989: 24).

Of note, Oliver, (1989: 24), posited that “The Afrocentric world view is not anti-White.” “Afrocentric ideology is about “reclaiming traditional African values that emphasize mankind’s oneness with nature; spirituality, and collectivism” (Oliver, 1989: 24), all of which are contradiction to hegemony and the notion of individualism in terms of being competitive. Significant to the risk for CJS contact and the stereotyping of Black males as hyper-criminals, the adoption of an Afrocentric perspective does not “...promote definitions of Blacks as being innately inferior to Whites, ignorant, lazy, dependent, promiscuous, and violent” (Oliver, 1989: 24).

A unique and distinctly differing social phenomenon known as Afrocentrism was reported within seven of the qualitative- meta-analyzed studies (Table 1), which technically is

not considered masculine behavior(s) in normative masculine terms. Accounts of Afrocentric behaviors and practices discovered within the qualitative meta-analysis included:

1. “[L]eadership and community involvement” (Harris, et al., 2011:55).
2. “[D]iscuss[ions of] masculinity in terms of family and social responsibility” (Duck, 2009: 293).
3. “[W]hat men expected of themselves was framed not only by family role expectations but by their perspective on identity and the development of self, connections to family and community, and spirituality and worldview (Hunter & Davis, 1994: 29).
4. “[W]hat is also clear from these narratives is the triangulation of self, family, and community among these Black men. In particular, manhood as responsibility for family parallels the African collectivist paradigm (e.g., the African traditional value of regarding the needs of the individual as the needs of the group)” (Chaney, 2009: 119).
5. “[T]he findings show evidence of ... an Afrocentric model that is largely due to the salience of race in identity construction for members of oppressed groups, with an emphasis on community and cooperation” (McClure, 2006: 62).
6. “A man mentors other people” “A man thinks about how he can influence younger people” “I have to prove stereotypes against Black men wrong” “A man provides for his family, children, or other family” (Mincey, 2014: 174).
7. “Additionally with academic success, the participants believed it was important that they established “well-rounded” profiles in college. In other words, they should display competence and success in multiple domains - not only academics, but also, leadership and community involvement” (Hunter & Davis, 1994: 55).

There were only two studies that did not report Afrocentric findings were Adams (2007) and Roberts-Douglass & Curtis-Boles (2013). None the less, these Afrocentric findings counter typical descriptions of Black males as emotionless, violent, aggressive, uncaring, individualist, who seek out multiple sex partners in order to substantiate or validate their masculinity. They also counter the notion that viable and adaptive constructs of masculinity have failed to develop in Black communities in spite of structural blocks (Alexander, 2010; Garfield, 2010). Hunter and Davis (1992) reported similar findings, wherein their respondents identified three Afrocentric thematic themes of masculine behaviors: 1) Identity and the development of self; 2) connections

to family; and 3) spiritualism and humanism. “The interviews with these men offer clear examples of the complexity of constructing a black male identity in American society today. The men utilize their fraternity membership in ways that reflect the Afrocentric model of cooperation and connectedness to the black community and more specifically to other males.”

It is suggested by this author that Afrocentrism should not be correlated with risk for DMC. However, the very nature of Afrocentrism may put Black men at risk for criminality when they do not have legitimate means to fulfill that role, i.e., the provider role. Lastly, it is further suggested that these findings are generally inconsistent with mainstream scholarship reporting on Black masculinity, labeling it as a set of hyper-masculine behaviors, leading risk for DMC with the CJS and risk for criminality.

The comparison of the CMNI; Oliver’s Three-Part Typology; and the Qualitative Meta-Analysis

Previous empirical studies on risk for DMC tend to take a dichotomous approach, attributing risk for criminality to either cultural explanations (Oliver, 2006: 927-928), structural explanations Alexander (2010: 179; Duck, 2009: 284-286), or a combination of the two (Alexander, 2010). Excluding narratives reporting Afrocentrism, the content analysis of these three studies do not explain distinctly different social phenomena defined as normative masculinity. Conversely, narratives reporting Afrocentric behavior does explain a distinctly different social phenomenon, which is not defined as a normative masculine trait. (See Table 2).

All three of the studies were content analyzed, (See Table 2), and did not support findings that risk for DMC or risk for CJS contact could be explained by cultural explanations. However, these findings do suggest that risk for DMC or risk for CJS contact could be explained by structural reasons or systemic racism. Structural reasons include the stereotyping and Black males as criminal, and in this instance CJS agents, i.e., the police, reacting off the stereotypes.

These findings suggest that stereotyping can result in prejudice and discrimination, further resulting in structural exclusion to those institutions, e.g., education and employment, needed to fulfill the provider role, placing Blacks males at risk for DMC, and risk for criminality, and risk for CJS contact as a result of using non-traditional means to fulfill the role of the provider. .

Lastly, excluding socio-economic status and educational attainment, these findings suggest that all three studies listed in Table 2, explain the same masculine normative behavior(s), differing only in label. It is further suggested that masculine labels are generally defined by race/ethnicity as in the case of Oliver's Three-Part Typology. Also, the three masculine types listed in Oliver's Three-Part Typology have been cited as compensated masculine behaviors, resulting from the failure to perform or conform to normative masculinity (Roberts-Douglass & Curtis-Boles, 2013: 11). To this point, these findings indicate that the descriptive masculine labels cited in qualitative meta-analyzed studies closely parallel those listed in the CMNI rather than Oliver's Three-Part Typology.

Low-Income Heterosexual Inner City Black Males Constructing, Defining and Engaging in Masculine Identities.

Question 2: How do low-income heterosexual inner city Black males from this study construct, define and engage in masculine identities? In normative and Afrocentric ways.

Table 3: Sample Characteristics (N=24)

Age	Educational Attainment	Primary Source of Income	Types of Employment
19-29 (n=13)	<= 12 (n=7)	Selling Drugs (n=2)	Maintenance (n=1)
30-39: (n=4)	HS/GED (n=9)	Employed (n=7)	Security (n=1)
40-50: (n=7)	Some College (n=6)	PA/SS/SSI (n=13)	Retail (n=3)
	College Graduate (n=2)	Family (n=2)	Health aide (n=1)
			Livery cab driver (n=1)

The average age of these respondents was thirty-one. Three of these respondents were nineteen at the time of the data collection, with slightly over half the men aged twenty-eight or older. Most (n=16) of the sample had a high school/GED education or less. Slightly less than a third (n=7) reported being employed; and of these, all could be considered low status jobs. (See Table 3).

Provider Role(s)

Many of these respondents reported selling drugs at one time in their lives. However, only two reported that they were actively selling drugs at the time of the survey. (See Table 3). Respondents Day-Day and Peezee, two of the youngest respondents in the study sold drugs as a means of survival, and they are not *ballas*²⁶, in the definition presented by Oliver (2006). I met Day-Day, aged 19, in my neighborhood. I would see him walking through or standing around an apartment building that was a hangout. He was raised by foster parents, had been incarcerated as a juvenile and as an adult, had a ninth grade education, and lived on the streets. He would find menial labor occasionally; but he could not survive with that work. Selling drugs was his only option for survival. Day-Day defined masculinity as, “I smoke weed, drink, fuck bitches and make my money. I usually make money is playing (women), selling drugs and work too. Marijuana and I used to sell crack and cocaine.” (See Table 3).

All of these respondents reported experiencing some form of employment at one time in their lives in areas such as maintenance, retail, fast food, construction, human services, and security. However, many had lost their jobs for varying reasons such as:

Tugga: The nigger (manager) told me I threw away some pots....Yeah. He never checked the camera. He just went on the assumption because when he looked at the camera that night it didn't show me taking out the garbage. It showed the Chinese kid taking out the

²⁶ In this instance, a *balla* is one who sells large amounts of drugs

garbage and it showed me in the back but he said I did it. He said he was going to fire me for right now even though he didn't see it on the camera.

Tugga defined masculinity as:

“You always gotta be the man of the house and you always gotta take charge ... The male who brings home the bacon and eggs Somebody you can look up to taking care of your responsibilities.” Someone who is “braver [and] taking more steps out there you know? ... I don't care, cause I'm stepping out gotta do what I gotta do, providing, most definitely I'm providing, I'm always providing so definitely I'm living that life.”

Conceptually this response could fall under the CMNI (Primacy of Work) role (brings home the bacon and eggs) and an Afrocentric value (Somebody you can look up to [a role model]).

I have known Tuuga for 16 years. He dropped out of high school, has low to no human or social capital that would enable him to get meaningful employment. He is an opportunist hustler, but not a balla. He sold drugs when he could get them. However, I learned from a family members that Tugga was a poor drug dealer. He was his best weed customer). He was not a player, nor a tough guy/gangster; he is a quiet guy who is gang affiliated, rarely venturing out of his neighborhood. Tugga wears baggy clothing reminiscent of the 80s, as do most males in his community dress this way. He lives in classic broken windows community, with a high volume of broken windows policing. This is a community where crack and heroin never left.

Tugga: I don't care, 'cause I'm stepping out (doing what is necessary) gotta do what I gotta do, providing, most definitely I'm providing, I'm always providing so definitely I'm living that life.

Tugga's narrative falls into the role normative definition of masculinity as a hustler and risk taker. He is also self-reliant. However, his human capital places him in the role of selling drugs (marijuana, crack, and heroin) to generate income. At the age of twenty-two, he is gang affiliated, and basically stays around the block, rarely venturing out of his neighborhood. He

dropped out of high school early, and has no employable skills. Tugga's behaviors are systemic of the neighborhood where he lives: Low income, low levels of literacy, lack of employable skills resulting in the lack of employment, gangs, drug usage and selling, and marginalization. This is a community in disrepair and at risk for DMC with the CJS.²⁷

When asked "Give me an example of someone who is not (traditionally) masculine"

Tugga replied:

I would have to put my dad in that situation...for example, not being around and all that wild crazy shit. That wasn't being a male...that wasn't being masculine. That was being a sucker.

I have known M&M for the majority of my life, and he was aged 50 at the time of the study. He earned his GED while in Federal prison for selling drugs. He is employed occasionally doing menial work. However, his main source of income is street hustling, and that means selling anything he can get his hands on. He can be found in the streets till the early morning light and, and one can tell that he is a hardcore drug addict, which makes it hard for him to be a drug dealer. He has an unhealthy look of someone who abuses drugs. He has seven children; he and his wife have been on public assistance prior to their children being born.

M&M, at age 50, defined masculinity as "I always keep it manly like, you know what I mean. Being responsible as a man. Taking care of my responsibilities inside my home, and handling my responsibilities out in the streets. Taking care of my rent, providing for my wife and kids, mom and them. Things like that. Taking care of my wife and kids. Not where they need to depend on welfare and some shit. Taking care of my mom and paying my rent and bills."

²⁷ This researcher has a personal knowledge of what goes on in the communities where these men. He grew up and was raised on the same streets.

I have known PDL for over 20 years, and at the time of the study was 46 years old. He received his GED while incarcerated in a State prison, and has since been in a number of vocational programs in hopes of gaining employment. He has not been able to get employed other than doing truck deliveries when he can find work, and was on public assistance. He has unsuccessfully gotten back into selling drugs in order survive: Paying rent, food, clothing, and his children. He used to be a major drug dealer. However, and for reasons not explained, when he returned home from his last prison bid he was only given very small amounts of drugs to sell. Frustrated, he left the drug game.

PDL defined masculinity as, "It's more like a macho type of man. -macho, like he's very aggressive, uh, he's under the impression that he has to over exert himself. You know, things like that. Macho, you know, being tough. - Egotistical, you know guys walking around with their puffy chest out. - some guys believe that they are not supposed to cry. Some guys believe it's manly to not show emotions, and you know, that's my terminology of macho, not tapping into their emotions. Yeah, you know, a guy that just don't understand that it doesn't make you less of a man to cry or to show emotions."

PDL further defined masculinity as:

Responsible, taking care of kids, family, showing kids right from wrong, principles and morals.

PDL is a former hustler/balla, a drug dealer who sold large quantities of cocaine. He served fifteen years in prison for selling drugs. For the most part he has lived on his own since he was released from prison. He lost his wife and kids for cheating with another woman. The places where he lived were drug infested, with criminality being the norm. Yet, he has not had any contact with the law since his release.

However, he desired to get back into selling drugs, and the people he sold drugs for in the past would only give him small amounts of drugs; and it perplexed as to why. I can only surmise that they were slow walking him back into the game, determining whether he still had the hustler/balla in him. One thing I observed about PDL was that he was impatient. He wanted things in his life to happen in the immediacy. He was struggling economically, needed to survive, stating that he could not find consistent and lasting work so that he could pay his bills. Thus, he sold drugs. He is presently living and working in the country where was born.

I met Fly through an acquaintance, Ski aged 46, at the time of the study. They met while incarcerated in a State prison. Fly was 42, unemployed; but he was aggressively seeking employment. His main source of income at the time was public assistance. He was presently a freshman in college. Fly defined masculinity as, “it deals with a lot of my manhood. um...me being masculine meaning that I'm all male. You know, um, no homo. Um...and-and pride and, you know, all of those things come into place when I hear, um, masculinity. Security. You know, I'm secure in my own (talking to someone). That's it, like just secure in my manhood. You know?” He added “Yes. I say what I mean and mean what I say. Like, you know, if I say I'm gone do some- thing I'mma do that. If I'm not gone do it, I'm not gone do it. Um...I'm sorry, I don't wan- na jump ahead and use the other word again, but- ...Masculinity just defines, um, me being a-um-not a dominant male, but a confident male. dominant meaning, like, you know, a um- I guess dominant being more aggressive. Confidence is just, you know, being sure.”

Ski was 46 at the time of the survey, and I have known him for at least ten years. He received a graduate degree while incarcerated. Yet, he was unable to find employment, and was on public assistance. His definition of masculinity was, “Living in a male dominated world, masculinity. More machismo like... Meaning male ways are really, more dominate...Over

everybody. Oh his behaves probably more directly towards a woman. A woman is more passive... is more aggressive type....”

I met Peezee, aged 23, through Tugga at the time of the study. He lived with his mom, and occupied a front room of their apartment. He was not employed and had an eleventh grade education. He sold weed and crack. Peezee’s definition of masculinity was “Responsibilities as in, as a man is supposed to do...like stuff in the household, stuff need to be fixed or stuff need to be paid or things that need to be done in the household.”

I met SP, as he was entering the apartment building that was a hangout. He lived there with his mom and sister. He was aged 34, had a GED, and drove a legal dollar van. I would speak to him and his mother when I would see them. He stated that he had done time in another state for drug trafficking, serving eight years. He too did not know the meaning of masculinity. However, he is not tough guy; but he has sold drugs and engaged in multiple sexual partnering.

PDL lost numerous off the book truck driving jobs because of downsizing. Smiley, aged 29 with some college education, who I have known for 17 years, was fired from his overnight retail position because he did not report that he had been formerly incarcerated. Once fired he had to seek public assistance. He claimed to sell drugs when things got rough economically, but my sources could not confirm that narrative. Smiley’s definition of masculinity was expressed as “Someone that has morals, and doesn’t stand for anything. Like, doesn’t take no shit from anybody. He makes his decisions. ..., my masculinity is that I don’t take shit from nobody, and the way I carry my-self is more of a person that has respect with themselves. You know what I’m saying, I don’t take shit from nobody.”

Day-Day was fired as an assistant (massage) therapist because he got into a fight with the manager over a minor dispute. He was not arrested. Although not arrested, Joker, aged 22, was

fired from Duane Reid for running a credit card scam. I met him in my neighborhood, as I would see him occasionally. He had gone to college up to being a junior. He was looking employment, and living with his mom at the time of the study. Joker did not know what the meaning of the word masculinity meant, “I don’t really know about masculinity. That is what I’m trying to tell you. Probably just like male...power.”

Similarly, Bones, who I met hanging out at the apartment building, aged 22, high a school dropout, and unemployed, was also arrested for the possession of marijuana right after his interview. After his interview conducted in a park filled with parents and children, Bones decides to start smoking weed, and was arrested as soon as he left the park. When asked his definition of masculinity, Bones replied:

“No hold on. I don't know that word. Sorry about that...Well to be a man is to do what a man do like, um, take a woman out, um...you buy her stuff. Flowers. Chocolate. Like you bring them out. Take them out to movies, eat. You know, go-You know, what a man supposed to do. Give them money sometime if they down. That's pretty much it.”

Working for a carpet company, Fly was fired because used the company van to move a television from his aunt’s home who had just passed away. I met S, aged 28 at his family’s place of business, and he had received an associate’s degree. He was fired as a customer representative from two retail stores for credit card scams, and served 60 days in a City jail for it. His definition of masculinity was, “The man is the leader of the family. He’s the responsible...the one that all families look to...even the wife.”

Losing his job, P90 was arrested due to an altercation with the police in another state while employed for Sleepy’s Mattress company. At the time of the study he was aged 24, had a grade tenth education, and was on public assistance. I met P90 while he was hanging out in front of an apartment building with his friends. His definition of masculinity was, “Yeah, I guess a

strong man to a female a buff, built nigga.” He goes on to explain why he was not living that definition:

“Not right now, nah? Um, uh it kinda affects me a little bit but not in like if you could really play back my life who gives a fuck about all dat shit, you know I mean? Cause right now, it ain’t all about dat like you nah I mean, they caught up in the wrong things. Uh, actually I need to go stacky, I need to go get my weed up and all dat shit too you know I mean, word...right uh fuck...uh I think so. Dat shit is dead, what else I do for a hustle, (laughter) help me write dese damn books (laughter). Yeah my physical, I should be more toned up right now. I want to nah I mean. I’m trying to find a way how can I live while doing dat? You nah I mean. Yeah, yeah, I wouldn’t, even if I get a job, I can’t get a job I done applied is no jobs hiring.”

I met Fame in my old neighborhood as well. He was aged 20, had attended college, and was working in a retail store. Fame reported that he had been arrested on numerous occasions, some of which were a result of wrongful identity. However, he was also arrested for selling fake cocaine, and for smoking and drinking alcohol in a school zone. He had been taken to the City jail for four to five days due to a brawl he was involved in at his school. His definition of masculinity had a twist:

“The word masculine, basically the man in the relationship or the one stronger. The strongest one in the relationship, basically the one you know, the one that’s in charge. To me she’s [his girlfriend] masculine because basically she’s the man. If she telling you when to, what to do, when to do it and how to do it, she’s the man.” He added “They [females] bring in the money ... sometimes I swear the females going out to work bringing in all the money, financially stable. ... And the husband or the boyfriend just stay home and take care of the kids. Because if it came down to the situation when she need money, she can’t ask him. Well ... she [his girlfriend] does make more income than me”

Fame: The strongest one in the relationship. The one in charge. It can be a female.

I have known DJ for over ten years. He is aged 32, had attended college, and was working as in janitorial services. I would see him occasionally a various functions related to prison re-entry. Like Fame, DJ had a twist on the definition of masculinity:

“My sense of masculine identity is my wife and daughter having everything that they

desire in this life. And my being able...my wife and daughter having everything that they need in terms of material things and immaterial things. And my being able to provide those things regularly without a question. That's what I equate with masculinity.” He adds, “Mentally tough, um, a deep voice, strength, those are qualities that characterize masculinity. Football. Basketball. Talk to girls. Get at smuts. Um...you know, throw 315 up on the bench. These things are masculine. There are women that are masculine. A masculine woman does the same thing as a male. It's just that she's a female. She goes after women. She prefers the company of women, plus her attitude and behaviors reflect that By, carrying out what I said verbally. Because I get at girls-smuts. I play sports. I love beer. And I am absolutely without question 100% heterosexual. So, everything that I do is masculine.”

DJ goes on to add:

“There are women that are masculine. A masculine woman does the same thing as a male. It's just that she's a female. She goes after women. She prefers the company of women, plus her attitude and behaviors reflect that.”

The above two narratives contradict the traditional masculine role of the males being the sole provider, suggesting their definitions of masculinity was not gender center, being based more on performance as the head of household or provider:

Table 4: CJS Contact (N=24)

CJS contact at least once	Convicted at least once	Incarcerated at least once
Yes (n=23)	Never (n=1)	State prison (n=10)
No (n=1)	Felony (n=12)	City jail (n=6)
	Misdemeanor (n=11)	Juvenile (n=1)
		Never (n=6)

Risk for CJS Contact

Twenty-three of the respondents in this study reported that they had experienced some form of CJS contact at least once in their lives. (See Table 4). Young was the only respondent to report that he not experienced any form of CJS contact. Peculiarly he is the only respondent who reported initiating and engaging in violent behavior (fighting) while partying with friends. Of

those that did have contact with the CJS, charges/convictions, for example included trespassing, selling drugs, armed robbery, domestic violence, assault, and homicide.

Fifteen respondents had experienced multiple arrests; and seven respondents reported being incarcerated for ten years or more during one stint of incarceration. For example, M&M, reported that he had been arrested more than 20 times. He has done time in the Federal and State prison systems; and it is assumed that he was not incarcerated each time he was arrested.

Twelve respondents reported that had felony convictions; and eleven reported that that had misdemeanor convictions. (See Table 4). (These numbers are not aggregated). Eighteen of the respondents reported that they had been incarcerated at least once from a conviction. And at the time of the study only one of the respondent reported that they were under post release CJS supervision. Of those incarcerated at least once after a conviction, ten respondents reported doing time in a State prison; six respondents reported doing time in a City jail; one respondent reported doing time in a Juvenile facility; and six respondents reported never being incarcerated. (These numbers are not aggregated).

For example 540, had been arrested after he had purchased a small amount of marijuana for his personal use. Immediately afterwards, he was approached by the police and asked if he had any weed on him. Honesty would get him booked quickly and released. Honesty got him an extended stayed in the prescient for over five hours as a result of being honest.

Only two of the youngest respondents, Young and R. Black, reported that they had never earned income by committing a crime. However, R Black had been arrested for possession of marijuana. Dee, aged 23, was employed working with a special needs population, and had received his school diploma. I met him while he was hanging out in front of the apartment. He

too had been arrested for possession of marijuana. Unfortunately he lost his job as a result of that arrest.

Chronic was another who was arrested numerous times for selling marijuana in front of the apartment building that was a hangout. This is where I met him. He could not hold down a job for any period of time, claiming he was always looking for work, and he was on public assistance. He was the only respondent who I thought gained esteem from selling drugs. He was a nice guy, someone who you sent to run errands.

Aged 31, and possessing a GED, Chronic defined masculinity as:

“It means how much, um, emotions. Like, how much emotions you show. Masculinity, when you hear the word, that refers to males who are not supposed to show emotion, you are supposed to be masculine. You are not supposed to cry or get all emotional, you are supposed to suck it up and toughen up as part of masculinity.” Being more specific, he followed with “Because excuse me, I know you guys heard this before but I am an emotional thug. An emotional thug is just someone who has thuggish ways, but is very emotional with everything in terms of females, family, everything. No matter how thuggish he may look, no matter how thug he may act, he still has that little- it’s not masculinity. How can I put it, not feminine side, but he has that soft side in him. Emotional thug is someone that gets very emotional over a lot of different situations For me, the definition of an emotional thug is just someone who gets emotional at times and can’t help it, it’s just in me.”

