# ACCENTUATING POSITIVE MASCULINITY: A NEW FOUNDATION FOR THE PSYCHOLOGY OF BOYS, MEN, AND MASCULINITY

*Mark S. Kiselica, Sheila Benton-Wright, and Matt Englar-Carlson*

Since the late 1970s and early 1980s, the psychological study of masculinity and the practice of gender-sensitive approaches to psychotherapy with boys and men has gradually become a specialty area within psychology. Recognizing that masculinity is a central aspect of men's lives, psychologists began to study the male socialization process, socially prescribed notions of masculinity, and the psychological and social problems of boys and men (Englar-Carlson, 2006). Within this movement, a group of pioneering psychologists developed the gender role strain paradigm (GRSP) as a framework for the psychological study of men and masculinity (Levant, 2011; see Chapter 2, this handbook).

Originally formulated by Pleck (1981), the GRSP is based on the assumptions that gender roles are social constructions, they are contradictory and inconsistent, and the number of people who violate gender roles is high. Pleck proposed that some men tend to experience a particular type of psychological distress known as gender role strain when they fail to live up to internalized notions of masculinity. Subsequently, a growing number of psychologists have used the GRSP to question the rigid adherence to traditional norms for the male role, such as the emphasis on dominance, aggression, extreme self-reliance, and restrictive emotionality, and to view certain problems common to men, such as aggression and violence, homophobia, misogyny, detached fathering, and neglect of health, "as unfortunate but predictable results of male gender role socialization processes" (Levant, 2011, p. 766). The dedicated work of these psychologists has helped to raise awareness about the harmful impact of constricted notions and expectations regarding masculinity on men and their worlds and to develop approaches to counseling and psychotherapy that are designed to help men to address their gender role conflicts (Englar-Carlson, 2014). In addition, their work underscored the need for "creating positive new visions for how to be a man in today's world, visions that could support the optimal development of men, women, and children" (Levant, 2011, p. 766).

The positive psychology–positive masculinity paradigm (PPPM) is a response to the need for a positive vision of masculinity. Originally proposed by Kiselica, Englar-Carlson, and their colleagues in the mid-to-late 2000s (Kiselica, Englar-Carlson, & Fisher, 2006; Kiselica, Englar-Carlson, Horne, & Fisher, 2008), the PPPM was developed to address some of the shortcomings of the GRSP tradition, which has been overly focused on male pathology and identifying men's problems and has tended to overlook masculinity strengths, adaptive behavior, and the positive aspects of being a man (Englar-Carlson & Kiselica, 2013; O'Neil & Lujan, 2009). Isacco, Talovic, Chromik, and Yallum (2012) observed that, on the basis of the entirety of research generated by the GRSP tradition and the absence of an alternative understanding, it is easy to conclude that traditional masculinity, or masculinity as a whole, is always negative and problematic. They added the critical distinction, however, that the rigid, restrictive, sexist enactment of traditional male roles—not traditional masculinity per se—is associated with negative outcomes.

The widespread influence of the GRSP tradition and its heavy emphasis on constricted masculinity and male-linked problems has contributed to a lack of awareness of positive notions of masculinity that are transmitted across generations and have many benefits for boys, men, their significant others, and society (Kiselica, 2011). As an alternative point of view, the PPPM is based on the basic assumptions of positive psychology, which emphasize strengths over deficits, and it accentuates noble aspects of masculinity, such as male courage and generative fatherhood (Kiselica et al., 2008). The purpose of this chapter is to propose that the PPPM serve as a new foundation for the psychology of boys, men, and masculinity and for clinical work with boys and men.

We begin this chapter with a critique of the GRSP tradition, which has raised awareness of the detrimental effects of constricted masculinity on boys and men and their relationships with others but has also promoted a deficit view of boys, men, and masculinity and male development. We argue that the psychology of men and masculinity can be enhanced by infusing the central assumptions and research findings of positive psychology and the study of positive masculinity into psychological research and psychotherapy pertaining to boys, men, and masculinity. We provide an overview and critique of positive psychology and positive masculinity, and we propose future pertinent directions for practice and research.

## CONTRIBUTIONS AND LIMITATIONS OF THE GENDER ROLE STRAIN PARADIGM TRADITION

The GRSP tradition emerged amid serious concerns about the harsh aspects of the male socialization experience and the social and psychological problems that are believed to be linked to gender expectations for men. In response to these concerns, a small group of compassionate psychologists who empathized with men and their difficulties began to meet and discuss men's issues and to develop ideas that could shape and inform research on men and masculinity (Kiselica, 2011). The GRSP was an outgrowth of this movement, which has grown steadily

over the past 3 decades and is associated with many avenues of research and clinical practice regarding boys, men, and masculinity (O'Neil, 2012, 2013).

Research associated with the GRSP tradition has provided us with an expanded knowledge base regarding the psychology of boys, men, and masculinity. In two previous extensive reviews of the literature on the topic, Kiselica (2011) and Levant (2011) noted that psychologists from the new specialty area pertaining to the psychology of men and masculinity and working in the GRSP tradition enhanced understanding of numerous topics, including the social construction of masculinity, constricted traditional masculinity, men's sexism and homophobia, men's gender role conflicts, variations in how men from different ethnic and racial backgrounds and sexual orientations define masculinity, the gender-related problems of boys and men (such as the pressure to act tough and eschew vulnerability and tenderness, male dominance, domestic violence, the objectification of women, alexithymia, masked depression, and the reluctance of males to seek and use professional help), and male-sensitive approaches to psychotherapy. The findings generated by research conducted within the GRSP has informed important outreach campaigns targeting several populations of at-risk males, such as men with depression (Kersting, 2005) and men whose children were involved in the child welfare system (Kiselica, 2009). GRSP findings have also informed an American Psychological Association (APA) working group that is developing the Guidelines for Psychological Practice With Boys and Men. Thus, the GRSP has had a positive impact on the growth of the specialty field of the psychology of men and masculinity; psychological research on boys, men, and masculinity; and the development and provision of male-oriented interventions and services (Kiselica, 2011).

Although these contributions are certainly valuable, the extensive emphasis the GRSP has placed on constricted masculinity and gender role strain has fostered within psychology a deficit perspective for understanding boys, men, and masculinity. What is curiously missing in the GRSP tradition is some analysis or conceptualization of adaptive, healthy, and prosocial aspects and contributions of boys,

men, and masculinity (O'Neil, 2012). Instead, the framework for understanding men and masculinity has emphasized flawed development and mental illness. For example, Pollack (1995) stated that it is normative for boys to experience a forced, premature, emotional separation from their mothers and to conform to traditional norms of masculinity and that the strain associated with these experiences leaves them emotionally scarred for life, craving intimacy on the one hand and recoiling from it on the other. Pollack went on to say that normative development for males leaves them looking "remarkably similar to a description of the prototypical narcissistic personality" (p. 47).

Not only does this deficit model of male development lack empirical support, it is also contradicted by a large body of research (see Kiselica, 2001, 2003b; Kiselica & O'Brien, 2001). As Kiselica (2011) has pointed out, extensive research findings have indicated that (a) most boys and men have secure attachments (Kiselica, 2001; Kiselica & O'Brien, 2001); (b) most boys and men are well-adjusted human beings (Kiselica, 2006a, 2006b; Kiselica & O'Brien, 2001); (c) the ability of most boys and men to recognize, experience, and express emotions is within the normal range (Kiselica & O'Brien, 2001; Wester, Vogel, Pressly, & Heesacker, 2002); (d) boys and men have long traditions of acting in a prosocial manner (Kiselica & Englar-Carlson, 2010; Kiselica et al., 2008); and (e) decent boys and men model noble notions of masculinity and pass them on from one generation of males to the next (Kiselica & Englar-Carlson, 2010; Kiselica et al., 2008; Pleban & Dietz, 2007; Snarey, 1993; Thomas, 1994). In short, there is a strong, positive counterpart to the negative male socialization experiences and the deficit model of male development that has been emphasized in the GRSP tradition. Nevertheless, because of the significant influence of the GRSP, little attention has been devoted to studying positive masculinity and promoting the many strengths of boys and men.

Because so much of the psychological literature on men has been focused on gender role strain and a host of problems linked to subpopulations of troubled and troubling men—such as emotional deficits, violence, substance abuse, and absent

and non-nurturing fathering—psychologists have a tendency to view males as being dysfunctional, damaged, and emotionally disengaged victims of flawed development (Kiselica, 2006a; Kiselica et al., 2008). When working under the sole influence of this point of view, psychologists fail to see that there is a continuum of masculinity ranging from the highly dysfunctional at one end to the highly positive at the other end. Furthermore, deficit models of male development foster pejorative and harmful stereotypes about boys and men that can have a detrimental impact on how practitioners treat male clients (Englar-Carlson & Kiselica, 2013; Heesacker et al., 1999; Kiselica & Kiselica, 2011; Kiselica & Sturmer, 1993; Romo, Bellamy, & Coleman, 2004) and can make it difficult to even see men as human (O'Neil, 2014). To acquire a more complex understanding of boys and men, psychologists must widen their lens of inquiry to include an examination of positive masculinity.

## POSITIVE PSYCHOLOGY–POSITIVE MASCULINITY PARADIGM

There is something beautiful about being a witness to the lives of decent boys and men, and there are many great lessons to be learned from these admirable human beings. Boys who are raised with the belief that they have a duty to care for and provide for others, work hard, serve their communities, be courageous and self-reliant, and take healthy risks tend to grow up to be well-adjusted men and role models who make significant contributions to their families and society. The lives of these individuals are guided by a form of noble masculinity that has been passed down across generations through a positive male socialization process that is rarely acknowledged in the psychological literature. In response to this oversight, Kiselica et al. (2008) urged psychologists to examine the lives of boys and men who have learned, embraced, and transmitted this tradition of positive masculinity throughout history. In addition, in a series of pertinent conference presentation and publications, Kiselica, Englar-Carlson, and colleagues have suggested that psychologists consider the qualities of positive

masculinity as building blocks for promoting well-ness and honorable manhood in boys and men (Englar-Carlson & Kiselica, 2013; Kiselica, 2008a, 2008b, 2011; Kiselica & Englar-Carlson, 2010; Kiselica, Englar-Carlson, & Fisher, 2006; Kiselica et al., 2008).

