The Dissertation Committee for Wafa M. Amayreh Certifies that this is the approved version of the following Dissertation:

The Role of Social Dominance Orientation, Acculturation, and Gender Roles on Self-Reported Sexual Aggression in Ethnic Minority College Student Men

Committee:

Germine H. Awad, Supervisor

Kevin O. Cokley

Christopher J. McCarthy

Mona Ghosheh

The Role of Social Dominance Orientation, Acculturation, and Gender Roles on Self-Reported Sexual Aggression in Ethnic Minority College Student Men

by

Wafa M. Amayreh

Dissertation

Presented to the Faculty of the Graduate School of

The University of Texas at Austin

in Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements

for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

The University of Texas at Austin

August 2019

Abstract

The Role of Social Dominance Orientation, Acculturation, and Gender Roles on Self-Reported Sexual Aggression in Ethnic Minority College Student Men

Wafa M. Amayreh, Ph.D.

The University of Texas at Austin, 2019

Supervisor: Germine H. Awad

This study examined the roles of social dominance orientation and ambivalent sexism in predicting sexual aggression through the pathways of conformity to masculine role norms, gender role conflict, and acculturative stress. This study contributes to a growing understanding of the relations among attitudes towards women, beliefs about masculinity, and social dominance orientation and sexually aggressive behaviors. Hierarchical regressions examined the role that gender role conflict, masculine role norm adherence, acculturative stress, social dominance orientation, and ambivalent sexism played in predicting self-reported sexual aggression for 267 male college students who identified as ethnic minorities. Hispanic and Asian participants emerged as the largest groups of participants in this study. Adherence to traditional masculine role norms was found to predict self-reported sexual aggression, while gender role conflict, acculturative stress, social dominance orientation, and ambivalent sexism did not. Moderation analyses revealed that Hispanic or Asian racial identification did not serve as a significant

moderator of adherence to traditional masculine role norms and self-reported sexual aggression. Study findings suggest that interventions to decrease sexual aggression may benefit from paying attention to adherence to traditional masculine role norms.

Keywords: sexual aggression, acculturative stress, gender role conflict, social dominance orientation, ambivalent sexism, masculine role norm adherence

Table of Contents

Chapter One: Introduction

There is a large body of research that examines the impact of masculinity and men's attitudes toward women, especially in the context of violence against women performed by men (Fleming, Gruskin, Rojo, & Dworkin, 2015; Gallagher & Parrott, 2011; Ruiz-Perez, Plazaola-Castano, & Vives-Cases, 2007; Swan, Gambone, Caldwell, Sullivan, & Snow, 2008). Intimate partner violence and sexual aggression toward women are acknowledged worldwide as a public health issue. This recognition has been accompanied by significant research interest in interventions to reduce intimate partner violence and sexual aggression (Bourey, Williams, Bernstein, & Stephenson, 2015; Tappis, Freeman, Glass, & Doocy, 2016; Wathen & MacMillan, 2003). Men's attitudes towards women are also known to be important predictors of intimate partner violence and sexual aggression (Lin, Sun, Liu, & Chen, 2016; Tran, Nguyen, & Fisher, 2016; Yoshihama, Blazevski, & Bybee, 2014). While researchers have extensively considered the general impacts of masculinity and attitudes toward women on sexual aggression, risk and protective factors associated with ethnicity and culture have received much less attention in this literature (Nagayama Hall, Teten, DeGarmo, Sue, & Stephens, 2005; Wong, Liu, & Klann, 2017). Race and ethnicity are often used as a proxy for implicit, unnamed psychological constructs in studies that would otherwise help to explain differences in the prevalence of violence in racial and ethnic minority communities (Grossman & Lundy, 2007; McDermott, Kilmartin, McKelvey, & Kridel, 2015; Wong, Liu, et al., 2017). Ethnic minority men's experiences may not be captured in existing

1

research for a number of reasons (Hall & Barongan, 1997; Nagayama Hall et al., 2005; Wong, Liu, & Klann, 2017). Lack of sample diversity, insufficient inclusion of ethnic minority men and women in samples, and inadequate statistical techniques for detecting different groups' rates of aggression toward women have all been cited as limitations of research on aggression perpetrated by men (Baugher & Gazmararian, 2015; McDermott et al., 2015; Stockman, Hayashi, & Campbell, 2015). Despite these limitations of existing research, there is evidence to suggest that differences may exist across ethnic groups in terms of the prevalence of intimate partner violence. Non-Hispanic Black and Native American/Alaska Native women experience higher prevalence rates of lifetime IPV compared to non-Hispanic white women (Halpern, Spriggs, Martin, & Kupper, 2009; Stockman et al., 2015). Foreign-born Hispanic and Asian women residing in the United States are more likely to experience IPV compared to their US-born counterparts (Cho, 2012, Raj & Silverman, 2003; Stockman et al., 2015). While these studies suggest that non-white women experience higher rates of intimate partner violence than white women, they do not provide information on the race or ethnicity of perpetrators, leaving readers to assume that ethnic minority men are perpetrating this violence.

While few of the studies reporting prevalence rates provide information about perpetrators, several risk factors for men's violence against women have been identified by other sources. After controlling for risk factors such as rape myth acceptance and attitudes condoning violence, hostility toward women emerges as a risk factor for men's violence against women (Abbey & McAuslan, 2004; Forbes, Adams-Curtis, & White, 2004; Gallagher & Parrott, 2011; D. J. Parrott, Zeichner, & Stephens, 2003). One of the

2

variables that may contribute to the formation of attitudes condoning hostility toward women, but has not been sufficiently researched, is acculturative stress, or stress that can be attribute specifically to the process of acculturation. Acculturative stress has been linked to vulnerability to a number of negative outcomes, including suicide attempts (Gomez, Miranda, & Polanco, 2011), depressive symptoms (Walker, Wingate, Obasi, & Joiner, 2008), and substance abuse (Ruiz, Torrente, Rodriguez, & Ramirez, 2007). It is unknown whether or not men who experience acculturation and acculturative stress may be at higher risk for developing attitudes that condone hostility towards women. More attention to the relations among masculinity, gender role conflict (i.e., the negative psychological impact that socialized gender roles can have on individuals, and acculturative stress can help shape and inform efforts to prevent sexual aggression.

The purpose of this study is to examine the roles of social dominance orientation and acculturative stress in predicting attitudes toward women and sexual aggression. This study also accounts for the impact of gender role conflict and adherence to traditional masculine role on men's self-reported sexual aggression. By examining these relationships in a sample of ethnic minority men, this study will contribute to the literature by identifying factors that may explain why some men hold hostile attitudes toward women, which may in turn help predict why some men have higher rates of sexually aggressive behavior. This study will also contribute to a growing understanding of the influence of acculturative stress on gender role conflict and conformity to masculine role norms in ethnic minority men.

3

Chapter Two: Integrative Analysis of the Literature

The following integrative analysis of the literature establishes a theoretical basis for investigating social dominance orientation, acculturative stress, conformity to masculine role norms, gender role conflict, attitudes toward women, and sexual aggression.

MASCULINITY

Given that it cannot be observed or measured directly, masculinity is a hypothetical construct assumed to be composed of behaviors, thoughts, and/or emotions (Connell & Messerschmidt, 2005; Kahn, 2009; Levant & Wong, 2017). There is considerable debate about the specific behaviors, thoughts, and/or emotions that should be included in the definition of masculinity. Even when researchers do agree on components included in the construct, they do not agree on the arrangement of these factors within their models. Despite the existence of multiple conflicting definitions, a reasonable starting point for understanding the study of masculinity is the American Psychological Association's statement that it is the "study of how boys' and men's psychology is influenced and shaped by both gender and sex, and encompasses the study of the social construction of gender, sex difference and similarities, and biological processes" (2017). The experiences of individuals who identify as male in the cognitive, behavioral, emotional, and cultural domains are all components of the definition of masculinity in the field of psychology (Kahn, 2009; Levant & Wong, 2017; Pleck, 2017a).

Masculinity is often discussed in the plural (i.e. masculinities) in an attempt to acknowledge the many different configurations the experiences of men can take within a culture (Baugher & Gazmararian, 2015; Griffith, Gunter, & Watkins, 2012; Smiler, 2004). The use of the plural indicates and acknowledges that different men (and cultures) construct varying versions of masculinity. The terms "masculinity," "masculinities," and "masculine gender role" are often used synonymously and interchangeably in the literature. The language used in this proposal will reflect language used in cited studies.

FEMINISM AND THE STUDY OF MASCULINITY

Models developed by theorists for understanding and organizing the complex associations and interactions associated with experiences of masculinity owe a considerable debt to feminist theory (Flood & Howson, 2015; Hurtado & Sinha, 2016; Kahn, 2009). Like masculinity, feminism takes on many and sometimes contradictory configurations. It has been argued, however, that all feminisms share attention to issues of social inequality and a general agreement that women are socially undervalued and underrepresented (Hebert, 2007; Kahn, 2009). Psychologists like Joseph Pleck and Edward Thompson, whose work is central to the study of men and masculinity, built on work initiated by feminist theorists as they began using masculinity ideologies to describe the cultural values, beliefs, and norms that script men's lives.

Works like Betty Friedan's *The Feminine Mystique*, in which femininity ideologies were explored and critiqued, were formative influences that helped to inspire

the study of masculinity ideologies (Thompson & Bennett, 2015). Feminist thinking has been crucial not only to the formation, but also to the cementing of masculinity studies as a rigorous academic field with implications for social movements (Gardiner, 2005). Feminist theorists spearheaded the paradigm shift from studying gender as an inborn biological trait to understanding gender as social construction (Gardiner, 2005). The degree to which this shift transformed popular assumptions about why men and women behave in the ways that they do (and even about the very categories of "men" and "women") cannot be over-emphasized. In its work against misogyny, feminist theory worked to show that not only were women and femininity embodied, culturally constructed products of specific times and contexts, but so were men and masculinity (Gardiner, 2005). Feminist traditions including liberal feminism (i.e., the belief that women and men are similar and should be equal) (McCammon, Taylor, Reger, & Einwohner, 2017), womanism or black feminist thought (i.e., the belief that race and racism are central not only to the identity development of women of color but also to social inequalities) (Hill Collins, 1990), and radical feminism (i.e., the belief that gender affects and drives every aspect of human interaction and is therefore the most important factor in understanding inequality) (Schneider & Pham, 2017) are all foundational to the study of masculinity.

The feminist models listed above lend to the study of masculinity their emphasis on access to social and cultural resources, social class and social class identity, race and racial identity, and socially constructed knowledge of gender. Men's experiences of gender are subject to the many of the same phenomena that feminist theorists describe. While it is

true that men are influenced by factors similar to those feminism has identified as shaping the lives and experiences of women, these phenomena do not have the same impact on men that they do on women (Kahn, 2009). Many psychological studies of masculinity are influenced either implicitly or explicitly by feminism. In the field of psychology, the impact of feminism on the study of masculinity tends to be implicit and rooted in the development of constructs, rather than explicitly embedded in the design of studies. For example, a review of the study of sexuality and gender relationships in rap music demonstrated that while a large proportion of the literature on this topic has been rooted in feminist theory, empirical work explicitly deploying masculinity and feminist constructs has tended to be less robust (Herd, 2015).

Examples of other scholarship on masculinity rooted in feminist theory include most studies that use measures of gender role conflict (i.e., the negative psychological impact that socialized gender roles can have on individuals). The roots of gender role conflict theory lie in feminist men's studies that developed in the 1970s (O'Neil, Wester, Heesacker, & Snowden, 2017). In the last five years, gender role conflict has been used in empirical studies of HIV risk behaviors in men (Fields et al., 2015; Fleming et al., 2017; Gottert et al., 2017), depression in men (Ramirez & Badger, 2014; Wahto & Swift, 2014), and acceptance of violence (Berke, Reidy, Gentile, & Zeichner, 2016; Goldenberg, Stephenson, Freeland, Finneran, & Hadley, 2016; McDermott, Naylor, McKelvey, & Kantra, 2017). Specific findings of these and other relevant studies will be discussed in later sections. They are listed here to demonstrate the influence feminist theory has had on the way masculinity is studied in the field of psychology.

7

TRAIT AND SOCIAL PSYCHOLOGY APPROACHES TO THE STUDY MASCULINITY

The psychological study of men and masculinity has been influenced by two major domains in psychology: personality trait theory and social psychology. The origins of the psychological scholarship of masculinity can be traced to the 1930s and personality trait theory. Trait theory can be thought of as a taxonomical model in which adherence to particular inborn attributes defines a person's level of masculinity; it is similar to taxonomical models of personality psychology (John & Srivastava, 1995). Inquiry into masculinity as a trait has been described as falling under the gender role identity paradigm. The gender role identity paradigm is a positivist view of masculinity that assumes that the essence of masculinity can be measured, and that it is defined by its measurement (Kahn, 2009; Levant & Powell, 2017). Gender identity is defined as the way individuals develop their own understanding of their gendered experience in the world (Pleck, 2017a). A number of trait-based studies of masculinity grew out of positivist views of gender (R. W. Jones & De Cecco, 1982; O'Neil, 1981; Ovesey & Person, 1973). Studies published using these one, two, and three-factor models of gender use linear, unidimensional frameworks with masculinity on one end and femininity on the other. In response to critiques that these models are reductionist, interactive models of masculinity were developed. These models attempted to consider the wide range of culturally embedded ways in which individuals make sense of gender. Masculinity ideology is an example of an interactive model for understanding gender. Masculinity ideology describes the perceived importance of men's adherence to standards for male behavior defined by culture (Pleck, Sonenstein, & Ku, 1993). Traditional masculinity

ideology is the term used to describe attitudes toward masculine gender role norms that fit within, or would be found acceptable by, current dominant male role norms (Pleck et al., 1993). Non-traditional masculinity ideology is defined as any ideology that goes against predominant trends in masculinity (Pleck et al., 1993).

