

We Don't Talk About Boys: Masculinity Norms Among Adolescents in Brazil

Ieda Matavelli*

April 28, 2025

Abstract

Masculinity norms are the beliefs about what men should or should not do, such as that men should suppress their emotions or use violence. I measure masculinity norms among 2,608 adolescents in Rio de Janeiro and document large misperceptions about these norms: most boys and girls overestimate the share of peers that hold traditional views of masculinity. I examine whether a lack of horizontal communication (i.e., communication with peers) or biased communication (i.e., communication with a selected group) perpetuates misperceived norms through two field experiments in 25 schools. In a first experiment, I randomly assigned adolescents to a mediated discussion to learn peers' opinions about masculinity or a placebo discussion about recycling. Masculinity discussions reduce misperceptions about classmates' beliefs by about 50% immediately, with effects persisting three weeks later. Discussions in which people self-select into speaking or are randomly asked to speak reduce misperceptions equally. This suggests that misperceptions are due to a lack of broad communication with peers. In a second experiment in a similar setting, adolescents choose the peers with whom they want to discuss masculinity. Encouraging communication with chosen peers also reduces misperceptions, suggesting that adolescents do not talk about masculinity even with closer peers. Further evidence from this experiment suggests that underestimating interest and comfort in these discussions might explain the lack of communication.

*University of New South Wales; iedamatavelli@gmail.com. I especially thank Matt Lowe and Jamie McCasland for their invaluable guidance, mentorship and advice since the inception of this project, and Siwan Anderson, Pauline Grosjean and Nathan Nunn for their feedback and mentorship. This study also benefited from comments from Deivis Angeli, Victoria Baranov, Lisa Botbol, Nina Buchmann, Leonardo Bursztyn, Josh Dean, Alexia Delfino, Claudio Ferraz, Patrick Francois, Alessandra L. González, Federico Masera, Vinicius Peçanha, Chris Roth, Heather Sarsons, Fernando Secco, Frank Schilbach, Manisha Shah, and Munir Squires. I thank seminar participants at PacDev, ECBE, SIOE, URPP Conference on Boys and Men at the University of Zurich, University of Melbourne, Insper, Monash University, University of Auckland, University of Sydney, the Berlin Workshop on Empirical Public Economics: Gender Economics, IEA-World Bank Gender Norms and the Law, Universidade Católica de Brasília. Finally, I thank the Secretariat of Education of Rio de Janeiro, and especially Caroline Guedes, for collaborating on the project. I gratefully acknowledge financial support from the Canada Excellence Research Chairs program awarded to Dr Erik Snowberg in Data-Intensive Methods in Economics and the Center for Effective Global Action. This project was approved by UBC's Behavioral Research Ethics Board (H22-01226) and Insper's Research Ethics Committee (Opinion N. 213/2022 and N. 344/2024), and pre-registered in the AEA RCT Registry under codes AEARCTR-0009508 and AEARCTR-0013292.

1 Introduction

Men are considerably more likely than women to die from suicide or drug abuse (OECD, 2020), and commit over 90% of the world’s homicides (UNODC, 2019). Social scientists have argued that the beliefs about what men should or should not do, i.e. masculinity norms, can, at least partially, explain these gender gaps (Jakupcak et al., 2002; Mahalik et al., 2007; Poteat et al., 2011; Wong et al., 2017). A central dimension of masculinity norms is *restrictive emotionality*, which prescribes that men are expected to hide their vulnerable feelings and emotions (e.g., “men should not cry”). Another dimension is *aggression*, which prescribes that men are expected to use violence. While a growing body of work in economics studies gender norms constraining the behaviors of women, or women relative to men (Alesina et al., 2013; Bertrand et al., 2015; Bursztyn et al., 2020b; Dhar et al., 2022), the study of masculinity norms remain overlooked, even though it predicts important economic outcomes (DeHaas et al. 2024).

Overestimating others’ beliefs in traditional masculinity might be harmful to men and society as men could avoid help-seeking behaviors or use violence if they incorrectly think that is what others expect. Hence, shedding light on the mechanisms that sustain these norms in equilibrium might be important. What factors contribute to the existence of misperceived social norms?¹ On the one hand, misperceptions about others’ beliefs could exist due to a lack of horizontal communication, i.e. communication with peers (Bursztyn et al., 2020b). In the absence of horizontal communication, people might infer their peers’ views from older family members (Bisin and Verdier, 2001) or the media (Ferrara et al., 2012). In such cases, understanding the barriers to communication might be relevant. On the other hand, horizontal communication could exist but be biased (Kitts, 2003). For example, it may be that the more masculine² people talk, and listeners may fail to correct for this selection when updating their beliefs. In addition, people could talk only with a selected group, such as more vocal or closer peers.

In this paper, I experimentally examine whether a lack of communication or biased communication explains the existence of misperceived social norms in the context of masculinity norms. I use two field experiments with 13 to 15-year-old boys and girls from 25 coeducational schools in Rio de Janeiro—known to have a strong masculine culture (Taylor et al., 2016). Early adolescence is a key stage for the formation of beliefs around masculinity, as boys enter manhood (Kimmel et al., 2004; Way, 2011; Lundgren et al., 2013; Kågesten et al., 2016). In the first experiment ($N = 2,249$), I examine whether a lack of communication exists by encouraging a group discussion about masculinity. I also test for biased communication by randomizing whether participants self-select

¹Several theoretical models could explain the persistence of misperceived social norms, such as motivated reasoning (Bénabou and Tirole, 2016), confirmation bias (Nickerson, 1998), false consensus (Marks and Miller, 1987; Thaler, 2000), and pluralistic ignorance (Bicchieri, 2005). Empirical exceptions to the determinants of the persistence of misperceived social norms are Braghieri (2024) and Ho and Huang (2024), which discuss the role of social image concerns and silence, respectively.

²In this paper, I refer to people who agree more with traditional masculinity beliefs as “more masculine” or “traditionally masculine”.

into speaking or are randomly asked to speak in these discussions. In the second experiment ($N = 359$), I examine whether more natural communication with closer friends exists by allowing them to select their discussion peers. This design also adds to recent calls in the policy arena to listen to boys' perspectives about masculinity (Reeves, 2022; Way, 2024).

Teenagers have large misperceptions about boys' and girls' beliefs about masculinity. In a pre-discussion survey, I measure masculinity by eliciting whether they agree or disagree with the beliefs "men who cry are weak" and "men should use violence to get respect if necessary", which represent the *restrictive emotionality* and *aggression* dimensions of masculinity. In a post-discussion survey, adolescents guessed the percentage of boys and girls, separately, in their classroom who agree with these beliefs. I define misperceptions as the difference, in percentage points, between one's guess about the percentage of boys or girls in their classroom who agree with each belief and the actual fraction who agree with the belief. Only 10% of boys agree with the belief about crying. In contrast, boys guess that 31% of other boys in their classroom agree with this belief. Hence, boys misperceive other boys' beliefs about crying by 21pp. Following a similar logic, boys misperceive girls' beliefs about crying by 28pp. Boys misperceive other boys' and girls' beliefs about violence by 13pp and 11pp, respectively. Girls' misperceptions are of similar magnitudes. The propensity to provide socially desirable answers, measured using the [Crowne and Marlowe \(1960\)](#) scale, does not significantly predict misperceptions.

In the first experiment, I test whether a lack of horizontal communication is a source of misperceptions by randomly assigning teenagers from the same classroom into a one-time 15-minute discussion about masculinity or a control discussion about recycling. In the masculinity discussions, male mediators asked students whether they agreed and why with the beliefs about crying and violence. These discussions could be of two types. In the *Voluntary* type, adolescents self-selected into speaking. In the *Randomized* type, I randomly selected the adolescents asked to speak. The control discussions were about recycling practices and were only *Voluntary*, i.e., teenagers would speak as they want. I surveyed students before, immediately, and three weeks after the discussion. Boys and girls participated in these discussions. The mediators did not express their opinions to isolate the effect of learning their peers' opinions. On average, there were 13 people in the discussions.³

The masculinity discussions reduce boys' and girls' misperceptions by about 50% in the short-run ($p < 0.001$), similarly across the *Randomized* and *Voluntary* arms. Boys' *Voluntary* speakers are 25% more vocal than *Randomized* ones ($p = 0.07$) based on a peer-reported measure of vocality. This suggests that even vocal types do not talk about masculinity at school; otherwise, participants in the *Voluntary* group would not have learned any new information. The likelihood of providing more socially desirable answers does not explain these results.

³In each session, a maximum of 6 teenagers would speak to allow for a cleaner comparison between the *Voluntary* and *Randomized* arms. In the limit, if all participants spoke, we could expect effects to be similar by construction since they were randomized into these groups.

Why do the *Randomized* and *Voluntary* groups similarly affect misperceptions? The public opinions expressed among *Randomized* and *Voluntary* speakers are similar, so participants hear the same views in both groups. In addition, they use similar narratives in these two groups. Similar effects happen because boys in the *Randomized* group lie in public towards having less masculine views, compared to their private views, so misperceptions would be smaller if average boys spoke about masculinity naturally. In addition, boys who speak in the *Voluntary* group are, on average, 57% less masculine than the boys who speak in the *Randomized* group, measured by their private views ($p=0.03$). In the pre-discussion survey, I find correlational evidence that the more masculine adolescents are also less vocal ($p<0.001$), suggesting that self-selection among the less masculine is not an effect of the discussion setting. In contrast, girls' speakers are equally masculine across the two groups, and they do not lie. These results support that lack of communication drives misperceived masculinity norms, given lying and self-selection indicate less masculine views would be expressed.

Three weeks later, the effects of the masculinity discussions on misperceptions persist. This indicates that the adolescents retained what they learned and that such information did not spillover to those in the control discussion. This result sheds some light on the way norms are formed: in a social environment such as schools, encouraging communication among a random part of a social network (i.e., half a classroom) about a stigmatized topic is not sufficient to change perceived norms more broadly.⁴

Besides correcting boys' perceptions of their peers' agreement with masculinity norms, the masculinity discussions also change their first order beliefs: treated boys become 50% less likely to agree with the belief about crying, immediately and three weeks after the discussion. The impacts on beliefs are consistent with the evidence that adolescents have malleable views (Kohlberg 1976; Markus and Nurius 1986). Girls' beliefs about masculinity do not change, but they are considerably less masculine compared to boys in the first place. Nevertheless, belief changes do not reflect behavioral changes around low-incidence behaviors such as the expression of vulnerable emotions and involvement in violence. The lack of behavioral effects suggests that updating behavior may take longer than updating beliefs or need reinforcement to enact behavioral change. In this sense, longer-term interventions might be necessary (as in Dhar et al. 2022).

In a second experiment ($N = 359$) with 13 to 15-year-old boys and girls across three public schools in Rio de Janeiro,⁵ I test whether teenagers discuss their views about masculinity more naturally with closer peers. I relaxed two features of the first experiment: there was no mediator present all the time, and they could choose their discussion peers (i.e., it was not randomized). The discussions had a similar script and length as in the first experiment, and an average of 5

⁴Nevertheless, there is evidence that randomly selecting some students to participate in multiple hours of anti-conflict training (i.e., encouraging top-down communication) changes perceived social norms against conflicts at the school level (Paluck et al. 2016).

⁵The participating schools are not the same across the first and second experiments. Nevertheless, schools and students' characteristics are statistically indistinguishable (See Table B3).

people. This design also allows for variation in the sex composition of the groups: 50% of them were single-sex. Everyone participated in the discussion within a classroom, and I randomized the outcome elicitation to be before or after it, allowing me to estimate causal effects.

I find that conversations with close peers about masculinity also reduce boys' misperceptions about other boys by about 50%. Nevertheless, there is no evidence that boys' misperceptions about girls change, and they even slightly increase regarding violence. This increase is due to boys in boys-only groups: their misperceptions about girls suggestively increase by 9pp for crying ($p=0.28$) and 11pp for violence ($p=0.27$), indicating a potential backlash effect. In contrast, when in boys-only groups, boys' misperceptions about other boys reduce for crying ($p=0.01$), and do not change for violence. We can interpret this as evidence against *locker room talk*: even when in boys-only groups, boys' misperceptions about other boys' beliefs do not increase, suggesting that they do not express very masculine views in such a setting. Interestingly, boys who self-select to boys-only groups are significantly less masculine ($p<0.001$) than those in groups with girls. For girls in girls-only groups, their misperceptions about boys suggestively decrease, so they might infer boys' views by listening to other girls' opinions only.

Taken together, my findings indicate that the lack of horizontal communication drives misperceived masculinity norms among adolescents. I do not find evidence of biased communication: peers who self-select into speaking are *less* masculine than average peers, and peers randomly asked to speak lie towards being *less* masculine. Misperceptions would then be smaller if there were broad natural communication about masculinity. Further, there is no evidence that communication with closer friends explains misperceptions. In addition, for boys, it seems to be relevant to include girls in these discussions, as they do not infer girls' views when in conversations with boys only. Nevertheless, engaging participants in a one-time short discussion does not seem to generate broader discussions about masculinity, as effects persist three weeks later.

One natural next step is understanding why adolescents do not naturally talk about masculinity. In the second experiment, I measured whether adolescents have miscalibrated views on how the conversations would go, in an exercise inspired by [Kardas et al. \(2022\)](#). Before the discussion, participants indicated how comfortable and interested they would be in the conversation and whether they would feel more connected with peers afterward. After the discussion, they indicated their realized impressions. Within-individual comparisons of these impressions before and after the discussions indicate that boys and girls underestimate interest and comfort by roughly 40% ($p<0.001$).

This paper makes several contributions. First, while a large literature in economics has studied norms about women's roles (e.g., [Alesina et al. 2013](#); [Dhar et al. 2022](#); [Dean and Jayachandran 2019](#); [Bursztyn et al. 2020b](#)), norms about men have received little attention. An exception is [DeHaas et al. \(2024\)](#), in which we measure masculinity norms across 70 countries and find that they predict behaviors in important outcomes in economics, health, and politics, showing the importance of studying these norms on top of gender norms that constrain women's behaviors.

Hence, misperceptions about masculinity norms can potentially reinforce these correlations, as individuals also make choices based on their beliefs about what others expect. Another exception is Baranov et al. (2023), which study the historical origins of masculinity norms. In contrast, this paper provides causal evidence of how conversations with same-generation peers shape perceptions of masculinity norms. Other papers have worked with boys and men to directly address aggressive behaviors (Blattman et al. 2017; Heller et al. 2017; Shah et al. 2023), but they do not directly measure its ties with masculinity norms. In addition, I study masculinity norms among adolescents, which is a crucial stage for brain development and belief formation (Steinberg 2014), in an environment that constitutes an important part of adolescents' social networks (Paluck and Shepherd 2012). To the best of my knowledge, this work is the largest-scale data collection on masculinity norms among adolescent boys and girls.

Second, while a large body of work in economics uses simple information provision experiments to correct misperceptions about others' views (see Bursztyn and Yang 2022 for a review), they do not discuss where misperceptions come from. Bursztyn et al. (2020b) provide descriptive evidence of a lack of communication as a source of misperceptions. My main contribution is to provide causal evidence on the role of communication in generating and sustaining misperceived norms, allowing for different types types of selection into communication. Understanding the mechanisms around communication have implications for addressing misperceptions across domains that go beyond social norms, such as help-seeking behaviors (Roth et al. 2024) and discrimination (Webb 2024). In addition, following the developmental psychology literature on masculinity norms (Way et al. 2014), I discuss that early adolescence is an important age for interventions that address misperceptions about masculinity norms, as they likely increase with age.

Finally, this paper contributes to recent work on belief formation. A growing empirical literature studies how people update their first-order beliefs upon encountering new information by discussing the role of e.g. unobserved signals (Enke, 2020), motivated reasoning (Zimmermann, 2020), memory (Bordalo et al., 2024), narratives (Graeber et al., 2024). While various aspects of belief formation have been studied, we know less about how higher-order beliefs are formed. A notable exception is Ho and Huang (2024), which shows that limited attention to silent peers in a discussion increases second-order beliefs. My paper contributes to this literature by studying the specific mechanisms through which communication patterns and selection into communication shape higher-order beliefs in a high-stakes field context. Moreover, building on Kardas et al. (2022), I provide evidence on a suggestive explanation for why we systematically observe such incorrect beliefs in equilibrium: people may have miscalibrated expectations about how conversations will go, preventing discussions that could correct their perceptions of what others think in the first place.

2 Background: Masculinity Norms and Context

Masculinity Norms. Gender scholars use the terms *traditional masculinity*, *masculinity ideology*, *hegemonic masculinity* or *masculinities* to refer to the cultural expectations around attitudes, and beliefs that prescribe men’s behaviors, inferiorizing “non-masculine” men or women (Connell, 1987; Kimmel et al., 1989; Connell, 2020). Despite the existence of many different masculinities, there is a common set of standards and expectations associated with the traditional male role (Pleck, 1995; Levant et al., 2007). Seven of these dimensions are avoidance of femininity, fear and hatred of homosexuals, self-reliance, aggression, achievement/status, non-relational attitudes toward sexuality, and restrictive emotionality. Social psychologists have developed an extensive measurement of traditional masculinity encompassing these dimensions (see Thompson Jr and Bennett 2015 for a review).

Other social sciences have studied masculinity norms for several decades (Connell, 1987; Carriigan et al., 1985; Thompson Jr and Pleck, 1986; Kimmel et al., 1989). A myriad of work has studied the relationship between masculinity and health outcomes (e.g., Mahalik and Rochlen 2006; Wong et al. 2017), aggressive behaviors (e.g., Bosson et al. 2009; Reidy et al. 2009; Cheryan et al. 2015), occupational choice (e.g., Cross and Bagilhole 2002). However, most of the evidence is correlational or comes from small-scale studies in the lab in developed countries. In low-income countries, public health scholars have documented positive results of interventions that engage men in discussions about masculinity to improve women’s sexual health and prevent gender-based violence (e.g., Hossain et al. 2014, Gibbs et al. 2020, Pérez-Martínez et al. 2023).

In addition, developmental psychologists provide longitudinal qualitative evidence that boys enter their teenage years resisting traditional masculinity by expressing their feelings of vulnerability and avoiding aggressive behaviors (Way, 2011; Way et al., 2014). However, as they transition into manhood in later adolescence, boys increasingly refer to the pressures to “man up” and avoid appearing feminine or gay, causing their emotionally expressive language to become more guarded. In essence, boys begin to disconnect from their emotions and others in pursuing “manhood”. In this study, most boys are starting this transition, so it is a critical time to understand where misperceptions come from, as they may suggestively increase further as boys become adults, especially if they do not discuss their beliefs about masculinity norms.

Context. This research took place in Rio de Janeiro, where organized crime dominates 18% of its territory (Cruzado-RJ, 2024). In the Americas, 89% of homicide victims are men, affecting especially young black men (UNODC, 2023). In Latin America, the presence of organized crime and the recruitment of youth into these groups further increases the risks of homicide. Often, young men involved in gangs are desired as sexual partners by young women and admired by their male peers (Barker, 2005). Nevertheless, only a minority of young men become involved in these gangs. In-depth interviews among low-income black youth in Rio de Janeiro highlight the importance of

engaging boys in programs that resignify notions of manhood by e.g. encouraging caregiving and normalizing emotional vulnerabilities as violence prevention tools (Barker and Loewenstein, 1997; Taylor et al., 2016).⁶

Adolescents in my sample are public school students and are more likely to come from economically disadvantaged backgrounds, be black, and live in favelas, compared to a representative sample from Brazil (IBGE, 2022). I selected 25 schools across the city, allowing me to sample schools exposed to different levels of violence (Figure A1). For example, there are schools located in regions with high homicide rates (Panel A), comparable to those in the most violent countries in the world (UNODC, 2023). On the other hand, there are schools located in less violent regions. Nevertheless, most schools are close to favelas—regions dominated by drug factions (Panel B). Anecdotal evidence from school staff and the Secretariat points that most public school students in Rio likely live in favelas. Violence affects students' day-to-day life: in 2022, 25% of the municipal schools in Rio de Janeiro were closed for at least one day because of shootings in their surroundings.⁷ Shooting episodes also caused four delays in my field operations.

Living in such an environment may further increase the pressures to conform to traditional masculinity norms, potentially leading to larger misperceived norms. In this context, boys' traditionally masculine behaviors may be rewarded, both by other boys and girls. For example, boys may see guns as tools to achieve status and to demonstrate power and control over other men and women, especially combined with the existing social vulnerabilities in these areas (Barker, 2005). In addition, boys in focus groups I conducted often said that they were ashamed to share their vulnerable feelings with friends, as they thought their friends expected them to be tough and could punish them otherwise.

