




12-2012

Influences in the Platonic Same-Sex Friendships of Heterosexual Black Males

Darian Mitchell

Western Michigan University, darian.d.mitchell@gmail.com

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarworks.wmich.edu/dissertations>

 Part of the [Race and Ethnicity Commons](#), and the [Social Psychology and Interaction Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Mitchell, Darian, "Influences in the Platonic Same-Sex Friendships of Heterosexual Black Males" (2012). *Dissertations*. 114.
<https://scholarworks.wmich.edu/dissertations/114>

This Dissertation-Open Access is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate College at ScholarWorks at WMU. It has been accepted for inclusion in Dissertations by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks at WMU. For more information, please contact maira.bundza@wmich.edu.



INFLUENCES IN THE PLATONIC SAME SEX FRIENDSHIPS OF
HETEROSEXUAL BLACK MALES

by

Darian Mitchell

A Dissertation
Submitted to the
Faculty of The Graduate College
in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the
Degree of Doctor of Philosophy
Department of Counselor Education and Counseling Psychology
Advisor: Lonnie Duncan, Ph.D.

Western Michigan University
Kalamazoo, Michigan
December 2012

INFLUENCES IN THE PLATONIC SAME-SEX FRIENDSHIPS OF HETEROSEXUAL BLACK MALES

Darian Mitchell, Ph.D.

Western Michigan University, 2012

This study sought to examine potential influences of intimacy levels in the same-sex friendships of Black males. Attention was given to adherence to traditional masculine norms, age, socioeconomic status, religious support, and adult male presence as potential influences. One hundred and thirty-nine Black males completed a survey consisting of a demographic questionnaire, the index of Emotional Intimacy in Same-Sex Friendships (EISSF), the Religious Support Scale (RSS), the Barratt Simplified Measure of Social Status (BSMSS), and the Conformity to Masculine Norms Inventory (CMNI). This study found a minimal positive relationship between emotional intimacy and the hypothesized influences.

Copyright by
Darian Mitchell
2012

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to thank God, my family, and everyone else who has helped me in this journey.

Darian Mitchell

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|---|----|
| ACKNOWLEDGMENTS | ii |
| LIST OF TABLES | vi |
| CHAPTER | |
| I. INTRODUCTION..... | 1 |
| II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE..... | 12 |
| History of Men’s Same-Sex Friendships | 13 |
| Men’s Same-Sex Friendships | 15 |
| Black Men’s Same-Sex Friendships | 19 |
| Intimacy | 27 |
| Influences..... | 30 |
| Adherence to Masculine Norms..... | 33 |
| Understanding Black Masculinity..... | 37 |
| Socioeconomic Status | 41 |
| Age..... | 45 |
| Religious Support | 48 |
| Male Presence | 49 |
| Summary..... | 52 |
| III. METHODOLOGY..... | 55 |

Table of Contents—continued

| | | |
|------------|--|-----|
| III. | METHODOLOGY..... | 55 |
| | Measures | 57 |
| | Procedure | 62 |
| | Hypotheses | 63 |
| IV. | RESULTS | 65 |
| | Descriptive Analyses..... | 65 |
| | Bivariate Correlations | 67 |
| | Additional Bivariate Correlations Analyses..... | 70 |
| | Summary of Bivariate Correlations | 71 |
| | Regression Analyses | 72 |
| | Additional Regression Analyses | 73 |
| | Summary of Regression Analyses..... | 75 |
| | Summary of Data | 75 |
| V. | DISCUSSION | 76 |
| | Limitations and Directions for Future Research | 80 |
| | Implications..... | 85 |
| | Conclusions..... | 87 |
| APPENDICES | | |
| | A. Demographic Questionnaire | 97 |
| | B. Index of Emotional Intimacy in Same Sex Friendships | 98 |
| | C. Conformity to Masculine Norms Inventory: Sample | 99 |
| | D. Religious Support Scale: Support Questionnaire..... | 100 |

Table of Contents—continued

| | |
|---|-----|
| E. Barrat Simplified Measure of Social Status (BSMSS) Measuring SES..... | 101 |
| F. Informed Consent | 103 |
| G. Institutional Review Board Permissions | 104 |
| BIBLIOGRAPHY | 108 |

LIST OF TABLES

| | |
|--|----|
| 1. Age Group..... | 56 |
| 2. Adult Male Presence | 56 |
| 3. Descriptive Statistics..... | 67 |
| 4. Bivariate Correlations of Predictor Variables | 68 |
| 5. Bivariate Correlations of CMNI Subscales and Number of Male Friends/Age..... | 71 |
| 6. Multiple Regression of Independent Variables..... | 89 |
| 7. Regression of Emotional Intimacy and Adherence to Masculine Norms | 90 |
| 8. Regression of CMNI Subscales and Emotional Intimacy | 91 |
| 9. Number of Male Friends | 92 |
| 10. Regression of Select CMNI Subscales and Emotional Intimacy | 93 |
| 11. Regression of CMNI Subscales and Age | 94 |
| 12. Regression of Select CMNI Subscales and Emotional Intimacy | 95 |
| 13. Regression of CMNI Subscales and Number of Male Friends | 96 |

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Men's same sex friendships have been discussed in popular literature. However, there are few empirical studies that have solely examined male heterosexual same sex friendships (Levy, 2005; Belgrave & Allison, 2006). The studies that exist have mostly examined men's heterosexual same sex friendships in comparison to females' same sex friendships. Some of these studies examined the forming of friendships (Fehr, 1996; Caldwell & Peplau, 1982, Rose 1985), conservation of those friendships, satisfaction, closeness, and intimacy (Parks & Floyd, 1996; Veniegas & Peplau, 1997; Banks & Hansford, 2005). Many of these studies have found that men's heterosexual same sex friendships are less intimate than women's heterosexual same-sex friendships (Sapadin, 1988; Mosley et al, 1987; Fehr, 2004, 1996; Winstead & Griffin, 2001; Kimmel, 2004). With the constant reiteration of these findings one can assert that many studies have looked at male platonic same sex friendships from a deficit model. Constantly comparing women's platonic same sex friendships to men's platonic same sex friendships has created the idea that men are less capable or less willing of forming and maintaining these (emotionally) intimate friendships with other males.

Many of the studies that are in existence, although potentially problematic, have not been inclusive of African American men. With very few studies regarding African American men's friendships one can deduce that there is a need to address this topic in greater detail (Harris, 1992; Franklin, 1992; Roberts, 1994). However, this topic is still fairly scarce in peer reviewed journals and other traditional social science literature. Researchers and scholars have suggested that traditional masculinity (Harris, 1992); socioeconomic status (Franklin, 1992) and religiosity/spirituality may influence same sex friendships of African American men (Mattis et. al, 2001).

Studying Black male platonic same sex friendships is important because a lack of empirical research in this area has perpetuated the belief that African American men do not develop meaningful relationships but develop relationships that are superficial, violent, contentious, or pathological (Franklin, 1992). A lingering question, is, what are the factors that lead to African American men developing healthy emotionally intimate friendships with other men? Given the fact there are few studies examining the same sex friendships of African American men, this study will examine if adhering to traditional masculine norms influences intimacy levels in those friendships while keeping in mind certain contextual variables; adult male presence, socioeconomic status, religious support, and age. The psychosocial variables (intimacy and masculinity) and contextual variables (male presence, socioeconomic status, religious

support, and age) will be discussed to highlight their importance in the lives of African American men. It has been suggested that adhering to masculine norms can cause problems in relating to others. Men's same sex friendships are typically viewed as being less supportive and intimate than women's same sex friendships (Sapadin, 1988; Mosley et al, 1987; Fehr, 1996). In a very informative study, Banks and Hansford (2000) tested six possible explanations for why men's same sex friendships were less intimate and supportive than women's same sex friendships. Included in the explanations were emotional restraint, homophobia, masculine self identity, competitive strivings, and role conflicts all of which can be related to traditional masculine norms.

Fehr (2004), in discussing intimacy expectations in same-sex friendships identified three different perspectives: (a) women and men agree on the path to intimacy, but men will ignore it; (b) there are different but equal paths to intimacy for men (activities) and women (self disclosure); (c) there are two paths of intimacy for men (self disclosure and activities).

Although the literature has not refuted these three different perspectives on men's expectations concerning intimacy in same-sex friendships, measuring intimacy has been controversial. Hook et. al (2003) asserted that intimacy (from a Western perspective) has been measured improperly. In order to produce a more accurate assessment of this construct the components of a) love and affection, b) personal validation,

c) trust, and d) self-disclosure should be measured. These four components can be viewed as being relative to one another. The individual, who seemingly feels the love and affection, may begin to sense personal validation, which will allow them to trust and become more comfortable in disclosing personal information. This would hopefully create a true sense of intimacy.

When discussing how men relate to one another it is important to consider their adherence to traditional masculine norms. What needs to be understood is that these traditional norms have been created and established from a European American point of view. African American men, since coming to the United States, have been forced to develop and achieve their masculinity in accordance with these European American norms. It can be argued that this adoption of traditional masculine norms is rooted in the results of (and abolishment) of slavery. Slavery in and of itself was a dehumanizing and emasculating process for African American males (Myers, 1988; Bush, 1999; Harris, 1992; Leary, 2005).

Subsequently, some African American males have adopted the masculine norms of the society they inhabited in order to survive and be accepted.

Traditional masculine norms that might be adhered to can be identified as; 1) winning, 2) emotional control, 3) risk taking, 4) violence, 5) power over women, 6) dominance, 7) playboy, 8) self reliance, 9) primacy of work, 10) disdain for homosexuals, and 11) pursuit of status (Mahalik et al., 2003).

For those African American males that adopt the “traditional” masculine norms there is potential for great difficulty. In general there is potential for mental stress for men who over subscribe to these masculine norms, and possible damaging of relationships with family and friends. Berger et. al (2005) found that adherence to these masculine roles can be related to alexithymia and depressive symptoms. Burn & Ward (2005) found adherence to masculine norms as having a negative influence on how male participants assessed their relationships and the satisfaction within them. Shepard (2002) also found a link between restricted emotionality and depressive symptoms amongst college men. Overall it is apparent that the following of these “rules” of masculinity can lead to challenges in the formation and maintenance of emotionally intimate friendships with other men.

In examining how African American men relate to other men, it is be important to consider the presence of a significant adult male in the lives of young African American males. Family structure and those within that structure (parents, more specifically father) can play an important role in the socialization process of an African American male. Myers (1998) reviewed the Black family structure and discussed stereotypes and characteristics associated with that structure. According to Myers, the Black family has been viewed to be dysfunctional and ultimately pathological because it has not matched the nuclear family structure of White America. This view can still be maintained today as over the last

40 years there has been a decline in two parent homes for African Americans. According to a report by the United States Census Bureau cited in the *Journal of Blacks in Higher Education*, 50% of all Black children are being raised in female single-parent homes. However, while there are absent Black fathers, there are those children who simply live with their mothers while the father still takes an active role in their life (Coles, 2001).

The increased absence of Black fathers has been offset by members of the extended family (Kane, 2000; Taylor & Chatters, 1989; Foster, 1983). Within the extended family there may be involvement from grandfathers, older brothers, uncles, and other strong male figures. However, extended family members do not dismiss the importance of the (Black) father. Greene (2002) discussed in general how the relationship between a young man and his father has the potential to be a barrier in the development of intimate friendships with other men. The investigation of adult male presence is necessary because it would be important to identify where or if a still developing Black male received messages or influence from an older adult male counterpart in his childhood. Overall, one might suggest that a young African American man being exposed to strong adult male figures can influence his own creation and maintenance of friendships whether it is through positive, negative or no messages at all.

As a Black male grows older he may need to accomplish various tasks at different stages in his development. Levinson et. al (1978)

detailed a life cycle that may begin to explain variation among African American males regarding their same sex friendships. It is stated that there is overlap between stages. The stages in the cycle are; 1) childhood and adolescence (0-22), 2) early adulthood (17-45), 3) middle adulthood (40-65), and 4) late adulthood (60-?). The transition period between these stages takes four or five years.

Levinson (1978) stated during the early adult transition (17-22) the first task is to start moving out of the pre-adult world. The young man begins to question the nature of the world and his place in it. There is modification or termination of existing relationships with important people, groups, and institutions (also reappraisal and modification of the self formed within these relationships). The second task is to begin considering one's self as a part of the adult world by establishing an adult identity. In the transition period of entering the adult world (22-28) the young man must become a novice adult. He makes choices regarding job, romantic relationships (which can include marriage and family), peer relationships, values, and life style. The young man's objective is to perform opposing tasks. He must explore the possibilities of the adult world via keeping options open, avoiding strong commitments, and maximizing alternatives. In addition he must create a stable life structure. These tasks have the potential to influence the dynamics of African American men's heterosexual same sex friendships. Levinson (1978) points out the need for the young male to explore all available options and

not allow himself to be restricted, which can possibly minimize the levels of intimacy in the friendships that may be created as the young male moves through this stage. The young male also has other responsibilities to attend to in the midst of trying to find a balance between completing opposing tasks and there is a chance that his platonic friendships with other males will suffer (Rotundo, 1989).

Another factor to consider in African American heterosexual same sex friendships may be socioeconomic status. Franklin (1992) conducted a study using short unstructured interviews from 30 Black males discussing their same sex friendships. He found that class emerged as a factor in those friendships. Findings from this study were presented in the categories of 1) working class Black men and friendship and 2) upwardly mobile Black men and friendship. Working class Black men discussing their same-sex friendships had expectations of loyalty, altruism, and closeness. They spoke intensely about their friendships almost to the point of crying. Franklin asserted that a working class male friendship may be more susceptible to self disclosure, intimacy, and holism. The upwardly mobile Black men spoke about individual success, sharing activities, and discussing business. Reasoning for this can be because those Black men who adopt more societal (European) definitions of masculinity lose certain traits necessary for the creation of close friendships. Essentially, the altruism, trust and loyalty, which might be more ideal for friendship, are replaced with aggression, competitiveness, stoicism, rational thinking, and

independence, which can be associated with traditional masculine norms. This study gives some indication the socioeconomic status can possibly influence the intimacy in the same sex friendships of African American males.

Another factor to consider in Black male heterosexual same sex friendships may be religion and the subsequent support it can provide. Mattis et al. (2001) stated there is no empirical research that examines the relationship between religiosity/spirituality and those friendships. In discussing religion Mattis et al. (2001) suggested that those who identify themselves as religious and follow the ideas of loving and caring for others (which religion can highlight) may emphasize forging relationships that have higher levels of openness, love, and kindness. If an individual perceives to have religious support, which may consist of perceived amount of support from God, the congregation, and the church leader (Fiala, Bjorck, & Goursuch, 2002), he may be more willing to follow those ideas that religion can highlight.

It has been asserted that religion and church have been important in the lives of African Americans (Taylor & Chatters, 1989; Mattis et al., 1999). There have been various benefits that have been attributed to religious involvement such as positive psychological well being (St. George & Mcnamara, 1984; Levin et al, 1995; Levin & Chatters, 1998; Levin & Taylor, 1998), guidelines for moral behavior, and provide spiritual assistance (Taylor et al. 1987). Given the role of religion in the

African American,, it would be plausible to consider how this may influence African American male heterosexual same sex friendships.

This study seeks to examine how traditional masculine norms influence the intimacy levels in same sex friendships of African American males. More specifically, the contextual variables of age, religious support, socioeconomic status, and adult male presence will be considered in order to gain a deeper understanding of possible factors that may produce differences amongst African American male participants.

In general when studies have been conducted on men's same sex friendships there has usually been comparison to the friendships of women. Also, as stated previously there has only been a small amount of research on African American male same sex friendships. This investigation seeks to contribute to the field of men's studies by addressing both of these issues. The first goal is to conduct research solely dedicated to men's same sex friendships rather than a comparison study. The second goal will be to provide much needed insight regarding the same sex friendships of African American males. Third, these friendships will be examined from a more strength based approach unlike previous studies. Finally, the intimacy levels in these friendships will be measured more accurately unlike previous literature. Belgrave and Allison (2006) in their brief discussion of this topic mostly referred to the Franklin (1992) study indicating that there is still a serious need for contributions to this area It is important to examine these friendships as it has been asserted

that developing positive friendships can be an important factor in healthy psychological development (Fehr, 1996) and having a general sense of well-being (Veniegas & Peplau, 1997). By giving this topic the attention it deserves the variables that lead to a healthy formation and maintenance of African American platonic same sex friendships can begin to be identified.

CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

As mentioned earlier, friendship can be defined as a voluntary association with others that involves intimacy, trust, acceptance, dependability, caring, and enjoyment (Sapadin, 1988). With much of the current literature comparing men's platonic same sex friendships to women's platonic same-sex friendships there has been a lack of focus solely on the dynamics of men's platonic same sex friendships. Within this current literature it has been strongly suggested that women are more intimate, supportive, and close in their platonic same sex friendships. Because of the lack of studies focusing on only male platonic same sex friendships it is important to study the dynamics of these friendships to identify potential influences in the intimacy levels of these friendships. It is important to challenge the current views and provide research indicating that men's heterosexual same sex friendships have the potential to be as intimate as women's. Consequently, there is a lack of studies examining the platonic same-sex friendships of minorities, more specifically African American males. This literature review examines the platonic same sex friendships of men and more specifically African American men. In examining these friendships attention will be given to (emotional) intimacy, barriers, and the potential contextual influences of intimacy in those friendships such as socioeconomic status, religious support, presence

of an adult male figure, and adherence to masculine norms. Examining all of these potential factors have justification because various studies exploring men's same sex friendships have been lacking in providing a holistic approach of the Black male experience.

