

Average-Size Erect Penis: Fiction, Fact, and the Need for Counseling

Bruce M. King

To cite this article: Bruce M. King (2021) Average-Size Erect Penis: Fiction, Fact, and the Need for Counseling, Journal of Sex & Marital Therapy, 47:1, 80-89, DOI: [10.1080/0092623X.2020.1787279](https://doi.org/10.1080/0092623X.2020.1787279)

To link to this article: <https://doi.org/10.1080/0092623X.2020.1787279>



© 2020 The Author(s). Published with license by Taylor & Francis Group, LLC



Published online: 15 Jul 2020.



Submit your article to this journal [↗](#)



Article views: 69468



View related articles [↗](#)



View Crossmark data [↗](#)

Average-Size Erect Penis: Fiction, Fact, and the Need for Counseling

Bruce M. King



Department of Psychology, Clemson University, Clemson, SC, USA

ABSTRACT

Most men believe that the average length of an erect penis is greater than 6 inches (15.24 cm). This belief is due, in part, to several often-cited studies that relied on self-reported measurements, with means of about 6.2 inches (15.75 cm) for heterosexual men and even greater for gay men. These studies suffered from both volunteer bias and social desirability bias. In this review, the combined mean for 10 studies in which researchers took measurements of erect penises was 5.36 inches (13.61 cm; $n = 1,629$). For 21 studies in which researchers measured stretched penises, the mean was approximately 5.11 inches (12.98 cm; $n = 13,719$). Based on these studies, the average length of an erect penis is between 5.1 and 5.5 inches (12.95–13.97 cm), but after taking volunteer bias into account, it is probably toward the lower end of this range. Studies show that a majority of men wish they were larger, with some choosing penile lengthening surgery. These surgeries are considered by the American Urological Association to be risky. Most men seeking surgery have normal sized penises. Counseling with factual information about penis size might be effective in alleviating concerns for the majority of men who worry about having a small penis.

Studies find that many men have concerns that their penis is not large enough and that they are smaller relative to other men (Johnston, McLellan, & McKinlay, 2014; Lee, 1996; Lever, Frederick, & Peplau, 2006; Morrison, Bearden, Ellis, & Harriman, 2005; Tiggemann, Martins, & Churchett, 2008). They equate penis size with sexual competence and masculinity (Morrison et al., 2005; Tiggemann et al., 2008; Wylie & Eardley, 2007). As a result, 45–68.3% of men wish they had a larger penis (Lever et al., 2006; Tiggemann et al., 2008). Most men believe that the average erect penis is over 6 inches (15.24 cm) in length, and for many their ideal penis length is considerably longer than that (Johnston et al., 2014).

This paper reviews all known studies of measurements of erect or stretched penis length. The review includes 10 studies that relied on self-reported measurements, 11 studies in which researchers measured erect penises, and 22 studies in which researchers measured stretched penises (see Table 1). Only studies of abnormalities of the penis, or of children, were excluded. The purpose of not excluding other studies is two-fold: (1) to point out the methodological flaws in many studies that contributed to men's false beliefs that the average-size erect penis is 6+ inches (15.24+ cm) in length, and (2) based on better conducted studies, to estimate within a small range of values the actual mean length of an erect penis. By including flawed studies, therapists may better address false beliefs by clients based on those studies. The primary sources for the review were Medline and Social Sciences with Full Text (1975 to present), using "penis" as the key search word.

CONTACT Bruce King  bking2@clemson.edu  Department of Psychology, Clemson University, 418 Brackett Hall, Clemson, SC 29634, USA

© 2020 The Author(s). Published with license by Taylor & Francis Group, LLC

This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>), which permits non-commercial re-use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited, and is not altered, transformed, or built upon in any way.

Studies of penis length that relied on self-reports

There are several influences on men's beliefs about penis size. These include a focus on the penis throughout history as the symbol of masculinity (Friedman, 2001), the popular media (Lehman, 1993; Owen & Campbell, 2018), pornography and erotic literature with their emphasis on large penises (Brennan, 2018; Cranney, 2015; Mondaini et al., 2002; Sharp & Oates, 2019; Zilbergeld, 1978, pp. 21–31), and in recent years, science.

It began with data collected by Alfred Kinsey and colleagues (Kinsey, Pomeroy, & Martin, 1948), who asked men to measure the length of their erect penis (on the top from the abdomen to the tip) and then mail the results to the researchers. Kinsey did not include these data in his 1948 book. Colleagues at the Kinsey Institute later published frequency distributions for the data (Gebhard & Johnson, 1979), and in 1988 Jamison and Gebhard published descriptive statistics for 2,770 Caucasian men aged 20–59. The mean erect length was 6.21 inches (15.77 cm).

Three studies published in the 1990s that also relied on self-reported measurements seemed to confirm the Kinsey Institute data. Richters, Gerofi, and Donovan (1995) found a mean length of 6.299 inches (16.0 cm; $n = 156$), Smith, Jolley, Hocking, Benton, and Gerofi (1998) found a mean length of 6.185 inches (15.71 cm; $n = 194$), and Bogaert and Hershberger (1999) reported a mean length of 6.14 inches (15.6 cm) for heterosexual men ($n = 3,417$). In two studies for which homosexual men self-reported their erect penis lengths the mean lengths were even greater: 6.46 inches (16.41 cm), $n = 813$ (Bogaert & Hershberger, 1999) and 6.52 inches (16.56 cm), $n = 118$ (Coxon, 1996). The myth had begun. In a 2014 study, men were asked to estimate the average length of an erect penis; the mean estimate was 6.22 inches (15.8 cm) (Johnston et al., 2014).