MASCULINITY IDEOLOGY

Masculinity ideology has been described as a framework that successfully addresses some of the problems with trait-based approaches. Unlike measures developed from trait-based frameworks to the study of masculinity, measures developed from masculinity ideology theory are attitude-focused (Thompson & Bennett, 2015). Commonly used masculinity ideology measures for adults include the Masculine Role Norms Inventory (Levant, Hirsch, Celentano, & Cozza, 1992), the Gender Role Conflict Scale (O'Neil, Helms, Gable, David, & Wrightsman, 1986), the Conformity to Masculine Role Norms Inventory (Mahalik et al., 2003), and the Male Role Norms Scale (Thompson & Pleck, 1986).

A number of studies using masculinity ideology measures have demonstrated a relationship between attitudes toward specific components of masculinity, health beliefs, and health behaviors. These studies use samples of mostly White and African American men in North America, and they rarely include men of other ethnic or racial backgrounds (e.g., Levant, Parent, McCurdy, & Bradstreet, 2015; Thompson & Bennett, 2015). Examples of research questions addressed by these scholars include the impact of masculinity on health behaviors related to prostate cancer (Harvey & Alston, 2011), diet

9

and drinking (Levant & Wimer, 2014a), and aging (Evans, Frank, Oliffe, & Gregory, 2011). Levant et al. (2015) found significant positive associations between endorsement of traditional masculinity ideology and expectations for the benefits of energy drinks, which was in turn linked to greater sleep disturbance. Harvey and Alston's work established that endorsement of traditional masculinity norms influenced preventive health behaviors related to seeking prostate cancer screenings in African American men (Harvey & Alston, 2011). emphasizes the internalization of masculine ideology rather than innate traits or roles, has influenced the study of masculinity in important ways. Masculinity ideologies are socially constructed ideas and beliefs about what it means to be a man; communities appraisee men's masculinity based on these ideologies men are appraised with reference to these ideologies by their communities (Thompson & Bennett, 2015). As noted earlier, the constructivist nature of masculinity ideology represents a significant shift away from trait-based masculinity studies. The masculinity ideology paradigm is by far the most dominant approach to the study of men and masculinity today, although some trait-based measures of masculine and feminine traits continue to be used.

Major critiques of the masculinity ideology approach have focused largely on the lack of attention scholars pay to power (Kahn, 2009). While the study of masculinity ideology defines what masculine role norms are and examines prevalent attitudes toward these norms, it does little to address how these norms come to be and who has the power to make decisions about what is considered normative masculinity (Kahn, 2009). Studies have demonstrated that power and control emerge as significant factors in men's health

and health behaviors (Calasanti, Pietila, Ojala, & King, 2013; McVittie & Willock, 2006). One qualitative study on how older men manage poor health found that many participants made sense of the experience of growing older and being in poor health in terms of power and control (McVittie & Willock, 2006). Another study, on preventive behaviors related to prostate cancer in a sample of African American men, found that adherence to traditional masculine role norms of control over the physical body was a significant factor affecting men's reluctance to seek preventative screenings (Harvey & Alston, 2011). It has also been suggested that as men age, adherence to the traditional masculine role norm of control contributes increased positive changes in health-related behaviors, but this adherence can also lead to higher levels of psychological distress as men experience a lack of control over their aging bodies (Calasanti et al., 2013). Self-esteem, self-compassion, and men's adherence to traditional masculine role norms have also been found to be moderated by shame (Reilly, Rochlen, & Awad, 2014).

In addition to the critique that masculinity ideology research devotes inadequate attention to issues of power, other critiques assert that this research is overly focused on dominant masculinities in a way that further marginalizes already-marginalized men and discounts their experiences (Kahn, 2009). Many studies do not take social class, race, culture, age, or other contextual factors into account in their analyses (Thompson & Bennett, 2017). One review began to address this issue by identifying gaps in the literature on masculinity and the health of men of color (Griffith et al., 2012). This review identified 22 studies addressing masculinity and health outcomes published between 2000 and 2011, 13 of which included samples composed entirely of self-identified men of

color (i.e., African American, Asian, Hispanic, or Latino) (Griffith et al., 2012). Overall, results from these studies indicated that in samples of men of color, masculinity was related to 17 positive health relationships (i.e., higher scores on masculinity measures associated with higher rates of the health outcome) and seven negative health relationships (i.e., higher scores on the masculinity measures associated with lower rates of the health outcome) (Griffith et al., 2012). The study also found conditional relationships in five studies (i.e., higher scores on masculinity measures associated with higher rates of a health outcome only under certain conditions) and no relationship between masculinity measures and some health outcomes in eight studies (Griffith et al., 2012). Findings from this review also suggest that adherence to traditional masculinity is positively associated with alexithymia (i.e., the inability to identify emotions) (Griffith et al., 2012) in men of color, while gender role conflict is positively associated with depression, psychological distress, and stress (Griffith et al., 2012). Negative relationships were found between masculinity and sexual health risk-taking behaviors on a measure of personal wellness (Griffith et al., 2012). In addition to demonstrating the importance of including masculinity when analyzing the attitudes and behaviors of men of color, this review provides information about empirically demonstrated relationships between gender role conflict, adherence to masculine role norms, and several behavioral health outcomes in this sample.

Other conceptual and empirical contributions to the understanding of masculinity in men of color include literature on the expression and attainment of dominant cultural ideals of masculinity in African American men (Bowleg et al., 2011). Bowleg et al.

(2011) implicate conformity to the gender role norms that Black heterosexual men cannot decline sex and that women should be responsible for condom use as potential sexual health risk factors for African American men. Research suggests that African American men experience higher levels of gender role conflict in all domains than European American men (Norwalk, Vandiver, White, & Englar-Carlson, 2011). In addition, the culturally specific masculinity constructs of machismo (i.e. a stereotypic view of Latino masculinity commonly described as aggressive and hypersexualized) and caballerismo (i.e. masculinity norms that emphasize collaboration, caretaking, and respect for others) have been emphasized in research on Hispanic and Latino masculinity (Arciniega, Anderson, Tovar-Blank, & Tracey, 2008; Ojeda & Piña-Watson, 2013).

HEGEMONIC MASCULINITY, ATTITUDES TOWARD WOMEN, AND VIOLENCE

While it is important to acknowledge the how complex the expression and experiences of masculinity can be, it is also important to understand the impact that adherence to traditional masculine gender roles can have on a number of mental health outcomes. Men are socialized into dominant gender role ideologies (i.e., beliefs about how important it is for men and women to follow cultural standards for gendered behavior) through social learning and influence (Levant & Powell, 2017). Traditional masculine role norms, also called hegemonic and dominant masculine role norms, are patterns of gender role expectations and behaviors theorized to be learned through observation and reinforced through punishment for deviation from traditional norms (Levant & Powell, 2017). Higher levels of some types of gender role conflict (i.e.,

restrictive affectionate behavior between men) and adherence to total overall traditional masculinity ideology have been found to negatively predict men's attitudes toward seeking psychological help (Berger, Levant, McMillan, Kelleher, & Sellers, 2005). Masculine gender role stress, measures of which correlate highly with measures of masculine role norm adherence, has been found to significantly and positively predict acceptance of different forms of dating violence in college men (McDermott et al., 2017). Stronger adherence to traditional masculine role norms was associated with higher levels of chronic nonsuicidal self-injury in a study also using a sample of college men (Green, Kearns, Ledoux, Addis, & Marx, 2015). These studies suggest that traditional masculinity ideology shapes men's behavior by simultaneously encouraging compliance with norms and sanctioning deviance from them (Levant & Powell, 2017). Since the 1980s, socialization into patterns of and adherence to hegemonic gender role expectations and behaviors has been used to explain the dominance of men and the subordination of women (Connell & Messerschmidt, 2005; Jewkes et al., 2015).

Hegemonic masculinity comprises three different groups of norms that each have important social value: status; toughness; and anti-femininity (Thompson & Pleck, 1986). The extent to which men adhere to these traditional norms can also be referred to as their adherence to hegemonic masculinity (Connell & Messerschmidt, 2005). Status is the belief that a man who is successful in his masculinity must gain the respect of others (Thompson & Pleck, 1986). Toughness is the belief that men should be physically strong and aggressive (Thompson & Pleck, 1986). Finally, traditional masculine gender role

beliefs are rooted in anti-femininity, or the belief that men should not engage in stereotypically feminine behaviors (Thompson & Pleck, 1986).

Masculinities of exploited or oppressed groups, including ethnic minorities, are referred to as "marginalized" in relation to hegemonic masculinity (Connell, 2000). Socialization into hegemonic masculinity causes distress when men and boys cannot meet gender role expectations and standards, a situation that is often called gender role strain (Pleck, 2017b) or masculine gender role stress (Eisler & Skidmore, 1987). In addition to negotiating hegemonic masculine role norms, ethnic minority men receive and learn masculinity from ethnic minority cultures (Isacco & Wade, 2017). Gender role strain may develop for men who are required to negotiate potentially conflicting definitions of masculinity from a dominant and minority culture (Isacco & Wade, 2017; Wade & Rochlen, 2013; Wong, Liu, et al., 2017). In one study on racial differences in adherence to masculine role norms and mental health outcomes, adherence to the masculine norm of toughness was negatively associated with interpersonal competencies among white men but positively associated with interpersonal competencies among African American men (Lease et al., 2010). The same study showed that the masculine role norm of status was also negatively associated with interpersonal competencies in white men but was positively associated with interpersonal competencies in African American men (Lease et al., 2010). Anderson (2009) suggests that men of color with fewer resources adhere more rigidly to hegemonic role norms, while men with race or class privilege do not need to adhere as rigidly to the norms of hegemonic masculinity in order to feel powerful. Vincent et al. (2016) suggest that men of color may be even more

15

likely to adhere to traditional masculine role norms because racism and racial oppression prevent them from ever fully achieving the norms and expectations associated with hegemonic definitions of masculinity. This adherence may be associated with increased gender role conflict that can be attributed to racism and discrimination, which frustrate these men's attempts to fulfil traditional masculine role norms (Wade & Rochlen, 2013).

Many studies have investigated adherence to status, toughness, and anti-femininity in relation to a wide range of outcomes, including hostile attitudes toward women (Gallagher & Parrott, 2011), aggression toward gay men (Vincent, Parrott, & Peterson, 2011), and substance use and health behaviors (Gordon et al., 2013). Overall, these studies have consistently found significant associations between traditional masculine gender role beliefs and an increased likelihood of negative outcomes (i.e. increased hostility toward women, aggression toward gay men, and substance use). Some of the studies cited here operationalize hegemonic masculinity as masculine gender role stress (MGRS), defined as the distress associated with encountering situations where the norms of status, antifemininity, and toughness are challenged. Measures of male role adherence to hegemonic masculine role norms and masculine gender role stress correlate highly with one another (McDermott et al., 2017), and masculine gender role stress research is included in this review. Parrott, Peterson, and Bakeman (2011) conducted a study of aggression toward sexual minorities and found that masculine gender role stress is positively associated with endorsed aggression toward sexual minorities. Another study found that masculine gender role stress partially mediated the relationship between insecure attachment styles and acceptance of intimate partner violence (McDermott & Lopez, 2013).

16

In another study, masculine gender role stress mediated the relationship between rigid adherence to masculine gender roles and hostility toward women (Gallagher & Parrott, 2011). In addition, masculine gender role stress levels were associated with self-reported sexual, physical, and psychological violence (Moore et al., 2010), while higher levels of masculine gender role stress were positively associated with anger, negative intent, and verbal aggression (Moore & Stuart, 2005).

Although empirical research on the construction of masculinity across cultures is not extensive, studies have yielded some evidence of cultural differences in this area (Iwamoto & Liu, 2009). In a comparative study on Asian American and European American men, Chua and Fujino (1999) found that status was a more salient component of masculinity for European Americans; they also found that masculinity was not defined in opposition to femininity for Asian Americans, though it was defined in this way for European Americans. Kim, O'Neil, and Owen (1996) found that Asian American men with higher levels of acculturation felt more pressure toward success, power, and competition, but also had less restrictive emotionality compared to men with lower levels of acculturation. Liu and Iwamoto (2006) report that a higher degree of enculturation (i.e., the process through which individuals retain the norms of their groups of origin) in Asian American men was associated with higher levels of gender role conflict. This evidence suggests that for Asian American men, an understanding of the construction of masculinity is incomplete without an understanding of acculturation and enculturation. Because adherence to certain components of masculinity through behaviors and beliefs associated with masculine role norms is associated with violence in men (Connell &

Messerschmidt, 2005), adherence to masculine role norms is an important construct to study.