Drawing from the principles of positive psychology—which emphasize the study of strengths and virtue over disease, weakness, and damage and are focused on building what can be right in people rather than fixing what is wrong with them (Aspinwall & Staudinger, 2003; Seligman & Csikszentmihalyi, 2000; Snyder & Lopez, 2007)—and from their observations on the admirable quali-ties of decent men, Kiselica, Englar-Carlson, and their colleagues (Englar-Carlson & Kiselica, 2013; Kiselica, 2008a, 2011; Kiselica & Englar-Carlson, 2010; Kiselica, Englar-Carlson, & Fisher, 2006; Kiselica et al., 2008) developed the PPPM for the study and treatment of boys and men. This para-digm explains how boys and men learn and adopt prosocial and healthy norms of masculinity (Cialdini & Goldstein, 2004).

The PPPM model presents general notions or themes of positive masculinity. Cultural and contex-tual factors influence the definition, development, and expression of masculinity strengths because men contribute to others in reference to the cultural expectations around them. Therefore, the PPPM adopts a culturally embedded perspective (see Englar-Carlson & Smart, 2014; Grothaus, McAuliffe, & Craigen, 2012; McNulty & Fincham, 2012; Pedrotti & Edwards, 2009) to understand positive masculinity. A man's social identities are not separate categories that can be examined in iso-lation; rather, they are constructed through the intersection of multiple influences. A man's identity and expression of masculinity are connected to his social class, race, sexual orientation, ability status, religion, and other salient identities and roles (Shields, 2008). Therefore, any conversation about male strengths and positive masculinity would need to be conducted within a framework that embraces the context of one's identity.

We define positive masculinity as prosocial atti-tudes, beliefs, and behaviors of boys and men that produce positive consequences for self and others.

These characteristics are not innate. Rather, they are learned and internalized through a socialization pro-cess in which boys and men develop masculine ways of thinking and behaving that promote healthy development while also fostering a sense of duty to others. In short, this process involves teaching males how to become decent men.

A deficit perspective on boys, men, and mascu-linity limits the ability of psychologists to see and appreciate this form of transgenerational positive masculinity and the full range of the lives of boys and men. We propose that studying masculinity strengths and promoting the following 11 adaptive and healthy characteristics of masculinity could enhance our understanding of and clinical work with boys and men.

## Male Relational Styles
Boys and men tend to develop friendships and inti-macy with each other through shared activities (Buhrmester, 1996; McNelles & Connolly, 1999), which are often instrumental (Clinchy & Zimmer-man, 1985; Surrey, 1985) and have a high action orientation (Kiselica, 2001, 2003a, 2003b, 2006a), such as playing a sport or an electronic game or working together on a project.

## Male Ways of Caring
In psychologically healthy families and communi-ties, boys and men are raised with the expectation that they must care for and protect their loved ones and friends (Hammond & Mattis, 2005; Kiselica et al., 2008). They also demonstrate high levels of action empathy, which is the ability to take action based on how a person sees things from another's point of view (Levant, 1995).

## Generative Fatherhood
Men who are good parents engage in positive father work, or *generative fathering*, which refers to the way a father responds readily and consistently to his child's developmental needs over time with an eye toward helping the next generation lead a better life (Dollahite & Hawkins, 1998). Through generative fathering, men foster the positive emotional, educa-tional, intellectual, and social growth of their chil-dren (see Kiselica, 2008b).

## Male Self-Reliance

Boys and men are socialized to use their own resources to confront life's challenges (Levant, 1995). A boy or man with a healthy dose of self-reliance considers the input of others with regard to problems, yet remains his own man and does not allow others to force their decisions on him (Hernandez, 2002). At the same time, he expresses his self-reliance in relation to others, considering their needs and how he can serve them (Kiselica et al., 2008; White, 2008).

## Worker–Provider Tradition of Men

There is a cultural expectation that a man will work, so engaging in work helps a man to feel that he has achieved one of society's criteria for manhood (Skovholt, 1990). Earning an income through employment allows a man to fulfill his culturally prescribed role as a provider for his loved ones (Bernard, 1981; Christiansen & Palkovitz, 2001; Loscocco, 2007). In addition, work provides men with a sense of purpose and meaning (Heppner & Heppner, 2009; Kiselica et al., 2008). For all of these reasons, being a worker and a provider is a central component of male identity and self-esteem (Axelrod, 2001; Heppner & Heppner, 2001).

## Men's Respect for Women

Decent men demonstrate a deep respect for women. They detest and refrain from violence against women and actively challenge norms and other men who promote sexism and violence against women (Gidycz, Orchowski, & Berkowitz, 2011; Kilmartin & Berkowitz, 2005). For example, the White Ribbon organization is the world's largest movement of men and boys working to end violence against women and girls while promoting gender equity, healthy relationships, and a new vision of masculinity (White Ribbon, 2014).

As another expression of respect for women, when it comes to raising children, men work with the mothers of their children to form strong coparenting relationships, recognizing the important contributions of both mother and father to the well-being of a child, whether those contributions occur within the bonds of marriage, cohabitation, or relationships characterized by separation or divorce.

They teach their children to respect their mothers and other women. Decent men also support the career aspirations of their wives and partners and work with their wives and partners as a team to address the domestic duties of maintaining a household (Kiselica, 2008b).

## Male Courage, Daring, and Risk Taking

Boys and men display many forms of daring, and the courage they muster while taking worthwhile risks—such as facing peril to protect others, completing dangerous but necessary jobs, or pushing themselves to their limits during athletic competitions—is admirable. Boys and men with good judgment are able to distinguish between sensible risks and foolhardy and reckless behaviors, the latter of which they learn to avoid (Kiselica et al., 2008).

## Group Orientation of Boys and Men

Boys and men are oriented toward banding together to achieve a common purpose, and they have participated in groups (e.g., athletic teams, Boy Scouts, work crews, and social clubs) for centuries (Andronico, 1996). Research has shown that males spend more time in coordinated group activity and females engage in longer episodes of dyadic interaction (Benenson, Apostoleris, & Parnass, 1997). Baumeister (2007) also observed that if one looks at a list of activities conducted in groups one is likely to find things men tend to enjoy more than women. Thus, it appears that boys and men tend to feel comfortable in and value groups, which can provide them with important sources of identity and community (Kiselica et al., 2008).

## Male Forms of Service

One of the key aspects of positive masculinity is the belief that men have a duty to provide service to the community and contribute to the social welfare. This belief may be expressed in numerous ways, such as doing volunteer work on an individual basis (e.g., by mentoring a boy through the Big Brothers Program) or contributing to the missions of male-oriented humanitarian organizations. For example, throughout history, men have formed organizations, such as the Shriners and 100 Black Men of America,

whose primary mission is to provide service to others. The Shriners, which is the highest order of Freemasons, embrace the philosophy of "pleasure without intemperance, hospitality without rudeness and jollity without coarseness" (Ben Ali Shrine Center, 2006, para. 3). Freemasons provide more than $1 million a day, year after year, for charitable causes, funding academic scholarships, medical research, hospitals for crippled children, facilities for people with speech disorders and mental illness, and services for people with serious eye problems, respiratory difficulties, and disabilities. The national organization 100 Black Men of America is focused on improving the quality of life of and enhancing educational and economic empowerment for African Americans. With a strong emphasis on youth mentoring, the foundation of the organization is built on respect for family, spirituality, justice, and integrity (100 Black Men in America, 2009). Involvement in male service organizations provides opportunities and experiences for boys and men to develop social interest, which can be defined as a sense of belonging and participating with others for the common good and includes the notion of striving to make the world a better place (Carlson & Englar-Carlson, 2013). Such involvement is also a way in which men express respect and support for other men.

## Men's Use of Humor

Many boys and men use humor as a vehicle to attain intimacy (Kiselica, 2003b; Vereen, Hill, & Butler, 2013), a means of having fun and creating happy experiences with other boys, a foundation for building and supporting a friendship, a way to demonstrate that they care about others, and a strategy to reduce tension and manage conflicts (Kiselica, 2001). Also, research has indicated that boys and men use humor as a healing and coping tool in times of stress and illness (R. Brooks & Goldstein, 2001; Chapple & Ziebland, 2004; Kilmartin, 2014; Wolin & Wolin, 1993).

## Male Heroism

Throughout the ages, countless boys and men have exemplified the positive qualities of traditional masculinity through their heroic lives. Heroic boys and men use many or all of the previously mentioned qualities to demonstrate exceptional nobility in the way they live, overcoming great obstacles and making great contributions to others through extraordinary efforts (Kiselica et al., 2008). Heroic men include the monumental male figures in history, such as Abraham Lincoln, Martin Luther King Jr., Nelson Mandela, Cesar Chavez, and Harvey Milk, or everyday heroes, such as hard-working, devoted fathers and husbands.