There are some major problems with men's self-reports of erect penis length. First, it is likely that self-reports are unreliable, as low test-retest reliability was found even when gay men's sexual partners took the measurements (Harding & Golombok, 2002). Second, for several studies there was a likely possibility of volunteer bias. For example, in the Kinsey Institute study only about one-half of the men surveyed agreed to participate and return (by mail) their penile measurements (Jamison & Gebhard, 1988). In another study in which 64.8% of gay and bisexual men self-reported erect penis lengths of 6 to 10+ inches (15.24 to 25.4+ cm), the researchers obtained their sample by approaching men as they walked by a booth on the street (Groves, Wells, & Parsons, 2013). Even studies that did not rely on self-reports sometimes had obvious volunteer bias. One study recruited 81 volunteers from newspaper advertisements and gay naturist meetings to have their erect penises photographed with a background measurement scale (Sparling, 1997). Participants in sex surveys tend to be more sexually liberal and permissive, and less sexually inhibited than individuals who choose not to participate (see Catania, Gibson, Chitwood, & Coates, 1990). Could it be that men who agree to report the size of their penis have larger penises than those who do not volunteer?

Perhaps the most serious concern about the self-reported data is social desirability bias, i.e., “the need of [individuals] to obtain approval by responding in a culturally appropriate manner” (Crowne & Marlowe, 1960, p. 353). Individuals who are influenced by social desirability tend to under-report undesirable behaviors and over-report desirable behaviors and traits (Paulhus, 1984). For example, research in the field of nutrition has relied heavily on self-reported information, but when self-reported energy intake and body weights are compared to factual data (the gold standard) misreporting in a socially desirable direction is found to be pervasive and often extreme (see Archer, Pavea, & Lavie, 2015; Burke & Carman, 2017; Ioannidis, 2013). The degree of misreporting is correlated with social desirability (e.g., Hébert et al., 2001; Scagliusi, Polacow, Artioli, Benatti, & Lancha, 2003; Taren et al., 1999; Toozee et al., 2004).

Sex researchers are rarely able to verify self-reported information with factual data, but there is evidence that social desirability influences some men's self-reports of penis size. In a sample of 130 sexually experienced college men, 30.8% reported erect penis lengths of 7 inches (17.78 cm) or more, and there was a significant correlation between self-reported lengths and social

desirability scores (King, Duncan, Clinkenbeard, Rutland, & Ryan, 2019). Sexual imagery of penises is common in gay culture (Drummond & Filiault, 2007), thus social desirability bias may be another reason (in addition to volunteer bias) that in one study 64.8% of gay and bisexual men self-reported penis lengths of 6 to 10+ inches (15.24 to 25.4+ cm) (Groves et al., 2013). In a study designed to get men to honestly self-report the length of their erect penis, Herbenick, Reece, Schick, and Sanders (2014) asked 1,661 men to measure their erect penis in order to receive condoms that fit them. The mean self-reported length was 5.57 inches (14.15 cm).

Studies in which researchers measured erect penis length

In studies of penis size, most researchers use a standard procedure to measure the length of the dorsal surface (Wessells, Lue, & McAninch, 1996). Nevertheless, there is not a consensus on methodology and some of the difference in results is probably due to procedural differences (see Greenstein, Dekalo, & Chen, 2020). For example, see the discussion by Şengezer, Öztürk, and Deveci (2002) comparing their procedure and results with those of Wessells et al. (1996). Greenstein et al. (2020) have recently made recommendations for future studies of penis size.

In eight studies in which measurements were done by researchers, the mean erect penis lengths were found to be 5.01 inches (12.73 cm; $n = 200$, erections induced by self-stimulation) (Şengezer et al., 2002), 5.07 inches (12.89 cm; $n = 80$, erections induced pharmacologically) (Wessells et al., 1996), 5.09 inches (12.93 cm; $n = 41$, self-stimulation) (Promodu, Shanmughadas, Bhat, & Nair, 2007), 5.35 inches (13.6 cm; $n = 55$, pharmacologically) (Chen, Gefen, Greenstein, Matzkin, & Elad, 2000), 5.41 inches (13.73 cm; $n = 278$, pharmacologically) (Yafi et al., 2018), 5.70 inches (14.48 cm; $n = 111$, self-stimulation) (Schneider, Sperling, Lümmer, Syllwasschy, & Rübber, 2001), 5.71 inches (14.5 cm; $n = 150$, pharmacologically) (da Ros et al., 1994), and 5.92 inches (15.04 cm; $n = 105$, pharmacologically) (Salama, 2018).

Each study reported the mean (sum of the scores divided by sample size) and sample size, thus allowing this author to calculate sum of the scores for each study. Adding sum of the scores and sample size for all eight studies revealed a combined mean for 1020 men of 5.42 inches (13.76 cm).

The calculated combined mean length of 5.42 inches (13.76 cm) excluded three other studies in which researchers took measurements. A study of 309 Korean military men found the mean erect penis length (induced by self-stimulation and pharmacological injection) to be 4.68 inches (11.88 cm) (Park et al., 1998). Near the other extreme, a study of 300 men conducted by Ansell Research (2001) found a mean erect penis length of 5.88 inches (14.98 cm; induced by self-stimulation). This latter study has been criticized for its obvious volunteer bias (Herbenick et al., 2014). The men were at a bar in Cancun and volunteered to have themselves measured. However, even if these two studies are included, the overall combined mean erect penis length (again, taking sample size into account) for 1,629 men is 5.36 inches (13.62 cm). (The study by Sparling, 1997, was excluded because of an unconventional measurement technique.)