Several theories have been developed by sociologists, criminologists, and psychologists to explain the pathways that lead to violence perpetrated by men in many different contexts (e.g. war, violent crime, and interpersonal violence). In the domain of interpersonal violence and violence by men toward women, gender role strain and hegemonic masculinity emerge as common themes in many theoretical models attempting to explain how sexual aggression and hostility toward women develop and are maintained. Both men and women perpetrate violence against intimate partners, but men are responsible for more violence than women in most social contexts worldwide (Jewkes & Morrell, 2017; Lauritsen, Heimer, & Lynch, 2009).

Gender role conflict measures the negative consequences of socialized masculine gender roles, but the degree to which men conform to masculine role norms can produce either negative impacts or positive benefits depending on context and population (Mahalik et al., 2003). Conformity to masculine role norms describes the degree to which men adhere to social expectations for what constitutes masculine behavior and identity, in both public and private life (Mahalik et al., 2003). The conceptual root of the construct of conformity to masculine role norms lies in the psychology of social norms more broadly (Wong, Ho, Wang, & Miller, 2017). It has been theorized that the differences in outcomes associated with conformity to masculine role norms result from the different levels of social rewards associated with conformity in different cultural contexts (Wong, Ho, et al., 2017). A meta-analysis examining conformity to masculine role norms, mental health, and psychological

help-seeking found that conformity to masculine norms was positively associated with negative mental health and was negatively related to positive mental health as well as psychological help-seeking (Wong, Ho, et al., 2017). Another study of men's conformity to masculine role norms and associations with psychological distress found that positive associations between risk-taking and psychological distress were more likely to be found in Asian American men, while negative associations between risk-taking and psychological distress were more likely to be found in White men (Wong, Owen, & Shea, 2012). The authors suggest that these differences are most likely to be a function of the cultures of individual participants (Wong et al., 2012).

Studies suggest that adherence to some but not all masculine gender role norms is a risk factor for the perpetration of sexual aggression (Murnen, Wright, & Kaluzny, 2002; Sheffield, 1987; Smith, Parrott, Swartout, & Tharp, 2015). In a meta-analytic review, Murnen, Wright, and Kaluzny (2002) found that the most consistently significant and largest effect sizes of masculine ideology on sexual aggression were in domains of masculinity that include acceptance of aggression against women, hostile beliefs about women, and men's dominance over women. Scores on measures of general gender role adherence such as the Bem Sex Role Inventory were found to be weak predictors of sexual aggression in this review (Murnen et al., 2002). Smith et al. (2015) conducted a study of the roles of antifemininity, subordination to women, and sexual dominance in predicting perpetration of sexual violence in a sample of men enrolled in a large southeastern US university. This study found that the tendency to experience stress when placed in positions subordinate to women and adherence to the antifemininity norm were indirectly related to

self-reported perpetration of sexual aggression through adherence to the norm of sexual dominance (Smith et al., 2015). A study of risk factors for sexual aggression in young men found that dominance and hostility toward women were positively and directly associated with self-reported numbers of sexually aggressive acts (Abbey, Jacques-Tiura, & LeBreton, 2011).

GENDER ROLE CONFLICT

While the concepts of gender role conflict (GRC) and masculine gender role stress are sometimes used interchangeably in the literature, these concepts developed from slightly different theories, and there are subtle distinctions between them that warrant delineation. Gender role conflict is defined as the negative psychological consequences of socialized gender roles (O'Neil, 2015). Gender role conflict theory has been consistently refined over the past forty years since its initial development, and a large body of empirical research using gender role conflict measures has contributed to a more nuanced understanding of the pathways for the development of gender role conflict in men. Masculine gender role stress is the psychological distress that occurs when men are confronted with situations that require traditionally feminine or otherwise "unmanly" behavior (Eisler & Skidmore, 1987). More specifically, it is the stress that men are likely to experience when the hegemonic masculine role norms to which they usually adhere are threatened (Smith et al., 2015).

These negative consequences, and the adverse psychological impacts of gender roles on men, fall into the gender role strain theory literature. Similar to gender role conflict theory, gender role strain theory asserts that masculine role socialization adversely impacts men when they are pressured to fulfill certain male role norms completely or rigidly (Pleck, 2017b). In Pleck's gender role strain paradigm, as men work to conform to culturally prescribed gender roles, they also experience psychological strain caused by attempts to adhere to rigid and sometimes contradictory norms (2017).

O'Neil (2015) states that gender role conflict has been operationally defined using a combination of psychological domains, situational contexts, and personal and interpersonal experiences. The psychological domains of gender role conflict include a cognitive aspect comprised of thoughts about gender roles, an emotional aspect that includes how men feel about their gender roles, a behavioral aspect composed of the ways that men respond to and interact with others, and an unconscious domain of thoughts, feelings, and behaviors about gender roles that lie beyond individuals' conscious awareness (O'Neil, 2015). The situational contexts of gender role conflict are defined simply as categories within which gender role conflict is experienced (O'Neil, 2015). These contexts are: intrapersonal (within a man by himself,) interpersonal (expressed toward others), interpersonal (experienced from others), and gender role conflict experienced during developmental gender role transitions (O'Neil, 2015).

These theoretical components of gender role conflict are important for understanding the origins and nuances of the construct as a whole. They are not researched empirically as separate constructs. Instead, the four specific components of gender role

conflict originating in O'Neil's theory (1981) that are used in empirical research are restrictive emotionality (RE); success, power, and competition (SPC); restrictive affective behavior between men (RABBM); and conflict between work and family relations (CWF).

Roughly 10% of the nearly 400 studies published in the last 30 years have used the constructs of gender role conflict and masculine gender role stress to examine men's interpersonal violence, including sexual violence. Masculine gender role stress was positively associated with acceptance of physical and sexual dating violence in a sample of college men (McDermott et al., 2017). However, this same study found that only two domains of masculine gender role conflict (restricted emotionality and restrictive same-sex affectionate behaviors) had significant relationships with dating violence acceptance (McDermott et al., 2017). In a study using a forensic sample, higher levels of gender role conflict and conformity to masculine role norms were associated with higher self-reported levels of violence on the prison inmate inventory (Amato, 2012). This same study—which surveyed 144 White men, 39 Hispanic or Latino men, 50 African American men, and 25 men from other groups (i.e. Asian/Pacific Islander, Native American, and Bi-racial)—also uses race to predict self-reported past violence and fails to account for other variables that might better explain the association between race and violence. Another study using focus groups identified gender role conflict as a source of tension that could contribute to intimate partner violence in same-sex relationships (Goldenberg et al., 2016). An examination of gender role conflict among college football players found a relationship between restrictive affectionate behavior between men and life satisfaction moderated by context (i.e., life outside of football vs. in a football environment) (Steinfeldt, Wong, Hagan, Hoag, &

Steinfeldt, 2011). These results suggest that cultural context is an important component of men's gender role conflict.

Researchers investigating relationships between gender role conflict and men's attitudes toward women have found significant correlations between men's gender role conflict and traditional attitudes toward women (Blazina & Watkins, 1996; Robinson & Schwartz, 2004). Consistent significant positive relationships between gender role conflict and sex role stereotyping (e.g., Rando, Rogers, & Brittan-Powell, 1998) suggest that there is a correlation between higher levels of gender role conflict in men and sexist attitudes and beliefs about women. Rando et al. (1998) also found that hostility toward women was significantly positively correlated with likelihood that men in the study would self-identify as sexually aggressive. In this sample of college students, adherence to traditional male gender roles as measured by the gender role conflict scale (i.e., success, power, & competition; restrictive emotionality; and restrictive affectionate behavior between men) related to higher levels of rape myth acceptance, hostility toward women, and sex role stereotyping (Rando et al., 1998). The results also suggest that more adherence to the norm of restrictive affectionate behavior between men is associated with an increased likelihood of self-disclosed sexual aggression toward women (Rando et al., 1998). Men with higher levels of gender role conflict demonstrate an increased likelihood of endorsing more conservative attitudes toward women (Robinson & Schwartz, 2004).

Gender role conflict has been significantly associated with sexually aggressive behaviors and the endorsement of attitudes accepting of sexual harassment, as well as an increased likelihood of abusive behaviors, coercion, threats, intimidation, hostile sexism,

and hostility toward women. Higher levels of adherence to the norms of masculine success, power, and competition significantly predicted higher levels of sexual entitlement in a sample of male undergraduate psychology students (Hill & Fischer, 2001). In addition, sexual entitlement levels then predicted rape-related criterion variables (e.g., date rape myth acceptance and victim blaming) (Hill & Fischer, 2001). These findings suggest that masculine gender role socialization predicts both general and sexual entitlement, which in turn predicts rape-related attitudes and behaviors (Hill & Fischer, 2001). Other studies suggest a relationship between higher levels of gender role conflict in men and increased self-reported sexual aggression (Kaplan, O'Neil, & Owen, 1993), higher tolerance of sexual harassment (Kearney, King, & Rochlen, 2004; Glomb & Espelage, 2005), and a higher likelihood of violence with women (O'Neil & Nadeau, 1999).

Abusive men who have low restrictive emotionality (a masculine role norm often used as an indicator of gender role conflict) reported higher use of threat and intimidation in dating situations (J. P. Schwartz & Waldo, 2003). Berke, Wilson, Mouilso, Speir, and Zeichner (2015) found that conformity to masculine norms and gender role conflict both directly accounted for men's physical aggression. Homeless men who report their own use of physical force to injure, damage, or destroy in both dating and non-dating situations also have higher self-reported levels of gender role conflict than homeless men who report lower levels of use of force (Amato & MacDonald, 2011) .

The experiences of ethnic minority men are different from those of white men in ways that may cause the pathways to psychological strain and negative mental health consequences to vary as well. Social and structural inequalities shape and alter the

experiences of ethnic minority men throughout their lifecycle (Thorpe, Duru, & Hill, 2015). Health disparities literature attributes the differences in ethnic minority and white men's health outcomes not to biological factors, but to social, psychological, and economic experiences influenced by internalized gender role norms and expectations (Thorpe et al., 2015). Subtle relationships between cultural and gender role norms for ethnic minority men have only recently begun to be examined in the literature.

While masculinity and the role of gender role stress for ethnic minority men is still underdeveloped (Thorpe et al., 2015), some studies do contribute to an understanding of gender role conflict in ethnic minority men. Significant positive correlations between gender role conflict and anxiety and depression were found in a sample of African American male college students, as were significant negative correlations between gender role conflict and self-esteem.

A sample of African American male college students showed significant positive correlations between gender role conflict, lower self-esteem, higher anxiety, and higher depression (Lilly, 2000). Significant positive correlations between gender role conflict and psychological distress (Wester, Kuo, & Vogel, 2006), and loneliness (Blazina & Kogan, 2016) have also been found in samples of African American male college students. Higher levels of gender role conflict in samples of adult African American men are significantly correlated with higher levels of depression, hopelessness, and marital dissatisfaction (Laurent, 1998). Canonical correlation analyses conducted using a sample of African American men suggest that gender role conflict is actually related to multiple variables such as class and social position (Stillson, O'Neil, & Owen, 1991). The evidence suggests

that gender role conflict is a factor that is relevant in the lives of African American men, and more research is needed in order to better understand how it develops and how it is experienced (O'Neil, 2015). Further research on the gendered pathways that impact ethnic minority men's behaviors can contribute to a growing understanding of sexual aggression in men, attitudes toward women, masculine gender role stress, and ambivalent sexism.

GENDER ROLE CONFLICT AND ETHNIC IDENTITY

An assumption underlying gender role conflict theory and masculine gender role stress is that in general, men internalize gender role norms, expectations, and beliefs that they receive from the dominant culture (Arellano-Morales, Liang, Ruiz, & Rios-Oropeza, 2016). At the same time, it is likely that they are also receiving and internalizing norms from the non-dominant groups to which they belong. Research on Latino masculinity suggests that Latino men have beliefs and attitudes about masculinity that are both similar to and different from dominant masculinity ideology due to the influence of racial oppression and perceived racism (Arellano-Morales et al., 2016). For example, a study conducted using a sample of Latino day laborers suggests that higher levels of racism strengthened the association between masculinity ideologies and gender role conflict in these men (Liang, Salcedo, & Miller, 2011). Masculine role norms have also been found to moderate the relationship between racism and depressive symptoms in African American men (Hammond, 2012). A study conducted using a sample of male Latino day laborers found that perceived racism moderated the association between gender role conflict and life satisfaction (Arellano-Morales et al., 2016). The authors of this study also

suggest that for Latino men, pressure to provide for the family and to be perceived as good providers may be more important than other more traditional components of gender role conflict (i.e. success, power, and competition; restrictive affectionate behavior between men; and restrictive emotionality); however, the researchers did not test this hypothesis in this study (Arellano-Morales et al., 2016).