History of Men's Same Sex Friendships

Before addressing current issues in heterosexual male same sex friendships it is important to understand the beginnings of those friendships. In earlier centuries supportive and intimate male same sex friendships were looked at more favorably, widely accepted, and very prominent. Nardi (1992) suggested that because of the social construction of masculinity it would be important for men to avoid anything that would be considered anti-masculine such as having close friendships with other men. Subsequently, he asserted that [heterosexual] men are not likely to look for other men with the goal of establishing friendship. In today's society having an emotionally close friendship with another man might suggest homosexuality and might be looked upon negatively. As previously stated, men's same sex friendships did not always garner such negative connotations. Sutherland and Anderson (1961) chronicled friendship from the biblical times to the 20th century in various countries. Men's same sex friendships as recently as the 20th century could have been considered to be romantic and/or erotic without being sexual. Men openly spoke of their emotions and love for one another without the fear of being thought of as less of a man. Rotundo (1989) discussed romantic

friendship among male youth during the period of 1800 to 1900. He gave some reasons as to the decreased presence of this type of relationship amongst men. He indicated that the assuming of man's duties might have been a cause. More specifically he talked about marriage being a potential cause for a decrease in the intimacy levels and amount of contact in men's same-sex friendships. Another reason for a decline in friendship intimacy was the commitment to career. Levant and Kopecky (1995) also asserted that as men age they become increasingly focused on work. An overall theme may have been that as these young males grew into men the demands placed on them caused them to abandon what they might have valued as young men. Intimate, meaningful friendship and companionship with others like themselves gave way to what Rotundo identified as independent action, cool detachment, and sober responsibility. Pangle (2003) discussed how throughout literature this idea has been prominent. There was a time when many writers of literature and philosophy believed that only men could have true friendships. It was thought that women were not able to experience or achieve such intimate friendship.

Due to the evolved and current social construction of masculinity as well as femininity there has been a shift in this mode of thinking. Women are now viewed as the sex that can have close, open, and emotional friendships with members of the same sex. As mentioned earlier, research has suggested that women's same sex friendships are more supportive and intimate than men's same sex friendships. In addition

Freedman (1988) discussed how later in the 19th century that same-sex relationships became “medicalized” and stigmatized because of the phenomena of male sexual acts with men and female sexual acts with females. Men being able to express their emotions and indicating love for one another in this social context may have been viewed as perverted or deviant. With these new social constructs put in place there was no longer room for acceptance of previous views of men’s same sex friendships. New and essentially more restrictive masculine norms had been created and men were to follow accordingly in order to be considered manly. With these societal changes it can be asserted that the interpersonal dynamics between men have experienced significant changes.

Men’s Same-Sex Friendships

Contrary to some of the literature suggesting that males (as they grow into men) will essentially rid themselves of friendships with other men, Grief (2006) asserted that many men indicate there is a level of importance in same sex friendships.

Wright (1982) characterized same-sex friendships in this way; men have shoulder-to-shoulder friendships, while women have face-to-face friendships. This essentially means that there is a higher probability for men to be comfortable with other men through engaging in activities such as sports. Conversely, women would be more comfortable interacting with other women through direct conversation.

Keeping in mind the societal shift in the view of same sex friendships between men it has been suggested that there has been hesitance has existed amongst them to establish close, intimate platonic relationships with one another. In examining adult same sex friendships research has consistently reflected differences between males and females with a main difference being that men's same sex friendships are supposedly less intimate than women's same sex friendships (Fehr, 2004, 1996; Winstead & Griffin, 2001). Felmlee (1999) found that women were significantly more approving than men of a friend's crying or hugging and less approving of the act of shoving. This provides evidence that men have a penchant to avoid that, which would be deemed to be feminine, such as expression of emotion. Conversely it is shown that men are more accepting of more aggressive physical expression like shoving. Instantly connections can be made to some of the masculine norms that have already been discussed for example, emotional control and general toughness. Also in the same study it was men were less disapproving of a male friend canceling plans to go on a date or a male friend who kisses someone who is not his partner, This can provide evidence to the expectations of the playboy script or sexual promiscuity. It has been reiterated by Fehr (2004) that women's same sex friendships involve talking, more specifically about emotions, feelings, their relationships, and other personal issues, while men's friendships were centered on activities.

Despite this difference it has been suggested that both men and women deem intimacy to be a very important feature of friendship (Sapadin, 1988; Fehr, 1996; Parks and Floyd, 1996). Cotter (1993) found that men emphasized trust reliability, openness and honesty, perceived similarity, comfort, and enjoyment of being together, along with emotional expression and support. Relationships were often activity and task oriented. He did also find that men rejected the idea of intimacy as applying to their male friendships. This particular finding, while seemingly contradictory might be possible due to the potential negative connotation of intimacy (being feminine) as it may now be viewed socially. Roy, Beneson & Lily (2000) studied the quality of close friendships of both adolescent and adult men and women. They examined the degree to which participants would support close friends in times of difficulty and degree to which they would celebrate with friends in times of success. Results found that females reported more desire to spend time with close friends at times of difficulty and celebrate during times of success. Despite the fact that this study has continued in the comparison of both men and women it is interesting to find that men celebrate less with their same sex friends in times of success. This particular finding can fall in line with some of the male proscriptions such as not caring too much. In a study by Benenson and Christakos (2003) in examining the fragility of females and males (ages 10-15) closest same sex friendships and it was found that females' same sex friendships were of shorter

duration and females had already done something to negatively effect the friendship. Also females reported more former friendships than male respondents. While it can be argued that females' same sex friendships might involve more content that is emotionally focused (as evidenced by proposed gender norms) therefore leading to the possibility of doing/saying something hurtful one also can insinuate that males have the capacity to maintain their same sex friendships at some level and potentially for a longer period of time than their female counterparts.

If intimacy is to be considered a very important factor in friendship it will be imperative that explanations behind this seeming "lack of intimacy" in platonic male same sex friendships are identified.

McCoy (1998) asserted that there has been less research on the development and attributes of men's same sex friendships. McCoy attempted to explain barriers men face in their platonic same sex friendships. There was also a desire to address the lack of emotional closeness (non sexual intimacy) and the lack of male friends (particularly decline after adolescence). McCoy too discussed Greenson's (1968) disidentification from the mother and the reattachment to the father known as Lucente's (1996) hyperidentification to masculinity, which may lead one to believe that the process of developing into a man in and of itself can pose some sort of barrier or hindrance.

Banks and Hansford (2000) asked why men's best same-sex friendships are less intimate and supportive. Six possible explanations for

this finding were examined; lack of parental models for friendship, emotional restraint, homophobia, masculine self-identity, competitive strivings, and role conflicts. Of these six potential explanations emotional restraint and homophobia toward gay men provided the most explanatory power for gender effects on both intimacy and support in best friendships. This study again, emphasizes the change in the view of male's same sex friendships.

Black Men's Same Sex Friendships

Todd Boyd, from a book entitled "Being a Black Man" (2007) said, "We (Black men) have an unspoken bond about life". From the same book a man named Marc Morial said, "Black men relate to each other in a special way". Comments of this nature continue to fuel the idea that Black men's experience is unique and that this needs to be taken into account.

As previously mentioned there has been a lack of studies with same sex friendships of men in general. Subsequently there is limited research focusing on African American men. Nardi (1992) believed that if structural variables (e.g., gender, marital status) affected how men's friendships are constructed and maintained that cultural differences would do the same. Burlew (2002) discussed information on friendship patterns of African Americans being fairly absent from psychological literature as well. Problems include many existing studies operating out of a European-American framework.

A continued lack of empirical research may allow the perpetuation of the belief that [African American] men do not develop meaningful relationships but rather relationships that have been looked at as superficial, violent, contentious, or pathological (Franklin, 1992).

While not empirical research Smith (1991) began to provide some insight based on his own experience(s) as a Black male in the context of his platonic friendships with other Black men. He discussed the difficulties and restrictions that Black men might face regarding their emotions and true feelings. He recalled his envy of the female's ease of emotional expression at an early age and indicated how he longed for the ability to be that way as well. He discussed his desire to be emotional with his close male friends because of his love for them as human beings. Smith asserted that things such as hugging and emotional letting go can ease the internal pain that Black males can have. He goes on to discuss his friendships with other Black males and indicated the lack of emotional expression amongst one another. He stated it was easier for his friends to discuss results of sporting events, cars, and sexual conquests with women but minimal to no discussion about their emotions or what they truly felt. Smith's frustration was fueled by his strong desire to discuss what was in the hearts and minds of his closest male friends. He stressed the importance of not withholding these feelings and embracing a deeper relationship amongst our male friends. The emotional restriction or lack of perceived emotional "safety" Smith speaks of further emphasizes the

potential internalization of masculine norms and its' potential influences in friendships.

Further insight can be provided by Simmons (1981) discussing the dynamics of African American male friendships and what it really means to have a friend as a Black man. He identified the nature of society being characterized as a jungle, being dangerous and hostile. He proposed the need to have a friend (more specifically other Black men) to accompany him in navigating this "jungle". Simmons also said;

I think that men who cannot or have not established deep friendships with other men – men who have no main man or that their best friends are their wives or their women – are without strong psychological support, without another worldly male view, without a truly empathetic, understanding of the social and political forces at work in the jungle, so they are too often paranoid, prudent, or alone to challenge the world. (p, 137).

This testimony by Simmons further implicated the desire for something more out of his platonic same sex friendships than some past and current empirical research might suggest. Further reiterating this desire or need for a more in depth, fulfilling friendship, Roberts (1994) pointed out one of the more consistent findings in exploring Black men's same sex friendships is the descriptions of those friendships as brotherly.

In another of the few studies involving Black male friendships Burlew (2002) attempted to use an African American framework in examining affective sharing in the African American men and women's same and cross sex friendships. Burlew addressed Black men's constructions of manhood being poorly understood and manhood being focused on emasculation and pathology. Burlew hypothesized that social location (gender, age, partner status, income, and education), social network composition (number of women friends and total number of male friends), friendship quality (how supported individuals feel by their friends), relationship stress, and communalism would directly influence affective sharing. Men's friendships with other men reported no difference in levels of affective sharing based on age, income, education, or partner status. Results found younger men share more effectively than older men therefore age negatively associated with levels of affective sharing in friendships with other men. Romantic status, education, and income were not associated in levels of affective sharing in friendships with other men. Men who felt closer to their male friends were more likely to share their feelings with their male friends. Men who reported higher levels of both family and social communalism reported feeling closer to their male friends. Relationship status and friendship quality were the sole significant predictors of affective sharing with their male friends. Burlew's (2002) study made efforts to examine friendships from an African American

context and examine multiple variables to further explain the dynamics of Black men's same sex friendships.

An early and significant study by Franklin II (1992) involved using short unstructured interviews from 30 Black males discussing their same sex friendships that were conducted over a three month period. These Black males were asked to discuss their same sex friendships or lack of friendships, the number of friendships, characteristics of the relationships, depth, meanings, and extensiveness. This study was significant as it began to identify differences in African American males across socioeconomic status. Franklin found that men who were lower on his socioeconomic classes (working class) spoke in more depth about their friendships with other men and had the propensity to speak about their feelings. The Black men higher up (upwardly mobile) on his socioeconomic status were more likely not to discuss their close male friendships or feelings about them. These "upwardly mobile" Black men were more likely to identify with the norms of their White male counterparts.

In the United States traditionally males have been taught to internalize traits that distort and can potentially interfere with the development of same sex friendships. Franklin found in his study that Black male conceptions of self, identities, and commitments were all critical variables related to friendship formation. For working class Black males race seemed to be a positive factor in the development of more intimate same sex friendships. For upwardly mobile Black males class was a salient

negative factor impeding the development of intimate same sex friendships. Based on Franklin's study it would be necessary to examine the contextual factor of social or socioeconomic status.

Mattis et al. (2001) studied factors that shape the quality of African American men's friendships. The relationship between affective sharing, advice exchange, and perceived support in African American men's same sex and cross sex platonic friendships was examined. A sample of 171 African American men was used to examine the relative utility of subjective religiosity, spirituality, advice exchange, and affective sharing as predictors of level of perceived support from male and female friends. One hundred and seventy one men ranged from 17 to 79 years old with a median age of 22 years with 69% report never being married, median income of \$50,000-\$59,999, and 1% reporting less than a high school diploma. Participants were asked to identify how likely it would be that they would share 10 particular emotions with their male friends as well as female friends. Advice exchange included measuring the likelihood that men would ask for or give advice to their friends (male and female). Subjective religiosity was measured using three items and subjective spirituality was measured using a single item. The quality of men's friendships was measured by assessing levels of perceived support from male and female friends. Results showed age differences in subjective religiosity, subjective spirituality, and in level of advice and affective

exchange in men's same sex as well as cross sex friendships. There was a difference in men's perceptions of supportiveness of their friendships with women but not men. Age was not a predictor of perceived supportiveness of friendships. Subjective religiosity did not predict support in friendships. Subjective spirituality positively predicted support in men's same sex friendships. In following suit with a more inclusive approach in examining Black men's same sex friendships the aspect of spirituality/religiosity has showed the potential to be influential.

Harris (1992) examined how alternative masculine behaviors are expressed within same-sex peer groups and friendships. These alternative masculine behaviors or Black masculinity has been adopted by African American males to combat and cope with social and interpersonal stressors. This style of coping has been characterized with more negative consequences than positive ones. African American men have been charged with adhering to the standards of traditional masculinity even though there is great conflict between values and expectations. As a result, alternative behaviors are developed in order maintain positive feelings toward the self and feel like a man. These behaviors and expressions can also attempt to conceal painful emotions that men should not share in public based on norms and standards of traditional masculinity. One of the ways in which African American males learn these behaviors is through peer interactions.

In the peer interactions or friendships that are formed there is less concern with closeness and intimacy but there is focus on shared activities. It is discussed that low income male youth have their peer alliances mean earlier in their development. Support in these friendships consists of activities and companionship instead rather than the conversation and intimate self disclosure of female friendships. In the development and maintenance of male same sex friendships competitive and combative activities have a significant role. These interactions assist in the enhancement of well being and validation of members' masculinity. Males who excel in alternate behaviors acquire group status and recognition as a leader. Those who do not excel are likely to be rejected and ridiculed by their peers. A failure to abide by peer norms may lead to the fear of being perceived as feminine. While traditional masculinity says all things feminine should be avoided the consequences may be harsher amongst African American males. More specific catalysts for anti-feminine remarks may be a preference for academics instead of activities or cooperation and compliance with standards of mainstream social institutions.

Last it was discussed how African American males join gangs to meet intrapersonal and interpersonal needs that are not met in socially acceptable ways. There is appeal in the gang membership that is increased because there is an outlet for Black males (typically low-income) to form early superficial bonds based on activities, competitiveness and

combativeness. Gang memberships can offer African American males social status, economic opportunity, and social support. These opportunities fit what is provided by a traditional social organization but they are achieved in vastly different ways. Sadly, the behaviors within these same sex friendships can be maladaptive, destructive, and restrictive.

In a piece by Ray Smith (1991) a freelance writer he highlighted a quandary that Black men may find themselves in. He said:

There are times when, I am man, want to hug or kiss other brothers, not because of any sexual thang, but because I love men as human beings. This society's constraints train us not to hug and kiss one another. It's considered taboo. But hugging and emotional letting go can ease the internal pain that brothers often are ashamed of or unwilling to admit to having. (p.32)

This quote can speak volumes to the cultural clash that may exist as well as the notion that men value emotionally intimate friendships with their male counterparts. Continued inclusion of the African American experience in various facets of life must be considered to properly explore the dynamics of a Black male's platonic same sex friendship(s).

Intimacy

Researchers have continued to suggest that men's platonic same sex friendships are less intimate than their female counterparts (Fehr, 2004, 1996; Winstead & Griffin, 2001). Subsequently these recurring

findings have led to several controversies regarding same sex friendships. Hook et. al (2003) suggested that intimacy has been defined and measured improperly. Ray, Benenson, & Lilly (2000) pointed out that intimacy is typically equated with “quality” of friendship and men and women may define intimacy in different ways. Last, men simply do not have meaningful friendships with other men.

Cotter (1993) examined how men perceive male friendships, how they construct the concept, and participate in their construction of friendships with other men. Interviews addressed participation in current male friendships, how they define male friendship, description of male friendships (closeness, trust, benefits, satisfaction, and importance), applicability to the term intimate, and perception of male friendships in general. Results revealed variance among participants regarding their perceptions, experiences, attitudes, and participation in their friendships with men. Limitations included a small sample size and limited characteristics of the participants. Eleven were Caucasian, one Arabic, and one Asian. All were married except for one who was in a romantic relationship with a woman. Nine men identified 1-3 men they believed met their own definition of close friendship, two said none, and one said 10-15 men. Eight men indicated friendships having begun years ago and becoming close through shared activity, day to day interactions, and task/goal oriented activity. Here we see men connecting mostly through activity which has been asserted in research. Monsour (1992) conducted a

study to examine how individuals in both same and cross sex friendships defined and expressed intimacy. Using a self report measure participants were asked to define intimacy in the context of their friendships. Results indicated seven definitions of intimacy by the participants. The meaning most frequently given was self disclosure. Regarding results for male participants, 41% gave one meaning to intimacy. Males also ranked self disclosure as the most important of the seven meanings discovered. Parks & Floyd (1996) attempted to more accurately define closeness and intimacy using a self-report survey with college students asking what made same and cross-sex friendships close and how that closeness was expressed. Participants' definition(s) of closeness would then be compared with Monsour's definitions of intimacy. Results showed 13 different meanings for closeness with the most frequent definition being closeness was self disclosure. Men used self disclosure 63.7% as opposed to women at 76.2%. The results of these two studies indicated that in the traditional sense of intimacy men value the construct a great deal, just as women do. Unfortunately because of the constant comparisons to women men's potential value of intimacy has been minimized or as stated previously men do not know how to maintain "quality" same-sex friendships.