In the only study that compared self-reported erect penis length with actual measurements, mean lengths were 5.12 inches (13.01 cm) and 5.09 inches (12.93 cm), respectfully (Promodu et al., 2007). However, in this study, the men likely knew that they would be measured by the researchers and this would have minimized over-reporting (on the self-reports) due to social desirability. Interestingly, in the same study in which men's mean estimate of average penis length was 6.22 inches (15.8 cm), the mean for women's estimate of average erect penis length was 5.29 inches (13.44 cm) (Johnston et al., 2014).

Studies in which researchers measured stretched penises

In 22 studies, researchers measured penis size using a stretch technique, i.e., fully stretching a flaccid penis. However, the stretch technique tends to underestimate full erect length (e.g.,

Habous et al., 2015; Şengezer et al., 2002), and inter-observer variability is about 27% (Habous et al., 2015).

In a study of 3,300 young Italian men (none with abnormalities of the penis), the median length was 4.92 inches (12.5 cm) (Ponchiatti et al., 2001). Ten other studies similarly reported mean stretched lengths of less than 5 inches (12.7 cm) (Chen et al., 2000; Choi et al., 2011; Chrouser et al., 2013; Mehraban, Salehi, & Zayeri, 2007; Promodu et al., 2007; Şengezer et al., 2002; Siminoski & Bain, 1993; Son, Lee, Huh, Kim, & Paick, 2003; Spyropoulos et al., 2002; Wessells et al., 1996), while 10 others reported mean lengths of 5.08 to 5.63 inches (12.9 to 14.3 cm) (Aslan et al., 2011; Awwad et al., 2005; Kamel, Gadalla, Ghanem, & Oraby, 2009; Khan, Somani, Lam, & Donat, 2012; Savoie, Kim, & Soloway, 2003; Schonfeld & Beebe, 1942; Shah & Christopher, 2002; Shalaby, Almohsen, El Shahid, Abd Al-Sameaa, & Mostofa, 2015; Söylemez et al., 2012; Yafi et al., 2018).

In a review of studies using the stretch technique, Dillon, Chama, and Honig (2008) concluded that the maximum stretched length is 5.71 to 5.91 inches (14.5 to 15.01 cm). One study reported a mean length of 6.59 inches (16.74 cm) (Bondil, Costa, Daures, Louis, & Navratil, 1992), but their stretch technique has been criticized by other researchers who used the technique (Wessells et al., 1996; Shah & Christopher, 2002). Excluding this last study, if one assumes that for two studies that reported the median (Ponchiatti et al., 2001; Shah & Christopher, 2002) those values were close to the mean, the overall combined mean stretched length for 13,719 men was 5.11 inches (12.98 cm).

It should be noted that some studies have found a positive correlation between penis length and height (Aslan et al., 2011; Mehraban et al., 2007; Ponchiatti et al., 2001; Promodu et al., 2007; Spyropoulos et al., 2002) and index finger length (Mehraban et al., 2007; Spyropoulos et al., 2002), but there is little to no evidence that penis length is correlated with shoe size (Edward, 2002; Shah & Christopher, 2002). The published studies provide no evidence for differences related to race or sexual orientation (Herbenick et al., 2014; Veale, Miles, Bramley, Muir, & Hodsooll, 2015).

Conclusion

With one exception (Herbenick et al., 2014), the studies of erect penis length that relied on self-reported measurements had serious flaws, most notably volunteer bias and social desirability bias. Some of these studies have no doubt contributed to men's insecurities about penis size and should be dismissed and ignored. In 22 studies, researchers measured stretched penises, thus eliminating social desirability bias, but this technique tends to under-report erect penis size (e.g., Habous et al., 2015; Şengezer et al., 2002). In 11 studies, researchers measured erect penises. However, one used an unconventional technique (Sparling, 1997) and this and another study had obvious volunteer bias (Ansell Research, 2001; Sparling, 1997). Based on the other nine studies, the actual average length of an erect penis is probably between 5.1 and 5.5 inches (12.95 to 13.97 cm).

Recall that among the studies in which researchers measured erect penis length, one of the largest reported means was 5.71 inches (14.5 cm) (da Ros et al., 1994). In that study, only 12% of men had an erect penis longer than 6.3 inches (16.0 cm). In the study in which men self-reported erect penis lengths in order to receive correctly-sized condoms (but there still may have been some over-reporting due to social desirability), only 17% of men had penises that were longer than 6.3 inches (16.0 cm) (Herbenick et al., 2014). Mean erect penis lengths in these two studies were at the high end of the many studies in which measurements could be trusted as accurate. Thus, it is likely that even fewer than 12–17% of men have a penis that measures greater than 6.3 (16.0 cm) inches when erect.

In a previous review of studies of penis size, Veale et al. (2015) cautioned that because many of these studies relied on volunteers there is still the possibility of volunteer bias. That is, men with larger penises might have been more likely to volunteer to be measured than men with smaller penises. If true, the estimated average erect penis length of 5.1 to 5.5 inches (12.95 to 13.97 cm) is likely to be toward the lower end of this range.

For a review of flaccid penis length and circumference, see Veale et al. (2015).

Implications for counseling and surgical intervention

Most men underestimate the size of their penises compared to other men (Lee, 1996; Veale et al., 2016). In a nationally representative sample, only 58% of men were satisfied with the length of their erect penis (Gaither et al., 2017). In another survey of 52,031 heterosexual men, 66% considered their penis to be of average size and only 12% as small, yet 45% wished they were larger (Lever et al., 2006). Another study similarly found that men who believed they had an average-sized penis wished they were larger, with a mean ideal length of 7.27 inches (18.47 cm) (Johnston et al., 2014). As stated by Zilbergeld (1978, p. 23), “It is not much of an exaggeration to say that penises in [men’s] fantasyland come in only three sizes—large, gigantic, and so big you can barely get them through the doorway.”