Men's failure to meet social expectations of masculinity is associated with negative health outcomes and decreased overall well-being (Courtenay, 2000; Gough & Flanders, 2009). Ethnic minority men may experience gender role devaluations and restrictive gender role expectations not only from dominant hegemonic masculinity, but also from the masculinities prescribed by their own non-dominant communities (O'Neil, 2015). Many ethnic minority men may find themselves in positions of being unable to achieve the forms of masculinity prescribed by white middle class norms (Lu & Wong, 2013). Comprehensive research suggests that stress can have a significant influence on mental health in men from racial and ethnic minority groups (D. J. Jones, Crump, & Lloyd, 2012). Ethnic minority men are also vulnerable to poorer psychological health outcomes because they are at heightened risk of experiencing stress related to discrimination. A number of studies demonstrate the negative impacts of perceived discrimination on mental health and psychological distress (Cokley, Hall-Clark, & Hicks, 2011; Gee, Spencer, Chen, & Takeuchi, 2007; Pascoe & Smart Richman, 2009). Studies demonstrate significant positive correlations between perceived discrimination and levels of depressive symptoms and stress (Todorova, Falcón, Lincoln, & Price, 2010), symptoms of PTSD in African American men (Bogart et al., 2011), depressive symptoms in Latino sexual minority men

(Sun et al., 2016), and a significant negative correlation between perceived discrimination and general well-being in men of Mexican origin (Flores et al., 2008). Findings suggest that perceived discrimination has a greater impact on mental health than physical health, and that this impact tends to be even greater for ethnic minority groups (Cokley et al., 2011).

The relationship of racial and ethnic identity to gender role conflict for African American men has received some attention in the literature. Laurent (1998) found that African American men with higher levels of African American cultural identity (as measured by the African Self-Consciousness Scale) also reported lower levels of gender role conflict. Two studies have suggested that higher levels of gender role conflict correlate significantly with pre-encounter stages of racial identity (Carter, Williams, Juby, & Buckley, 2005; Wade, 1996). Wester, Vogel, Wei, and McLain (2006) found that African American's gender role conflict scores positively predicted their reported levels of psychological distress. In this study, the self-hatred subscale of the Cross Racial Identity Scale partially mediated the relationship between gender role conflict and psychological distress (Wester, Vogel et al., 2006). In a sample of Black men, racial identity attitudes fully mediated the relationship between gender role conflict and psychological symptoms, while they partially mediated this relationship in Asian and Latino men (Carter et al., 2005). Another study found that racial identity did not mediate the relationship between gender role conflict and stress (Manning, 2011); however, this is one of only a few studies on gender role conflict and racial or ethnic identity that did not yield significant results.

Overall, the results of these studies suggest that gender role conflict is related to social position, racial identity, and acculturation in African American men.

A study conducted using a sample of Mexican American university students found that restrictive emotionality was a significant positive predictor of increased overall stress as measured by the Hispanic Stress Inventory (Fragoso & Kashubeck, 2000). In addition to an overall mean stress score (Mejias, 2010), the Hispanic Stress Inventory measures stress in four domains: occupational/economic; parental; marital; and family/culture (Fragoso & Kashubeck, 2000). Fragoso and Kashubeck's study uses the overall mean score on the Hispanic Stress Inventory and does not provide information about subscale scores (2000). Another study found a positive correlation between higher levels of gender role conflict and the desire for muscularity in Latino men (Mejias, 2010). Other literature has examined the impact of gender role conflict on help-seeking in Latino men. One study found that, contrary to what was hypothesized, restrictive affectionate behavior between men did not mediate the relationship between machismo and help-seeking attitudes (Davis & Liang, 2015). The authors theorize that this finding might be explained by some other cultural phenomenon that has yet to be explored (Davis & Liang, 2015).

Significant associations have been found between all components of gender role conflict and lower levels of acculturation in Hispanic and Latino men. Success, power, and competition issues have emerged as the strongest predictors of lower levels of acculturation in these studies (S. J. Schwartz et al., 2014). On the other hand, two studies did not find significant relationships between acculturation and gender role conflict in Hispanic and Latino men (Rivera, 1996; Silva, 2002). Liang and colleagues (2011) found that machismo

was significantly positively correlated with all aspects of gender role conflict in a sample of Hispanic and Latino men, while caballerismo correlated significantly with lower levels of restrictive affective behavior between men. This study also found that higher levels of machismo and restrictive affective behavior between men were associated with higher levels of perceived racism (Liang et al., 2011). The role of acculturation in psychological health outcomes among Latino and Hispanic men remains unclear given the mixed results of the studies cited above. More studies are needed to further investigate the relationships between acculturation and gender role conflict in marginalized men (O'Neil, 2015).

Studies have also investigated the role of acculturation and other cultural variables in gender role conflict in Asian American men. Gender role conflict in this population has been found to correlate significantly with Asian cultural values as measured by the Asian Values Scale (Kim, Atkinson, & Yang, 1999) and composed of subscales for emotional self-control, collectivism, humility, family recognition through achievement, conformity to norms, and filial piety. One study found that Asian American men who reported higher levels of acculturation were likely to report significantly less restrictive emotionality—and more struggles with success, power, and competition—than less acculturated men (Kim et al., 1996).

In African American, Asian American, and Latino and Hispanic American men, gender role conflict is related to acculturation, racial, and ethnic identity constructs. The mixed nature of some of these findings and the relatively small number of studies indicate that further study of these constructs in ethnic minority men is warranted (O'Neil, 2015; Wong, Liu, et al., 2017). Latino and Hispanic men's masculinity is often stereotyped as

more aggressive and hypersexualized than that of middle-class white men (Falicov, 2010). For both Asian American and Latino American men, alternative, culturally specific masculinities allow individuals to counteract stereotypes and maintain alternative standards of masculinity (Hirsch et al., 2007). While these alternative constructs may produce positive outcomes, hegemonic masculinity ideologies remain a significant factor in negative mental health outcomes.

While more recent theory and research have stressed the importance of cultural context and the potential race and ethnicity have to shape the trajectory of the development of masculine identity, researchers continue to be criticized for paying too little attention to the role of culture in the overall development of masculine gender role stress and conflict (Griffith et al., 2012; O'Neil, 2015). Most theories and measures of masculine gender role strain were developed and normed on predominantly white samples, and they have been critiqued for not considering the unique stressors that men in ethnic minority communities may face (Griffith et al., 2012). The dominant masculine ideology in the United States is associated with traits that include assertiveness, dominance, control, physical strength, and emotional restraint (O'Neil, 2015). While some differences from dominant masculinity ideology in men from non-dominant cultural or ethnic backgrounds might be expected, empirical research with diverse samples has demonstrated that there are also some similarities.

ACCULTURATION, ACCULTURATIVE STRESS, AND GENDER ROLE CONFLICT

Acculturation theory may provide a helpful framework for understanding differences in ethnic minority masculinities and ethnic minority men's experiences of gender role conflict. The concept of acculturation is used to describe the internal changes that individuals may experience when they come into contact with a new culture (Lakey, 2003). Acculturation has been defined as a dual process of both shedding attributes of an origin culture and acquiring attributes of a host culture (Berry, 2006). Through social learning, individuals undergoing acculturation adapt in order to attempt to cope with the external demands of their new cultures (Berry, 2006). Acculturative stress, in contrast to psychological adjustment, is defined as a stress reaction in response to the events and experiences associated with acculturation (Berry, 2006).

Relationships between mental health outcomes and acculturation are well-established. A meta-analysis of 325 studies of acculturation and mental health outcomes reported that overall, acculturation was significantly associated with both negative (i.e., depression, anxiety, and psychological distress) and positive (i.e., self-esteem and positive affect) mental health outcomes, while enculturation (i.e. the retention of attributes of a culture of origin) was only positively related to positive outcomes (Yoon et al., 2013). A number of studies identify nonsignificant effects of acculturation on both negative and positive mental health indicators (Birman & Tran, 2008; Jang & Chiriboga, 2010; Juang & Cookston, 2009). Differing conceptualizations and operationalizations of acculturation may explain some of the mixed results among studies on mental health outcomes and acculturation (Yoon et al., 2013; Yoon, Langrehr, & Ong, 2011). Two recent studies found

that greater acculturation to Anglo-American culture left Latinx community members at greater risk for both exposure to and perpetration of IPV (Cummings, Gonzalez-Guarda, & Sandoval, 2013; Mancera, Dorgo, & Provencio-Vasquez, 2017).

Acculturative stress, sometimes called immigration stress or acculturation stress, refers to psychological distress and the negative psychological consequences experienced by individuals due to the process of acculturation (Berry, Kim, Minde, & Mok, 1987). Acculturative stress builds conceptually on the concept of culture shock (Oberg, 1960), or the anxiety experienced by individuals who lose aspects of their cultures of origin when confronted with new cultures. Sources of acculturative stress include differences in norms, values, systems of education, and political systems. A small proportion of the literature on acculturation has examined acculturative stress. The occurrence of acculturative stress has been recorded in immigrant families who experience shifting families roles and responsibilities as a result of immigration experiences (Arbona et al., 2010). For example, women who were expected to work within the home in their country of origin may seek employment outside of the home post-migration, and this change may lead to acculturative stress due to shifting family structures and changing roles (Kwak, 2003). Research indicates the presence of acculturation-related stressors in samples of Latino, Asian, and African immigrants. A Norwegian study of young people with origins in Asian, African, and Eastern European countries found differences between ethnic groups in terms of acculturation-related stressors, mental health problems, and perceived discrimination (Oppedal, Roysamb, & Heyerdahl, 2005).

Empirical research on acculturative stress, acculturation, and gender role conflict is limited, but some evidence does suggest that acculturative stress may be a pathway through which ethnic minority men experience increased gender role conflict and, consequently, develop more hostile attitudes toward women and increased sexual aggression. One study found no differences between Chinese-American, Japanese-American, and Korean-American men in terms of acculturation and patterns of gender role conflict, but it did find a significant correlation between acculturation and two gender role conflict patterns (success, power, and competition; and restrictive emotionality) (E. J. Kim et al., 1996).

Individuals may attempt to maintain the traditional patriarchal dynamics of their family of origin while acculturating to new environments; these attempts may provoke instability and interpersonal violence (Shalabi, Mitchell, & Andersson, 2015). Several studies suggest that certain immigrant populations are more vulnerable to interpersonal violence due to the process of migration and the experience of acculturative stress (Cainkar & Del Toro, 2010). Results of a study that included a sample of Arab immigrants to Canada suggested that emotional abuse perpetrated by men against women was twice as common among immigrants as among those born in Canada (Ahmad, Ali, & Stewart, 2005).

Few studies have examined the relationships between gender role conflict, acculturative stress, and attitudes toward women and sexual aggression. However, research on acculturative stress and other constructs in ethnic minority masculinity (e.g. body image and social comparison) suggests that acculturative stress may be an important factor to study in order to understand the development of attitudes toward women and sexual aggression in minority populations. For example, one study on the masculine norm of

restrictive emotionality and alexithymia (the inability to identify and describe emotions) in ethnic minority men suggests that acculturative stress should be examined in this population in order to better understand hypothesized mediators and moderators of established relationships between variables such as masculine gender role stress and restrictive emotionality (Levant, Wong, Karakis, & Welsh, 2015).

SOCIAL DOMINANCE ORIENTATION

Another variable that may predict attitudes toward women and violence is social dominance orientation. Social dominance orientation (SDO) refers to an individual's endorsement of group-based social inequality (Pratto, Sidanius, Stallworth, & Malle, 1994a). SDO has been used to help explain the existence and maintenance of hegemonic gender inequality. SDO is a central construct of Social Dominance Theory (SDT), which hypothesizes that people support ideologies that legitimize and maintain group-based social hierarches (Pratto et al., 1994a). Sidanius and Pratto (1999) argue that these hierarchies are maintained through three processes: individual discrimination, institutional discrimination, and behavioral asymmetry (i.e. the systematic ways that dominant and subordinate group members differ in their beliefs and behaviors). Individuals who endorse higher levels of SDO are more likely to endorse ideologies that legitimize a range of intergroup hierarchies (Pratto, Sidanius, & Levin, 2006), and SDO is hypothesized to help explain why an individual might act or endorse beliefs that support these processes (Sidanius & Pratto, 1999). Endorsement of SDO is also framed as a characteristic of individuals who favor support or maintenance of group-based social inequality.

Social dominance orientation is an important factor for understanding psychological phenomena behind intergroup differences in attitudes and behavior (Sidanius & Pratto, 1999). Social dominance theory is classed within the same group of psychological theories that aim to explain racism, stereotyping, and discrimination (Sidanius & Pratto, 1999). Many studies have examined the association between SDO and prejudice and discrimination (Akrami & Ekehammar, 2006; Bizer, Hart, & Jekogian, 2012; Sibley & Liu, 2010). Research also suggests that men score higher on SDO than women, reinforcing their own group's superior social status (Pratto et al., 2000; Pratto et al., 2006; Sibley, Wilson, & Duckitt, 2007; Sidanius, Pratto, & Bobo, 1994). Jost and Kay's study (2005) suggests that men perceive systems of gender stratification to be significantly more just than women do.