The school environment also provides a unique context to study these norms, as it constitutes an important part of the socialization of adolescents, reinforcing gender norms by, e.g., organizing activities by gender (Thorne, 1993; Bhana and Mayeza, 2016; Rosen and Nofziger, 2019). In my setting, schools are coeducational, and students within a given classroom attend all classes and activities together, intensifying the formation of within-classroom norms.

What Could Explain Misperceived Masculinity Norms? Misperceptions about same generation peers' views might exist for multiple reasons. Adolescents might form these views based on their parents' views (i.e., vertical transmission) (Bisin and Verdier, 2001; Giuliano, 2020), who might hold outdated beliefs about masculinity. They could also infer traditional views of masculinity from (social) media channels (Paluck, 2009; Ferrara et al., 2012). This is especially relevant

⁶Pioneer work on masculinities outside of the developed world started in Rio in the late 90s, giving birth to the world-leading NGO on masculinities *Instituto Promundo*—now split into *Equimundo* and *Promundo Brazil*. They have many masculinity-related programs around the world, including in the US, Mexico, Mozambique and Portugal.

⁷<https://g1.globo.com/rj/rio-de-janeiro/noticia/2023/07/31/em-meio-a-tiroteios-mais-escolas-fecharam-no-1o-semestre-de-2023-do-que-em-todo-o-ano-passado.ghtml>. Accessed on September 11, 2024.

with the rise of the *Red Pill* ideology, which disseminates misogynous content and traditional views of manhood as being superior in social media channels.⁸ Alternatively, misperceived views about traditional masculinity norms may exist if these norms were optimal in the past, but no longer are in current days (i.e., cultural mismatches exist) (Gelfand, 2021; Nunn, 2022; Gelfand et al., 2024).

Regardless of the foundations of misperceived norms, one explanation for their persistence is that people do not communicate their private views with a broad set of same-generation peers. In my sample, only 14% of boys talk to other boys and 7% to girls at school about what society expects of men.⁹ When asked what they talk about in an open-ended question, only 22% say they discuss that men should not be violent, especially against women. In addition, 26% talk about positive aspects of manhood, such as being responsible and hard worker. So it is not only that they rarely talk about masculinity. Even when they do talk about it, they rarely criticize traditional masculinity norms.

3 Experimental Design

My experiments study why misperceptions exist in the first place, specifically looking at the role of communication. In the first experiment, I disentangle between the role of broad communication or biased communication. To test whether a lack of broad communication explains misperceptions, I randomly allocate participants to a mediated discussion about masculinity or a control discussion, randomizing the participants who could speak in the masculinity discussion (*Randomized arm*). The *Randomized* arm thus shuts down selection into speaking. If participants truthfully share their private views in these discussions and listeners believe the information shared, we could expect the *Randomized* arm to reduce misperceptions, given that participants overestimate the share of peers with masculine views. To test whether biased communication with peers who self-select into communication explains misperceptions, I randomly allocate participants to a masculinity discussion in which they can self-select into speaking (*Voluntary arm*). The *Voluntary* arm would not necessarily reduce misperceptions, and it could even increase if those with very masculine views are more likely to speak. In the second experiment, I test whether biased communication with friends explains misperceptions by allowing participants to select their discussion peers. In this group, misperceptions would also not necessarily reduce if participants already know their friends' views or if they feel like they should express very masculine views in private conversations

⁸<https://g1.globo.com/al/alagoas/especial-publicitario/secom-secretaria-de-comunicacao-social/juntos-por-uma-alagoas-de-todos/noticia/2023/02/28/semudh-alerta-responsaveis-sobre-o-crescimento-do-consumo-de-conteudos-machistas-na-internet.ghtml>. Accessed on September 11, 2024

⁹This data comes from the baseline survey in the second experiment (N = 167 boys and N = 192 girls). I asked “Do you talk about what society expects of men?”. For those who answered “Yes”, I then asked who they talk to (e.g. male school friends, female school friends, mother, father), and an open-ended question on what they talk about.

with friends, consistent with *locker-room* talk.

This design has a natural policy implication: what types of communication are more effective at addressing misperceptions among adolescents? Communication devices could be easily implemented and scalable through, e.g., school programs. In addition, engaging boys in conversations about masculinity relates to recent calls by academics and public speakers to listen to boys in the debate about masculinity (Reeves, 2022; Way, 2024).

3.1 Experiment 1

3.1.1 Sample Selection

School Selection. I conducted this preregistered experiment between June and October 2022.¹⁰ I coordinated with my partner, the Secretariat of Education of the city of Rio de Janeiro, and selected 22 schools covering 9 out of the 11 school districts in the city.¹¹ This broadly covers the entire area of the city. Even though I did not randomly select the schools, they are fairly representative compared to all the 607 public schools offering secondary education in the city (see Table B3). Out of 12 characteristics, schools in my sample are only statistically different concerning the share of white students compared to all the schools ($p=0.04$), which is similar to a difference obtained by chance.

Student Selection. My target sample consists of 7th to 9th graders (i.e., \approx 12-14 years old) across 88 classrooms. Within each classroom, the study (baseline-treatment-endline) took 50-60 minutes. Due to time constraints, no more than 5 classrooms from the same school could participate. To accommodate this, in schools with over 5 7th-9th grade classes, I prioritized upper-year students. My sample thus consists of 2,249 students (1,154 girls and 1,095 boys), being 60% 9th graders, 32% 8th graders, and 8% 7th graders.¹²

3.1.2 Treatment Conditions


Treatment Assignment. Figure 1 outlines the structure of Experiment 1. Within classroom, I randomly assigned half of the students to one of three types of discussions, stratified by sex: Voluntary ($N = 795$), Randomized ($N = 750$), and Active Control ($N = 704$). Classrooms ($N = 88$) could then be one of three types: (i) $\frac{1}{2}$ Voluntary \times $\frac{1}{2}$ Active Control, (ii) $\frac{1}{2}$ Randomized \times $\frac{1}{2}$ Active Control, and (iii) $\frac{1}{2}$ Voluntary \times $\frac{1}{2}$ Randomized. I performed the randomization before

¹⁰There are no deviations from pre-registration in Experiments 1 and 2.

¹¹In fact, I visited schools from all districts. I piloted this experiment in two other districts, which were not included in the main sample. I also included a school from an 11th district in Experiment 2.

¹²To avoid contamination across classes, the field team would only visit a school once. Participating students represent about 75% of students in the schools. This difference is mainly due to students being absent rather than parents or students not consenting to their participation.

Figure 1: Experimental Design - Experiment 1



Notes: This figure displays the design structure of Experiment 1. Classrooms were randomized into one of three types: Class Type 1: *Voluntary X Control*; Class Type 2: *Randomized X Control*; Class Type 3: *Voluntary X Randomized*. Students were then randomly allocated into either the *Voluntary*, *Randomized*, or *Control* discussion within their classroom.

visiting the schools, upon receiving the list with students' names.

Masculinity Discussions. The treatments consist of focus group-like discussions about masculinity. Male mediators led the sessions, asking participants to share whether they agree or not with the beliefs “men who cry are weak” and “men should use violence to get respect if necessary”, and further explain and provide examples of their opinions.¹³ These beliefs represent the *restrictive emotionality* and *aggression* dimensions of masculinity. In focus groups I conducted with boys, they often mentioned that expressing vulnerable emotions, such as crying, is seen as a weakness

¹³The mediators were members of the NGO *Luta pela Paz* (Fight for Peace), who are experienced in conducting this type of activity with youth. At the time of the intervention, they were piloting a discussion session on masculinity with black youth across some favelas in Rio.

for men and a reason for mockery. In addition, they described that using violence is sometimes rewarded in their context, and it could give some social status. The belief about crying was also inspired by questions from the *Man Box* study (Barker et al., 2017) and the *Male Role Norms Inventory-Adolescent-revised* (Levant et al., 2012). The belief about violence came directly from the *Man Box* study. I piloted extensively, and adolescents comprehended their meaning well. I used the questions from the *Meanings of Adolescent Masculinity Scale* to validate that the masculinity beliefs of analysis (“men who cry are weak” and “men should use violence to get respect if necessary”) correlate with a measure of masculinity already used in the literature. Among boys, agreeing with the belief about crying predicts an increase of 0.78sd ($p < 0.001$) in the masculinity scale, and agreeing with the belief about violence predicts an increase of 0.65sd ($p < 0.001$), and similarly among girls.

In the discussions, participants first shared their views on the belief about crying, and then on the belief about violence. The mediators did not express their personal opinions: their only role was to guide the discussion. This avoids potential confoundings related to learning the mediators’ opinions. In addition, I alternated a boy and a girl speaking, and a maximum of six students could talk. I set a maximum number of speakers to allow me to differentiate between the *Voluntary* and *Randomized* students. If everybody spoke, I would not expect any differences between the treatments as speakers could be similar by construction since they were randomized into each session. In addition, fixing the number of students in the discussions shuts down another potential confounding between *Voluntary* and *Randomized* discussions, which could have been how many students spoke in each of them. Section C.3 presents a roadmap of the discussions. On average, the discussions took 15 minutes, with 13 people in each session, and they could be of two types:

1. *Voluntary*: Mediators asked subjects to raise their hands if they would like to share their views on the masculinity beliefs. The mediator always picked on the first boy to raise their hand, then alternated between a girl and a boy until it reached a maximum of six students. Hence, this treatment arm consists of only introducing a topic, aiming to mimic the dynamics of classroom-based discussions.
2. *Randomized*: Before the field team visited each school, I randomly selected students that the mediators would call out to speak following a random order. Following the same logic as in the *Voluntary* arm, mediators would first call out a boy, then a girl, to share their views until six students spoke. Called-out participants could refuse to speak, but this rarely happened, resulting in a strong first-stage when regressing a realized on a predicted speaking dummy ($\beta = 0.85$, F-stat = 548, Table B6).

Observers’ Form. A research assistant observer took notes during these discussions (survey form in Figure A3).¹⁴ They indicated (1) whether a student agreed, disagreed or was on the fence about

¹⁴There were 4 observers (3 female and 1 male), which would rotate across each school.

each masculinity belief, (2) keywords and quotes, (3) whether they shared a personal example, and (4) group dynamics (e.g. if there was laughter and jokes). I can then link the observers' notes with participants' baseline and endline individual responses. During these discussions, students sat in a circle with the mediator and the observer (Figure A2).

Active Control. The control group attended a discussion session about recycling practices, mediated by a male member of the environmental education NGO *Mangue & Tal*. Only participants who voluntarily raised their hands would speak up (i.e. there is no *Randomized* arm). The topic of recycling is not expected to affect perceptions about the school's current gender norms. The active control group accounts for the effects of meeting attendance and attenuates experimenter demand effects. I instructed the mediators not to comment on gender in any way. I find no difference in the levels of agreement with the beliefs about crying and violence between the survey immediately before and immediately after the discussion ($p=0.8$).

3.1.3 Data Collection and Outcomes

Baseline. All 2,249 participants completed a baseline survey, which included the following modules:¹⁵ (i) demographics; (ii) friendships and popularity; (iii) peer-reported measures of vocality, friendship and admiration; (iv) private views on whether agrees or disagrees with the masculinity beliefs “men who cry are weak” and “men should use violence to get respect if necessary”, and adherence to the *Meanings of Adolescent Masculinity Scale* (Oransky and Fisher 2009); (v) social desirability bias based on the [Crowne and Marlowe \(1960\)](#) index. Appendix C.2.1 presents all the questions included in the baseline survey.

Table B1 summarizes baseline characteristics of the sample and provides the p-value of an F-test of joint significance to test for covariate balance between the study arms, within sex. Among boys, 4 characteristics out of 27 are imbalanced at the 10% level: percent white ($p=0.09$), percent black ($p=0.05$), degree of self-reported influenced by girls ($p=0.07$) and social network score ($p=0.10$). Among girls, 3 characteristics are imbalanced at the 10% level: percent white ($p=0.06$), whether talk to friends about boys ($p=0.06$), and whether talk to friends about what society expects from a man ($p=0.07$).¹⁶

Immediate Endline Survey. Participants responded to an endline survey in the school, immediately after the discussions ended. I describe these outcomes below, and introduce other outcome measures when they appear in the discussion of my findings. Appendix C.2.2 presents all the questions included in this survey.

¹⁵Participants self-administered the baseline and school endline surveys on tablets using Qualtrics offline. All baseline data collection happened prior to the revelation of the treatment assignment.

¹⁶The main treatment effects are robust to including these variables as controls (Table B8).

WhatsApp Endline Survey. Three weeks after the field team visit to the school, I sent a second endline survey to participants' WhatsApp numbers (Appendix C.2.3 presents all the questions included in this survey.). 80% of boys and 87% of girls provided their WhatsApp information. Among those who provided their WhatsApp contact details, 42% completed the WhatsApp endline. Attrition is not correlated with baseline characteristics differentially by treatment status for most characteristics, among the WhatsApp sample (Table B2). Similarly to the baseline survey imbalance, only four characteristics among boys are not balanced across groups (age, living with mother, talking to friends about boys, and importance given to popularity), and three characteristics among girls (percent white, talking to friends about boys, talking to friends about girls).

My main outcome, measured at both endline surveys, is the misperceptions about the two masculinity beliefs they discussed (“men who cry are weak” and “men should use violence to get respect if necessary”). I define misperceptions as the percentage point wedge between students’ guesses¹⁷ of the percentage of boys and girls, separately, in their school classroom they think to agree with each of the beliefs and the actual percentage of boys and girls who agree with each belief at baseline. I only elicit the guesses at the endline surveys to avoid priming and consistency effects (Bursztyn and Yang 2022). I discuss other outcomes when they appear in the discussion of my findings.

3.2 Experiment 2

Sample Selection. I conducted this preregistered experiment in April 2024 with a sample of 359 8th-9th graders (i.e., \approx 13-14 years old) across 14 classrooms in 3 public schools in Rio de Janeiro. I selected the schools in coordination with my partner, the Secretariat of Education, similarly to how we did it in Experiment 1. The selected schools are similar in terms of observable characteristics, compared to all the public schools in Rio de Janeiro (Table B3, Column 5) and to the schools included in the Experiment 1 (Table B3, Column 6). Participating students are also similar across the two experiments for most characteristics (Table B4), except boys in the Experiment 2 are less likely to live with a father ($p=0.02$), more likely to live with a stepfather ($p<0.01$), and are more masculine ($p<0.01$).

Treatment Assignment. Figure A4 presents the structure of the Experiment 2. In this experiment, all participants engaged in discussions about masculinity with peers they selected. To estimate the causal effects of the discussion, I randomized, stratified by sex, the outcome variables elicitation to be in the survey before ($N = 185$) or after ($N = 174$) the discussion.

Masculinity Discussion. At the end of the pre-discussion survey, it explained we would ask

¹⁷I did not incentivize the elicitation of the guesses as my partner did not allow me to provide any sort of monetary and non-monetary incentives to the children.

them to talk to their friends about their opinions of what society expects of men. Facilitators then instructed them to organize a group of 5 to 6 people and sit in a circle (Figure A5). Participants read the discussion guidelines on their tablets, which instructed them to discuss their views about the beliefs “men who cry are weak” and “men should use violence to get respect if necessary”, similar to Experiment 1 guidelines. The discussions were partially mediated: three facilitators rotated across the groups,¹⁸ asking if they understood the guidelines, shared their views, and heard their peers’ opinions. Nevertheless, the mediators did not guide the discussions throughout, even though they were in the same room as the discussions took place.¹⁹ We timed the discussions to be 15 minutes long, to be consistent with the Experiment 1.

Data Collection and Outcomes. All 359 participants self-administered a pre-discussion survey, which included the following modules: (i) demographics; (ii) network questions asking students to name peers they spent the most time in the last week; (iii) four questions from the [Crowne and Marlowe \(1960\)](#) social desirability scale; (iv) questions on what they talk to their friends, including whether they talk about masculinity, and open-ended responses on what they talked, or why they do not talk; (v) adherence to the *Meanings of Adolescent Masculinity Scale* ([Oransky and Fisher 2009](#)). The survey then says we will ask them to discuss their opinions on what society expects of men with their friends, and they have to provide their impressions of how this discussion will go, regarding interest, comfort, and connection.

The main outcome of interest is the misperceptions about girls’ and boys’ beliefs about crying and violence, elicited in the same way as in the Experiment 1. Other outcomes include their private views about the masculinity beliefs, besides self-reported behaviors, such as willingness to serve as an emotional support peer and to be an anti-bullying advocate in the school. I randomly allocated participants to respond to these questions either in the pre-discussion (control) or in the post-discussion (treated) survey.²⁰ Table B5 presents summary statistics and balance tests across a series of characteristics, separate for boys and girls. The only imbalance is that control girls are more likely to be white ($p=0.02$) and less likely to be black ($p=0.01$) than treated girls.

Participants then responded to a short post-discussion survey. For control participants, it first elicited their post-discussion impressions regarding interest, comfort, and connection, whereas treated participants first responded to the outcomes of interest before responding to their discussion impressions. Finally, they indicated the peers who participated in their discussion group and responded whether each peer agreed or disagreed with the beliefs “men who cry are weak” and “men should use violence to get respect if necessary”.²¹

¹⁸On average, there were 5 discussion groups in a classroom.

¹⁹I piloted these discussions without any mediation, but some participants did not talk about the masculinity beliefs. I added some degree of mediation to (i) have a stronger first stage in talking about masculinity and (ii) make it more comparable with the design of Experiment 1.

²⁰I embedded the randomization on Qualtrics offline.

²¹One school did not send the list of participating students before the field team visited this school. As a result,

Group Characteristics. There were 49 groups, with an average of 5.25 people. The groups were equally sex-balanced, and the average group had 47% of boys. Nevertheless, 24.6% of them were composed of girls only, and 23.8% of boys only.

4 Results On Misperceptions

4.1 Experiment 1


Misperceived Social Norms. Boys and girls systematically overestimate their peers' levels of agreement with beliefs about traditional masculinity (Figure 2). The majority of boys overestimate other boys beliefs about crying and violence by 21pp and 12pp (Panel a, upper plots). These numbers come from the fact that boys' actual levels of agreement with the belief about crying is 10%, and 17% for the belief about violence, but they guess that 31% and 29% of boys agree with these beliefs. Boys also overestimate girls' beliefs by 28pp and 10pp (Panel a, lower plots). Girls similarly overestimate their peers' beliefs about masculinity (2, Panel b).

It is striking to find such misperceptions in an environment in which people have intense interactions every day: in this setting, boys and girls within a classroom take all classes and school activities together. The misperceptions about crying I document are similar to the ones in [Bursztyn et al. \(2020b\)](#) regarding the support for women working outside of the household, which has an average wedge of 24 pp, whereas the misperceptions about violence are about half of that. The authors also present evidence showing that knowing more people from the reference group predicts lower misperceptions. In my sample, on the contrary, correlations indicate that having more friends either increases or has no effect on misperceptions, whereas wanting more emotional support from their same-sex friends predicts larger misperceptions (Figure A6). These findings suggest that, in environments in which people already know each other, just the number of friends may not predict the degree to which people misperceive others' views. Instead, friendship characteristics such as the lack of emotional support, which relates to communication, may be a potential driver of misperceptions. Demographic characteristics (e.g. age, race, household composition, religion), how popular and how admirable a person is have no significant relationships with misperceptions.

There are several possible explanations for why the misperceptions about crying may be larger than the misperceptions about violence. First, communication about emotions and the expression of emotions may be constrained by an expectation that men remain emotionally stoic, exacerbating misperceptions about crying. Hence, not talking about this may be a product of masculinity-related expectations. Second, because violence is a public policy issue of great importance in this

the network question and the question to select which peers were in their discussion group could not be included. To allow me to test for gender composition effects, I added a question so they could indicate how many boys and how many girls were in their group.

Figure 2: Distribution of Guesses About Peers' Masculinity Beliefs



Notes: This figure plots the distribution of wedges, among the control group in Experiment 1, in perceptions about the beliefs of their male and female classmates regarding “men who cry are weak” and “men should use violence to get respect if necessary”. Wedges are calculated as the difference between a respondent guess about the percent of boys or girls in their classroom agreeing with each belief and the actual percent of boys or girls in a classroom agreeing with them. Respondents’ guesses are only elicited after treatment, so the sample in this plot consists of 376 girls and 328 boys in the control group.


context, discussions about violence (and potentially expectations around violent behavior) are likely more common than discussions about crying. In fact, 80% of the municipal schools in Rio have school-level programs that discuss violence, whereas only 30% discuss gender equality ([INEP 2021](#)), focusing especially on violence against women and sexual harassment. Third, crying can be a private behavior, whereas violence is usually a public one, so peers may infer others' views from the behaviors they observe.