Conversely, it has also been asserted that men might simply experience or define intimacy differently. Sherrod (1989) asserted that while men might rate their same-sex friendships lower regarding

emotional expression or self-disclosure intimacy is achieved through companionship and subsequently shared activities.

While not examining emotional intimacy, but rather emotional support Grief (2009) found in his study of older (Black and White) men's friendships that the majority of respondents indicated the need for emotional support in their same sex friendships. He also found in his sample that 75% of the respondents indicated receiving emotional support from friends. This study in and of itself combats the notions that may not want nor provide some form of emotional expression within their same sex friendships.

Influences

Potential factors influencing intimacy levels in men's platonic friendships may be both psychosocial and contextual. Roberts (1994) suggested that because of the White masculine role model men appear to be unable to provide each other with the kinds of affiliation experiences that men say they need. He discussed men's penchant to constantly compare themselves to other men and persistently feel the need to prove their manhood or masculinity. Roberts (1994) goes on to discuss how the White masculine role model provides few examples of closeness between men.

As mentioned previously traditional masculine norms or in this case the White masculine role model gives instructions on what a man should or should not do. Roberts emphasizes this notion in referring to

Druck & Simmons (1985) who listed several “don’ts” regarding men’s friendships. They discussed; 1) don’t let your guard down (except after a few drinks), 2) don’t show too much emotion (unless it’s anger), 3) don’t become too involved, friendly or frivolous, 4) don’t let on how much you really care, 5) don’t touch one another (except after scoring a basket or making a touchdown), and 6) don’t act like a sissy or appear feminine in any way. Again, as in many models of masculinity, including ones previously discussed emphasis is heavily placed on emotional restriction and suppression.

Though not a study focusing solely on men’s same sex friendships Afifi and Gurrero (1998) examined the extent to which parties of both same and cross-sex friendships avoid topics. Topics focused on relationship issues, negative life experiences, dating experiences, and outsidings friendships. Reasons for avoidance explored were self-protection, relationship protection, partner unresponsiveness, and social appropriateness. Results revealed that individuals were more inclined to avoid discussing negative life experiences and relationship issues with other males more than females. This study continued to feed the notion that man may be unwilling or incapable of offering up appropriate support.

Banks and Hansford (2000) asked why men’s best same-sex friendships are less intimate and supportive. Six possible explanations for this finding were examined; lack of parental models for friendship, emotional restraint, homophobia, masculine self-identity, competitive

strivings, and role conflicts of these six potential explanations emotional restraint and homophobia toward gay men provided the most reasonable explanation for gender effects on both intimacy and support in best friendships.

McCoy (1998) identified issues of fear and competition, fear of attachment, general fear of other males, due to lack of intimate attachment with father, fear of loss of autonomy, fear of homosexuality (homophobia). Greene (2002) discussed the problems of men's same sex friendships such as Western culture socializing men to be less emotionally expressive with other men. He also addressed the stereotypical male same sex friendship as being based on convenience or common interests only, or excuses to get together must serve some purpose (such as business).

In Greene's study he examined the potential factors hindering intimacy in men's same sex friendships. Potential factors included; fear of intimacy, homophobia, relationship with father, dogmatism (close mindedness), and community spirituality. Fear of intimacy, lack of emotional expression of father, and more negative views towards homosexuality were significantly related to men having less intimacy with other men (in their friendships). In his study men reported not having enough time and aspects of personality (their own personality preventing vs. did not find other men's personalities appealing). While Greene's study was only 3% African American it still began to address the need of a more holistic approach in examining various facets of men's lives.

Adherence to Masculine Norms

What can be identified as a very important factor in how men form and interact in their friendships with other men is masculinity and how it is defined or internalized. Addis, Syzdek & Mansfield (2010) argued that masculinity's current conceptualization pays little attention to contingent and contextual factor effects on the gendered social learning in men.

Thompson and Pleck (1995) indicated that masculinity ideology develops when boys as well as men internalize cultural norms and expectations about acceptable male behavior from different sources, such as family or society in general. More specifically, an important factor may be to what degree (African American) men adhere to traditional masculine norms. In an important study, David & Brannon (1976) presented four parts of what might be deemed traditional masculinity. First, man should not be feminine (no sissy stuff). Second, men should strive to be respected for successful achievement (the big wheel). Third, men should never show weakness (the sturdy oak). Finally, men should seek adventure and risk, even accepting violence if need be (give 'em hell). Levant (1992) identified; avoiding the feminine, restrict one's emotional life, emphasis on toughness and aggression, injunction to be self reliant, achieve status above all else, males must have non relational, objectifying attitudes towards sexuality, and there is a fear/hatred for those who do not identify as heterosexual. Levant and Kopescky (1995) characterized the

negative side of masculinity as; avoiding the feminine, emotional restriction, disconnecting sex and intimacy, pursuing achievement and status, being independent, strength and aggression, and denying affection from men.

More recently Good, Mahilick, and Englar-Carlson (2003) listed several masculine scripts or behaviors conducive to that of traditional masculinity. They are as follows; strong and silent, tough guy, give 'em hell, playboy, homophobic, winner, and independent scripts. Essentially men in this society who do not adhere to these norms will not be considered men. Adherence to traditional masculinity exemplifies independence, dominance, toughness, and success. As more research has been conducted a seemingly stricter list of behaviors and/or attitudes has been presented that men should carry out.

More specifically regarding platonic male same sex friendships scripts such as; homophobic and no sissy stuff may create a hindrance in those friendships. Avoiding that which has been believed to be feminine may result in one distancing himself from emotionally close friendships with other men. Delvin & Cowan (1985) examined homophobia, perceived fathering, and male intimate relationships. They utilized the Attitudes Towards Male Homosexuality Scale (ATHSM), eight intimacy scales, and four scales measuring participants' recollections of their fathers' parenting styles. They found a significant relationship between homophobia and intimacy in male-male relationships. Homophobic men

found their best male friends as less unique, expressed less trust in sharing, saw them as less sensitive and understanding, and less expression of love for him. Homophobia was also related to perception of their fathers encouraging male sex roles. Lehne (1989) indicated that homophobia has limited the discussion of loving, close male relationships and has contributed to a denial by men of the real importance of their friendships with other men. Nardi (1992) also asserted that homophobia has kept men from being open with other men (even regardless of sexual orientation).

To further understand the stressful nature of obtaining and/or maintaining masculinity it would be imperative to discuss the idea of gender role strain. Pleck (1995) discussed the gender role strain paradigm in which he suggested that contemporary gender roles are contradictory and inconsistent. He asserted that not maintaining these gender roles can lead to possible psychological distress, over-conformity of roles, and condemnation (possibly by other men). Three types of male gender role strain were identified. Discrepancy strain occurs when a man cannot live up to his own ideal of manhood (usually is the same as traditional masculinity). Dysfunction strain occurs when a man strictly meets the requirements of traditional male roles, which may result in the psychological harming of himself and/or others close to him. Last, trauma strain occurs from the male role socialization process, which is considered to be traumatic.

Racusin, Phelan & Rudman (2010) examined status incongruity and backlash against (modest) men who break the gender rules. They discussed how backlash emerges when atypical men and/or women are judged more negatively with identically behaving members of the other gender. Because of this notion they assert that despite the fact that stereotype conformity comes with a high cost, violation will lead to backlash.

In assessing traditional masculine norms and the process of maintaining them we can surmise several things. First, there seems to be a strong focus on the individual and what the male is capable of doing or what he should not be doing. Next adhering to these norms, roles or scripts is a stressful and potentially constant process. Last, going against these norms may lead to backlash or ridicule from male counterparts, which subsequently could be detrimental.

Ultimately, it can be surmised that anything that is not masculine is in fact feminine. With the inherent worry or fear of appearing feminine, whether by society as whole or male counterparts it makes sense that men would attempt to adhere to these rigid thought processes and actions. Masculine norms essentially deny men from incorporating emotional intimacy into their same sex friendships and potentially damaging or inhibiting the quality within them.

Understanding Black Masculinity

As traditional masculine norms have been discussed one must remember how they have been constructed and communicated to African American men. Traditional masculinity standards essentially have a man as a provider, protector, and a disciplinarian. Ultimately, Black males desire the most ordinary of successes; a steady job, the chance to be a productive citizen and provide for his family, a chance to help shape the direction and future of his country, and be able to live in peace (Majors, 1992). A Black male attempting to follow these masculine guidelines can be difficult due societal roadblocks, a possible lack of opportunities, and likely cultural clashes. Even still most African American males have internalized and accepted these standards of masculinity (Cazenave, 1984; Staples, 1982). When identifying some of these seemingly simple tasks one might refer to slavery and the impact it has had on the African American man. Burlew (2002) suggested slavery is important in understanding how black men and women conduct their relationships. In referring to African American men, slavery was a dehumanizing process that impacted the Black family unit and ultimately African American manhood. With traditional Afro-centric values being stripped away the European American masculine norms (and how to maintain them) were forced upon the Black man. In having these norms communicated there is much potential for a Black man to adopt and internalize some of these

norms.

As an African American male living in a prejudice, restrictive society can have serious affects on Black male development into a man. African American males achieving manhood in this type of environment will potentially be more difficult than that of European American males. Traditional definitions of masculinity or manhood when applied to African American males can help bring this issue to light. Through identifying these pressures and difficulties we may also begin to understand how Black men have issues in relating to other Black men and men in general.

Majors (1989) used the phrase cool pose to describe African American men and boys' ideas of certain roles, values, presentation along with behaviors that were based off of performance and behaviors that were constructed in a situational manner. Franklin (1984) referred to masculinity as an emphasis on physical strength, the desire of submissiveness and strength in women, angry impulsive behaviors, functional relationships between men as well as between men and women, and strong male bonding. Subsequently, after the "adoption" of these norms we must acknowledge the potential cultural clash that can result. For Black males who cannot meet these traditional standards manhood has to be redefined. With the restructuring of manhood the attitudes and behaviors that are adopted can be referred to as; compulsory masculinity, cool pose, exaggerated masculinity, Black male masculinity, reactionary masculinity, or the compulsive masculine alternative (Franklin 1984;

Harris 1992; Kochman, 1981; Majors, 1989; Majors & Billson, 1992; Oliver, 1989; Wilson, 1991).

Hunter & Davis (1992) identify self-determinism, pride, family, and spirituality and humanism as norms of Black masculinity. Hammond & Mattis (2005) identified; interconnected state of being (between God, self, family, community, and others), fluid process, a redemptive process, and a proactive course. Nandi (2002) conducted a study involving 37 African American male prisoners. She found that most of the participants thought of manhood in conceptual terms and not what males may do. To those particular prisoners, manhood was based upon thoughts and feelings, the focus of their desires, and what they imagine Masculinity norms that have been found in some of the limited research with African American males have been more focused on the collective and more abstract concepts.

There is great potential for African American males do adopt these and other male norms that are deemed acceptable by their White counterparts. Roberts (1994) also mentioned the possibility that Black men will internalize the characteristics of the White Masculine role model. However, the society that Black men inhabit will not let them achieve their manhood so to speak, therefore Black males must seek alternate routes to become men (by their standards). With this acceptance of traditional norms African American males are in a constant conflict with

those norms as well as their own specific cultural norms (collectivism, spirituality, oneness with nature).

What we find in these traditional models of masculinity is the strong focus on the individual and what he is capable of doing or what he should not be doing. Given the competing forces placed upon Black men there is potential to modify these traditional masculine norms to obtain manhood. Through modification there is the potential to over compensate certain norms if others cannot be fulfilled for example having relationships with multiple women (playboy, objectifying women. Oliver (1989) stated alternative behavior adopted by Black males consisted of the tough guy orientation and the player of women orientation. Harris (1995) asserted it was not uncommon for African American male youth of a low social status to place emphasis on sexual promiscuity, toughness, thrill seeking, and use of violence in interpersonal interactions. In addition to the asserted over compensation of masculine norms, the Black male may also find himself navigating through the cultural clash between traditional (European) masculine norms and norms that may be more culturally appropriate for Black males.

One common link that can be made between ideas of Black and White masculinity is the notion of the constant need to prove oneself or express manhood. Phillips (2001) suggests that from a social constructionist approach masculinity is a perpetual performance and is never secure. In summation, various scholars and researchers have

various views in regards to Black masculinity as some consider it to be more conceptual, behavioral, and possibly both. In addition it has also been viewed as an ongoing process, continually and perpetually having to be exhibited, defended, and refined.

Majors and Bilson (1992) suggests that a [Black] man's mind is his castle, a psychological stronghold designed to protect himself from the harshness that a (racist) society can and will ultimately bring. While this stronghold may in fact be a necessity it can be asserted that this castle can also prevent positive facets of life from being experienced such as a more in depth, emotionally intimate friendships with those that may be having similar experiences or struggles.

Socioeconomic Status

Way et al (2001) examined friendship patters among African American, Asian American, and Latino adolescents from low income families. They discussed a small body of research regarding the notion that culture can make a difference in the friendship patterns of adolescents.

They also referred to other studies such as Jones, Costin, & Ricard (1994) a study, which found African American males being more likely to reveal personal thoughts and feelings to their male friends more than Mexican or European Americans. They also referred to DuBois & Hirsch (1990) which found Black boys being more likely to have intimate conversations with their best friends than White boys. Harris (1992)

mentioned peer alliances meaning more to lower income youth, which continues to fuel the idea that social status or socioeconomic status may be influential in men's same sex friendships.

Franklin's (1992) significant study involving short unstructured interviews from 30 Black males discussing their same sex friendships provided much insight into the viewpoints of Black men in different social strata. These Black males were asked to discuss their same sex friendships or lack of friendships, the number of friendships, characteristics of the relationships, depth, meanings, and extensiveness. Participants ranged from ages 18 to 63 and loosely represented three social strata, 12 men were working class (\$18,000 or less), 12 were professional, white collar (between \$25,000-50,000), and 6 were corporate, upper middle class (more than \$50,000). Data also came from casual conversations with about 18 men in groups of two or three, who attended the meeting of the National Council of African American Men. Class was a significant factor possibly due to the importance of shared experiences. Findings from this study were presented in the categories of 1) working class Black men and friendship and 2) upwardly mobile Black men and friendship. Based on interview responses of working class Black men discussing their same-sex friendships there were expectations of loyalty, altruism, and closeness. Some men spoke very seriously about these relationships and reflected the intensity of their feelings towards these friends almost to the point of crying. Franklin discussed how these

reactions may be present because these friendships are holistic, intense, and empathic that there is the potential for these men to become violent when there is a perceived violation of trust, loyalty, or closeness. These friendship violations being mentioned in these interviews led to the working class Black men stating they would be repulsed, disappointed, and enraged if they were to occur. Also, some of the Black males' friendships are intimate to the point where those friends are considered to be like family members. The same-sex friendships of a working class Black male may have been more susceptible to self disclosure, intimacy, and holism.

Upwardly mobile Black men have received the same messages about emphasizing trust, empathy, warmth, and altruism in their same sex friendships. Also, like working class Black men they have received messages about the threats and barriers created by the larger society that can impede their success. Most of the upwardly mobile Black men interviewed perceived these blocked opportunities and discriminating policies to be less of a barrier to their successes. Discussions were more focused on the individual and their path towards success. They indicated the need to be the best regardless of prejudice, being competent, playing the game, and being helpful. Three men talked about their same-sex friendships and the conversation revolved around time spent with friends watching sports and discussing business ventures that they were individually interested in. Reasoning for this can be because those Black

men who adopt more societal (European) definitions of masculinity lose essential traits necessary for the creation of close friendships. Essentially, the altruism, trust and loyalty are replaced with aggression, competitiveness, stoicism, rational thinking, and independence. For upwardly mobile Black men these become role expectations that they hold for themselves and others. In this study some of these Black men questioned the need for deep relationships or did not discuss if they were in deep relationships. In general males are supposed to embody aggressiveness, rationality, competitiveness, etc. as they move upward socially. Comments made by upwardly mobile Black men about their views of same sex friendships might be more similar to their white male social class counterparts.

In the United States traditionally males have been taught to internalize traits that distort and can potentially interfere with the development of same sex friendships. Franklin has found in his study that Black male's conceptions of self, identities, and commitments were all critical variables related to friendship formation. For working class Black males race seemed to be a positive factor in the development of intimate same sex friendships. For upwardly mobile Black males class was a salient negative factor impeding the development of intimate same sex friendships. In their reviewing of adult Black male same sex friendships Belgrave and Allison (2006) reiterated some potential influence as it pertains to socioeconomic status noted that among poor and working class

Black men expectations in same sex friendships included loyalty, altruism, and closeness. Based on this assertion as well as Franklin's study it would be necessary to examine the contextual factor of social or socioeconomic status.

Age

Earlier the shift in the dynamics of men's same sex friendships was discussed. It was mentioned that there was a possibility that age may play a factor in the distance that may be created within these friendships. As a young male develops into a man certain responsibilities and tasks may be placed upon him to maintain. Based on this premise we might assert that younger men may be more inclined to engage in closer relationships with other males.

Burlew (2002) found younger men share more effectively than older men therefore age negatively associated with levels of affective sharing in friendships with other men. McCoy (1998) surveyed various studies finding, that a problem is many men simply have few to no male friends, as men got older, there were less male friends.

Spencer (2007) examined the closeness in male youth mentoring relationships. Qualitative interviews were conducted with 12 adolescent and adult pairs in a one on one community based youth mentoring program. Mentors were comprised of 11 White men and 1 African American man. Adolescents ranged from ages 12-16 with 3 being White, 5 being African American, 1 Latino, and 3 identifying as multi or bi-

racial. Themes found from the interviews were; 1) the importance of relationships with adult men in adolescence, 2) mentors' desires to be involved and emotionally connected male role models, 3) the close and enduring nature of the emotional connections forged, 4) the ways these relationships provided safe places for emotional vulnerability and support, 5) how these relationships helped some boys manage feelings of anger more effectively, and 6) vacillations on the part of the mentors between more and less conventional forms of masculinity in relation to the emotional nature of these relationships.