## Comments and Summary Regarding Male Strengths and Positive Masculinity

Several comments regarding these strengths are warranted. First, this is a representative rather than an exhaustive list of masculinity strengths that was generated to help the field begin a conversation about the qualities of positive masculinity. Second, Kiselica et al. (2008) acknowledged that there is overlap among the 11 strengths. Third, it is highly likely that these strengths are expressed in similar but slightly different ways across different cultures (Englar-Carlson & Kiselica, 2013; Kiselica & Englar-Carlson, 2010). Fourth, although these qualities are commonly found in men and boys who are considered well-adjusted and respected role models, they are not expressed by all boys and men (Kiselica, 2011). Fifth, these strengths are presented as social constructions that are neither male specific (e.g., there have been many daring women, such as Amelia Earhart) nor based on biologically determined sex differences between men and women. Therefore, the 11 qualities can be considered human strengths (Kiselica et al., 2008), though the expression by each man will be embedded within a cultural context (Pedrotti & Edwards, 2009). Nevertheless, it must also be recognized that, in civil societies, there is a powerful, normative emphasis for boys and men to develop and demonstrate these particular qualities and behaviors in accordance with social norms around gender identity and male behavior (Tobin et al., 2010). Culturally embedded norms for positive male behavior are then modeled for other boys and men and passed down from generation to generation in male-particular ways (Pleban & Diez, 2007; Snarey, 1993; Thomas, 1994). For example, qualitative research has indicated that family is a salient feature of what it means

to be a man for Latino men (Hurtado & Sinha, 2008) and African American men (Hammond & Mattis, 2005), and Latino and African American boys learn from elders within their communities the positive aspects of valuing family and how to enact appropriate behavior.

In summary, there is a socialization process that transmits to boys and men messages that a good man has a duty to be a brave and self-reliant protector and provider who cares for his loved ones and makes positive contributions to the community. In the eyes of decent men who strive to be good fathers, husbands, and partners and civically minded members of society, this is the essence of positive masculinity and what it means to be a good man.

A further distinction must be made that the male strengths highlighted in the PPPM are not universally positive; rather, they are adaptive in some settings and maladaptive in others (Englar-Carlson & Kiselica, 2013; Kiselica et al., 2008). Men must have the ability to be flexible in the enactment of these norms and the knowledge to know when it is adaptive. For example, men often take pride in their role as a worker and their ability to provide for others (Bernard, 1981; Heppner & Heppner, 2009); however, this can become problematic if a man is focused only on work tasks and completion at the expense of other important needs, such as assisting with child care and housework or attending to their own physical and mental health (G. R. Brooks & Silverstein, 1995; Levant, 1995). It is the ability to be flexible in the enactment of male strengths and the knowledge to know when it is adaptive that is critical (Kiselica & Englar-Carlson, 2010).

Although the PPPM perspective emphasizes noble masculinity, it should not be confused with some strands of the men's movement, such as the mythopoetic men's movement, which uses ritualistic storytelling, drumming, and discussions in a purported attempt to help men rediscover lost dimensions of their masculine identity (Williams & Myer, 1992), or the ManKind Project, which offers men's weekends, such as the New Warrior Training Adventure, and a network of peer-facilitated mentoring groups that are reportedly designed to help men become more authentic, responsible, and empowered (ManKind Project, 2013). Though

elements of the PPPM perspective may be found in these movements, these particular movements consist of self-help groups that emerged outside of the domains of professional psychology. By comparison, the PPPM paradigm is a psychological approach to studying, understanding, and helping boys and men that is based on established theory and peer-reviewed research in psychology and other social sciences.

## THEORETICAL AND EMPIRICAL FOUNDATIONS OF THE POSITIVE PSYCHOLOGY–POSITIVE MASCULINITY PARADIGM

There are three sources of the theoretical and empirical foundations of the PPPM paradigm. The first comes from the literature on positive psychology, the second from scholarship regarding positive masculinity, and the third from research on adolescent and young adult fathers. In the sections that follow, we summarize and critique each of these sources with reference to their implications for the psychology of boys, men, and masculinity.

### Theoretical and Empirical Foundations From Positive Psychology

Our work on positive masculinity is a new development in positive psychology, which spans both ancient and modern times. Diener (2009) observed that "in one sense, positive psychology is thousands of years old, dating back to the thoughts of ancient philosophers and religious leaders who discussed character virtues, happiness, and the good society" (p. 7). In another sense, its history is more recent. According to Lopez and Snyder (2009), Abraham Maslow first used the term *positive psychology* in 1954 when he criticized psychology for its overemphasis on the darker side of human beings. Maslow called for a more balanced approach to psychology, challenging psychology to broaden its focus on the shortcomings and psychiatric illnesses of human beings to include human potentialities, virtues, and achievable aspirations. Diener (2009) noted that many other scholars, practitioners, and social scientists have focused on the positive:

Social psychologists have studied altruism, counselors have explored personality strengths, and sociologists have studied happiness. Pioneers such as Don Clifton (who studied human strengths), George Vaillant (who studies effective coping), Shelley Taylor (who studies health), Jane Piliavin (who studies helping and volunteerism), and Mihaly [*sic*] Csikszentmihalyi (who studies flow and creativity) have worked in the field of positive psychology for decades, as have humanistic psychologists. (p. 7)

What had been missing, Diener argued, was an integrated network that would allow these scholars, like their traditional counterparts, to work toward a common mission. Similarly, Peterson (2006) stated that a focused movement on health, growth, and strengths was needed to counter "business-as-usual" psychology and its emphasis on negative aspects of the human experience. We agree with these points of view, and we contend that the addition of the PPPM is needed to counter and address the shortcomings of the deficit model of male development and masculinity that has dominated the literature on the psychology of boys, men, and masculinity.

Business-as-usual psychology achieved admirable success in identifying and treating mental illness over its short history. However, in 1998 the APA's new president, Martin E. P. Seligman, declared the success only "half-baked" (Lopez & Snyder, 2009, p. 3). Almost 45 years after Maslow's use of the term, Seligman reintroduced positive psychology and identified a new goal for APA: to explore the merits of positivity and its impact on human well-being and flourishing. Through Seligman's efforts, scientists and practitioners previously working in relative isolation were brought together with a common mission: essentially, to advance the proposition that the "good" in humans has a rightful place in the study and practice of psychology and, moreover, to provide scientifically based research in this arena.

Today, research in positive psychology has grown by leaps and bounds (e.g., Shane Lopez's work on hope in the field of education, Barbara

Fredrickson's continuing research with broaden-and-build theory, and Karen Reivich's work on resilience; see Snyder, Lopez, & Pedrotti, 2011, for pertinent reviews of this work). Positivity research is demonstrating that a focus on the positive not only encourages human well-being and flourishing but also provides powerful tools to combat destructive emotions (e.g., high anxiety levels, pessimism, depression). What Seligman officially labeled *positive psychology* and made an imperative for the APA is now working to provide business-as-usual psychology with a more balanced and improved therapeutic paradigm for the 21st century. PPPM is an extension of this balanced and enhanced therapeutic paradigm to the psychology of boys, men, and masculinity.

Seligman's work on learned optimism, a cornerstone of positive psychology, is credited with influencing research in a variety of domains, including social psychology and psychoimmunology, with more than 500 studies demonstrating the efficacy of applying optimism to sports training, improving health status, and alleviating depression while reducing its recurrence (Foster & Loyd, 2007). As an outgrowth of his research on optimism and positive emotion, Seligman formulated positive psychology's central theory of well-being, which is known by the acronym PERMA. PERMA consists of five essential elements: positive emotion, engagement, relationships, meaning, and achievement (Seligman, 2011). In Seligman's (2011) view, these five elements are integral components that must be addressed for an individual to attain and sustain well-being. Each of these five elements is bolstered by 24 signature strengths (e.g., love, creativity, fairness, gratitude, honesty), which are themselves categorized under six virtues: wisdom and knowledge, courage, humanity and love, justice, temperance, and transcendence. When used, the signature strengths support one's ability to face the challenges posed by the five main elements.

PERMA's elements, strengths, and virtues find correlatives in PPPM's 11 positive characteristics of masculinity. For example, PERMA's element of meaning by definition (Seligman, 2011) encompasses a goal larger than one's self, as does PPPM's generative fatherhood characteristic because

the latter is concerned with nurturing future generations through positive father work. Additionally, PERMA's signature strength of love may also underpin generative fatherhood because it relates to a father's loving care for his child's intellectual, emotional, and social development.

Although the 11 positive male traits delineated by PPPM may also be viewed as human strengths (as in the case of PERMA), their special relevance as common masculine strengths is noteworthy. As a starting point from which to help male clients identify and use their personal strengths, they also foster a positive approach to counseling and therapy that is male friendly. A strengths-based approach to intervention may actually facilitate rapport between client and practitioner and build a strong working alliance more quickly (Englar-Carlson & Kiselica, 2013).

Fredrickson's research on positive emotion, which culminated in her broaden-and-build theory, also speaks to the usefulness of a strengths-based approach with male clients. Recognizing a complex interplay between positive and negative emotions and the role each plays in survival (Fredrickson, 2000), Frederickson asserted that negative emotion narrows perspective (e.g., fight or flight) and positive emotion broadens one's ability to think freely. Positive emotion fosters creativity and exploration and leads to the "discovery of new knowledge, new alliances, and new skills" (Fredrickson, 2013, p. 2). Fredrickson (2006b) also contended that a positive mindset builds resources that contribute to what she called an *undoing effect* of negative emotions. In essence, by building a broader perspective, one also builds the skills necessary to better manage negative emotions.

In addition to her 15 years of research on positive emotion, Fredrickson (2009) pointed to a meta-analysis that covered almost 300 different scientific studies (cross-sectional, longitudinal, and experimental) that collectively tested more than 275,000 people. The study concluded that the happiness–success link exists not only because "success leads to happiness, but because positive affect (PA) engenders success" (Lyubomirsky, King, & Diener, 2005, p. 803). In a more recent update, Frederickson (2013) summarized extensive research

findings demonstrating that positive emotions "quite literally widen people's outlook on the world around them" (p. 815) and augment their personal resources such as competence, meaning, optimism, resilience, self-acceptance, positive relationships, and physical health.

On the basis of findings pertaining to Fredrickson's (2001) model, it is hypothesized that PPPM has the potential to foster positive emotions for the client during psychotherapy through the focus on positive masculinity. As the therapist helps the client to identify, seek, and expand masculinity strengths in everyday life, the client is likely to increase the ratio of positive to negative emotions, which in turn could stimulate flourishing mental health, which includes both feeling good (e.g., feeling optimistic and self-accepting) and doing good (e.g., developing positive relationships).