Immediate Effects of Discussions. The masculinity discussions reduce boys' and girls' misperceptions by over 50% across nearly all the comparison groups (Figure 3). In the control group, boys' average misperception about boys' beliefs about crying is 21p.p (Panel a, left plot). In the masculinity discussion in which people self-selected to speak (*Voluntary* arm), boys' average misperception is 10pp ($p<0.001$), and 11pp ($p<0.001$) for the group in which randomly selected participants spoke. The discussions are equally effective in reducing boys' misperceptions about girls' beliefs about crying and boys' beliefs about violence ($p<0.001$). Nevertheless, I cannot reject that the masculinity discussions shift boys' misperceptions about girls' views about violence ($p=0.22$), even though they suggest a 23% reduction in the *Voluntary* and *Randomized* groups, compared to the control group. The masculinity discussions also reduce the misperceptions held by girls (Figure 3, Panel b).

Three Weeks Effects of Discussions. The effects of the masculinity discussions on misperceptions persist after three weeks (Figure 4). In the control group, boys' average misperception about boys' beliefs about crying is 18p.p (Panel a, left plot). In the *Voluntary* discussions, boys' average misperceptions decrease to 9pp ($p=0.02$), and to 7pp ($p<0.001$) in the *Randomized* group. The discussions also significantly change boys' perceptions about girls about crying, and about violence for both sexes, except boys in the *Voluntary* group do change their views about girls' beliefs about violence ($p=0.34$). The effects of the discussions on girls' misperceptions follow similarly (Panel b).

A natural question is whether adolescents talk to their friends about what they learned in the discussions three weeks later (i.e., whether information spillovers). I find suggestive evidence that girls in the control group talk about the masculinity discussions after it's over, especially with their other girlfriends (Table B14). Three weeks later, girls with at least one treated girlfriend suggestively have lower misperceptions about other girls' beliefs about crying (-5.7pp, $p=0.49$, Panel B - Column 4) and violence (-10.8p.p, $p=0.14$, Panel B - Column 8), compared to their misperceptions immediately after the discussions. Boys with at least one treated boyfriend have suggestively smaller misperceptions about other boys' beliefs about crying, but suggestively larger misperceptions about violence, comparing their three weeks with their misperceptions immediately after the discussions. These are all noisy estimates as they consist of the sample of participants in the control group who responded to the WhatsApp survey. As a further test, comparing the

Figure 3: Masculinity Discussions Reduce Misperceptions Immediately After Treatment



Notes: This figure shows the effects of the *Voluntary* and *Randomized* discussion treatments. The wedge is calculated as the difference, in percentage points, between (*participants' guesses about the percentage of their male or female peers agreeing with each belief*) and (*the true percentage of participants agreeing with each belief at baseline*). A positive wedge means that people overestimate the prevalence of traditional beliefs about masculinity. 95% confidence intervals plotted, from a regression of the wedges on treatment status dummies, including school fixed effects. Standard errors are clustered at the classroom level.

three weeks with the immediate responses among the control group, girls' misperceptions about crying reduce by 10 pp three weeks later (Figure A8, Panel b), but boys' misperceptions do not change (Figure A8, Panel a).

These exercises are a further suggestive test of a lack of communication: the control group could have learned the information from their treated peers if the one-time masculinity discussion was enough to encourage natural communication about it in the classroom. While there is some evidence that girls talk to their other girlfriends about the discussions, there is no strong evidence that having a treated friend impacts boys' misperceptions three weeks later. In addition, the persistence of effects suggests that the information learned during the discussions was trustworthy. If treated participants no longer believed the information learned after going back to real world interactions with their friends, their misperceptions would have likely increased overtime.


4.1.1 Why Are Effects Similar Across the *Voluntary* and *Randomized* Groups?

In this section, I provide evidence that explains why the treatment effects of the *Voluntary* and *Randomized* discussions are statistically indistinguishable. I explore the public opinions shared in the discussions, the narratives used, the speakers' baseline characteristics, and the discussions' characteristics, as noted by the observers.

I find no evidence that people self-select into speaking about crying, but there is strong evidence that boys with less masculine views about violence speak in the *Voluntary*, compared to the ones in the *Randomized* group. Table 1 (Columns 1-3) presents regression coefficients from speakers' private opinions about crying and violence on a dummy equal to 1 if they spoke in the *Voluntary* discussions and 0 if they spoke in the *Randomized* discussions. Boys' private opinions about crying (Column 1, Panels A and B) are not statistically different comparing the speakers in the *Voluntary* and *Randomized* groups. This suggests that there is no evidence of self-selection in this dimension. Nevertheless, there is strong evidence of self-selection in the violence dimension among boys (Column 2, Panel A): boys who self-selected into speaking in the *Voluntary* group are 11pp less likely ($p < 0.001$) to privately agree with the belief about violence, compared to boys randomly asked to speak in the *Randomized* group. Taking the mean across the levels of agreement with the crying and violence beliefs, boys' speakers in the *Voluntary* group are 50% less masculine than those in the *Randomized* group (Panel A, Column 3). There is no evidence of self-selection among girls (Panel B).

Despite some selection into speaking, boys' and girls' public opinions about crying and violence are not statistically different across the masculinity discussion groups (Table 1, Columns 4-6). Boys and girls in the *Voluntary* discussions publicly express similar opinions to the ones in the *Randomized* discussions (Panels A and B). Hence, participants hear the same views regardless if they are in the *Voluntary* or *Randomized* discussions. This happens because, on average, *Randomized* speakers lie towards being less masculine in public, compared to their private views.

Figure 4: Masculinity Discussions Have Persistent Effects on Misperceptions After Three Weeks



Notes: This figure plots the treatment effects for the *Voluntary* and *Randomized* groups for the sample who responded to the second endline, distributed via WhatsApp 3 weeks after treatment. The wedge is calculated as the average difference, in percentage points, between (*participants' guesses about the percentage of their male or female peers agreeing with each belief*) and (*the true percentage of participants agreeing with each belief at baseline*). 95% confidence intervals plotted, from a regression of misperceptions on treatment status dummies, including school fixed effects. Standard errors are clustered at the classroom level. Red diamonds plot Endline 1 means for the WhatsApp sample.

In private, 5.6% of boys agree with the belief about crying, compared to 0.6% in public ($p=0.01$). Similarly, 15.6% of boys agree with the belief about violence in private, compared to 7.8% in public ($p=0.01$). Hence, *less* masculine boys self-select into speaking in the *Voluntary* discussions, and *Randomized* speakers lie towards being *less* masculine. So the publicly expressed opinions are similar.

Table 1: Less Masculine Boys Self-Select Into-Speaking in the *Voluntary* Discussions, But Express Similar Public Opinions to *Representative*

	Private Opinions			Public Opinions		
	Cry	Violence	Mean	Cry	Violence	Mean
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Panel A: Boys Who Spoke						
<i>Voluntary</i> Speaker (=1)	-0.038 (0.027)	-0.116*** (0.043)	-0.077** (0.030)	0.017 (0.033)	-0.070 (0.059)	-0.028 (0.038)
Observations	329	329	329	328	329	328
Dep. Var. Mean (<i>Randomized</i> Speakers)	0.09	0.19	0.14	0.07	0.23	0.15
School FE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Panel B: Girls Who Spoke						
<i>Voluntary</i> Speaker (=1)	0.003 (0.018)	-0.020 (0.024)	-0.008 (0.017)	0.022 (0.014)	-0.021 (0.048)	0.000 (0.026)
Observations	332	332	332	332	332	332
Dep. Var. Mean (<i>Randomized</i> Speakers)	0.02	0.07	0.04	0.00	0.10	0.05
School FE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

Notes: This table presents regression coefficients within the sample of speakers in the *Voluntary* and *Randomized* groups. The dependent variables are participants' private and public opinions about crying (Columns 1 and 4, respectively), violence (Column 2 and 5, respectively), and the average public and private opinions across crying and violence (Columns 3 and 6, respectively). The dependent variables in Columns (1) and (2) are participants' private opinions about crying and violence, which are a dummy equal to 1 if they agreed with the statement, and 0 otherwise. For the public opinions (Columns 4 and 5), the dependent variables are equal to 0 if they publicly disagreed with the statement, equal to 1 if they said that whether they agree or not depends on the situation, and 2 if they publicly agreed. The dependent variables in Column (3) and (6) is the mean opinions across crying and violence in Columns (1) and (2) and (4) and (5), respectively. The independent variable of interest is a dummy equals 1 if the speaker was in the *Voluntary* group, and 0 if in the *Randomized* group. One boy in the *Representative* group preferred not to express any opinions about crying, which explains the missing observation in Columns (4) and (6) in Panel A, compared to the other ones. All regressions include school fixed effects and standard errors clustered at the school-classroom level.

Besides expressing similar public opinions, participants in the *Voluntary* and *Randomized* groups use similar narratives to support their views (Figure A7). The argument that narratives matter builds on a growing literature in economics on the power of narratives (e.g. Shiller 2017; Andre et al. 2021). To test this, research assistants manually categorized the quotes shared

in the discussions, as recommended by Ferrario and Stantcheva (2022).²² For example, 70% of boys, equally across *Voluntary* and *Randomized* speakers ($p = 0.98$), justified their opinions on men crying by using arguments such as *crying is human*, categorized as *Everybody Has Feelings*. Similarly, roughly 50% of boys in both discussion groups ($p = 0.51$) justify their views on views using violence by arguing that there should be other ways to get respect, such as conversation. When supportive of men using violence as a way to get respect, participants mentioned violence should be used as a defense mechanism, categorized as *Honor/Fight back*. Generally, girls in both discussion groups also used similar narratives. In addition, speakers could choose not to provide any examples to support their views. Speakers in the *Randomized* group were less likely than those in the *Voluntary* group to not provide examples of their views about crying, but equally likely on their views about violence.

I find that speakers in both the *Voluntary* and *Randomized* are similar in other baseline characteristics, besides their beliefs about crying and violence, except for a vocality score (Table B9). To measure vocality, I asked peers to select the top 5 most talkative people in their class. The vocality score counts the number of times a person was reported, excluding themselves. Column 1 shows that boys and girls who speak in the *Voluntary* group are reported by their peers to be about 20% more vocal compared to those who speak in the *Randomized* group. Columns (2)-(5) provide evidence that speakers in both treatment groups are not different in other important domains, such as popularity, admiration by peers, masculinity, and social desirability. Only girls who speak in the *Voluntary* group are marginally more likely to provide socially desirable answers (6%) than those in the *Randomized* group.

Discussion. My findings so far suggest that communication explains misperceptions, regardless of whether speakers are randomly selected or self-select into speaking. Ex-ante, misperceptions would not necessarily reduce if those randomly selected to speak provide more masculine views in public compared to what they hold in private or if those who self-select into speaking have very masculine views. I show that, when randomly selected to speak, adolescents provide less masculine views in public, compared to their private views. In addition, speakers who self-select into speaking are less masculine. Hence, the average views expressed in the masculinity discussions are the same regardless if selection into speaking is allowed or not. A natural question is whether a one-time discussion generates broader communication about masculinity. Three weeks later, I do not find evidence that it does: the effects of the discussions persist, suggesting that the information learned did not spillover to the control group. This raises the question of why natural conversations do not evolve, which I discuss in Section 5. Another open question is whether misperceptions reduce even when more private conversations with friends is encouraged, or if adolescents express more masculine views in such a setting, which I address with Experiment 2 (see Section 4.2).

²²Table B10 presents all the categories used and provides some sample quotes for each of them.

4.1.2 Heterogeneity

Baseline Beliefs. The effectiveness of discussions about masculinity may vary depending on individuals' initial beliefs about masculinity. Nevertheless, I do not find strong evidence that those with more masculine views at baseline have more rigid misperceptions (Table B11). Boys in the Randomized arm who agreed with the masculinity belief about crying at baseline have significantly smaller misperceptions immediately after treatment (Panel A, Columns 1 and 2), but this effect only persists for misperceptions about girls three weeks later. On the other hand, there is little evidence that agreeing with the masculinity belief about crying in the Voluntary arm or with beliefs about violence in either arm produces differential treatment effects. These findings suggest that interventions addressing misperceptions are likely to be similarly effective regardless of individuals' baseline beliefs about masculinity.

School Location. The effects of masculinity discussions might vary depending on the school's exposure to violence, as norms regarding aggression and emotional expression could be more entrenched in high-violence environments.²³ Table B12 shows there are no strong differential treatment effects of the masculinity discussions depending on whether schools are located within favela regions or not, immediately and three weeks after. This lack of heterogeneity is encouraging, as it suggests the intervention's effectiveness is not diminished in environments where violence affects students lives more often. Even three weeks later, participants in favela schools do not revert to their prior misperceptions after returning to more violence-exposed environments, nor do they dismiss the discussions as irrelevant to their local context.

Self-Expression Effects. I find that boys randomly selected to speak in the *Randomized* discussions have roughly 5pp lower misperceptions in the short-run, compared to those who did not speak (Figure A9, Panel a). Three weeks later, however, these effects reverse, and boys who speak have roughly a 10pp larger misperception than listeners in most domains (Panel b). Among girls, there is no strong evidence that speaking affects their misperceptions immediately after the discussion (Panel c), but they have suggestively lower misperceptions about crying three weeks later (Panel d). These findings suggest that speaking generates stronger updating for boys immediately after the discussion, which vanishes in the medium-run. On the other hand, for girls, speaking has some medium-run impacts on belief updating.

Social Desirability. Social desirability bias does not drive the immediate and three weeks effects of the masculinity discussions on misperceptions. Empirically, social desirability bias could play a role if the effects of the discussions were stronger among people with high baseline scores of social

²³A caveat of this analysis, however, is that even students enrolled in schools outside of favela regions are likely to live in favelas (as discussed in Section 2).

desirability. However, the estimates in Table B13 suggest that having a high likelihood of giving socially desirable answers—measured by the [Crowne and Marlowe \(1960\)](#) social desirability index—do not predict statistically significant treatment effects on misperceptions. The only exception is in Panel C, where the coefficient on the interaction between *High Social Desirability Score* and *Voluntary* is significant; however the sign of the coefficient indicates misperceptions actually increased for those who score high on social desirability, suggesting it is not these students who drive the average reduction in misperceptions observed in the study.

4.2 Experiment 2


Misperceived Social Norms. Boys and girls overestimate their peers' levels of agreement with beliefs about traditional masculinity to a similar extent as in Experiment 1 (Figure A10). Boys overestimate other boys' beliefs about crying and violence by 20pp and 13pp (Panel a, upper plots). These numbers come from the fact that boys guess that 32% and 26% of other boys agree with these beliefs, but only 12%, and 13% of boys actually agree with them. Boys overestimate girls' beliefs by a similar magnitude (Panel a, lower plots), and girls also systematically overestimate their peers' beliefs about masculinity (Panel b).

Effects of Discussions With Friends. The masculinity discussions in which people choose who they want to be with reduce boys' misperceptions about other boys and reduce girls' misperceptions, but do not change boys' misperceptions about girls (Figure 5). Boys' average misperception about boys' beliefs about crying and violence reduce to 5pp and 7pp among the treated group, compared to 19pp and 12pp in the control group ($p < 0.01$ and $p = 0.1$, respectively). Boys' misperceptions about girls' beliefs about crying and about violence do not change ($p = 0.33$ and $p = 0.57$, respectively). The discussions are also effective in shifting girls' beliefs about boys' and girls' views (Panel b). Hence, differently from Experiment 1, masculinity discussions with selected peers do not reduce boys' misperceptions about girls' views, and reduce girls' misperceptions about other girls' views about violence.

Sex Composition. The misperceptions of boys' in boys-only group reduce only regarding other boys' views about crying ($p = 0.01$), whereas boys' misperceptions about girls' views even increase in magnitude (Figure A11, Panel a). Once in groups with girls, boys' misperceptions reduce across all domains, except regarding girls' views about violence ($p = 0.45$). On the other hand, the effects of the discussions for girls are fairly similar depending on whether they are in girls-only or in mixed-sex groups, with girls' misperceptions about boys suggestively reducing even when they are in the girls-only groups (Panel b).

Discussion. The results from Experiment 2 complement the findings from Experiment 1 by

Figure 5: Discussions With Chosen Peers Reduce Misperceptions



Notes: This figure plots the treatment effects of the discussions in Experiment 2. The wedge is calculated as the average difference, in percentage points, between (*participants' guesses about the percentage of their male or female peers agreeing with each belief*) and (*the true percentage of participants agreeing with each belief at baseline*). *Control* participants made the guesses before the discussion, and *Treated* participants made the guesses after the discussion. 95% confidence intervals plotted, from a regression of misperceptions on treatment status dummies, including school fixed effects. Standard errors are clustered at the classroom level.

showing that misperceptions about masculinity norms can be reduced even in private conversations with friends. This suggests that a lack of communication, rather than biased communication in private settings, drives misperceptions. Interestingly, boys in boys-only groups effectively update their beliefs about other boys but not about girls, highlighting the importance of having mixed sex discussions as in Experiment 1.

5 Why Don't Adolescents Talk About Masculinity?

Having shown descriptive and causal evidence that adolescents do not talk about masculinity, I now provide suggestive evidence that miscalibrated views about how these conversations will go may hinder natural conversations. In Experiment 2 experiment, I asked adolescents to predict how interested and how comfortable they would feel in the conversations with their peers, on a 0 (not interested/not comfortable at all) to 10 (extremely interested/extremely comfortable) scale. I also asked how much their predicted emotional connection with their discussion peers would increase, from 1 - not increase at all to 5 - increase a lot. Participants made the predictions before choosing their group, but after reading the discussion instructions. After the discussions, they answered to the same questions, this time rating how the conversation went. [Kardas et al. \(2022\)](#) inspired this exercise, who show that people overestimate how awkward conversations with strangers about a deep topic (e.g., describing a time they cried in front of someone else) will go.

Within-individual comparisons before and after the masculinity discussions show that boys and girls significantly underestimate interest and comfort in these discussions (Figure 6). Before the discussions, boys' average self-reported interest was 5.4, increasing to 7.2 afterward (Panel A, $p<0.001$). 18% of boys said they were not interested at all before the discussions, compared to only 3.6% after. The share of boys saying they are extremely interested and comfortable nearly doubled, getting close to 40%. There was no significant change in increased perceived connection with peers, which continued nearly stable at 3.5. The effects for girls follow similarly (Panel B): they underestimate interest and comfort in the masculinity discussions. Baseline correlations indicate that a 1sd increase in declared interest and comfort in the discussions increases the likelihood of talking about masculinity by about 6% ($p=0.02$ for interest and $p=0.06$ for comfort).

In addition, 37% of boys and 14% of girls say spontaneously, in open-text responses, that they are not interested in these discussions or that they would not feel comfortable talking about it.²⁴ Comparing the self-reported interest and comfort in these discussions in this subgroup, declared interest increased by 2.4 points ($p<0.001$) and comfort by 3 points ($p<0.001$) after the discussion. In addition, 24% of boys and 12% of girls say they do not know why they do not discuss masculinity norms with their friends. The discussions also significantly improve the perceptions of interest and comfort in this subgroup.

²⁴This was a follow-up question for those who answered “No” to the question “*Do you talk about what society expects of men*”. It was asked before they declared their interest and comfort in the discussions.

My findings suggest that people may have miscalibrated views about how conversations will go, even among peers with whom they interact daily. Specifically, adolescents significantly underestimate interest and comfort in these discussions. These findings differ from Kardas et al. (2022), which finds that people have miscalibrated views about how deep conversations with strangers will go, but not with close peers. These miscalibrated expectations creates a self-reinforcing cycle: adolescents avoid conversations about masculinity because they anticipate discomfort, which prevents them from learning their peers' true opinions, thus perpetuating misperceptions. However, this cycle can be interrupted: when encouraged to engage in discussions about masculinity, adolescents positively update their impressions and recognize that such conversations can be more comfortable and interesting than anticipated.

6 Downstream Outcomes


So far, I showed that the masculinity discussions were effective at correcting misperceptions about others' beliefs, regardless of the types of selection into speaking. A natural follow-up question is whether the discussions impacted other outcomes. In this section, I present treatment effects for three sets of outcomes: first-order beliefs, behaviors and social image concerns.