Van Bark (1998) examined how married men's friendships differed between the ages of 22 and 45 in regard to structure, intimacy, and satisfaction. Van Bark discussed the importance of addressing the developmental issues of males. While the sample mainly consisted of Anglo, Caucasian, and affluent males the sample was divided into four age groups consistent with Levinson's (1978) construct of young adulthood. In specifically focusing on age results indicated that age alone did not make a difference in the friendship patterns of the men in the sample.

Jones, Costin, and Richards (1994) in studying a group of 6th and 9th graders found that among boys, Black males were more likely to reveal their personal thoughts and feelings to their male friends rather than Mexican and European American boys Dubois and Hirsch (1990). Black males were more likely to have intimate conversations with their best friends rather than white boys.

Grief (2009) examined the same sex friendships of older Black and White men through qualitative interviews (part of a larger study) inquiring about importance of friendships, having enough friends, how they defined, carried out, and maintained their friendships, and last the nature of their father's friendships.

As we continue to examine the potential differences in Black male friendships we must examine how they develop more efficiently as well. Bowman (1989) discussed how the black males' experiences in the America have been studied using the concepts of pathology, oppression, coping, and ethnicity. He goes on to say that each perspective adds to a deeper understanding of the Black male experience but not without limitations. Bowman (1989) suggested that pathology researchers chose to focus on maladaptive behaviors and attempt to support the idea that cultural/psychological deficits are primary causal factors of such behaviors. He reviewed oppression research as maladaptive behaviors resulting from external and social barriers. Coping researchers examined more adaptive behaviors. Last, ethnicity focused on authentic and proactive responses to institutionalized barriers. He presents a theoretical model of role strain and adaptation, which identifies the interrelationships between previously mentioned variables. He emphasized that in this approach oppressive role barriers can result in either pathological or adaptive coping and that ethnicity can facilitate adaptive response patterns. Bowman relates his model with Erickson's psychosocial model by

addressing conflicts and growth tasks in each stage in order to develop in a healthy way.

By including age as a potential variable in future studies we may begin to identify potential areas for intervention.

Religious Support

In continuing with the need to examine multiple contextual factors in the experience of the African American male taking into account religion or religious support is necessary. From a cultural perspective religion and spirituality has been important and central in the lives of African American people (Taylor, Mattis and Chatters, 1999). Taylor et. al (2000) reiterated the notion that religion having a special prominence in lives of African Americans in addition to churches playing an influential role . Also Taylor, Mattis, and Chatters (1999) asserted stated that religion and spiritual beliefs and practices allow African Americans to make sense of and respond to both the difficulties and joys of life

Chatters et al (2002) examined the socio-demographic, family, and church factors as correlates of support from family and church members and found more than half of respondents receive assistance from their family and church networks. Taylor, Thorton, & Chatters (1987) found that church has helped Black's status in the context of the United States. Results reflected some demographic difference in the perception of the church's role. Older respondents, women, and Southerners were more likely to indicate that the church has helped as opposed to hurt. They

indicated that these findings were consistent with a small group of studies on the religious involvement of Blacks. Again we find African American men in comparison to other groups being left out or not as present in some of the expectations of various studies. Taylor, Mattis and Chatters (1999) asserted that religion, spiritual beliefs, and practices provide a meaningful context within which African Americans interpret and respond to both life's hardships and joys.

It has been mentioned that religion can provide several benefits such as positive psychological well-being (St. George & Mcnamara, 1984; Levin et al, 1995; Levin & Taylor, 1998) , providing unity, guidelines for moral behavior, and spiritual assistance (Taylor et al. 1987). With the assertion by Mattis et al (2001) that there has been little to no research that examines the relationship between religiosity or spirituality and men's same sex friendships it will be necessary to take into account another important facet of life in African American culture and minimize the gap in research.

Male Presence

Remnants of slavery to this day exist within the make-up or perceived make-up of the African American family. With traditional families being characterized as having a male at the head of the unit, slavery greatly influenced this dynamic through selling slaves, breeding, and overall separation of families. Further illustrating this point, Robyn Thorpe (2007) in *Being a Black Man* discussed seeing "the breach"

between Black men and women as residue of slavery. She said; “Four or five generations of you ripping my man from me, I am going to have to make do without him” (p. 150).

Staples (1987) discussed the trends within Black families. He stated the percentage of Black households headed by females had increased from 21% to 47% at that time. Ricketts (1989) highlighted the increase of Black female-headed households from 20.6% to 43.7% between the years of 1960-1985. In 1998 single women headed 54 percent of Black households.

With the increased trend in the Black household one has to examine the potential influence this may have on a young Black male. In examining how men relate to other men it would be important to take into account areas of life where these men have received various messages on how to interact with other men.

Major and Bilson (1992) in discussing Black masculinity noted that one of the problems with research has been the neglecting of father present families, and ignoring positive aspects of male presence (even when not living in the home). Additionally they indicated that when father absence has been a variable in studies presence of another stable and committed male is often over looked.

While various cultural and societal messages have been communicated to Black men as they have developed it will be important to review the

potential familial messages. More specifically it would be imperative to be aware of the presence (or lack thereof) of the father or adult male figure in the male's life. Subsequently attention should be paid to the nature of that relationship. Burlew (2002) found that men who reported higher levels of both family and social communalism reported feelings closer to their male friends.

McCoy (1998) discussed Greenson's (1968) disidentification from the mother and the reattachment to the father known as Lucente's (1996) hyperidentification to masculinity. This may fail to happen at all especially if there is no adult male figure.

Rutledge (1988) examined socialization experiences by family structure. There was an attempt to identify differences between those growing up in a one-parent home and a two-parent home. While this study's participants were all female and it was determined that family structure was not a salient factor it still took into account the necessity to include this variable in the experience of African Americans (females). Despite this study it would be remiss to exclude the family structure or male presence and how this might influence the socialization of the African American male. Delvin and Cowan (1985) in their study of male intimate relationships examined perceived fathering, discussing the possibility that a nurturing and perhaps emotionally in tune father could help subside the pressures of living up to the rigid and terse male sex role expectations. Continuing in focusing on the impact of the father Greene

(2002) found that men who report having less emotionally expressive fathers will report less intimacy with other men. Grief's (2009) examination of older men's friendships further emphasized the impact that the father can have on his son's views and valuing of friendships. Black male respondents reported receiving messages about the importance of friendship, being honest, and trustworthy to your friends. One participant deduced that there is importance in being open after reflecting on his father's more guarded nature. This study alone can speak to the significant influence

Summary

In discussing men's same sex friendships it is necessary to examine the Black male experience in a more holistic fashion to account for the potential variables that may influence the nature of these friendships. Given that literature has proposed that in one way or another the previously mentioned variables have had some relationship with the interactions in men's same sex friendships or at least their views of male same sex friendships further research was called for in this area due to the lack of research reviewing African American men's same sex friendships as well as existing research's inability to examine the phenomena in more depth.

Amplifying the importance of some of these variables might be a book entitled; *Being a Black Man: At the corner of progress and peril* which is a collection of articles, interviews, and narratives discussing

various facets of the experience of the Black man such as the being a success, being a father, the epidemic of Black men in prison, and the overall state of Black men's status in American society.

In examining the responses of the survey in this book it highlighted some of the important facets of life and contextual factors and characteristics already discussed. Also, this may provide some evidence to the notion that Black males may over-compensate maintenance of traditional masculine norms. Surveys were conducted comprised of Black and White men and women. Respondents were asked about topics ranging from view of Black men in American, the emphasis Black men place on various aspects of life, and potential problems Black men face. Overall there were 2864 randomly selected respondents, 1328 of which were Black men.

Regarding importance of being in a career 76% of Black male respondents indicated it as very important, 52% of Black male respondents indicated being married as very important, 70% of Black male respondents indicated living a religious life as very important, 76% of Black male respondents indicated being respected by others as very important, and only 26% of Black male respondents indicated having a lot of close friends as very important. Interestingly enough, of these categories, in comparison to White men the category yielding one of the greatest disparities was having close friends (45% of White men found this very

important). Here one can see the connections to prior assertions such as the focus on career, success, and managing a family and how these responsibilities might take away from the desire or time to maintain friendships with other men, let alone maintain emotionally intimate ones.

Regarding placing emphasis on various topics, 54% of Black male respondents indicated that Black men place too much emphasis on sports, 60% of Black male respondents indicated that Black men place too much emphasis on sex, 57% of Black male respondents indicated that Black men place too much emphasis on maintaining a tough image, and 54% of Black men stated that too little emphasis is placed on their families. In somewhat of a cultural consensus Black women respondents revealed similar thoughts with 53% of women indicating that Black men place too much of an emphasis on sports, 60 % responded too much emphasis on sex, and 50% said Black men placed too much emphasis on maintaining a tough guy image.

As can be seen within this sample, there is a stronger focus on matters such as career, marriage, and being respected, which can continue to reinforce ideas proposed by Levinson (1978) and Rotundo (1989) regarding the tasks and responsibilities males are charged with carrying out as they mature.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

This study attempted to recruit 200 men who identified as African American/Black were male, and 18 years of age or above. It was attempted to recruit participants from a historically Black university located in an eastern state, a predominantly White college in a Midwestern state, and an email list from professional organizations. Various department heads and list moderators were contacted via email for wider email distribution to those that may qualify for study participation. All participants were involved on a voluntary basis and completed an anonymous survey on a secure website. Responses by individuals who did not identify as male and African American/Black were disqualified from the study. It was expected that the survey would take less than 30 minutes. This study offered an incentive to enter an instant win game for a 100 gift card to an online retailer after completion of the survey in order to maximize response rate.

One hundred and thirty-nine (N=139) anonymous surveys were completed and thereby used for analysis. Criteria necessary for inclusion were identifying as African-American/Black, male, and 18 years or older. Respondents were also asked to indicate age as categorized by 6 different ranges; 18-20, 21-29, 30-39, 40-49, 50-59, and 60 or older. Of the 139 surveys 14.4% (20) fell into the range of 18-20, 38.1% (53) in 21-29,

14.4% (20) in 30-39, 19.4% (27) in 40-49, 12.9% (18) in 50-59, and 0.7% (1) in 60 or older (Please see table 1).

Table 1

Age Group

| Age | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|-------------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| 18-20 | 20 | 14.4 | 14.4 | 14.4 |
| 21-29 | 53 | 38.1 | 38.1 | 52.5 |
| 30-39 | 20 | 14.4 | 14.4 | 66.9 |
| 40-49 | 27 | 19.4 | 19.4 | 86.3 |
| 50-59 | 18 | 12.9 | 12.9 | 99.3 |
| 60 or older | 1 | .7 | .7 | 100 |

Respondents were also asked to indicate if they had a strong male presence in their lives in a simple yes (1) or no (0) question. 12.9% (18) responded no and 87.1% (121) responded yes. (Please see Table 2).

Table 2

Adult male presence

| Response | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|----------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| No | 18 | 12.9 | 12.9 | 12.9 |
| Yes | 121 | 87.1 | 87.1 | 100.0 |

Measures

The instruments used in this study included a demographic questionnaire developed for this study, the Barratt Simplified Measure of Social Status (BSMSS) (Barratt, 2006), the Religious Support Scale (RSS) (Fiala, Bjorck, & Goursuch, 2002), the Conformity to Masculine Norms Inventory (CMNI) (Mahailak et al., 2003), and the Index of Emotional Intimacy in Same Sex Friendships (EISSF) (Williams, 1985). (Please see Appendix A for measures)

Demographic Questionnaire

A nine-item questionnaire was constructed and administered to gather basic information relevant to the dynamics of African American men's heterosexual same-sex friendships. Questions asked pertained to, age range, relationship status, number of close male friends, number of close female friends, length of friendships, and the presence of an adult male figure in the participant's life.

The Barratt Simplified Measure of Social Status

The BSMSS (Barratt, 2006) is a measure based on the four factor measure developed by Hollingshead (1957, 1975). Hollingshead obtained a socioeconomic status score by obtaining education and occupational information. The BSMSS defines social status as comprised of marital status, employment status, educational attainment, and occupational prestige. The BSMSS attempts to measure social status by examining the level of school completed and occupation maintained by the individual

completing the BSMSS, his or her mother, father, and spouse (partner). A total score ranging between 8 and 66 is calculated through combining the sub-scores of the level of schooling completed and occupation. Though no validity or reliability data exist for this measure, that the BSMSS is based on Hollingshead's widely used measure (Duncan, 2001, Cerino et. Al, 2002) suggests that the measure has usefulness. For the current study a reliability coefficient of .827 was calculated.

The Religious Support Scale

The RSS (Fiala, Bjorck, & Goursuch, 2002) is a 21-item scale that measures an individual's perceived support from church leaders, his congregation, and God. Items are measured on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (5). A total religious score ranges from 21 to 105 with higher scores indicating more perceived religious support.

The main sample consisted of 249 respondents. Of the participants 75.9% were White, 13.7% were African American, 4.8% were Latino, 2% were Asian American, and 3.6% were other ethnicities. Participants were recruited from one predominantly African American church and two predominantly White churches. Authors initially began with 153 items. Fifty-one of those items were meant to reflect the hypothesized sub-categories of God, congregational and church leader support. Within these sub-categories, items were constructed to reflect the six areas of social provision. Ultimately, their pool of 72 items had three parallel sets of 24

items were designed to address the three hypothesized sub-categories.

Also, each set of 24 items included four items relating to the six areas of social provision.

In an initial factor analysis items that registered at less than .30 and items not clearly significant to any of the three factors were dropped. A second factor analysis indicated a three-factor solution, which accounted for 59% of the variance. Congregation and church leader factors had a correlation of .71. The God factor significantly correlated with both ($r = .29$ and $.22$). Each factor contained 7 items (one positive and six negative), which corresponded to five of the six sub-categories of social provision. Ultimately, a total Religious Support scale was created by linear combination of the 21 items from the three factors. Reliability for the Congregational, God, and Church leader support yielded alphas of .91, .75, and .90. Congregational and Church leader support yielded a correlation of .73. Both these scales were significantly related to God support with correlations of .24.

Fiala, Bjorck, and Goursuch (2002) months later conducted a cross-validation study. There were 93 participants (75% White, 9% African American, 9% Asian-American, 3% Latino, and 4% other). Alphas for Congregational, God, and Church leader support were .88, .84, and .92, respectively. Congregational and Church leader support yielded a correlation of .73. Both yielded a correlation of .21 with God support. For the current study a reliability coefficient of .905 was calculated.

The Conformity to Masculine Norms Inventory

The CMNI (Mahalik et al., 2003) is still a relatively new measure regarding traditional masculinity. The main purpose of the CMNI is to determine whether or not an individual is conforming or not conforming to masculine gender norms. The CMNI consists of 94 items and examines 11 different masculine norms. The norms are winning, emotional control, risk taking, violence, dominance, playboy, self-reliance, primacy of work, power over women, disdain for homosexuals, and pursuit of status. It was found that these 11 factors accounted for 44% of the variance.

Mahalik et al. (2003) conducted five studies to examine the appropriateness of the CMNI. Data were gathered mostly from Caucasian, heterosexual college students in the United States. There were 752 men in the study with an average age of 20 years. Twenty-four men were African American.

The first study was the factor analysis of the CMNI, which suggested it is a 94-item measure with 11 factors. In the second study internal consistency was examined and yielded a coefficient alpha of .94 for the total CMNI score. Subscale alphas (11) ranged from .72 to .91. Study 3 compared the CMNI scores with; the Brannon Masculinity Scale-Short Form (BMS; Brannon & Juni, 1984), the Gender Role Conflict Scale (GRCS; O'Neil et al., 1986), the Masculine Gender Role Stress Scale (MGRS; Eisler & Skidmore, 1987), the Brief Symptoms Inventory (BSI; Derogatis, 1993), the Attitudes Towards Seeking Professional

Psychological Help Scale (Fischer & Turner, 1970), and the Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale (MCSDS; Crowne & Marlowe, 1960).

Results found that the CMNI total scores significantly related to the total score of the BMS and moderately related to the GRCS and MGRS. The CMNI was also related to negative attitudes regarding psychological help seeking. Study 4 attempted to further establish concurrent validity of the CMNI by examining its' scores in relation to the Social Dominance Orientation Scale (SDO; Pratto et al., 1994), the Agression Questionnaire (TAQ; Buss & Perr, 1992), and the Drive for Muscularity Scale (DMS; McCreary & Sasse, 2000). The hypotheses suggesting that the CMNI would relate to these three measures were supported. The final study examined the temporal stability of the CMNI. The test-retest coefficient for the total CMNI score was .95. The subscales ranged from .51 to .96 (only two were below .70).

The authors have indicated that the CMNI has high construct validity, test-retest reliability, and strong internal consistency. While this instrument has limitations because of its lack of a diverse sample, the CMNI can have value given the assertion that African American males may adopt traditional masculine norms as their own. For the current study a reliability coefficient of .926 was calculated.

Index of Emotional Intimacy in Same Sex Friendships

The EISSF (Williams, 1985) was used to measure the amount of intimacy present in the relationship with one's closest or best same sex

friend. The EISSF consists of 20 statements measuring emotional intimacy using a five-point Likert scale ranging from 0 (strongly disagree) to 4 (strongly agree). Examples of items include; “When my friends and I are together, we spend most of our time participating in some type of sport or game,” and “When I am depressed I usually let my best friends know how I feel.” Data collected from 508 undergraduate students (303 females, 205 males) indicated that the EISSF consisted of one factor, which accounted for 84.3 percent of the variance. Scores ranged from 6 to 80. Higher scores indicate greater emotional intimacy while lower scores indicate less. Reliability of the EISSF was reported to be .90. For the current study a reliability coefficient of .379 was calculated.