PPPM, PERMA, and the broaden-and-build theory challenge a historically negative bias still at work in psychology today that can skew the understanding of ordinary and successful human functioning (Sheldon & King, 2001). By cultivating a positive approach to therapeutic intervention, mental health practitioners can help male clients grow the positive emotions that lead to a broader perspective. With a broader perspective, resources can be built that foster the confidence and resilience needed to face life's challenges and engender well-being (Cohn, Fredrickson, Brown, Mikels, & Conway, 2009; Fredrickson, Cohn, Coffey, Pek, & Finkel, 2008). Thus, PPPM is a positive framework for counseling and therapy that assists boys and men to recognize and use masculinity strengths that can lead them to a flourishing life.

## Foundations From Scholarship on Positive Masculinity

Similar to the work of Kiselica, Englar-Carlson, and their colleagues (Englar-Carlson & Kiselica, 2013; Kiselica, 2008a, 2011; Kiselica & Englar-Carlson, 2010; Kiselica, Englar-Carlson, & Fisher, 2006; Kiselica et al., 2008), several scholars have identified positive aspects of masculinity based on their observations about men, qualitative analyses of descriptive literature about men, and reviews of research findings pertaining to fathers. One of the finest

descriptions of positive masculinity was provided by Levant (1995):

> [A] man's willingness to set aside his own needs for the sake of his family; his ability to withstand hardship and pain to protect others; his tendency to take care of people and solve their problems as if they were his own; his way of expressing love by doing things for others; his loyalty, dedication, and commitment; his stick-to-it-ive-ness and will to hang in until a situation is corrected; and his abilities to solve problems, think logically, rely on himself, take risks, stay calm in the face of danger, and assert himself. (p. 232)

Other writers have accentuated similar qualities of positive masculinity. Kilmartin (2010) considered courage, decisiveness, problem solving, and risk taking to be admirable masculine qualities. Hawkins and Dollahite (1996) and their associates have devoted considerable attention to the ways in which fathers care for the next generation through positive father work, or *generative fathering*, which refers to the way a father responds in a loving manner to his child's developmental needs over time (Dollahite & Hawkins, 1998). Oren, Englar-Carlson, Stevens, and Oren (2010) also focused on fathers' strengths, including men's ability to help children learn to regulate emotions through active, physical play; encouraging children in the face of challenges; listening to children; being honest with their feelings; being fair disciplinarians; and providing children the freedom to be alone. Citing prior writings by Kornhaber, Taylor (2007) described the positive qualities of grandfathers, which include their roles as family historians, mentors and teachers, nurturers of emotional and physical well-being, role models, and playmates. Gallardo and Serrano (2010) discussed the positive qualities of masculinity among Mexican American men who are considered *caballeros* (the Spanish word for *gentlemen*). Compared with men who demonstrate dysfunctional machismo, characterized by hyperaggression, drunkenness, sexual prowess, infidelity, coercive control of women, and punitive child rearing, a caballero is a caring

provider and protector who conducts himself with honor and commands respect for himself and his family in the home and the community. White (2008), in exploring the narrative of 20 African American men from a wide range of family backgrounds, ages, geographical locations, sexualities, and occupations, focused on the creative agency to redefine the assumptions and practices of manhood, create social change, and establish egalitarian relationships with women, children, and other men. Riggle and Rostosky (2011) documented the many positive aspects of being a gay man, noting the importance of creating communities, being a role model for others, and living authentically.

An emerging body of research is providing some preliminary empirical findings to expand knowledge about positive masculinity. Arciniega, Anderson, Tovar-Black, and Tracey (2008) found empirical support for two dimensions of masculinity among Mexican American men. One form, referred to as *traditional machismo*, is associated with aggression, antisocial behavior, greater levels of alexithymia, and more wishful thinking as a coping mechanism. The second dimension, referred to as *caballerismo*, is associated with affiliation, ethnic identity, and problem solving as a coping mechanism. The authors concluded, "Traditional Machismo can be described as aggressive, sexist, chauvinistic, and hypermasculine, whereas caballerismo can be described as nurturing, family-centered, and chivalrous" (p. 29).

In an investigation of traditional Western masculine norms, positive psychology strengths, and psychological well-being in a sample of 250 men ranging in age from 18 to 79, Hammer and Good (2010) found that endorsement of some traditional Western masculine norms (e.g., risk taking, dominance, primacy of work, and pursuit of status) were associated with positive psychology constructs of personal courage, autonomy, endurance, and resilience. However, they also found that men who endorsed conformity to the norms of winning, emotional control, self-reliance, and pursuit of status had lower levels of positive psychology concepts of personal courage, grit, and resilience. They noted that these norms are more associated with conforming to the expectations of others and society and not resisting social pressure; hence, these men are less

flexible in their adherence to traditional masculine norms. As the PMMM model suggests, health and well-being for men rests in the ability to flexibly adapt one's sense of masculinity and enact masculine norms in accordance with what is beneficial for self and others in any given setting.

In a study examining hardiness (i.e., the courage and ability to turn difficult situations into growth opportunities), psychological well-being, and conformity to masculinity norms with 117 college-attending veterans and active-duty service members, Alfred, Hammer, and Good (2013) found that greater conformity to traditional masculine norms (such as emotional control and dominance) predicted lower hardiness (i.e., a weaker sense of purpose, autonomy, and change as a growth opportunity), which in turn predicted lower psychological well-being. Alfred et al. hypothesized that conformity to traditional masculinity norms might serve men well while in the military, but such conformity can adversely affect adjustment in the civilian world. On the basis of these findings, we repeat our proposition that embracing expanded notions of masculinity, such as the positive notions described in this chapter, and flexibly adapting one's masculinity to different environments has the potential to foster hardiness and psychological well-being in men.

In their study of masculine identity, Roberts-Douglass and Curtis-Boles (2013) found evidence for both positive and negative masculinity among Black and African American men ages 18 to 22 years. The participants in this study reported witnessing both positive and negative role models in their lives. Men who were seen in the community as respected, successful role models—identified as fathers, grandfathers, teachers, coaches, and counselors—modeled positive notions of masculinity, including the beliefs that a decent man strives to achieve in school, seeks employment and financial independence, eschews violence, and takes care of his duties to his family. The participants reported that the influence of these positive role models could be very powerful and outweigh the potential influence of negative role models who endorse and demonstrate negative forms of masculinity, such as misogyny and hyperaggressiveness.

Lujan and O'Neil (2008) conducted an exploratory study of positive masculinity using the Positive Masculinity Checklist (see O'Neil & Lujan, 2010, for a published version of the checklist). The Positive Masculinity Checklist is a paper-and-pencil checklist consisting of 60 potential qualities of positive masculinity. Lujan and O'Neil administered the checklist to a class of undergraduate students and asked them to rank the top 10 qualities they believed to be most important in their personal definitions of positive masculinity. Within the top three rankings, 11 qualities were most frequent. In order from highest to lowest frequency, the 11 qualities were loving, honest, respectful, loyal, nonviolent, confident, responsible, believes in equality, open minded, affectionate, and supportive. Lujan and O'Neil followed up this activity with a second task, which involved asking the students to write a paper elaborating on their views regarding positive masculinity. Next, they conducted a qualitative analysis for common themes in the paper that revealed several recurring beliefs about healthy masculinity. These findings revealed that students considered men who have positive masculinity to

- be true to themselves;
- express their needs;
- be confident, secure, trustworthy, and neither afraid of being ostracized or devalued nor concerned about having to prove their worth to others;
- have inner knowledge of themselves;
- be capable of relating to other men in an emotionally intimate manner;
- use their power in positive ways, such as providing service to and protecting others;
- recognize and respect women's power;
- be willing to admit when they have made a mistake;
- dedicate themselves to getting things done and achieving their goals; and
- be supportive husbands, partners, and fathers.

A team of researchers at the University of South Alabama is in the process of conducting a multipart study to develop a scale to measure positive masculinity. According to McDermott (personal communication, November 4, 2013), the team has started an

investigation designed to empirically define the construct of positive masculinity by asking participants in the study to state what constitutes a "good man." The team will also ask participants to rate a number of traditional attributes of masculinity that could be positive, such as assertiveness, chivalry, and decisiveness. The findings from these two preliminary investigations will be used to develop items for a positive masculinity scale, which will then be subjected to psychometric analysis.

In summary, scholars of masculinity have suggested that positive masculinity is composed of a variety of qualities that vary yet overlap across different cultural groups of men. The body of empirical literature on positive masculinity is limited but growing. In brief, the findings from this literature suggest that positive masculinity exists, it is distinct from constricted masculinity, it is passed down from one generation of good men to the next, and its presence can be a powerful counterbalance to the influence of dysfunctional masculinity modeled by men who endorse constricted notions of masculinity. Future research, such as the projects reported by Arciniega et al. (2008) and McDermott (personal communication, November 4, 2013), is recommended to develop and refine instruments that measure positive masculinity, which can then be used for basic research designed to better ascertain the relationship between positive masculinity and psychosocial adjustment. Additional recommendations for pertinent research are suggested at the end of this chapter.

## Foundations From Research on Adolescent and Young Adult Fathers

Findings from 3 decades of research targeting adolescent and young adult fathers have demonstrated that male-sensitive, strengths-based outreach and counseling increases the engagement and retention of clients in service programs for young fathers. These findings illustrate that looking for and accentuating masculinity strengths in a therapeutic context can have many positive benefits.

A strengths-based model for helping young fathers emerged as a response to a steady climb in out-of-wedlock, adolescent pregnancy and parenthood rates in the United States, which reached an all-time high during the 1990s. During this period, numerous service programs for pregnant and parenting teens were developed and provided throughout the country (Kiselica, 2008b). The purpose of these programs was to assist young mothers and fathers with the dual developmental challenges of adolescence and parenthood and to prevent many of the negative outcomes associated with teenage parenthood, such as school drop-out, long-term financial difficulties, and relationship problems. The first wave of these programs was highly successful in recruiting young mothers, but not young fathers. Consequently, teams of researchers began to explore why adolescent young adult fathers did not enroll in these programs and what could be done to promote their use of program services (Kiselica & Kiselica, 2014).