First-Order Beliefs. Do the masculinity discussions make adolescents' first-order beliefs less masculine? That is, can adolescents be persuaded upon learning their peers' opinions? Immediately after the discussions in Experiment 1, treated boys and girls become about 50% less likely to agree with the beliefs about crying, compared to the control mean (Table B15 - Panel A Columns 1 and 2). There are no significant effects on the beliefs about violence (Panel A Columns 3 and 4). Effects are statistically indistinguishable across the *Voluntary* and *Randomized* arms. Three weeks after the discussions, boys' in the *Randomized* arm are 50% less likely to agree with the beliefs about crying and violence, but the views for boys in the *Voluntary* arm do not change (Table B15 - Panel B Columns 1 and 3). The masculinity discussions only change girls' views about men crying immediately after the discussions, but have no effects on the violence beliefs or three weeks later (Table B15 - Panel B, Columns 2 and 4). The absence of belief change for girls likely happens because girls' views are, in the first place, considerably less masculine than boys' views.


Discussions with friends in Experiment 2, on the other hand, do not change boys' beliefs about masculinity (Figure B16, Columns 1 and 3), whereas girls' beliefs about men crying become about 50% less masculine (Column 2). Hence, open classroom discussions may be more effective at persuading others.

Behavioral Outcomes. Do the masculinity discussions lead to behavioral changes among boys?

Figure 6: Boys and Girls Underestimate Interest and Comfort in the Masculinity Discussions



(a) Boys



(b) Girls

Notes: This figure plots participants' impressions about the discussions before and after they took place, based on N = 167 boys and N = 192 girls in Experiment 2. They read the following on their survey: *Now, we are going to ask you to talk to your friends about your opinions on what society expects from a man. Before you start the conversation, please answer the following questions silently: 1. How interested are you in listening to your friends' opinions about this topic? (from 0-not interested at all to 10-Very interested), 2. How comfortable do you think you will feel during these conversations? (from 0-not comfortable at all to 10-Very comfortable) , 3. How much more connected do you think you will feel with your friends after the discussion (from 1-a lot less connected to 5-a lot more connected).* After the discussions, they answered, on the same scales: *1. How interesting was it for you to listen to your friends' opinions?, 2. How comfortable did you feel during these conversations?, 3. How much more connected do you think you will feel with your friends after the discussion?.* The p-values come from a regression comparing the scores before and after, including individual fixed effects.

Three weeks after the discussions in Experiment 1, there are no significant effects on boys' self- and peer-reported behaviors (see Appendix C.2.3 for a full description of these outcomes). Table B17 shows that the treatment has point estimates close to zero on self-reported involvement in violence (Column 1), crying in front of a friend (Column 2) and having a deep conversation (Column 3). To account for potential response biases common in self-reported measures (e.g. social desirability, experimenter demand effects), Table B18 (Panel A) presents treatment effects on behavioral outcomes using peer reports. Corroborating the findings on self-reported behaviors, I find no evidence that the discussion treatments impacted peer-reported measures of negative masculine behaviors (Panel A, Columns 1 to 3). In addition, the masculinity discussions did not improve boys' positive masculine behaviors (Panel A, Columns 4 to 7). If anything, treated boys became 4% less respectful toward girls (Panel A, Column 6) compared to control boys ($p=0.08$). Some reporters were also treated, which could bias the reporting. For example, the masculinity sessions could increase the salience through which reporters notice these behaviors, thus driving estimates downward. To account for this, Table B18 (Panel B) presents treatment effects on peer-reported behaviors considering reporters in the control group only. Besides being statistically non-significant, point estimates are small, corroborating the absence of effects on behavior.²⁵

Could learning school peers' opinions about masculinity make adolescents more likely to disseminate such messages on social media, where other people in their social network (e.g. family members, outside of school friends) could see it? In the three weeks survey, I ask adolescents to post a positive message about masculinity on their Instagram (see Appendix C.2.3 for a description). The Instagram post captures a public behavior that goes beyond the school community. Table B20 shows that boys and girls who participated in the masculinity discussions do not become more likely to post such messages on their Instagram. This suggests that adolescents are not willing to share such messages to a broader audience, even though (i) they privately support these views, and (ii) they just learned most of their school peers also support these views.

The behaviors elicited in Experiment 1 are low-incidence behaviors, happening at about 10% rate among the control group. In such case, behavioral changes might take longer and need reinforcement to take place. In Experiment 2, I ask about behaviors that could be more likely to happen: willingness to serve as a support group and to be an anti-bullying agent at school (see Appendix C.2.4 for a description of these outcomes). While the experiment is underpowered to detect effects on these outcomes ($N = 167$ boys), Table B21 (Column 1) shows that discussions with friends suggestively increase boys' willingness to serve as a peer support for other boys at school by 6% ($p=0.31$). On the other hand, boys' willingness to be an anti-bullying agent at school do not change (Table B21, Column 2).

²⁵ Nevertheless, adolescents hypothetical behaviors and attitudes immediately after treatment, measured through vignettes, become considerably less supportive of masculine behaviors (see Appendix C.2.2 for a full description of the vignettes). Boys and girls report they would act less masculine (Figure B19, Columns 1 and 2), become less likely to support masculine behaviors (Figure B19, Columns 3 and 4), and less likely to believe their peers were supportive of masculine behaviors (Columns 5 and 6).

Social Image Concerns. Boys might change public behaviors to conform to what is expected of them. Hence, social image concerns might be relevant in this context, especially after learning than their peers are less masculine than what they had initially predicted. To test this, I employ a survey experiment embedded in the survey immediately after the discussions, following (Bursztyn and Jensen, 2015). I ask participants when was the last time they cried, the last time they initiated a physical fight, and I use a Joy of Destruction game (Abink and Sadrieh 2009) to measure antisocial behavior, randomizing whether these responses were private or public to the other people int he room (see Appendix C.2.2 for a description). Table B22 presents the results for social image concerns: there are no significant effects of the masculinity discussions on reducing social image concerns. Nevertheless, the magnitudes suggestively indicate that social image concerns are offset.

7 Discussion: Summary and Implications

This paper finds that a lack of communication is a source of misperceived norms. Communication would not necessarily be effective in reducing misperceptions if (i) the people willing to speak are those with more masculine views, (ii) the non-masculine speakers misrepresent their views in public towards more masculine views, (iii) when in private conversations with friends, adolescents do not learn anything new because they already know their friends' opinions or they share very masculine views. In the context of masculinity norms, I provide evidence against (i), (ii) and (iii): adolescents who self-select into speaking are on average *less* masculine, only 8% of the boys lie in public towards being *less* masculine when randomized to speak, and misperceptions reduce even among private conversations with friends. Taken together, these findings point to a lack of communication as a reason why misperceptions exist. Next, I find that underestimating interest and comfort in these discussions suggestively drives the lack of communication, creating a self-reinforcing cycle: incorrect beliefs about conversation dynamics prevent the very discussions that would correct misperceptions.

A lack of communication is likely a fundamental driver of misperceptions across multiple domains, particularly where socially acceptable views are widely held but not widely discussed. This pattern appears in contexts such as help-seeking behaviors (Roth et al., 2024), women's rights (Bursztyn et al., 2020b), and discrimination (Webb, 2024). The efficacy of communication interventions in reducing misperceptions, however, may depend on which voices predominate in discussions. When minority views are disproportionately expressed—as among liberals opposing police defunding or conservatives support for the deportation of illegal immigrants (Bursztyn et al., 2023)—tools that randomize those who can share their opinions would produce representative narratives. In addition, in settings where social image concerns are strong, such as in topics related to political correctness, speakers could share public opinions that do not align with their private ones

(Braghieri, 2024). In such cases, offering a coordination mechanism that enables those with privately held views to coordinate without social repercussions, such as anonymous polling platforms, would be necessary.

My findings with adolescents also leaves open the question on whether there is a specific age that encouraging discussions might be more effective. Although it is beyond the scope of this paper to answer this question, I briefly discuss that early adolescence may be an important stage for encouraging such discussions, in the context of masculinity norms. In an exploratory survey with N=40 adult males (37 years old on average),²⁶ I find that adults have twice as large second-order beliefs as teenagers ($\approx 60\%$), while having similar first order beliefs about masculinity ($\approx 10\%$), resulting in average misperceptions of $\approx 50\text{pp}$. This is consistent with qualitative evidence from the developmental psychology literature (Way et al. 2014), which provides qualitative longitudinal evidence showing that the second-order beliefs increase as adolescents transition into adulthood. Similarly, in global data collected in 35 countries among adults, we find that being above 40 years old is associated with a 7pp larger ($p < 0.000$) second-order beliefs about other men's masculinity norms, whereas first-order beliefs about masculinity norms do not increase with age, suggesting that misperceptions about others' masculinity norms increases with age (Baranov et al. 2025). Given the larger second-order beliefs among adults, it is possible that masculinity discussions in this age group would lead to discussions in which people express *more* masculine views in public compared to their private views. Hence, such discussions could even increase misperceptions. While more work is needed to establish these results for adults, early adolescence is likely a lower bound for (mis)perceptions about others' masculinity norms, and an important age for interventions that encourage discussions to demystify these misperceptions.

Finally, even though the masculinity discussions lead to significant lower misperceptions three weeks later, they do not produce meaningful behavioral changes. Consistent with the discussion in Bursztyn and Yang (2022), there is likely some rigidity in the mapping between misperceptions and behavioral changes, especially for behaviors not elicited immediately after treatment. It is likely that behavioral changes need reinforcement and longer term interventions to take place (as in Dhar et al. 2022). In addition, I measure mostly lower incidence behaviors related to emotional expression and violence, which may be harder to change compared to behaviors related to a specific policy (Bursztyn et al. 2020a).

²⁶I conducted this survey with 30- to 50-year-olds in two favelas in Rio de Janeiro before Experiment 1 started. Hence, this is a similar population to my sample, as the adolescents from public schools in Rio are likely to live in favelas. I asked adults whether they agree or not with the same masculinity beliefs about crying and violence. I then asked them to predict the percent of men and women in their community who they think agree with each belief.

8 Conclusion

In a recent book, Way (2024) calls for policies to dismantle misperceptions about traditional masculinity norms and promote conversations among boys and men. In this paper, I find that, indeed, a lack of communication with peers is a source of misperceived masculinity norms among adolescents. Having mixed-gender discussions can be especially impactful, as I find that boys' misperceptions about girls suggestively become more inaccurate when they are in boys-only groups. Including such discussions in school curriculum is a cost-effective, scalable approach, as teachers could play the role of mediators. Targeting early adolescence—when boys start the transition from boyhood to manhood—appears crucial for preventing the solidification of these misperceptions as they become adults (Way, 2011).

This paper leaves several open questions for future research. First, would discussions of similar type lead to behavioral changes related to mental health and involvement in violence if they are longer and happen more often? Second, how do masculinity norms and perceptions about these norms change over one's life cycles and what types of life shocks shape these norms? Third, how to encourage natural conversations about masculinity? Fourth, what would be the outcomes of masculinity discussions among a population of adults? That is, would selection into speaking about masculinity among adults be different than among teenagers? Finally, how do adolescents form their perceptions about others' masculinity norms, if not from their school peers' opinions? This is especially relevant with the rise of masculinist influencers in social media, which propagate misogynous content and traditional views of manhood as being superior.

References

- Abbink, K. and Sadrieh, A. (2009). The pleasure of being nasty. *Economics letters*, 105(3):306–308.
- Alesina, A., Giuliano, P., and Nunn, N. (2013). On the origins of gender roles: Women and the plough. *The quarterly journal of economics*, 128(2):469–530.
- Andre, P., Haaland, I., Roth, C., and Wohlfart, J. (2021). Narratives about the macroeconomy.
- Baranov, V., De Haas, R., and Grosjean, P. (2023). Men. male-biased sex ratios and masculinity norms: evidence from australia’s colonial past. *Journal of Economic Growth*, 28(3):339–396.
- Baranov, V., De Haas, R., Grosjean, P., and Matavelli, I. (2025). Misperceptions about masculinity norms: Evidence from 35 countries. Working paper, Mimeo. Unpublished manuscript.
- Barker, G. (2005). *Dying to be men: Youth, masculinity and social exclusion*. Routledge.
- Barker, G., Harrison, A., and Heilman, B. (2017). The man box: A study on being a young man in the us, uk and mexico.
- Barker, G. and Loewenstein, I. (1997). Where the boys are: Attitudes related to masculinity, fatherhood, and violence toward women among low-income adolescent and young adult males in rio de janeiro, brazil. *Youth & Society*, 29(2):166–196.
- Bénabou, R. and Tirole, J. (2016). Mindful economics: The production, consumption, and value of beliefs. *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 30(3):141–164.
- Bertrand, M., Kamenica, E., and Pan, J. (2015). Gender identity and relative income within households. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 130(2):571–614.
- Bhana, D. and Mayeza, E. (2016). We don’t play with gays, they’re not real boys... they can’t fight: Hegemonic masculinity and (homophobic) violence in the primary years of schooling. *International journal of educational development*, 51:36–42.
- Bicchieri, C. (2005). *The grammar of society: The nature and dynamics of social norms*. Cambridge University Press.
- Bisin, A. and Verdier, T. (2001). The economics of cultural transmission and the dynamics of preferences. *Journal of Economic theory*, 97(2):298–319.
- Blattman, C., Jamison, J. C., and Sheridan, M. (2017). Reducing crime and violence: Experimental evidence from cognitive behavioral therapy in liberia. *American Economic Review*, 107(4):1165–1206.
- Bordalo, P., Burro, G., Coffman, K., Gennaioli, N., and Shleifer, A. (2024). Imagining the future: memory, simulation, and beliefs. *Review of Economic Studies*, page rdae070.
- Bosson, J. K., Vandello, J. A., Burnaford, R. M., Weaver, J. R., and Arzu Wasti, S. (2009). Precarious manhood and displays of physical aggression. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 35(5):623–634.

- Braghieri, L. (2024). Political correctness, social image, and information transmission. *American Economic Review*, 114(12):3877–3904.
- Bursztyn, L., Egorov, G., and Fiorin, S. (2020a). From extreme to mainstream: The erosion of social norms. *American economic review*, 110(11):3522–3548.
- Bursztyn, L., Egorov, G., Haaland, I., Rao, A., and Roth, C. (2023). Justifying dissent. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 138(3):1403–1451.
- Bursztyn, L., González, A. L., and Yanagizawa-Drott, D. (2020b). Misperceived social norms: Women working outside the home in saudi arabia. *American economic review*, 110(10):2997–3029.
- Bursztyn, L. and Jensen, R. (2015). How does peer pressure affect educational investments? *The quarterly journal of economics*, 130(3):1329–1367.
- Bursztyn, L. and Yang, D. Y. (2022). Misperceptions about others. *Annual Review of Economics*, 14:425–452.
- Carrigan, T., Connell, B., and Lee, J. (1985). Toward a new sociology of masculinity. *Theory and society*, 14(5):551–604.
- Cheryan, S., Cameron, J. S., Katagiri, Z., and Monin, B. (2015). Manning up. *Social Psychology*.
- Connell, R. W. (1987). Hegemonic masculinity and emphasized femininity. *Gender and power: Society, the person, and sexual politics*, pages 183–88.
- Connell, R. W. (2020). *Masculinities*. Routledge.
- Cross, S. and Bagilhole, B. (2002). Girls' jobs for the boys? men, masculinity and non-traditional occupations. *Gender, Work & Organization*, 9(2):204–226.
- Crowne, D. P. and Marlowe, D. (1960). A new scale of social desirability independent of psychopathology. *Journal of consulting psychology*, 24(4):349.
- Cruzado-RJ, F. (2024). Mapa histórico dos grupos armados. <https://geni.uff.br/2024/06/04/atualizacao-do-mapa-historico-dos-grupos-armados/>.
- Dean, J. T. and Jayachandran, S. (2019). Changing family attitudes to promote female employment. In *AEA Papers and Proceedings*, volume 109, pages 138–42.
- DeHaas, R., Baranov, V., Matavelli, I., and Grosjean, P. (2024). Masculinity around the world. Technical report, Working paper.
- Dhar, D., Jain, T., and Jayachandran, S. (2022). Reshaping adolescents' gender attitudes: Evidence from a school-based experiment in india. *American Economic Review*, 112(3):899–927.
- Enke, B. (2020). What you see is all there is. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 135(3):1363–1398.
- Ferrara, E. L., Chong, A., and Duryea, S. (2012). Soap operas and fertility: Evidence from brazil. *American Economic Journal: Applied Economics*, 4(4):1–31.

- Ferrario, B. and Stantcheva, S. (2022). Eliciting people's first-order concerns: text analysis of open-ended survey questions. In *AEA Papers and Proceedings*, volume 112, pages 163–69.
- Gelfand, M. J. (2021). Cultural evolutionary mismatches in response to collective threat. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 30(5):401–409.
- Gelfand, M. J., Gavrilets, S., and Nunn, N. (2024). Norm dynamics: Interdisciplinary perspectives on social norm emergence, persistence, and change. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 75(1):341–378.
- Gibbs, A., Myrttinen, H., Washington, L., Sikweyiya, Y., and Jewkes, R. (2020). Constructing, reproducing and challenging masculinities in a participatory intervention in urban informal settlements in south africa. *Culture, health & sexuality*, 22(5):535–550.
- Giuliano, P. (2020). Gender and culture. *Oxford Review of Economic Policy*, 36(4):944–961.
- Graeber, T., Roth, C., and Zimmermann, F. (2024). Stories, statistics, and memory. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 139(4):2181–2225.
- Heller, S. B., Shah, A. K., Guryan, J., Ludwig, J., Mullainathan, S., and Pollack, H. A. (2017). Thinking, fast and slow? some field experiments to reduce crime and dropout in chicago. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 132(1):1–54.
- Ho, Y. and Huang, Y. (2024). Breaking the spiral of silence.
- Hossain, M., Zimmerman, C., Kiss, L., Abramsky, T., Kone, D., Bakayoko-Topolska, M., Annan, J., Lehmann, H., and Watts, C. (2014). Working with men to prevent intimate partner violence in a conflict-affected setting: a pilot cluster randomized controlled trial in rural côte d'ivoire. *BMC public health*, 14:1–13.
- IBGE (2022). Censo brasileiro de 2022.
- INEP (2021). Sistema nacional de avaliação básica (saeb). *Ministério da Educação*.
- Jakupcak, M., Lisak, D., and Roemer, L. (2002). The role of masculine ideology and masculine gender role stress in men's perpetration of relationship violence. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity*, 3(2):97.
- Kågesten, A., Gibbs, S., Blum, R. W., Moreau, C., Chandra-Mouli, V., Herbert, A., and Amin, A. (2016). Understanding factors that shape gender attitudes in early adolescence globally: A mixed-methods systematic review. *PloS one*, 11(6):e0157805.
- Kardas, M., Kumar, A., and Epley, N. (2022). Overly shallow?: Miscalibrated expectations create a barrier to deeper conversation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 122(3):367.
- Kimmel, M. S., Hearn, J., and Connell, R. W. (2004). *Handbook of studies on men and masculinities*. Sage Publications.
- Kimmel, M. S., Messner, M. A., et al. (1989). *Men's lives*, volume 115. Macmillan New York.