Sexology clinicians commonly see men who worry that their penis is not big enough (Rosso, Ostacoli, Garbolino, & Furlan, 1998). Genital dissatisfaction is associated with lower sexual activity (Gaither et al., 2017). For many men, the major concern is that their sexual partner might think that they are not large enough (Van Driel, Weijmar Schultz, van de Wiel, & Mensink, 1998; Wylie & Eardley, 2007). One study using 3D images found that women preferred an erect penis length of 6.3–6.4 inches (16.0–16.26 cm) (Prause, Park, Leung, & Miller, 2015), and another study (using life-size computer-generated images) found that women’s ratings of male attractiveness increased with flaccid penis size but that the proportional increase in attractiveness declined after 3.0 inches (7.6 cm) (Mautz, Wong, Peters, & Jennions, 2013). However, another study found that women’s self-reported subjective arousal did not differ when reading stories about having sex with men who had small, average, or large penises (Fisher, Branscombe, & Lemery, 1983). Not only are women’s estimates of average erect penis length (5.29 inches; 13.44 cm) close to the actual mean length (Johnston et al., 2014), but another large-scale study found that 84% of women were satisfied with the size of their partner’s penis, and another 2% wished their partner was smaller (Lever et al., 2006). In a study of 174 women, only 21% regarded penis length as being important (Francken, van de Wiel, van Driel, & Weijmar Schultz, 2002). Zilbergeld (1978) asked several hundred women what was important to them during sexual intercourse. None mentioned penis size.

Many of the anxieties men have about the size of their penis could possibly be alleviated if researchers and others would stop quoting average penis lengths based on studies that relied on self-reported measurements. As shown in this paper, mean penis lengths obtained in studies in which researchers took measurements are about one inch (2.54 cm) smaller than mean self-reported penis lengths.

The conclusion of the present review that the mean length of an erect penis is 5.1 to 5.5 inches (12.95 to 13.97 cm) also has important implications for penile lengthening surgery. One study found that 45.5% of men seeking penile lengthening had erect penis lengths (measured by researchers) of 5.12 inches (13.0 cm) or longer, with another 44.5% measuring 3.94–5.12 inches (10.01–13.0 cm) (Shamloul, 2005). Another study similarly found that most men who sought surgical penile lengthening were normal in length (Mondaini et al., 2002). In both studies, the men overestimated the length of a “normal” sized penis. A recent review of 17 studies found that the large majority of “normal men complaining of small penis size” (i.e., men who did not have

Table 1. Summary of studies of penis length (in chronological order).

| Authors | Country | Sample | n | Mean | SD |
|---|-----------|----------------------|-------|-----------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| Studies that Relied on Self-Reported Measurements of Erect Penises | | | | | |
| Jamison & Gebhard, 1988 | US | | 2,770 | 6.21 in. 15.77 cm | 0.77 in. 1.96 cm |
| Richters et al., 1995 | Australia | | 156 | 6.30 in. 16.0 cm | |
| Coxon, 1996 | England | gay men | 118 | 6.52 in. 16.56 cm | |
| Smith et al., 1998 | Australia | | 184 | 6.18 in. 15.71 cm | 0.91 in. 2.31 cm |
| Bogaert & Hershberger, 1999 | US | heterosex. | 3,417 | 6.14 in. 15.6 cm | 0.74 in. 1.88 cm |
| | | gay men | 813 | 6.46 in. 16.41 cm | 0.82 in. 2.08 cm |
| Harding & Golombok, 2002 (measurements reported by partner) | England | gay men | 312 | 6.0 in. 15.25 cm | 0.91 in. 2.31 cm |
| Promodu et al., 2007 | India | | 93 | 5.12 in. ¹ 13.01 cm | 0.64 in. 1.62 cm |
| Grov et al., 2013 | US | gay & bisex. men | 463 | not reported | 64.8% = 6 – 10+ in. 15 – 25+ cm |
| Herbenick et al., 2014 | US | | 1,661 | 5.57 in. ² 14.15 cm | 1.05 in. 2.67 cm |
| King et al., 2019 | US | | 166 | 6.41 in. 16.28 cm | 1.12 in. 2.84 cm |
| Studies of Erect Penises Measured by Researchers: | | | | | |
| da Ros et al., 1994 | Brazil | | 150 | 5.71 in. 14.5 cm | |
| Wessells et al., 1996 | US | | 80 | 5.07 in. 12.89 cm | 1.15 in. 2.91 cm |
| Sparling, 1997 | US | | 81 | 6.05 in. ³ 15.37 cm | 24.7% > 6.5 in. > 16.51 cm |
| Park et al., 1998 | Korea | | 309 | 4.68 in. 11.88 cm | 0.52 in. 1.32 cm |
| Chen et al., 2000 | Israel | | 55 | 5.35 in. 13.6 cm | 0.67 in. 1.70 cm |
| Schneider et al., 2001 | Germany | | 111 | 5.70 in. 14.48 cm | 0.78 in. 1.99 cm |
| Ansell Research, 2001 | US/Mexico | | 300 | 5.88 in. 14.93 cm | 0.83 in. 2.10 cm |
| Şengezer et al., 2002 | Turkey | | 200 | 5.01 in. 12.73 cm | 0.04 in. 0.11 cm |
| Promodu et al., 2007 | India | | 41 | 5.09 in. 12.93 cm | 0.64 in. 1.63 cm |
| Salama, 2018 | Egypt | | 105 | 5.92 in. 15.04 cm | 0.59 in. 1.51 cm |
| Yafi et al., 2018 | US | erectile dysfunction | 278 | 5.41 in. 13.73 cm | 0.75 in. 1.9 cm |
| Studies of Stretched Penises Measured by Researchers: | | | | | |
| Schonfeld & Beebe, 1942 | US | | 125 | 5.15 in. 13.08 cm | |
| Bondil et al., 1992 | France | | 905 | 6.59 in. ⁴ 16.74 cm | 0.90 in. 2.29 cm |
| Siminoski & Bain, 1993 | US | | 63 | 3.70 in. 9.40 cm | 0.55 in. 1.40 cm |
| Wessells et al., 1996 | US | | 80 | 4.90 in. 12.45 cm | 1.07 in. 2.71 cm |
| Chen et al., 2000 | Israel | | 55 | 4.92 in. 12.5 cm | 0.55 in. 1.4 cm |