Procedure

Participants were acquired from both a historically Black university in an eastern state and a Midwestern university through emails that invited all men ages 18 and older, briefly described the study and, explained requirements for participation. The emails included a link that directed willing participants to the online survey. Those who accepted the request for participation read informed consent form over the internet. After reading consent participants were instructed to complete the online survey which consisted of; 1) a short demographic questionnaire, 2) The Barrat Simplified Measure of Social Status (2006), 3) The Religious Support Scale (2002), 4) The Conformity to Masculine Norms Inventory (2003), 5) The Emotional Index of Intimacy in Same Sex Friendships

(1985). After participants completed the study they were asked if they were asked if they responded to all items. After reviewing their response participants were thanked for their participation and asked to submit their responses by selecting a button indicating agreement for their responses to be submitted for purposes of the study.

The purpose of the current study was to contribute to the small body of empirical research on African American men's heterosexual same-sex friendships. In studying this concept, attention will be paid to how intensely African American males adhere to traditional masculine norms as well as how that influences the intimacy levels in their friendships with other men. Attention was given to variables that may have importance in a Black man's development of friendships with other men.

Hypotheses

For this study intimacy was identified as the dependent variable. Adherence to masculine norms, adult male presence, age, socioeconomic status, and religious support were independent variables. The following analyses were conducted for these hypotheses.

Hypothesis 1: Adherence to traditional masculine norms, adult male presence, age, religious support, and socioeconomic status will predict intimacy levels in Black men's heterosexual same-sex friendships. This hypothesis was analyzed with a standard multiple regression analysis with adherence to traditional masculine norms, adult male presence, age,

religious support, and socioeconomic status as the predictor variables and intimacy in same-sex friendships as the criterion variable. A standard multiple regression analysis will allow predictions to be more accurate as well as explain variance within the dependent variable.

Hypothesis 2: Adherence to traditional masculine norms will predict lower levels of intimacy in Black males. A simple regression analysis was conducted with reported intimacy levels in Black males' same-sex friendships being the criterion variable and adherence to traditional masculine norms being the predictor variable.

Hypothesis 3: There will be a significant relationship between the contextual variables (i.e., adult male presence, age, religious support, socioeconomic status) and adherence to traditional masculine norms. Bivariate correlations were run between all contextual variables (adult male presence, age, religious support, socioeconomic status) and adherence to traditional masculine norms.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

An anonymous survey was ultimately distributed to examine the relationship between contextual variables (age, socioeconomic status, adult male presence, adherence to traditional masculinity, and religious support) and emotional intimacy in the platonic same sex friendships of Black males. Pearson product moment correlations and multiple regression analyses were used with SPSS software. All results were evaluated at the .05 level. This chapter will discuss descriptive analyses, bivariate correlations, regression analyses, and summarize the data.

Descriptive Analyses

Means and standard deviations for the sample are presented in Table 3. Emotional intimacy (EISSFTOTAL), Conformity to masculine norms (CMNITOTAL), Religious Support (RSSTOTAL), and Socioeconomic Status (SESTOTAL) were examined.

Emotional intimacy (EISSF) among participants reflected a mean of 38.34 (SD=5.76). The Emotional Intimacy in Same Sex Friendships total score ranged from 6-80. This indicated the sample scoring slightly lower to moderate emotional intimacy. Conformity to masculine norms amongst participants reflected a mean of 122.34 (SD=24.79). The Conformity to Masculine Norms Inventory indicates that the higher the total CMNI score the more an individual conforms to masculine norms. The CMNI total was comprised of 11 separate subscales; 1) Winning, 2) Emotional Control, 3) Risk Taking, 4) Violence, 5) Power Over Women, 6) Dominance, 7) Playboy, 8) Self-Reliance, 9) Primacy of Work, 10) Disdain for Homosexuality, and 11) Pursuit of Status.

Subscales showed results of Emotional Control ($M = 15.51$, $SD = 5.90$), Disdain for Homosexuality ($M = 15.20$, $SD = 5.82$), Winning ($M = 14.07$, $SD = 4.23$), Risk Taking ($M = 13.57$, $SD = 3.46$), Playboy ($M = 11.79$, $SD = 6.18$), Status ($M = 11.04$, $SD = 2.66$), Violence ($M = 10.9$, $SD = 4.39$), Primacy of Work ($M = 9.88$, $SD = 3.72$), Power over Women ($M = 8.45$, $SD = 3.59$), Self-Reliance ($M = 6.45$, $SD = 3.29$), and Dominance ($M = 5.45$, $SD = 1.80$). Attention should also be paid to the sub scales of Emotional Control and Disdain for Homosexuality as the sample scored highest on these sub-scales. Religious support reflected a mean score of 71.68 ($SD=11.28$). The Religious support scale total score ranged from 21-105. Results indicated a moderately high sense of religious support for respondents.

The BSMSS consisted of two sub scale scores of education (3-21) and occupation (5-45) to form the total score. Education of participants yielded a mean of 16.55 ($SD = 2.93$). Occupation of participants yielded a mean of 28.9 ($SD = 9.62$). Socioeconomic status (or social status) reflected a mean total score of 45.44 ($SD= 11.28$). The Barratt Simplified Measure of Social Status (BSMSS) total score ranged from 8 to 66. Results indicated a moderately high SES for participants.

Table 3
Descriptive Statistics

| | N | Mean | | Std. Deviation | Variance |
|--------------------|-----------|-----------|------------|----------------|-----------|
| | Statistic | Statistic | Std. Error | Statistic | Statistic |
| EDUCATIONSUB | 139 | 16.5455 | .24893 | 2.93489 | 8.614 |
| JOBSUB | 139 | 28.8963 | .81589 | 9.61921 | 92.529 |
| SESTOTAL | 139 | 45.4418 | .95759 | 11.28984 | 127.461 |
| CMNITOTAL | 139 | 122.3381 | 2.10241 | 24.78708 | 614.399 |
| EISSFTOTAL | 139 | 38.3453 | .48829 | 5.75680 | 33.141 |
| RSSTOTAL | 139 | 71.6835 | 1.05436 | 12.43070 | 154.522 |
| WINNING | 139 | 14.0791 | .35885 | 4.23078 | 17.899 |
| EMOTION | 139 | 15.5108 | .50079 | 5.90427 | 34.860 |
| RISK | 139 | 13.5755 | .29346 | 3.45987 | 11.971 |
| VIOLENCE | 139 | 10.8993 | .37215 | 4.38756 | 19.251 |
| POWER | 139 | 8.4532 | .30483 | 3.59392 | 12.916 |
| DOMINANT | 139 | 5.4532 | .15290 | 1.80267 | 3.250 |
| PLAYBOY | 139 | 11.7914 | .52480 | 6.18726 | 38.282 |
| RELY | 139 | 6.4532 | .27912 | 3.29079 | 10.829 |
| WORK | 139 | 9.8777 | .31530 | 3.71729 | 13.818 |
| DISDAIN | 139 | 15.2014 | .49354 | 5.81874 | 33.858 |
| STATUS | 139 | 11.0432 | .22577 | 2.66178 | 7.085 |
| Valid N (listwise) | 139 | | | | |

Bivariate Correlations

Pearson correlation coefficients were computed in order to test hypothesis three. Coefficients were computed between predictor variables (SES, religious support, age, adult male presence) and adherence to traditional masculine norms. The third hypothesis stated that there would be a significant relationship between the contextual variables;

(adult male presence, age, religious support, socioeconomic status) and adherence to traditional masculine norms. Bivariate correlations were conducted between all the predictor variables (Please see Table 4).

Table 4

Bivariate Correlations of Predictor Variables

| | EI | RSS | CMNI | SES | Age | Male Presence |
|---------------|-------|-------|-------|--------|------|---------------|
| EI | 1.00 | | | | | |
| RSS | .122 | 1.00 | | | | |
| CMNI | .046 | -.020 | 1.00 | | | |
| SES | .071 | .083 | -.002 | 1.00 | | |
| Age | -.113 | .088 | -.022 | .272** | 1.00 | |
| Male Presence | -.025 | -.006 | .032 | .088 | .107 | 1.00 |

**Correlation is significant at the .01 level (2-tailed).

EI – Emotional Intimacy

RSS – Religious Support

CMNI - Conformity to Masculine Norms (Adherence to traditional masculine norms)

SES – Socioeconomic Status

Age

In regards to age analyses indicated a minimal positive correlation with religious support ($r = .088$, $p = .305$). The P value being greater than .05 indicated that the relationship was not statistically significant. There was a minimal positive correlation between age and socioeconomic status ($r = .272$, $p = .001$). The P value being less than .05 indicated that the relationship was statistically significant. There was a minimal negative

correlation between age and conformity to masculine norms ($r = -.022$, $p = .798$). The p value being greater than .05 indicated that the relationship was not statistically significant.

Male Presence

Male presence showed a minimal negative correlation with religious support ($r = -.006$, $p = .94$). The p value being greater than .05 indicated that the relationship was not statistically significant. There was a minimal positive correlation between male presence and conformity to masculine norms ($r = .032$, $p = .707$). The p value being greater than .05 indicated that the relationship was not statistically significant. Male presence also had a minimal positive correlation with socioeconomic status ($r = .088$, $p = .306$). The P value being greater than .05 indicated that the relationship was not statistically significant.

Religious Support

Religious support yielded a minimal negative correlation with conformity to masculine norms ($r = -.02$, $p = .819$). The P value being greater than .05 indicated that the relationship was not statistically significant. Religious support also revealed a minimal positive correlation with socioeconomic status ($r = .083$, $p = .332$). The P value being greater than .05 indicated that the relationship was not statistically significant.

Socioeconomic Status

Socioeconomic status revealed a minimal negative correlation with conformity to masculine norms ($r = -.002$, $p = .981$). The P value being greater than .05 indicated that the relationship was not statistically significant.

Additional Bivariate Correlations Analyses

Additional bivariate correlations were presented in Table 5. These correlations were conducted with subscale scores of the CMNI with number of friends. These correlations were computed because some literature has suggested that as males develop into men their focus may shift to carrying out tasks and responsibilities that come with masculinity. As a result the maintenance or obtaining of same-sex friendships may decrease or become non-existent. It was found that number of friends had a minimal positive relationship ($r = .199$, $p = .019$) with Risk Taking. There were also minimal negative associations with self - reliance ($r = -.167$, $p = .049$) and pursuit of status ($r = -.173$, $p = .041$). All relationships mentioned were statistically significant at the .05 level.

Bivariate correlations were also run between age and CMNI subscales. Again, additional correlations were run because of the assertion made by some prior literature suggesting that as males grow older that males can become more submersed in the responsibilities or characteristics of being a man. Results revealed a minimal negative correlation between Self Reliance (RELIANT) and age ($r = -.246$, $p = .004$). Results also showed a minimal negative correlation between Pursuit of STATUS and age ($r = -.195$, $p = .021$).

Last, an additional bivariate correlation was conducted between number of friends and age revealing no relationship ($r = .000$, $p = .997$). There was justification for these additional analyses because it has been asserted at points in the literature that when men get older and take the responsibilities of being men their amount of close male friends and number of friends in general may decrease.

Table 5

Bivariate Correlations of CMNI Subscales and Number of Male Friends/Age

| | Friend | Age |
|--------|--------|---------|
| Friend | 1 | |
| Age | .000 | 1 |
| WIN | -.10 | .000 |
| EMO | -.166 | .015 |
| RIS | -.199* | .067 |
| VIO | .036 | .024 |
| POW | .107 | .096 |
| DOM | -.104 | -.024 |
| PLA | .050 | .076 |
| REL | -.167* | -.246** |
| WOR | -.108 | -.100 |
| DIS | -.017 | -.006 |
| STA | -.173 | -.195* |

**Correlation is significant at the .01 level (2-tailed).

*Correlation is significant at the .05 level (2-tailed).

WIN – Winning

EMO – Emotion

RIS – Risk

VIO – Violence

POW – Power

DOM – Dominance

PLA – Playboy

REL – Rely

WOR – Work

DIS – Disdain for homosexuality

STA - Status

Summary of Bivariate Correlations

Overall bivariate correlations analysis found almost none of the previously mentioned correlations to be significant at the .05 level. (Please see table 6 for correlation data). Analysis of the third hypothesis yielded no significant relationships between

predictor variables. Additional bivariate correlations yielded some statistically significant relationships. Bivariate correlations were examined to identify the potential connections between various facets of the male's life.

Regression Analyses

Regression analyses were used to address hypothesis one and two. The general goal of this study was to examine contextual variables (age, SES, religious support, adult male presence, adherence to traditional masculine norms) that may influence the emotional intimacy in the platonic friendships of Black males. A simultaneous multiple regression was conducted in order to accomplish this goal with emotional intimacy serving as the criterion variable and all other remaining variables as predictors. The overall model was not significant,

The first hypothesis stated that adherence to traditional masculine norms, adult male presence, age, religious support, and socioeconomic status will predict intimacy levels in Black men's heterosexual same-sex friendships. Justification for utilizing these variables as predictors is due to the assertion that more studies than not in current research have focused on single aspects of the male participant's life. Subsequently a less holistic approach is taken and the complexities and potential relationships between various facets in a man's life are left unaccounted for.

A multiple regression analysis was conducted yielding a minimal positive correlation ($r = .206$, $p = .323$). However the p value was greater than .05 therefore rejecting the hypothesis of contextual variables predicting intimacy levels in the same sex friendships of Black males (Please see table 4). Examining each predictor variable (age,

male presence, SES, religious support, masculine norms) individually this would be contrary with current research whether empirical or theoretical.

The second hypothesis stated that adherence to traditional masculine norms will predict lower levels of intimacy in Black males. There is justification for exploring this model because literature has suggested that some of the characteristics or scripts of constructed masculinity may play a role in the interpersonal dynamics of men's same sex friendships. A regression analysis predicting emotional intimacy (EISSF) in same-sex friendships from conformity to masculine norms (CMNI) reflected a minor positive correlation ($r = .046$, $p = .593$). However p being greater than $.05$ indicated that hypothesis 2 would be rejected. (Please see table 5). Therefore, adherence to traditional masculine norms will not predict lower levels of intimacy in the platonic same sex friendships of Black males.

Additional Regression Analyses

Additional regression analyses were conducted utilizing the CMNI sub scale scores. The CMNI total score was broken down into its 11 subscales and were utilized as separate predictor variables. A regression analysis was again conducted and revealed a moderate positive correlation with emotional intimacy ($r = .425$, $p = .006$). Results also revealed p being less than $.05$ and therefore indicating that the relationship was statistically significant (Please see Table 7). Also, this particular model accounted for 18% of the variance regarding intimacy indicating that as the score on work increases so too does emotional intimacy. This lends to the idea that more statistically significant data may be found if examining these subscales (or some like measure) individually.

Additional regression analyses were run based on some of the assertions made by past literature regarding the reasons for shifts in men's same sex friendships. Focus was given to the CMNI subscales of; Emotional Control (EMOTION), Playboy (PLAYBOY), Self – Reliance (RELIANT), Primacy of Work (WORK), and Disdain for Homosexuality (DISDAIN). Regression utilizing these subscales as predictor variables to predict intimacy in men's same sex friendships. The regression model yielded a moderate positive relationship ($r = .329$, $p = .009$). With p being less than .05 indicating statistical significance. With these additional analyses we might surmise that higher subscale scores may lead to lower levels of emotional intimacy in same sex friendships of Black males.

Additional regression analysis was run with CMNI subscales as predictor variables for age. Results revealed a moderate positive correlation ($r = .387$, $p = .03$). With the p value being less than .05 the relationship was statistically significant ($p < .05$). This indicates that CMNI subscales might have some influence in the intimacy levels in same sex friendships of Black males. It is somewhat reasonable to believe that the higher the CMNI subscale scores the lower the intimacy level in the platonic same sex friendships of Black males.

Regression analyses were run using the subscales of Emotional Control (EMOTION), Pursuit of Status (STATUS), Disdain for Homosexuality (DISDAIN), and Primacy of Work (WORK) as predictor variables and emotional intimacy (EISSFTOTAL) as the criterion variable. Results showed a lower positive association between these CMNI sub-scales and Emotional Intimacy ($r = .306$, $p = .01$). With p being less than .05 this means the relationship is statistically significant.

Last, regression analysis was run using all the CMNI subscales as predictor variables and number of friends as the criterion variable. The model revealed a moderate positive relationship between CMNI subscales and number of friends ($r = .392$, $p = .025$). With the P value being less than .05 the relationship was statistically significant.

Summary of Regression Analyses

Regression analyses of hypotheses one and three yielded no statistical significance. Further analyses led to more significant results with use of CMNI subscales as separate independent variables. Proposed as well as additional analyses were conducted to identify potential predictors of the intimacy levels in the same sex friendships of Black males.

Summary of Data

Overall proposed hypotheses 1) age, socioeconomic status, religious support, adherence to traditional masculine norms, and adult male presence would predict emotional intimacy levels in Black men's same sex friendships, 2) higher levels of adherence to traditional masculine norms would predict lower levels of emotional intimacy in Black men's same sex friendships, and 3) there would be a significant relationship between predictor variables, yielded no significant relationships or statistical significance. Upon finding these results additional analyses not proposed were conducted yielding several statistically significant relationships that were both minimal and moderate via regression models and bivariate correlations. Significant relationships were discovered through examining CMNI subscales as separate variables.

CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION

The main purpose of this study was to examine the influences in the platonic same sex friendships of Black males. More specifically focus was given to the intimacy levels in those friendships and how they might be influenced. Contextual variables such as age, religious support, socioeconomic status, and adult male presence were identified as potential factors that may invoke differences amongst Black male participants. This chapter will revisit findings of the current study and merge them into literature regarding Black males same-sex friendships.