There is nothing touch or thuggish about Chronic.

Excel lived in my old neighborhood, and he another young fellow who I would speak to occasionally when I would see him walking through the neighborhood. He portrayed himself as pimp; but I would discover that he was simple a middleman between young women and the men they sexually serviced. When asked what his male script was when dealing with women, he stated that he was a warm and cuddly type of guy, and would never pimp a woman. And he insinuated that he was monogamous. He also claimed to have done four months in the county for possession of weed and a robbery. And he claimed to have sold drugs when he could get them.

Excel was aged 22, had a high school diploma; and collected Social Security benefits. He defined masculinity as, "... taking care of mine" and having "...and if "you got priorities and make sure you keep them first. I mean just take care of what you got."

I met O through an acquaintance. He was aged 33, had a GED, and was on public assistance. O defined masculinity as:

"I learned like basically to be respectful and treat the next person like you really wanted to be treated. And like I learned that there are people that you are just going to have to ignore. You just ignore them. You do the best you can for you and yours and try to help people or children that you see around you. You try to help them and try to like...like my grandfather would always try to tell all of us on the block...me and my little friends and all that...he would try to tell all of us on the block when we was doing something wrong. There was a lot of older people on my block at that time and they had like their own little pack and if they caught me doing something wrong or whatever they would beat me and drag me up the block to my grandparents and tell them he caught me doing this and he beat me. Then my grandparents would get me, you know. I experienced a lot of that on my block since there was a lot of older people on my block."

O had recently released after doing State time (ten years or so) in a prison for selling crack. He was on parole at the time of the survey. Unfortunately, he was violated by his parole officer, and sent back to prison. He claimed to have been arrested at least ten times, and incarcerated in the State prison from a manslaughter conviction, and he reported doing time in a City jail. He reported being arrested for a robbery, and possession a fake gun while in a train station. He narrated a horrible story of his girlfriend being shot and killed over a fake gold chain while he was with her.

Inch reported that he had been arrested at least 17 times, and that he did time for each arrest in the State, County and City detention areas; and violating parole. His crimes ranged from shootings, stabbings, robberies, stealing, drug selling, and petty offenses. He has not been arrested since 2007, and first arrested in 1985.

DJ has been arrested three times: possession of marijuana; possession of a fire arm; and assault and attempted robbery, which he served ten years in State prison. Like many of the men in the study, DJ seems to enjoy socializing on the streets. The clear exception not to enjoy socializing on the streets were Young, Fly, and Ski: One of the Youngest and two of the oldest respondents. DJ has affiliations with known gang members, and he was hanging out in an abandoned building next to where he lived, gambling, smoking weed and drinking alcohol, and chasing young women. He claimed to have been shot due to a drug deal gone bad.

Of note, all of the respondents resided in neighborhoods located in Brooklyn²⁸, and these neighborhoods are characterized as high risk for DMC and risk for CJS contact, based on broken windows policing, resulting from the perception that the residents living in and frequenting these neighborhoods are assumed to be criminally inclined (Harcourt, 2009).

Table 5: Household Structure, and Relationship with Women (N=24)

Living Arrangement	Who Raised You	Does having sex with several women make you feel like more of a man?	Intimate Partner Violence
Independent (n=5) Homeless (n=3) With mate (n=6) Parent/relative (n=10)	Mom (n=7) Mom/other relative (n=3) Mom/dad (n=3) Mom/step dad (n=4) Mom/streets (n=3) Grandparents (n=2) Foster parents (n=2)	Yes (n=1) No (n=18) Missing data (n=3)	Yes (n=1) No(n=20) Victim of (n=3)

²⁸ Brownsville, Crown Heights, East Flatbush, and East New York.

Gender Relations

Most of the respondents lived with a parent/relative; and close to a third of these men was raised in female headed households. (See Table 5). For example, Chronic lived with his family in their home. They would periodically refuse to let him into the house; or make him sleep in the garage. And M&M lived with his wife in a walled off area (a room) in the basement of his mother's home. He preferred that area because he could smoke crack, and enter and leave the house unnoticed from the basement.

Five respondents reported living in their own apartments or a room. PDL lived in a room on the top floor in an apartment where other formerly incarcerated men and women had rooms. Smiley also rented a room in an apartment along with another couple.

Three respondents reported being homeless. Day-Day and Dee lived in an abandoned building. However, to see them you would not know this. They were groomed. O was homeless as well, and he lived with his mate in an abandoned apartment building occupying the top floor. I visited O at the apartment. There was no gas, and the fire Department had recently shut the water off. They were getting their electricity from an extension cord attached to a street lamppost.

And six respondents lived with their significant other. Most of the older respondents: S, Inch, Ski, Fly, and Lionel lived with his significant others. (See Table 5).

Mom was reported as being the most influential person who raised the respondents of this study. Respondent Excel reported that:

Excel: My mother, I would say. Dad was doing his thing, you know. He was out there working and trying to bring back the bread, basically, so he wasn't really around but he was around though. Mama is where I spent my time with.

PDL: My mom That's who raised me. My mom. My father was not in the picture.

Seven respondents reported being raised in a single parent female headed household. Eight respondents reported that they had a bad relationship with their biological father while growing up, stating that their fathers had not taught them about being a man; nor had their fathers done anything with them when they were young such as playing catch or riding a bike. The narrative was that the father was not present enough in their lives to do the traditional bonding that fathers do with their sons. Respondent Excel further reported that:

My dad was an alcoholic. He never did anything with me like taking me to the park, showing me how to catch a ball, or taking me to a ballgame. He was too busy chasing women, and when I caught him he paid me to keep quiet. That's why I look up to my older cousin who is in the street, and when I was younger this other older guy used to sell drugs on my block.

There were also complaints of excessive drug use by parents, resulting in being raised by others, family members, or adoptive/foster parents. Tugga's narrative highlights this point:

I would have to put my dad in that situation [not being masculine]...for example, not being around and all that wild crazy shit. That wasn't being a male...that wasn't being masculine. That was being a sucker... I was raised by my aunts, uncles, and grandmother

One day I wanted to do something for my son for his birthday, and I knew my dad had some paper (money), so I asked him for a few dollars for my son. He said no, and a little while later I saw him go cop (buy) some hard (crack cocaine)... That's why I chose the streets to show me how to be a man.

The above narratives indicate that the relationship that some of these respondents had with their fathers while growing up was not positive. Yet, these narratives do not suggest that these relationships could explain DMC or risk with the CJS.

Collectively these respondents did not define their masculinity through their sexual conquest or multiple sexual partnering. Respondents in the present study were asked if having sex with several women make you feel like more of a man:

PDL: Hell no. That's just my personal opinion, that sleeping with 1,000 women doesn't make you a man.

Fame: I just sometimes try to make me feel better.
MP: Just better?
Fame: Yeah.
MP: It got nothin' to do wit your manhood.
Fame: Nah.
MP: Just a good piece of cootie.
Fame: Just good coochie (se)...keep the day going... faster.

540: No...it's...no not to me you just fuckin' yo look you just gettin' more, you just gettin' plenty pussy.
MP: It ain't got nothin' to do wit you bein'...
540: Ain't got nothin' to do wit...right yo just getting' plenty pussy.
MP: Ok, 66. How often do you have sex with your mate compared with your other sex partners?
540: I...how often?
MP: Yeah, do you have...
540: Three times a week. 540: Nah...it...it...that just make you feel like you getting more pussy.

Two respondents fed their egos when having sex with several women:

Lionel: Well when I was doing it (multiple sexual partnering)...yeah. It made me feel like I was the man! I can get this girl, I can get that girl! I am the man! I got like 3 girls...4 girls! Word!
MP: When you feel like the man, how do you feel?
Lionel: Just feel good, man. It feels like...it's just like the man!
MP: The fact that you are not now having sex with more than one woman or more, do you still feel like you are the man?
Lionel: Yeah! Yeah. I know I can get girls!
MP: So getting girls makes you feel like, I'm that captain!
Lionel Yeah, when you know! It's niggers out there that can't even do that! It is hard for them to get somebody.

Smiley: I don't look at it like that. I look at it like having sex with women period is just fun. It has nothing to do with my masculinity; it just is something that I like to do... I don't know it just feel like they could just conquer.
MP: Conquer?
Smiley: Conquer like you know you having all these women and you like, and then you got girls that got men and they still come to you, you know you feel like you the shit.

More on the traditional side of masculinity and sex, the below respondent narrated:

DJ: Yes.
MP: Why?
DJ: Because Kings did it. And Kings were and are the ultimate men.

DJ was the only respondent who associated multiple sexual partnering to be enjoyed by only the privileged, or those sitting on top of the male hierarchy. However, the overall theme within these narratives was that people who had multiple sexual partners did so for the sake of having sex as enjoyment, and not to their masculinity.

There were respondents in this study who did not favor multiple sexual partnering, and considered roles of playboy and player as dysfunctional and unnecessary:

Chronic: No. I would be happy with one.
MP: Okay. You don't have one right now?
Chronic: No, I don't have a main partner right now.

Bones: Uh...no.
MP: Why?
Bones: Cause basically having sex with other women is not good. Like you might bring the person or girlfriend some disease or anything. You know?

Inch: Because you have sex with different women, you just, you just a sex addict, you know, you, you the type of person who has to have multiple women. You know, in your life. You understand? With some men, it makes them feel more masculinity, you know, to me it doesn't.

SP: Some people it does.
MP: What about you?
SP: Not really.
MP: Why is that?
SP: I respect my body, and I don't get with too many people like that.

SKI: No.
MP: Why not?
SKI: Because sex is, is for me sexual application can happen to me anytime, but it doesn't happen, for me it doesn't I don't have to have several women in order to prove that I'm, that, I'm a man.

Fly: No.
MP: Why not? Or-or-not that you wrong. I'm just saying, what does it make you feel like? The fact that you have more than one, you know, multiple sexual partners-having sex with more than one women.
Fly: It just means that I have a hungry sexual appetite. That's all.

These respondents were older, and three were married.

In addition to other markers of masculinity, the current study looked for evidence of complications related to the consequences of sexual behavior that may lead to a “synergy of risk” for CJS contact—including for example, domestic violence, violent sexual rivalry, and prosecution for failure to comply with child support enforcement. Such partnering may also result in false accusations of criminal conduct stemming from romantic jealousy, anger and feelings of betrayal. (See e.g., Finney & Oliver, 2006).

bell hooks (2004) writes that there were those (Black males) who did not engage in patriarchal behavior or hegemonic behaviors of domination over women in this instance, both pre and post emancipation. In her empirical study on Black males experiencing intimate partner violence (IPV), Eckstein (2010: 69) reported that subordinated Black males “re-direct their exploitation to Black women in an effort to maintain dominance over someone....” In this case it is Black women who experience IPV from their significant other (Eckstein, 2010: 71).

Only one respondent in the present study admitted engaging in intimate partner violence, and was incarcerated in a City jail for eight months on a Domestic violence charge. (See Table 3).

P90: This one chick I was fucking with... She was...I find out six months later after I'm dealing with her this bitch is bipolar. Ah...this bitch was just off her rockers. You know what I'm saying? She would try to snuff (hit) me. Mad shit. I ain't really do nothing like that back to her. But one day I find out my grandmother died a year later. Know what I mean? of her time of death. You know what I'm saying? So it kind of hurt me and all that and she said some stupid shit. Fuck my grandmother and all that shit. I beat the shit out that bitch. Yeah, I got tired of that bitch...I did 8 months on the island for ...domestic violence?

P90 claims to have been arrested fifty times.

P90: Uh, I had everything (arrests) from robbery, disorderly conduct, urinating in public, um, domestic violence, um, assault. A lot of assaults. It was a lot of assaults.

MP: Who would you assault?

P90: Uh, dudes in the streets. Store clerks. Know what I mean? I had assault on a police officer. But that ain't stick cause he-ah man, it was a live audience. And they seen him hit

me first. Yeah, you know what I'm saying? Armed robberies. Assault. Um, possession of illegal narcotics.

MP: What kind of narcotics?

P90: Uh, weed. That was about it. Just weed.

MP: Anything else?

P90: Yeah. I had one gun charge. One gun charge and...Oh, yeah, obstruction of, um...some shit, administration. And um, I was locked up for- yeah, I was also locked up for the Rockefeller Rico Law. But that-

MP: That was a drug case right?

P90: Yeah, that was drug-yeah. That was a drug raid. Conspiracy.

MP: What you mean a drug raid? You was in a spot and they raided the spot?

P90: Yeah. I was outside the spot at my man crib and they raided it.

MP: Oh you was outside?

P90: Yeah. And um, they took his-um-his girlfriend, his girlfriend sister, and she kind of dry snitched on me talking bout I was his friend and all that. So the police snatched me up (Central booking)

P90: Yeah. I was kind of part of the investigation too and, know what I'm saying, that was kind of crazy though. I just came home and, you know, I was trying to get back on my feet. And I'm fucking with this dude and this dude telling me like, know what I'm saying, everything good. Not knowing that he was under a 6 month investigation. And police was showing me pictures of me giving him pounds and all that. So that was kind of crazy. But through God's grace I came out of it.

MP: You got around it?

P90: Yeah.

MP: Here's the other question now. Out of all them arrest how many did you do time for?

P90: One (domestic violence).

P90 abuses alcohol daily. He is about six feet, weighting over two-hundred pounds. He has been running in the street since he was twelve. He is in his late 20's. He tries to be a bully when drinking. He can be found hanging on a corner or in from of a tenement building until the wee hours of the morning. His mother smoked crack when he was a youth and, was teased in the streets and when attending school. When interviewed he was living in a two family house with his brother and his brother's girlfriend. His brother was arrested on drug charges, and the girlfriend has moved out. He is still maintaining the apartment. However, he has been a squatter.

I witnessed an older woman stop P90 one day, and asked him why he was always hanging out on the corner and in front of the tenement building, and talking loud. She told him

that he could do better than what he was doing. He looked apprehensive at first and shocked after the woman had spoken to him. He replied, “Thank you. No one has ever spoken to me like that. I am going to try and do better.” He then walked away, and I rarely see him.

I have never seen P90 commit a violent act or criminal act. One night he was upset because a friend of his had not paid for a bag of marijuana as promised, and wanted to beat the guy up. I talked him out of it, asking him if it is worth it. He thanked me and went on about his business. It appears that no one has taught P90 that there is another set of normative social skills to resolve conflict other than those from the streets, which are associated with risk for CJS contact.²⁹

Three respondents from this study reported being victims of IPV:

MP: Have you experienced violence with any of your female partners?

Peezie: Punches and swinging and all that.

MP: Who is doing the punching and the swinging?

Peezie: Her and me.

MP: So you was beating on her?

Peezie: I wasn't beating her. I was trying to grab her so she don't punch me. I was just pushing her away trying to get her off me.

MP: Have you experienced violence with any of your female partners?

Smiley: Yeah, I got slapped.

MP: You got slapped?

Smiley: Not slapped I guess...

MP: Swung at?

Smiley: Swung at, shirt ripped, kicked in the ass...

MP: What you do? Nah whoa, whoa, whoa...I'mma find out because I know you ain't did nothing because you ain't locked up, but I said what did you do for this woman to wanna do that to you?

Smiley: Well my, the girl I was dealing with that I told her I didn't want no relationship with before me and my girl got serious...

MP: Right.

Smiley: Called her.

MP: Called who your girl?

Smiley: Yeah, and told her she was pregnant and uh...

MP: She was pregnant? How she got the number?

²⁹ Ironically, it was a woman who was instructing P90 on how he should act socially, or more so as a man.

Smiley: Don't ask me.
 MP: How you think she got the number?
 Smiley: Uh, I think she broke into my phone.
 MP: How'd she do that?
 Smiley: I don't know, these females is nice at breaking in phones. 'Cause I got a lock on my phone and it's hard to break into.
 MP: What's.... (inaudible) to break into phones?
 Smiley: They been breaking into phones in all the nights we had...
 MP: So what your girl say when she got that information?
 Smiley: She stepped out on me.
 MP: Did you tell her...she set you up?
 Smiley: I told you girls...bugged out.
 MP: So apparently it worked 'cause you still together with your girl.
 Smiley: Yup.
 MP: Aight now let me tell...when you guys, when you guys slept, where was you at when this happen?
 Smiley: Huh?
 MP: When the girl attacked you? Where was this at?
 Smiley: On her block...
 MP: Oh you were thinking she has a crew on there, who was to jump on you?
 Smiley: Nope. I wasn't going to hit, I ain't hit no female I wasn't worried about it.

MP: Have you experienced violence with any of your female partners?
 Fame: Yeah.
 MP: What you do?
 Fame: I had girls try and beat me up. (Laughs).
 MP: So women tried to attack you?
 Fame: Mm-hmm.
 MP: Chase you down the block for cheating on them?
 Fame: Yeah. Or stupid arguments.
 MP: Have you ever beat on a woman?
 Fame: No.
 MP: Have you ever thought about beating on a woman?
 Fame: Yeah.
 MP: But you never did it?
 Fame: Um-um.
 MP: But they beat on you?
 Fame: Yeah. Mm-hmm. I thought about it. How far can that go?
 MP: Yeah, the precinct.
 Fame: Mm-hmm. That's what I thought.

Three significant findings were discovered herein: 1) Multiple sexual partnering was not found to be a means of defining these men's masculinity; 2) save one respondent, IPV was not

reported. And there were three respondents reporting that they were victims of IPV. The findings on IPV are significant; and 3) to a man, these men had pride, and wanted much more out of life than what they were working. And it is at this juncture that these men on their own accord are at risk for criminality and CJS contact in hopes of fulfilling masculine roles, i.e., the provider.

Placing himself at risk for CJS contact, Young engaged fighting offensively when out clubbing. Yet, he was the only respondent in the study that reported never having contact with the:

“Masculinity. Um, with my friends now, like I’m always like the first to fight. Like, like it’s a bad habit, but it’s like, I have a quick temper, and if we walking in the street, like, alright like parties for example. If you’re walking in a part, and like, I understand it gets crowded, people push, stuff; they shake it and throw it in the crowd. And one time, that happened. And I went to the VIP, and, under the ropes, and I snuffed the dude that did it. And we, me and my crew and him and his crew got into a fight, police came, they tear gassed the place like. So don’t push me, you know what I mean? And people, they have a tendency to going to (unintelligible) and throwing rose³⁰ into the crowd that, but, I know it doesn’t make sense but I hate getting pushed. But I love to party. They shake it and throw it in the crowd. And one time, that happened. And I went to the VIP, and, under the ropes, and I snuffed the dude that did it. And we, me and my crew and him and his crew got into a fight, police came, they tear gassed the place.”

No other respondent in the study reported engaging in violence or fighting offensively, as opposed to protecting himself against an attack. Researching and reporting on studies on the Black-subculture-of-violence, Cao, et al., (2000: 48-49), reported that “...poor whites are more likely to fight than poor blacks, again contrary to the expectation from the black subculture of violence thesis.” They (2000: 49) go on to add that “whites are more likely to condone interpersonal violence in retaliatory situations.” Their findings (2000: 49), also suggested that studies claiming to actually test the Black-subculture-of-violence thesis, may not have actually

³⁰ *Rose* is Rosea champagne.

tested the thesis. In a similar vein, the same can be said about the hyper masculine labels attached to Black masculinity. The hyper masculine labels are ascribed, as opposed to being reported from empirical studies.

Other than being a light skinned Black male, and starting with his physical attributes, Young had nothing in common with the other respondents in the study. Facial features have been cited as being important when perceiving and associating crime and Black faces (Eberhardt; et al., 2006; 2004; Goff et al., 2008). Eberhardt; et al., (2004: 876), posited that “The mere presence of a Black man, for instance, can trigger thoughts that he is violent and criminal.” They (2004: 876), go on to posit that “In the current article we argue that just as Black faces and Black bodies can trigger thoughts of crime, thinking of crime can trigger thoughts of Black people—that is, some associations between social groups and concepts are bidirectional.

In their study researching who was worthy of the death penalty, Eberhardt, et al., (2006: 383) argued “... that only in death-eligible cases involving White victims—cases in which race is most salient—will Black defendants’ physical traits function as a significant determinant of deathworthiness.” “The more stereotypically Black a person’s physical traits appear to be, the more criminal that person is perceived to be (Eberhardt, et al., 2004)” (Eberhardt, et al., (2006: 383).” That is priming police officers with crime caused them to remember Black faces in a manner that more strongly supports the association between Blacks and criminality ... Thus, thoughts of violent crime led to a systematic distortion of the Black image—a phenomenon that Ralph Ellison so masterfully highlighted over 50 years ago” (Eberhardt, et al., 2004: 888). For example, stereotypical physical facial features or traits that impact judgement about Blacks and criminality included the lips, the nose, hair texture, and skin tone. (See e.g., Eberhardt, et al., 2004: 886).

Other than stereotypical facial features associating Blacks with criminality (Eberhardt, et al., 2004), clothing, demeanor, attitude when confronted by law enforcement, hair style, jewelry could can be stereotyped, associating Black s with criminality, creating risk for DMC as a result of a perception. Consider the culture of rappers as stereotyped in the media, for example (Ward, 2005: 497; Peterson-Lewis &. Bratton, 2004: 94). Ecology or community could be stereotyped, creating risk for DMC based perception: Broken windows policing (Harcourt, 2009). These men, also, looked like they knew the streets and how to survive in the streets.

Self-Reported Masculine Identities

Question 3: Do their self-reported masculine identities reflect a unique “Black masculinity”? No and yes.

Table 6: Respondents Reporting Definitions of Masculinity Paralleling those in the CMNI

CMNI	The Present Study (N=24)	Self-Reported Narratives
Provider Role(s)		
Winning Primacy of Work Pursuit of status Self-Reliance	n=22 n=22 n=19 n=22	“A man real brings home the money.” (Young)
Gender Relations		
Power over Women Playboy	n=5 n=8	“A real man has more than one girl” (Young)
Risk for CJS Contact		
Emotional Control Risk-Taking Violence Dominance	n=8 n=24 n=13 n=5	“...it’s either we gonna walk whoop some ass together, or we gonna get our ass whooped together. If you run on me- “(Young)
Homophobia		
Disdain for Homosexuals	n=5	“A real man not gay” (Young)
Afrocentrism		
	n=5	“... respect for woman, himself, children, and others” (Fly)

These sampled low-income heterosexual inner city Black males constructed, defined and engaged in traditional masculine identities. The large majority, (n=19-22), of these men ascribed

to the traditional masculine traits cited as the provider role. A number (n=5-8), of those sampled ascribed to engaging in masculine traits of having power over women or being a playboy. A Third of the sample (n=8), spoke of the importance of having emotional control. All of the men of this sample ascribed to the trait of “risk-taking” (See Table 6).

It is noted that the risk taking is not the end, and should not be the dominate defining masculine characteristics for these men. Young’s narrative suggest that his risk has more to do with a young man sowing his oats in the name masculinity. Significant to this finding is the fact that Young narrated that he had never experienced contact with the CJS.

Slightly over half (n=13), of these men reported ascribing to the use of violence as an important part of masculinity in terms of defending themselves, but not as a tool of dominance. Only a small part (n=5). (See Table 6).