(continued)

Table 1. Continued.

| Authors | Country | Sample | n | Mean | SD |
|--------------------------|----------|-------------------------|-------|------------------------------|---------------------|
| Ponchiatti et al., 2001 | Italy | | 3,300 | 4.92 in. (median) 12.5 cm | |
| Şengezer et al., 2002 | Turkey | | 200 | 3.54 in. 8.98 cm | 0.04 in. 0.09 cm |
| Spyropoulos et al., 2002 | Greece | | 52 | 4.79 in. 12.17 cm | 0.67 in. 1.7 cm |
| Shah & Christopher, 2002 | England | | 104 | 5.12 in. (median) 13.0 cm | |
| Savoie et al., 2003 | US | | 63 | 5.31 in. 13.49 cm | 1.02 in. 2.59 cm |
| Son et al., 2003 | Korea | | 123 | 3.78 in. 9.6 cm | 0.31 in. 0.79 cm |
| Awwad et al., 2005 | Jordan | | 271 | 5.31 in. 13.5 cm | 0.91 in. 2.3 cm |
| Mehraban et al., 2007 | Iran | | 1,500 | 4.56 in. 11.58 cm | 0.57 in. 1.45 cm |
| Promodu et al., 2007 | India | | 301 | 4.28 in. 10.88 cm | 0.56 in. 1.42 cm |
| Kamel et al., 2009 | Egypt | | 949 | 5.08 in. 12.9 cm | 0.75 in. 1.9 cm |
| Aslan et al., 2011 | Turkey | | 1,132 | 5.39 in. 13.7 cm | 0.63 in. 1.6 cm |
| Choi et al., 2011 | Korea | | 144 | 4.61 in. 11.7 cm | 0.75 in. 1.9 cm |
| Söylemez et al., 2012 | Turkey | | 2,276 | 5.50 in. 13.98 cm | 0.62 in. 1.58 cm |
| Khan et al., 2012 | Britain | | 610 | 5.63 in. 14.3 cm | 0.67 in. 1.68 cm |
| Chrouser et al., 2013 | Tanzania | | 93 | 4.53 in. 11.5 cm | 0.63 in. 1.6 cm |
| Shalaby et al., 2015 | Egypt | | 2,000 | 5.45 in. 13.84 cm | 0.53 in. 1.35 cm |
| Yafi et al., 2018 | US | erectile dysfunction | 278 | 5.51 in. 14.0 cm | 0.75 in. 1.9 cm |

¹Men in this study likely knew that the researchers would also be taking measurements.

²In this study, men were told to self-report their erect penis length in order to receive condoms that fit them perfectly.

³Measurements were taken with an unconventional technique: profile photos with a background measurement scale.

⁴The stretch technique used in this early study has been criticized by others who used the stretch technique.

abnormalities of the penis), in fact, had normal size penises (Marra, Drury, Tran, Veale, & Muir, 2020).

Reviews of penile enlargement surgery have deemed it to be “a highly risky procedure” with “documented and significant complications” (Dillon et al., 2008; Furr, Hebert, Wisenbaugh, & Gelman, 2018; Urology Care Foundation, 2019; Wylie & Eardley, 2007). As a result, the American Urological Association’s position is that the stretched penis length must be less than 2.95 inches (7.49 cm) to be considered for elongation surgery (Urology Care Foundation, 2019). Surgery on men with penises longer than this is viewed by many professionals as cosmetic and unnecessary, with serious ethical issues (Dillon et al., 2008; Mondaini et al., 2002; Vardi, 2006; Wylie & Eardley, 2007), yet penile enlargement surgeries for cosmetic purposes are increasing (Littara, Melone, Morales-Medina, Iannitti, & Palmieri, 2019; Wylie & Eardley, 2007). Instead of surgery, psychological counseling and sex education should be offered, with particular emphasis on educating men about the normal range of values for penis size (Dillon et al., 2008; Mondaini et al., 2002; Pastoor & Gregory, 2020; Wylie & Eardley, 2007). A recent review of many studies has found that counseling is often effective in convincing a majority of men who worry about having a small penis that their penis is of normal size (Marra et al., 2020).

Disclosure statement

The author reports no conflicts of interest.