The current study hypothesized several things. It was hypothesized that; 1) age religious support, adult male presence, socioeconomic status, and adherence to traditional masculine norms would predict levels of emotional intimacy in same sex friendships of Black males, 2) higher levels of adherence to traditional masculine norms would predict lower levels of emotional intimacy in same sex friendships, and 3) there would be a significant relationship between predictor variables and adherence to traditional masculine norms.

It was found that the aforementioned contextual variables did not predict intimacy levels in the same sex friendships of Black men. Second, higher levels conformity to masculine norms alone did not predict lower intimacy levels in the same sex friendships of Black males. It should be noted that through further analysis results did indicate positive moderate relationships between certain CMNI subscales and emotional intimacy. Finally, there were no significant relationships between predictor variables.

In additional analyses it was found that as participants scored higher on the CMNI subscale of work emotional intimacy would increase. This finding may be indicative of several things. First, arguably the primary responsibility of being a man, which could be classified as work, could have a positive influence on intimacy in Black men's same-sex friendships. This is contrary to literature suggesting that the responsibilities of work and subsequently success take away from a man's opportunity to engage in and potentially establish intimate same-sex friendships. Given this finding it could be argued that work might present opportunities to establish such friendships through companionship, shared activities, and business ventures, which have all been mentioned as potential alternate paths towards intimacy.

In general, previous literature on men's same sex friendships has been consistently compared to women's same sex friendships and subsequently been viewed as less intimate, despite limited empirical research. This study attempted to address this through focusing solely on Black males.

Van Bark (1998) voiced the notion that not enough is known about men's same sex friendships and suggested one of the main problems in studies that existed was focus on singular aspects of the friendships as opposed to his attempt at a more holistic examination. He examined age, marriage, parenthood, education, and income in the context of his male sample's same sex friendships. This study attempted to be more holistic with its inclusion of five potential predictor variables..

Greene (2002) also attempted a more holistic approach as he examined fear of intimacy, homophobia, relationship with father, dogmatism, and community spirituality.

While not having significance on its own participants' summarized responses regarding the Disdain for Homosexuality CMNI subscale revealed it to be higher than almost all other subscales. Subsequently these results should continue to stress the potential importance in measuring the possibility of homophobia. Also, regarding this subscale one might question the use of the word disdain and if this may further indicate the certain way in which intimacy may be viewed, especially when presented among men. An insinuation that can be made when presenting the word intimacy is the possibility of sexual activity thus heightening any underlying homophobia or decrease the willingness to accept emotional intimacy between men.

Currently Harris (1992) and Franklin (1992) appear to remain the most referenced studies regarding Black men's same sex friendships. Both of these studies asserted the possibilities of differences in Black males same sex friendship because of socioeconomic status (or concepts affiliated with SES such as low income). While the current study did not find a significant relationship between SES and friendship neither of the previously mentioned studies utilized quantitative methods.

As it pertains to intimacy it has already been suggested that men's same sex friendships have less intimacy than women's same sex friendships according to current research. Descriptive analyses of this study revealed a mean of 38.34 (on a scale of 6-80) indicating the sample scored slightly on the lower to moderate end of the emotional intimacy. While the mean score may be on the lower end of this measure one positive outcome is the data focused solely on men. In addition several questions can be raised because of this data for future research. It may be worthwhile to inquire about the ethnicity of the participant's male friends. Simmons (1981) highlighted the dynamics and

experience of having another Black man as a friend.

As mentioned earlier religion Mattis et. al (2001) found that subjective religiosity did not predict Black men's support in same sex friendships. While not the same concepts the current study indicated that religious support did not have a relationship with emotional intimacy in Black men's same sex friendships.

Research available regarding men's same sex friendships as it pertains to age is somewhat minimal. The current study has some consistency with Van Bark's (1998) findings that age did not influence friendship patterns of men.

The current study did not find a significant relationship between adult male presence and intimacy in same sex friendships. It may have been difficult to address this, as there was minimal variability in the sample regarding this matter, as only 12.9% indicated having no strong male presence in their household or life. Burlew's (2002) reported higher levels of both family and social communalism felt closer to male friends' further stress the need to examine the nature participant's relationships with those male figures.

In examining adherence to masculine norms analyses yielded no significant relationship with emotional intimacy. However, upon further review conducting regression analysis with all (CMNI) subscales as separate variables, a moderate positive correlation was found that was statistically significant. As mentioned earlier further examination of the various sub scales may lead to more insightful results.

Finally, regarding intimacy there has been contention in research regarding how the concept is measured. It has been suggested that men may experience or conceptualize

intimacy differently than women. It is also possible that what needs to be measured is the fear of being emotionally intimate with another man in the context of a friendship rather than the potential male's or males' capacity to be emotionally intimate.

The current study may add to the current literature in order to further understand the phenomenon of Black male's same sex friendships. In particular it may provide further insight regarding the potential influences in the intimacy levels, quality, or closeness in those friendships. In addition to being mindful of these factors, there is also a strong need for more developmental models pertaining to African American men. The more models regarding Black male development present the more accurately we might discuss the current phenomenon.

Limitations and Directions for Future Research

More inclusive studies regarding the experiences of African American males as it pertains to their same sex friendships were needed. The current study offered a more holistic approach in identifying potential influences in the platonic same sex friendships of African American/Black males. In addition this study focused solely on African-American/Black male participants thus eliminating the more frequent comparison studies with women and White men. It must also be mentioned that this study and its results reflect important limitations as well as directions for future research.

The first limitation of this study was sample size. There were 139 surveys completed in full by Black males. Increase of sample size to provide more variability will be needed in future studies of a quantitative nature. Constructing a survey with less items may produce more participants.

An area to examine further would be the race or ethnicity of the participants'

friends. It has been indicated that a special bond exists between Black men and that there is a certain level of understanding regarding experiences as being a Black man in society. There is a strong possibility from an increased comfort level with those that may share the same daily experiences. While it has been proposed that (Black) men tend to be emotionally (because of masculine norms) guarded it would also be plausible to entertain the possibility that Black men might be more open or emotionally intimate with one another as opposed to White men or men from other ethnicities. Therefore, identification of male friend's race or ethnicity might reveal variability in the intimacy levels in the same sex friendships of Black males.

Regarding adult male presence in the participant's life more variability may be identified through further examining who that adult male presence is. The current study found the overwhelming majority of respondents identifying having a strong male presence in their home and/or in their life. In addition to identifying the title of the possible adult male presence it might also be important separate between the adult male being in the respondent's life and physically in the home. Further inquiry regarding definition of "strong male presence" has the potential to reveal different responses from different participants. For example; one cannot assume that because a male figure is physically present he is emotionally present. Conversely one cannot assume that because a male figure is not present in the home that he is not present emotionally. As mentioned previously, there has been increasing absence of fathers in the home within the Black community over the last several decades Even with this phenomenon the Black family unit has also expanded to where other men (e.g., uncle, grandfather, older brother, etc.)

have filled the role of a male presence or father figure. In addition examining the nature of those relationships in future research may be beneficial. Identifying specific messages on friendships, manhood, and emotion that a male participant has received during his formative years can provide significant insight into his current interpersonal and intrapersonal dynamics. While an important question to ask the current male presence question does not speak to the dynamics of a relationship between a young Black male and a father, father figure, or strong adult male presence during his formative years.

Given the strong presence religion holds in the African American community the Religious Support Scale was utilized to examine perceived religious support of participants. While this was reasonable to measure, a limitation in the study may be not being inclusive of those Black males that may not identify either having a religious preference or indicating that religion holds no place in their life. An individual who might have no religious or spiritual beliefs would have to choose unsure or some level of disagreement with using the Religious Support Scale. Subsequently, this may not capture the nature of where they are spiritually or religiously. Mattis et. al (2001) found that subjective spirituality positively predicted Black men's perceived support in their same sex friendships suggesting that utilizing a measure that examined the broader concept of spirituality may lead to more significant data. Even still it must also be taken account those Black males that might ascribe to no spiritual beliefs. While religion and/or spirituality can hold great importance within the Black community identifying those without a religious affiliation or any spiritual beliefs may add a different direction in exploring the same sex friendships of black males. There may be a possibility that this

particular group of Black males may value their friendships in a different manner that may otherwise be unaccounted for with use of the current instrument for this study.

As it pertains to intimacy in the future it may be necessary to further examine the concept with additional instruments. It has already been suggested that men's same sex friendships have less emotional intimacy than women's same sex friendships according to current research. Descriptive analyses of this study revealed a mean of 38.34 on a scale of 6-80) indicating that the sample scored slightly on the lower to moderate end of emotional intimacy. Research has reflected differing views in how men conceptualize (emotional) intimacy. Some stated that men will conceptualize intimacy in the more traditional sense through identifying closeness, loyalty and disclosure where other researchers indicated that men may develop emotional intimacy through shared activities and common interests. Again, utilizing additional instruments on emotional intimacy may yield more detailed and informative results amongst potential participants. Regarding age it may be beneficial to align age with Levinson's theory in an attempt to account for the myriad of interpersonal changes and emerging responsibilities that a male may have throughout life. Also, one could obtain exact age of participants.

In regards to socioeconomic status, identifying income of participants may be beneficial as well as identifying the actual job of participants. The measure used (BSMSS) did not ask about income, nor did it specifically ask about exact jobs or position. Instead, the BSMSS asked participants to identify their job title (and that of parents or partner) through choice a particular group with multiple titles, which would increase in value based on job prestige.

It may be beneficial to utilize a tool measuring masculinity standardized

using more Black participants from a quantitative perspective or a tool measuring masculinity from a more multicultural perspective. While research has proposed that Black men internalize and thus adopt traditional (European) masculine norms conversely it has also been posited that African American men have formulated and established their own masculine norms. Overall it has been stated and rightfully so that African Americans in general have had significantly different experiences that have shaped their gender norms and more appropriately for this study, manhood (or masculinity).

Another direction that may yield positive data is building upon Franklin's (1992) study through structured interviews. Structured interviews have the potential to gather important data from various areas. The use of structural interviews can fully examine the process of participants establishing friendships with other men, necessary parameters for maintaining a friendship, and discussing in more depth the interpersonal dynamics within those friendships. Structural interviews can also lead to in depth discussions about how various Black men might operationalize intimacy as well as Black masculinity.

Last, the inclusion of a scale or measure regarding adherence to Black or African American cultural norms may be useful. This can lead to an examination of the potential intrapersonal and cultural conflicts that may exist within the Black male experience. It can be posited that in growing up an emphasis may have been placed on those specific cultural norms, which might clash with norms of the larger society. Utilizing a measure examining African American cultural norms in combination with traditional masculine norms may pinpoint specific problems areas for Black males that may ultimately hinder

their same sex friendships.

Results in this study reflected minimal relationships between variables it has still provided meaningful insight into this subject matter. Efforts were made to solely focus on a sample of Black males and variables in their lives that may influence the dynamics in their platonic friendships with other men. The study still stressed the importance in holistically examining the experiences and backgrounds of these men. Literature on Black male's same sex friendships is still relatively small; therefore this phenomenon still has a vast amount of areas to explore.

Implications

Through this study those who desire to further understand Black males or may be in helping professions can have a more informed context with which to understand factors in the interpersonal dynamics of Black males. Piecing together what could be a deeper understanding of Black male same sex friendships would be beneficial and potentially applicable to diverse groups of Black males. Not only might this be helpful in Black males interactions with other males it there may be potential for generalization in other relationships and interpersonal interactions. It can be asserted that how a Black male constructs and expresses his masculinity as well as his intimacy will be important factors in fully grasping his experiences with himself in addition to others in his life. While taking into account these behaviors one must also remain cognizant of the potential intrapersonal conflicts that may arise at various levels, possibly regarding the Black males' individual views, societal norms, and cultural norms.

As it pertains to masculinity and how it is to be expressed, Western Culture (and

subsequently the White masculine model) tends to enforce an emotionally restrictive, individually success driven, win at all costs “tough guy” visage. This is drastically opposite from what has been acceptable in the past periods of society. Rotundo’s chronicling of men’s same sex friendships indicated that society at one point deemed it acceptable for men to have emotionally intimate and close relationships with other males, traces of which can be seen in some research asserting that men still desire such things even if disguised by the current incarnation of acceptable masculinity.

Culturally, from an African American perspective there is emphasis on a group (family and/or community) orientation, being somewhat emotionally expressive, and being connected with God or spirituality. These characteristics are in violation or strongly opposed to the aforementioned traditional masculine norms.

Finally one must take into account the individualized experiences of the Black man, such as age and adult male presence, relationship with a father figure, messages the Black male has received, and socioeconomic status.

Ultimately, as Black men continue to have men’s issues it will be important to be mindful of how submersed they might be in the masculine norms of larger society and the subsequent effects that this experience has on interpersonal dynamics with others, establishing of relationships, physical, and mental health.

Through studies of this nature clinicians can have a more informed context of the environmental and social factors as it pertains to the Black man. Examination of this phenomenon can lead to discovery of the possible internalization of European-American norms and values, modern constructed views of male same-sex friendships, views of

masculinity. Subsequently, a clinician will be able to more accurately understand 1) intrapersonal dynamics, 2) interpersonal dynamics, 3) connectedness with others/community, and 4) socialization. Having further knowledge and understanding regarding the Black male experience will help guide the clinician in being more intentional in interventions and also creating more culturally appropriate goals. The clinician must realize the numerous layers of the Black male experience whether it be family dynamics, social support, socioeconomic status, or the various environmental stressors present.

This will be important for those individuals at both the supervisory and trainee levels in the goal to produce further culturally competent clinicians. While this will enhance cultural sensitivity as it pertains to Black men it will more importantly provide a more in depth cultural knowledge while still being mindful of the individual differences that will be present from client to client. Putting together a culturally competent plan of intervention would be helpful to those Black males in a variety of settings. The more informed the clinician regarding this matter will be more prepared to intervene, provide meaningful insight, and assist a potential client in cultivating meaningful interpersonal relationships based on his individual needs and subsequently improved mental health. In addition, culturally knowledgeable interventions of this nature may also provide the potential client with insight and ability to more accurately assess his own dynamics.

Conclusions

This study has examined the possible influences in the intimacy levels in the platonic same sex friendships of adult Black males. It has suggested that Black men's

age, perceived religious support, male presence in childhood, socioeconomic status, and adherence to traditional masculine norms could influence the intimacy levels of friendships with other males. This study found little to no significant relationship between the previously mentioned variables and emotional intimacy. This study did however, find a moderate positive relationship between emotional intimacy and the sub – scales (that total conformity to masculine norms).

This study attempted to offer a more in depth, holistic view of the intimacy levels within the friendships of Black males. Preliminary results showed participants to have a slightly lower to moderate level of emotional intimacy within their same-sex friendships suggesting that future research should continue in identifying factors that may cause this dynamic. It is also possible that taking a different perspective in measurement of asserted influences may yield even more thorough, informative results. Ultimately, this study has added to current research regarding African American males' same-sex friendships, which still needs significant contribution.

TABLES

Table 6

Multiple Regression of Independent Variables

Model Summary

| Model | | | | |
|-------|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------------------|
| | R | R Square | Adjusted R Square | Std. Error of the Estimate |
| 1 | .206 ^a | .042 | .006 | 5.73831 |

a. Predictors: (Constant), RSSTOTAL, Male Presence, CMNITOTAL, SESTOTAL, Age

Model Summary

| Model | Change Statistics | | | | |
|-------|-------------------|----------|-----|-----|---------------|
| | R Square Change | F Change | df1 | df2 | Sig. F Change |
| 1 | .042 | 1.178 | 5 | 133 | .323 |

ANOVA^b

| Model | | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
|-------|------------|----------------|-----|-------------|-------|-------------------|
| 1 | Regression | 193.977 | 5 | 38.795 | 1.178 | .323 ^a |
| | Residual | 4379.447 | 133 | 32.928 | | |
| | Total | 4573.424 | 138 | | | |

a. Predictors: (Constant), RSSTOTAL, Male Presence, CMNITOTAL, SESTOTAL, Age

b. Dependent Variable: EISSFTOTAL

Table 7

Regression of Emotional Intimacy and Adherence to Masculine Norms

Model Summary

| Model | R | R Square | Adjusted R Square | Std. Error of the Estimate |
|-------|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------------------|
| 1 | .046 ^a | .002 | -.005 | 5.77172 |

a. Predictors: (Constant), CMNITOTAL

Model Summary

| Model | Change Statistics | | | | |
|-------|-------------------|----------|-----|-----|---------------|
| | R Square Change | F Change | df1 | df2 | Sig. F Change |
| 1 | .002 | .287 | 1 | 137 | .593 |

ANOVA^b

| Model | | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
|-------|------------|----------------|-----|-------------|------|-------------------|
| 1 | Regression | 9.570 | 1 | 9.570 | .287 | .593 ^a |
| | Residual | 4563.855 | 137 | 33.313 | | |
| | Total | 4573.424 | 138 | | | |

a. Predictors: (Constant), CMNITOTAL

b. Dependent Variable: EISSFTOTAL

Table 8

*Regression of CMNI Subscales and Emotional Intimacy***Model Summary**

| Model | Change Statistics | | | |
|-------|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------------------|
| | R | R Square | Adjusted R Square | Std. Error of the Estimate |
| 1 | .425 ^a | .181 | .110 | 5.43148 |

a. Predictors: (Constant), STATUS, POWER, RELY, WORK, RISK, WINNING, DISDAIN, DOMINANT, VIOLENCE, PLAYBOY, EMOTION

Model Summary

| Model | Change Statistics | | | | |
|-------|-------------------|----------|-----|-----|---------------|
| | R Square Change | F Change | df1 | df2 | Sig. F Change |
| 1 | .181 | 2.548 | 11 | 127 | .006 |