- Kitts, J. A. (2003). Egocentric bias or information management? selective disclosure and the social roots of norm misperception. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, pages 222–237.
- Kohlberg, L. (1976). Moral stages and moralization: The cognitive-development approach. *Moral development and behavior: Theory research and social issues*, pages 31–53.
- Levant, R. F., Rogers, B. K., Cruickshank, B., Rankin, T. J., Kurtz, B. A., Rummell, C. M., Williams, C. M., and Colbow, A. J. (2012). Exploratory factor analysis and construct validity of the male role norms inventory-adolescent-revised (mrni-ar). *Psychology of Men & Masculinity*, 13(4):354.
- Levant, R. F., Smalley, K. B., Aupont, M., House, A. T., Richmond, K., and Noronha, D. (2007). Initial validation of the male role norms inventory-revised (mrni-r). *The Journal of men's Studies*, 15(1):83–100.
- Lundgren, R., Beckman, M., Chaurasiya, S. P., Subhedi, B., and Kerner, B. (2013). Whose turn to do the dishes? transforming gender attitudes and behaviours among very young adolescents in nepal. *Gender & Development*, 21(1):127–145.
- Mahalik, J. R., Burns, S. M., and Syzdek, M. (2007). Masculinity and perceived normative health behaviors as predictors of men's health behaviors. *Social science & medicine*, 64(11):2201–2209.
- Mahalik, J. R. and Rochlen, A. B. (2006). Men's likely responses to clinical depression: What are they and do masculinity norms predict them? *Sex roles*, 55:659–667.
- Marks, G. and Miller, N. (1987). Ten years of research on the false-consensus effect: An empirical and theoretical review. *Psychological bulletin*, 102(1):72.
- Markus, H. and Nurius, P. (1986). Possible selves. *American psychologist*, 41(9):954.
- Nickerson, R. S. (1998). Confirmation bias: A ubiquitous phenomenon in many guises. *Review of general psychology*, 2(2):175–220.
- Nunn, N. (2022). On the causes and consequences of cross-cultural differences. *Handbook of Advances in Culture and Psychology*, 9:125.
- OECD (2020). How's life? 2020: Measuring well-being.
- Oransky, M. and Fisher, C. (2009). The development and validation of the meanings of adolescent masculinity scale. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity*, 10(1):57.
- Paluck, E. L. (2009). Reducing intergroup prejudice and conflict using the media: a field experiment in rwanda. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 96(3):574.
- Paluck, E. L. and Shepherd, H. (2012). The salience of social referents: a field experiment on collective norms and harassment behavior in a school social network. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 103(6):899.
- Paluck, E. L., Shepherd, H., and Aronow, P. M. (2016). Changing climates of conflict: A social network experiment in 56 schools. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 113(3):566–571.

- Pérez-Martínez, V., Marcos-Marcos, J., Cerdán-Torregrosa, A., Briones-Vozmediano, E., Sanz-Barbero, B., Davó-Blanes, M., Daoud, N., Edwards, C., Salazar, M., La Parra-Casado, D., et al. (2023). Positive masculinities and gender-based violence educational interventions among young people: a systematic review. *Trauma, Violence, & Abuse*, 24(2):468–486.
- Pleck, J. (1995). The gender role strain paradigm: An update. *A new psychology of men/BasicBooks*.
- Poteat, V. P., Kimmel, M. S., and Wilchins, R. (2011). The moderating effects of support for violence beliefs on masculine norms, aggression, and homophobic behavior during adolescence. *Journal of Research on Adolescence*, 21(2):434–447.
- Reeves, R. (2022). *Of Boys and Men: Why the Modern Male is Struggling, why it Matters, and what to Do about it*. Brookings Institution Press.
- Reidy, D. E., Shirk, S. D., Sloan, C. A., and Zeichner, A. (2009). Men who aggress against women: Effects of feminine gender role violation on physical aggression in hypermasculine men. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity*, 10(1):1.
- Rosen, N. L. and Nofziger, S. (2019). Boys, bullying, and gender roles: How hegemonic masculinity shapes bullying behavior. *Gender Issues*, 36(3):295–318.
- Roth, C., Schwardmann, P., and Tripodi, E. (2024). Depression stigma.
- Shah, M., Seager, J., Montalvao, J., and Goldstein, M. (2023). Sex, power, and adolescence: Intimate partner violence and sexual behaviors. Technical report, National Bureau of Economic Research.
- Shiller, R. J. (2017). Narrative economics. *American economic review*, 107(4):967–1004.
- Steinberg, L. D. (2014). *Age of opportunity: Lessons from the new science of adolescence*. Houghton Mifflin Harcourt.
- Taylor, A., Moura, T., and Barker, G. (2016). This isn't the life for you: Masculinities and nonviolence in rio de janeiro, brazil. results from the international men and gender equality survey (images) with a focus on urban violence. *Washington, DC and Rio de Janeiro, Brazil: Promundo, 2016*.
- Thaler, R. H. (2000). From homo economicus to homo sapiens. *Journal of economic perspectives*, 14(1):133–141.
- Thompson Jr, E. H. and Bennett, K. M. (2015). Measurement of masculinity ideologies: A (critical) review. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity*, 16(2):115.
- Thompson Jr, E. H. and Pleck, J. H. (1986). The structure of male role norms. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 29(5):531–543.
- Thorne, B. (1993). *Gender play: Girls and boys in school*. Rutgers University Press.
- UNODC (2019). Global study on homicide.
- UNODC (2023). Global study on homicide.

- Way, N. (2011). *Deep secrets: Boys' friendships and the crisis of connection*. Harvard University Press.
- Way, N. (2024). *Rebels with a Cause: Reimagining Boys, Ourselves, and Our Culture*. Dutton.
- Way, N., Cressen, J., Bodian, S., Preston, J., Nelson, J., and Hughes, D. (2014). "it might be nice to be a girl... then you wouldn't have to be emotionless": Boys' resistance to norms of masculinity during adolescence. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity*, 15(3):241.
- Webb, D. (2024). Silence to solidarity: Using group dynamics to reduce anti-transgender discrimination in india.
- Wong, Y. J., Ho, M.-H. R., Wang, S.-Y., and Miller, I. (2017). Meta-analyses of the relationship between conformity to masculine norms and mental health-related outcomes. *Journal of counseling psychology*, 64(1):80.
- Zimmermann, F. (2020). The dynamics of motivated beliefs. *American Economic Review*, 110(2):337–363.

ONLINE APPENDIX


We Don't Talk About Boys: Masculinity Norms Among Adolescents in Brazil

Ieda Matavelli


University of New South Wales

Online Appendix A: Supplementary Figures

Figure A1: Study Schools Location and Exposure to Violence



(a) Schools and Homicide Rate By Region



(b) Schools and Favela Boundaries

Notes: This figure plots a map of Rio de Janeiro, indicating the participating schools in Experiments 1 and 2. The colors in Panel A represent the 2023 official homicides rate per 100,000 people in each police region, obtained from the Institute of Public Security of Rio de Janeiro. The shaded areas in Panel B represent favela (e.g., regions dominated by drug gangs) boundaries.


Figure A2: Experiment 1 Discussion Setting



Figure A3: Observers' Form

SCHOOL: _____	CLASSROOM: _____	MEDIATOR: _____	TIME (IN MINUTES): _____					
STUDENT NUMBER (IDENTIFIER)	STATEMENT	AGREED?	KEY WORDS		QUOTES	PERSONAL EXAMPLES	OTHER NOTES	
	Men who cry are weak	YES NO UNCERTAIN	Family environment Use of alcohol or drugs Psychological problems Emotional imbalance	Everybody has feelings When is mad When is cheated on				
	Men should use violence to get respect if necessary	YES NO UNCERTAIN	Family environment Use of alcohol or drugs Psychological problems Emotional imbalance	Everybody has feelings When is mad When is cheated on				
	Men who cry are weak	YES NO UNCERTAIN	Family environment Use of alcohol or drugs Psychological problems Emotional imbalance	Everybody has feelings When is mad When is cheated on				
	Men should use violence to get respect if necessary	YES NO UNCERTAIN	Family environment Use of alcohol or drugs Psychological problems Emotional imbalance	Everybody has feelings When is mad When is cheated on				
	Men who cry are weak	YES NO UNCERTAIN	Family environment Use of alcohol or drugs Psychological problems Emotional imbalance	Everybody has feelings When is mad When is cheated on				
	Men should use violence to get respect if necessary	YES NO UNCERTAIN	Family environment Use of alcohol or drugs Psychological problems Emotional imbalance	Everybody has feelings When is mad When is cheated on				
GENERAL NOTES:			GROUP BEHAVIOR: Dominant boys Dominant girls Shy group Conversation took time to happen		Engaged group Wanted to debate Much laughter/jokes			

Figure A4: Experimental Design - Experiment 2




Notes: This figure presents the design of the supplementary experiment. All participants engaged in a discussion about masculinity with peers they selected. To estimate the causal effects of the discussion, I randomized the outcome variables elicitation to be before or after it, stratified by sex.


Figure A5: Experiment 2 Discussion Setting



Figure A6: Correlates of Misperceptions



(a) Boys



(b) Girls


Note: This figure plots the regression coefficients of the boys' (Panel a) and girls' (Panel b) misperceptions about crying and violence on a series of baseline characteristics. The sample consists of boys (N=328) and girls (N=376) in the control group. The regressions include school-classroom fixed effects. The bars represent 90% confidence intervals. Standard errors are clustered at the school-classroom level.

Figure A7: Narratives to Justify Opinions During the Masculinity Sessions




Notes: This figure plots the distribution of topics discussed in the masculinity sessions, separated by boys and girls and by discussion type (i.e. *Voluntary* and *Randomized*). The bars represent the percentage of times a topic was mentioned. Next to each bar I present the p-values of a t-test comparing the *Voluntary* and *Randomized* means. Note that the categories were not mutually exclusive, so the sum within each group is above 100%.

Figure A8: Change in Misperceptions Between the Immediate and the Three Weeks Follow Up, Among the Control Group




Notes: This figure shows changes in misperceptions over time within the control group. The plot displays regression coefficients comparing wedges measured at the three-week endline versus the immediate endline. Each coefficient represents the effect of: (1) time alone (top row), (2) having at least one treated boyfriend and time (middle row), or (3) having at least one treated girlfriend and time (bottom row). All regressions include individual fixed effects. Horizontal bars indicate 90% confidence intervals, with standard errors clustered at the school-classroom level. A negative coefficient suggests that misperceptions decreased over time, potentially indicating information spillover from treated peers.

Figure A9: Causal Effects of Speaking vs Listening in the *Randomized* Discussions




Notes: This figure plots the coefficients on the effects of speaking in the *Randomized* discussions. The coefficients are from an IV regression, in which I instrument the realized speaking in the regression by the theoretical random assignment for speaking. The dependent variables are the immediate (Panels a and c) three weeks misperceptions (Panels b and d). I control for the misperception at the immediate survey in the regressions for the three weeks misperceptions. All regressions include school-fixed effects. Standard errors clustered at the school-classroom level.

Figure A10: Distribution of Guesses About Peers' Masculinity Beliefs



Notes: This figure plots the distribution of wedges, among the control group in Experiment 2, in perceptions about the beliefs of their male and female classmates regarding “men who cry are weak” and “men should use violence to get respect if necessary”. Wedges are calculated as the difference between a respondent guess about the percent of boys or girls in their classroom agreeing with each belief and the actual percent of boys or girls in a classroom agreeing with them. The sample consists of 90 boys and 95 boys in the control group (i.e., those randomized to answer the second-order beliefs question before the masculinity discussion).

Figure A11: Effects By Sex Composition of the Group (Experiment 2)



Notes: This figure plots the treatment effects of the discussions in Experiment 2, split by whether boys allocated themselves in groups with boys only (Panel a), or in groups with at least one girl (Panel b), and whether girls allocated themselves in groups with girls only (Panel c), or in groups with at least one boy (Panel d). 95% confidence intervals plotted, from a regression of misperceptions on treatment status dummies, including school fixed effects. Standard errors are clustered at the classroom level.

Online Appendix B: Supplementary Tables

Table B1: Baseline Characteristics - By Sex And Treatment Status

	Boys			P-Value	Girls			P-Value
	Voluntary (N = 384)	Randomized (N = 383)	Control (N = 328)		Voluntary (N = 411)	Randomized (N = 367)	Control (N = 376)	
Age	13.94 (0.97)	13.93 (0.99)	13.99 (0.86)	0.58	13.90 (0.87)	13.82 (0.85)	13.91 (0.88)	0.26
White	0.27 (0.45)	0.29 (0.45)	0.35 (0.48)	0.09*	0.37 (0.48)	0.29 (0.46)	0.31 (0.46)	0.06*
Black	0.68 (0.47)	0.65 (0.48)	0.59 (0.49)	0.05*	0.59 (0.49)	0.64 (0.48)	0.64 (0.48)	0.30
Evangelical	0.43 (0.50)	0.38 (0.49)	0.42 (0.49)	0.44	0.37 (0.48)	0.39 (0.49)	0.34 (0.47)	0.25
Catholic	0.20 (0.40)	0.21 (0.41)	0.20 (0.40)	0.91	0.17 (0.37)	0.17 (0.38)	0.17 (0.38)	0.97
Lives W/ Mother	0.82 (0.39)	0.86 (0.34)	0.84 (0.37)	0.20	0.86 (0.35)	0.88 (0.33)	0.85 (0.36)	0.50
Lives W/ Father	0.46 (0.50)	0.48 (0.50)	0.43 (0.50)	0.36	0.42 (0.49)	0.45 (0.50)	0.41 (0.49)	0.44
Lives W/ Step Father	0.14 (0.34)	0.14 (0.35)	0.16 (0.37)	0.66	0.13 (0.34)	0.15 (0.36)	0.15 (0.35)	0.81
Talks to Friends About Boys	0.08 (0.28)	0.08 (0.26)	0.11 (0.31)	0.28	0.47 (0.50)	0.55 (0.50)	0.52 (0.50)	0.06*
Talks to Friends About Girls	0.50 (0.50)	0.48 (0.50)	0.51 (0.50)	0.66	0.31 (0.46)	0.29 (0.46)	0.36 (0.48)	0.11
Talks to Friends About Personal Life	0.36 (0.48)	0.35 (0.48)	0.36 (0.48)	0.95	0.65 (0.48)	0.66 (0.47)	0.64 (0.48)	0.78
Talks to Friends About Situations That Made You Sad	0.16 (0.37)	0.17 (0.38)	0.15 (0.36)	0.77	0.45 (0.50)	0.49 (0.50)	0.44 (0.50)	0.27
Talks to Friends About Feelings or Personal Problems	0.44 (0.50)	0.42 (0.49)	0.38 (0.49)	0.23	0.65 (0.48)	0.67 (0.47)	0.66 (0.47)	0.84
Talks to Friends About What Society Expects from a Man	0.23 (0.42)	0.26 (0.44)	0.23 (0.42)	0.65	0.50 (0.50)	0.44 (0.50)	0.52 (0.50)	0.07*
Would Like More Emotional Support from Male Friends	0.42 (0.49)	0.46 (0.50)	0.40 (0.49)	0.18				
Would Like More Emotional Support from Female Friends					0.75 (0.43)	0.79 (0.41)	0.76 (0.43)	
Importance Given To Popularity, 0-4	1.05 (1.25)	1.23 (1.33)	1.10 (1.28)	0.14	0.63 (1.00)	0.70 (1.02)	0.80 (1.11)	0.12
Influenced by School Girls, 0-3	0.99 (0.93)	1.09 (0.94)	0.93 (0.90)	0.07*	0.54 (0.86)	0.61 (0.90)	0.65 (0.91)	0.21
Influenced by School Boys, 0-3	1.05 (0.97)	0.99 (0.97)	0.94 (0.98)	0.32	0.92 (0.96)	0.98 (0.98)	1.04 (0.97)	0.26
Agrees With Men Who Cry Are Weak	0.10 (0.30)	0.09 (0.29)	0.11 (0.32)	0.68	0.03 (0.18)	0.04 (0.20)	0.06 (0.23)	0.30
Agrees With Men Should Use Violence to Get Respect	0.18 (0.38)	0.15 (0.36)	0.17 (0.38)	0.63	0.07 (0.25)	0.04 (0.20)	0.05 (0.21)	0.32
Vocality Score	4.18 (4.48)	4.01 (4.24)	3.68 (4.15)	0.30	4.23 (4.36)	4.60 (4.78)	4.38 (4.45)	0.51
Social Network Score	2.09 (1.55)	1.89 (1.48)	2.09 (1.56)	0.10*	2.07 (1.43)	2.13 (1.48)	2.15 (1.52)	0.75
Admiration Score	1.55 (1.78)	1.45 (1.73)	1.46 (1.79)	0.70	2.34 (2.62)	2.35 (2.67)	2.48 (2.52)	0.69
Social Desirability Score, 0-4	2.84 (0.93)	2.82 (1.00)	2.77 (0.97)	0.69	2.85 (0.92)	2.83 (0.98)	2.80 (0.92)	0.75
Masculinity Score, 0-4	1.14 (0.95)	1.21 (1.08)	1.17 (1.07)	0.66	0.52 (0.82)	0.55 (0.83)	0.55 (0.88)	0.85
Gave WhatsApp	0.82 (0.38)	0.76 (0.43)	0.82 (0.39)	0.12	0.87 (0.34)	0.89 (0.32)	0.86 (0.34)	0.67

Notes: This table presents baseline characteristics (mean and standard deviation in parenthesis), by sex, treatment groups and control group. Within sex, it presents the p-value of a joint F-test for comparison across treatment arms.

Table B2: WhatsApp Sample Characteristics - By Sex and Treatment Status

	Boys				Girls				P-Value
	Voluntary (N = 126)	Randomized (N = 132)	Control (N = 117)	P-Value	Voluntary (N = 193)	Randomized (N = 173)	Control (N = 163)	P-Value	
Age	13.77 (0.84)	14.07 (0.99)	14.07 (0.87)	0.01***	13.90 (0.84)	13.87 (0.80)	14.00 (0.90)	0.32	
White	0.28 (0.45)	0.31 (0.46)	0.37 (0.48)	0.34	0.40 (0.49)	0.29 (0.46)	0.37 (0.48)	0.07*	
Black	0.68 (0.47)	0.63 (0.48)	0.56 (0.50)	0.16	0.55 (0.50)	0.63 (0.48)	0.60 (0.49)	0.32	
Evangelical	0.45 (0.50)	0.38 (0.49)	0.44 (0.50)	0.44	0.35 (0.48)	0.40 (0.49)	0.31 (0.46)	0.16	
Catholic	0.21 (0.41)	0.27 (0.45)	0.24 (0.43)	0.56	0.20 (0.40)	0.19 (0.39)	0.21 (0.41)	0.80	
Lives W/ Mother	0.83 (0.38)	0.89 (0.32)	0.79 (0.41)	0.10	0.88 (0.33)	0.88 (0.33)	0.87 (0.34)	0.93	
Lives W/ Father	0.42 (0.50)	0.52 (0.50)	0.47 (0.50)	0.28	0.44 (0.50)	0.49 (0.50)	0.42 (0.50)	0.45	
Lives W/ Step Father	0.13 (0.34)	0.16 (0.37)	0.18 (0.39)	0.53	0.14 (0.35)	0.12 (0.33)	0.13 (0.34)	0.91	
Talks to Friends About Boys	0.06 (0.24)	0.12 (0.33)	0.14 (0.35)	0.08*	0.46 (0.50)	0.56 (0.50)	0.56 (0.50)	0.08*	
Talks to Friends About Girls	0.42 (0.49)	0.49 (0.50)	0.48 (0.50)	0.43	0.31 (0.46)	0.27 (0.44)	0.38 (0.49)	0.08*	
Talks to Friends About Personal Life	0.43 (0.50)	0.43 (0.50)	0.45 (0.50)	0.92	0.70 (0.46)	0.71 (0.46)	0.70 (0.46)	0.97	
Talks to Friends About Situations That Made You Sad	0.16 (0.37)	0.21 (0.41)	0.15 (0.36)	0.41	0.52 (0.50)	0.51 (0.50)	0.45 (0.50)	0.34	
Talks to Friends About Feelings or Personal Problems	0.42 (0.49)	0.44 (0.50)	0.36 (0.48)	0.44	0.62 (0.49)	0.65 (0.48)	0.71 (0.46)	0.26	
Talks to Friends About What Society Expects from a Man	0.20 (0.40)	0.29 (0.45)	0.24 (0.43)	0.32	0.51 (0.50)	0.47 (0.50)	0.55 (0.50)	0.37	
Would Like More Emotional Support from Male Friends	0.39 (0.49)	0.41 (0.49)	0.41 (0.49)	0.89					
Would Like More Emotional Support from Female Friends					0.76 (0.43)	0.78 (0.41)	0.80 (0.40)	0.59	
Importance Given To Popularity, 0-4	0.95 (1.15)	1.16 (1.27)	0.79 (1.03)	0.04**	0.60 (0.98)	0.72 (0.99)	0.86 (1.15)	0.08*	
Influenced by School Girls, 0-3	0.86 (0.83)	1.02 (0.87)	0.84 (0.79)	0.16	0.49 (0.83)	0.58 (0.81)	0.58 (0.84)	0.48	
Influenced by School Boys, 0-3	1.00 (0.92)	1.02 (0.92)	0.89 (0.93)	0.51	0.91 (0.93)	0.99 (0.95)	1.01 (0.94)	0.62	
Agrees With Men Who Cry Are Weak	0.07 (0.25)	0.04 (0.20)	0.09 (0.28)	0.30	0.02 (0.13)	0.03 (0.17)	0.03 (0.17)	0.61	
Agrees With Men Should Use Violence to Get Respect	0.14 (0.35)	0.11 (0.32)	0.11 (0.32)	0.67	0.03 (0.18)	0.02 (0.12)	0.04 (0.20)	0.24	
Vocality Score	5.08 (5.23)	4.85 (4.48)	5.30 (5.16)	0.77	4.61 (4.60)	4.95 (4.98)	5.17 (4.85)	0.55	
Social Network Score	2.38 (1.63)	2.11 (1.33)	2.17 (1.67)	0.34	2.25 (1.44)	2.19 (1.43)	2.33 (1.60)	0.69	
Admiration Score	1.90 (2.29)	1.73 (1.82)	1.74 (2.22)	0.77	2.60 (2.77)	2.59 (2.72)	2.90 (2.75)	0.49	
Social Desirability Score, 0-4	2.89 (0.88)	2.87 (1.06)	2.91 (0.94)	0.95	2.88 (0.91)	2.80 (0.99)	2.80 (0.92)	0.62	
Masculinity Score, 0-4	1.11 (0.92)	1.05 (1.06)	1.09 (1.08)	0.89	0.42 (0.71)	0.51 (0.77)	0.47 (0.80)	0.45	
Gave WhatsApp	1.00 (0.00)	1.00 (0.00)	1.00 (0.00)		1.00 (0.00)	1.00 (0.00)	1.00 (0.00)		

Notes: This table presents baseline characteristics (mean and standard deviation in parenthesis), by sex, treatment groups and control group. Within sex, it presents the p-value of a joint F-test for comparison across treatment arms.