References

- Ansell Research. (2001). The penis size survey. Retrieved October 12, 2019, from esvc000171.wic049u.server-web.com/education/research.htm.
- Archer, E., Pavela, G., & Lavie, C. J. (2015). The inadmissibility of What We Eat in America and NHANES dietary data in nutrition and obesity research and the scientific formulation of national dietary guidelines. *Mayo Clinic Proceedings*, 90(7), 1–16.
- Aslan, Y., Atan, A., Aydin, A. O., Nalçacıoğlu, V., Tuncel, A., & Kadioğlu, A. (2011). Penile length and somatometric parameters: A study in healthy young Turkish men. *Asian Journal of Andrology*, 13, 339–341.
- Awwad, Z., Abu-Hijleh, M., Basri, S., Shegam, N., Murshidi, M., & Ajjlouni, K. (2005). Penile measurements in normal adult Jordanians and in patients with erectile dysfunction. *International Journal of Impotence Research*, 17, 191–195.
- Bogaert, A.F., & Hershberger, S. (1999). The relationship between sexual orientation and penis size. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 28, 213–221.
- Bondil, P., Costa, P., Daures, J.P., Louis, J.F., & Navratil, H. (1992). Clinical study of the longitudinal deformation of the flaccid penis and of its variations with aging. *European Urology*, 21, 284–286.
- Brennan, J. (2018). Size matters: Penis size and sexual position in gay porn profiles. *Journal of Homosexuality*, 65, 912–933.
- Burke, M. A., & Carman, K. G. (2017). You can be too thin (but not too tall): Social desirability bias in self-reports of weight and height. *Economics and Human Biology*, 27(Part A), 198–222.
- Catania, J.A., Gibson, D.R., Chitwood, D.D., & Coates, T. J. (1990). Methodological problems in AIDS behavioral research: Influences on measurement error and participation bias in studies of sexual behavior. *Psychological Bulletin*, 108, 339–362.
- Chen, J., Gefen, A., Greenstein, A., Matzkin, H., & Elad, D. (2000). Predicting penile size erection. *International Journal of Impotence Research*, 12, 328–333.
- Choi, H., Kim, K. H., Jung, H., Yoon, S. J., Kim, S. W., & Kim, T. B. (2011). Second to fourth digit ratio: A predictor of adult penile length. *Asian Journal of Andrology*, 13, 710–714.
- Chrouser, K., Bazant, E., Jin, L., Kileo, B., Plotkin, M., Adamu, T., ... Koshuma, S. (2013). Penile measurements in Tanzanian males: Guiding circumcision device design and supply forecasting. *Journal of Urology*, 190, 544–550.
- Coxon, A. P. M. (1996). *Between the sheets: Sexual diaries and gay men's sex in the era of AIDS*. London: Cassell.
- Cranney, S. (2015). Internet pornography use and sexual body image in a Dutch sample. *International Journal of Sexual Health*, 27, 316–323.
- Crowne, D.P., & Marlowe, D. (1960). A new scale of social desirability independent of psychopathology. *Journal of Consulting Psychology*, 24, 349–354.
- da Ros, C., Telöken, C., Sogari, P., Barcelos, M., Silva, F., & Souto, C. (1994). Caucasian penis: What is the normal size? *Journal of Urology*, 151(Suppl), 381.
- Dillon, B. E., Chama, N. B., & Honig, S. C. (2008). Penile size and penile enlargement surgery: A review. *International Journal of Impotence Research*, 20, 519–529.
- Drummond, M. J. N., & Filaault, S.M. (2007). The long and short of it: Gay men's perceptions of penis size. *Gay and Lesbian Issues and Psychology Review*, 3, 121–129.
- Edward, R. (2002). *Definitive penis size survey*. Retrieved October 12th, 2019 from <http://www.sizesurvey.com>
- Fisher, W. A., Branscombe, N. R., & Lemery, C. R. (1983). The bigger the better: Arousal and attributional responses to erotic stimuli that depict different size penises. *Journal of Sex Research*, 19, 377–396.
- Francken, A. B., van de Wiel, H. B. M., van Driel, M. F., & Weijmar Schultz, W. C. M. (2002). What importance do women attribute to size of the penis? *European Urology*, 42, 426–431.
- Friedman, D. M. (2001). *A mind of its own: A cultural history of the penis*. New York: The Free Press.
- Furr, J., Hebert, K., Wisenbaugh, E., & Gelman, J. (2018). Complications of genital enlargement surgery. *Journal of Sexual Medicine*, 15, 1811–1817.
- Gaither, T., Allen, I., Osterberg, E., Alwal, A., Harris, C., & Breyer, B. (2017). Characterization of genital dissatisfaction in a national sample of U.S. men. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 46, 2123–2130.
- Gebhard, P. H., & Johnson, A. B. (1979). *The Kinsey data: Marginal tabulations of the 1938–1963 interviews conducted by the Institute for Sex Research*. Philadelphia: Saunders.
- Greenstein, A., Dekalo, S., & Chen, J. (2020). Penile size in adult men—recommendations for clinical and research measurements. *International Journal of Impotence Research*, 32, 153–158.
- Grov, C., Wells, B. E., & Parsons, J. T. (2013). Self-reported penis size and experiences with condoms among gay and bisexual men. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 42, 313–322.