Several demonstration projects (Achatz & MacAllum, 1994; Barth, Claycomb, & Loomis, 1988; Brown, 1990; Huey, 1987; Klinman, Sander, Rosen, Longo, & Martinez, 1985; Kost, 1997; Romo et al., 2004), which are described in detail elsewhere (see Kiselica, 2008b; Kiselica & Kiselica, 2014), were initiated to explore these questions. In addition to these service evaluation projects, a handful of pioneering scholars investigated the needs of young fathers, their attitudes regarding service programs, and how they were treated by medical, social service, and school professionals (e.g., Hendricks, 1988; Hernandez, 2002; Kiselica, Gorczynski, & Capps, 1998; Kiselica & Sturmer, 1993; Sullivan, 1985). The collective findings from these varied investigations revealed that adolescent fathers wanted help with the many stresses associated with early parenthood, but service programs had been geared toward the needs of young mothers, not young fathers. Thus, the programs had little appeal to males facing the crisis of early paternity. In addition, well-intentioned practitioners who did outreach with young fathers did not understand male ways of relating, which became a barrier to establishing rapport and engaging these young men. It was also the case that too many of the professionals employed in early teen parenting programs had pejorative views of young fathers and treated them in a judgmental manner, which alienated these youths and fed their mistrust of service providers.

On the basis of this information, programs were redesigned and guided by principles that are consistent with a positive masculinity framework. For example, recognizing the central importance of the worker–provider role to the lives of young fathers, program developers made sure to accentuate career counseling and job placement as major components of service programs, which, from the perspective of the young fathers, was a change that made the programs more appealing. Ineffective outreach strategies were replaced with those that involved male ways of relating. For example, instead of insisting on holding face-to-face meetings with clients in formal office settings, practitioners began to have their initial contacts in places where young men were accustomed to forming friendships, such as basketball courts and pool halls. Hernandez (2002) even went so far as meeting young men in their homes and assisting them with tasks that required manual labor, which prompted his clients to tell him intimate, emotional details about their lives. Case managers made sure to keep early contacts with the fathers light; to talk with the young men about nonthreatening topics, such as events in the local community; and to infuse timely doses of humor into the conversations. It is through these types of activities that young men form bonds with friends, so tapping into this male style of relating increased the success rate for engaging young men in service programs. Program developers also tapped into the active and group orientation of boys and men by incorporating recreational activities and male-oriented support groups into the programs. Discussions in these groups were designed to affirm the generative fatherhood strivings of these young men, even though many of them had histories of criminal activity and substance abuse—problems that were addressed later on, rather than right away, during the helping process. Thus, a positive focus on masculinity strengths helped the practitioners to earn the trust of the young men so that more sensitive topics could eventually be addressed.

As a result of making these changes, the number of young fathers enrolling in service programs exploded, and subsequent programs (e.g., Fagan, 2008; Florsheim et al., 2012; Mazza, 2002; Robbers, 2008, 2009, 2011; Weinman, Buzi, Smith, &

Nevarez, 2007) based on these male-friendly features and practices were developed (see Kiselica, 2008b; Kiselica & Kiselica, 2014, for summaries regarding each of these programs). A variety of encouraging outcomes were reported in these more recent studies and in those mentioned earlier. In all of the programs, the majority of the participants expressed favorable attitudes toward the treatment. Other beneficial outcomes included the following:

- Positive gains among program participants in terms of school and general educational development enrollment rates (Achatz & MacAllum, 1994; Barth et al., 1988; Huey, 1987; Klinman et al., 1985; Kost, 1997); internship placements (Kost, 1997); employment rates (Achatz & MacAllum, 1994; Barth et al., 1988; Brown, 1990; Huey, 1987; Klinman et al., 1985; Kost, 1997); wages and benefits earned (Achatz & MacAllum, 1994); and knowledge regarding child support laws, legal rights and responsibilities (Achatz & MacAllum, 1994; Huey, 1987), and birth control and pregnancy resolution options (Huey, 1987).
- Compared with a control group of adolescent fathers, greater involvement by program fathers in the prenatal care of their infants and higher birth weights of infants of program fathers (Barth et al., 1988).
- Increased use of resources for food, clothing, and transportation; more frequent use of wellness and sick care services for both the father and his child; heightened participation in parenting skills training; more responsible use of birth control; increased frequency of interactions between the father and child; more fathers establishing paternity; greater use of a support system; improved interpersonal relationships; increased use of public aid; greater implementation of plans to manage financial affairs; and increased paternal financial support of the child (Brown, 1990).
- Use of job-readiness training and a fatherhood preparation curriculum; increased declaration of paternity and child support payments; and positive changes in attitudes toward the child support system (Achatz & MacAllum, 1994).
- Increases in father–child interactions, decreases in conflict with father's partner, and increases

135

in employment, child support orders, and paternity establishment among program participants (Romo et al., 2004).

■ Significant increases in condom and contraceptive use and decreases in cigarette use (Weinman et al., 2007).

■ Significant improvements in parenting attitudes and behaviors and fathers' involvement with the baby (Robbers, 2008, 2009, 2011).

■ Significantly greater gains by fathers participating in a comprehensive program relative to those participating in a parenting skills group in employment rates, short-term and long-term career planning, feeling positive about their current and future relationships with their children, condom use during sex, seeing themselves as being a responsible man, having close friends, and being willing to consult with a social worker about a personal problem (Mazza, 2002).

■ Significantly higher pretest-to-posttest improvements in self-reported coparenting by program fathers relative to fathers in childbirth and childcare education and nontreatment control conditions (Fagan, 2008).

■ Significantly more likely engagement in child rearing and reporting of a more positive relationship with their coparenting partners at 18 months postnatal by fathers participating in a program for young parents than by fathers in a standard treatment consisting of traditional prenatal and social service (Florsheim et al., 2012).

In summary, the results of these intervention projects with adolescent fathers demonstrate that a strengths-based, male-friendly approach to program design, outreach, counseling, and case management is a highly effective way to foster numerous benefits for male clients, their loved ones, and society.

## IMPLICATIONS FOR COUNSELING AND PSYCHOTHERAPY WITH MEN

A large body of research has demonstrated that client variables contribute to successful psychotherapy outcomes (Wampold, 2010). Client strengths represent one of the core components of client variables. In a recent study of how therapists use client

strengths, Scheel, Davis, and Henderson (2012) reported the following findings:

> Therapists described strength work as having many advantages. It was perceived as building trust in the therapeutic relationship, motivating clients and instilling hope, and demonstrating the therapist's hope for and belief in the client. Therapists also reported that the use of client strengths broadened client perspectives about themselves, about the problems for which they had sought therapy, and about how change could occur. (p. 422)

Consistent with these practices, there has been a growing focus on applying strengths-based approaches to counseling and psychotherapy (Chapin & Boykin, 2010; Kosine, Steger, & Duncan, 2008; Smith, 2006), including specifically looking at strengths-based psychotherapy with men (Englar-Carlson & Kiselica, 2013). The intersection of positive psychology and counseling share the assumptions that "human goodness, growth, development, and excellence are as authentic and deserving of attention as disease, disorder, and distress" (p. 399). Therapists who accentuate males' strengths during their work with boys and men communicate to their clients a sense of hope about their clients' potential, help their clients see their positive male qualities, and provide them with a model of noble masculinity to strive for. On the basis of these considerations, a focus on positive masculinity could "increase the appeal and utility of counseling for more therapy-resistant men" (Hammer & Good, 2010, p. 314). Thus, echoing our prior work on this topic (Englar-Carlson & Kiselica, 2013; Kiselica, 2010, 2011; Kiselica & Englar-Carlson, 2010), we recommend that positive masculinity become a new foundation for counseling and psychotherapy with boys and men.

Therapists who do strength work have recommended striving to pay equal attention to both strengths and problems with clients. They see "problems and strengths as comprising two different continuums, making it possible to simultaneously concentrate on the client's problems and his or her

strengths . . . . Too much emphasis on one would diminish or undeservedly minimize the other" (Scheel et al., 2012, p. 423). We agree with this point of view and recommend that identifying, affirming, and promoting positive masculinity be balanced by efforts to address constricted notions of masculinity that have a destructive impact on a client and the significant others in their lives. Related to this idea, Kiselica (2011) suggested that therapists begin their work with boys and men from a PPPM perspective, using discussions about clients' masculinity strengths as a way to establish rapport and identify initial therapeutic goals. Then, after trust has been established, the focus can gradually broaden to include work to address gender role conflicts.

Positive masculinity can also be the foundation for primary prevention work with boys (O'Neil & Lujan, 2009). Kiselica et al. (2008) considered the teaching of positive masculinity to be "a building block for promoting wellness and honorable manhood in boys" (p. 32). Such instruction involves teaching boys about noble forms of masculinity while steering them away from constricted notions of masculinity that can do them harm. For example, they can be encouraged to be courageous and self-reliant and to take risks while being discouraged from walling themselves off from others emotionally or from being reckless in their behavior (Kiselica et al., 2008). Through such instruction, boys can also "learn alternatives to sexist attitudes and behaviors that can cause gender role conflict" (O'Neil & Lujan, 2009, p. 263).