Table 7: Comparative Definitions and Descriptions of Masculinity

Present Study	Qualitative Meta-Analysis	CMNI	Oliver's Three-Part Typology
Provider Role(s)			
Caring for family Autonomy/Employment Hustling ³¹	Academic success, accumulation of wealth (Roberts-Douglass & Curtis-Boles, 2013: 11) Autonomy (Adams, 2007: 167) Marriage, children, economic security, aspired to normative values, competence, intellectual skill, emotional self-containment, self-control, prestige, success, individualism (Adams, 2007) Taking care of business, working hard, securing a future, succeeding in school, family betterment Family, provider, successful problem solver, autonomy/independence (Harper, 2004: 98-99)	Winning Primacy of Work Pursuit of status Self-Reliance	The Hustler/Balla
Gender Relations			
Monogamy Respect for woman Multiple sexual partners	Sexism (Harris, et al., 2011: 56-57) Romantic love (Adams, 2007: 167)	Power over Women Playboy	The Player
Risk for CJS Contact			
Showing emotion Violence for protection Violence: Proactive Criminal activity Drug use	Only illegitimate means to an economic end (Adams, 2007: 167) Physical dominance and the Subordination of others (Duck, 2009: 298) Requirements of the dominant masculine model (McClure, 2006: 62)	Emotional Control Risk-Taking Violence Dominance	Tough guy/Gangsta
Homophobia			
Respect for homosexuals Disdain for Homosexuals Heterosexuality	Fear of being perceived as feminine (Harris et al., (2011: 56-57)	Disdain for Homosexuals	Not reported
Afrocentrism			
Role model Caring for community and its members	Financial, emotional, or spiritual care of others (Chaney, 2009: 116-117) Social responsibility (Duck, 2009: 293) Community and spirituality (Hunter & Davis, 1994: 29) Community cooperation (McClure, 2006: 62) Leadership, Afro American community advancement Communal world view (Harper, 2004: 97) Humanism, a connectedness to the "I" and "We", equality, faith, caring, unselfishness, collective respect (Hunter & Davis, 1994: 35)	Not reported	Not reported

³¹ Engaging in the provider role in the black and grey markets.

Below are some of the respondents' narratives, defining masculinity, and also where they learned about masculinity and manhood.

There were a small number of the men in this study who take exception with their fathers, Tugga is angry and disappointed with his father. His father did not meet the expectation of what he felt his father should be, and he sees his father as weak, which is not a masculine trait. However, Tugga is not hostile toward his father, and whether in the house or in the streets, when he interacts with his father he shows no disrespect. This is another unique finding because it shows a sense of family wherein the father chose drugs over raising his son. Tugga recognizes the wrong that his father has done to him, and still respects him as his biological father. Except for the usage of hard drugs, incarceration, and the care he gives his five year old son,³² Tugga's life course mirrors one aspect of his father's life course: Gang affiliation, selling drugs. Of note, gang affiliation is a major part of the culture where Tugga lives, as is selling and using drugs.

Tugga has been arrested for possession of marijuana twice, and has a misdemeanor record of conviction for it. He has never been incarcerated. As a child Tugga was hospitalized for starvation. He was raised by his aunt and uncle, Lionel, in a two family house, and he shares a small room with his two children and their mother. His parents have been using hardcore drugs (heroin and crack cocaine) before his birth, and they live next door in a single family owned home belonging to his grandmother, along with his siblings.

I have known Lionel, aged 44, for close to 17 years. He was meaningfully employed as a maintenance worker, and he was family oriented. He was one of the few respondents who had a vehicle, and willingly drove his family members to medical appointment and food shopping. His

³² Respondents Chronic, Bones, Excel, Lionel, 540, and R Black either baby sit their siblings or other young family members. Of these respondents, Lionel is the only one employed.

family could depend on him to get them around. He liked to party and was a member of a SUV trucking club. His narrative did not indicate that the club was into violence and criminality. They were into pimping their SUVs out,³³ and partying.

Tugga's life story is not unique for many of these respondents regarding definitions and meanings of manhood are experienced by other men in this study. Chronic's narrative is an example:

Masculinity, when you hear the word, that refers to males who are not supposed to show emotion, you are supposed to be masculine. You are not supposed to cry or get all emotional, you are supposed to suck it up and toughen up as part of masculinity.

Chronic describes himself as an emotional thug Experiencing emotions are large a part of Chronic's masculine identity, contradicting the definition of normative masculinity, and in opposition to the norms listed in the CMNI, and has no place in Oliver's three-part typology. However, it appears that his showing of emotion can be characterized as an Afrocentric value. Chronic learned about masculine behavior from:

"I learned it (masculinity) from my male cousins because I don't have any brothers that live with me. I have 2 half brothers but they don't live with me. So I learned mostly from my cousins, not my pops, my cousin... Cause he (pops) was always on something. He was always busy working or something, and when he was home, I don't know if cause I am the baby boy I am never supposed to get old, but he was always on something, I was never supposed to get old. So he felt like he never had to show or teach me nothing, just a basic go to work, take care of the family.

Chronic did not finish high school, he cannot hold a job, and when he is employed is claimed that someone at his job would "pick on him", and he would quit the job. I have seen him walk pass his mom in the street, and neither spoke to the other. It was learned that Chronic did not want to work, and wanted to be a hustler selling drugs (weed). He stays with his family in their owned home. On one of many occasions, his mom has kicked him out because she had found his

³³ Pimping a sports utility vehicle (SUV) out refers to customizing the SUV.

marijuana on the living floor, and his refusal to work. On other occasions, his family has made him sleep in their garage. Often times he can be found sleeping in buildings, some abandoned and some not, or on the subway. It can be assumed that his family feels that he is a failure in terms of taking care of himself. His family members are professional service providers.

Chronic claimed the 'hood' as his where he lives as his own. However, he is not respected as a man, and viewed more so as helpless by those in the streets. He can be found running errands for people in the neighborhood for a couple of dollars. There is an apartment building where he hangs out, standing in front of the building, recruiting people to join him simply to hang out and smoke weed. They talk loud, lollygag until the wee hours of the morning. Early in the morning Chronic can be found walking streets, looking like he just rolled out of bed without washing his face or brushing his teeth. He has been arrested for selling weed out of this building, and has returned to the same spot after each arrest doing the same thing. Although he has no employment, and is on public assistance, it is believed that he sells weed to boost his image.

For these respondents aggression in the street or in general was talked about as a form of defense versus being aggressive as a means to an end:

Smiley: ...my masculinity is that I don't take shit from nobody, and the way I carry my-self is more of a person that has respect with themselves.

540: masculine your appearance how you look you know I'm sayin' you, you, you look very, you may look a little hard, you know I'm sayin'?

Another key finding was a definition of masculinity demonstrating an Afrocentric value system, a system that "...emphasizes collectivity and community over competition (Akbar, 1990)" (McClure, 2006: 68). In Afrocentric terms, respondent Fly defined masculinity as the

being a provider and respecting women. Inclusive of the Afrocentric model is respecting women, which has not been cited as a traditional masculine trait.

Fly: He provides. He takes care of his self. He-um-he respects women. He-um- He's a[n] individual that provides, um, a direction...comes from a direction that he's heading in. Like, he's a leader. He's not a follower. He has confidence...He's not playing any games about what it is that he needs to do and then going about doing it.

Fly is one of the older respondents and married. He spent 20 plus years in prison, and earned a graduate degree while incarcerated. He has been employed, but was unemployed when interviewed. Fly cannot use his graduate degree to seek employment because he cannot or does not know how to market himself through the degree. Meaning, he does not have the social capital that would allow his education to help him get employed.

Fly's search for employment occurs with many of the formerly incarcerated. The formerly incarcerated must fight in the job market, and with a felony conviction it makes matters worse. The rules of parole leave one to believe that there is total autonomy d regarding r success when released: Attend programming (e.g., drug/alcohol and violence), do not use drugs or alcohol, do not fraternize with the formerly incarcerated, find employment, do not leave your jurisdiction without permission, report on our scheduled day to see your parole officer, and abide by your curfew. The formerly incarcerated are not informed on how to navigate structural blocks and outright discrimination.

Ski, another older respondent, who was incarcerated for fifteen years, employed, and living with his significant other, also had an Afrocentric value when defining masculinity. Wherein, his narrative reflected a "respect for woman, himself, children, and others." And also, "You know his nature is to be you know be a hero, provider, responsible that kinda situation."

In contradiction of Fly and Ski's respect for women, a much younger respondent, Joker, reported that he had a more traditional notion of masculinity when it came to women: "Male

power over female ... I don't really know about masculinity. That is what I'm trying to tell you."

At the age of twenty-two, Joker is living with his mom, working at menial jobs, and desires to return to college. He smokes marijuana daily, and chases the young ladies (CMNI/The three part typology: a player). He has had minor CJS contact, possession of marijuana, and has not been incarcerated.

Homophobia

There were four respondents like Joker who literally did not know what the word masculinity meant: "SP: I heard, but I don't know how people use it." There were those who gave detailed meaning(s) to the term manhood, defining manhood as a heterosexual behavior in terms of sexuality.

I have known DJ for over ten years. He is aged 32, had attended college, and was working as in janitorial services. I would see him occasionally at various functions related to prison re-entry. Like Fame, DJ had a twist on the definition of masculinity. "My sense of masculine identity is my wife and daughter having everything that they desire in this life. And my being able...my wife and daughter having everything that they need in terms of material things and immaterial things. And my being able to provide those things regularly without a question. That's what I equate with masculinity." He adds, "Mentally tough, um, a deep voice, strength, those are qualities that characterize masculinity. Football. Basketball. Talk to girls. Get at smuts. Um...you know, throw 315 up on the bench. These things are masculine. There are women that are masculine. A masculine woman does the same thing as a male. It's just that she's a female. She goes after women. She prefers the company of women, plus her attitude and behaviors reflect that By, carrying out what I said verbally. Because I get at girls-smuts. I

play sports. I love beer. And I am absolutely without question 100% heterosexual. So, everything that I do is masculine.”

Dee defined masculinity as:

“It's real easy, you know what I'm saying. Growing up. Living life. Kissing nobody's ass. Not taking no bullshit from nobody. You know what I'm saying? Just you know do for you. Meaning to do for you. Cause I got- Like I said, it's do for you. Know what I'm saying? Forget...you know. Do you. Forget everybody else. You know what I'm saying? You gotta do you before anybody else come through, you know My masculine identity is, you know, psss....I'm a real dude, you know.. Jamaican, you know. I'm not that big. But you know I'm type... You know I'm...I do pushups, sit-ups, pull-ups. I do the weights. Fore weights, you know. Know what I'm saying. What else? You know... I like to dress. You know I like to look fly (dressed nicely).”

Manhood and sexuality was most often talked about when making references to jail and/or prison:

Smiley: Someone that is taking it from a man, and making you soft, just disrespecting you. It's like disrespecting the term of a man, some people say when you are in jail, someone takes your peanut butter, that means he took your man-hood.

540, who I met through a relative, aged 40, who earned his GED, and was on public assistance, defined masculinity as:

“You got more masculinity in you, you more hard, you more harder than you nah I'm sayin'? You, you...Ok, well look, look, ok, I can't ok you're your,(inaudible)...masculine your appearance how you look you know I'm sayin' you, you, you look very, you may look a little hard, you know I'm sayin' Yeah, you could hard masculinity yeah you look like you, you, not like you'll hurt somebody like you'll look in you no nonsense you won't take no shit. Exactly if, that's right, you masculinity nobody gonna take, nah then...You got the look and you can't represent it. In my eyes, no the nigga wouldn't be no, you know I'm sayin'? no how could you?...if I think you holdin' it down and you...nah, and you, and yo, and you nah pussy, no, of course not. No, in my eyes, no. You gotta be able to...exactly. You know like me, I'm not goin'... act all aggressive if not gonna be aggressive if, if, if, I have to be aggressive or be physical, motherfucka look I bust you upside your shit, just like you'll bust me upside mine, it's no court, you know I'm sayin,' so that's how, that's how, that's where it stayed at it stay. Nah I 'm saying? That you, that you, you a man, you standing out...his chest to you like you younging he's masculine he has broad shoulders, big chest, big arms, you know what I'm saying? Nice size arms, he's masculine, you know I'm saying? Um, I was born a man I'm you what I'm saying? It was no definition that I was born you know I'm saying?

So I'm, I'm, I'm a man, I'm not, I'm not a gay man, I'm not you know I'm saying? I'm a man...see like a gay man you still man but you just gay."

And there were those who combined the two terms:

Fly: ...it [masculinity] deals with a lot of my ... being masculine meaning that I'm all male.

You know, um, no homo... and pride and, you know, all of those things come into place when I hear, um, masculinity.

On the subject of homosexuality, there were those in this study who held negative opinions. However, there narratives indicated that that there was disdain for homosexuals:

DJ: I just wanna clarify on the record and for the record that, you know, I believe that everybody has a right to like what they want. And um, you know, a person's sexuality is none of concern whatsoever. I just choose to uh...distinguish myself from um, you know, homosexuality

I met Inch by the apartment building that was the hangout. I was in a motorized wheel chair. I would learn that he was in an automobile accident. He was aged 43, had received his high school diploma, and was receiving disability from the accident. Inch reported:

"Oh, definition of masculinity is a man who uh, you know, you know, he's a man, he's a strong stand-up man. He's a, you know, all he prefers, is a woman. He doesn't step outside of that. doesn't step outside of his masculinity, as far as fucking with a homo or anything like that. Shit, nigga."

Fly added:

"Uh, securing my manhood means that I don't have a problem with someone who is a male, however, what do the correct term, a gay male. I wouldn't have a problem engaging in a conversation with a gay male, and coming away from that conversation feeling anything other than masculine. And so, in terms of my masculinity in that sense, you know."

Do these respondents' self-reported definitions of masculinity reflect a unique Black masculinity? No they do not. And 'Is there an association between low-income heterosexual

inner city Black males' construction, definition, and engagement of masculine identity and their risk for DMC?' No, there is no association. The narratives from the present study reveals that Black masculinity is not associated with criminal behavior. However, some of the men in this study reported that at one time in their lives they either engaged in or desired to engage in criminality to fulfill the masculine role of provider, putting them at risk for DMC. It is suggested that this means of fulfilling the provider role may be present when engaging in Afrocentrism. In this case criminality, creating risk for DMC with the CJS is a means to fulfill the provider when other means are unavailable.

Also, and indicating the need for autonomy economically to fulfill the role of the provider, these respondents may desire to or engage in criminal behaviors due to the lack of social capital and human capital. And the lack of social capital and human capital is a reflection of their socio-economic-status as being low income, being formerly incarcerated, lacking employable skills, and abusing drugs/alcohol, to say the least, resulting in marginalization. As Garfield's (2010: 227-228) concluded "In the complex coexistence between agency and structural arrangements, the decisions the men (of her study) made and the actions taken occurred under conditions that shaped the choices, options, and opportunities available to them." Moreover, the data does indicate that the social consequences and outcomes of these respondents are reflective of what resources they have available to them. And thus, overall, these findings on Black males engaging in masculine behaviors cannot explain DMC for risk with the CJS.

Challenges to Black males risk with the CJS in terms of actually engaging in risky or criminal behavior is reduced by having a positive support system (Adams, 2007). These findings reveal that many of these respondents, incarcerated at a young age, learned about masculinity behind prison walls. Others learned from persons in the streets and male relatives who they did

not live with. Only about six respondents reported learning about masculinity from their fathers or grandfathers, indicting a positive support system. Yet, the collective narratives do not seem to explain DMC and risk with the CJS. As noted, the uniqueness of some of these respondents' definitions of masculinity included an Afrocentric value system.

Both theory (Oliver, 2006) and empirical studies (Karp, 2010) report and research Black masculinity as a hyper-masculinity associated with aggression, violence (Mears et al., 2013: 291), and criminality (Duck, 2009: 286; Cools, 2008: 33). Added to this report is Black hyper-sexuality (Karp, 2010; Oliver, 2006; Ward, 2005: 496; Pleck, 1992). Wherein, Black males engage in sexual conquest, intimate partner violence, promiscuity, and multiple sexual partnering as a demonstration and proof of being masculine (see e.g., Oliver, 2006).

Findings listed in Table 7 suggest that stereotypes attributing Black masculinity as a hyper-masculinity, were not found in the narratives from the present study. These narratives indicated that these men define their masculinity in traditional or normative terms. Some of the men also expressed a positive and unique masculinity defined as Afrocentrism, a masculinity that advocates for positive development and growth of the individual, family, others, and the community, which may account for DMC.

Of those respondents who were selling drugs, and those who had done so in the past, did so out of the need to provide for themselves; and not as a self-defining point of their masculine identity. And it has not been thoroughly explained in the literature how a single behavior has come to define one's masculine identity. Black males are not the only group of men engaging in criminal activity, putting them at risk for CJS contact.

Table 8: Relationship with Children

Respondents	How many women have children by you?	Do you still have a relationship with the women?	Do you support your children?	What kind of support do you provide?
Tugga	1	Yes. They live together	Yes	"You gotta provide for your family...bring home the food, clothes..., I provide...definitely."
Peezee	1	No, and he does not see his daughter	"... we talk but I haven't chilled with her in a couple of minutes ... Her parents...her mom."	"Yes, the best way I can or my mom helps me. Like I'll buy her some sneakers and stuff like that."
PDL	3 children by two women	"Only a friendship."	"Best as I can...moral support. ... Talk to them at least every day or every other day. I said financially if I-when I can."	Only two, the third and oldest is in college and "independent".
Lionel	2 (Biological and step son.)	Yes	"Well he (biological son) calls sometimes and needs some money and I send him money through Western Union, you know. I treat him (step who lives with him) just like he's my biological son."	2
M&M	Claiming 4 Not sure if the kids from 3 are his.	Only wife.	"Financial and moral (support)."	7
Chronic	1 (Autistic)	No	"I try to. (Support with) money."	1
540	3	"Me and her have a little relationship but it ain't like that."	"I'm the main provider. I take care of what they need...their clothing, their food, and whatever they need I supply it."	"Right now I'm supporting just the two...the 17-year old and the 14-year old and I give whatever support I can for my 11-year old son in Long Island. I mail him money or send him money."
DayDay	1	No	"Like before the baby came out we went to WIC, you know I helped her do some of the programs so she could get herself together."	1
DJ	1	"Yes...She lives with me fulltime, with her mom."	Financially. Emotionally. Spiritually.	1
Dee	1	"It's real good, man. Real cool. We talk about how we doing. Nah, she ain't shut it (sex) down. It's just that I don't really talk to her like that to be wanting to have sex with her."	"I talk to him. Let him know I love him every day. I do anything for him. I buy him things. Stuff like that, man."	1
Inch	2 boys: live their mom; 2 step daughters live with he and wife.	Not with sons' mother	"As far as money for clothes, money for	4

			schooling, money for her daily things.”	
SP	2	1	Child support	2

Only 12 of the respondents reported having children. Five of these men live with their children who are under the age 18, and two live with their children(s) who are aged 18 or older. All of these men reported the desire to support their children. Most of these men reported that they supported their children in the form of monetary and moral support. Yet, only three respondents reported that they supported their children consistently. Others reported only being able to support their children monetarily on an inconsistent basis, if at all. (See Table 8).

The failure to pay child support is one avenue of risk for CJS contact. Half the respondents reported having at least one child. Only one respondent reported paying court mandated child reported, with many of these being at risk for child support enforcement, which puts them at risk for CJS contact. (See Table 8). Yet, many of the sampled men are not economically self-sufficient, either being unemployed and/or living with a family member. What these findings suggest is that the failure to consistently be able to support their children monetarily in the form of the provider, these men are placed at risk for DMC with the CJS. With no legitimate means of generating income, non-traditional means become a viable options to fulfill that role.

Black Males Performance of Normative Masculine Roles

Question 4: Are Black males performance of normative masculine roles associated with their risk for DMC with the CJS? Yes

Table 9: Comparative Definitions of Masculinity from the Outlier Compared to the Present Study, and the CMNI

The Outlier (Young)	Present Study	Mahalik, et al's., CMNI
Provider Role(s)		
"A real brings home the money"	Caring for family Autonomy/Employment Hustler	Winning Primacy of work Pursuit of status Self-Reliance
Gender Relations		
"A real man has more than one girl." "A real man don't get caught when they talk to more than on girl." "Um, real man don't let no girl run your head which means like, no woman can tell you what to do."	Monogamy Respect for woman Multiple sexual partners	Power over women Playboy
Risk for CJS Contact		
"... it's either we gonna walk whoop some ass together, or we gonna get our ass whooped together. If you run on me-."		
"[A] real man does what he wants when he wants."		
"I'm not really big on showing too much emotion, I'm not really big on letting people inside of me."	Violence for protection Violence: Proactive Criminal activity Drug use	Emotional control Risk-taking Violence Dominance
Homophobia		
"Real men are not gay"	Respect for homosexuals Disdain for Homosexuals Heterosexuality	Disdain for homosexuals
Afrocentrism		
Not reported	Role model Caring for community and its members Showing emotions	Not reported

These group of Black male's performance of normative masculine roles is associated with their 'risk' for DMC with the CJS for two reasons. The first: Sample characters indicate that these men maintain low human and social capital, reflecting their inability to engage the provider role in a meaningful and substantial manner. Yet, low human and social capital does not appear to prevent these men from desiring to perform the provider role. The second: These men come from neighborhoods characterized as high crime; and the people who live these neighborhoods are policed as though they have the potential to be criminal. And this potential creates risk for DMC with the CJS based on law enforcement's racially stereotypical perception of criminality as associated with Black faces and vice versa (Eberhardt, et al., 2006; 2004).

At the age of 19, I met Young, deemed the Outlier, at the four year college he was attending. He was deemed the Outlier because his definitions in terms of his of masculinity paralleled those listed in the CMNI. And unlike the other respondents, he reported that he had never had contact with the CJS or any of its agents, where risk for CJS contact existed. He understood the need to be the provider; his gender relations indicated that he had multiple sexual partners to legitimize his masculinity; his risk for CJS contact is evident with his offensive aggression and willingness to be violent,³⁴ and he was homophobic.

Young spoke (Caribbean accent), is light skinned, wore his hair short, stood around six feet, and weighted about two-hundred pounds. Unlike the other respondents, he wore clothing best described as European fit. I did not get the opinion that he socialize in the streets. He was employed, and one of jobs was security position at the college he attended.

³⁴ That is, his narrative indicated that he could be the aggressor and initiate a fist fight. All of the other men in the reported that there would engage in violence only to defend themselves.

Young's defining his masculinity, paralleled those listed in the CMNI. (See Table 9). That is, a willingness to commit violence as a result of fighting, risk-taking as a result of fighting, dominance in his relationships with women, playboy as result of multiple sexual partnering, power over women; and a disdain for homosexuals. Yet, Young, labelled the Outlier, reported having no contact with the CJS or its agents at all, despite ascribing to masculinity traits that create risk for DMC with the CJS contact. Young's narrative epitomized and conceptualizing normative masculine behaviors.