- Habous, M., Muir, G., Tealab, A., Williamson, B., Elkhoully, M., Elhaddek, W., ... Veale, D. (2015). Analysis of the interobserver reliability in penile length assessment. *Journal of Sexual Medicine*, *12*, 2031–2035.
- Harding, R., & Golombok, S. E. (2002). Test-retest reliability of the measurement of penile dimensions in a sample of gay men. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, *31*, 351–357.
- Hébert, J. R., Peterson, K. E., Hurley, T. G., Stoddard, A. M., Cohen, N., Field, A. E., & Sorensen, G. (2001). The effect of social desirability trait on self-reported dietary measures among multi-ethnic female health center employees. *Annals of Epidemiology*, *11*, 417–427.
- Herbenick, D., Reece, M., Schick, V., & Sanders, S. A. (2014). Erect penile length and circumference dimensions of 1,661 sexually active men in the United States. *Journal of Sexual Medicine*, *11*, 93–101.
- Ioannidis, J. P. A. (2013). Implausible results in human nutrition research. *BMJ*, *347*(Nov. 14), f6698. doi:10.1136/bmj.f6698
- Jamison, P.L., & Gebhard, P. H. (1988). Penis size increase between flaccid and erect states: An analysis of the Kinsey data. *Journal of Sex Research*, *24*, 177–183.
- Johnston, L., McLellan, T., & McKinlay, A. (2014). (Perceived) size really does matter: Male dissatisfaction with penis size. *Psychology of Men & Masculinities*, *15*, 225–228.
- Kamel, I., Gadalla, A., Ghanem, H., & Oraby, M. (2009). Comparing penile measurements in normal and erectile dysfunction subjects. *Journal of Sexual Medicine*, *6*, 2305–2310.
- Khan, S., Somani, B., Lam, W., & Donat, R. (2012). Establishing a reference range for penile length in Caucasian British men: A prospective study of 609 men. *British Journal of Urology*, *109*, 740–744.
- King, B. M., Duncan, L. M., Clinkenbeard, K. M., Rutland, M. B., & Ryan, K. M. (2019). Social desirability and young men's self-reports of penis size. *Journal of Sex & Marital Therapy*, *45*, 452–455.
- Kinsey, A. C., Pomeroy, W. B., & Martin, C. E. (1948). *Sexual behavior in the human male*. Philadelphia: Saunders.
- Lee, P. A. (1996). Survey report: Concept of penis size. *Journal of Sex & Marital Therapy*, *22*, 131–135.
- Lehman, P. (1993). *Running scared: Masculinity and the representation of the male body*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Lever, J., Frederick, D. A., & Peplau, L. A. (2006). Does size matter? Men's and women's views on penis size across the lifespan. *Psychology of Men & Masculinities*, *7*, 129–143.
- Littara, A., Melone, R., Morales-Medina, J. C., Iannitti, T., & Palmieri, B. (2019). Cosmetic penile enhancement surgery: A 3-year single-centre retrospective clinical evaluation of 355 cases. *Scientific Reports*, *9*(1), 6323.
- Marra, G., Drury, A., Tran, L., Veale, D., & Muir, G. H. (2020). Systematic review of surgical and nonsurgical interventions in normal men complaining of small penis size. *Sexual Medicine Reviews*, *8*, 158–180.
- Mautz, B. S., Wong, B. B. M., Peters, R. A., & Jennions, M. D. (2013). Penile size interacts with body shape and height to influence male attractiveness. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences USA*, *110*, 6925–6930.
- Mehraban, D., Salehi, M., & Zayeri, F. (2007). Penile size and somatometric parameters among Iranian normal adult men. *International Journal of Impotence Research*, *19*, 303–309.
- Mondaini, N., Ponchietti, R., Gontero, P., Muir, G. H., Natali, A., Di Loro, F., ... Biscioni, S. (2002). Penile length is normal in most men seeking penile lengthening procedures. *International Journal of Impotence Research*, *14*, 283–286.
- Morrison, T. G., Bearden, A., Ellis, S. R., & Harriman, R. (2005). Correlates of genital perceptions among Canadian post-secondary students. *Electronic Journal of Human Sexuality*. Retrieved from <http://www.ejhs.org/volume8/GenitalPerceptions.htm>
- Owen, C., & Campbell, C. (2018). How do men's magazines talk about penises? *Journal of Health Psychology*, *23*, 332–344.
- Park, K., Kim, S. W., Lee, H. W., Lee, E. S., Lee, C. W., Kim, S. W., & Paick J. S. (1998). Penile nomogram in Korean males. *Korean Journal of Andrology*, *16*, 153–158.
- Pastoor, H. & Gregory, A. (2020). Penile size dissatisfaction. *Journal of Sexual Medicine*. doi:10.1016/j.jssxm.2020.03.015
- Paulhus, D. L. (1984). Two-component models of socially desirable responding. *Journal of Social Psychology*, *46*, 598–609.
- Ponchietti, R., Mondaini, N., Bonafè, M., Di Loro, F., Biscioni, S., & Masieri, L. (2001). Penile length and circumference: A study on 3,300 young Italian males. *European Urology*, *39*, 183–186.
- Prause, N., Park, J., Leung, S., & Miller, G. (2015). Women's preference for penis size: A new research method using selection among 3D models. *PLoS ONE*, *10*(9), e0133079.
- Promodu, K., Shanmughadas, K. V., Bhat, S., & Nair, K. R. (2007). Penile length and circumference: An Indian study. *International Journal of Impotence Research*, *19*, 558–563.
- Richters, J., Gerofi, J., & Donovan, B. (1995). Are condoms the right size(s): A method for self-measurement of the erect penis. *Venereology*, *8*, 77–81.
- Rosso, C., Ostacoli, L., Garbolino, S., & Furlan, M. P. (1998). Il "pene piccolo": Considerazioni sulla difettualità soggettiva del pene. *Archivio Italiano Urologia e Andrologia*, *70*(5), 227–233.