## IMPLICATIONS FOR RESEARCH

Several avenues of future research will enhance the understanding of positive masculinity, starting with additional efforts to develop scales to measure positive masculinity. Stating that a positive framework for studying, understanding, and helping boys and men was long overdue and that such a framework would have great potential for clinical work with these populations, Wester (2006) and Rochlen (2006) suggested developing a measure of masculinity strengths, which could then be used in basic research and in psychotherapy to formally assess

positive masculine qualities in boys and men. Such a measure would nicely complement the Gender Role Conflict Scale (O'Neil, Helms, Gable, David, & Wrightsman, 1986), a psychometrically sound instrument that has been used for more than 30 years in hundreds of research studies and in psychotherapy to assess four patterns of gender role conflict (see O'Neil, 2008, 2013). Using both types of instruments might provide mental health professionals with a more accurate picture of both the benefits and the conflicts associated with different forms of masculinity.

On the basis of these suggestions, we applaud the work of Lujan and O'Neil (2008) and McDermott (personal communication, November 4, 2013) to develop a positive masculinity instrument. As research teams interested in developing a positive masculinity scale move forward with their work, we encourage them to incorporate the findings from descriptive accounts (e.g., Dollahite & Hawkins, 1998; Gallardo & Serrano, 2010; Hawkins & Dollahite, 1996; Kilmartin, 2010; Kiselica et al., 2008; Levant, 1995; Oren et al., 2010; Riggle & Rostosky, 2011; Taylor, 2007; White, 2008), qualitative research (e.g., Roberts-Douglass & Curtis-Boles, 2013), and empirical studies (e.g., Arciniega et al., 2008; Hammer & Good, 2010; Lujan & O'Neil, 2008) of positive masculinity as a foundation for scale construction. Kiselica and Englar-Carlson (2010) recommended that the results of such research be compared with the construct of positively valued masculinity, which has been identified by Spence and colleagues (Spence, 1993; Spence, Helmreich, & Holahan, 1979) in their empirical investigations regarding the multifactorial dimensions of gender.

Additional research should focus on the development of positive masculinity over time and in different contexts. Hammer and Good (2010) called for longitudinal research on the development of masculinity strengths, and several scholars have recommended additional research exploring how groups of men from various cultural backgrounds define positive masculinity (Arciniega et al., 2008; Hammer & Good, 2010; Roberts-Douglass & Curtis-Boles, 2013). Arciniega et al. (2008) noted that studies of masculinity tend to rely heavily on men who have

high socioeconomic status and advanced educational backgrounds and are members of professional fields. Therefore, more research using men with different socioeconomic status, educational, and occupational backgrounds is needed. Also, more studies of the social contexts and other factors (such as the mass media and music) that influence conformity to masculinity norms at an early age are recommended (Roberts-Douglass & Curtis-Boles, 2013).

Much of the current support for the clinical efficacy of the PPPM model has come from the studies of successful intervention projects with adolescent and young adult fathers that were reviewed earlier in this chapter. Central components of these projects included identifying, confronting, and working to reduce and eliminate biases about young fathers, looking for and affirming male strengths, and delivering male-oriented services (see Kiselica, 2008b). Although the theoretical underpinnings of these projects were PPPM-like in their design, they did not include the systematic application and evaluation of the particular aspects of adaptive, positive masculinity we have proposed in this chapter and in our earlier work on the subject (Englar-Carlson & Kiselica, 2013; Kiselica, 2008a, 2008b, 2011; Kiselica & Englar-Carlson, 2010; Kiselica, Englar-Carlson, & Fisher, 2006; Kiselica, Englar-Carlson, & Horne, 2008; Kiselica, Stevens, & Englar-Carlson, 2006). More complete therapeutic applications of the model have been reported in the literature, but those have been limited to case studies (Kiselica, 2011; Kiselica & Englar-Carlson, 2010). Thus, more research evaluating the clinical utility of the model is necessary, with a particular focus on examining its potential to promote in boys and men many of the positive benefits examined in positive psychology, such as self-acceptance, optimism, resiliency, and positive relationships.

The field also needs to devote more attention to evaluating interventions combining the PPPM and the gender role conflict models in counseling and psychotherapy with boys and men. As we have suggested here and elsewhere (Kiselica, 2011; Kiselica & Englar-Carlson, 2010), combining the two models creates a balanced approach to work with men that builds on masculinity strengths while addressing the gender role conflicts of men. Related

to this idea, Stevens (2006) has designed a model for psychotherapy that merges both perspectives, which he described in a presentation at the 114th Annual Meeting of the American Psychological Association. Stevens proposed that acknowledging traditional male strengths could serve as an inroad to addressing gender role conflicts and other detrimental effects of constricted masculinity. The literature on psychotherapy with boys and men could benefit from the publication of Stevens model and others like it.

## CONCLUSION

In her moving tribute to courageous men, Parker (2008) cogently commented that we have no paucity of male role models; "what we have is a failure to notice them" (p. 11A). Historically, psychology has contributed to this failure, and it is time for our profession to address this shortcoming by acknowledging that our world is blessed by the presence of decent men and by learning what we can from them about what it means to be a good man. As the lens of psychology widens to include the study of positive masculinity and masculinity strengths, the profession's ability to foster the maximum development of boys and men will be greatly enhanced.

## References

Achatz, M., & MacAllum, C. A. (1994). *Young unwed fathers: Report from the field*. Philadelphia, PA: Public/Private Ventures.

Alfred, G. C., Hammer, J. H., & Good, G. (2014). Male student veterans: Hardiness, psychological well being, and masculine norms. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity*, *15*, 95–99.

Andronico, M. (1996). Introduction. In M. Andronico (Ed.), *Men in groups: Insights, interventions, psychoeducational work* (pp. xvii–xxiv). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Arciniega, G. M., Anderson, T. C., Tovar-Blank, Z. G., & Tracey, T. J. G. (2008). Toward a fuller conception of machismo: Development of a traditional machismo and caballerismo scale. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, *55*, 19–33.

Aspinwall, L. G., & Staudinger, U. M. (2003). A psychology of human strengths: Some central issues of an emerging field. In L. G. Aspinwall & U. M. Staudinger (Eds.), *A psychology of human strengths: Fundamental questions and future directions for a*

*positive psychology* (pp. 9–22). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Axelrod, S. D. (2001). The vital relationship between work and masculinity: A psychoanalytic perspective. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity*, 2, 117–123.

Barth, R. P., Claycomb, M., & Loomis, A. (1988). Services to adolescent fathers. *Health and Social Work*, 13, 277–287.

Baumeister, R. F. (2007, August). *Is there anything good about men?* Invited address at the 105th Annual Meeting of the American Psychological Association, San Francisco, CA.

Ben Ali Shrine Center. (2006). *Want to be a Shriner?* Retrieved from http://www.ben-ali-shriners.org/Want2be.htm

Benenson, J. F., Apostoleris, N. H., & Parnass, J. (1997). Age and sex differences in dyadic and group interaction. *Developmental Psychology*, 33, 538–543. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0012-1649.33.3.538

Bernard, J. (1981). The good-provider role: Its rise and fall. *American Psychologist*, 36, 1–12.

Brooks, G. R., & Silverstein, L. B. (1995). Understanding the dark side of masculinity: An interactive systems model. In R. F. Levant & W. S. Pollack (Eds.), *A new psychology of men* (pp. 280–336). New York, NY: Basic Books.

Brooks, R., & Goldstein, S. (2001). *Raising resilient children*. Chicago, IL: Contemporary Books.

Brown, S. (1990). *If the shoes fit: Final report and program implementation guide of the Maine Young Fathers Project*. Portland: University of Southern Maine, Human Services Development Institute.

Buhrmester, D. (1996). Need fulfillment, interpersonal competence, and the developmental contexts of early adolescent friendship. In W. M. Bukowski, A. F. Newcomb, & W. W. Hartup (Eds.), *The company they keep: Friendship in childhood and adolescence* (pp. 158–185). New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Carlson, J. D., & Englar-Carlson, M. (2013). Adlerian therapy. In J. Frew & M. Spiegler (Eds.), *Contemporary psychotherapies for a diverse world* (1st rev. ed., pp. 87–130). New York, NY: Routledge.

Chapin, M., & Boykin, R. (2010). Gray matter: Integrating positive psychology techniques into rehabilitation counselor education. *Rehabilitation Education*, 24, 25–34.

Chapple, A., & Ziebland, S. (2004). The role of humor for men with testicular cancer. *Qualitative Health Research*, 14, 1123–1139.

Christiansen, S., & Palkovitz, R. (2001). Why the "good provider" role still matters: Providing as a form of paternal involvement. *Journal of Family Issues*, 22, 84–106.

Cialdini, R., & Goldstein, N. (2004). Social influence: Compliance and conformity. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 55, 591–621.

Clinchy, B., & Zimmerman, C. (1985). *Growing up intellectually: Issues for college women* (Work in Progress, No. 19). Wellesley, MA: Wellesley College, Stone Center for Developmental Services and Studies.

Cohn, M. A., Fredrickson, B. L., Brown, S. L., Mikels, J. A., & Conway, A. M. (2009). Happiness unpacked: Positive emotions increase life satisfaction by building resilience. *Emotion*, 9, 361–368. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0015952

Diener, E. (2009). Positive psychology: Past, present, and future. In S. J. Lopez & C. R. Snyder (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of positive psychology* (2nd ed., pp. 7–12). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Dollahite, D. C., & Hawkins, A. J. (1998). A conceptual ethic of generative fathering. *Journal of Men's Studies*, 7, 109–132.

Englar-Carlson, M. (2006). Masculine norms and the therapy process. In M. Englar-Carlson & M. S. Stevens (Eds.), *In the room with men: A casebook of therapeutic change* (pp. 13–47). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Englar-Carlson, M. (2014). A primer on counseling men. In M. Englar-Carlson, M. Evans, & T. Duffey (Eds.), *A counselor's guide to working with men* (pp. 1–35). Alexandria, VA: American Counseling Association.

Englar-Carlson, M., & Kiselica, M. S. (2013). Affirming the strengths in men: A positive masculinity approach to assisting male clients. *Journal of Counseling and Development*, 91, 399–409.