At the time of the interview Young was 19 years of age, smoked marijuana, engaged in multiple sexual partnering as a rule (sometimes on first dates), attended a four year college and was about to graduate, and was accepted into a graduate program He was raised by a single mom once he arrived in America from Jamaica at a young age, and a bad relationship with his dad, which exist at the time of the interview. While living in Jamaica he grew up in a household with his maternal grandparents and his uncles and aunts. He reported that he learned the importance of the provider role from his maternal grandfather, and learned the importance of multiple sexual partnering from his mother's brothers.

His opinion of homosexuality indicated that he was homophobic:

A real man is not gay. A real man talks to more than one girl. A real man don't get caught when they talk to more than one girl. Real man brings home the money. Um, real man don't let no girl run your head which means like, no woman can tell you what to do. Um, uh, um, real man does what he wants when he wants.

The Outlier's homophobia was consistent with normative masculine behavior; and this consistency is present within Black communities (Lemelle & Battle 2004; Lewis, 2003; Ernst, et al., 1991).

It is suggested that the Outlier engaged in behaviors that put him at risk for CJS contact; and has not experienced DMC because he does not fit the racial stereotype, and is not perceived as possessing stereotypically black traits associated with criminality (Eberhardt, et al., 2006; 2004).

Kawakami and colleagues (Kawakami & Dovidio, 2001; Kawakami et al., 2000) demonstrated that Black stereotypic primes could facilitate the racial categorization of Black faces as well. In their studies, stereotypic traits appeared to automatically prime the Black racial category just as the Black racial category automatically primed stereotypic traits. (Eberhardt; et al., 2004: 877). Crime, for example, may trigger images of those Black Americans who seem most physically representative of the Black racial category (i.e., those who look highly stereotypical). Likewise, highly stereotypical Blacks should be the most likely to trigger thoughts of crime (Eberhardt; et al., 2004: 877). In a crime-obsessed culture, for example, simply thinking of crime can lead perceivers to conjure up images of Black Americans that “ready” these perceivers to register and selectively attend to Black people who may be present in the actual physical environment (Eberhardt; et al., 2004: 877). Thinking of crime may have led officers to falsely identify the more stereotypically Black face because more stereotypically Black faces are more strongly associated with the concept of crime than less stereotypically Black faces (Eberhardt; et al., 2004: 889).

Eberhart et al., (2006: 385) found that “Previous laboratory research has already shown that people associate Black physical traits with criminality (Eberhardt et al., 2004).” Banks et al., (2006: 1172) reported that African Americans are stereotyped as “violent and prone to criminality”, and “... this is the stereotype most commonly applied to Blacks--or at least to young Black males.” For example, Eberhart et al., (2006: 384) researched the perceived

stereotypicality of Black defendants in predicting capital-sentencing outcomes. “Raters were asked to rate the stereotypicality of each Black defendant’s appearance and were told they could use any number of features (e.g., lips, nose, hair texture, skin tone)³⁵ to arrive at their judgments (2006: 384). Eberhart et al., (2006: 384) also reported that “... defendants whose appearance was perceived as more stereotypically Black were more likely to receive a death sentence than defendants whose appearance was perceived as less stereotypically Black.”³⁶

In the same vein as Eberhart et al., (2006) and Goff et al., (2008: 294) posited that the United States the stereotypes associated with Blacks can “... influence perception and behavior—even when people do not personally endorse them and are motivated to be racially egalitarian.” It is important to note that although visual processes may reinforce stereotypic associations, the associations themselves are the consequences of widely shared cultural understandings and social patterns (Eberhardt; et al., 2004: 891); and reactions to these beliefs are cited as intentional automatic responses towards Blacks (Eberhardt; et al., 2004). See also, Goff et al., (2008),

Schranz, et al., (2000: 1) argued that “The causes of such [racial] disparity are varied and can include differing levels of criminal activity, law enforcement emphasis on particular communities, legislative policies, and/or decision making by criminal justice practitioners who exercise broad discretion in the justice process at one or more stages in the system.” Included here are broken windows policing practices, and the aggressive use of stop and frisk, especially in communities of color (Harcourt, 2009). Schranz, et al., (2000: 6) also argued that “...inequitable access to resources can result in very different outcomes between middle-class

³⁵ This study did not indicate which stereotypical traits were more likely focused on by the raters.

³⁶ “Thus, defendants who were perceived to be more stereotypically Black were more likely to be sentenced to death only when their victims were White” (Eberhart et al., 2006: 385).

and low-income individuals even though they may share similar behavioral problems.” Adding to this equation is the over-exaggerated connection of Blacks to crime, creating the justification for risk DMC, and supported by aggressive CJS policy negatively impacting Blacks. (See e.g., Hetey & Eberhardt, 2014).

Independent of personal behavior, Rosich (2007: 5-7, 12-15) reported that the type of policing that Blacks experience, both individually and within their urban communities may explain their risk for DMC. Armour & Hammond (2009, January: 4) reported that DMC could “range from jurisdictional issues, certain police practices and punitive juvenile crime legislation of the 1990s to perceived racial bias in the system.”

Significantly, Young’s narrative did not indicate that he used the streets as a place of socialization other than going out with friends, and going to establishments. Nor did he report engaging in intimate partner violence. Unlike the remaining 23 men of the study, his narrative did not indicate that he engaged in any behaviors associated with street hustling.

Young’s narrative suggests that appearance or perception, as opposed to behavior, is important in determining risk for DMC with the CJS for Black males. It also highlights the importance of structural responses to Black males, explaining their risk for CJS contact for reasons out of their control. Also, Young’s narrative does suggest that he will not be at risk for engaging conventional crimes resulting in risk for criminality.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

Research conducted by Garfield (2010); Young (2003, 2004); Cools (2008); and others suggests that the reasons for and causes of Black males’ risk for DMC are quite complex and include multi-faceted interplays between micro level and macro level factors and dynamics. By simultaneously using alternate instruments that purport to measure normative masculinity and

Black masculinity, an opportunity was provided to detect areas of overlap and divergence in the theoretical frames on masculinity and Black masculinity, in hopes of discovering data that has not previously been found in the literature regarding either form of masculinity.

The purpose of the study assessed the usefulness of masculinity theory to understand and assess Black males' risk for DMC with the CJS. A substantial amount of research and theory suggests that Black males' risk for DMC can be explained by their engagement in criminal behavior that stems from unique attributes of Black masculinity (Cooper, 2113; Gabbidon & Greene, 2013: 20; McFarlen, 2013; Oliver, 2006;). This study challenged the notion that Black masculinity explains risk for DMC with the CJS. Proceeding in a two stage process, this study sought to discover whether Black masculinity is something uniquely different from normative masculinity, or a hyper-masculinity; and whether Black masculinity, contributed to and explained Black males risk for DMC with the CJS.

The first stage of this study sought to discover whether the existing literature on masculinity and Black masculinity described two uniquely different social phenomena. At this stage findings from the qualitative meta-analyzed Black masculinity studies were compared to the CMNI, representing normative masculine behavior; and to Oliver's Three Part Typology, representing Black masculine behavior. At the second stage, respondents self-reported narratives were content analyzed for their definitions of masculinity. This researcher wanted to discover whether their definitions of masculinity were consistent or inconsistent with prevailing definitions of normative masculinity; whether their definitions were consistent with the literature on Black masculinity; or whether their definitions expressed a unique form of masculinity. Finally the narratives were further examined for the contextual details of these men's lives, and

whether their reports of masculine behavior might contribute to their risk for criminal justice system contact.

The qualitative meta-analysis confirmed that Black males ascribe to traditional masculinity, but also exhibited “Afrocentrism”—concern for the welfare of their families and the broader community. More specifically, some definitions of masculinity were positive (e.g., the provider role: without and outside the family [Afrocentrism]); and some definitions of masculinity were described negative (e.g., dominating someone and being aggressive). Adams (2007) was the only study where it was reported that his respondents engaged in behaviors that would put them at risk for DMC. Adams (2007) sampled a young marginalized group of Black males, concluding that their risk for DMC was a result of the lack of guidance as opposed to the expression of their masculine identity. The remaining studies did not connect or associate definitions of masculinity as reported by their respondents, to risk for DMC with the CJS.

Two points can be drawn from the qualitative meta-analysis. The first, and somewhat obvious is that different behavioral outcomes are discovered when the research questions focus on normative masculinity, and researching Black masculinity or Black males as though they do not engage masculine that is not normative (Jackson & Dangerfield, 2002: 120-130). For example, normative masculinity is researched, and findings are reported as normative behaviors, with some of those behaviors being more extreme than others. Typically, when Black males and their masculinity is researched, the research focuses on pathological behaviors of the marginalized, and reporting these findings as hyper masculine behaviors representing all Black males. The findings from the qualitative meta-analyzed studies did not report findings of hyper-masculinity as typically espoused in mainstream scholarship when researching Black males.

It is suggested here that mainstream scholarship focuses on the marginalized, describing Black males' masculine tendencies as something different from normative masculine behavior. Consequently, a significant amount of such research focused on and/or reinforced the pathological behaviors and stereotypes, describing it as Black masculinity. For example, exceptions would be the research conducted by Duck (2009: 284, 286) and Adams (2007: 158). It is important to note that differing masculine behavioral outcomes are reported from studies conducted with marginalized Black male as opposed to Black males who are not marginalized (Jackson & Dangerfield, 2002: 120-130; Hunter, 1994).

These findings also suggest that Blacks engage in masculine behaviors no different than Whites. However, behaviors for Black males are given different labels (Thug/Tough Guy; Player; Hustler/Balla), labels whose connotations are deviant and criminal. This finding is important when considering structural responses from CJS agents, who in turn, view Blacks as engaging in 'Black masculinity', something viewed as something different than traditional masculine behaviors. And this is defined as criminal or deviant in most cases. For example, Adams (2007: 157) noted that, "In short, [Black males] exist within familial and community structures that do not adequately facilitate their healthy development." Duck (2009: 286) adds "Depending on the context of the research, African American men are alternately described as 'hypermasculine,' 'androgynous,' or 'effeminate.'" From another perspective Roberts-Douglas and Curtis-Boles (2013: 7) state that "Many studies have focused on participants from low-income backgrounds, and few studies have researched adaptive strategies to support gender role strain on African American men."

Within the marginalized Black male population, there are differences in behavioral outcomes reported as well, and they are not necessarily an indication of risk for DMC, as

evidenced by the qualitative meta-analysis conducted herein. Findings from the qualitative meta-analysis also revealed that those respondents varied socioeconomically, by age, and by education; and regardless of their demographics, these men do engage in normative masculine behavior.

Two disturbing trends emerged and are highlighted here. The first, when reporting on the social ills, e.g., poverty, violence, and crime, these social ills are reported as though they are unique Black males and their families. Conversely, when these same social ills are reported for the dominate culture, findings are presented as though they are the exception. It is suggested here that the labels describing masculine behaviors listed in the CMNI, and the labels describing masculine behaviors listed in Oliver's Three-Part Typology are describing the same behavioral events, even though the labels listed within Oliver's e Three-Part Typology are associated with criminality and deviance, creating risk for DMC. This suggestion is important because it demonstrates how Black masculinity is researched, being broken down into three descriptive stereotypical categories.

Secondly, the comparative analysis of the qualitative meta-analyzed studies, the CMNI, and Oliver's Three-Part Typology, revealed two things: 1) the qualitative meta-analyzed studies reported descriptions, or labels, that paralleled those reported in the CMNI as opposed to Oliver's Three-Part Typology; and 2) the comparative analysis revealed that Black males and Whites males do engage and define their masculine behaviors the same. It is suggested here that when White males engage in masculine behaviors, rarely are those behavior viewed as criminal at the stop, question, and risk stage, creating risk for CJS contact. At this stage their behavior is typically viewed as 'the boys are simply having fun', or 'boys will be boys'. And from this suggestion raises another factor regarding risk for DMC, and that is the structural response(s) to

Black males, which is independent of their behavior. This is best described as the structures (society's) perception and its reaction to Black males, which in most times is based on some a stereotype.

Regardless of labels, these findings revealed that the sampled respondents' definitions and expressions of masculine behavior(s) were consistent with the normative masculine behaviors as outlined in the CMNI, and those described in Oliver's three-part typology (2006). More specifically, their narratives revealed that these men saw masculinity in terms of the showing of healthy emotions, role model for all, caring for community and its member, autonomy, respect for woman, monogamy, criminal activity, violence as a means of protection, and respect for homosexuals.

By content analyzing the respondents self-reported narratives defining their masculinity, an opportunity was offered to assess the strength and contours of the long-standing body of theory and research that suggest that Black males' risk for DMC can be explained by Black males' adoption of a unique "brand" of masculine identities and behaviors that are transmitted across generations, especially within urban neighborhoods, and which increase the likelihood that they will engage in behaviors defined as criminal or deviant.

Reports on behavioral outcomes for Black masculine behavior usually focus on the negatives, stereotypes, or the hyper-masculine behaviors, which have been associated with criminality, violence, multiple sexual partnering, intimate partner violence, and drug/alcohol usage. If you consider definitive markers such as hyper-violent, hyper-aggressive, and hyper violent that have come to define Black masculinity, those markers were not part of the narratives as these men defined their masculinity. Overall, it was discovered that these men's definitions of masculinity paralleled traditional masculine roles cited within the CMNI.

The focus of this study was to determine if this group of Black males defined their masculinity in a unique ways that would put them at risk for DMC, or whether they engaged in masculine behaviors that would put them at risk for DMC. It was also discovered that two of these men were selling drugs at the time of their interviews, and all of the others except the Outlier had sold drugs one time in their lives, creating risk for DMC. It is suggested here that drug selling was a means to fulfil the provider role.

The data from this study revealed that risk for DMC with the CJS can be explained as a result of Black males' not being able to fulfill the provider role using normative means, e.g., gainful employment. When any group has been marginalized, existing in poverty, criminal activity has been well document outcome (Reiman & Leighton, 2015; Duster, 1987; Sampson, 1987). Yet, when other ethnic/racial groups experience similar socio-variables that make them susceptible to crime, the entire group is not stereotyped as criminal. To reiterate, findings from the content analysis also suggest that even among these socially marginalized Black males, their attempts to conform to masculine identities results in complex social and psychological dynamics. Specifically, the failure to be able to fulfill the role of the breadwinner/provider can lead to risk for DMC, whether for one's immediate family, or an attempt to assist others.

Findings from the sample characteristics, reports of CJS contact and, household structure and relationship with women may further explain these men's inability to perform the traditional masculine role of the provider. As noted, the men of this study are marginalized. Most have these men had a high school/GED education or less. And of those who reported having some college education, or received a degree, there is no indication that this education translated into an employment opportunity. Also, slightly less than a third of the men reported being employed, and the types of jobs that they were employed in were not jobs that could be considered to

generate a lucrative income. And their ability to be providers is further stymied by their arrests and convictions. And most of these men are not living independently, residing with their families. The importance of the provider role is highlighted, wherein, the large majority of the sampled men ascribed the provider role in their definition of masculinity. As noted, their inability to perform this role meaningfully in the traditional sense, may put them at risk for DMC with the CJS.

It would be misleading to assume that risk for DMC as a means to fulfil the role of breadwinner in non-traditional terms is the definitive marker of what Black masculinity stands for overall. Moreover, this assumption, regarding the association of masculinity and crime, is not made when it comes to White males. For White males 'behavior(s)' is defined as hyper; does not define the entire group of White males. Structurally, and in stereotypical terms, behaviors that lead to risk for DMS are attributed to and have come to define Black manhood in totality, ignoring other positive masculine roles that these men engage in. From a broader perspective, as with any ethnic/racial group experiencing poverty and unemployment, criminal activity can be a consequent.

Not to be overlooked were the lack of findings in support of the notion that these men engaged in multiple sexual partnering, and/or IPV as a means to define or prove their masculinity. These findings are significant because they contradict mainstream scholarship professing and describing a Black hyper-sexual masculinity and a hyper-violent/violent Black masculinity. Of note, only one respondent reported that he had engaged in IPV as a result of having his recently past grandparent talked badly about.

A small number of these men ascribed to engaging in the masculine trait of having power over women. It is suggested that having power over women in this instance can be translated as

providing for family, or leadership. There were men in the sample who ascribed to being a playboy. However, their meaning of playboy was more reflective of the meaning cited in the CMNI as opposed to Oliver's Three-Part Typology; that is, multiple sexual partnering. Some of the men in this study spoke of the importance of having emotional control. The importance of having emotional control may reflect these men's expression of a strategy needed toward fulfilling the role of the provider or leader of the family; or simply being in control of one's self as a man. All of the men of this sample ascribed to the masculine trait of "risk-taking". With the exception of two of the younger respondents, it is suggested risk-taking was the result of fulfilling the role of the provider, and not having the human capital and social capital to fulfill that role the traditional or normative ways. A slight majority of these men reported ascribing to the use of violence as an important part of their masculine identity. However, these narratives indicated that their importance of violence was associated defensive, or protecting themselves and family while engaging in the protector and provider role. A unique Black masculinity was reported these respondents: Afrocentrism. Primarily the older respondents expressed engaging in Afrocentrism. This finding could be attributed to the maturity of these older men.

It was also discovered that some of these men engaged in a positive unique masculine identity described as Afrocentrism, or Afrocentric values (the caring for family others, and community) when defining masculinity and manhood. This finding was unexpected because mainstream research on Black masculinity rarely captures and reports on Afrocentrism as it relates to Black masculinity (see McClure, 2006). Other positive unexpected findings included narratives regarding respect for women, the showing of healthy emotions, only using violence as a means of defend one's self, and monogamy.

Contrary to popular mainstream belief, Afrocentrism is not indicative of an expression of xenophobia, or separatism. The Afrocentric perspective is cited as the "... reclaiming [of] traditional African values that emphasize mankind's oneness with nature; spirituality, and collectivism" (Oliver, 1989: 24). That is, caring for those outside of the immediate family, and receiving that communal care in return. "It represents the Africanness of a people, positing the human being as the centrality/totalness of all existence as opposed to Eurocentrism, which posits political power and crass materialism as the centrality/totalness of all existence. The human factor/element is not central" (Hoskins, 1992: 253-254). The Eurocentric perspective has been cited as a "... world view which encourages; controlling nature; materialism and individualism" (Oliver, 1989: 24).

Several of the men in this study expressed a sense of concern for family and their broader community that is outside of the masculine characteristics identified in the CMNI or Oliver's Three-Part-Typology. This communal concern may leave these men more emotionally vulnerable than their White male counterparts, contributing to their risk of CJS contact as a provider and as a defensive protector of those community members they perceive as being under attack). Also, this communal attachment can be a positive unique masculine trait for Black males with adequate resources to support (both emotionally and materially) family and members of the broader community. In a resource deficient environment that characterizes the urban neighborhoods from which the respondents come from, the sense of responsibility for the welfare of family, neighborhood or even the entire race—specifically, holding up the image of the "strong Black man"—may provide unique stressors that create emotional and physical vulnerabilities not experienced by White males. And these stressor may place one at risk for DMC with the CJS as a provider or protector. Subsequent research with larger samples and

cross-race samples will allow this finding to be examined further. Roberts-Douglas and Curtis-Boles (2013: 7), noted that studies on Black masculinity rarely research and report on adaptive strategies they men use to combat gender role strain

This finding also suggest that beyond their own behavior, societal reaction to Black males' performance of masculine roles (e.g. describing it as sexual promiscuity, physical aggression, dominance) are reacted to in ways that increase their vulnerability to risk for DMC, particularly when they live in communities that are under higher levels of police and governmental surveillance and control (including welfare systems and criminal justice system agencies) than are White males engaged in the same behavior. This notion is supported by the substantially lower amount of justice system contact experienced by the one study participant, the Outlier, who is more White culturally and middle class in his physical appearance, style of dress and social conduct, despite his admitted involvement in substantial criminal activity.

Empirical studies on risk for DMC with the CJS tend to explore this risk using cultural explanations (Oliver, 2006: 927-928), structural explanations (Duck, 2009: 284-286); or a combination of the two (Alexander, 2010: 179). For example, and highlighting structural explanations and responses, Blacks risk for DMC has been associated with how Blacks are being perceived independent of any specific behavior(s) being manifested (Eberhardt, 2006; 2004). To further exemplify this point, Goof (2008: 292) wrote, "It is commonly thought that old-fashioned prejudice has given way to a modern bias that is implicit, subtle, and often unintended. This new understanding of racial bias may have led researchers and laypeople alike to believe that the dehumanization and subjugation of Blacks was primarily a historical phenomenon. However, as recently as the early 1990s, California state police euphemistically referred to cases involving young Black men as N.H.I.—No Humans Involved."

Independent of agency, and the lack of human capital and social capital, Black males performing masculine behaviors in the context of the world in which they live in, and how they are perceived by that world, increases the likelihood that their behaviors will be viewed as criminal, increasing risk for CJS contact. These men came from communities where broken windows policing is the norm, where suspicion creates risk for DMC with the CJS is based on racial stereotyping. It is suggested that the more Black features (i.e., physical appearance; demeanor, speech, and dress) that law enforcement perceives, the greater the risk for DMC with the CJS (Eberhardt, 2006; 2004).

Citing a study conducted by Eberhardt, et al., (2004), Banks, et al., (2006: 1172) reported that “In one study, they exposed police officers to a group of Black faces or a group of White faces and asked, “Who looks criminal?”³⁷ They found that police officers not only viewed more Black faces than White faces as criminal, but also viewed those Black faces rated as the most stereotypically Black (e.g., those faces with wide noses, thick lips, or dark skin) as the most criminal of all.” Banks, et al., further citing, “Eberhardt and colleagues [2004: 886-888] found that both students and police officers, when they were primed to think about violent crime, became more likely to look at a Black face rather than a White face.”

The further examination of the contextual details of these men’s lives, and the masculine behaviors that they engage in that might contribute to their risk for criminal justice system contact revealed, an interesting societal phenomenon was discovered. That is, the stereotyping of Black males creates risk for DMC where none may not exist, particularly within Black communities.³⁸ As noted above, racial features have been cited as being important when others

³⁷ “The faces were all of Stanford University students and staff, none of whom had any criminal history” (Banks, et al., (2006: 1172).

³⁸ However, although the perceived for risk for DMC occurs in Black communities in a greater frequency, it is not limited to Black communities.

are perceiving and associating crime and Black faces (Eberhardt, et al., 2006; 2004; Goff, et al., 2008); and vice versa as a are bidirectional process (Eberhardt; et al., 2004: 876). And, “The more stereotypically Black a person’s physical traits appear to be, the more criminal that person is perceived to be (Eberhardt, et al., 2004)” (Eberhardt, et al., (2006: 383).” It is suggested that this phenomenon explains why the Outlier’s risk (fighting in the streets) for DMC has not translated into an arrest. Under these circumstances it is difficult to discern whether Eberhardt, et al., (2006) and Goff, et al., (2008) are reporting on findings reflecting implicit bias as opposed to outright racism.