- Salama, N. (2018). Penile dimensions of diabetic and nondiabetic men with erectile dysfunction: A case-control study. *American Journal of Men's Health*, 12, 514–523.
- Savoie, M., Kim, S. S., & Soloway, M. S. (2003). A prospective study measuring penile length in men treated with radical prostatectomy for prostate cancer. *Journal of Urology*, 169, 1462–1464.
- Scagliusi, F. B., Polacow, V.O., Artioli, G. G., Benatti, F. B., & Lancha, A. H. (2003). Selective underreporting of energy intake in women: Magnitude, determinants, and effect of training. *Journal of the American Dietetic Association*, 103, 1306–1313.
- Schneider, T., Sperling, H., Lümmer, G., Syllwasschy, J., & Rübber, H. (2001). Does penile size in younger men cause problems in condom use? A prospective measurement of penile dimensions in 111 young and 32 older men. *Urology*, 57, 314–318.
- Schonfeld, W. A., & Beebe, G. W. (1942). Normal growth and variation in the male genitalia from birth to maturity. *Journal of Urology*, 48, 759–777.
- Şengezer, M., Öztürk, S., & Deveci, M. (2002). Accurate method for determining functional penile length in Turkish young men. *Annals of Plastic Surgery*, 48, 381–385.
- Shah, J., & Christopher, N. (2002). Can shoe size predict penile length? *BJU International*, 90, 586–587.
- Shalaby, M. E., Almohsen, A. E.-R. M., El Shahid, A. R., Abd Al-Sameea, M. T., & Mostofa, T. (2015). Penile length-somatometric parameters relationship in healthy Egyptian men. *Andrologia*, 47, 402–406.
- Shamloul, R. (2005). Treatment of men complaining of short penis. *Urology*, 65, 1183–1185.
- Sharp, G., & Oates, J. (2019). Sociocultural influences on men's penis size perceptions and decisions to undergo penile augmentation: A qualitative study. *Aesthetic Surgery Journal*, 39, 1253–1259.
- Siminoski K., & Bain, J. (1993). The relationships among height, penile length, and foot size. *Annals of Sex Research*, 6, 231–235.
- Smith, A. M. A., Jolley, D., Hocking, J., Benton, K., & Gerofi, J. (1998). Does penis size influence condom slippage and breakage? *International Journal of STD and AIDS*, 9, 444–447.
- Son, H., Lee, H., Huh, J.-S., Kim, S. W., & Paick, J.-S. (2003). Studies on self-esteem of penile size in young Korean military men. *Asian Journal of Andrology*, 5, 185–189.
- Söylemez, H., Atar, M., Sancaktutar, A. A., Penbegül, N., Bozkurt, Y., & Önem, K. (2012). Relationship between penile size and somatometric parameters in 2276 healthy young men. *International Journal of Impotence Research*, 24, 126–129.
- Sparling, J. (1997). Penile erections: Shape, angle, and length. *Journal of Sex & Marital Therapy*, 23, 195–207.
- Spyropoulos, E., Borouzas, D., Mavrikos, S., Dellis, A., Bourounis, M., & Athanasiadis, S. (2002). Size of external genital organs and somatometric parameters among physically normal men younger than 40 years old. *Urology*, 60, 485–491.
- Taren, D. L., Tobar, M., Hill, A., Howell, W., Shisslak, C., Bell, I., & Rittenbaugh, C. (1999). The association of energy intake bias with psychological scores of women. *European Journal of Clinical Nutrition*, 53, 570–578.
- Tiggemann, M., Martins, Y., & Churchett, L. (2008). Beyond muscles: Unexplored parts of men's body image. *Journal of Health Psychology*, 13, 1163–1172.
- Tooze, J. A., Subar, A. F., Thompson, F. E., Troiano, R., Schatzkin, A., & Kipnis, V. (2004). Psychosocial predictors of energy intake in a large doubly labeled water study. *American Journal of Clinical Nutrition*, 79, 795–804.
- Urology Care Foundation. (2019). The Foundation's recommendation on penile augmentation. Retrieved October 22, 2019, from www.urologyhealth.org/urologic-conditions/penile-augmentation
- Van Driel, M. F., Weijmar Schultz, W. C. M., van de Wiel, H. B. M., & Mensink, H. J. A. (1998). Surgical lengthening of the penis. *British Journal of Urology*, 82, 81–85.
- Vardi, Y. (2006). Is penile enlargement an ethical procedure for patients with a normal sized penis? *European Urology*, 49, 609–611.
- Veale, D., Miles, S., Bramley, S., Muir, G., & Hodsoll, J. (2015). Am I normal? A systematic review and construction of nomograms for flaccid and erect penis length and circumference in up to 15521 men. *BJU International*, 115, 978–986.
- Veale, D., Miles, S., Read, J., Bramley, S., Troglia, A., Carmona, L., ... Muir, G. (2016). Relationship between self-discrepancy and worries about penis size in men with body dysmorphic disorder. *Body Image*, 17, 48–56.
- Wessells, H., Lue, T. F., & McAninch, J. W. (1996). Penile length in the flaccid and erect states: Guidelines for penile augmentation. *Journal of Urology*, 156, 995–997.
- Wylie, K. R., & Eardley, I. (2007). Penile size and the 'small penis syndrome.' *BJU International*, 99, 1449–1455.
- Yafi, F. A., Alzweri, L., McCaslin, I. R., Libby, R. P., Sangkum, P., Sikka, S. C., & Hellstrom, W. J. G. (2018). Grower or shower? Predictors of change in penile length from the flaccid to erect state. *International Journal of Impotence Research*, 30, 287–291.
- Zilbergeld, B. (1978). *Male sexuality: A guide to sexual fulfillment*. Boston; Little Brown.