The key premise of social dominance theory (SDT) is the observation that people live in systems of group-based hierarchies (Sidanius & Pratto, 1999). SDT attempts to integrate individual attitudes and behaviors with institutional behaviors and social structures in order to explain the factors that lead to intergroup conflict and oppression (Sidanius & Pratto, 1999). In SDT, group-based social hierarchies are assumed to be stable and ubiquitous (Sidanius & Pratto, 1999). Gender hierarches in particular are assumed to have been particularly stable and insidious throughout history. Sidanius and Pratto (1999) argue that while there are several examples of matrilineal societies where descent is traced through the mother's family, for example, there are actually no known examples of matriarchal societies in which women control society in terms of political, military, or cultural power. These authors argue that gender hierarchies in which men have power over

36

women in society are "completely universal" (Sidanius & Pratto, 1999, p. 36), citing historical evidence that women have been excluded from political and military power worldwide for at least 5,000 years. The gender hierarchy is an example of a group-based rather than individual-based hierarchy. A group-based social hierarchy is one in which social power is afforded to individuals based on their membership in specific social groups (e.g. race or gender), and not based on individual characteristics such as athletic ability or intelligence (Sidanius & Pratto, 1999).

Social dominance theory maintains that it is neither a strictly psychological theory nor a strictly sociological theory. Instead, it draws on principles from both fields, among others, to explain how group-based social hierarchies are maintained. These processes include aggregated individual discrimination, aggregated institutional discrimination, behavioral asymmetry, and legitimizing myths (Sidanius & Pratto, 1999). Aggregated individual discrimination consists of quotidian acts of discrimination by individuals toward other individuals. Aggregated institutional discrimination consists of acts of discrimination maintained through what SDT calls "systematic terror" (Sidanius & Pratto, 1999). Aggregated institutional discrimination is often carried out through the systems in a society meant to maintain law and order (Sidanius & Pratto, 1999). Behavioral asymmetry refers to the dual processes of active oppression by dominant members of society and passive compliance by subordinate members (Sidanius & Pratto, 1999). Legitimizing myths are collections of attitudes, beliefs, stereotypes, and ideologies that provide social value within a social system through systems of moral and intellectual justification (Sidanius & Pratto, 1999). There are many types of legitimizing myths whose function is to maintain group-

based hierarchy. In SDT, legitimizing myths are discussed in terms of their potency (or the degree to which a particular myth is anchored in a society and is considered powerful enough to make authoritative claims about truth) and in terms of their functional type (whether a particular myth justifies social equality or social inequality) (Sidanius & Pratto, 1999). Examples of legitimizing myths include racism, sexism, classism, socialism, and universalism (Sidanius & Pratto, 1999).

Social dominance orientation (SDO) is the term used to describe the differences individuals display in their orientation toward valuing nonegalitarian or hierarchical relationships between social groups (Sidanius & Pratto, 1999). More than just an orientation, SDO is framed as the motive driving individual attitudes about social groups and social inequality in SDT (Sidanius & Pratto, 1999). Orientation to social dominance indicates preference or support for the dominance of certain groups over others, regardless of the way these groups come to be constructed or defined (Sidanius & Pratto, 1999). Individuals vary in the degree to which they endorse group-based inequality and dominance (Sidanius & Pratto, 1999).

Innumerable empirical studies have provided support for the reliability and validity of measures of social dominance orientation. Empirical evidence suggests that measures of sexism consistently and reliably correlate with social dominance orientation. People high in SDO have been shown to hold negative attitudes toward women and ethnic minority group members (Altemeyer, 1999; Christopher & Wojda, 2008; Duriez & Soenens, 2006; Ekehammar, Akrami, & Araya, 2000; Reynolds, Turner, Haslam, & Ryan, 2001; Simmons, Duffy, & Alfraih, 2012). Among both men and women, positive correlations have been

found between SDO and the belief that men should be sexually dominant (Rosenthal, Levy, & Earnshaw, 2012). SDO has also been shown to correlate with opposition to social policies that would reduce inequality between US nationals and immigrants, ethnic groups, and men and women (Pratto et al., 1994).

SEX, GENDER, AND SOCIAL DOMINANCE ORIENTATION

The relationships between gender, sex, and social dominance orientation are complex. The often-replicated finding of higher levels of SDO in males than in females has been called one of the most well-documented empirical findings of social dominance theory-based research (Sidanius & Pratto, 1999). This finding has been demonstrated in studies using samples from all over the world (Foels & Reid, 2010; Küpper & Zick, 2011; Rosenthal et al., 2012; Wilson & Liu, 2003). While evolutionary theory has been used to describe why these differences between males and females occur, more compelling arguments have been offered by cultural determinists, who maintain that behavioral differences between men and women are better understood in terms of situation, context, and culture (Sidanius & Pratto, 1999). The findings of one study indicate that in a community sample of metropolitan New Zealanders, it is actually the strength of gender group identification in both men and women that moderates the relationship between gender and SDO (Wilson & Liu, 2003). Men scored significantly higher than women on a measure of SDO, while women scored significantly higher than men on a measure of gender group identification (Wilson & Liu, 2003). Results indicated that a gender by gender group identification interaction variable significantly predicted SDO, suggesting

that gender group identification moderates the relationship between gender and SDO (Wilson & Liu, 2003).

Social dominance theorists argue that gender has an impact on individual levels of social dominance orientation above and beyond the impact of membership in other arbitrary social groups (e.g. racial or ethnic groups) (Sidanius & Pratto, 1999). This disparate impact is hypothesized to result not from innate sexual strategies and psychological characteristics, but rather from the unique and pervasive influence of patriarchy on the lives of both men and women (Sidanius & Pratto, 1999). This phenomenon is often referred to as the gender invariance hypothesis, regardless of whether explanations for its occurrence are culturally deterministic or evolutionary in nature (Sidanius & Pratto, 1999). As mentioned above, the literature suggests that men consistently endorse higher levels of SDO than women. However, the reasons for this difference have been the subject of some debate. Much of the support for the gender invariance hypothesis comes from evolutionary theorists, who claim that higher levels of social status and power have always been of greater reproductive benefit to males than to females throughout history; that status, resources, and dominance is best acquired and maintained in social groups; and that SDO is the principal mechanism through which this acquisition of resources and power is achieved (Sidanius, Sinclair, & Pratto, 2006). However, there have been numerous challenges to evolutionary explanations for gender invariance in SDO levels across cultures. Challengers maintain instead that SDO is mediated by contextual factors such as values (Caricati, 2007; Passini & Morselli, 2016) and threat perception (Duckitt, 2006). Other challenges to the invariance hypothesis

maintain that rather than being a cause of inequality, SDO may instead be a reflection of the drive to maintain pre-existing inequality in a given context (Fiske & Taylor, 2013). One study suggests that gender differences in SDO may be linked to gender self-stereotyping and hostile and benevolent sexism, rather than to innate reproductive strategies (Schmitt & Wirth, 2009). This study found that gender differences in SDO in a sample of university undergraduates (72 female and 149 male) were fully mediated by gender differences in femininity; these differences in SDO were also found to be mediated by hostile and benevolent sexism (Schmitt & Wirth, 2009).

The relationships between gender and ethnicity and levels of SDO are complex, but very little empirical research has examined the intersections of race or ethnicity and gender with SDO. While there has been some activity in the literature examining hierarchy-enhancing and hierarchy-attenuating outcomes and their diverse associations with SDO, very little of this research has specifically examined the potential relationships between acculturative stress and SDO. One study on the role of SDO in mediating the effects of sex and ethnicity on legitimizing SDO myths (e.g. racism and sexism) relating to gender and ethnic hierarchy showed that SDO mediated hostile sexism, but not benevolent sexism or legitimizing myths relating to ethnic group hierarchy (Pehrson, Carvacho, & Sibley, 2017).

SEXUAL AGGRESSION, AMBIVALENT SEXISM, AND GENDER INEQUALITY

Violence against women is a broad category that encompasses sexual aggression. It has been defined as any act of gender-based violence (GBV) that results in (or is likely

to result in) physical, sexual, or psychological harm or suffering to women, including threats of acts such as coercion or arbitrary deprivation of liberty, whether occurring in public or private life (*Declaration on the elimination of violence against women*, 1994). Violence against women is also characterized as one manifestation of gender inequality. Researchers have theorized that gender role conflict may play a key role in men's violence toward women because some men may abuse their partners as a way of regaining control from distress-inducing gender role violations (Franchina, Eisler, & Moore, 2001; O'Neil, 2015). Studies have found associations between gender role stress and men's self-reported anger and desire for aggression against female partners in hypothetical dating scenarios (Eisler, Franchina, Moore, Honeycutt, & Rhatigan, 2000). In addition, masculine gender role stress has been found to play an important role in the relationship between the endorsement of traditional male roles and violence toward women (Gallagher & Parrott, 2011; McDermott & Lopez, 2013).

O'Neil and Harway (1999) proposed that internalized sexism and patriarchal beliefs are externalized as violence women. Allison and Kilmartin (2007) also proposed a conceptual model in which men's violence against women can be explained by asymmetries in power and as indicators of patriarchal culture. While the majority of individual men never contribute to overtly violent gender-based acts, internalized sexism, patriarchy, and sensitivity to power structures contribute to an overall culture in which hostile sexism rationalizes violent acts against women (Allison & Kilmartin, 2007).

One of the constructs used to help understand violence against women is ambivalent sexism. Ambivalent sexism consists of two positively correlated components

that represent different orientations toward the evaluation of women: hostile sexism, or a subjectively negative orientation, and benevolent sexism, or harmful sexism which is disguised in a positive, paternalistic way (Glick & Fiske, 1996). Individuals who are high in benevolent sexism tend to view women as weaker and needing the protection of men (Glick & Fiske, 1996). Ambivalent sexism has been framed as a tool used in the maintenance of patriarchy and traditional gender roles (Vecina & Piñuela, 2017). Ambivalent sexism appears to be present in many cultures (Glick et al., 2000; Sibley & Becker, 2012). A study conducted using data from 19 different countries with a wide range of cultural and historical heritages found that hostile and benevolent sexist attitudes were prevalent among men and women in all 19 countries (Glick et al., 2000). This study also demonstrated that mean scores for hostile and benevolent sexism were positively correlated (Glick et al., 2000). A longitudinal study of sexism and gender inequality in 57 different countries suggests that overall, sexism predicted gender inequality for both males and females (Brandt, 2011).

The idea that men should be chivalrous and protect weaker individuals (i.e., women) is a component of benevolent sexism (Glick & Fiske, 1996; Phelan, Sanchez, & Broccoli, 2010). Results of one study suggest that benevolent sexist ideas not only impact how women are viewed, but can also result in negative appraisals of men in caregiver roles (Gaunt, 2013). Benevolent sexism may moderate attitudes about violence toward women. One study found that individuals who endorsed benevolent sexist attitudes were more likely to view forced sex in the context of marriage as a wifely duty than participants who did not endorse these attitudes (Durán, Moya, & Megías, 2011). Research into the

relationship between benevolent sexism and IPV has yielded mixed results. Some studies suggest that the endorsement of benevolent sexism may in fact act as a protective factor against the perpetration of gender-based violence by men (Allen, Swan, & Raghavan, 2009; Sakall, 2001). Research shows that women accept benevolent sexist ideology by excusing hostile sexist actions by men to whom they are close (Glick & Fiske, 2001). The endorsement of benevolent sexism has been shown to be associated with victim-blaming in cases of rape and violence (Abrams, Viki, Masser, & Bohner, 2003), and with excusing or dismissing the acts of male perpetrators (Glick, Sakallı–Ugurlu, Ferreira, & Aguiar de Souza, 2002). Individuals who endorse benevolent sexism perceive women as incompetent outside of the domestic sphere (Dardenne, Dumont, & Bollier, 2007). In turn, women who endorse benevolent sexism are more likely to see benevolent sexism as acts protective, rather than prejudicial (Glick & Fiske, 2001). Studies have also demonstrated that men can see their benevolent sexist behaviors as fulfilling the traditional gender role of being a provider (Good & Sanchez, 2009). Benevolent sexism in a sample of American and Chinese college students predicted ideals for romantic partners (e.g., preferences for a warm, strong, attractive, and feminine partner) in men and women in both groups (Lee, Fiske, Glick, & Chen, 2010). Individuals with hostile and benevolent sexist beliefs have been shown to rate females lower than males of similar ability levels (Reilly, Rackley, & Awad, 2016).

The relationship between social dominance orientation and ambivalent sexism is fairly well-established, with social dominance orientation being significantly positively correlated with both hostile and benevolent sexism (Feather & McKee, 2012; Sibley et al.,

2007). The hypothesized relationships between social dominance orientation and gender role conflict are exploratory, as these relationships remain under-studied. Examples of sexually aggressive tactics used by individuals who have tried to convince a woman to have sex when she does not want to include enticement, emotional manipulation, and intoxication in addition to force. Since the use of these tactics is predicted by sexual aggression, sexual aggression may itself be predicted by higher levels of adherence to toughness and dominance, masculine role norms, and gender role conflict.