Table B3: Schools' Characteristics - Census and Study Schools

	All Schools Census (1)	Experiment 1 (2)	Experiment 2 (3)	Census-Experiment 1 P-Value (4)	Census-Experiment 2 P-Value (5)	Experiment 1-Experiment 2 P-Value (6)	Joint P-Value (7)
Boys	0.51 (0.03)	0.51 (0.04)	0.50 (0.02)	0.40	0.55	0.70	0.49
Black	0.55 (0.09)	0.54 (0.09)	0.57 (0.16)	0.68	0.65	0.70	0.88
Students per Class	32.94 (4.21)	33.23 (3.31)	32.25 (4.25)	0.74	0.78	0.64	0.86
Students per Teacher	20.51 (24.01)	12.41 (5.22)	11.02 (6.92)	0.11	0.49	0.69	0.00***
Internet for Learning	0.52 (0.50)	0.68 (0.48)	0.33 (0.58)	0.13	0.51	0.23	0.22
Lunchroom	0.99 (0.12)	0.95 (0.21)	1.00 (0.00)	0.23	0.83	0.31	0.01**
Sport Court	0.83 (0.38)	0.82 (0.39)	1.00 (0.00)	0.91	0.43	0.03**	0.00***
Green Area	0.43 (0.50)	0.36 (0.49)	0.67 (0.58)	0.54	0.40	0.30	0.56
Number of Classrooms in Use	14.06 (5.41)	13.05 (4.80)	16.33 (7.51)	0.37	0.47	0.37	0.49
Student Union	0.83 (0.37)	0.91 (0.29)	1.00 (0.00)	0.33	0.44	0.14	0.00***
Accessible Facilities	0.59 (0.49)	0.50 (0.51)	0.33 (0.58)	0.36	0.36	0.57	0.41

Notes: This table compares the schools' and students' characteristics considering all the municipal schools in Rio de Janeiro (obtained through the Brazilian School Census) and the sample of participating schools and students in Experiments 1 and 2. Columns (1), (2), and (3) present the respective variable means for each sample. Column (4) presents p-values of a t-test comparing the variable means between the School Census and Experiment 1 sample; Column (5) presents p-values of a t-test comparing the variable means between the School Census and the Experiment 2 sample; Column (6) presents p-values of a t-test comparing the variable means between Experiment 1 and Experiment 2; Column (7) presents p-values of a F-test comparing the variable means across the School Census, Experiment 1, and Experiment 2 samples.

Table B4: Students' Characteristics - Comparison Experiments 1 and 2

	Boys			Girls		
	Experiment 1 (1)	Experiment 2 (2)	P-Value (3)	Experiment 1 (4)	Experiment 2 (5)	P-Value (6)
Age	13.95 (0.95)	13.97 (0.72)	0.80	13.88 (0.87)	13.77 (0.70)	0.10*
White	0.30 (0.46)	0.28 (0.45)	0.51	0.32 (0.47)	0.34 (0.47)	0.69
Black	0.65 (0.48)	0.70 (0.46)	0.17	0.62 (0.48)	0.61 (0.49)	0.81
Evangelical	0.41 (0.49)	0.34 (0.48)	0.10	0.37 (0.48)	0.38 (0.49)	0.82
Catholic	0.20 (0.40)	0.16 (0.37)	0.21	0.17 (0.38)	0.16 (0.37)	0.77
Lives W/ Mother	0.84 (0.37)	0.87 (0.33)	0.26	0.86 (0.35)	0.85 (0.35)	0.82
Lives W/ Father	0.46 (0.50)	0.36 (0.48)	0.02**	0.43 (0.50)	0.38 (0.49)	0.20
Lives W/ Step Father	0.14 (0.35)	0.23 (0.42)	0.00***	0.14 (0.35)	0.14 (0.34)	0.78
Talks to Friends About Boys	0.09 (0.28)	0.10 (0.30)	0.76	0.51 (0.50)	0.47 (0.50)	0.24
Talks to Friends About Girls	0.50 (0.50)	0.51 (0.50)	0.77	0.32 (0.47)	0.28 (0.45)	0.22
Talks to Friends About Situations That Made You Sad	0.16 (0.37)	0.15 (0.36)	0.74	0.46 (0.50)	0.44 (0.50)	0.62
Agrees With Men Who Cry Are Weak	0.10 (0.30)	0.11 (0.31)	0.77	0.04 (0.21)	0.04 (0.20)	0.87
Agrees With Men Should Use Violence to Get Respect	0.17 (0.37)	0.17 (0.37)	0.99	0.05 (0.22)	0.05 (0.22)	0.96
Social Desirability Score, 0-4	2.81 (0.97)	2.83 (1.01)	0.79	2.83 (0.94)	2.77 (0.98)	0.45
Masculinity Score, 0-4	1.17 (1.03)	1.50 (1.06)	0.00***	0.54 (0.84)	1.04 (1.14)	0.00***

Notes: In this table, columns (1), (2), (4), and (5) present the students' characteristics (mean and standard deviation in parenthesis) by experiment and sex. Columns (3) and (6) show the p-value of the t-test comparing the means of each variable between Experiment 1 and Experiment 2, for boys and girls, respectively.

Table B5: Balance Tests - Experiment 2

	Boys			Girls		
	Treated (1)	Control (2)	P-Value (3)	Treated (4)	Control (5)	P-Value (6)
Age	13.98 (0.78)	13.96 (0.66)	0.88	13.75 (0.77)	13.78 (0.63)	0.72
White	0.26 (0.44)	0.30 (0.46)	0.54	0.42 (0.50)	0.26 (0.44)	0.02**
Black	0.71 (0.46)	0.69 (0.47)	0.75	0.53 (0.50)	0.70 (0.46)	0.01**
Evangelical	0.34 (0.48)	0.34 (0.48)	0.93	0.37 (0.48)	0.38 (0.49)	0.85
Catholic	0.16 (0.36)	0.17 (0.38)	0.82	0.15 (0.36)	0.18 (0.38)	0.60
Lives W/ Mother	0.87 (0.34)	0.88 (0.32)	0.75	0.88 (0.32)	0.82 (0.38)	0.25
Lives W/ Father	0.31 (0.47)	0.42 (0.50)	0.16	0.38 (0.49)	0.38 (0.49)	0.97
Lives W/ Step Father	0.27 (0.44)	0.19 (0.40)	0.28	0.14 (0.35)	0.13 (0.34)	0.95
Talks to Friends About Boys	0.11 (0.32)	0.08 (0.27)	0.47	0.44 (0.50)	0.49 (0.50)	0.47
Talks to Friends About Girls	0.52 (0.50)	0.49 (0.50)	0.71	0.24 (0.43)	0.31 (0.46)	0.30
Talks to Friends About Situations That Made You Sad	0.16 (0.36)	0.14 (0.35)	0.82	0.42 (0.50)	0.46 (0.50)	0.55
Social Desirability Score, 0-4	2.91 (0.98)	2.74 (1.04)	0.28	2.80 (1.02)	2.74 (0.94)	0.68
Masculinity Score, 0-4	1.46 (1.11)	1.56 (1.01)	0.53	0.93 (1.05)	1.14 (1.21)	0.18

Notes: This table presents baseline characteristics (mean and standard deviation in parenthesis) by sex and treatment status of Experiment 2 participants (Columns (1), (2), (4), and (5)). Columns (3) and (6) present the p-values of a t-test comparing the means between the control and treatment groups, by sex.

Table B6: First-stage among randomized speakers

	Spoke		
	All	Boys	Girls
	(1)	(2)	(3)
Randomly Assigned to Speak	0.849*** (0.036)	0.838*** (0.046)	0.852*** (0.047)
Observations	750	382	366
F-Stat	548.16	332.66	334.45
School FE	Yes	Yes	Yes

*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

Notes: This table presents regression coefficients within the sample of those in the *Randomized* group only. The dependent variable is a dummy equal to 1 if a participant spoke in the discussion. The independent variable of interest is a dummy equal to 1 if the speaker was randomly assigned to speak in the *Randomized* discussion. All regressions include school-classroom fixed effects and standard errors clustered at the school-classroom level.

Table B7: Effects of the Discussions Are Robust To Including Controls Unbalanced at Baseline (Immediately After Treatment)

	Wedge: Men Who Cry Are Weak				Wedge: Men Should Violence to Get Respect			
	To boys		To girls		To boys		To girls	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
Panel A: Boy								
<i>Voluntary</i>	-10.290*** (2.474)	-10.540*** (2.540)	-13.483*** (2.615)	-13.564*** (2.650)	-9.573*** (2.384)	-9.823*** (2.369)	-1.307 (2.026)	-1.307 (2.063)
<i>Randomized</i>	-10.540*** (2.508)	-10.914*** (2.485)	-13.019*** (2.794)	-13.103*** (2.841)	-8.911*** (2.586)	-9.276*** (2.526)	-1.765 (2.083)	-1.774 (2.101)
Observations	1,095	1,095	1,095	1,095	1,095	1,095	1,095	1,095
Control Mean of Dep. Var.	21.38	21.38	27.68	27.68	11.82	11.82	9.96	9.96
School FE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Unbalanced Controls	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes
Panel B: Girls								
<i>Voluntary</i>	-12.475*** (2.620)	-12.358*** (2.663)	-13.388*** (2.812)	-13.222*** (2.822)	-6.242** (2.418)	-6.172** (2.442)	0.842 (1.821)	0.751 (1.869)
<i>Randomized</i>	-12.711*** (2.758)	-12.680*** (2.784)	-9.443*** (2.639)	-9.301*** (2.666)	-7.580*** (2.593)	-7.495*** (2.630)	0.867 (1.835)	1.047 (1.860)
Observations	1,154	1,154	1,154	1,154	1,154	1,154	1,154	1,154
Control Mean of Dep. Var.	23.57	23.57	24.47	24.47	10.15	10.15	5.83	5.83
School FE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Unbalanced Controls	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes

*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

Notes: This table presents regression coefficients of the treatment effects of the *Randomized* and *Voluntary* discussions on boys' (Panel A) and girls' (Panel B) misperceptions about crying and violence in the survey immediate after treatment (Columns 1, 3, 5, and 7). Columns 2, 4, 6, and 8 present robustness to including controls that are unbalanced at baseline, as highlighted in Table B1. All regressions include school fixed effects. Standard errors clustered at the school-classroom level.

Table B8: Effects of the Discussions Are Robust To Including Controls Unbalanced at Baseline (Three Weeks Later)

	Wedge: Men Who Cry Are Weak				Wedge: Men Should Violence to Get Respect			
	To boys		To girls		To boys		To girls	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
Panel A: Boys								
<i>Voluntary</i>	-9.591** (4.028)	-9.605** (4.068)	-10.850*** (3.574)	-10.907*** (3.652)	-6.906* (3.642)	-6.678* (3.662)	-4.311 (3.256)	-4.469 (3.302)
<i>Randomized</i>	-11.502*** (3.765)	-11.682*** (3.863)	-8.383** (3.557)	-8.435** (3.602)	-12.974*** (4.007)	-12.661*** (4.054)	-7.367** (2.849)	-7.076** (2.904)
Observations	354	354	354	354	342	342	342	342
Control Mean of Dep. Var.	17.54	17.54	20.98	20.98	11.16	11.16	9.87	9.87
School FE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Unbalanced Controls	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes
Panel B: Girls								
<i>Voluntary</i>	-8.332** (3.789)	-8.637** (3.779)	-3.864 (3.249)	-3.891 (3.231)	-7.070* (3.976)	-7.208* (3.849)	-1.711 (2.601)	-1.725 (2.567)
<i>Randomized</i>	-16.806*** (3.491)	-16.936*** (3.584)	-7.773*** (2.896)	-8.014*** (2.929)	-11.076*** (3.930)	-11.491*** (4.049)	-4.398** (1.939)	-4.672** (2.004)
Observations	504	504	504	504	490	490	490	490
Control Mean of Dep. Var.	19.78	19.78	13.94	13.94	8.09	8.09	5.22	5.22
School FE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Unbalanced Controls	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes

*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

Notes: This table presents regression coefficients of the treatment effects of the *Randomized* and *Voluntary* discussions on boys' (Panel A) and girls' (Panel B) misperceptions about crying and violence in the survey three weeks after treatment (Columns 1, 3, 5, and 7). Columns 2, 4, 6, and 8 present robustness to including controls that are unbalanced at baseline, as highlighted in Table B1. All regressions include school fixed effects. Standard errors clustered at the school-classroom level.

Table B9: *Voluntary* Speakers Only Differ From Randomized Ones in a Vocality Score

	Vocality	Popularity	Admiration	Masculinity	Social Desirability
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Panel A: Boys					
<i>Voluntary</i>	0.950*	-0.013	-0.023	-0.087	-0.028
	(0.495)	(0.160)	(0.185)	(0.114)	(0.099)
Observations	329	329	329	329	329
School FE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
<i>Randomized</i> Dep. Var. Mean	3.95	2.02	1.51	1.15	2.85
Sample	Speakers	Speakers	Speakers	Speakers	Speakers
Panel B: Girls					
<i>Voluntary</i>	1.267**	0.089	0.374	0.031	-0.186*
	(0.523)	(0.154)	(0.348)	(0.075)	(0.111)
Observations	332	332	332	332	332
School FE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
<i>Randomized</i> Dep. Var. Mean	4.36	2.01	2.39	0.46	2.92
Sample	Speakers	Speakers	Speakers	Speakers	Speakers

*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

Notes: This table presents regressions of each dependent variable on an indicator if a person spoke in the *Voluntary* group, where the omitted category is a person who spoke in the *Randomized group*. *Vocality*, *Network*, and *Admiration* are the count of how many times a participant was selected by their friends as being, respectively: among the top 5 most talkative people in the class, among the people someone spent the most time with in the last week, among the people someone admires the most. *Masculinity* is a score from 0 to 4 from a Masculinity Scale, with a larger number for self-reports of more traditionally masculine beliefs. *Desirability* is a score from 0 to 4 from the Social Desirability Scale, with a larger number meaning that the person gives more socially desirable answers. Standard errors are clustered at the classroom level.

Table B10: Categories and Examples Shared in the Masculinity Discussions

Men Who Cry Are Weak			Men Should Use Violence to Get Respect When Necessary		
Category	Quote	Frequency	Category	Quote	Frequency
Coping Mechanism	When you're having a bad day, out of disappointment, you cry because you feel like it	110	Other Ways to Get Respect	You have to treat others as you would like to be treated, you don't have to use bad words or physical violence to be respected	307
Relative/ Depends	I think men don't always need to cry. Ex: if they took a weak slap, they don't need to cry	14	Generates fear	If you use violence you will not be respected you will be feared	38
Everybody Has Feelings	Man has the right to cry, crying is human	462	Generates more violence	Men shouldn't use violence, violence brings even more violence, if you want to be respected you have to treat them with respect.	58
Form of Expression	It's a body's feeling, men cry when something happens to the familiar or they get hurt, crying takes the pain out	102	Honour/fight back	Most of the time you don't have to use violence, you can use violence to defend yourself or when someone is offending you	94
Grieving	When you lose someone in your family, when you lose a childhood friend	86	Crime/Wrong/ Bad	It's wrong. My dad never beat me and I respect him for that.	42
Happy Crying	Crying when you win a competition	18	Never Justified/Doesn't	Because that way you won't get anywhere, we need education to get somewhere	50
Love Relationships	I saw my brother crying after a breakup	44	Society/Machismo	If women can't beat others, men can't either	30
Societal/Family Values	Boys are raised told by their parents not to cry	51	Violence Against Women	I saw my brother having a jealousy crisis with his girlfriend and beat her. I felt distressed.	34
Strength	Showing feelings is a sign of strength, the person who holds on to himself cannot cry and express himself	27			

Notes: This table presents examples of what students' shared during the masculinity discussions in Experiment 1, categorized by the research assistants according to the content of the statements.

Table B11: Heterogeneity in Treatment Effects by Baseline Masculinity Beliefs

	Immediately After Discussions								Three Weeks After Discussions							
	Boys				Girls				Boys				Girls			
	To Boys (1)	To Girls (2)	To Boys (3)	To Girls (4)	To Boys (5)	To Girls (6)	To Boys (7)	To Girls (8)	To Boys (5)	To Girls (6)	To Boys (7)	To Girls (8)	To Boys (7)	To Girls (8)	To Boys (7)	To Girls (8)
Panel A: Dep. Var.: Wedge for Men Who Cry Are Weak																
<i>Voluntary</i>	10.000*** (2.545)	-12.841*** (2.688)	-8.683** (3.827)	-9.112** (3.599)	-13.110*** (2.665)	-12.677*** (2.691)	-9.019** (3.897)	-3.382 (3.303)								
<i>Randomized</i>	-9.028*** (2.646)	-11.657*** (2.992)	-9.469** (3.866)	-6.054 (3.817)	-12.837*** (2.818)	-7.907*** (2.556)	-17.037*** (3.751)	-7.701** (3.059)								
<i>Agree Crying</i>	3.603	7.033	17.352*	20.958	-5.909	18.177*	-13.822	14.455								
<i>Agree Crying × Voluntary</i>	(6.347)	(5.972)	(10.117)	(14.486)	(8.186)	(10.436)	(9.589)	(11.205)								
<i>Agree Crying × Randomized</i>	-2.891 (7.601)	-5.832 (8.502)	-13.087 (18.009)	-8.045 (27.044)	12.854 (12.059)	-11.215 (13.327)	38.357** (18.614)	-9.369 (18.409)								
<i>Observations</i>	-15.163*** (7.304)	-13.003* (6.592)	-19.663 (13.446)	-23.614 (16.424)	-0.644 (10.334)	-34.259*** (11.061)	9.218 (11.689)	-3.146 (34.746)								
Control Mean of Dep. Var.	1095	1095	342	342	1154	1154	490	490								
School FE	21.38	27.68	17.48	20.61	23.57	24.47	19.67	13.88								
Panel B: Dep. Var.: Wedge for Men Should Use Violence																
<i>Voluntary</i>	-10.079*** (2.309)	-1.685 (1.949)	-6.323** (2.502)	0.185 (1.843)	-6.855* (3.664)	-4.750 (3.014)	-6.028 (4.112)	-0.947 (2.597)								
<i>Randomized</i>	-8.885*** (2.568)	-1.767 (2.122)	-7.473*** (2.620)	-0.993 (1.886)	-12.882*** (4.002)	-7.293*** (2.686)	-11.382*** (3.002)	-4.456** (1.951)								
<i>Agree Violence</i>	5.646*** (2.816)	6.846*** (2.239)	1.878 (3.453)	3.382 (4.204)	11.964** (5.282)	11.730** (5.592)	16.853 (10.545)	7.107 (5.391)								
<i>Agree Violence × Voluntary</i>	6.410 (5.055)	5.316 (4.651)	1.870 (8.293)	14.803 (9.048)	6.713 (15.408)	15.792 (17.722)	-15.766 (10.028)	-20.567** (4.064)								
<i>Agree Violence × Randomized</i>	-0.869 (4.940)	-0.638 (3.655)	-4.716 (6.058)	-7.183 (6.283)	-9.468 (8.564)	-10.631** (4.115)	19.922 (33.415)	5.678 (26.499)								
<i>Observations</i>	1095	1095	1154	1154	342	342	490	490								
Control Mean of Dep. Var.	11.82	9.96	10.15	5.83	11.16	9.87	8.09	5.22								
School FE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes								

*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

Notes: This table presents heterogeneous treatment effects based on baseline beliefs about masculinity. The dependent variables are misperceptions (in percentage points) about boys' and girls' views on whether (Panel A) and whether (Panel B). Columns 1-4 show effects on misperceptions measured immediately after the discussions, while Columns 5-8 show effects measured three weeks later. *Agree Crying* is a dummy equal to 1 if the respondent agreed at baseline that men who cry are weak. *Agree Violence* is a dummy equal to 1 if the respondent agreed at baseline that men should use violence to get respect if necessary. The interaction terms *Agree Crying × Voluntary*, *Agree Crying × Randomized*, *Agree Violence × Voluntary*, and *Agree Violence × Randomized* capture the differential effects of the respective treatments for those who initially held more traditional masculinity beliefs. All regressions include school fixed effects. Standard errors are clustered at the classroom level.