With few exceptions, the men of this study collectively expressed, when compared to the CMNI and Oliver’s Three-Part Typology, defined their masculine behavior in normative terms. Also, a number of these men expressed having an Afrocentric value system. The behavioral reality for the men of this study are representative of their social standing as marginalized men living in a large American urbanized city. Black males do engage in normative masculine male roles (e.g., the provider role). Unfortunately, these men engage in normative masculine male roles as the provider by the best nonconventional means available to them, which are reflective of their social capital and the worth of their human capital. A major point of caution is given here. The concentration of the marginalized in the urbanized American cities is not unique to Blacks. Labels for urbanized American cities have been cited as the Ghetto, the slums, and presently the hood, which have been structurally stereotyped and associated exclusively with Black faces. And with these labels come anticipated behaviors, and the anticipated behaviors are viewed as deviant or criminal. The negative behaviors associated with living in the ‘Hood’, were present when other White ethnic/racial groups predominated the inner cities of American.

In comparison to the theoretical constructs of traditional or normative masculinity, and so-called Black masculinity, these data did not indicate that the Black men of this study engaged in a hyper-masculinity; or a unique masculinity that would.

Theoretical framings and several empirical studies have suggested that Black masculinity is a unique best described as hyper-masculinity. More specifically, according to the theoretical framings and several empirical studies, Black masculinity or hyper-masculinity, is a stereotyped set of behaviors involving over aggression and promiscuity (hyper-sexual) that Black males engage in as a means of proving their manhood or masculine status. In turn, Black masculinity has been commonly associated with aggression, violence, and criminality. It has been suggested that this unique form of masculinity, hyper-masculinity, expressed attributed to Black males contributes to and explains their risk for disproportionate contact with the criminal justice system.

In sum, these findings suggest that these Black men do engage in masculinity; and that some do engage in the unique practice of Afrocentrism. To this extent, marginalized Black males engaging in masculine roles may be at risk for DMC with the CJS, resulting from their inability to fill the provider role. Lastly, these findings challenged the notion of a Black hyper-masculinity. At Stage one and Stage two, collectively there were no findings nor self-reported narratives supporting the Black hyper-masculinity theory. What was also discovered was that reports of Black hyper-masculinity appear to be grounded on theoretical posits, as opposed to empirical studies, explaining as to why marginalized Black males do not socio-economically produce the same as college educated White men. Lastly, studies reporting on findings on Black masculinity for the marginalized, eventually become narrated as findings for Black males collectively.

Significance of the Findings

The analysis and findings from this research offered a broader and more nuanced understanding of the factors underlying official statistics that document the over-representation of Black males in prisons and DMC with other components of the CJS. This study focused on Black males' risk of CJS contact rather than merely their potential for deviant behavior, and addressed Black men's risk for DMC from more complex and less value-laden perspectives. (See Rios, 2011.

This study looked at the theoretical constructs defining normative masculinity and Black masculinity, and provided an opportunity to address some of the conflicting literature regarding whether, in fact, there is a unique Black masculine identity, or if such an identity is the product of social construction in response to and in support of historical "othering" of Black identity and as a means of explaining why Black males are at risk for DMC.

These findings indicate that there is a need to develop a broader understanding of what is associated with Black men's risk for CJS contact at micro and macro levels, and the contours of that risk—beyond identification as a perpetrator or potential perpetrator--appropriate interventions may be developed to break generational cycles and change systemic responses. Such findings will expand the existing knowledge and (hopefully) shift the existing discourse on masculinity, race, crime and criminal justice risk/processing from one that places significant emphasis on individual responsibility as dispositive of criminal justice positioning in reference to Black men, to one that is mindful of the impact of social inequality and differential external interpretations of 'masculine' behaviors.

These findings raise the question of whether there is truly a cultural or social phenomenon known as Black masculinity beyond stereotyped descriptions of Black males'

normative masculine behavior as atypical and dysfunctional. And if so, what are its true contours? Generally, the investigation, evaluation, and analysis of Black masculinity focus on the negative attributes (McClure, 2006: 58). “This characterization [the negative and/or the hyper portrayal of Black men] has been carried through several decades of research that has typically been conducted on African-American men from a lower class background who often have criminal records, and who are in no way representative of the entire black male population” (Hunter & Davis, 1994).

Unfortunately, studies on the behavioral outcomes of marginalized low-income inner-city Black males have become the generalized face of Black males.³⁹ In turn, the social circumstances and conditions that low income inner city Black males live under, or their socio-economic-status would better explain their risk for CJS contact. Thus, it may be that Black males are not engaging in an adaptive, compulsive, hyper, or a reactionary masculinity. Instead, they may simply be engaging in masculinity or male behavior based on their social capital and human capital. Although interrelated, their social capital and human capital is measured through their social category or socio-economic-status, and should not identify by their ethnic/racial identity.

The literature has indicated that Black males who have the social and human capital to overcome social and structural circumstances prevail. It is the marginalized or low income with associated variables (e.g., drug/alcohol abuse and literacy challenged), who do not prevail, succumbing to criminal proclivities. In this instance criminal enterprise becomes the means

³⁹ Marginalization is defined as social exclusion, and this exclusion appears to be intentional (structural blocks). Can we argue that behaviors (criminal/risky, deviant) associated with marginalization are unique to Black men; or are they unique to being marginalized? I argue that the latter holds true. The numbers indicate that Blacks are disproportionately represented as being marginalized. This is not to say that being marginalized, Black, and males equates to criminal proclivities.

accomplish the role of the breadwinner. Harris, et al., (2011: 50) reported that a consequent for collegiate men not being able to live up masculine expectations, is rule breaking.

Removing the human capital and social capital argument, the Black experience speaks to structural racism, discrimination in many of society's institutions, socially constructed identities as the 'other' and criminal. A social construction of Black males is created, and society's reaction is to treat them as though have committed or about to a crime, particularly CJS agents. The lack human capital and social capital may also be a result the Black experience in America.

Another key factor in understanding Black male's risk for DMC, is the type of policing Blacks experience in their communities. Black marginalized communities are portrayed as high crime areas, where criminals reside. It is a wide held belief that most crime is committed in these communities. These communities have been portrayed in the media as such, fostering that belief. Arrest data by ethnicity/race negates that belief. What is significant is that Blacks become the face of crime, and crime becomes the face of Blacks. It follows then that when a CJS agent sees a Black face, that face is identified with crime, bolstering risk for DMC with a violation or crime being committed. Of note, this Black to crime –crime to Black imagery is not confined to the marginalized.

Black males of this study and their behaviors should be assessed as low income marginalized men living in the urban areas of New York City. Ecology, e.g., America's inner cities, plays a significant role when determining behavioral outcomes for expressions of masculine behavior. In the New Millennium many of the streets of urban areas are now known as the 'hood', and have become synonymous with Blackness. More specifically, the social and cultural dynamics of the streets, or inner cities of urban areas of America, called by many negative names including 'the slum', 'the ghetto', presently known as 'the Hood, and particularly

New York City, have historically been associated with crime, poverty, drug/alcohol abuse, gangs, and violence (Miller 2003; Anbinder, 2001; Lubove, 1963; Yablonsky, 1962: 959; Riis, 1890;). This historical finding and associated behaviors are not unique to Black males. Thus, as an independent variable, it is argued that being Black, male, and living in the inner-cities cannot explain DMC risk with the CJS.

Challenges to Black males risk with the CJS in terms of actually engaging in risky or criminal behavior is reduced by having a positive support system (Adams, 2007). These findings reveal that many of these respondents, incarcerated at a young age learned about masculinity behind prison walls in a total institution. Others learned from persons in the streets and male relatives who they did not live with. Only about six respondents reported learning about masculinity from their fathers or grandfathers, indicting a positive support system.

By developing a broader understanding of what is associated with Black men's risk for CJS contact at micro and macro levels, and the contours of that risk—beyond identification as a perpetrator or potential perpetrator--appropriate interventions may be developed to break generational cycles and change systemic responses. The findings from this research should expand the existing knowledge and (hopefully) shift the existing discourse on masculinity, race, crime and criminal justice processing from one that places significant emphasis on individual responsibility as dispositive of criminal justice positioning in reference to Black men, to one that is mindful of the impact of social inequality and differential external interpretations of 'masculine' behaviors.

Policy Implications

These findings may be useful in helping to better understand Black males' risk DMC as a by-product of a number of forces that extend beyond their personal control. Relevant factors

include their presence in communities that are under higher levels of surveillance than their White counterparts; the interpretation of their normative masculine behaviors as criminal or deviant; an emotional commitment and sense of responsibility to and for a broader community; and, a retracted set of environmental circumstances under which they must attempt to fulfill socially ascribed male roles. The current research reveals both the internal and external struggles that Black males face in their attempts to engage with dominant definitions of masculinity, particularly in contextual settings replete with stereotypes and negative expectations about Black males. Importantly, consistent with social psychological literature, it suggests that stereotypes about Black male criminality may increase the chances of Black males having contact with criminal justice agents, like the police, even when they are not engaged in crime but that appearing less Black and less stereotypical may act as a buffer against contact or result in more lenient treatment once contact occurs. This was the case with the Outlier, who engaged in normative masculine behaviors, and had no CJS contact. Having less of what we would be considered typical Black features, he has a non-threatening demeanor. .

The policy implications of these findings are significant. Many current interventions that have been designed to address risk of DMC and those that have been designed to facilitate prisoner re-entry focus on changing the behavior and attitudes of either criminal justice agents or the at-risk /formerly incarcerated population. The findings from the current study suggest that there are a host of social and psychological issues that must be attended to in the design of interventions and that the targets of intervention must include academic researchers, criminal justice agents and those receiving services. For the service recipients, the resources must be made available to not only address tangible needs such as employment, housing, educational opportunities etc. but should also include psychological support via professional counseling or

peer counseling to address the very real emotional conflict, turmoil and anxiety that Black males are facing as they attempt to perform masculine roles under high levels of surveillance in economically and socially constrained environments.

For criminal justice agents and other service providers, interventions must include a cultural competence component that helps them to recognize and combat the implicit biases that may be affecting how they see, assess, and address Black males and how such biases can be counter-productive to the aims of the interventions (e.g. fair policing, impartial court processing, successful social re-integration of the formerly incarcerated).

Finally, as academics seek funding and conduct research on Black males and their masculinity, it is hopeful that the findings from the current study will encourage them to think in more complex and less stereotypical ways about appropriate research questions and conceptual and analytic frameworks, and engage in more sophisticated interpretations of the resulting data. Put another way, it is anticipated that the findings from this study will help reshape the thinking about the existence of a distinct Black masculine identity and the causes of Black male risk for DMC with the CJS. In turn, this new conceptualization may serve to better inform decision-making around potential interventions to address and reduce their DMC.

Limitations of the study

This study used a selected small sample (n=24), self-identifying, inner-city, marginalized, heterosexual, Black males, aged 19-50, and the data were collected from one City. This was a small convenience sample. Small samples are often used in qualitative studies because the collection of in-depth data via in-person interviews is extremely labor intensive. However, data from a small sample of subjects, drawn from a single city, may not be

representative of the experiences of individuals in other places, or with different demographics, may not be generalizable. Replication of this study might allow these findings to be validated.

The researcher proposed a retrospective analysis of cross-sectional data that was previously collected. At the time that this research paper was being written, there were no opportunities to collect additional information from the subjects⁴⁰, which means the data presents only a snapshot of the subjects' lives', and not experiences across their life course. This concern may also reduce the generalizability of these findings.

In the original research, the NDRI research staff was concerned about the possibility of eliciting "socially desirable responses" (Leite, 2010), from subjects, particularly where the questions being asked reflected a man's social and economic worth, and because the subjects were being paid for the interviews. The literature suggests that the perceived "socially desirable responses" to the questions posed in the instruments may vary based on the gender of the interviewer. Since the subjects and the interviewer were both male, the possibility of exaggerated responses, particularly in reference to questions about sexual conquests does exist, while the desire to minimize behavior thought as dysfunctional or unmanly could also have occurred. Efforts were made to minimize this risk, but it could not be guarded against completely.

Another potential source of bias in the data collection was the fact that the researcher has known some of the study subjects and their families for a number of years, resulting in interviewer bias. The identification of transcripts by code number rather than by the name of the subject did provide a level of anonymity to the data, though not an ideal one. The researcher

⁴⁰ The NDRI study had ended, and access to the sample as a researcher would have been unethical.

was committed to attempting to engage in an objective analysis and reporting of research results. Also, this relationship in some cases guarded against socially desirable answers.

This study did not utilize a comparison group of men other than those self-identified as Black, and the results may not be exclusive to Black men. By contrast, Mahalik, et al., (2003), note that masculinity is a “culturally defined construct”, and that different normative values defining masculine behavior and conformity may vary by race/ethnicity. They warn against the reliability of the CMNI when it comes to assessing beliefs about masculinity and men of color. Their study apparently assumed that men of color would not have the same normative masculine values and beliefs as their racial counterparts. This evidences an inherent bias in the thought process underlying the construction of the instrument.

Oliver (1994) tested the validity of his three-part typology by checking the internal consistency of the responses, in part, by comparing them with his personal knowledge of the subjects. In the proposed research, the research will triangulate data from the interview responses, the field notes, and the researcher’s knowledge of the subjects as a means of confirming the accuracy of the data and use an external coder to reassess coding decisions. A potential source of bias in the Oliver typology stems from the fact that he focused his inquiries exclusively on “incidents that occurred in bars and bar like settings...” (1994: 56). Hence the measurements themselves may be biased based on the method of construction.

Appendix A: Meaning units, a summary of selected qualitative meta-analyzed studies on Black masculinity⁴¹

Author(s)	Mincey et al., 2014	Roberts-Douglass & Curtis-Boles, 2013 ⁴²	Harris, et al., 2011
Research topic(s)	This research developed a Masculinity Inventory Scale (MIS) for Black men that accounted for their masculinity ideals.	This research explored socialization factors that contribute to the development of positive masculine identity in African American adolescent males.	This research explored Black men's insights into their conceptualizations of masculinities and the behavioral expressions that emerged as outcomes of these conceptualizations.
Methodology	Qualitative data were used to develop a culturally sensitive masculinity scale for Black men. Four focus groups were conducted, and 13 in-depth interviews were conducted, six at the HBCU and seven at the PWI.	One-on-one interviews, followed by the construction of The Multicultural Masculinity Scale (MMIS) (N=15).	Semi-structured individual interviews (n=4) and focus groups (n=18). ⁴³
Demographics	Undergraduate African American/Black, (roughly 2 were Hispanic) male college students, aged 18-24.	Black/African American men, raised in lower, middle, and upper-middle class surroundings, aged 18-22 with a high school diploma or GED. Thirteen were attending college, and two had completed college. The study took place at two large public universities located in Northwestern United States.	Black male undergraduate college students attending Western University located in the United States. Nineteen men described their socioeconomic backgrounds as "affluent" or "middle class", and three participants described their backgrounds as "low-income". All of the men were members of a Black college fraternity.
Findings/conclusion(s)	"While research on masculinity and manhood with Black men has reported that their ideas of manhood are quite different from "traditional" male characteristics, current measures that continue to only address 'traditional' characteristics are continually used to measure masculinity in this group" (2014: 177).	"As adults, the majority of participants spoke of a more nuanced interpretation and self-identification of African American male masculinity than is represented in academic research historically conducted in homogeneous low-income, urban setting" (2013: 10). "African American males in this study, while frequently exposed to traditional masculinity norms, can and do form definitions of masculinity and self-perception with intentional inclusion of positive schemas (provider, education) and resilience against negative schemas (violence, misogyny)" (2013: 10).	"By and large, the participants' conceptualizations of masculinities were consistent with culturally defined norms and expectations of men. Concepts like "toughness," "strength," and "aggressiveness" were consistently offered as requisite characteristics of masculinities" (2011: 53). "The men in the study also associated masculinities with the accumulation of wealth and material possessions. Several of the participants described this as "balling." For these men, earning a generous income not only allowed a man to fulfill the role of breadwinner in the home, but was also an indicator of the extent to which he was successful in his chosen

⁴¹ Some the qualitative meta-analyzed studies used a mixed method. The focus for this research is the qualitative methodologies.

⁴² It is noteworthy that "The results of this study suggests that Black males can defy negative portrayals of Black masculinity that they learned to follow during adolescence" (2013: 12), a problem that is not associated with traditional or hegemonic masculinity.

⁴³ "The data on which this article is based came from a larger qualitative study of college men and masculinities involving 68 undergraduate men who represented diverse backgrounds, experiences, and social group identities" (2011: 51).

		<p>“Although there was variance in the depth and intimacy of father–son relationships, the vast majority of participants cited the example set by their father and/or the direction laid out by their father as a major differentiator in their understanding of masculinity as African American males” (2013: 10).</p> <p>Contrary to the frequency of images of masculine identity purported in mass media, few participants reported seeing their peers fight for status and recognition over sexual prowess, physical appearance, and material goods (2013: 12).</p> <p>All of the participants reported that their view of masculinity incorporated future aspirations of academic success; most adhered to conventional aspirations and markers of adulthood such as achieving employment and financial independence. Pursuing higher education was the most common response regarding how to accomplish the above (2013: 11).</p> <p>These results indicated that participants held opinions of manhood that did not coincide with the exaggeration of male stereotypical behavior, such as an emphasis on strength, aggression, or sexual prowess (2013: 12).</p> <p>“The findings in this study supports arguments made by many researchers that Black men are portrayed as aggressive, dominant, adventurous, materialistic, amoral, and hypersexed in the media (Arnett, 1995; Davis, 2006; Hansen & Hansen, 2000). In addition, the results suggest that Black media and music are essential pieces of African American male adolescents’ identification with Black culture. However, these images do not assume dominance over their ideals of Black masculinity, as evidenced by the participants in this study. It is plausible that positive male role</p>	<p>profession. Interestingly, several of the men in the study noted that they would define their success after college by this standard” (2011: 53).</p> <p>“While overall, the findings may be indicative of the ways in which Black men conceptualize and express masculinities during their college years, they also reflect where the participants were developmentally at the time the data were collected, and could very likely change as these men grow and mature in life” (2011:58).</p>
--	--	--	--

		<p>models in participants family had a greater impact, enabling them to feel less inclined toward developing behaviors that are contradictory in rap lyrics and music videos” (2013: 13).</p> <p>“The results, however, suggests that African American male adolescents are capable of holding beliefs consistent with traditional European definitions of masculinity while selectively and intentionally embracing alternative definitions of masculinity” (2013: 13).</p> <p>“Essentially, adolescent males in this study were able to form and develop an image of masculinity from their cultural environment independent from pressure to conform to traditional masculine images of White men” (2013: 12).</p> <p>“Family was the most salient environment from which participants established a blueprint for their masculine identities. Here, the men served as role models, in particular the father and second to him, the grandfather This was also the case in the present study as the majority of participant’s were taught about gender norms through interactions and experiences with their fathers or grandfathers” (2013: 12).</p> <p>“The results suggests that Black males can defy negative portrayals of Black masculinity that they learned to follow during adolescence” (2013: 12).</p>	
--	--	---	--

Appendix A: Meaning units, a summary of selected qualitative meta-analyzed studies on Black masculinity, continued

Author(s)	Chaney, 2009	Duck, 2009	Adams, 2007
Research topic(s)	This research was concerned with how Black men define the term manhood.	This research challenged the hyper masculine approaches defining Black masculinity by looking at the relationship between masculinity and health.	This research explored the value of support networks for young African American and their models of masculinity.
Methodology	Individual open ended surveys were used, and narratives that responses were content analyzed.	Phase one: Four focus groups (N=12) (three men in each group) and one interview. Phase two: In-depth interviews (N = 60), including surveys and vignettes).	Individual audio recorded interviews.
Demographics	Twenty-four low-income Black men living in Illinois and Tennessee, aged 18-51 years of age. Income ranged from \$10,000-\$30,000. Educational attainment ranged from 12.03 years and 6 were college students.	African American men (N=72) living in the Midwest. Half of the men were college students; half were middle class workers or professionals and age ranged from 18 – 88.	American-born Black men (N = 21), aged 18-35, living their entire lives in low-income areas in New York City. Group A: 10 reported no criminal record. One admitted armed robbery but had never been arrested. Group B: 10 had felony convictions.
Findings/ conclusion(s)/	<p>Four themes were discovered revealing that manhood is directly related to education attainment, economic stability, positive and healthy relationship with family, others "... in the form of caring for the financial, emotional, and spiritual care..." (2009: 119), and the community, and good parenting.</p> <p>Theme 1: Maturity and responsibility for self, reflecting a need for autonomy (2009: 115-116).</p> <p>Theme 2: Responsibility for family (2009: 116).</p> <p>Theme 3: The Provider role, including, "financial, emotional, or spiritual care of others" (2009: 116-117).</p> <p>Theme 4: Self-awareness of "... one's abilities to perform in the world stage, and also how one is perceived in deed and in physical appearance" (2009: 117-118).</p>	<p>For many in this study, masculinity was discussed in terms of "family and social responsibility". Other areas of discussion included, (an emphasis on) marriage, caring and supporting for one's children, and employment (2009: 293).</p> <p>"What is revealing in their remarks is how hegemonic aspirations to marriage and family and dominance appear to be both implicit and salient in their responses.... Many ... themes [patriarchy, heterosexuality, subordination of others (men and women), economic security and physical dominance] were evident in the responses of other participants in the study whose responses echoed themes emphasized by hegemonic masculinity." (2009: 298)</p> <p>"The narratives suggest that marginalized men will not knowingly do anything that would marginalize their masculine status. The findings of this study confirm that hegemonic masculinity is the standard by which African American men evaluate themselves, even though they may be excluded from it. African American men may support hegemonic beliefs</p>	<p>"All the men subscribed to normative mainstream ideals of the type of man they aspired to become. They had been socialized to believe that physical health, strength, and competence, intellectual skill, and emotional self-containment and self-control would lead to the traditional perquisites of masculinity in American society: prestige, security, autonomy, love, and money" (2007: 167).</p> <p>"[O]pportunities to develop these attributes are not always available to poor Black men, at least not all at once. All the men chose some over others, using legitimate or illegitimate tactics in their individual ways" (2007: 167).</p> <p>"Poor African American men in this study had few safe arenas in which they could expansively explore the potentials of their developing masculinity" (2007: 171).</p>

	<p>The care of others reflects an Afro-Centric or model an “African collectivist paradigm (e.g., the African traditional value of regarding the needs of the individual as the needs of the group}” (2009: 119)</p> <p>As evidenced by these narratives. Black men both confirm and challenge hegemonic notions of masculinity. Perhaps what is most revealing is the need for Black men to be self-sufficient, self-efficacious, and independent” (2009: 119).</p>	<p>because they benefit from the advantages men in general gain from the overall subordination of women and other men (2009: 301).</p>	
--	---	--	--

Appendix A: Meaning units, a summary of selected qualitative meta-analyzed studies on Black masculinity, continued