MASCULINITY AND SEXUAL AGGRESSION

Understanding the cultural significance of masculinity is critical to understanding the development and perpetration of sexual aggression (Kulwicki & Ballout, 2015). Perspectives that take masculinity into account when examining sexual aggression stress that the difficulty of living up to ideas of "successful manhood" can be the source of stress that might lead men to abuse their partners, especially in ethnic minority communities (Kulwicki & Ballout, 2015). There is evidence to suggest that the concept of masculine gender role stress (MGRS) explains why some males use violence against women disproportionately (Baugher & Gazmararian, 2015).

Sexual aggression perpetrated by men against women is seen not only as an expression of male power and dominance, but also as a reaction to the difficulty of meeting social expectations of masculinity that might be unattainable, especially for ethnic minority men (Kulwicki & Ballout, 2015). The inability to successfully meet social expectations of manhood has been theorized to trigger a crisis of identity, which can result in violence

against women (Kulwicki & Ballout, 2015). This resulting violence allows for a man to express dominance over his partner in ways that may be prohibited elsewhere in society (Kulwicki & Ballout, 2015).

Attitudes and beliefs that support male dominance over women (i.e. patriarchal attitudes) and adherence to a strict definition of men's and women's roles in relationships are also related to an increased risk of perpetrating sexual violence and aggression. McDermott and Lopez (2013) found a positive correlation between the endorsement of traditional masculine gender roles and the acceptance of intimate partner violence in a sample of male US college students; in contrast, egalitarian sex role beliefs were negatively associated with attitudes supporting intimate partner violence. In addition, hostility toward women has been identified as a risk factor for aggression perpetrated by men against women (Gallagher & Parrott, 2011).

Chapter Three: Methods

Statement of Purpose

The primary purpose of this study was to extend current research on masculinity in ethnic minority men. Drawing from the theoretical and empirical literature reviewed above, and in response to a number calls for more research (O'Neil, 2015; Wong, 2017; Wong, Ho, et al., 2017), this study investigates the relationships between gender role conflict, conformity to masculine role norms, acculturative stress, social dominance orientation, sexism, and self-reported sexual aggression. This research examines the extent to which gender role conflict mediates relationships between sexual aggression, hostile sexism, social dominance orientation, and conformity to masculine role norms. Additionally, this research examines whether race impacts gender role conflict, conformity to masculine role norms, acculturative stress, social dominance orientation, sexism, and self-reported sexual aggression. This study sought to examine conformity to traditional masculine role norms in ethnic minority college men and to advance understanding of what roles acculturation and acculturative stress play in men's conformity to these norms. This study also aimed to advance understanding of how conformity to masculine role norms is linked to gender role conflict in ethnic minority men.

Study Hypotheses

Research Question 1: What is the relationship between sexual aggression and the independent variables of interest (social dominance orientation, acculturative stress, masculine role norm adherence, gender role conflict, and ambivalent sexism)?

Hypothesis 1a: It was predicted that social dominance orientation will be significantly correlated with sexual aggression. Participants with higher scores on the SDOS were expected to also report higher rates of sexual aggression as measured by the SSS.

Rationale 1a: This hypothesis is exploratory. The relationship between social dominance orientation and acceptance of sexual aggression myths in men was partially mediated by hostile sexism against women in one study (Camas & Mese, 2016). In another study on acceptance of sexual aggression myths in German residents, social dominance orientation was moderately correlated with rape myth acceptance, but this correlation did not explain unique variance in rape myth acceptance beyond what could be explained by right-wing authoritarianism (Sussenbach & Bohner, 2011). To date, little research has examined the direct relationship between social dominance orientation and self-reported perpetration of sexual aggression. One study on the endorsement of non-egalitarian beliefs and sexual violence in Peruvian boys suggests that sexual double standards are less important than violent attitudes in the perpetration of sexual violence (Moyano, Monge, & Sierra, 2017). Moyano, Monge, and Sierra (2017) suggest that social dominance orientation may be less important than the endorsement of non-egalitarian sexual beliefs (i.e., double standards about the appropriateness of certain sexual behaviors when performed by either

men or women), but their study does not measure or report relationships between social dominance orientation and experiences of sexual aggression.

Other researchers (Russell & Oswald, 2001; Zurbriggen, 2000) have suggested that male sexual aggression may be driven by gratification gained from dominating women. The theory developed by Malamuth (1998) that sexual dominance orientation (i.e., the degree to which someone is sexually motivated by feelings of control over their partner) is one of the three distinct paths that leads to sexual aggression in men is supported by some empirical studies showing a direct, positive association between sexual dominance and problems in interpersonal relations, to include sexual aggression (Malamuth, Linz, Heavey, Barnes, & Acker, 1995; Dean & Malamuth, 1997). The association between sexual and social dominance orientation has not yet been fully explored in the literature.

Hypothesis 1b: It was predicted that acculturative stress will be significantly and positively associated with sexual aggression. Men who reported experiencing more acculturative stress as measured by the SAFE were expected to also report higher levels of sexual aggression on the SSS.

Rationale 1b: This hypothesis is also exploratory in nature, as little empirical research examining the relationship between acculturative stress and self-reported sexual aggression has been conducted to date. Stressors associated with acculturation (e.g., conflicted ethnic identity and family acculturation conflict) were associated with higher rates of acceptance and perpetration of dating violence in male and female Mexican-American adolescents (Hokoda, Galvan, Malcarne, Castaneda, & Ulloa, 2003). Acculturative stress was found to have an indirect effect on risky sexual behavior through

sexual compulsivity in male and female ethnic minority college students (Jardin, Garey, Sharp, & Zvolensky, 2015). No studies have been published to date examining specific associations between acculturative stress and self-reported sexual aggression.

Hypothesis 1c: It was predicted that higher levels of adherence to the traditional hegemonic masculine role norms would be significantly and positively associated with sexual aggression. Participants with higher levels of adherence to traditional masculine role norm ideology as measured by the MRNI were predicted to also report higher levels of sexual aggression.

Rationale 1c: Precarious manhood theory suggests that because the status associated with traditional patriarchal masculinity is difficult to earn and easy to lose, some men will use violence to hold onto it (Vandello, Bosson, Cohen, Burnagord, & Weaver, 2008). Men who adhere more strictly to traditional hegemonic masculinity perpetrate more aggression toward their partners because intimate partner conflict is appraised as a threat to rigidly held views about masculinity (Lisco, Leone, Gallagher, & Parrott, 2015). The results of three experiments designed to test whether men's physical aggression was part of a cultural script for restoring threatened masculine gender role status showed that challenges to men's gender status elicited more physically aggressive behaviors; men's anxiety was also found to decrease when these physically aggressive displays were used (Bosson, Vandello, Burnaford, Weaver, & Wasti, 2009). While precarious manhood theory may explain why threatened gender role status is associated with increased physically aggressive behavior in the public domain, less is known about the impact threats to gender role status may have in the generally more private realm of sexual aggression.

50

Antifemininity and toughness (two domains of traditional hegemonic masculine role norms) facilitated intimate partner aggression in men with a history of heavy episodic drinking (Lisco et al., 2015). Adherence to antifeminine hegemonic masculine role norms was also shown to be positively associated with sexually aggressive behavior in heterosexual young adult men (Smith-Hunter, Parrott, Swartout, & Tharp, 2015). Perceived threats to strongly held traditional masculine role norms may be associated with sexual aggression.

Hypothesis 1d: It was predicted that higher levels of gender role conflict would be significantly and positively related to sexual aggression. In other words, participants with higher levels of gender role conflict as measured by the GRCS-SF were expected to also report higher levels of sexual aggression.

Rationale 1d: Similar to the rationale for hypothesis 1c, since manhood is theorized to be a status difficult to achieve, easy to lose, and hard to maintain, men who experience gender role conflict may be at increased risk of attempting to resolve that conflict through sexual aggression. Very little research has been published investigating the role of gender role conflict and aggressive reactions to threats to manhood (Vandello & Bosson, 2013). Gender role conflict was found to be positively associated with sexual aggression perpetration in male college students (Rando et al., 1998). While few studies published to date have directly examined the relationship between self-reported sexual aggression and gender role conflict, some studies suggest that masculine gender role conflict is significantly associated with a range of other attitudes and cognitions that support sexual aggression perpetration (Amato, 2012).

Hypothesis 1e: It was predicted that higher levels of ambivalent sexism will be significantly and positively correlated with sexual aggression. Participants with higher scores on the ambivalent sexism inventory (ASI) were expected to also reported higher levels of sexual aggression as measured by the SSS.

Rationale 1e: Theoretical models of the role of gender (including differences in the psychology of men and women) in understanding violent and aggressive behavior emphasize the importance of understanding not only the interpersonal dynamics that lead to sexually aggressive behavior, but also the social contexts and attitudes within which these behaviors are enacted (Bosson, Parrott, Swan, Kuchynka, & Schramm, 2015). Ambivalent sexism has been demonstrated to have a direct effect on self-reported sexual aggression (Lisco, Parrott, & Tharp, 2012; Masser, Viki, & Power, 2006). Hostile sexism, one component of ambivalent sexism, was shown to account for unique variance in attitudes condoning spousal abuse in a sample of Turkish and Brazilian men, while benevolent sexism was not (Glick, Sakalli-Ugurlu, Ferreira, & de Souza, 2002). This study suggests that hostile sexism supports the justification of spousal abuse, while benevolent sexism fails to protect women from abuse if their partners decide their authority has been challenged or if traditional gender role norms have been violated (Glick et al., 2002). Ambivalent sexism in men has been proposed as a risk factor for sexual aggression against women (Bosson et al., 2015), and a positive predictive relationship between men's hostile sexism and sexual aggression towards women has been demonstrated in a wide range of longitudinal and cross-sectional studies (e.g., Abbey & McAuslan, 2004; Hall, Teten, Degarmo, Sue, & Stephens, 2005).

Analysis 1a-e: These hypotheses were tested by calculating Pearson's correlation between participants' overall scores on the Social Dominance Orientation Scale, the Social Attitudinal, Familial, and Environmental Stress Scale, the Masculine Role Norms Inventory, the Gender Role Conflict Scale, the Ambivalent Sexism Inventory, and scores the Sexual Strategies Scale.

Research Question 2: What do social dominance orientation and ambivalent sexism add to the prediction of sexual aggression above what can be explained by gender role conflict, adherence to traditional masculine role norms, and acculturative stress? What are the unique contributions of adherence to traditional masculine role norm ideology, gender role conflict, social dominance orientation, acculturative stress, and ambivalent sexism to the prediction of sexual aggression?

Hypothesis 2: It was predicted that social dominance orientation and ambivalent sexism would account for a significant portion of the variability in the prediction of the endorsement of sexually aggressive strategies among ethnic minority male college students beyond what was predicted by gender role conflict, traditional masculine role norm adherence, and acculturative stress.

Rationale 2: Precarious manhood theory holds that men with higher levels of adherence to traditional masculine role norm ideology and increased conflict or stress about their gender roles may be at increased risk of using aggressive behavior to restore, or attempt to restore, the status associated with manhood (Vandello et al., 2008). The realistic and symbolic threat perceived by men who are members of a cultural outgroup and who are undergoing acculturative stress may include not only broadly-encompassed morals,

attitudes, values, beliefs, and standards (Oskamp, 2000), but could also be expected to extend into the domain of attitudes, values, and beliefs about masculinity and gender roles. Limited empirical evidence is available that explicitly identifies the relationships between acculturative stress, traditional masculine role norm adherence, and gender role conflict. However, theory suggests that acculturative stress may play a role in increasing conflict about traditional hegemonic masculine role norms, which may result in higher risk for sexual aggression.

Analysis 2: Hierarchical multiple regression was used to test this hypothesis. Hierarchical multiple regression was used to evaluate whether or not the variables of interest explain a significant amount of variance in the dependent variable after accounting for all other variables. The overall regression model was tested for significance by inspecting the F-value associated with the model. This testing focused on highlighting significant increments in explained variance associated with the individual variables entered in the subsequent steps, above and beyond the variance explained by predictor variables that were already included in the regression equation. The change in variance (ΔR^2), its associated change in F (ΔF^2), and its p-value (Petrocelli, 2003) were examined. Next, the R^2 associated with the model was reviewed. R^2 represents the proportion of the variance in the criterion variable accounted for by the overall model.

The variables were entered in three hierarchical blocks. The first block contained control variables identified in preliminary analysis in addition to self-deceptive enhancement and impression management (i.e., socially-desirable responding). The second block contained variables associated with precarious manhood (i.e., gender role conflict

and traditional masculine role norm adherence), as well as a variable hypothesized to have an impact on gender role conflict and masculine role norm adherence (i.e., acculturative stress).

The third block contained social dominance orientation and ambivalent sexism, attitudes well known to be associated with support for rape myths and myths about sexual violence. There is little empirical evidence for or against a relationship between these variables and self-reported sexual aggression. All variables of interest were regressed on participants' scores on the SSS.

Research Question 3: Does sexual aggression differ by racial group self-identification? Since this research question is exploratory in nature, no direction is hypothesized.

Rationale 3a: This hypothesis was exploratory in nature and dependent on significant predictors being found in the hierarchical multiple regression outlined above. Moderation effects of race were tested on any significant predictor variables using Aiken and West's 1991 guidelines for testing moderators.