Table B12: Discussions In Favela Schools Are Equally Effective in Reducing Misperceptions, Compared to Non-Favela Schools

	Men Who Cry Are Weak						Men Should Use Violence			
	Boys		Girls		Boys		Boys		Girls	
	To Boys (1)	To Girls (2)	To Boys (3)	To Girls (4)	To Boys (5)	To Girls (6)	To Boys (7)	To Girls (8)		
Panel A: School Endline - Immediately After Treatment										
<i>Voluntary</i>	-9.270*** (2.679)	-13.408*** (2.853)	-10.167*** (3.098)	-11.876*** (2.877)	-7.521*** (2.653)	-0.785 (2.253)	-7.481*** (2.780)	-1.657 (2.081)		
<i>Randomized</i>	-9.794*** (2.554)	-13.089*** (3.186)	-8.286*** (3.023)	-6.217** (2.870)	-6.566** (3.018)	-1.618 (2.314)	-6.174** (3.090)	3.243 (2.153)		
<i>Favela</i>	2.148 (4.919)	0.517 (5.789)	2.619 (6.341)	1.156 (5.612)	4.020 (5.636)	1.784 (3.343)	-10.594* (5.709)	-2.292 (3.179)		
<i>Favela × Voluntary</i>	-5.011 (7.686)	2.375 (6.752)	-5.230 (8.455)	-3.225 (8.399)	-9.161 (5.837)	-2.515 (5.272)	9.393 (5.928)	0.050 (5.051)		
<i>Favela × Randomized</i>	-3.384 (8.566)	3.824 (8.254)	-25.059*** (7.870)	-12.631* (7.139)	-11.095 (6.798)	-1.072 (6.170)	-8.409 (6.813)	-8.245* (4.731)		
Observations	1095	1095	1154	1154	1095	1095	1154	1154		
Control Mean of Dep. Var.	21.38	27.68	23.57	24.47	11.82	9.96	10.15	5.83		
Panel B: WhatsApp Endline - 3 Weeks After Treatment										
<i>Voluntary</i>	-6.201 (4.452)	-7.991* (4.299)	-6.669 (4.643)	-3.747 (3.663)	-5.084 (4.320)	-4.451 (3.591)	-3.695 (4.712)	-0.741 (2.769)		
<i>Randomized</i>	-7.663* (4.062)	-9.202** (4.551)	-15.131*** (4.082)	-7.475** (3.015)	-11.611*** (3.806)	-7.713** (3.055)	-10.660** (4.281)	-3.850* (2.060)		
<i>Favela</i>	7.820 (9.581)	0.577 (6.795)	-3.567 (7.302)	1.363 (5.556)	1.181 (8.927)	1.483 (6.271)	-5.009 (6.686)	0.852 (5.143)		
<i>Favela × Voluntary</i>	-6.527 (10.665)	-1.092 (10.599)	-1.398 (9.637)	2.264 (8.061)	1.274 (9.821)	-0.655 (6.852)	-10.513 (8.015)	-3.783 (5.826)		
<i>Favela × Randomized</i>	-10.149 (10.844)	14.565 (9.910)	-8.430 (8.245)	-1.917 (7.357)	-1.690 (12.487)	8.641 (9.295)	-0.980 (12.554)	0.230 (5.282)		
Observations	342	342	490	490	342	342	490	490		
Control Mean of Dep. Var.	17.48	20.61	19.67	13.88	11.16	9.87	8.09	5.22		

*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

Notes: This table presents regression coefficients that estimates whether being a student from a school in a favela – regions dominated by drug gangs – has differential effects on misperceptions. The main coefficients of interest are the interaction terms *Favela* × *Voluntary* and *Favela* × *Randomized*. *Favela* is a dummy equal to 1 if the student is enrolled in a school in a favela. The outcome variables are the misperceptions, in percentage points, of boys' beliefs about boys and girls for the statements *Men Who Cry Are Weak* (Columns 1 and 2) and *Men Should Use Violence to Get Respect If Necessary* (Columns 5 and 6) at the immediate (Panel A) and three-weeks later follow up surveys 2 (Panel B). Columns (3), (4), (7) and (8) present the same regression estimates for girls. Standard errors are clustered at the classroom level.

Table B13: Social Desirability Does Not Drive Differential Effects on Misperceptions Across Treatment Groups

	Men Who Cry Are Weak						Men Should Use Violence			
	Boys		Girls		Boys		Boys		Girls	
	To Boys (1)	To Girls (2)	To Boys (3)	To Girls (4)	To Boys (5)	To Girls (6)	To Boys (7)	To Girls (8)		
Panel A: School Endline - Immediately After Treatment										
Voluntary	-8.753*** (3.623)	-13.813*** (3.667)	-9.758*** (3.456)	-14.210*** (3.984)	-10.094** (4.228)	-1.340 (3.401)	-6.722 (4.110)	0.303 (3.471)		
Randomized	-7.912* (4.195)	-11.662** (4.496)	-11.214*** (3.824)	-9.335** (4.087)	-7.870 (5.085)	-1.140 (3.404)	-7.458* (4.011)	0.547 (3.296)		
High Social Desirability Score	-2.979 (3.503)	-3.294 (3.425)	-0.722 (3.379)	-2.286 (3.485)	-6.677 (4.256)	-4.854* (2.692)	-2.840 (3.553)	-2.672 (2.246)		
High Social Desirability Score \times Voluntary	-2.360 (4.534)	0.513 (4.543)	-4.068 (4.687)	1.316 (4.873)	0.812 (4.918)	0.058 (3.656)	0.820 (4.578)	0.905 (3.818)		
High Social Desirability Score \times Randomized	-3.761 (4.808)	-1.867 (4.561)	-2.212 (4.406)	-0.054 (4.966)	-1.258 (5.764)	-0.720 (3.620)	-0.053 (4.923)	0.595 (3.753)		
Observations	1095	1095	1154	1154	1095	1095	1154	1154		
Control Mean of Dep. Var.	21.38	27.68	23.57	24.47	11.82	9.96	10.15	5.83		
Panel B: WhatsApp Endline - 3 Weeks After Treatment										
Voluntary	-16.313** (7.961)	-11.684 (7.124)	-8.463 (5.377)	-6.501 (4.692)	-20.969*** (7.506)	-10.303 (6.203)	-8.073 (5.733)	-3.560 (3.751)		
Randomized	-18.122** (8.331)	-7.092 (7.841)	-24.167*** (4.704)	-13.291*** (3.876)	-26.366*** (7.953)	-10.364* (6.033)	-13.334** (5.087)	-5.024* (2.857)		
High Social Desirability Score	-18.080*** (6.273)	-1.631 (6.449)	-3.892 (5.008)	-1.552 (3.842)	-19.715** (7.711)	-6.393 (5.897)	1.136 (5.637)	-0.911 (3.185)		
High Social Desirability Score \times Voluntary	7.979 (8.245)	1.033 (7.743)	0.346 (6.376)	4.022 (6.230)	19.084** (9.113)	8.297 (7.228)	1.443 (6.741)	2.798 (4.272)		
High Social Desirability Score \times Randomized	9.218 (8.530)	-1.838 (8.924)	11.315* (5.959)	8.477* (5.051)	18.520** (8.301)	4.075 (6.560)	3.470 (6.444)	0.981 (3.781)		
Observations	354	354	504	504	342	342	490	490		
Control Mean of Dep. Var.	17.54 Yes	20.98 Yes	19.78 Yes	13.94 Yes	11.16 Yes	9.87 Yes	8.09 Yes	5.22 Yes		
School FE										

*** p<0.001, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

Notes: This table examines whether social desirability bias explains treatment effects on misperceptions. The main coefficients of interest are the interaction terms: “*High Social Desirability \times Voluntary*” and “*High Social Desirability \times Randomized*”. *High Social Desirability* is a dummy equal to 1 if a participant’s baseline social desirability score (based on the Crowne and Marlowe scale) is at or above the sample median. The outcome variables are misperceptions (in percentage points) about boys’ and girls’ beliefs regarding the two masculinity statements, measured immediately after treatment (Panel A) and three weeks later (Panel B). All regressions include school fixed effects. Standard errors are clustered at the classroom levels.

Table B14: Control Girls Who Have At Least One Treated Girl Friend Have Smaller Misperceptions About Other Girls' Beliefs 3 Weeks Effects

	Delta: Men Who Cry Are Weak				Delta: Men Should Violence to Get Respect			
	Boys		Girls		Boys		Girls	
	To Boys	To Girls	To Boys	To Girls	To Boys	To Girls	To Boys	To Girls
Panel A: Boy-Friends Controls								
Has Any Treated Boy Friends	-6.279 (18.238)	6.188 (9.221)	13.410 (9.597)	-8.455 (12.470)	9.399 (11.842)	2.743 (8.436)	-8.655 (9.996)	2.578 (7.669)
Number of Boy Friends	-1.412 (5.233)	-1.252 (4.575)	1.154 (3.488)	3.124 (2.343)	-3.748 (5.262)	-2.206 (5.726)	2.425 (3.028)	-3.082 (4.492)
Panel B: Girl-Friends Controls								
Has Any Treated Girl Friends	2.879 (12.522)	6.909 (13.350)	3.814 (11.529)	-5.714 (8.290)	0.734 (11.905)	1.814 (11.551)	-5.884 (8.803)	-10.802 (7.172)
Number of Girl Friends	2.758 (7.281)	-4.315 (6.623)	-3.495 (4.331)	0.472 (4.101)	-1.750 (7.590)	-2.829 (6.591)	1.668 (1.959)	3.027 (2.151)
Panel C: Any-Friends Controls								
Has Any Treated Friends	-0.920 (35.365)	7.364 (17.935)	9.595 (11.295)	-5.737 (6.890)	3.485 (23.957)	-11.883 (19.143)	-5.603 (10.260)	-14.292* (7.707)
Number of Friends	0.025 (3.923)	-1.718 (3.232)	-0.113 (2.355)	0.778 (2.018)	-3.255 (3.164)	-3.181 (3.539)	1.040 (1.198)	0.313 (1.797)
Observations	110	110	159	159	107	107	154	154
Dep. Var. Mean	-1.65	-3.16	-5.29	-8.99	5.15	3.29	-2.66	-0.09
School FE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

Notes: This table presents regression coefficients among control participants which estimate whether having a treated friend impacts their change in misperceptions between the follow-up survey immediately after and the one 3 weeks after the discussions. The dependent variables are the percentage point difference in the misperceptions about crying (Columns 1-4) and violence (Columns 5-8) between the 3-week and the immediate follow-up surveys. *Has Any Treated Boy Friends*, *Has Any Treated Girl Friends*, and *Has Any Treated Friends* are a dummy equal to 1 if the participant listed at least one treated boy, one treated girl, or either one treated boy or a treated girl as someone they spent the most time with in the last two weeks. *Number Boy Friends*, *Number of Girl Friends*, *Number of Friends* are the total number of boys, girls, or boys and girls listed as someone they spent the most time with in the last two weeks. All regressions include school fixed effects. Standard errors clustered at the school-classroom level.

Table B15: Discussion Groups Make Boys' First-Order Beliefs Less Masculine Immediately and Three Weeks After

	Men Who Cry Are Weak		Men Should Use Violence	
	Boys	Girls	Boys	Girls
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Panel A: School Endline - Immediately After Treatment				
<i>Voluntary</i>	-0.038** (0.017)	-0.029*** (0.010)	-0.014 (0.028)	-0.021 (0.018)
<i>Randomized</i>	-0.048*** (0.016)	-0.021* (0.011)	-0.036 (0.033)	0.012 (0.020)
Observations	1,095	1,154	1,095	1,154
School FE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Control Mean of Dep. Var.	0.09	0.04	0.20	0.06
P-Value: $\beta_{Voluntary} = \beta_{Randomized}$	0.52	0.28	0.48	0.12
Panel B: Whatsapp Endline - 3 Weeks After Treatment				
<i>Voluntary</i>	-0.011 (0.025)	-0.001 (0.011)	-0.027 (0.057)	0.031 (0.021)
<i>Randomized</i>	-0.044* (0.025)	0.008 (0.013)	-0.107** (0.046)	0.003 (0.021)
Observations	375	529	375	529
School FE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Control Mean of Dep. Var.	0.08	0.01	0.19	0.04
P-Value: $\beta_{Voluntary} = \beta_{Randomized}$	0.11	0.50	0.10	0.22

*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

Notes: This table presents regressions of an indicator for whether participants' agreed with the statements "men who cry are weak" (Columns 1 and 2) and "men should use violence to get respect if necessary" (Column 3 and 4) at endline 1 (Panel A) and endline 2 (Panel B) on treatment status dummies. Regressions include school fixed effects and baseline values of the dependent variables. Standard errors are clustered at the classroom level.

Table B16: Discussions With Friends Do Not Change Boys' Masculinity Beliefs

	Men Who Cry Are Weak		Men Should Use Violence	
	Boys	Girls	Boys	Girls
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
<i>Treated</i>	-0.028 (0.040)	-0.058* (0.029)	0.063 (0.054)	-0.025 (0.039)
Observations	167	192	167	192
School FE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Control Mean of Dep. Var	0.12	0.07	0.13	0.06

*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

Notes: This table presents regressions of each dependent variable on an indicator for treatment status in Experiment 2. The dependent variable in Columns (1) and (2) is a dummy equals to 1 if the respondent agrees with the belief , and 0 otherwise. The dependent variable in Columns (3) and (4) is a dummy equals to 1 if the respondent agrees with the belief , and 0 otherwise. Participants were randomly assigned to answer these questions either before (*Treated*=0) or after (*Treated*=1) participating in a discussion about masculinity with friends. Columns (1) and (3) show results for boys, while Columns (2) and (4) show results for girls. All regressions include school fixed effects. Standard errors are clustered at the classroom level.

Table B17: Discussion Group Has No Effects on Boys' Self-Reported Behaviors

	Was Involved in Physical Fight	Cried In Front of a Friend	Had a Deep Talk
		(1)	(2)
<i>Voluntary</i>	-0.009 (0.035)	0.023 (0.049)	0.076 (0.066)
<i>Randomized</i>	0.013 (0.042)	0.015 (0.050)	0.008 (0.064)
Observations	334	334	334
School FE	Yes	Yes	Yes
Control Mean of Dep. Var	0.10	0.15	0.34
P-Value: $\beta_{Voluntary} = \beta_{Randomized}$	0.60	0.89	0.29

*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

Notes: Outcomes are a dummy variable indicating whether over the last 3 weeks the student: was involved in a physical fight, including e.g. slaps, kicks, and punches (Column 1); cried in front of a friend (Column 2); had a deep conversation with a friend about their personal life or insecurities (Column 3). All regressions include school fixed effects. Standard errors clustered at the school-classroom level.

Table B18: Discussion Group Has No Effects on Boys' Peer-Reported Behaviors

	Negative Behaviors			Positive Behaviors			
	Inappropriate Language	Violence	Negative Average	Non-Conflict Resolution	Sensitive	Respectful to Girls	Positive Average
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
Panel A: All Reporters							
<i>Voluntary</i>	-0.052*	0.043**	-0.004	-0.001	0.012	-0.042**	-0.010
	(0.029)	(0.021)	(0.022)	(0.018)	(0.019)	(0.018)	(0.013)
<i>Randomized</i>	-0.025	0.014	-0.006	0.009	0.018	-0.022	0.002
	(0.026)	(0.019)	(0.018)	(0.024)	(0.018)	(0.022)	(0.015)
Observations	1,043	1,043	1,043	1,043	1,043	1,043	1,043
School FE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Control Mean Dep. Var	0.50	0.18	0.34	0.33	0.23	0.74	0.43
P-Value: $\beta_{Voluntary} = \beta_{Randomized}$	0.31	0.10	0.93	0.63	0.73	0.33	0.35
Panel B: Control Reporters							
<i>Voluntary</i>	0.007	0.052*	0.030	-0.005	-0.050*	-0.019	-0.025
	(0.035)	(0.028)	(0.028)	(0.033)	(0.028)	(0.028)	(0.020)
<i>Randomized</i>	0.003	-0.009	-0.003	-0.046	-0.014	-0.048	-0.036
	(0.039)	(0.027)	(0.026)	(0.033)	(0.031)	(0.033)	(0.023)
Observations	574	574	574	574	574	574	574
School FE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Control Mean of Dep. Var	0.54	0.19	0.37	0.32	0.26	0.74	0.44
P-Value: $\beta_{Voluntary} = \beta_{Randomized}$	0.93	0.07	0.31	0.39	0.30	0.51	0.70

*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

Notes: Each outcome corresponds to the share (number of reported behaviors/number of times a student could have been reported) a student was reported on each behavior over the last 3 weeks: used inappropriate language to communicate to other students, such as cursing and profanity (Column 1); committed any form of physical aggression against another student, such as slaps, punches or kicks (Column 2); helped resolve a conflict in a non-violent way (Column 4); demonstrated to be a sensitive person (Column 5); was respectful towards girls (Column 6). Column 3 and Column 7 are, respectively, the average share across negative behaviors and positive behaviors. All regressions include school fixed effects. Standard errors clustered at the school-classroom level.

Table B19: Discussion Group Make Students' Hypothetical Behaviors Less Masculine

	Would Act Masculine		It's Right to Act Masculine		Peers Would Support Acting Masculine	
	Boys	Girls	Boys	Girls	Boys	Girls
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Voluntary	-0.329*** (0.065)	-0.202*** (0.056)	-0.243*** (0.076)	-0.139** (0.055)	-0.157** (0.078)	-0.336*** (0.078)
Randomized	-0.156** (0.074)	-0.246*** (0.068)	-0.182* (0.095)	-0.115* (0.060)	-0.114 (0.076)	-0.322*** (0.073)
Observations	1,095	1,154	1,095	1,154	1,095	1,154
School FE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
P-Value: $\beta_{Voluntary} = \beta_{Randomized}$	0.02	0.50	0.44	0.65	0.48	0.83

*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

Notes: At the survey immediately after the discussions in Experiment 1, I presented students with three vignettes (See Appendix C.2.2 for the verbatim description of the vignettes). The first one describes a situation in which a boy is afraid of showing their feelings to their other male friends for fearing social sanctions. The second one shows a boy who reacts with violence (e.g. a punch) after their friend refused to lend him a pen. Finally, the last one depicts a girl making a decision on whether to date or not a sensitive boy. For each vignette, I ask students whether they agree or disagree with three dimensions: (i) self-reported behaviours: whether they would act masculine, (ii) normative behaviours: whether they think the masculine behaviour was right, and (iii) school norms: whether their school peers would support acting masculine. This table presents regressions of an index, standardized by the control mean and standard deviation, within each of these three dimensions. Negative coefficients mean treated students become less supportive of masculine behaviours.