Author(s)	McClure, 2006	Harper, 2004	Hunter & Davis, 1994
Research topic(s)	This research looked at how a historically Black fraternity helped its members to develop a masculine identity in contradiction to the negative stereotypes.	This research examined within-group alternative conceptualizations of masculinity.	This research sought to discover Black men's conceptualizations on manhood,
Methodology	Audio recorded semi-structured open-interviews were collected at a large PWI Southeastern University	This was a phenomenological study using face to face individual interviews, conducted at six predominantly White research universities in the Midwest.	Using convenience sampling, face-to-face private interviews were conducted in Central New York. Conceptualization methodology was used to represent their ideas of Black men.
Demographics	Twenty members of a historically Black fraternity, aged 19–23. All were at least sophomores; and came from middle to upper-middle class families.	Thirty-two high-achieving African American male undergraduates, with a mean GPA for the sample was 3.32. Participants were between the ages of 18-22 years old and single with no dependents.	Thirty-two Black men were recruited from local institutions such as churches and barbershops. Eighty-seven percent were 25 or older; slightly over 50% held a college or graduate degree. All were employed or was attending college.
Findings/ conclusion(s)/	<p>"The findings show evidence of the influence of two different types of masculinity, first a hegemonic model that is typically associated with White men but is primarily the result of a capitalist economic context with an emphasis on success, competition, and individualism. Secondly, an Afrocentric model that is largely due to the salience of race in identity construction for members of oppressed groups, with an emphasis on community and cooperation" (2006: 62).</p> <p>"Clearly, the members were committed to success and doing what it took to achieve success, both in the fraternity and on their own. This commitment reinforces the class-based nature of many of the requirements of the dominant masculine model" (2006: 65).</p> <p>A "...sense of cooperation is a clear deviation from an individualistic focus, is consistent with the</p>	<p>"The participants were convinced that activities in which they were engaged—such as, holding multiple leadership positions; achieving top academic honors in the classroom; and maintaining a high-profile status on campus—would not have made it into the African American undergraduate male portfolio of masculinity" (2004: 97).</p> <p>"By contrast, the participants in this study offered different definitions of masculinity. Though they too enjoyed playing recreational sports and pursuing romantic relationships (time permitting), the high achievers did not consider those activities paradigmatic examples of masculinity. Instead, their shared definition overwhelmingly included "taking care of business." For example, many participants talked about the importance of working hard to secure their futures, and handling the business that would protect them from dropping out or failing out of school. Failing to do well and having to return home to their mothers did not strike them as being very masculine, especially for men who called themselves adults" (2004: 98-99).</p>	<p>"Although it was often recognized that there were unique challenges to being a Black man, the central challenge of manhood was defined in terms of what they expected of themselves. And what men expected of themselves was framed not only by family role expectations but by their perspective on identity and the development of self, connections to family and community, and spirituality and worldview" (1994: 29).</p> <p>Three themes conceptualizing manhood are reported here: Identity and the Development of Self, Connections to family; and Spirituality and Humanism.</p> <p>Identity and the Development of Self: "Men felt that economic viability, particularly the ability to support one's self, was necessary for independence;" "Being totally accountable for personal actions and able to rectify bad situations one has created were articulated as cornerstones of maturity" "A sense of self direction-to have one's own mind and the free will to pursue the path chosen-was a central theme" (1994: 29).</p> <p>Connections to Family: "Beyond the self-regardless of age, and marital or family status-family was central to men's definition of manhood and part of what was perceived to give a man's life meaning" (1994: 31).</p>

	<p>concept of a fraternal brotherhood, and is also characteristic of the communal nature of an Afrocentric philosophy” (2006: 66).</p> <p>“The men utilize their fraternity membership in ways that reflect the Afrocentric model of cooperation and connectedness to the black community and more specifically to other males” (2006: 68).</p> <p>“The men in this study do not fit easily into either of the two models described here but instead move between the two” (2006: 69)</p>	<p>“They also strongly believed that leadership and community advancement had been historically associated with men” (2004: 99).</p> <p>“Regarding masculinity, the participants strongly believed that being a man had a lot to do with preparing to take care of a family ... Or how useful was a man who did not stand up for his family and attempt to make their lives better” (2004: 100).</p> <p>“It appears that committing one’s time to the advancement of the African American community and assuming responsibility for bringing about changes that would improve the quality of life for minority students were the primary ways by which the high-achievers were able to negotiate with their uninvolved male peers who would ultimately benefit from the improved campus conditions” (2004: 101).</p> <p>“It does appear, however, that the high-achievers held certain beliefs and aspired to roles that are consistent with traditional, mainstream White definitions of masculinity (i.e. provider, family man, and executive). At the same time, their motives were strikingly different. They were involved in leadership roles for selfless reasons and believed their work as student leaders was central to the advancement of the African American community on their campuses “(2004: 102).</p> <p>“There was no mention of solely personal gain or competing for the sake of simply being on top. This social commitment is inconsistent with the self-serving, ultra-competitive depiction of White men who subscribe to traditional definitions of masculinity. Moreover, the high-achievers’ views of masculinity were clearly alternative and inconsistent with those of fellow African American male peer” (2003: 102).</p>	<p>“There were three major components of men’s discussions about manhood in relation to family: (a) family connections and responsibilities, (b) relationships to women, and (c) family role expectations” (1994: 31-34)</p> <p>Spirituality and Humanism: “Men expressed a range of ideas and philosophies about being a man and one’s relationships to other human beings-ideas that included the importance of spiritual groundedness and connections to members of the human community. These constructs reflect men’s thinking about the relationship between the “I” and the “We” (1994: 35)</p> <p>“Men talked about equality among people and an approach to others that involves faith, caring, unselfishness, and respect” (1994: 35).</p> <p>“The extent to which these conceptions of manhood appear idyllic, we think, is a function of men attempting to grapple with what is truly important and defining about manhood, and to integrate notions about personal identity, social roles, and the demands and responsibilities of adulthood.” (1994: 36)</p> <p>“This work does counter the notion that viable and adaptive constructs of manhood have failed to develop in Black communities.” (1994: 36).</p> <p>“Manhood defined in multiple arenas and contexts both within and beyond the traditional notions of masculinity and the male role provide men with varied tools and avenues to define themselves and negotiate manhood. This multidimensional construction of manhood may serve as a cultural mechanism for adaptation and survival” (1994: 36-37).</p> <p>“Although Black males may be at risk for a number of social and economic ills, within this context of risk there is also survival. The conceptions of manhood reported here are a part of this survival” (1994: 37)</p>
--	---	--	--

Appendix B

MULTIPLE SEXUAL PARTNERING & HIV RISKS AMONG LOW INCOME HETEROSEXUAL BLACK MEN: SOCIALIZATION, SCRIPTS AND PRACTICES IN-DEPTH RESPONDENT PROTOCOL FOR INTERVIEWS WITH FOCAL SUBJECT

This study is about sexual “scripts,” or roles that you play – things you say and things you do – in your sexual relationships with women. I will ask you questions about social and sexual relationships, about condom use and drug use and sales, and about your present and prior family situations.

With recorder on: This is ethnographer [your name], with [participant code name & number]. Today is [DATE] and we are in [Brooklyn/Manhattan/etc.]. [Participant code name] is [living with partner 3 yrs or more/living with partner less than 3 yrs/does not live with main partner/has no main partner].

SECTION I: DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION

1. *How old are you?*
2. *Race*
3. *Ethnicity*
4. *Date of Birth*
5. Where were you born?
6. Where did you grow up?
7. How many sisters and brothers do you have? (Probes: Ages? Where are they now? Do any use drugs? Talk about them.) Do you all have the same two parents? If not, talk about this.
8. Who raised you?
9. What were your parents’ (the people who raised you) occupation(s) while you were growing up?
10. What are your parents’ (the people who raised you) highest education levels?
11. *How far in school did you go? (Probes: Have any problems in school – Academic? Social? Behavioral? Did you take any special training classes? How long? Did you complete training/get certified? Ever use that training?)*
12. *Have you ever been legally married? Are you married now? (If not, why not?) Do you live with someone now? (Probes: How long? Do you have children by that person?)*
13. *Have you ever been arrested? Discuss prior arrests and incarcerations (number of arrests, jail or prison time, length of sentence(s), types of crimes [violent/non-violent, property, drug, e.g.]).*

EMPLOYMENT

14. *What legal jobs have you held? (Probes: How long did you work? What was your weekly/biweekly pay? Positions held? Why did you leave?) Did you have taxes taken out of your pay?*
15. *What other ways have you earned money? (Probes: off-book employment, hustles) How did you come to do these things, and how did you learn how to do them?*
16. *What is your primary source of money now? How long have you been earning/receiving this? (Probes: job, family, friends, welfare, disability, hustle).*
17. *Have you ever received any type of public assistance? (Probes: unemployment, SSI, other disability, welfare). How long? Why?*
18. *What skills do you have? Have you ever used these skills to make a living?*

SECTION II: SOCIALIZATION

GROWING UP YEARS

Let's talk a little about your experiences while you were growing up.

19. *Who lived in the household you grew up in? (Probes: Talk about each person. Where are they now? What was the main source of income for the household?).*
20. *Did your biological mother play a part in your upbringing? (Talk about this.)*
21. *Did your biological father play a part in your upbringing? (Talk about this.)*
22. *Were you closer to your mother or father? Why? Talk about this. Describe your mother, your father.*
23. *What kinds of activities did you do with your family?*
24. *Did you experience being raised by a stepfather/stepmother, grandfather/grandmother, adoptive parents, foster parents and/or any other adult(s)? Talk about this.*
25. *Did any other males serve as father figures to you while you were growing up? (Probes: Who? How Related? Uncles? Grandfathers? Talk about the experiences.)*
26. *While growing up, what did you see as the role of the father in the family? How about the role of the mother? Where did you learn that? And is it what you experienced?*
27. *What did you learn about manhood/womanhood while growing up? Who did you learn this from?*
28. *How did your father treat your mother? How did your mother treat your father?*
29. *Did your mother and/or father have an outside intimate relationship that you know of? (i.e., boyfriend or girlfriend) (If yes, was the relationship secretive or open? How did it affect you at the time? Do you think it has any effect on you now?)*
30. *While you were growing up, did your mother talk about your father with you? Talk about this. Did your father talk about your mother to you? Talk about this. (Probes: What were the complaints? Praise? Discussion about marriage? Cheating? Etc.)*
31. *Did your father have children with other women besides your mother? Talk to me about this.*
32. *Did your mother have children with other men besides your father? Talk to me about this.*

33. Did your father treat all of his children the same? Did your mother treat all her children the same?
34. Did your mother change mates while you were growing up? (Probe: How often? Talk about this).
35. *What was the neighborhood like you grew up in? (Probes: Was it safe? Was it stable – did neighbors know each other? Who lived there? Was there violence?)*
36. *Who did you hang out with? (Why those people? Where did you hang out? What did you do?)*
37. *Was there anyone you looked up to in your neighborhood? Talk about this person. (Why did you look up to him/her?)*
38. Did any of your family members use alcohol/drugs while you were growing up? Who? Types of substance? How often? How did this affect you? What did you think about it? What did people around you say about it?
39. Did any of your family members sell drugs or alcohol while you were growing up? Tell me about this? Did their selling affect you in any way? How?
40. In what ways did adult females talk about males as you can remember? And how did they act towards them? (Probes: were they supportive? hostile? neutral? Did they talk about them concerning sex? money? work?)
41. *In what ways did adult males talk about females as you can remember? And how did they act towards them? (Probes: were they supportive? hostile? neutral? Did they talk about them concerning sex? money? work?)*

CHILDHOOD SEX EDUCATION

Let's now talk about things you learned while growing up:

42. At what age did you learn about drugs or alcohol? What did you learn? Who taught you? (Probe: Did your parents or guardians teach you about drugs or alcohol? What? (Probes: Forbidden? Accepted under certain conditions?).
43. *At what age did you learn about sex? What did you learn? Who taught you? (Did your parents or guardians ever teach you anything about sex? Who? What was taught? Talk about this).*
44. At what age did you learn about birth control? What were you taught? Who taught you? Talk about this. Did you learn from any parent or guardian?
45. At what age did you learn about sexually transmitted diseases and HIV/AIDS? What were you taught? Who taught you? Did you learn from any parent or guardian?
46. What did your parent(s)/people who raised you teach you about being a male? (What was a male supposed to do and not supposed to do? What was seen as appropriate behavior?) What did they teach you about what to expect from females?
47. *What different ways did you see men present themselves to women? (Probes: Did you learn about being a player, or drug seller, or those with lots of women?)*

48. Did religion play a role in what or how you thought about sex and about girls? Talk about that. Did you attend any religious services? (Probes: Why? Were you required to go? Who took you?).
49. Did you have household duties to do? How often? Talk about this. (What about your brothers and sisters? Were they given duties also? Were the male duties different from those of the girls? How were the boys treated? How were the girls treated?).
50. Did you feel loved while growing up? (What did your parent[s] do to make you feel like this? Who was it – mother or father? Others?)?
51. Were you hugged and kissed while growing up? (Probes: By whom? How often? If not, why not?).
52. *To whom did you go to help you solve your problems (i.e., when you had questions) while growing up? (Probes: Relative? Friend? What kinds of problems? Talk about this.)*

SECTION III: SEXUAL SCRIPTS/PARTNERING

PRESENT LIVING ARRANGEMENTS

Let's now talk about your living arrangements at this point in time:

53. Do you have a mate (female sexual partner) with whom you are currently living? Yes ____
No ____
54. *How long have you been living with your mate?*

____ 3 years or more	____ does not live with main partner
____ less than 3 years	____ does not have a main partner
55. Please give your mate a code name, and tell me her ethnicity, age, and year of birth?
56. *Talk about your household. Who is the leaseholder? Who pays the rent? Who is the head of household?*
57. *Who lives in your household? How are they related to you (and your mate)? Ages?*
58. How did you become a part of (incorporated into) this household? (Circumstances: i.e., “spent the night,” “moved in with a few clothes and other personal effects,” “drugs,” etc.).
59. *What do (or did) you specifically bring to the household? To the relationship? To the kids? (money, sex, drugs, chores [cook, clean, babysit], protection, “Any is better than none,” companionship).*
60. Where were you living before the current living arrangement? (i.e., jail/prison, shelter, TC/other drug treatment program, boot camp, mother, family, homeless, etc. Probe for details.)
61. *Within the past five years, how many different households have you lived in? Why did you leave each one? (evicted, left on own, broke up, put out by spouse).*

SEXUAL SCRIPTS

Now I want to have you talk about several “scripts” with which you may be familiar. Scripts are roles that you play – things you say and things you do – in your sexual relationships with women.

62. I’m going to throw out a few terms and ask you if you’ve heard of them and what they mean: player ...dog...lover...pimp...courting...trick...gentleman...prostitute...being on the prowl. Tell me about them.
63. What are your personal scripts? Describe your sense of masculine identity. When do you see yourself in these scripts? Can you suggest other scripts or influences you use to seek out other sexual partners in addition to your current mate? Given your own scripts, what traits are you looking for in women?
64. Talk about paying for sex. Have you ever paid a woman for sex? Has a woman paid you? What do you pay with (cash, drugs, other goods)? Tell me how that works.
65. *What do you think of the idea of being faithful and only having sex with one female partner? Is that common? How are faithful men seen by others?*
66. How often do you have sex with your mate? (Probe: vaginal? anal? oral?)
67. How does your mate respond to what you say and do sexually?
68. *[If formerly incarcerated:] How does your history of incarceration affect your ability to meet women?*

MULTIPLE SEXUAL PARTNERS

69. *Excluding your current mate, with how many women have you had sex in your lifetime? How many women in the past two years? How old are they? How many in past 30 days? What are their ages? How many have you had vaginal or oral sex with? How many have you had anal sex with?*
70. *Why do you have more than one sex partner?*
71. What is your sexual appetite? Do all of your women satisfy it, or do you have different women to satisfy different appetites?
72. Do you conceal and/or deny having sex with other women from your current mate? Why do you do this?
73. *Have you experienced violence with any of your female partners?*
74. Talk about: Being on the prowl. What does this mean to you? How do you do it?
75. Do you know whether your mate has sex with other men or women? How many? How do you know? How do you feel about it?
76. What puts you in the mood for having sex? Do you read sex magazines? Go to strip clubs? Watch porno videos? Use the internet? Talk about your sexual desires and fantasies? How do these affect your intentions to find a willing sex partner (other than your mate)?
77. Excluding your current mate, think about a woman with whom you had sex recently. Give her a code name? Talk about where you met her, how you located and interacted with her? How long before you and she had intercourse? Where did that first occur? Was this a “one

night stand?" Or have you had sex with her again? Do you think you will have sex with her in the future?

78. Talk about where you go to find women you are likely to have sex with? (Probes: Community meetings? Bars/clubs? Hip hop/rap events? Sex venues?) Do you use different techniques in different places?
79. Are there certain types of women you seek out and attempt to have sex with? (Probe: Specific ages, backgrounds, smoke/not smoke, drug users, sex workers, etc.)? How often are you able to have sex with women you meet?
80. Talk about: The types of women you generally avoid? Under what circumstances would you refuse to have sex with a woman who came on to you? Why?
81. How do drugs and alcohol influence your choice of sexual partners?
82. Do you or have you exchanged sex to get drugs? To get money? Or anything else? Tell me about this.
83. How many of your sexual partners use drugs? (Probe: What type of drug?)
84. Talk about your condom use: Do you usually have a condom with you? Where do you usually keep them? What types of sex do you use them for? How often? How would being high or drunk affect your likelihood of using a condom?
85. What types of sexual activity do you participate in: vaginal, anal, oral, etc. (And which are important to use condoms)? Which are not acceptable? And Why?
86. How many concurrent sexual partners do you currently have? Talk to me about this. (How did this happen? Do they know about each other? How do you keep them apart? What do they feel about this situation if they know about each other?)
87. Do you know other men who have several female sex partners? Do you talk to each other about this? Tell me more about this.

SAFER SEX AND CONDOM USE/NONUSE

88. What and where have you learned about safer sex? Can you tell me what you have learned?
89. Do you and your current mate discuss various ways to have safe sex? Talk about what you discuss and how this is arranged?
90. Do you use condoms with your current mate? Why or why not? How often do you and your mate use condoms? What would regular condom use mean for your relationship with your mate?
91. Does she use birth control (pills, IUDs, other means)? Do you use condoms for birth control?
92. Excluding your current mate, have you been in a situation where not using a condom has meant not having sex? Talk about how you talk about condoms with your partners.
93. Excluding your current mate, talk to me about a recent sex partner where you used a condom. Why did you think you needed a condom? Did you or she suggest using a condom? What happened? How did that affect the sex act? Did you have sex with her before or after this occasion?

94. Excluding your current partner, talk to me about a recent sex partner where you did not use a condom. Did you or she suggest using a condom? Did you argue about it? How did that affect the sex act? Did you have sex with her before or after this occasion?
95. Does HIV/AIDS influence your choice of women? How? Talk about this.
96. Do you use condoms with some women, but not with others? Talk about how you think about this.
97. How does the widespread availability of condoms influence you? Do you get them free from offices, clinics, or outreach programs? Or do you purchase them? Does this influence whether you have one available or on your person?
98. In your opinion, how does condom availability influence people's sexual practices?

SECTION IV: DRUG USE/SALES

Let's now talk about your experiences with drugs.

99. Tell me about the first time that you took any drug or alcohol. (Probes: How old were you? What kind of drugs? Where were you at the time? Where did you get it from? What did you take next? How long did you use each substance? How often did you use each?)
100. What or who influenced you to use drugs? Talk about this.
101. What is your favorite drug now? Why? (Probes: What do you like about it? How often do you use it? Whom do you use it with? How do you use it? How do you get it?).
102. Does your current mate use drugs? Do you use drugs together? Is alcohol and drug use an important part of your relationship? How does the use of drugs impact upon your sexual desire, negotiations regarding sex, and frequency of sex?
103. Do you have sex when high? Talk about this. Do you use condoms or not? Who do you generally have sex with while high?
104. *Have you ever sold drugs? Talk about which drugs you sell and how long you have done so? Have you provided female drug users with drugs in exchange for sex? If so, what kinds of sex have you had? Oral, straight, or anal sex? Talk about a recent occasion in which this happened?*
105. Talk about your relationship with female drug users. Do you have sex with them? Tell me about that.

SECTION V: PARENTHOOD

106. How many children do you have? Are they your biological children? (Probes: Ages? Sex? Where are they now? Any drug use? What are they doing now? How do they earn a living?).
107. *How many women have children by you? Where are these women now? Do you still have a relationship with them? Where are the children now? Do you support them? What kind of support do you provide? How many of them do you support?*
108. Does your current mate have children from previous relationships? Talk about how you relate to your mate's children. What do you do with them?
109. Do you talk to your children about sex? What do you specifically teach them about sex?

CONCLUSION

110. How do you feel about this interview? Are there any questions that you feel I should have asked but did not? Are there any issues that we did not cover but you feel are important?

Appendix C

MULTIPLE SEXUAL PARTNERING & HIV RISKS AMONG LOW INCOME HETEROSEXUAL BLACK MEN: SOCIALIZATION, SCRIPTS AND PRACTICES IN-DEPTH FOLLOW-UP PROTOCOL FOR INTERVIEWS WITH FOCAL SUBJECT

This study is about sexual “scripts,” or roles that you play – things you say and things you do – in your sexual relationships with women. I will ask you questions about social and sexual relationships, about condom use and drug use and sales, and about your present and prior family situations.

With recorder on: This is ethnographer [your name], with [participant code name & number]. Today is [DATE] and we are in [Brooklyn/Manhattan/etc.] to conduct [continue] the first [second] follow-up interview. The last time we met was [DATE of previous session].

SECTION I: DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION

12. Are you legally married now? (If not, why not?) Do you live with someone now? (Probes: How long? Do you have children by that person?).
13. Have you been arrested since we last met? Discuss any arrests and incarcerations (number of arrests, jail or prison time, length of sentence(s), types of crimes [violent/non-violent, property, drug, e.g.]).
- F1. Has your employment situation changed since we last met? (Probes: What is your weekly/biweekly pay? Position held?) Do you have taxes taken out of your pay? If not, why not?
16. What is your primary source of money now? (Probes: job, family, friends, welfare, disability, hustle). Has that changed since the last time we met?
15. What other ways do you earn money? (Probes: off-book employment, hustles) Are these the same things you did before? How did you come to do these things, and how did you learn how to do them?

SECTION III: SEXUAL SCRIPTS/PARTNERING

PRESENT LIVING ARRANGEMENTS

Let’s now talk about your living arrangements at this point in time:

53. Do you have a mate (female sexual partner) with whom you are currently living? Yes ____
No ____
Is it the same person you were living with last time we talked? Yes ____ No ____ [If NO, tell me about this.]
54. How long have you been living with your mate?

____ 3 years or more ____ does not live with main partner

____ less than 3 years ____ does not have a main partner

55. Please give your mate a code name, and tell me her ethnicity, age, and year of birth?

56. Talk about your household. Who is the leaseholder? Who pays the rent? Who is the head of household?

57. Who lives in your household? How are they related to you (and your mate)? Ages?

58. How did you become a part of (incorporated into) this household? (Circumstances: i.e., “spent the night,” “moved in with a few clothes and other personal effects,” “drugs,” etc.).

59. What do (or did) you specifically bring to the household? To the relationship? To the kids? (money, sex, drugs, chores [cook, clean, babysit], protection, “Any is better than none,” companionship).