Englar-Carlson, M., & Smart, R. S. (2014). Positive psychology of gender. In J. T. Pedrotti & L. Edwards (Eds.), *Perspectives on the intersection of positive psychology and multiculturalism* (pp. 125–142). New York, NY: Springer.

Fagan, J. (2008). Randomized study of a prebirth coparenting intervention with adolescent and young fathers. *Family Relations*, 57, 309–323. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1741-3729.2008.00502.x

Florsheim, P., Burrow-Sánchez, J., Minami, T., McArthur, L., Heavin, S., & Hudak, C. (2012). Young Parenthood Program: Supporting positive paternal engagement through coparenting counseling. *American Journal of Public Health*, 102, 1886–1892.

Foster, S. L., & Lloyd, P. J. (2007). Positive psychology principles applied to consulting psychology at the individual and group level. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research*, 59, 30–40. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/1065-9293.59.1.30

Fredrickson, B. L. (2000). Cultivating research on positive emotions: A response. *Prevention and Treatment*, 3, Article 7r. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/1522-3736.3.1.37r

Fredrickson, B. L. (2009). *Positivity*. New York, NY: Three Rivers Press.

Fredrickson, B. L. (2013). Updated thinking on positivity ratios. *American Psychologist*, *68*, 814–822. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0033584

Fredrickson, B. L., Cohn, M. A., Coffey, K. A., Pek, J., & Finkel, S. M. (2008). Open hearts build lives: Positive emotions, induced through loving-kindness meditation, build consequential personal resources. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *95*, 1045–1062. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0013262

Gallardo, M. E., & Serrano, R. (2010, June). *Intimate partner violence: Understanding men's perspectives*. Symposium presented at the Second National Conference on Psychotherapy With Men, Austin, TX.

Gidycz, C. A., Orchowski, L. M., & Berkowitz, A. D. (2011). Preventing sexual aggression among college men: An evaluation of a social norms and bystander intervention program. *Violence Against Women*, *17*, 720–742.

Grothaus, T., McAuliffe, G., & Craigen, L. (2012). Infusing cultural competence and advocacy into strength-based counseling. *Journal of Humanistic Counseling*, *51*, 51–65.

Hammer, J. H., & Good, G. E. (2010). Positive psychology: An empirical examination of beneficial aspects of endorsement of masculine norms. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity*, *11*, 303–318.

Hammond, W. P., & Mattis, J. S. (2005). Being a man about it: Manhood meaning among African American men. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity*, *6*, 114–126.

Hawkins, A. J., & Dollahite, D. C. (Eds.) (1996). *Generative fathering: Beyond deficit perspectives*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Heesacker, M., Wester, S. R., Vogel, D. L., Wentzel, J. T., Mejia-Millan, C. M., & Goodholm, C. R. (1999). Gender-based emotional stereotyping. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, *46*, 483–495.

Hendricks, L. E. (1988). Outreach with teenage fathers: A preliminary report on three ethnic groups. *Adolescence*, *23*, 711–720.

Heppner, M. J., & Heppner, P. P. (2001). Addressing the implications of male socialization for career counseling. In G. R. Brooks & G. E. Good (Eds.), *The new handbook of psychotherapy and counseling with men* (pp. 369–386). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Heppner, M. J., & Heppner, P. P. (2009). On men and work: Taking the road less traveled. *Journal of Career Development*, *36*, 49–67.

Hernandez, R. (2002). *Fatherwork in the crossfire: Chicano teen fathers struggling to take care of business* (Report No. JSRI-WP-58). East Lansing: Michigan State University, Julian Samora Research Institute.

Huey, W. C. (1987). Counseling teenage fathers: The "Maximizing a Life Experience" (MALE) group. *School Counselor*, *35*, 40–47.

Hurtado, A., & Sinha, M. (2008). More than men: Latino feminist masculinities and intersectionality. *Sex Roles*, *59*, 337–349.

Isacco, A., Talovic, E., Chromik, L., & Yallum, N. (2012). Addressing men's mental health through a strength-based approach. In J. M. Rippe (Ed.), *Lifestyle medicine* (2nd ed., pp. 369–382). Boca Raton, FL: CRC Press.

Kersting, K. (2005). Men and depression: Battling stigma through public education. *Monitor on Psychology*, *36*(6), 66. Retrieved from http://www.apa.org/monitor/jun05/stigma.html

Kilmartin, C. T. (2010). *The masculine self* (4th ed.). Cornwall-on-Hudson, NY: Sloan.

Kilmartin, C. T. (2014). Using humor and storytelling in men's work. In A. B. Rochlen & F. E. Rabinowitz (Eds.), *Breaking barriers in counseling men: Insights and innovations* (pp. 20–29). New York, NY: Routledge.

Kilmartin, C. T., & Berkowitz, A. D. (2005). *Sexual assault in context: Teaching college men about gender*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Kiselica, M. S. (2001). A male-friendly therapeutic process with school-age boys. In G. R. Brooks & G. Good (Eds.), *The handbook of counseling and psychotherapy with men: Vol. 1. A guide to settings and approaches* (pp. 43–58). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Kiselica, M. S. (2003a, Autumn). Male-sensitive counseling with boys. *Counselling in Education*, 16–19.

Kiselica, M. S. (2003b). Transforming psychotherapy in order to succeed with boys: Male-friendly practices. *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, *59*, 1225–1236.

Kiselica, M. S. (2006a, August). Contributions and limitations of the deficit model of men. In M. S. Kiselica (Chair), *Toward a positive psychology of boys, men, and masculinity*. Symposium presented at the 114th Annual Meeting of the American Psychological Association, New Orleans, LA.

Kiselica, M. S. (2006b, August). *Invited Division 17 Fellow's address: Thinking complexly about boys, men, and masculinity*. Paper presented at the 114th Annual Meeting of the American Psychological Association, New Orleans, LA.

Kiselica, M. S. (2007, March). *A positive psychology of boys, men and masculinity: A strength-based perspective on engaging males*. Keynote address presented at the annual conference of the American Men's Studies Association, Kansas City, MO.

Kiselica, M. S. (2008a, August). Implementing strength-based initiatives with men: Lessons from the field.

In M. S. Kiselica (Chair), *Strength-based psychotherapy with boys and men: Issues and challenges*. Symposium presented at the 116th Annual Meeting of the American Psychological Association, Boston, MA.

Kiselica, M. S. (2008b). *When boys become parents: Adolescent fatherhood in America*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.

Kiselica, M. S. (2009). Reaching nonresident fathers in the child welfare system: Understanding male help-seeking behavior. *Child Law Practice, 27, 161*, 166–170.

Kiselica, M. S. (2011). Promoting positive masculinity while addressing gender role conflicts: A balanced theoretical approach to clinical work with boys and men. In C. Blazina & D. Shen-Miller (Eds.), *An international psychology of men: Theoretical advances, case studies, and clinical innovations* (pp. 127–156). New York, NY: Routledge.

Kiselica, M. S., & Englar-Carlson, M. (2010). Identifying, affirming, and building upon male strengths: The positive psychology/positive masculinity model of psychotherapy with boys and men. *Psychotherapy: Theory, Research, Practice, Training, 47*, 276–287.

Kiselica, M. S., Englar-Carlson, M., & Fisher, M. (2006, August). A positive psychology framework for building upon male strengths. In M. S. Kiselica (Chair), *Toward a positive psychology of boys, men, and masculinity*. Symposium presented at the 114th Annual Meeting of the American Psychological Association, New Orleans, LA.

Kiselica, M. S., Englar-Carlson, M., Horne, A. M., & Fisher, M. (2008). A positive psychology perspective on helping boys. In M. S. Kiselica, M. Englar-Carlson, & A. M. Horne (Eds.), *Counseling troubled boys: A guidebook for practitioners* (pp. 31–48). New York, NY: Routledge.

Kiselica, M. S., Gorczynski, J., & Capps, S. (1998). Teen mothers and fathers: School counselor perceptions of service needs. *Professional School Counseling, 2*, 146–152.

Kiselica, M. S., & Kiselica, A. M. (2011). Moving beyond simplistic stereotypes: A male-friendly perspective on understanding and helping adolescent fathers. In National Fatherhood Initiative (Ed.), *Father facts six* (pp. 43–46). Germantown, MD: National Fatherhood Initiative.

Kiselica, M. S., & Kiselica, A. M. (2014). The complicated worlds of adolescent fathers: Implications for clinical practice, public policy, and research. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity, 15*, 260–274.

Kiselica, M. S., & O'Brien, S. (2001, August). Are attachment disorders and alexithymia characteristic of males? In M. S. Kiselica (Chair), *Are males really emotional mummies? What do the data indicate?* Symposium conducted at the 109th Annual Meeting of the American Psychological Association, San Francisco, CA.

Kiselica, M. S., Stevens, M., & Englar-Carlson, M. (2006, August). Promoting strengths and addressing dysfunction during clinical work with men. In M. S. Kiselica (Chair), *Toward a positive psychology of boys, men, and masculinity*. Symposium presented at the 114th Annual Meeting of the American Psychological Association, New Orleans, LA.

Kiselica, M. S., & Sturmer, P. (1993). Is society giving teenage fathers a mixed message? *Youth and Society, 24*, 487–501.

Klinman, D. G., Sander, J. H., Rosen, J. L., Longo, K. R., Martinez, L. P. (1985). *The teen parent collaboration: Reaching and serving the teenage father*. New York, NY: Bank Street College of Education.

Kosine, N., Steger, M., & Duncan, S. (2008). Purpose-centered career development: A strengths-based approach to finding meaning and purpose in careers. *Professional School Counseling, 12*, 133–136.

Kost, K. A. (1997). The effects of support on the economic well being of young fathers. *Families in Society, 78*, 370–382.

Levant, R. F. (1995). Toward the reconstruction of masculinity. In R. F. Levant & W. S. Pollack (Eds.), *A new psychology of men* (pp. 239–251). New York, NY: Basic Books.