PARTICIPANTS

Two hundred and ninety participants were recruited from the University's Educational Psychology subject pool. Individuals who self-identified as men and as ethnic minorities were eligible to participate. The G* Power 3.1.9.2 program (Faul, Erdfelder, Lang, & Buchner, 2007) was used to determine the sample size necessary to detect significant findings using hierarchical multiple regression. Using an alpha probability of

0.05, a power level of 0.80, and a medium effect size of .12, a minimum sample size of 87 was required. The effect size used in the a priori power analysis was determined through a review of prior research with similar variables and outcomes. Tabachnick and Fidell (2000) recommend that the sample size for multiple regression equal the number of predictors plus 104, or the number of predictors times 8 plus 50. These recommendations would bring the total sample size needed to at least 210.

The final sample consisted of 267 heterosexual ethnic minority male college students. The racial/ethnic identification of participants was as follows: 27 (9.2%) identified as African American/Black, 85 (28.9%) identified as Hispanic/Latino, 6 (2.0%) identified as Middle Eastern/North African, 1 (0.3%) identified as American Indian, 129 (43.9%) identified as Asian, 1 (0.3%) identified as other, and 41 (13.9%) identified as multiracial. There were 43 (14.8%) freshmen, 80 (27.6%) sophomores, 64 (22.1%) juniors, and 98 (33.8%) seniors. The mean age of participants was 20.76 years old (SD = 2.50). Most participants were born in the United States (76.2%). Participants who were born outside of the United States had spent an average of 12 years in the country. This sample included 23 (7.9%) international students. The majority of the sample considered themselves middle class (42.8%) or upper middle class (32.4%). Participants were asked to rate themselves on a 10-step SES ladder where step 1 symbolizes Americans who are the worst off, and step 10 symbolizes Americans who are best off. On this measure, the majority of students placed themselves on rungs 5 (16.2%), 6 (17.6%), or 7 (31.0%). The majority of participants in this sample identified as heterosexual (n=267; 92.1%). Ten participants identified as bisexual (2.4%). Six participants identified as gay (2.1%), five as

questioning (1.7%), and two participants identified primarily with an "other" category of sexual orientation (0.6%). (See Table 1). Participants who did not identify as heterosexual were excluded from the study.

Measures

Demographic survey. Participants completed a brief demographic survey that collected information on race/ethnicity, gender, age, classification (year in school), socioeconomic status (SES), current academic major, international student status, sexual orientation, country of birth, and length of time spent living in the United States.

Social Dominance Orientation Scale. The Social Dominance Orientation Scale (SDOS; Pratto, Sidanius, Stallworth, & Malle, 1994b) measures preferences for the maintenance of inequality between social groups. The SDOS consists of 14 items that are rated on a 7-point Likert-type scale, with 1 being *very negative* and 7 being *very positive.* Ratings on the SDOS are averaged, with higher scores indicating greater dominance orientation. Sample items include: "Some groups of people are simply inferior to others" and "Inferior groups should stay in their place." There is evidence to support the unidimensionality of the SDO scale. The scale also has good internal reliability, with alpha levels averaging at .83 across samples (Pratto et al., 1994). More recently reported Cronbach's alphas for SDOS items are .89 (Goodman & Moradi, 2008) and .93 (Poteat, Espelage, & Green Jr., 2007). SDO scores in studies using samples of college students have been shown to correlate positively with measures of sexism, homophobia, and cultural elitism (Pratto et al., 1994). In the current study, Cronbach's alpha for the SDOS was .93.

Social, Attitudinal, Familial, and Environmental Stress Scale. The Social, Attitudinal, Familial, and Environmental Stress Scale *(*SAFE; Mena, Padilla, & Maldonado, 1987) is a 24-item measure of acculturative stress that was originally developed to assess stress related to acculturation in the social, attitudinal, familial, and environmental contexts. Rigorous factor structure and measurement invariance testing led to the publication of an updated 13-item version in 2015 (Suh et al., 2015). The 13-item version used in this study provides a measure of general stress due to acculturation. Items on this version of the SAFE are rated on a Likert-type scale ranging from 1 (not at all stressful) to 5 (very stressful). Respondents can also choose "not applicable" for items that may not apply to them. Scores on the SAFE are summed, and a mean score is computed. Higher scores indicate higher levels of general acculturative stress. Reliability for the SAFE has been demonstrated in a variety of populations, including Asian Americans and international students (α = .89; Mena et al., 1987) and a heterogeneous sample of Hispanic Americans (α = .89), Haitians and Haitian Americans, and African American college students (α = .89) (Gomez et al., 2011). The SAFE scale has been found to have construct validity when used with Hispanic college students (Fuertes & Westbrook, 1996) and African American college students (Joiner Jr. & Walker, 2002). Tests of structural and measurement invariance suggest no significant variability in the general stress factor over time (Suh et al., 2015). The measure can be adapted to be specific to individuals from certain ethnic backgrounds. For example, the item. "People look down upon me when I practice my _____ customs" can be adapted to read "Korean," "African American," or "Hispanic." Other sample items include "It bothers me when people pressure me to

assimilate" and "People think I am unsociable when in fact I have trouble communicating in English." For the current study, Cronbach's alpha for the SAFE was .82.

Male Role Norms Inventory – Short Form. The Male Role Norms Inventory-Short Form (MRNI-SF; Levant, Hall, & Rankin, 2013) is a 21-item measure of traditional masculinity ideology with items rated on a 7-point Likert-type scale (1 = *strongly disagree*; 7 = *strongly agree*). Higher scores indicate higher levels of endorsement of traditional masculinity ideology. The MRNI-SF measures all three components of hegemonic masculinity (status, toughness, and antifemininity), in addition to measuring several other male role norms (e.g., self-reliance through mechanical skill; Thompson & Bennett, 2015). The traditional masculinity ideology domains, corresponding sample items, and alpha coefficients reported by the developers of the MRNI-SF are as follows: Restrictive Emotionality (e.g., "Men should not be too quick to tell others that they care about them," $\alpha = .83$); Self-reliance through Mechanical Skills (e.g., "Men should be able to fix most things around the house," $\alpha = .86$); Negativity Toward Sexual Minorities (e.g., "Homosexuals should never marry," $\alpha = .88$); Avoidance of Femininity (e.g., "A man should prefer watching action movies to reading romantic novels," $\alpha = .90$); Importance of Sex (e.g., "A man should always be ready for sex," $\alpha = .83$); Dominance (e.g., "A man should always be the boss," $\alpha = .87$); and Toughness (e.g., "I think a young man should try to be physically tough, even if he's not," $\alpha = .79$). An overall mean is also used to calculate a general traditional masculinity ideology score. The alpha coefficient of the general traditional masculinity ideology latent factor was reported by developers as .92. Levant et al. (2013) found evidence for factor structure, reliability of the subscales, and

convergent, divergent, and concurrent validity of this measure. This study uses the overall general traditional masculinity ideology score, and Cronbach's alpha for the scale was 0.95. Should the general traditional masculinity ideology score be found to be a significant predictor of sexual aggression, all seven individual subscales will be investigated to determine which specific domains are related to sexual aggression in this sample.

Gender Role Conflict Scale – Short form. The Gender Role Conflict Scale-Short Form (GRCS-SF; Wester, Vogel, O'Neil, & Danforth, 2012) is a 16-item self-report scale that measures four components of men's gender role conflict: restricted emotionality; success, power, and competition; restrictive affectionate behavior between men; and conflicts between work and family relations. The items on the GRCS-SF scale are ranked on a 6-point Likert-type scale from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 6 (*strongly agree*). A total mean score is calculated to give an indication of overall gender role conflict. It is also possible to calculate mean scores for each of four subscales to characterize gender role conflict in those specific domains. Sample items include: "I strive to be more successful than others" and "Being very personal with other men makes me feel uncomfortable." The GRCS-SF was developed in response to critical analysis of the original GRCS, which consisted of the same four subscales but also exhibited excessive factorial variance between groups and was criticized for a lack of face validity (O'Neil, 2015). Revisions made in the GRCS-SF addressed these concerns and resulted in a shorter measure that has good internal consistency and reliability, with coefficient alphas between .78 and .80 for all four subscales (Wester et al., 2012). This study used the overall mean gender role conflict scale. Cronbach's alpha for this study was 0.87.

Balanced Inventory of Desirable Responding – Short Form. The short form of the Balanced Inventory of Desirable Responding (BIDR-16; Hart, Ritcher, Hepper, & Gebauer, 2015) is a 16-item self-report scale that measures self-deceptive enhancement and impression management. Self-deceptive enhancement is a tendency towards responding in an honest but overly positive way (Hart et al., 2015). Impression management describes a response style that reflects a desire to please others (Hart et al., 2015). Measures like the BIDR-16 were developed in an attempt to control patterns of socially desirable responding in self-report social science research (Hart et al., 2015). While it is possible to score the BIDR-16 dichotomously and to subsequently assign participants to groups based on the presence or lack of self-deceptive enhancement or impression management, this study scored the measure continuously, following recommendations from a series of researchers (Hart et al., 2015; Kam, 2013). Alpha reliabilities for studies using the BIDR-16 ranged from 0.63 to 0.82 (Hart et al., 2015). A validity examination of the BIDR-16 suggested that continuous scoring of the measure produces consistently higher validity than dichotomous scoring (Kam, 2013). The Cronbach's alpha for the SDE subscale was 0.65 in this study, while it was 0.61 for the IM subscale.

Sexual Strategies Scale. The Sexual Strategies Scale (SSS; Strang, Peterson, Hill, & Heiman, 2013) is a 22-item scale that measures the use of enticement, emotional manipulation, intoxication, and force as strategies to convince a woman to have sex after initial refusal. The SSS is scored both dichotomously, classifying participants into two groups (either aggressive or nonaggressive) based on their endorsement of aggressive

behaviors, and continuously, providing sum scores for participants on items that measure their endorsement sexually aggressive strategies. Participants check "yes" for all strategies that they have used, and endorsement of specific items is consistent with the four domains mentioned above. This measure does not ask explicitly about "sexual coercion," "rape," or "sexual assault." Instead, it describes behaviors that participants endorse. Sample items include: "Using your older age to convince her" and "Using physical restraint." Attempts have also been made to create severity-based hierarchies based on responses to the SSS. However, analysis of the psychometric structure of the continuously scored SSS better supports the existence of a single, unidimensional domain of perpetration of aggression in the domains of enticement, verbal coercion, exploitation, and physical force, rather than hierarchical outcomes (Testa, Hoffman, Lucke, & Pagnan, 2015).

There is some controversy about the validity and reliability of self-report measures of sexual aggression, as participants may fail to disclose behaviors that scales like the SSS attempt to measure (either intentionally or unintentionally). Positive impression management can also impact disclosures on scales like the SSS (Strang et al., 2013). There is evidence to suggest that the SSS has better Rasch properties than comparable measures of sexual aggression perpetration (Testa et al., 2015). Evidence also suggests that the SSS is less susceptible to the underreporting problems associated with other measures of self-reported sexual aggression, resulting in higher reported rates of sexual aggression than other measures (Craig, Peterson, Janssen, Goodrich, & Heiman, 2017; Strang & Peterson, 2017). Previously reported Cronbach's alphas (Kuder

Richardson-20) for the SSS range from .76 to .79 (Testa et al., 2015). In this study, the coefficient alpha (KR-20) for the 22 items was 0.85.

Ambivalent Sexism Inventory. Developed as a measure of hostile sexism (HS) and benevolent sexism (BS), the Ambivalent Sexism Inventory (ASI; Glick & Fiske, 1996) is a 22-item self-report measure. Participants rate how much they agree or disagree with each of the items on a 6-point Likert-type scale (0 = *disagree strongly*, 5 = *agree strongly*). Two separate subscale scores (i.e., hostile and benevolent sexism) are calculated in addition to an overall ambivalent sexism score that is calculated by averaging subscale scores. A sample benevolent sexism item is: "A good woman should be set on a pedestal by her man." A sample hostile sexism item is: "Many women are actually seeking special favors, such as hiring policies that favor them over men, under the guise of asking for 'equality.'" The ASI has yielded Cronbach's alphas of 0.88 for the total scale, 0.86 for the HS subscale, and 0.83 for the BS subscale suggesting adequate reliability (León-Ramírez & Ferrando, 2013). Construct validity of both the hostile and benevolent sexism subscales has been established by studies conducted using participants from a wide range of ethnic and national backgrounds (e.g., Garaigordobil & Aliri, 2013; Curun, Taysi, & Orcan, 2017). In this study, the Cronbach's alpha for the total scale was 0.86. The Cronbach's alpha was 0.86 for the HS subscale and 0.75 for the BS subscale.

PROCEDURES

This study was conducted in compliance with all applicable guidelines and procedures established by the University of Texas at Austin's Institutional Review Board

for the Protection of Human Subjects. The study also conformed to the American Psychological Association's (APA) Ethical Principles of Psychologists and Code of Conduct. All participants were required to complete electronic informed consent forms prior to participating in the study. Since participants responded to a set of online surveys, written consent forms were not collected. Participants were informed that their participation in the study was voluntary and that they could withdraw at any time without penalty. All participants completed the study online using Qualtrics, a software that enables participants to complete surveys at a time and place of their choosing. The first page of the survey included a project description, requirements for participation, and a statement asking the participant to indicate whether or not he wished to continue. The choice not to continue took participants to a page with a message thanking him for considering participation and a link to alternative studies in the subject pool. Participants were also informed that the survey would take no more than 45 minutes to complete. As an incentive for choosing to participate in this study, participants received one research credit.