ANOVA^b

| Model | | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
|-------|------------|----------------|-----|-------------|-------|-------------------|
| 1 | Regression | 826.804 | 11 | 75.164 | 2.548 | .006 ^a |
| | Residual | 3746.621 | 127 | 29.501 | | |
| | Total | 4573.424 | 138 | | | |

a. Predictors: (Constant), STATUS, POWER, RELY, WORK, RISK, WINNING, DISDAIN, DOMINANT, VIOLENCE, PLAYBOY, EMOTION

b. Dependent Variable: EISSFTOTAL

Table 9
Number of Male Friends

| Number of male friends | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|------------------------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| 0 | 7 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 |
| 1 | 20 | 14.4 | 14.4 | 19.4 |
| 2 | 19 | 13.7 | 13.7 | 33.1 |
| 3 | 28 | 20.1 | 20.1 | 53.2 |
| More than 3 | 65 | 46.8 | 46.8 | 100.0 |

Table 10

Regression of Select CMNI Subscales and Emotional intimacy

Model Summary

| Model | Change Statistics | | | |
|-------|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------------------|
| | R | R Square | Adjusted R Square | Std. Error of the Estimate |
| 1 | .329 ^a | .108 | .075 | 5.53738 |

a. Predictors: (Constant), WORK, DISDAIN, RELY, PLAYBOY, EMOTION

Model Summary

| Model | Change Statistics | | | | |
|-------|-------------------|----------|-----|-----|---------------|
| | R Square Change | F Change | df1 | df2 | Sig. F Change |
| 1 | .108 | 3.231 | 5 | 133 | .009 |

ANOVA^b

| Model | | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
|-------|------------|----------------|-----|-------------|-------|-------------------|
| 1 | Regression | 495.305 | 5 | 99.061 | 3.231 | .009 ^a |
| | Residual | 4078.120 | 133 | 30.663 | | |
| | Total | 4573.424 | 138 | | | |

a. Predictors: (Constant), WORK, DISDAIN, RELY, PLAYBOY, EMOTION

b. Dependent Variable: EISSFTOTAL

Table 11

*Regression of CMNI Subscales and Age***Model Summary**

| Model | | | | |
|-------|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------------------|
| | R | R Square | Adjusted R Square | Std. Error of the Estimate |
| 1 | .387 ^a | .150 | .076 | 1.256 |

a. Predictors: (Constant), STATUS, POWER, RELY, WORK, RISK, WINNING, DISDAIN, DOMINANT, VIOLENCE, PLAYBOY, EMOTION

Model Summary

| Model | Change Statistics | | | | |
|-------|-------------------|----------|-----|-----|---------------|
| | R Square Change | F Change | df1 | df2 | Sig. F Change |
| 1 | .150 | 2.036 | 11 | 127 | .030 |

ANOVA^b

| Model | | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
|-------|------------|----------------|-----|-------------|-------|-------------------|
| 1 | Regression | 35.347 | 11 | 3.213 | 2.036 | .030 ^a |
| | Residual | 200.408 | 127 | 1.578 | | |
| | Total | 235.755 | 138 | | | |

a. Predictors: (Constant), STATUS, POWER, RELY, WORK, RISK, WINNING, DISDAIN, DOMINANT, VIOLENCE, PLAYBOY, EMOTION

b. Dependent Variable: Age

Table 12

*Regression of Select CMNI Subscales and Emotional Intimacy***Model Summary**

| Model | | | | |
|-------|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------------------|
| | R | R Square | Adjusted R Square | Std. Error of the Estimate |
| 1 | .306 ^a | .094 | .067 | 5.56096 |

a. Predictors: (Constant), STATUS, WORK, DISDAIN, EMOTION

Model Summary

| Model | Change Statistics | | | | |
|-------|-------------------|----------|-----|-----|---------------|
| | R Square Change | F Change | df1 | df2 | Sig. F Change |
| 1 | .094 | 3.473 | 4 | 134 | .010 |

ANOVA^b

| Model | | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
|-------|------------|----------------|-----|-------------|-------|-------------------|
| 1 | Regression | 429.572 | 4 | 107.393 | 3.473 | .010 ^a |
| | Residual | 4143.853 | 134 | 30.924 | | |
| | Total | 4573.424 | 138 | | | |

a. Predictors: (Constant), STATUS, WORK, DISDAIN, EMOTION

b. Dependent Variable: EISSFTOTAL

Table 13

Regression of CMNI Subscales and Number of Male Friends

Model Summary

| Model | Model Summary | | | |
|-------|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------------------|
| | R | R Square | Adjusted R Square | Std. Error of the Estimate |
| 1 | .392 ^a | .154 | .081 | 1.225 |

a. Predictors: (Constant), STATUS, POWER, RELY, WORK, RISK, WINNING, DISDAIN, DOMINANT, VIOLENCE, PLAYBOY, EMOTION

Model Summary

| Model | Change Statistics | | | | |
|-------|-------------------|----------|-----|-----|---------------|
| | R Square Change | F Change | df1 | df2 | Sig. F Change |
| 1 | .154 | 2.099 | 11 | 127 | .025 |

ANOVA^b

| Model | | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
|-------|------------|----------------|-----|-------------|-------|-------------------|
| 1 | Regression | 34.665 | 11 | 3.151 | 2.099 | .025 ^a |
| | Residual | 190.717 | 127 | 1.502 | | |
| | Total | 225.381 | 138 | | | |

a. Predictors: (Constant), STATUS, POWER, RELY, WORK, RISK, WINNING, DISDAIN, DOMINANT, VIOLENCE, PLAYBOY, EMOTION

b. Number of friends

Appendix A

Demographic Questionnaire

- 1) Which category below includes your age? 18-20, 21-29, 30-39, 40-49, 50-59, 60 or older
- 2) Are you male or female?
- 3) Are you married, widowed, divorced, separated, never married, or in a romantic relationship?
- 4) Are you White, Black or African American, American Indian, Asian, Hispanic, or other?
- 5) Friendship can be defined as a voluntary association with others that involves intimacy, trust, acceptance, dependability, caring, and enjoyment. How many close male friends do you have? 0, 1, 2, 3, or more than 3
- 6) How long have you known him or them? 0-2 yrs, 3-5 years, more than 5 years, does not apply
- 7) How many close female friends do you have? 0, 1, 2, 3, more than 3
- 8) How long have you known her or them? 0-2 yrs, 3-5 years, more than 5 years, does not apply
- 9) When growing up did you have an adult male presence in your household and/or life? Yes, No

Appendix B

Index of Emotional Intimacy in Same Sex Friendships

Please answer the following questions in terms of your “best” or “closest” male friends. If you do not have a best or closest male friend, please answer in terms of the acquaintances you feel closest to. Choose one for each question; 0 Strongly disagree, 1 Disagree, 2 Neither Agree nor disagree, 3 Agree, 4 Strongly agree

1. When my friends and I are together, we spend most of our time participating in some type of sport or game
2. With my best friends, conversation usually stays on a casual level and doesn't involve our personal feelings.
3. When I am excited or happy about something, I usually tell my best friends about it, even if it's rather unimportant.
4. It's very important to me that my friends understand my ideas and feelings.
5. I often confide in my friends about my dreams for the future.
6. When I have a problem, I usually discuss it with my best friends.
7. My friends and I often get together to just talk.
8. I sometimes hide my real feelings so my friends won't know when I'm anxious about something.
9. It doesn't matter if my friends understand my feelings as long as we like to do the same kinds of things.
10. It would humiliate me if my best friend saw me crying about a serious emotional problem.
11. My friends and I often tell each other how much our friendship means to us.
12. My friends and I talk more about everyday events than about our personal lives.
13. My friends and I are usually involved in some activity when we are together and don't spend a lot of time just talking.
14. When I am depressed I usually let my best friends know.
15. As long as we have a good time together, I don't care if my best friends know what I'm really like or not.
16. It would embarrass me to hug my best friend.
17. When I feel unsure of myself, I am careful not to let my best friends know.
18. I have told my best friend that I really like him/her
19. My friends and I talk mostly about our feelings and personal lives.
20. I like my friends to be “happy-go-lucky” and not involve me in their problems.

Appendix C

Conformity to Masculine Norms Inventory: Sample

The following items contain a series of statements about how men might think, feel or behave. The statements are designed to measure attitudes, beliefs, and behaviors associated with both traditional and non-traditional masculine gender roles.

Thinking about your own actions, feelings and beliefs, please indicate how much **you personally agree or disagree with each statement** by circling SD for "Strongly Disagree", D for "Disagree", A for "Agree", or SA for "Strongly agree" to the right of the statement. There are no correct or wrong answers to the items. You should give the responses that most accurately describe your personal actions, feelings and beliefs. It is best if you respond with your first impression when answering.

| | | | | |
|--|----|---|---|----|
| 1. My work is the most important part of my life | SD | D | A | SA |
| 2. I make sure people do as I say | SD | D | A | SA |
| 3. In general, I do not like risky situations | SD | D | A | SA |
| 4. It would be awful if someone thought I was gay | SD | D | A | SA |
| 5. I love it when men are in charge of women | SD | D | A | SA |
| 6. I like to talk about my feelings | SD | D | A | SA |
| 7. I would feel good if I had many sexual partners | SD | D | A | SA |
| 8. It is important to me that people think I am heterosexual | SD | D | A | SA |
| 9. I believe that violence is never justified | SD | D | A | SA |
| 10. I tend to share my feelings | SD | D | A | SA |
| 11. I should be in charge | SD | D | A | SA |
| 12. I would hate to be important | SD | D | A | SA |
| 13. Sometimes violent action is necessary | SD | D | A | SA |
| 14. I don't like giving all my attention to work | SD | D | A | SA |
| 15. More often than not, losing does not bother me | SD | D | A | SA |
| 16. If I could, I would frequently change sexual partners | SD | D | A | SA |
| 17. I never do things to be an important person | SD | D | A | SA |
| 18. I never ask for help | SD | D | A | SA |
| 19. I enjoy taking risks | SD | D | A | SA |
| 20. Men and women should respect each other as equals | SD | D | A | SA |
| 21. Winning isn't everything, it's the only thing | SD | D | A | SA |
| 22. It bothers me when I have to ask for help | SD | D | A | SA |

Appendix D

Religious Support Scale: Support Questionnaire

We would like to learn about people's perceptions of support, related to their *life of faith*. Please rate the following items for the degree to which you feel each one applies to you in general. For these items, "**congregation**" refers to regular attendees of your current church. "**Church leaders**" refers to anyone in a leadership position within the congregation, including pastors, deacons, Sunday School teachers, etc. Please respond to items 1 to 21 using the following **5-point scale**:

1 = Strongly Disagree 2 = Disagree 3 = Unsure 4 = Agree 5 = Strongly Agree

1. I can turn to others in my congregation for advice when I have problems.
2. If something went wrong, my church leaders would give me assistance.
3. God gives me the sense that I belong.
4. Others in my congregation care about my life and situation.
5. I have worth in the eyes of my church leaders.
6. I feel appreciated by God.
7. I do not feel close to others in my congregation.
8. I can turn to church leadership for advice when I have problems.
9. If something went wrong, God would give me assistance.
10. Others in my congregation give me the sense that I belong.
11. My church leaders care about my life and situation.
12. I have worth in the eyes of God.
13. I feel appreciated by others in my congregation.
14. I do not feel close to my church leaders.
15. I can turn to God for advice when I have problems.
16. If something went wrong, others in my congregation would give me assistance.
17. My church leaders give me the sense that I belong.
18. God cares about my life and situation.
19. I have worth in the eyes of others in my congregation.
20. I feel appreciated by my church leaders.
21. I do not feel close to God.

Appendix E

The Barratt Simplified Measure of Social Status (BSMSS) Measuring SES

Circle the appropriate number for your Mother's, your Father's, your Spouse / Partner's, and your level of school completed and occupation. If you grew up in a single parent home, circle only the score from your one parent. If you are neither married nor partnered circle only your score. If you are a full time student circle only the scores for your parents.

| <u>Level of School Completed</u> | <u>Mother</u> | <u>Father</u> | <u>Spouse</u> | <u>You</u> |
|--|---------------|---------------|---------------|------------|
| Less than 7 th grade | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| Junior high / Middle school (9 th grade) | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 |
| Partial high school (10 th or 11 th grade) | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 |
| High school graduate | 12 | 12 | 12 | 12 |
| Partial college (at least one year) | 15 | 15 | 15 | 15 |
| College education | 18 | 18 | 18 | 18 |
| Graduate degree | 21 | 21 | 21 | 21 |

Circle the appropriate number for your Mother's, your Father's, your Spouse / Partner's, and your occupation. If you grew up in a single parent home, use only the score from your parent. If you are not married or partnered circle only your score. If you are still a full-time student only circle the scores for your parents. If you are retired use your most recent occupation.

| <u>Occupation</u> | <u>Mother</u> | <u>Father</u> | <u>Spouse</u> | <u>You</u> |
|---|---------------|---------------|---------------|------------|
| Day laborer, janitor, house cleaner, farm worker, food | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| Garbage collector, short-order cook, cab driver, shoe | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 |
| Painter, skilled construction trade, sales clerk, truck driver, cook, sales counter or general office clerk. | 15 | 15 | 15 | 15 |
| Automobile mechanic, typist, locksmith, farmer, carpenter, receptionist, construction laborer, | 20 | 20 | 20 | 20 |
| Machinist, musician, bookkeeper, secretary, insurance | 25 | 25 | 25 | 25 |
| Supervisor, librarian, aircraft mechanic, artist and artisan, electrician, administrator, military enlisted personnel, buyer. | 30 | 30 | 30 | 30 |

| | | | | |
|--|----|----|----|----|
| Nurse, skilled technician, medical technician, counselor, manager, police and fire personnel, financial | 35 | 35 | 35 | 35 |
| Mechanical, nuclear, and electrical engineer, educational administrator, veterinarian, military officer, elementary, high school and special | 40 | 40 | 40 | 40 |
| Physician, attorney, professor, chemical and aerospace engineer, judge, CEO, senior manager, public | 45 | 45 | 45 | 45 |

Appendix F

Informed Consent

Western Michigan University [Counselor Education/Counseling Psychology]

Principal Investigator: [Lonnie Duncan]
Student Investigator: [Darian Mitchell]
Title of Study: [A study of influences in the platonic same sex friendships of Black males]

You are invited to participate in a research project entitled “A Study of Influences in the Platonic Same Sex friendships of Black Males designed to analyze the nature of Black male’s friendships. The study is being conducted by Dr. Lonnie Duncan and Darian Mitchell from Western Michigan University, Department of Counseling Psychology. This research is being conducted as part of the dissertation requirements for Darian Mitchell.

This survey is comprised of 146 multiple choice questions and will take approximately 30-35 minutes to complete. This anonymous survey is comprised of a demographic questionnaire and four specific measures. This survey will be completed via the internet. Your replies will be completely anonymous and you will not be prompted to provide identifying information from investigator(s).

You can choose to stop participating in the study at any time for any reason. You will not suffer any prejudice or penalty by your decision to stop your participation. You will experience NO consequences either academically or personally if you choose to withdraw from this study.

The investigator can also decide to stop your participation in the study without your consent.

Should you have any questions prior to or during the study, you can contact the primary investigator, [Lonnie.duncan@wmich.edu] at [269-387-5152] or [darian.d.mitchell@wmich.edu] at [269-365-3658]. You may also contact the Chair, Human Subjects Institutional Review Board at 269-387-8293 or the Vice President for Research at 269-387-8298 if questions arise during the course of the study.

This consent document has been approved by the Western Michigan University Human Subjects Institutional Review Board (HSIRB) on December 1, 2011
 Do not participate after July 31, 2012

Appendix G

Institutional Review Board Permissions

WESTERN MICHIGAN UNIVERSITY



Human Subjects Institutional Review Board

Date: December 1, 2011

To: Lonnie Duncan, Principal Investigator
Darlan Mitchell, Student Investigator for dissertation

From: Victoria Janson, Interim Chair

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Victoria Janson".

Re: HSIRB Project Number 11-11-28

This letter will serve as confirmation that your research project titled "A Study of Influences in the Platonic Same Sex Friendships of Black Males" has been **approved** under the **exempt** category of review by the Human Subjects Institutional Review Board. The conditions and duration of this approval are specified in the Policies of Western Michigan University. You may now begin to implement the research as described in the application.

Please note that you may **only** conduct this research exactly in the form it was approved. You must seek specific board approval for any changes in this project. You must also seek reapproval if the project extends beyond the termination date noted below. In addition if there are any unanticipated adverse reactions or unanticipated events associated with the conduct of this research, you should immediately suspend the project and contact the Chair of the HSIRB for consultation.

The Board wishes you success in the pursuit of your research goals.

Approval Termination: December 1, 2012



Office of the Provost

MEMORANDUM

Application Approval Notification

TO: Mr. Darian Mitchell

FROM: Cosmas U. Nwokefor, Ph.D.
Chair, IRB
Bowie State University
Bowie, MD 20715

RE: **IRB Number 011-068**
**Project Title: “A study of Influences
in the Platonic Same Sex Friendships
of Black Males”**

Approval Date: December 15, 2011

Expiration Date: December 15, 2012

Type of Application New Project

Type of Research: Nonexempt

**Type of Review
For Application** Expedited

The Bowie State University Institutional Review Board (IRB) approved your IRB Proposal application in accordance with 45 CFR 46, the Federal Policy for the Protection of Human Subjects and the Bowie State University’s IRB guidelines and

procedures. Please reference the above-cited IRB application number in any future communications with the Board regarding your research.

Recruitment/Consent: For research requiring written informed consent, the IRB-approved and stamped informed consent document will be enclosed. The IRB approval expiration date has been reserved. Please keep copies of the consent forms used for this research and this memorandum for three years after the completion of the research.

Continuing Review: If you intend to continue to collect data from human subjects or to analyze private, identifiable data collected from human subjects, after the expiration date for this approval (indicated above), you must submit a renewal application to the Chair of BSU IRB at least 30 days before the approval expiration date.