60. Where were you living before the current living arrangement? (i.e., jail/prison, shelter, TC/other drug treatment program, boot camp, mother, family, homeless, etc. Probe for details.) Why did you leave?

SEXUAL SCRIPTS

Now I want to have you talk about several “scripts” with which you may be familiar. Scripts are roles that you play – things you say and things you do – in your sexual relationships with women.

62. I’m going to throw out a few terms and ask you if you’ve heard of them and what they mean: gangsta ...creepin’ ...slider ... baiting ... spittin’ G ... gigolo. Tell me about them. (Probe: What is the difference between prostitute and gigolo?) Are there other terms like these that you use? Are any of these terms also used by women?

F2. Now I’m going to mention a few terms that are used to describe women, and ask you to tell me if you’ve heard of them and what they mean: smut ... jump-off ... slimeball ... ma ... pop ... dirt ... shorty ... dirty girls.

F3. Since the last interview, has anything changed in the way you approach women? Tell me about this.

F4. What does the word masculinity mean to you? Where did you learn about it? Are you living this definition of masculinity? (If YES, How?) (If NO, How do you feel about that?) What about manhood? Define that. Are you living that definition? Describe behavior that is not considered masculine. (Explore the differences.)

F5. Does having sex with several women make you feel like more of a man? Tell me about that.

F6 Do you approach women differently when you’re in a group vs. when you’re alone? Talk to me about that.

F7. Do you approach women differently when *they’re* in a group vs. when they’re alone? Talk to me about that.

64. Talk about paying for sex. Have you paid a woman for sex since our last interview? Has a woman paid you? What do you pay with (cash, drugs, other goods)? Tell me how that works.

66. How often do you have sex with your mate compared with your other sex partners? (Probe: vaginal? anal? oral?)
68. [If incarcerated since last interview:] How does your recent incarceration experience affect your ability to meet women? (Probes: Does it affect how you present yourself? Does it affect how women respond to you?)

MULTIPLE SEXUAL PARTNERS

69. Excluding your current mate, with how many women have you had sex with since our last meeting? How many have you had vaginal or oral sex with? How many have you had anal sex with?
- F8. Have these other partners changed since the last interview?
70. *Why do you have more than one sex partner? How did this come about? How do you add additional partners? Describe your techniques for adding new partners.*
71. What is your sexual appetite? Has your appetite changed since last time? Do all of your women satisfy it, or do you have different women to satisfy different appetites?
72. *Do you conceal and/or deny having sex with other women from your current mate? Tell me about this. Have you ever gotten caught? What happened? Tell me about it.*
73. *Have you experienced violence with any of your female partners since we last met? What kind? Any sexual violence? Talk to me about this.*
75. Do you know whether your mate has sex with other men or women? How many? How do you know? How do you feel about it?
76. What puts you in the mood for having sex? Do you read sex magazines? Go to strip clubs? Watch porno videos? Use the internet? Do you have any new sexual desires and fantasies? Do you use toys? How do your fantasies affect your intentions to find a willing sex partner (other than your mate)?
77. Excluding your current mate, think about a woman with whom you had sex since the last interview. Give her a code name? Talk about where you met her, how you interacted with her? How long before you and she had intercourse? Where did that first occur? Was this a “one night stand?” Or have you had sex with her again? Do you think you will have sex with her in the future? Is this your usual pattern when you add a new sex partner?
78. Since we last met, are you going to any new places to find women you are likely to have sex with? (Probes: Community meetings? Bars/clubs? Hip hop/rap events? Sex venues?) Do you use different techniques in different places?
79. Are there certain types of women you seek out and attempt to have sex with? (Probe: Specific ages, backgrounds, smoke/not smoke, drug users, sex workers, etc.)? How often are you able to have sex with women you meet?
- F9. When you meet someone you want to have sex with, how do you go about getting her into bed?
84. *Talk about your condom use: Do you usually have a condom with you? Where do you usually keep them? What types of sex do you use them for? How often? What types of sexual*

activity do you participate in: vaginal, anal, oral, etc. (And which are important to use condoms)? Which are not acceptable? And Why?

86. How many sexual partners do you currently have? Talk to me about this. (How did this happen? Do they know about each other? How do you keep them apart? What do they feel about this situation if they know about each other?)

SAFER SEX AND CONDOM USE/NONUSE

88. Have you learned anything new about safer sex since last time we met? Tell me about what you have learned?
89. Do you and your current sexual partners discuss various ways to have safe sex? Talk about what you discuss and how this is arranged?
90. Do you use condoms with your mate? Why or why not? How often do you and your mate use condoms? What kind do you use? Do you use them for disease prevention?
- F10. Have your safe sex practices changed since the last time we met? How? Talk about this.
91. Do you use condoms for birth control?
92. Excluding your current mate, have you been in a situation where not using a condom has meant not having sex since our last interview? Talk about how you talk about condoms with your partners.
93. Excluding your current mate, talk to me about a recent sex partner – since the last interview - where you used a condom. Why did you think you needed a condom? Did you or she suggest using a condom? What happened? How did that affect the sex act? Did you have sex with her before or after this occasion?
94. Excluding your current mate, talk to me about a recent sex partner – since the last interview - where you did not use a condom. Did you or she suggest using a condom? Did you argue about it? How did that affect the sex act? Did you have sex with her before or after this occasion?
- F11. Have you ever been tested for HIV/AIDS? Why? How many times?
- F12. Has your mate been tested for HIV/AIDS? Why? How do you know?

SECTION IV: DRUG USE/SALES

Let's now talk about your experiences with drugs.

101. What is your favorite drug now? Has it changed since we last met? Why? (Probes: What do you like about it? How often do you use it? Whom do you use it with? How do you use it? How do you get it?)
102. Does your current mate use drugs? Do you use drugs together? Is alcohol and drug use an important part of your relationship? How does the use of drugs impact upon your sexual desire, negotiations regarding sex, and frequency of sex? Does it affect your chances of practicing safer sex?

103. Have you had sex when high since we last met? Talk about this. Do you use condoms or not?
104. Since we last met, have you sold drugs? Which ones?
- 104a. Since we last met, have you given women drugs in exchange for sex? If so, what kinds of sex have you had? Oral, straight, or anal sex? In these cases, do you practice safer sex? Talk about a recent occasion in which this happened?
- F13. How many of your sexual partners use alcohol or other drugs (including marijuana)? (Probe: what type of drugs?)

SECTION V: PARENTHOOD

106. Have you had any children since we last met? (Probes: Ages? Sex? Where are they now? Any drug use? Where are they now?).
107. How many women have children by you? Where are these women now? Do you still have a relationship with them? Where are the children now? Do you support them? What kind of support do you provide? How many of them do you support?
108. Does your current mate have children from previous relationships? Talk about how you relate to your mate's children. What do you do with them?
109. Do you talk to your children about sex? What do you specifically teach them about sex?

CONCLUSION

110. *How do you feel about this interview? Are there any questions that you feel I should have asked but did not? Are there any issues that we did not cover but you feel we should have?*

REFERENCES

- Adams, J. (2007). Respect and reputation: The construction of masculinity in poor African American men. *Journal of African American Studies*, 11:157–172.
- Akbar, N. (1990). *Visions for Black Men*. Tallahassee, FL: Mind Productions.
- Alexander, M. (2010). *The New Jim Crow: Mass Incarceration in the Age Of Colorblindness*. New York: The New Press.
- Anbinder, T. (2001). *Five Points: The 19th-Century New York City Neighborhood That Invented Tap Dance, Stole Elections, and Became The World's Most Notorious Slum*. New York: Simon and Schuster.
- Anderson, E. (2011). Against the wall: Poor, young, black, and male. In *Against the Wall: Poor Young, Black, and Male*. Pp: 1-27. C. West (Forward) and E. Anderson (Editor). University of Pennsylvania Press.
- (1999; 1994). *Code Of The Street: Decency, Violence, And The Moral Life of the Inner City*. New York: Norton.
- Archer, L., Pratt, S., & Phillips, D. (2001). Working-class men's constructions of masculinity and negotiations of (non)participation in higher education. *Gender and Education*, 13: 431–449.
- Archer, L., & Yamashita. H. (2003). Theorizing inner-city masculinities: 'Race', class, gender and education. *Gender and Education*, 15: 115–132.
- Armour, J., & Hammond, S. (2009, January). Minority youth in the juvenile justice system: Disproportionate minority contact. In *Washington, DC: National Conference of State Legislatures*.
- Armstrong D, Gosling A, Weinman J, Marteau T. (1997). The place of inter-rater reliability in qualitative research: an empirical study. *Sociology*, 31:597-606.
- Baldwin, J. (1974). *If Beale Street Could Talk*. Penguin Group (USA) Inc.
- Banks, R., Eberhardt, J., & Ross, L. (2006). Discrimination and implicit bias in a racially unequal society. *California Law Review*, 94: 1169-1190.
- Barnett, T., Rowley, S., Zimmerman, M., Vansadia, P., & Howard Caldwell, C. (2011). A longitudinal study of household change on African American adolescents. *Journal of Community Psychology*, 39: 303-315.
- Battle, S. (2002). African American males at a crossroad. *Journal of Health & Social Policy*, 15:

- Beale-Spencer, M., Fegley, S., Harpalani, V., & Seaton, G. (2004). Understanding hypermasculinity in context: A theory-driven analysis of urban adolescent males' coping responses. *Research in Human Development*, 1: 229–257
- Beck, R. (1987). *Iceberg Slim, Pimp: The Story of My Life*. CA: Holloway House.
- Benjamin, L. (1983). The dog theory: Black male/female conflict. *Western Journal of Black Studies*, 7:49-55.
- Benoit, E., Newsome, V., Dunlap., E. & Walker, J, (2014). Sexual scripts that promote multiple concurrent sex partners among low-income African American men. Publication pending.
- Biernacki, P., and D. Waldorf. (1981). Snowball sampling: Problems, techniques and chain referral sampling. *Sociological Methods and Research*, 10: 141-163.
- Bogardus, E. (1947). Measurement of personal-group relations. *Sociometry*, 10: 306–311.
- Bonczar, T., & Beck, A., (1997). *Lifetime likelihood of going to State or Federal prison*. Special Report, NCJ 160092. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics.
- Bowleg, L., Lucas, K., & Tschann, J. (2004). “The ball was always in his court:” An exploratory analysis of relationship scripts, sexual scripts, and condom use among African American women. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 28:70-82.
- Boyd-Franklin, N., Franklin, A. & Toussaint, P. (2000). *Boys into Men: Raising our African American teenage sons*. New York: Dutton.
- Brewer, R., & Heitzeg, N. (2008). The racialization of crime and punishment: Criminal justice, colorblind racism, and the political economy of the prison industrial complex. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 51: 625–644.
- Brod, H. (Editor). (1992). *The Making of Masculinities: The New Men's Studies*. Forward by, C. Stimpson. New York: Chapman and Hall, Inc.
- Broidy, L., & Agnew, R. (1997). Gender and crime: A general strain theory perspective. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 34: 275-306.
- Brown, A., & Donnorb, J. (2011). Toward a new narrative on Black males, education, and public policy. *Race Ethnicity and Education*, 14: 17-32.
- Bruce, S., & Yearley, S. (2006). *The Sage Dictionary of Sociology*. Sage.
- Buchanan, C., Maccoby, E., & Dornbusch, S. (1996). *Adolescents After Divorce*. Cambridge:

Harvard University Press.

- Bumpass, L., Martin, T., & Sweet, J. (1991). The impact of family background and early marital factors on marital disruption. *Journal of Family Issues*, 12: 22-42.
- Bumpass, L. & Sweet, J. (1989). Children's experience in single-parent families: Implications of cohabitation and marital transitions. *Family Planning Perspectives*, 21: 256-60.
- Bureau of Labor Statistics. (2011). Table A-2: *Employment Status of The Civilian Population by Race, Sex, And Age*. <http://www.bls.gov/news.release/empst.t02.htm>.
- Bush, V. (1999). Am I a man?: A literature review engaging the sociohistorical dynamics of Black manhood in the United States. *Western Journal of Black Studies*, 23: 49-57.
- Cao, L., Adams, A. T., & Jensen, V. J. (2000). The empirical status of the black-subculture-of-violence thesis. *The System in Black and White*, editors, Marcowitz, M. and Jones-Brown, D. Greenwood, West Point, CT, 47-61.
- Carson, C. (2001). *The Autobiography of Martin Luther King, Jr.* Hachette, Diggital, Inc.
- Case, P. (2008). The relationship of race and criminal behavior: Challenging cultural explanations for a structural problem. *Critical Sociology*, 34: 213-238.
- Cassidy, E., & Stevenson, Jr., H. (2005). They wear the mask: Hypervulnerability and hypermasculine aggression among African American males in an urban remedial disciplinary school. *Journal of Aggression, Maltreatment & Trauma*, 11: 53-74.
- Caster, P. (2008). Prisons, race, and masculinity in twentieth-century U.S. literature and film. In *Black Performance and Cultural Criticism*. V. Lee and E. Johnson, series editors. Columbus: The Ohio State University Press.
- Caudill, J., Morris, R., El Sayed, S., Yun, M., & DeLisi, M. (2013). Pathways through the juvenile Justice System: Predictors of Formal Disposition. *Youth Violence and Juvenile Justice*. 11: 183-195.
- Chaney, C. (2009). Boys to men: How perceptions of manhood influence the romantic partnerships of black men. *The Western Journal of Black Studies*, 33: 110-112.
- Cheng, C. (1999). Marginalized masculinities and hegemonic masculinity: An introduction. *Journal of Men's Studies*, 7: 295-315.
- Cleaver, E. (1999). *Soul on Ice*. New York: Delta.
- Cockburn, C. (1986) *Machinery of Dominance*, London: Pluto Press.
- Coles, T. (2009). Negotiating the field of masculinity the production and reproduction of

- multiple dominant masculinities. *Men and Masculinities*, 12: 30-44.
- Comstock, G., & Paik H. (1994). The Effects of television violence on antisocial behavior: A meta- analysis1. *Communication Research*, 4 21: 516-546.
- Connell, R. (2000). *The Men and The Boys*. Sydney: Allen and Unwin.
- (1995). *Masculinities*. Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- (1989). Cool guys, swots and wimps: the interplay of masculinity and education, *Oxford Review of Education*, 15: 291–203.
- (1982). Class, patriarchy, and Sartre's theory of practice. *Theory and Society*, 11: 305-320.
- Connell, R., & Messerschmidt, J. (2005). Hegemonic masculinity: Rethinking the concept. *Gender and Society*, 19: 829-859.
- Cools, J. (2008). A profeminist approach to African American male characters. *The Journal of Men's Studies*, 16: 32-40.
- Cooper, F. (2013). We are always already imprisoned: Hyper-Incarceration and Black male identity performance. *Boston University Law Review*, 93: 1185-1204.
- (2009). Our first unisex president? Black masculinity and Obama's feminine side. *Denver University Law Review*, 86: 633-661.
- (2006). Against Bipolar Masculinity, 38 *University of California, Davis, Law Review*, 83: 853-906.
- Couch, K. & Fairlie, R. (2010). Last hired, first fired? Black-white unemployment and the business cycle. *Demography*, 47: 227-247.
- Cose, E. (1993). *The Rage of a Privileged Class*. New York: HarperCollins.
- Covington, S., & Bloom, B. (2003). Gendered Justice: Women in the Criminal Justice System. In *Gendered Justice: Addressing Female Offenders*. Barbara E. Bloom, Editor. Durham, NC: Carolina Academic Press, pp. 3-23.
- DiLulio, J. (2005). My Black crime problem, and ours. *Race, crime, and justice: A reader*, 73-86.
- DuBois, W.E.B. (2001). *Souls of Black Folk*. Rebound By Sagebrush.
- (1995). *On Sociology and the Black Community*. University Of Chicago Press.

- Duck, W. (2009). Black male sexual politics: Avoidance of HIV/AIDS testing as a masculine health practice. *Journal of African American Studies*, 13: 283–306.
- Dunifon, R. & Kowaleski-Jones, L. (2002). Who's in the house? Race differences in cohabitation, single parenthood, and child development. *Child Development*, 73: 1249-1264.
- Dunlap, E., Benoit, E., & Graves, L. (2013). Recollections of sexual socialisation among marginalized heterosexual black men. *Sexual Education*, 13: 560-572.
- Dunlap, E., Golub, A., & Benoit, E. (2010). The invisible partners: Cohabiting males as ‘caring daddies’ in inner-city ‘mother-only’ households. In *Family life: Roles, bonds and impact*. Edited by F. Columbus. Pp. 33-54. Hauppauge, New York: Nova Science Publishers.
- Dunlap, E., Golub, A., & Johnson, B. (2006). The severely-distressed African-American family in the Crack Era: Empowerment is not enough. *Journal of Sociology and Social Welfare*, 33: 115-139.
- Duster, T. (1987). Crime, youth unemployment, and the black urban underclass. *Crime & Delinquency*, 33: 300-316.
- Dyke, L., & Murphy, S. (2006). How we define success: A qualitative study of what matters most to women and men. *Sex Roles*, 55:357–371.
- Eberhardt, J. L., Goff, P. A., Purdie, V. J., & Davies, P. G. (2004). Seeing black: race, crime, and visual processing. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 87: 876.
- Eberhardt, J. L., Davies, P. G., Purdie-Vaughns, V. J., & Johnson, S. L. (2006). Looking deathworthy perceived stereotypicality of black defendants predicts capital-sentencing outcomes. *Psychological Science*, 17: 383-386.
- Eckstein, J. (2010). Masculinity of men communicating abuse victimization. *Culture, Society & Masculinities*, 2: 62-74.
- Ellison, R. (1989). *Invisible man*. NY: Vintage Books.
- Ernst, F. A., Francis, R. A., Nevels, H., & Lemeh, C. A. (1991). A gender-specific phenomenon? Condemnation of homosexuality in the black community: A gender-specific phenomenon? *Archives of Sexual Behavior*. 20: 579-585.
- Fagan, J., & Davies, G. (2000). Street stops and broken windows: Terry, race, and disorder in New York City. *Fordham Urban Law Journal*, 28: 457-504.
- Federal Bureau of Justice Statistics (2002). Federal Bureau of Justice Statistics

Recidivism Study.

<http://www.cor.state.pa.us/stats/lib/stats/BJS%20Recidivism%20Study.pdf>.

Finney, C., & Oliver, W. (2006). *Domestic Violence and Prisoner Reentry: Experiences of African American Women and Men*. Vera Institute of Justice.

Fox, J. & Zawitz, W. (2012). "Trends by Race," *Homicide Trends in the U.S.* (Washington, DC: Bureau of Justice Statistics, U.S. Department of Justice, 2010), accessed November 2, 2012, <http://bjs.ojp.usdoj.gov/content/homicide/race.cfm>.

Franklin, C. (1986). Conceptual and logical issues in theory and research related to Black masculinity. *The Western Journal of Black Studies*, 10: 161-166.

(1984). *The Changing Definition of Masculinity*. NY: Plenum Press.

Frazier, E.F. (1932). *The Negro Family in Chicago*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Freeman, R. (2003). *Can we Close The Revolving Door? Recidivism vs. Employment of Ex-Offenders in the U.S.* The Urban Institute Reentry Roundtable Discussion Paper: <http://www.urban.org/publications/410857.html>.

Gabbidon, S., & Greene, H. (2013). *Race and crime*, 3rd ed. Sage: California.

Garfield, G. (2010). *Through Our Eyes: African American men's experiences or race, gender, and violence*. New Jersey: Rutgers University Press.

Gibbs, J. T. (1988). *Young, Black and Male in America: An endangered species*. New York: Auburn House.

Goff, P. A., Eberhardt, J. L., Williams, M. J., & Jackson, M. C. (2008). Not yet human: Implicit knowledge, historical dehumanization, and contemporary consequences. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 94: 292-306.

Greene, H., Polzer, K., & Lavin-Loucks, D. (2006). Reentry and Transition in Dallas, Texas. *Williams Review*, 33-62.

Gross, S. & Shaffer, M. (2012). Exonerations in the United States, 1989 – 2012. Report by the National Registry of Exonerations. *University of Michigan Law School and the Center on Wrongful Convictions at Northwestern University School of Law*. http://www.law.umich.edu/special/exoneration/Documents/exonerations_us_1989_2012_full_report.pdf

Hacker, A. (2003). *Two Nations: Black and White, Separate, Hostile, Unequal*. New York: Scriber.

Hall, S. (2002). Daubing the drudges of fury Men, violence and the piety of the 'Hegemonic

- masculinity' thesis. *Theoretical Criminology*, 6: 35-61.
- Harcourt, B. (1998). Reflecting on the subject: A critique of the social influence conception of deterrence, the broken windows theory, and order-maintenance policing New York style. *Michigan Law Review*, 291-389.
- Harper, S. (2004). The measure of a man: Conceptualizations of masculinity among high-achieving African American male college students. *Berkeley Journal of Sociology*, 48: 89-107. <http://works.bepress.com/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1004&context=sharper>
- Harris, F., Palmer, R., & Struve, L. (2011). "Cool Posing" on Campus: A Qualitative Study of Masculinities and Gender Expression among Black Men at a Private Research Institution. *The Journal of Negro Education*, 80: 47-62.
- Hartney, C. & Vuong, L. (2009). Racial and ethnic disparities in the US criminal justice system. National Council on Crime and Delinquency, March. http://www.nccdglobal.org/sites/default/files/publication_pdf/created-equal.pdf.
- Hattery, A., & Smith, E. (2008). Incarceration: A tool for racial segregation and labor exploitation. *Race, Gender and Class*. *Race, Gender & Class*, 15: 79-97.
- Heidensohn, F., & Gelsthorpe, L. (2007). Gender and crime. *The Oxford handbook of criminology*, 381-420.
- Henderson, J. (1994). Masculinity and crime: The implications of a gender-conscious approach to working with young men involved in joyriding, *Social Action*, 2: 19-26.
- Henderson-King, E., & Nisbett, R. (1996). Anti-Black prejudice as a function of exposure to the negative behavior of a single black person. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 71: 654-664.
- Hetey, R. C., & Eberhardt, J. L. (2014). Racial disparities in incarceration increase acceptance of punitive policies. *Psychological Science*. 25: 1949-1954.
- hooks, b. (2004). *We Real Cool: Black Men and Masculinity*. New York University Press.
- Hoskins, L. (1992). Eurocentrism vs. Afrocentrism: A geopolitical linkage analysis. *Journal of Black Studies*, 23: 247-257.
- Hsia, H. M., & Hamparian, D. M. (1998). *Disproportionate minority confinement: 1997 update*. US Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention. <https://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles/170606.pdf>.
- Hunter, A., & Davis, J. (1994). Hidden voices of Black men: The meaning, structure, and complexity of manhood. *Journal of Black Studies*, 25: 20-40.