Table B20: Discussion Groups Do Not Make Adolescents More Likely to Post Positive Masculinity Message on Instagram

	Posted Positive Masculinity Message	
	Boys	Girls
	(1)	(2)
<i>Voluntary</i>	0.066 (0.062)	0.010 (0.042)
<i>Randomized</i>	-0.035 (0.053)	0.027 (0.050)
Observations	218	352
School FE	Yes	Yes
Control Mean of Dep. Var	0.08	0.13
P-Value: $\beta_{Voluntary} = \beta_{Randomized}$	0.06	0.69

*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

Notes: This table presents regressions of public support for a positive masculinity message on treatment status dummies. The dependent variable in Columns (1) and (2) equals 1 if the participant actually posted the image on Instagram (verified through screenshots uploaded to the survey), and 0 otherwise. *Voluntary* indicates participants who volunteered to join the discussion group, while *Randomized* indicates participants who were randomly assigned to the discussion group. See Appendix C.2.2 for a verbatim description of these outcomes. All regressions include school fixed effects. The regressions exclude 97 boys and 112 girls who declared not having Instagram. Standard errors are clustered at the school-classroom level.

Table B21: Discussions With Friends Do Not Change Boys' Self-Reported Behaviors

	Support Others	Anti-Bullying Agent
	(1)	(2)
<i>Treated</i>	0.060 (0.057)	-0.008 (0.069)
Observations	167	167
School FE	Yes	Yes
Control Mean of Dep. Var	0.50	0.62

*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

Notes: This table presents regressions of each dependent variable on an indicator for treatment status in Experiment 2. The dependent variable in Column (1) is a dummy equals to 1 if the respondent is willing to serve as support for other boys at school, and 0 otherwise. The dependent variable in Column (2) is a dummy equals to 1 if the respondent is willing to be an anti-bullying agent, and 0 otherwise. See Appendix C.2.4 for the verbatim description of these outcomes. Participants were randomly assigned to answer these questions either before (*Treated*=0) or after (*Treated*=1) participating in a discussion about masculinity with friends. All regressions include school fixed effects. Standard errors are clustered at the classroom level.

Table B22: Masculinity Discussion Do Not Change Boys' Social Image Concerns

	Last Cried	Last Violent	Joy of Destruction
	(1)	(2)	(3)
<i>Public</i>	0.129 (0.129)	0.071 (0.107)	0.083 (0.120)
<i>Voluntary</i>	0.070 (0.117)	-0.036 (0.104)	0.071 (0.116)
<i>Randomized</i>	-0.045 (0.110)	0.079 (0.116)	0.054 (0.107)
<i>Public</i> \times <i>Voluntary</i>	-0.226 (0.172)	-0.031 (0.161)	-0.212 (0.165)
<i>Public</i> \times <i>Randomized</i>	-0.076 (0.158)	-0.141 (0.148)	-0.017 (0.156)
Observations	1,095	1,095	1,095
School FE	Yes	Yes	Yes
P-Value: $\beta_{PublicXVoluntary} = \beta_{PublicXRandomized}$	0.39	0.74	0.22
P-Value: $\beta_{Public} + \beta_{PublicXVoluntary} = 0$	0.21	0.68	0.28
P-Value: $\beta_{Public} + \beta_{PublicXRandomized} = 0$	0.61	0.51	0.55

*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

Notes: This table presents regressions of each dependent variable (see Appendix C.2.2 for a description) – standardized by the control group mean and standard deviation – on an indicator for whether participants' answers were public in the survey experiment, were treated in the *Voluntary* or Randomized treatments, and an interaction term between them. *Last Cried* (*Violent*) are scores from 0 to 5, in which larger values mean they have cried further away in time (been violent more recently). *Joy of Destruction* is a score from 0 to 5, in which 0 means participants will not remove any money from the winner, and 5 means they will remove all the money. Standard errors are clustered at the classroom level.

Online Appendix C: Supplementary Materials

C.1 Consent Process

I visited the 25 participating schools to discuss the study purposes, schedule the study day, obtain the list of students from participating classes, and hand the parental consent and assent forms to principals. I instructed principals to deliver the consent forms to students at least one week prior to the scheduled study day, and I sent reminders to guarantee they followed this timeline. I obtained parental consent in an opt-out way: parents had to sign the form to withhold consent. Otherwise, consent was assumed. The consent forms communicated to parents and students that this study aimed to understand how the societal expectations around boys' behaviors are formed.

C.2 Survey Structure

This section presents the survey questions included in Experiments 1 and 2. I outline the questions in the same order as participants responded to it and I highlight when the question was only asked in either one of the experiments. Participants self-administered the questionnaire privately in individual tablets I provided, using Qualtrics offline. If they had questions, they could raise their hands and a member of the study team would assist them. All questions were mandatory.

C.2.1 Baseline Survey

Identification. Respondents selected their school, classroom ID, and name from a dropdown list.

Demographics. Respondents indicated their age, sex (male or female), race, religion and who they live with.

What Talks To Friends About.

What do you usually talk to your friends about? Select all that apply.

Girls; Boys; Sports; Games; Things you saw online; Jokes, Your personal life; Things or situations that made you sad; School-related topics; Other (open text box)

Talks About Feelings (Experiment 1 Only).

Do you usually talk to your friends about your feelings or personal problems? Yes; No

Heard About How Men Should Behave (Experiment 2 Only).

Have you ever heard that a man or a boy should or should not behave in a certain way only for being a man or a boy? Yes; No

[IF YES]

Who did you hear that from

Mother; Father; Grandmother; Grandfather; Older brother; Older sister; Younger brother; Younger sister; Another older family member; Another younger family member; My male friends from school; My female friends from school; My male friends from outside of school; My female friends from outside of school

Talks About Masculinity.

Do you usually talk to your friends about what society expects of men? Yes; No

[IF YES - EXPERIMENT 2 ONLY]

Who do you usually talk to about this

Mother; Father; Grandmother; Grandfather; Older brother; Older sister; Younger brother; Younger sister; Another older family member; Another younger family member; My male friends from school; My female friends from school; My male friends from outside of school; My female friends from outside of school

And what exactly you talk about? [OPEN TEXT BOX]

[IF NO - EXPERIMENT 2 ONLY]

And why you do not talk about it? [OPEN TEXT BOX]

Emotional Support (Experiment 1 Only).

For boys: *Would you like more emotional support from your male friends? Yes; No*

For girls: *Would you like more emotional support from your female friends? Yes; No*

Importance Given To Popularity (Experiment 1 Only).

For you, how important it is to be popular at your school?

Very important; Important; Somewhat Important; Sometimes Important; Nothing Important

Influentiality (Experiment 1 Only).

Indicate how much you are influenced by:

[SHOWN IN RANDOM ORDER, BUT ALL IN THE SAME SCREEN]

- the girls from your school
- the boys from your school

Very influenced; Influenced; A little influenced; Not influenced at all

Vocality, Popularity, Admiration Scores. I asked respondents to nominate those that were more vocal in class (Experiment 1 only), that they spent the most time with in the last two weeks, and that they admire the most (Experiment 1 only). I inputted students' name from each classroom to the survey, based on the student list I received from principals a few days before the study day. If a person did not want to indicate anyone, they could raise their hands and a team member would write down their school, class, and name so I could remove their answers for this specific question. The respondent could not select themselves. In addition, since I received the student list before the study day, respondents could select names for students that did not participate in the study. See below for the exact wording of each question.

Vocality question (Experiment 1 only).

Select the 5 people from your class at school who participate the most in class by expressing their opinions

[LIST WITH STUDENTS' NAMES IN THE SAME CLASS AS THE RESPONDENT]

I calculate a **Vocality Score**, which is the number of times a respondent was nominated by other students in this question.

Popularity question (Experiment 1 only).

Select at least 2 people from your class at school with whom you spent the most time this past week, both inside and outside of school

[LIST WITH STUDENTS' NAMES IN THE SAME CLASS AS THE RESPONDENT]

I calculate a **Popularity Score**, which is the number of times a respondent was nominated by other students in this question.

Admiration question.

Select at least 2 people from your class at school that you admire the most

[LIST WITH STUDENTS' NAMES IN THE SAME CLASS AS THE RESPONDENT]

I calculate an **Admiration Score**, which is the number of times a respondent was nominated by other students in this question.

Masculinity Beliefs.

Indicate below whether you agree or disagree with each of the following statements

[STATEMENTS SHOWN IN RANDOM ORDER, BUT ALL IN THE SAME SCREEN]

In my opinion, men who cry are weak

In my opinion, men should use violence to get respect if necessary

In Experiment 2, I randomized respondents into answering to this question before or after the masculinity discussion.

Masculinity Score. I used the following statements from the Meanings of Adolescence Masculinity Scale ([Oransky and Fisher 2009](#)).

For each statement below, please indicate whether you agree or disagree.

[STATEMENTS SHOWN IN RANDOM ORDER, BUT ALL IN THE SAME SCREEN]

- *No matter what happens, a guy should seem strong to others*
- *Guys should try to appear manly in almost all situations*
- *It is weird for a guy to talk about his feelings with other guys*
- *It is hard to respect a guy who shows his feelings*

To calculate the masculinity score, I average across all the statements, coding 1 as agree and 0 as disagree.

Social Desirability Score. I used the following questions from the ([Crowne and Marlowe, 1960](#)) social desirability scale.

For each statement below, indicate whether they are true or false for you.

[STATEMENTS SHOWN IN RANDOM ORDER, BUT ALL IN THE SAME SCREEN]

- *No matter who I am talking to, I am always a good listener*
- *I am always willing to admit when I make a mistake* [reverse coded]
- *There have times when I was quite jealous of the good fortune of others*
- *I sometimes think when people have a misfortune they only got what they deserve* [reverse coded]

To calculate the social desirability score, I average across all the statements, meaning the higher the score the more likely to provide socially desirable answers.

Discussion Impressions.

Now, we're going to ask you to talk to your friends about your opinions on what society expects from a man.

Before starting the conversation, please silently answer the questions below:

- *How interested are you in hearing the other person's responses on the above topic?* Answers from 0-not at all interested to 10-very interested, in increments of 1
- *How comfortable do you think you will feel during this conversation?* Answers from 0-not at all comfortable to 10-very comfortable, in increments of 1
- *Do you think your connection with the other people in your group will change after this conversation?* A lot less connected; Less connected; Connection will not change; More connected; A lot more connected

C.2.2 Immediate Endline Survey - Experiment 1

Second-Order Beliefs.

At the end of the questionnaire you previously answered, you indicated whether you agreed or disagreed with the statements "men who cry are weak" and "men should use violence to be respected when necessary" All the other people in your class at school also indicated whether they agreed or disagreed with these statements.

Now, we ask you to guess what percentage of the boys and girls in your class at school you think agreed with each of these statements in the previous questionnaire. Remember that 0% indicates that nobody agreed and 100% indicates that everyone agreed.

- *Drag the bar to indicate the percentage of boys from your class that you think agreed with "men who cry are weak" in the questionnaire before the discussion*
- *Drag the bar to indicate the percentage of girls from your class that you think agreed with "men who cry are weak" in the questionnaire before the discussion*
- *Drag the bar to indicate the percentage of boys from your class that you think agreed with "men should use violence to get respect if necessary" in the questionnaire before the discussion*

- Drag the bar to indicate the percentage of girls from your class that you think agreed with "men should use violence to get respect if necessary" in the questionnaire before the discussion

Masculinity Beliefs.

Indicate below whether you agree or disagree with each of the following statements

[STATEMENTS SHOWN IN RANDOM ORDER, BUT ALL IN THE SAME SCREEN]

In my opinion, men who cry are weak

In my opinion, men should use violence to get respect if necessary

Vignettes.

In the next pages, you will read three short stories about hypothetical situations that could happen in your school. You will then answer to some questions about these stories.

[THE ORDER OF THE VIGNETTES BELOW WAS RANDOMIZED]

Vignette 1.

“João is a boy your age from another school in the neighborhood.

One day at school, João asked Diego to borrow a pen, and Diego refused.

João got angry and punched Diego.”

Please answer whether you agree or disagree with each of the statements below, based on João’s story. There is no right or wrong answer. Respond according to what you believe.

- *I would act the same way as João*
- *I think João did the right thing by punching Diego*
- *People from my school would judge João’s behavior as wrong*

Vignette 2.

“Pedro is a boy your age from another school in the neighborhood.

He is a very sensitive boy. He has two best friends with whom he would like to share his insecurities and sometimes even feels like crying in front of these friends when he is sad.

However, he prefers to hold back the tears, as he is afraid that his friends will judge him or make fun of him.”

Please answer whether you agree or disagree with each of the statements below, based on João’s story. There is no right or wrong answer. Respond according to what you believe.

- *I would act the same way as Pedro and would not cry in front of my friends*
- *I think Pedro did the right thing by not crying in front of their friends*
- *At my school, Pedro would be teased by his friends if he cried in front of them*

Vignette 3.

“Carlos is a boy your age from another school in the neighborhood.

He is a very sensitive person and sometimes cries when other boys bother him at school. Carlos likes Julia, a girl from his class.

However, he prefers to hold back the tears, as he is afraid that his friends will judge him or make fun of him.”

However, Julia sees Carlos as a weak person because he cries and doesn’t want to get romantically involved with him because of that.

- *I would act the same way as Julia*
- *I think Julia is right not to get involved with Carlos because he cries*
- *At my school, people would support Julia’s decision not to get involved with Carlos because he cries*

Social Image Concerns.

Public arm: *Please, answer the following questions silently. Your answers **might** be discussed with other people in the room.*

Private arm: *Please, answer the following questions silently. Your answers **will not** be discussed with other people in the room.*

- When was the last time you cried?
- When was the last time you initiated a physical fight, such as slaps, punches, kicks?

Before 1 week ago; Between 1 week and 1 month ago; Between 1 and 3 months ago; Between 3 and 12 months ago; More than 12 months ago; Never

[Joy of destruction game]:

In another survey we are conducting with people your age in the city of Rio, participants play a game in which they win 5 reais if they win.

You will be paired with a winner who won the game, and have the chance to reduce the amount of money they will receive. You won't lose or gain anything by reducing the 5 reais prize.

Please select below how much you want the corresponding winner to receive. Your choice will be implemented by the survey, and the winner will receive the amount of money you selected.

I want the winner to get 5 reais. That is, I do not wish to remove any money from them; I want the winner to get 4 reais. That is, I want to remove 1 real from them; I want the winner to get 3 reais. That is, I want to remove 2 reais from them; I want the winner to get 2 reais. That is, I want to remove 3 reais from them, I want the winner to get 1 reais. That is, I want to remove 4 reais from them; I want the winner to get 0 real. That is, I want to remove 5 reais from them

C.2.3 WhatsApp Endline Survey (3 Weeks Later) - Experiment 1

Second-Order Beliefs and Masculinity Beliefs: Asked in the same way as described in Appendix C.2.2.

Self-Reported Behaviors.

The next questions are about your behaviors in the last 3 weeks. Your answers are confidential and will not be shared in any way that could identify you.

- In the last 3 weeks, have you been involved in any physical fights, such as slapping, kicking, or punching? Yes; No
- In the last 3 weeks, have you cried in front of any friend? Yes; No

- In the last 3 weeks, have you had a deep conversation with a friend about your personal life or insecurities? Yes; No

Peer-Reported Behaviors. I presented boys and girls with the names of 3 randomly selected boys who participated in each one of the discussion groups within their classroom (a total of 6 names, excluding their own), and asked:

In the next few pages, the names of some classmates from your school will be presented to you. You will be asked to answer some questions about the behaviors of these people. All your answers are confidential and will only be used for the purposes of this research.

[LOOPING OVER PEERS 1 TO 6]

Indicate whether in the last 3 weeks, has the student [PEER NAME]:

[QUESTION SHOWN IN RANDOM ORDER WITHIN EACH RESPONDENT]

- Used inappropriate language to refer to or communicate with other students, such as insults and swear words? Yes; No
- Committed any act of physical aggression against another student at the school, such as slapping, punching, or kicking? Yes; No
- Helped resolve any conflicts in a non-violent manner? Yes; No
- Showed to be a sensitive person? Yes; No
- Been respectful to the girls at school? Yes; No

Instagram Post.

Now, we would like you to post the image below on your Instagram story or feed.

You should then upload a screenshot to confirm that you posted the image. You MUST NOT mention participation in this survey.

From your phone, you can save the image by pressing it and clicking on the "Save Image" option.

- I want to post this image on my Instagram and I'll upload a screenshot to confirm that I posted it
- I don't want to post this picture on my Instagram
- I do not have Instagram

[IF ANSWERED IT WOULD POST THE IMAGE ON INSTAGRAM]

Please upload a screenshot of your Instagram to show that you posted the image on your story or feed.

Instagram Figure To Be Uploaded



Notes. This figure shows a message in Portuguese that reads "HOMEM NÃO CHORA!" with "NÃO" crossed out and "TAMBÉM" written in red. This translates to English as "MEN DON'T CRY!" with "DON'T" crossed out and "ALSO" written in red.

C.2.4 Outcome Measures - Experiment 2

In Experiment 2, I randomized participants into responding to the *second-order beliefs, masculinity beliefs* and *self-reported behaviors* below before or after the masculinity discussions, stratified by sex. An exception is the question on *discussion impression*, which everyone responded before and after to gauge predicted versus realized impressions.

Second-Order Beliefs.

Now, we ask you to guess what percentage of the boys and girls in your class at school you think agreed with each of these statements in the previous questionnaire. Remember that 0% indicates that nobody agreed and 100% indicates that everyone agreed.

- *Drag the bar to indicate the percentage of boys from your class that you think agree with "men who cry are weak"*
- *Drag the bar to indicate the percentage of girls from your class that you think agree with "men who cry are weak"*
- *Drag the bar to indicate the percentage of boys from your class that you think agree with "men should use violence to get respect if necessary"*
- *Drag the bar to indicate the percentage of girls from your class that you think agreed with "men should use violence to get respect if necessary"*

Masculinity Beliefs.

Indicate below whether you agree or disagree with each of the following statements

[STATEMENTS SHOWN IN RANDOM ORDER, BUT ALL IN THE SAME SCREEN]

In my opinion, men who cry are weak

In my opinion, men should use violence to get respect if necessary

Self-Reported Behaviors.

Would you be willing to serve as support for other boys at your school? If yes, your name may be publicly disclosed at the school so everyone knows they can talk to you when they need help. Yes; No

Sometimes, people at school bully others. For example, they call others bad names or even commit physical violence like pushes and pinches. Would you be willing to defend your schoolmates when a case of bullying happens? If yes, your name may be publicly disclosed at the school so everyone knows you will report to the administration when a bullying case happens. Yes; No

Discussion Impressions.

[NOT RANDOMIZED-SHOWN TO EVERYONE]

Now, we're going to ask you to talk to your friends about your opinions on what society expects from a man.

Before starting the conversation, please silently answer the questions below:

- How interesting was it for you to hear others' opinions in your discussion group? Answers from 0-not at all interesting to 10-very interesting, in increments of 1
- How comfortable did you feel during this conversation? Answers from 0-not at all comfortable to 10-very comfortable, in increments of 1
- Do you think your connection with the other people in your group will change after your conversation? A lot less connected; Less connected; Connection will not change; More connected; A lot more connected

C.3 Experiment 1 Discussion Script

The mediators followed the script below in the Voluntary **[Randomized]** discussions.

Hi everyone, good morning/afternoon! First, thank you for taking the time to complete this survey. We are now going to start a conversation where I want to hear your views about some of the questions asked at the end of the survey. I want to remind you this is a safe space, in which you can express your opinions without being judged by me or your peers. I ask that the peers be respectful and do not interrupt whoever is speaking.

To put some order in the discussion, people who want to speak should raise their hands [I will call out some students to speak up].

Calls the first boy who raises his hand [Calls first boy in the randomized student list]

Do you agree that “men who cry are weak”? Can you explain or give an example of why you believe this?

Do you agree that “men should use violence to be respected when necessary”? Can you explain or give an example of why you believe this?

And so on...

Important notes

- The idea is NOT for everyone to talk. Only a few people will voice their opinion, but we don't need to communicate this to them.
- Each group should have around 15 people, and a maximum of 6 people should participate in the discussion, alternating 1 boy and 1 girl.

- *The idea of the discussion is to be a focus group, so the mediator (or anyone else in the room) should NOT be judgmental. We want to know what THEY think, and why!*

C.4 Experiment 2 Discussion Script

Respondents read the instructions below in their tablets, upon completing the baseline survey. Research assistants walked around the classroom making sure they had understood the instructions and were allocated to a group.

We will now ask you to talk with your friends about your views on what society expects from a man! We ask that you organize yourselves in groups of about 5 people. Specifically, we want you to discuss:

Whether you agree or disagree with the phrase "men who cry are weak". You can explain why through examples and personal experiences.

Whether you agree or disagree with the phrase "men should use violence to be respected when necessary". You can explain why through examples and personal experiences.

Remember that there is not a right or wrong answer. RESPECT AND LISTEN to the opinion of your other friend(s)!