Modifications: Any changes to the approved protocol must be approved by the IRB before the change is implemented, except when a change is necessary to eliminate apparent immediate hazards to the subjects. If you would like to modify the approved protocol, please submit an addendum request to the IRB Chair. The instructions for submitting a request could be obtained from IRB Chair.

Unanticipated Problems Involving Risks: You must promptly report any unanticipated problems involving risks to subjects or others with your application.

Student Researchers: Unless otherwise requested, this IRB approval was sent to the Principal Investigator (PI). The PI should pass on the approval document or a copy to the student researchers. This IRB approval document may be a requirement for student researchers applying for graduation. The IRB Chair may not be able to provide copies of the approval documents if several years have passed since the date of the original approval.

Congratulations and best wishes in the completion of your study.

Additional Information: If you have any IRB related questions or concern, please contact:

Dr. Cosmas U. Nwokefor, Chair IRB
Center for Business and Graduate Studies
Suite 1312
Bowie State University
Bowie MD 20715
301-860-3410
301-860-3414
cnwokefor@bowiestate.edu



BOWLING GREEN STATE UNIVERSITY

Office of Research Compliance

DATE: February 22, 2012
 TO: Darian Mitchell, M.A.
 FROM: Bowling Green State University Human Subjects Review Board
 PROJECT TITLE: [292906-2] A study of influences in the same sex platonic friendships
 of Black males
 SUBMISSION TYPE: Revision

ACTION: APPROVED
 APPROVAL DATE: February 17, 2012
 EXPIRATION DATE: January 16, 2013
 REVIEW TYPE: Expedited Review

REVIEW CATEGORY: Expedited review category # 7

Thank you for your submission of Revision materials for this project. The Bowling Green State University Human Subjects Review Board has APPROVED your submission. This approval is based on an appropriate risk/benefit ratio and a project design wherein the risks have been minimized. All research must be conducted in accordance with this approved submission.

The final approved version of the consent document(s) is available as a published Board Document in the Review Details page. You must use the approved version of the consent document when obtaining consent from participants. Informed consent must continue throughout the project via a dialogue between the researcher and research participant. Federal regulations require that each participant receives a copy of the consent document.

Please note that you are responsible to conduct the study as approved by the HSRB. If you seek to make any changes in your project activities or procedures, those modifications must be approved by this committee prior to initiation. Please use the modification request form for this procedure.

All UNANTICIPATED PROBLEMS involving risks to subjects or others and SERIOUS and UNEXPECTED adverse events must be reported promptly to this office. All NON-COMPLIANCE issues or COMPLAINTS regarding this project must also be reported promptly to this office.

This approval expires on January 16, 2013. You will receive a continuing review notice before your project expires. If you wish to continue your work after the expiration date, your documentation for continuing review must be received with sufficient time for review and continued approval before the expiration date.

Good luck with your work. If you have any questions, please contact the Office of Research Compliance at 419-372-7716 or hsrb@bgsu.edu. Please include your project title and reference number in all correspondence regarding this project.

This letter has been electronically signed in accordance with all applicable regulations, and a copy is retained within Bowling Green State University Human Subjects Review Board's records. Generated on IRBNet

Bibliography

- Addis, M.E., Mansfield, A.K., Syzdek, M.R. (2010). Is masculinity a problem? Framing the effects of gendered social learning in men. *Psychology of Men and Masculinity, 11*, 77-90.
- Afifi, W. A., & Guerrero, L. K. (1998). Some things are better left unsaid II: Topic avoidance in friendships. *Communication Quarterly, 46*, 231-249.
- Belgrave, F.Z., Allison, K.W. (2006). *African American psychology : from Africa to America*. Thousand Oaks, Calif. Sage Publications.
- Brannon, R. (1976). The male sex role: Our culture's blueprint for manhood, what it's done for us lately. In D. David & R. Brannon (Eds.) *The forty-nine percent majority: The male sex role*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley
- Bank, B.J., Hansford, S.L. (2000). Gender and friendship: Why are men's best same-sex friendships less intimate and supportive? *Personal Relationships, 7*, 63-78.
- Barratt, W. (2006). The Barratt Simplified Measure of Social Status (BSMSS) measuring SES. Unpublished manuscript. Indiana State University available at http://wbarratt.indstate.edu/socialclass/Barratt_Simplified_Measure_of_Social_Status.pdf
- Benenson, J.F., Christakos, A. (2003). The greater fragility of females' versus males' closest same-sex friendships. *Child Development, 74*, 1123-1129.
- Berger, J. M., Levant, R., McMillan, K. K., Kelleher, W. & Sellers, A. (2005). Impact of gender role conflict, traditional masculinity ideology, alexithymia, and age on men's attitudes towards psychological help seeking. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity, 6*, 73-78.
- Burlew, R.D. (2002). Affective sharing in African American men and women's same

and cross-sex friendships. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Michigan, United States – Michigan. Retrieved July 8, 2008, from Dissertations & Theses: FullText.(Publication No. AAT 3057903).

Bowman, P.J. (1989). Research perspectives on Black men: Role strain and adaptation across the Black adult male life cycle. In R. Jones (ed.), *Black adult development and aging* (pp. 117-150). Verkeley, CA: Cobb & Henry.

Burn, S.M., Ward, A.Z. (2005). Men's conformity to traditional masculinity and relationship satisfaction. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity*, 6(4), 254-263.

Caldwell, M. & Peplau, L. (1982). Sex differences in same-sex friendship. *Sex Roles*, 8, 721-732.

Chatters, L.M., Taylor, R.J., Lincoln, K.D., Schroepfer, T. (2002). Patterns of Informal Support from Family and Church Members among African Americans. *Journal of Black Studies*, 33(1), 66-85.

Coles, R.L. (2001). The parenting roles and goals of single Black full-time fathers. *The Western Journal of Black Studies*, 25, 101–116.

Cotter, G.P. (1993). Men's same-sex friendships: An expansion of the current intimacy paradigm. Ph.D. dissertation, The Fielding Institute, United States – California. Retrieved July 8, 2008, from Dissertations & Theses: Full Text.(Publication No. AAT 9406045).

Delvin, P.K., Cowan, G.A. (1985). Homophobia, perceived fathering, and male intimate relationships. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 49, 467-473.

Descutner, C.J.; Thelen, M.H. (1991). Development and validation of a fear of intimacy scale. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 3(2), 218-225.

DuBois, D. L., Hirsch, J. (1990). School and Neighborhood Friendship Patterns of

- Blacks and Whites in Early Adolescence. *Child Development*, 61, 524-536.
- Fehr, B. (2004). Intimacy expectations in same-sex friendships: A prototype interaction-pattern model. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 86(2), 265-284.
- Fehr, B. (1996). *Friendship processes*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Fiala, W.E.; Bjorck, J.P.; Gorsuch, R. (2002). The Religious Support Scale: Construction, Validation, and Cross-Validation, *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 30(6), 761-86.
- Foster, H.J. (1983). African Patterns in the Afro-American Family. *Journal of Black Studies*, 14(2), 201-232.
- Franklin, C. W. (1992). "Hey, home—yo, bro": Friendship among Black men. In P. Nardi (Ed.), *Men's friendships: Research on men and masculinities* ((Ed.), *Men's friendships: Research on men and masculinities* (pp. 201–214). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Franklin, C. (1984). Black male-female conflict: Individually caused and culturally nurtured. *Journal of Black Studies*, 15, 139-154.
- Good, G.E., Robertson, J.M., Fitzgerald, L.F., Stevens, M.A., & Bartels, K.M. (1996).
The relation between masculine role conflict and psychological distress in male university counseling center clients. *Journal of Counseling & Development*, 75, 44-49.
- Greene, Heath Lane (2002). A study of barriers to intimacy in male same-sex friendships. Ph.D. dissertation, Fuller Theological Seminary, School of Psychology, United States -- California. Retrieved June 16, 2008, from Dissertations & Theses:

Full Text.(Publication No. AAT 3095331).

Good, G. E., Borst, T. S., & Wallace, D. L. (1994). Masculinity research: A review and critique. *Applied & Preventive Psychology, 3*, 3-14.

Grief, G.L (2009). Understanding Older Men and Their Male Friendships: Comparison of African American and White men, *Journal of Gerontological Social Work, 52:6*, 618-632.

Grief, G.L. (2006). Male friendships: Implications from research for family therapy. *Family Therapy; 33(1)*, 1-15.

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.

Harris, S. M. (1995). Psychological development and black male masculinity: Implications for counseling economically disadvantaged African American male adolescents. *Journal of Counseling & Development, 73*, 279-287.

Harris, S.M. (1992). Black male masculinity and same sex friendships. *The Western Journal of Black Studies, 16*, 744-781.

Hook, M. K., Gerstein, L. H., Detterich, L. & Gridley, B. (2003). How close are we? Measuring intimacy and examining gender differences. *Journal of Counseling and Development, 81*, 462-472.

Hunter, A. G., & Davis, J. E. (1992). Constructing gender: An exploration of Afro-American men's conceptualization of manhood. *Gender & Society, 6*, 464-479.

Jones, D.C., Costin, S. E., & Ricard, R. J. (1994, February 10). Ethnic and sex differences in best friendship characteristics among African American, Mexican-American, & European-American adolescents. *Poster session presented at Society*

for Research on Adolescence, San Diego, CA.

Kane, C.M. (2000), African American Family Dynamics as Perceived by Family Members. *Journal of Black Studies*, 30(5), 692-701.

Kimmel, M.S. (2004). *The gendered society*. New York : Oxford University Press.

Lehne, G.K. (1989) Homophobia Among Men: Supporting and Defining the Male Role. In *Men's Lives*, Edited by: Kimmel, M. and Messner, M. 416–429. New York: Macmillan.

Kunjufu, F. (1986). Countering the conspiracy to destroy black boys (Vol. 2.). *Chicago: African American Images*.

Kochman, T. (1981). Black and white styles in conflict. Chicago: The University of Chicago.

Levant, R.F., Hirsch, L., Celentano, E., Cozza, T., Hill, S., MacEachern, M., Marty, N., & Schnedeker, J. (1992). The male role: An investigation of norms and stereotypes. *Journal of Mental Health Counseling*, 14, 325-337.

Levin, J.S.; Taylor, R.J. (1998). Panel Analyses of Religious Involvement and Well-Being in African Americans: Contemporaneous vs. Longitudinal Effects. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 37(4), 695-709

Levin, J.S.; Chatters, L.M. (1998). Religion, health, and psychological well-being in older adults. *Journal of Aging and Health*, 10(4), 504-531.

Levin, J.S., Chatters, L.M., Taylor, R.J. (1995). Religious effects on health status and life satisfaction among Black Americans. *Journal of Gerontology: Social Sciences*, 50B, S154–S163.

Levinson, D., Darrow, C., Klein, E., Levinson, M., McKee, B. (1978). The Seasons of

- a Man's Life. New York: Alfred A. Knopf,
- Levy, D. (2005). Hegemonic Complicity, Friendship, and Comradeship: Validation and Causal Processes among White, Middle-Class, Middle-Aged Men. *Journal of Men's Studies*, 13(2), 199-224.
- Mahalik, J. R., Locke, B. D., Ludlow, L. H., Diemer, M. A., Gottfried, M., Scott, R. P. J. & Freitas, G. (2003). Development of the Conformity to Masculine Norms Inventory. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity*, 4, 3-25.
- Majors, R. & Billson, J. M. (1992). *Cool Pose: The dilemmas of black manhood in America*. New York: Lexington.
- Majors, R. (1989). Cool pose: The proud signature of black survival. In M. S. Kimmel & M. A. Messner (Eds.), *Men's lives*, 83-87. New York: Macmillan.
- Mattis, J. S., Murray, Y. F., Hatcher, C. A., Hearn, K. D., Lawhon, G. D., Murphy, E. J., & Washington, T. A. (2001). Religiosity, Spirituality, and the Subjective Quality of African American Men's Friendships: An Exploratory Study. *Journal of Adult Development*. 8(4), 221-30.
- Mccooy, L. D. (1998). Man-to-man: A psychodynamic/developmental understanding of adult male same-sex friendship. Dissertation Abstracts International: Section B: The Sciences and Engineering. Vol. 59(6-B), Dec 1998, pp. 3122. *ProQuest Dissertations & Theses: Full Text*. Mosley et. Al , 1987
- Moss-Racusin, C.A., Phelan, J.E., Rudman, L.A. (2010). When men break the gender rules: Status incongruity and backlash against modest men. *Psychology of Men and Masculinity*, 11(2), 140-151.
- Monsour, M. (1992), 'Meanings of Intimacy in Cross- and Same-Sex Friendships', *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, Vol. 9, 277-295.

- Myers, L.W. (1998). *Black male socialization: Revisited in the minds of respondents*. Stamford, Conn.: JAI Press
- Nandi, M. (2002). Re/Constructing black masculinity in prison. *The Journal of Men's Studies, 11*, 91-107.
- Nardi, Peter M. (ed.). (1992). *Men's Friendships*. London: Sage.
- Oliver, W. (1989). Sexual conquest and patterns of black-on-black violence: A structural-cultural perspective. *Violence and Victims, 4*, 257-273.
- Pangle, L.S. (2003). *Aristotle and the philosophy of friendship*. Cambridge University Press.
- Parks, M. R. & Floyd, K. (1996). Meanings for closeness and intimacy in friendship. *J. Soc. Pers. Relationships, 13*, 85-107.
- Phillips, J. (2001). Cultural construction of Manhood in Prison. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity, 2*, 13-23.
- Pleck, J. H. (1995). The gender role strain paradigm: An update. In R. F. Levant & W. S. Pollack (Eds.), *A new psychology of men* (pp. 11-32). New York: Basic Books.
- Reisman, J.M. (1990). Intimacy in same sex friendships. *Sex Roles, 23*, 65-82.
- Richburg, M.T. (1998). The relationship between dyadic adjustment and the structure, satisfaction, and intimacy of married men's same-sex friendships. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Denver, United States -- Colorado. Retrieved July 8, 2011, from Dissertations & Theses: Full Text.(Publication No. AAT 9901386).
- Roberts, G.W. (1994). Brother to brother: African American modes of relating among men. *Journal of Black Psychology, 24*, 379-390.
- Rotundo, E. Anthony (1989). Romantic friendship: Male intimacy and middle-class

- youth in the northern United States, 1800–1900. *Journal of Social History* 23: 1–25.
- Roy, R., Benenson, J. & Lilly, F. (2000). Beyond intimacy: Conceptualizing differences in same-sex friendships. *Journal of Psychology*, 134, 93-101.
- Ricketts, E. (1989). The origins of Black Female-Headed families. *Focus* 12(1) : 32-36.
- Rose, S.M. (1985). Same- and cross-sex friendships and the psychology of homosociality. *Sex Roles*, 12 (1-2), 63-74.
- Rutledge, E.M. (1988). African-American socialization experiences by family structure. *Journal of Black Studies*, 19(2), 204-215.
- Sapadin, L. A. (1988). Friendship and gender: Perspectives of professional men and women. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 5, 387-403.
- Shepard, D. S. (2002). A negative state of mind: Patterns of depressive symptoms among men with high gender role conflict. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity*, 3, 3-8.
- Sherrod, D. (1989). The influence of gender on same-sex friendships, In C. Hendrick (Ed.) *Close relationships*, pp. 164-186. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.
- Simmons, M. (1981, November). My Main Man!: The Truth About Male Friendships. *Essence*, 86-87; 137-139.
- Smith, R. (1991, November) Big Men Don't Cry. *Essence*, 22 ,7, 32-33.
- Staples. R. (1987).. Social Structure and Black Family Life: An Analysis of Current Trends. *Journal of Black Studies*. 17:267–86.
- Sutherland, Alistair, and Patrick Anderson. (eds). (1961). *Eros: An Anthology of Male Friendship*. London: Anthony Blount.
- Spencer, R. (2007). “I just feel safe with him”: Emotional closeness in male youth

- mentoring relationships. *Psychology of Men and Masculinity*, 8, 185-198.
- St. George, A., McNamara, P.H. (1984). Religion, Race and Psychological Well-Being. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 23 (4), 351-363.
- Taylor R.J., Ellison C.G., Chatters L.M., ,Levin J.S., Lincoln K.D. (2000). Mental health services within faith communities: the role of clergy in black churches. *Soc. Work*. 45: 73-87
- Taylor, R. J., Mattis, J., & Chatters, L. M., (1999). Subjective religiosity among African Americans: A synthesis of findings from five national samples. *Journal of Black Psychology*, 25 (4), 524-543.
- Taylor, R.J, Thorton, M.C., Chatters, L.M. (1987). "Black Americans' Perceptions of the Sociohistorical Role of the Church." *Journal of Black Studies* 18 (123-128).
- Van Bark, William Peter (1998). Structure, intimacy, and satisfication in men's same-sex friendships in early adulthood. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Denver, United States – Colorado. Retrieved July 8, 2011, from Dissertations & Theses: Full Text.(Publication No. AAT 9830241).
- Veniegas, R. C., & Peplau, L A. (1997). Power and the quality of same-sex friendships. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 21, 279-297.
- Washington Post Staff (2007). Being a Black Man: At the Corner of Progress and Peril. Public Affairs New York, NY.
- Way, N., Cowal, K., Gingold, R., Pahl, K., & Bissessar, N. (2001). Friendship patterns among African American, Asian American, and Latino adolescents from low-income families. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 18, 29–53.
- Williams, D.G. (1985). Gender, masculinity-femininity, and emotional intimacy in

same-sex friendship. *Sex Roles*, 12(5/6), 587-600.

Winstead, B.A., and Griffin, J.L. (2001). Friendship styles. In J. Worell (Ed.) *Encyclopedia of Women and Gender* (pp.481-492). Boston: Academic Press.

Wright, P. H. (1982). Men's friendships, women's friendships and the alleged inferiority of the latter. *Sex Roles*, 8, 1-20.