- (1992). Constructing gender: An exploration of Afro-American men's conceptualization of manhood. *Gender & Society*, 6: 464-479.
- Incarcerated America. (2003). *Human Rights Watch Backgrounder*.
<http://backspace.com/notes/images/us042903.pdf>.
- Jackson, G. (2010). Soledad Brother: The Prison Letters of George Jackson.
<http://libcom.org/files/soledad-brother-the-prison-letters-of-george-jackson.pdf>.
- Jackson, R. L. & Dangerfield, C. (2002). Defining black masculinity as cultural property: An identity negotiation paradigm. L. Samovar & R. Porter (Eds.), *In Intercultural Communication: A Reader*, (pp. 120-130). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth. Reprinted in Jackson, R. L. (in press). *African American Communication & Identities*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Jamison, D. (2006). The relationship between African self-consciousness, cultural misorientation, hypermasculinity, and rap music preference. *Journal of African American Studies*, 9: 45-60.
- Jefferson, T. (2002). Subordinating hegemonic masculinity. *Theoretical Criminology*, 6: 63-88.
- Jelen, T. & Wilcox, C. (1998). Context and conscience: The Catholic Church as an agent of political socialization in Western Europe. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 37: 28-40.
- Jones-Brown, Stoudt, B; Johnston, B; & Moran, K. (2013). *Stop, question & frisk policing practices in New York City: A primer (revised)*. Center on Race, Crime and Justice, John Jay College of Criminal Justice, 2013.
- Kahn, J; Holmes, J; & Brett, B. (2011). Dialogical masculinities: Diverse youth resisting dominant masculinity. *Journal of Constructivist Psychology*, 24: 30-55.
- Karp, D. (2010). Unlocking men, unmasking masculinities: Doing men's work in prison. *Journal of Men's Studies* 18:63-83.
- Kawakami, K., & Dovidio, J. F. (2001). The reliability of implicit stereotyping. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 27, 212-225.
- Kawakami, K., Dovidio, J. F., Moll, J., Hermsen, S., & Russin, A. (2000). Just say no (to stereotyping): Effects of training in the negation of stereotypic associations on stereotype activation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 78, 871-888.
- Kelly, R. (2013). *New York City Police Department Stop Question & Frisk Activity: For the period July 1, 2013 through September 30, 2013*.
http://www.nyclu.org/files/2013_3rd_Qtr.pdf

- Khoury, L. (2009). Racial profiling as dressage: a social control regime! *African Identities*, 7: 55–75.
- Kimmel, M. (2005). *Manhood in America: A cultural history*, 2nd edition. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Krienert, J. (2003). Masculinity and Crime: A quantitative exploration of Messerschmidt's hypothesis'. *Electronic Journal of Sociology*, ISSN: 1198 3655, 7(2).
<http://www.soc.iastate.edu/sapp/masculinity2.pdf>.
- Lane-Steele, L. (2011). Studs and protest-hypermasculinity: The tomboyism within Black lesbian female masculinity. *Journal of Lesbian Studies*, 15:480–492.
- Leite, W. (2010). Detecting social desirability bias using factor mixture models. *Multivariate Behavioral Research*, 45:271–293.
- Lemelle, A. (2002). Patriarchal reversals of black male prestige: Effects of the intersection of race, gender and educational class. *Journal of African American Men*, 6:29-46.
- Lemlle, A & Battle, J. (2004). Black masculinity matters in attitudes toward gay males. *Journal of Homosexuality*. 47: 39-51.
- Lewis, G. (2003). Black-white differences in attitudes toward homosexuality and gay rights. *Public Opinion Quarterly*. 67: 59-78.
- Liebow, E. (2003). *Tally's Corner: A Study of Negro Streetcorner Men*. Introduction and foreword by William Julius Wilson and Charles Lemert. Rowman & Littlefield Publishers: USA.
- Loprest, P., & Nichols, A. (2011). Characteristics of low-income single mothers disconnected from work and public assistance. *Low-Income Working Families Fact Sheet*. Urban institute, August: 1-5.
<http://www.urban.org/UploadedPDF/412375-Low-Income-Single-Mothers-Disconnected-from-Work.pdf>.
- Loury, G. C. (2000). Social exclusion and ethnic groups: The challenge to economics. *The World Bank*, 225-252. <http://www.bu.edu/irsd/files/socialethnic.pdf>.
- Lubove, R. (1963). *The Progressives and The Slums: Tenement House Reform in New York City, 1890-1917*. Pittsburgh, Pa: University of Pittsburgh Press;
- Lynch, J., & Sabol, W. (2004). Assessing the effects of mass incarceration on informal social control in communities. *Commentary*, 3: 267-294.
- Mahay, J., Laumann, E. & Michaels, S . (2001). Race, gender, and class in sexual scripts. In *Sex, Love, and Health in America*. E.O. Laumann and R.T. Michael, Editors.

- University of Chicago Press: Chicago. p. 197-238.
- Mahalik, J., Locke, B., Ludlow, L., Diemer, M., Scott, R., Gottfried, M., & Freitas, G. (2003). Development of the Conformity to Masculine Norms Inventory. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity*, 4: 3-25.
- Malcolm X., & Haley, A. (1969). The autobiography of Malcolm X. Penguin Books.
- Markey, J. (1926). A redefinition of social phenomena: Giving a basis for comparative sociology. *American Journal of Sociology*, 31: 733-743.
- Mbiti, J. S. (1969) *African Religious and Philosophy*. New York: Fredrick A. Praeger, Publishers.
- McClure, S. (2006). Improvising masculinity: African American fraternity membership in the construction of a Black masculinity. *Journal of African American Studies*, 10: 57-73.
- McDowell, L. (2002). Masculine discourses and dissonances: Struttinglads', protest masculinity, and domestic respectability. *Environment and planning D*, 20: 97-120
- McFarlane, H. (2013). Masculinity and criminology: The social construction of criminal man *The Howard Journal*, 52: 321–335.
- McMillan, T. (2004). *How Stella got her groove back*. NAL Trade-Penguin Group.
- Mears, D., Pickett, J., Golden, K., Chiricos, T., & Gertz, M. (2013). The effect of Interracial contact on Whites' perceptions of victimization risk and Black Criminality. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 50: 272-299.
- Mechoulam, S. (2011). The external effects of Black-male incarceration on Black females. *Journal of Labor Economics*, 29: 1-35.
- Menard, S., Morris, R., Gerber, J., & Covey, H. (2011). Distribution and correlates of self-reported crimes of trust. *Deviant behavior*, 3: 877-917.
- Messerschmidt, J. (2000). *Nine Lives: Adolescent Masculinities, the Body, and Violence*: Westview Press.
- (1993). *Masculinities and Crime: Critique and Reconceptualization of Theory*. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield.
- Messner, M., & Sabo, D. (1994). *Sex, violence & power in sports : Rethinking masculinity*. Freedom, CA : Crossing Press.
- Mincey, K., Alfonso, M., Hackney, A., & Luque, J. (2014). Being a Black man: Development of

- the Masculinity Inventory Scale (MIS) for Black men. *The Journal of Men's Studies*, 22: 167-179.
- Moynihan, P. (1967). The negro family: The case for national action. In *The Moynohan Report and the Politics of Controversy*. Editors, L. Rainwater and W. Yancy. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Mumford, K. (2012). Untangling pathology: The Moynihan report and homosexual damage, 1965–1975. *The Journal of Policy History*. 24: 53-73.
- Murrell, Jr, P. (2006). Toward social justice in urban education: a model of collaborative cultural inquiry in urban schools. *Equity & Excellence in Education*, 39: 81–90.
- New York State Judicial Commission (1991). Report of the New York State Judicial Commission on Minorities. *Fordham Urban Law Journal*, 19: 182-311).
- Oleson, J. (2002). The punitive coma. *California Law Review*, 90: 829-901.
- Oliver, W. (2006), “The Streets”: An alternative Black male socialization institution. *Journal of Black Studies*, 36: 918-937.
- (2003). The structural-cultural perspective: A theory of Black male violence. *Violent crime: Assessing race and ethnic differences*, 280-302.
- (1994). *The Violent Social World of Black Men*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- (1989). Black males and social problems: Prevention through Afrocentric socialization. *Journal of Black Studies*, 20: 15-39.
- Oliver, W., & Hairston, F. (2008). Intimate partner violence during the transition from prison to the community: Perspectives of incarcerated African American men. *Journal of Aggression, Maltreatment & Trauma*, 16: 258-276.
- O'Neil, J. M. (1981). Patterns of gender role conflict and strain: Sexism and fear of femininity in men's lives. *The Personnel and Guidance Journal*, 60: 203-210.
- Onwuachi-Willig, A. (2006). Undercover other. *California Law Review*, 94: 873-906.
- Pager, D. (2007). *Marked: Race, Crime, and Finding Work in an Era of Mass Incarceration*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- (2005). Double jeopardy: race, crime, and getting a job. *Wisconsin Law Review*, 2: 617-662.
- (2003). The mark of a criminal record. *American Journal of Sociology*, 108: 937–975.

- Paik, H., & Comstock, G. (1994). The Effects of television violence on antisocial behavior: A meta- analysis¹. *Communication Research*, 21: 516-546.
- Parent, M., & Moradi, B. (2009). Confirmatory factor analysis of the conformity to masculine norms inventory and development of the conformity to masculine norms inventory-46. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity*, 10: 175–189.
- Pauker, K., Ambady, N., & Apfelbaum, E. (2010). Race salience and essentialist thinking in racial stereotype development. *Child Development*, 81: 1799–1813.
- Pellebon, D. (2011). The Asante-Based Afrocentricity Scale: Developing a scale to measure Asante's Afrocentricity paradigm *Journal of Human Behavior in the Social Environment*, 21: 35–56.
- Peralta, R. (2010). Raced and gendered reactions to the deviance of drunkenness: A sociological analysis of race and gender disparities in alcohol use. *Contemporary Drug Problems*, 37: 381-415.
- Peters, J., Nason, C., & Turner, W. (2007). Development and testing of a new version of the hypermasculinity index. *Social Work Research*, 31: 171-182.
- Peterson-Lewis, S., & Bratton, L. (2004). Perceptions of "Acting Black" among African American teens: Implications of racial dramaturgy for academic and social achievement. *The Urban Review*, 36: 81-100.
- Phillips, D. (2005). Reproducing normative and marginalized masculinities: Adolescent male popularity and the outcast. *Nursing Inquiry*; 12: 219–230.
- Philogène, G. (2000). Blacks as 'serviceable other'. *Journal of community & Applied Social Psychology*, 10: 391-401.
- Pieterse, J. N. (1995) *White on Black: Images of Africa and Blacks in Western Popular Culture*. (New Haven: Yale University Press).
- Pinderhughes, E. (2002). African American marriage in the 20th century. *Famly Process*, 41: 269-282.
- Piquero, A. R., & Brame, R. W. (2008). Assessing the race–crime and ethnicity–crime relationship in a sample of serious adolescent delinquents. *Crime & Delinquency*. 20: 1-33.
- Piquero, A. R., Farrington, D. P., Welsh, B. C., Tremblay, R., & Jennings, W. G. (2009). Effects of early family/parent training programs on antisocial behavior and delinquency. *Journal of Experimental Criminology*, 5: 83-120.
- Pleck, J. 1992. The theory of male sex-role identity: Its rise and fall, 1936 to the present. In *The*

- making of masculinities: The new men's studies*. Edited by H. Brod. Pp: 21-38. Forward by C. Stimpson. New York: Chapman and Hall, Inc.
- Ramaswamy, M. (2010). Progressive paths to masculinity for young Black and Latino men in an urban alternatives-to-incarceration program. *The Western Journal of Black Studies*, 34: 412- 424.
- Rattan, A., Levine, C., Dweck, C., & Eberhardt, J. (2012). Race and the fragility of the legal distinction between juveniles and adults. *PLoS ONE*; May2012, Vol. 7 Issue 5, p1. <http://www.plosone.org/article/info%3Adoi%2F10.1371%2Fjournal.pone.0036680>.
- Rector, R. (2010). Marriage: America's greatest weapon against child poverty. *Backgrounder*, Published by the Heritage Foundation, 2465, September, 1-16. <http://www.northeastern.edu/policyschool/wp-content/uploads/2011/07/MarriageGreatestWeaponAgainstPoverty092010.pdf>
- Reiman, J., & Leighton, P. (2015). *The Rich Get Richer and The Poor Get Prison: Ideology, Class, and Criminal Justice*. Routledge.
- Riis J (1890). A. *How the Other Half Lives: Studies Among the Tenements of New York*. NY: Charles Scribner's.
- Rios, V. (2011). *Punished: Policing the lives of Black and Latino Boys*. NYU Press.
- (2009). The consequences of the criminal justice pipeline on Black and Latino masculinity. *The Annals Of The American Academy*, 623: 150-162.
- Roberts, D. (2004). The social and moral cost of mass incarceration in African American communities. *Stanford Law Review*, 56: 1271-1305.
- Roberts-Douglass, K., & Curtis-Boles, H. (2013). Exploring positive masculinity development in African American men: A retrospective study. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity*, 14: 7–15.
- Robinson, M. (2001). *The construction and reinforcement of myths of race and crime*. *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice*, 24: 169-179.
- Rose, D. & Clear, T. (1998). Incarceration, social capital, and crime: Implications for social disorganization theory. *Criminology*, 36: 441-480.
- (2003). Incarceration, reentry, and social capital: Social networks in the balance. Pp: 313-342. In Jeremy Travis and Michelle Waul (eds.), *The Impact of Incarceration & Reentry on Children, Families & Communities*. Washington, DC: Urban Institute Press.
- Rosich, K. (2007). *Race, Ethnicity, and the Criminal Justice System*. Washington, DC: American

- Sociological Association. <http://asanet.org>.
- Ross, M., (1998). In search of Black men's masculinities. *Feminist Studies*, 24: 599-626.
- Russell-Brown, K. (2009). *The Color of Crime: Racial Hoaxes, White Fear, Black Protectionism, Police Harassment, and Other Macroaggressions*. 2nd Edition. New York University Press: New York and London.
- Russo, M. (2007). How to review a meta-analysis. *Gastroenterology & Hepatology*, 3: 637-642.
- Sabol W., & J., Lynch. (2003). Assessing the longer-run consequences of incarceration: Effects on families and employment. In Darnell Hawkins, Samuel L. Myers, Jr., , Randolph Stone (eds.), *Crime Control and Social Justice: The Delicate Balance*. Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press.
- Sampson, R. (1987). Urban black violence: The effect of male joblessness and family disruption. *American journal of Sociology*, 93: 348-382.
- Sampson, R. & Wilson, W. J. Jr. (1995). "Toward a Theory of Race, Crime and Urban Inequality" in *Crime and Inequality*, J. Hagan and R. Peterson (eds), Stanford University Press, pp. 37-54.
- Schranz, D., McElroy, J., & Sentencing Project. (2000). *Reducing Racial Disparity in the Criminal Justice System: A Manual for Practitioners and Policy Makers*. J. Gainsborough, & M. Mauer (Eds.). Sentencing Project.
- Schur, E. (1984). *Labeling Women Deviant: Gender, Stigma, and Social Control*. New York: McGraw Hill.
- Seaton, G. (2007). Toward a theoretical understanding of hypermasculine coping among urban Black adolescent males. *Journal of Human Behavior in the Social Environment*, 15, 367-390.
- Silverman, I., & Dinitz, S. (1974). Compulsive masculinity and delinquency an empirical investigation. *Criminology*, 11: 498-515.
- Simmons, C. W. (2000). *Children of Incarcerated Parents* (p. 4). California State Library, California Research Bureau.
- Skogan, W. (1995). Crime and the racial fears of White Americans. *The Annals of American Society*, 539: 59-71.
- (1974). The validity of official crime statistics: An empirical investigation. *Social Science Quarterly*, 55: 25-38.
- Smith, E. (2008). African American men and intimate partner violence. *Journal of African American Studies*, 12: 156–179.

- Smith, S. (2000). Mobilizing social resources: race, ethnic, and gender differences in social capital and persisting wage inequalities *The Sociological Quarterly*, 41: 509-537.
- Smith, E., & Hattery, A. (2011). Race relations theories: Implications for sport management. *Journal of Sport Management*, 25: 107-117.
- Snyder, A., McLaughlin, D., & Findeis, J. (2006). Household composition and poverty among female-headed households with children: Differences by Race and Residence. *Rural Sociology*, 71: 597–624.
- Soler, M., & Garry, L. M. (2009). *Reducing disproportionate minority contact: Preparation at the local level*. US Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention. <https://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/ojjdp/218861.pdf>
- Sourcebook of Criminal Justice Statistics Online. (2011). <http://www.albany.edu/sourcebook/> Table 4.10.2011.
- (2010). <http://www.albany.edu/sourcebook/> Table 4.12.2010.
- (2003). <http://www.albany.edu/sourcebook/>.
- Spohn, C., & DeLone, M., (2000). When does race matter?: An examination of the conditions under which race affects sentence severity. *Sociology of Crime, Law, and Deviance*, 2: 3-37.
- Staples, R. (2010). Masculinity and Race: The dual dilemma of Black men. *Journal of Social Issues*. 34: 163-189.
- (1979) The myth of black macho: A response to angry black feminists. *The Black Scholar*, 10: 24-33.
- Stucky, T. (2012). The conditional effects of race and politics on social control: Black violent crime arrests in large cities, 1970 to 1990. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 49: 3-30.
- Sugie, Naomi F. (2012). “Punishment and welfare: paternal incarceration and families’ receipt of Public Assistance.” *Social Forces*, 90:1403–1427.
- Swan, A. (1974). A methodological critique of the Moynihan Report. *Black Scholar*, 5: 18-24.
- Swanson, C., Lee, C., Sansone, F. & Tatum, K. (2013). Incarcerated fathers and their children: Perceptions of barriers to their relationships. *Prison Journal*, 93: 453-474.
- Terpstra, D., & Larsen, J., Jr (1980). A note on job type and applicant race as determinants of hiring decisions. *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, 53: 117-119.

- The Innocence Project (2014). Fact sheet: DNA exonerations nationwide. *News and Information: Press Releases*. <http://www.innocenceproject.org/Content/351PRINT.php>
- Thomas, G., Farrell, M. P., & Barnes, G. M. (1996). The effects of single-mother families and nonresident fathers on delinquency and substance abuse in Black and White adolescents. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*. 58: 884-894.
- Timulak, L., Buckroyd, J., Klimas, J., Creaner, M., Wellsted, D., Bunn, F., Bradshaw, S. & Green, G. (2013). *Helpful and unhelpful aspects of eating disorders treatment involving psychological therapy – A meta-synthesis of qualitative research studies*. Lutterworth, Leicestershire: British Association for Counselling and Psychotherapy. <http://eprints.uwe.ac.uk/22130/1/Nicola%20Rance%20Thesis%20-%20December%20>
- Timulak, L. & Creaner, M. (2013). Experiences of conducting qualitative meta-analysis. *Counseling Psychology Review*, 28: 94-104.
- Tonry, M., (1998). Crime and Punishment in America, 1971-1996. *Overcrowded Times*, April: 15.
- Travis, J., & Waul, M. (2003). **Prisoners Once Removed**: The children and families of prisoners. In *Prisoners Once Removed*: pp:1-33. In Jeremy Travis and Michelle Waul (eds). *The Impact of Incarceration & Reentry on Children, Families & Communities*. Washington, DC: The Urban Institute Press.
- Treas, J., & Giesen, D. (2000). Sexual infidelity among married and cohabiting Americans. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*. 62: 48–60.
- Uniform Crime Reports. (2011). Crime in the United States 2011. Ten-year arrest trends, by sex, 2002–2011: Table 33. Criminal Justice Information Service Division. <http://www.fbi.gov/about-us/cjis/ucr/crime-in-the-u.s/2011/crime-in-the-u.s.-2011/tables/table-33>.
- United States Department of Justice. (2011). Table 42. *Personal crimes of violence, 2008: Percent distribution of single-offender victimizations, by type of crime, race of victim, and perceived race of offender*. Criminal Victimization in the United States, 2008 Statistical Tables National Crime Victimization Survey. <http://www.bjs.gov/content/pub/pdf/cvus08.pdf>.
- Wachtler, S. (1991). Introduction: Report of the New York State Judicial Commission on Minorities. *Fordham Urban Law Journal*, 19: 175-179.
- Wacquant, L. (2001). Deadly Symbiosis: When Ghetto and Prison Meet and Mesh. *Punishment & Society*, 3: 95-133.

- Wang, W., Parker, K., & Taylor, P. (2013). Breadwinner moms. *Pew Research Social & Demographic Trends*. Available at: <http://www.pewsocialtrends.org/2013/05/29/breadwinner-moms>
- Warde, B. (2013). Black male disproportionality in the criminal justice systems of the USA, Canada, and England: a comparative analysis of incarceration. *Journal of African American Studies*, 17: 461-479.
- Ward, E. (2005). Homophobia, hypermasculinity and the US black church. *Culture, Health & Sexuality*, 7: 493-504.
- Welch, K. (2007). Black criminal stereotypes and racial profiling. *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice*, 23: 276-288.
- Wendt, S. (2007). They finally found out that we really are men: Violence, non-violence and Black manhood in the Civil Rights era. *Gender and History*, 19:543-564.
- West, H. (2010). Prison inmates at midyear 2009—Statistical tables. U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, *Bureau of Justice Statistics*, June: NCJ 230113.
- Western, B. (2004). *Incarceration, Marriage, and Family Life*.
https://www.russellsage.org/sites/all/files/u4/Western_Incarceration,%20Marriage,%20%26%20Family%20Life.pdf.
- (2002). The impact of incarceration on wage mobility and inequality. *American Sociological Review*, 67: 26—546.
- Western, B., & Wildeman, C. (2009). The Black family and mass incarceration. *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 621: 221-242.
- Wildman, C., & Western, B. (2010). Incarceration in fragile families. *Future of Children*, 20: 157-177.
- Wilson, F. H. (2012). *Race, class, and the postindustrial city: William Julius Wilson and the promise of sociology*. SUNY Press.
- Wilson, W. (1987). *The Truly Disadvantaged: The Inner-City, The Underclass, and Public Policy*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- (1996). *When Work Disappears: The World of the New Urban Poor*. New York: Alfred P. Knopf.
- Woldoff, R., & Washington, H. (2008). Arrested contact: The criminal justice system, race, and father engagement. *The Prison Journal*, 88: 179-206.
- Wolfe, W. A. (2003). Overlooked role of African-American males' hypermasculinity in the

epidemic of unintended pregnancies and HIV/AIDS cases with young African-American women. *Journal of the National Medical Association*, 95: 846-852.

Wright, B. (1987). *Black Robes, White Justice*. L. Stuart: New Jersey.

Wright; R. (1945). *Black Boy*. NY: Harper and Brothers.

Yablonsky, L. (1962). *The Violent Gang*. New York: The McMillan Company.

(1959) The delinquent gang as a near group. *Social Problems* 7: 108-17.

Young, A. (2004). *The Minds of Marginalized Black Men: Making Sense of Mobility, Opportunity, and Future Life Chances*. 2nd Edition. NJ: Princeton University Press.

(2003). *On The Outside Looking In: Low-Income Black Men's Conception Of Work Opportunity And The Good Job*. In *Coping With Poverty: The Social Contexts Of Neighborhood, Work, And Family In The African-American Community*. Edited by S. Dandier & A. Chih Lin. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press.