Levant, R. F. (2011). Research in the psychology of men and masculinity using the gender role strain paradigm as a framework. *American Psychologist, 66*, 765–776. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0025034

Lopez, S. J., & Snyder, C. R. (2009). A case for positive psychology. In S. J. Lopez & C. R. Snyder (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of positive psychology* (2nd ed., pp. 3–6). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Loscocco, K. (2007). Gender patterns in provider role attitudes and behavior. *Journal of Family Issues, 28*, 934–954.

Lujan, M., & O'Neil, J. M. (2008, August). *Investigating parameters of healthy masculinity using the Positive Masculinity Checklist*. Poster presented at the 116th Annual Meeting of the American Psychological Association, Boston, MA.

Lyubomirsky, S., King, L., & Diener, E. (2005). The benefits of frequent positive affect: Does happiness lead to success? *Psychological Bulletin, 131*, 803–855. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.131.6.803

ManKind Project. (2013). *Hear the call, take the risk, get the rewards*. Retrieved from http://mkpusa.org

Mazza, C. (2002). Young dads: The effects of a parenting program on urban African-American adolescent fathers. *Adolescence, 37*, 681–693.

McNelles, L., & Connolly, J. (1999). Intimacy between adolescent friends: Age and gender differences in intimate affect and intimate behaviors. *Journal of Research on Adolescence*, *9*, 143–159. http://dx.doi.org/10.1207/s15327795jra0902_2

McNulty, J., & Fincham, F. (2012). Beyond positive psychology? Toward a contextual view of psychological processes and well-being. *American Psychologist*, *67*, 101–110.

100 Black Men in America, Inc. (2009). *About us.* Retrieved from http://www.100blackmen.org

O'Neil, J. M. (2008). Summarizing 25 years of research on men's gender role conflict using the Gender Role Conflict Scale: New research paradigms and clinical implications. *Counseling Psychologist*, *36*, 358–445.

O'Neil, J. M. (2012). The psychology of men. In E. Altmaier & J. Hansen (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of counseling psychology* (pp. 375–408). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

O'Neil, J. M. (2013). Gender-role conflict research 30 years later: An evidence based diagnostic schema. *Journal of Counseling and Development*, *91*, 490–498.

O'Neil, J. M. (2014). Foreword. In M. Englar-Carlson, M. Evans, & T. Duffey (Eds.), *A counselor's guide to working with men* (pp. ix–xix). Alexandria, VA: American Counseling Association.

O'Neil, J. M., Helms, B., Gable, R., David, L., & Wrightsman, L. (1986). Gender Role Conflict Scale (GRCS): College men's fear of femininity. *Sex Roles*, *14*, 335–350.

O'Neil, J. M., & Lujan, M. L. (2009). Preventing boys' problems in schools through psychoeducational programming: A call to action. *Psychology in the Schools*, *46*, 257–266. http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/pits.20371

O'Neil, J. M., & Lujan, M. L. (2010). An assessment paradigm for fathers and men using gender role conflict theory. In C. Oren & D. C. Oren (Eds.), *Counseling fathers* (pp. 49–72). New York, NY: Routledge.

Oren, C. Z., Englar-Carlson, M., Stevens, M. S., & Oren, D. C. (2010). Counseling fathers from a strength-based perspective. In C. Oren & D. C. Oren (Eds.), *Counseling fathers* (pp. 23–48). New York, NY: Routledge.

Parker, K. (2008, September 14). Real heroes: Giants among the Lilliputians. *Bucks County Courier Times*, p. 11A.

Pedrotti, J. T., & Edwards, L. M. (2009). The intersection of positive psychology and multiculturalism in counseling. In J. G. Ponterotto, J. M. Casas, L. A. Suzuki, & C. M. Alexander (Eds.), *Handbook of multicultural counseling* (3rd ed., pp. 165–174). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Peterson, C. (2006). *A primer in positive psychology*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Pleban, F. T., & Diez, K. S. (2007). Fathers as mentors: Bridging the gap between generations. In S. E. Brotherson & J. M. White (Eds.), *Why fathers count: The importance of fathers and their involvement with children* (pp. 307–318). Harriman, TN: Men's Studies Press.

Pleck, J. H. (1981). *The myth of masculinity*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Pollack, W. S. (1995). No man is an island: Toward a new psychoanalytic psychology of men. In R. F. Levant & W. S. Pollack (Eds.), *A new psychology of men* (pp. 33–67). New York, NY: Basic Books.

Riggle, E., & Rostosky, S. (2011). *A positive view for LGBTQ: Embracing identity and cultivating well-being*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Robbers, M. P. (2008). The caring equation: An intervention program for teenage mothers and their male partners. *Children and Schools*, *30*, 37–47. http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/cs/30.1.37

Robbers, M. P. (2009). Facilitating fatherhood: A longitudinal examination of father involvement among young minority fathers. *Child and Adolescent Social Work Journal*, *26*, 121–134. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10560-008-0157-6

Robbers, M. P. (2011). Father involvement among young Hispanics. *Families in Society*, *92*, 169–175.

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.

Rochlen, A. (2006, August). Discussant's comments. In M. S. Kiselica (Chair), *Toward a positive psychology of boys, men, and masculinity*. Symposium presented at the 114th Annual Meeting of the American Psychological Association, New Orleans, LA.

Romo, C., Bellamy, J., & Coleman, M. T. (2004). *TFF final evaluation report*. Austin, TX: Texas Fragile Families Initiative.

Scheel, M. J., Davis, C. K., & Henderson, J. D. (2012). Therapist use of strengths: A qualitative study of positive processes. *Counseling Psychologist*, *41*, 392–427.

Seligman, M. E. P. (2011). *Flourish*. New York, NY: Atria Books.

Seligman, M. E. P., & Csikszentmihalyi, M. (2000). Positive psychology: An introduction. *American Psychologist*, *55*, 5–14.

Sheldon, K. M., & King, L. (2001). Why positive psychology is necessary. *American Psychologist*, *56*, 216–217. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.56.3.216

Shields, A. (2008). Gender: An intersectionality perspective. *Sex Roles*, *59*, 301–311. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11199-008-9501-8

Skovholt, T. (1990). Career themes in counseling and psychotherapy with men. In D. Moore & F. Leafgren (Eds.), *Men in conflict* (pp. 39–53). Alexandria, VA: American Association for Counseling and Development.

Smith, E. (2006). The strength-based counseling model. *Counseling Psychologist*, *34*, 13–79.

Snarey, J. (1993). *How fathers care for the next generation: A four-decade study*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Snyder, C. R., & Lopez, S. J. (2007). *Positive psychology: The scientific and practical explorations of human strengths*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Snyder, C. R., Lopez, S. J., & Pedrotti, J. T. (2011). Hope. In C. R. Snyder, S. J. Lopez, & J. T. Pedrotti (Eds.), *Positive psychology: The scientific and practical explorations of human strengths* (2nd ed., pp. 183–191). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Spence, J. T. (1993). Gender-related traits and gender ideology: Evidence for a multifactorial theory. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *64*, 624–635.

Spence, J. T., Helmreich, R. L., & Holahan, C. K. (1979). Negative and positive components of psychological masculinity and femininity and their relationship to self-reports of neurotic and acting out behaviors. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *37*, 1673–1682.

Stevens, M. A. (2006, August). Engaging men and psychotherapy: Respect and challenge. In M. S. Kiselica (Chair), *Toward a positive psychology of boys, men, and masculinity*. Symposium presented at the 114th Annual Meeting of the American Psychological Association, New Orleans, LA.

Sullivan, M. L. (1985). *Teen fathers in the inner city: An exploratory ethnographic study* (Report No. UD 024 536). New York, NY: Vera Institute of Justice.

Surrey, J. L. (1985). *Self-in-relation: A theory of women's development* (Work in Progress, No. 13). Wellesley, MA: Wellesley College, Stone Center for Developmental Services and Studies.

Taylor, A. C. (2007). Grandfathers: Rediscovering America's forgotten resource. In S. E. Brotherson & J. M. White (Eds.), *Why fathers count: The importance of fathers and their involvement with children* (pp. 91–104). Harriman, TN: Men's Studies Press.

Thomas, J. L. (1994). Older men as fathers and grandfathers. In E. H. Thompson (Ed.), *Older men's lives* (pp. 197–217). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Tobin, D. D., Menon, M., Menon, M., Spatta, B., Hodges, E., & Perry, D. G. (2010). The intrapsychics of gender: A model of self-socialization. *Psychological Review*, *117*, 601–622.

Vereen, L., Hill, N., & Butler, S. (2013). The use of humor and storytelling with African American men: Innovative therapeutic strategies for success in counseling. *International Journal for the Advancement of Counselling*, *35*, 57–63.

Wampold, B. E. (2010). *The basics of psychotherapy*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Weinman, M. L., Buzi, R. S., Smith, P. B., & Nevarez, L. (2007). A comparison of three groups of young fathers and program outcomes. *School Social Work Journal*, *32*, 1–13.

Wester, S. (2006, August). Discussant's comments. In M. S. Kiselica (Chair), *Toward a positive psychology of boys, men, and masculinity*. Symposium presented at the 114th Annual Meeting of the American Psychological Association, New Orleans, LA.

Wester, S. R., Vogel, D. L., Pressly, P. K., & Heesacker, M. (2002). Sex differences in emotion: A critical review of the literature and implications for counseling psychology. *Counseling Psychologist*, *30*, 629–651.

White, A. (2008). *Ain't I a feminist? African American men speak out on fatherhood, friendship, forgiveness, and freedom*. New York: State University of New York Press.

White Ribbon. (2014). *Who we are*. Retrieved from http://www.whiteribbon.ca/who-we-are

Williams, R. C., & Myer, R. A. (1992). The men's movement: An adjunct to traditional counseling approaches. *Journal of Mental Health Counseling*, *14*, 393–404.

Wolin, S. J., & Wolin, S. (1993). *The resilient self*. New York, NY: Villard Books.