Participants who met inclusion guidelines (i.e., those who self-identified as both male and ethnic minorities) and consented to participate were first asked to complete the demographics survey. The title of the survey was "Men's Stress." A false depiction of the nature of the study was warranted, as participants' awareness of the true nature of the study may have jeopardized their willingness to participate and biased their responses. Data were collected over the course of two long semesters.

Chapter 4: Results

Preliminary Analyses

The variables of interest in this study were social dominance orientation, acculturative stress, gender role conflict, traditional masculine role norm adherence, ambivalent sexism, and sexual aggression. Before proceeding with multiple regression analyses, one-way ANOVAs were conducted to determine if there were mean differences among participants on demographic variables (e.g., sexual orientation, international student status, socioeconomic status, income, and race). Any significant differences between participants on the demographic variables were then controlled for in the first block of the hierarchical multiple regression. Assumptions for multiple regression analyses were considered and tested before proceeding.

Testing of Statistical Assumptions

First, the normality of the data was evaluated by examining scatterplots of the residuals (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2000). These scatterplots were also used to evaluate the dataset for potential outliers, homoscedasticity, and linearity of the data (Osborne & Waters, 2002). Skewness and kurtosis were then assessed. Multicollinearity of the variables was assessed by examining Variance Inflation Factor (VIF) values greater than four and tolerance factors in excess of .2 (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2000). Descriptive statistics and correlations for all variables were reported.

The assumption of independence of observations was tested by examining the Durbin-Watson statistic. Durbin-Watson values of approximately 2 indicate no

correlation between residuals and no problems with autocorrelation. The Durbin-Watson statistic in this regression was 1.88, indicating that there was independence of residuals and no autocorrelation. Next, the collective linear relationship of the independent variables to the dependent variable, and the linear relationships of each independent variable to the dependent variable, were tested. These relationships were tested first by plotting a scatterplot of the studentized residuals against the predicted values. Next, partial regression plots were used to determine whether a linear relationship existed between each independent variable and the dependent variable. The scatterplot of studentized residuals against predicted values showed that residuals formed a horizontal band, suggesting that the relationship between independent variables was likely to be linear. An examination of the partial regression plots between each independent variable and the dependent variable also supported the existence of approximately linear relationships between the variables. After the linearity of relationships between variables was established, the assumption of homoscedasticity was tested by examining the scatterplot of studentized residuals against unstandardized predicted values. The spread of residuals did not increase or decrease across the predicted values, suggesting that the homoscedasticity assumption was not violated.

The presence of multicollinearity was assessed first by an inspection of the correlation coefficients, and next by consulting the tolerance values in the coefficients table. Correlations between independent variables of greater than 0.7 indicate problems with multicollinearity. No correlations between independent variables were greater than 0.7 in this study. Tolerance values of less than 0.1 indicate problems with

multicollinearity. Next, tolerance and variance inflation factors for all independent variables were checked for indications of multicollinearity. Tolerance values less than 0.1 and variance inflation factors greater than 10 indicate problems with multicollinearity. Tolerance values for all independent variables in this study were all greater than 0.1, ranging from .53 to .96. Variance inflation factors for all independent variables in this study were less than ten, ranging from 1.00 to 1.88. This evidence suggests that no problems with multicollinearity exist in this dataset.

Casewise diagnostics were evaluated to detect outliers. A common criterion used to evaluate whether or not an individual's scores might be outliers is to examine whether that case's standardized residuals are ±3 standard deviations. Using this criterion, no scores had standardized residual values higher than three standard deviations on the Sexual Strategies Scale. Ordered leverage values were inspected to determine whether any cases had problematic leverage values. No leverage values were above the accepted value of 0.2, and the range of leverage values was .001 to .16. Data points were then checked for influential points by examining Cook's Distance. The rule of thumb suggests that Cook's Distance values above 1 should be investigated for possible influence. All Cook's Distance values fell below 1, ranging from .0001 to .25.

Normality of the residuals of the variables of interest was assessed through visual inspection of the data using histograms, normal Q-Q plots, and evaluation of descriptive statistics of skewness and kurtosis. A visual inspection of the histogram of standardized residuals suggested an approximately bimodal distribution. An examination of the P-P

plot was also conducted to confirm these findings. The P-P plot indicated that residuals were approximately bimodally distributed. Skewness values for the independent variables ranged from -.19 to .85. Kurtosis values were acceptable, with the lowest kurtosis value being -1.62 and the highest being 1.33. These values indicate an acceptable symmetry of the distribution (Pallant, 2001). While the normality assumption was violated because of a bimodal distribution of the residuals, the regression analysis was run anyway because it is fairly robust to non-normality (Hellevik, 2009).

Testing for Group Differences

Prior to conducting regression analyses to answer Research Questions 2 and 3, a series of t-tests, ANOVAs, and Pearson product-moment correlations were conducted to assess for differences in age, grade classification, international student status, socially-desirable responding, and SES on the predictor and criterion variables. The results of preliminary analyses described below did not suggest any significant differences between groups in terms of the dependent variable.

An independent samples *t* test was conducted to assess for age differences on the dependent variable. Participants were split into two groups according to age. Group A consisted of respondents between the ages of 18 and 22, and Group B consisted of participants 23 years of age and older. No significant age group differences were detected. The assumption of homogeneity of variances was met, as indicated by nonsignificant Levene's test statistics for each age group on all of the predictor and criterion variables.

An independent samples *t* test was also conducted to assess for differences on the dependent variable due to status as an international student. International students (*n*=19) were compared to non-international students (*n*=248). There was homogeneity of variances for scores on the independent variables for participants in both groups, as determined by nonsignificant results of Levene's test for equality of variances. There were no significant differences between international students and non-international students on any of the independent variables.

ANOVA was used to determine whether there were differences between participants on the dependent variable due to school year classification. Levene's test for homogeneity of variance was not significant for school classification error variances. There was no statistically significant difference between freshmen, sophomores, juniors, seniors, and students of other classifications (e.g., graduate students) on the dependent variable. ANOVA was also used to determine whether there were differences between participants on the dependent variable due to perceived socioeconomic status. Levene's test for homogeneity of variance was also nonsignificant for perceived socioeconomic status. No differences were found between participants in any of the perceived SES groups (working class, middle class, upper middle class, or other).

Differences between the two largest racial groups in the sample, Asian (*n* = 122) and Hispanic (*n* = 77) men, on the dependent variable (i.e., self-reported sexual aggression) were also assessed using an independent samples *t* test. There was no statistically significant difference between racial groups on self-reported sexual

aggression. Due to differences in group size causing a significant difference in Levene's test for homogeneity of variance when all racial groups (i.e., Hispanic, Black, Middle Eastern and North African, Multiracial, Other, and Asian) were included in an ANOVA, a Kruskal-Wallis test was conducted to asses for differences on the dependent variable due to membership in smaller groups in the sample (i.e., Black, Middle Eastern and North African, Multiracial, and Other). The Kruskal-Wallis H test showed no statistically significant difference in self-reported sexual aggression between the different racial groups.

Pearson product-moment correlations between the Self-Deceptive Enhancement (SDE) scale of the Balanced Inventory of Desirable Responding (BIDR) and other study measures (i.e., Social Dominance Orientation Scale; Social, Attitudinal, Familial, and Environmental Stress Scale; Masculine Role Norms Inventory; Gender Role Conflict Scale; and Ambivalent Sexism Inventory) were calculated (see Table 3). A significant negative correlation was found between Self-Deceptive Enhancement and acculturative stress ($r = -.21$; $p = .01$) . Participants who were higher in Self-Deceptive Enhancement were more likely to report lower levels of acculturative stress. A significant negative correlation was also found between Self-Deceptive Enhancement and gender role conflict ($r = -.25$; $p = .01$). Participants reporting higher levels of self-deceptive enhancement were also more likely to report lower levels of gender role conflict. The correlation between Self-Deceptive Enhancement and the dependent variable (self-reported sexual aggression) was nonsignificant ($r = -.024$; $p= .698$).

Pearson product-moment correlations were also calculated between the Impression Management (IM) scale of the Balanced Inventory of Desirable Responding (BIDR) and the Social Dominance Orientation Scale; Social, Attitudinal, Familial, and Environmental Stress Scale; Masculine Role Norms Inventory; Gender Role Conflict Scale; and Ambivalent Sexism Inventory. These correlations are also displayed in Table 3. A significant negative correlation was found between Impression Management and Gender Role Conflict ($r = -.25$; $p = .01$), with participants higher in Impression Management also more likely to report lower Gender Role Conflict. A significant negative correlation was also found between Impression Management and Social Dominance Orientation ($r = -.13$; $p = .05$). Study participants reporting higher Impression Management were also more likely to report lower levels of Social Dominance Orientation. The correlation between Impression Management and the dependent variable (self-reported sexual aggression) was nonsignificant ($r = -.061$; $p = .325$).

Descriptive Statistics

Descriptive statistics (i.e., mean, standard deviation, minimum and maximum scores) are presented for each variable for the total sample. See Table 2 for descriptive statistics.

Main Analyses

Research Question 1. What is the relationship between sexual aggression and the independent variables of interest (social dominance orientation, acculturative stress, masculine role norm adherence, gender role conflict, and hostile and benevolent sexism)?

To address Research Question 1, Pearson product-moment correlations were used to examine bivariate relationships between the variables in this study (see Table 3). Research Question 1 postulated that social dominance orientation, acculturative stress, traditional masculine role norm adherence, gender role conflict, and hostile and benevolent sexism would be positively correlated with sexual aggression.

Hypothesis 1a postulated that social dominance orientation would be significantly and positively associated with sexual aggression, with participants who scored higher on the SDOS also scoring higher on the SSS. This hypothesis was supported. Results of the Pearson product-moment correlations revealed a significant relationship between social dominance orientation and sexual aggression, ($r = .18$, $p = .011$). Those with higher levels of social dominance orientation reported higher levels of sexual aggression.

Hypothesis 1b predicted that participants with higher levels of acculturative stress as would also report higher levels of sexual aggression. This hypothesis was not supported. The Pearson product-moment correlation revealed a non-significant relationship between acculturative stress and sexual aggression, ($r = .07$, $p = .724$).

Hypothesis 1c posited that there would be a significant positive correlation between adherence to traditional masculine role norms and sexual aggression. This hypothesis was supported, as the Pearson product-moment correlation revealed a significant relationship between traditional masculine role norm adherence and sexual aggression, ($r = .23$, $p = .001$). Participants who endorsed more traditional masculine role norm ideology also endorsed higher levels of sexual aggression.

Hypothesis 1d postulated that there would be a significant correlation between gender role conflict and sexual aggression. This hypothesis was supported, as the Pearson product-moment correlation revealed a significant relationship between gender role conflict and sexual aggression ($r = .12$, $p = .05$). Participants who endorsed higher levels of gender role conflict also self-reported higher levels of sexual aggression.

Hypothesis 1e postulated that there would be a significant positive correlation between hostile and benevolent sexism and sexual aggression. This hypothesis was supported, as the Pearson product-moment correlation revealed a significant relationship between hostile sexism and sexual aggression, ($r = .18$, $p = .003$), and benevolent sexism and sexual aggression ($r = .12$, $p = .04$). Participants who endorsed higher levels of both hostile and benevolent sexism also reported higher levels of sexual aggression.

Research Question 2. What do social dominance orientation and hostile and benevolent sexism add to the prediction of sexual aggression beyond what can be explained by gender role conflict, adherence to traditional masculine role norms, and acculturative stress? What are the unique contributions of adherence to traditional masculine role norm ideology, gender role conflict, social dominance orientation, acculturative stress and hostile and benevolent sexism to the prediction of sexual aggression?

Hypothesis 2: It was predicted that social dominance orientation and hostile and benevolent sexism would account for a significant portion of the variability in the prediction of the endorsement of sexually aggressive strategies among ethnic minority male college students beyond what was predicted by gender role conflict, traditional masculine role norm adherence, and acculturative stress.

To assess this hypothesis, a hierarchical multiple regression analysis was conducted to determine whether traditional masculine role norm ideology, gender role conflict, and acculturative stress would account for a significant portion of variability in the prediction of sexual aggression above and beyond that accounted for by social dominance orientation and hostile and benevolent sexism. The criterion variable in this regression analysis was sexual aggression. Gender role conflict, traditional masculine role norm adherence, and acculturative stress were entered into the first block. Social dominance orientation and hostile and benevolent sexism were entered into the second block. Squared semi-partial correlations were calculated to indicate the unique variance attributed to each predictor.

Hypothesis 2 was partially supported. Results of the first step of hierarchical multiple regression analysis revealed that sexual aggression was predicted by gender role conflict, adherence to traditional masculine role norms, and acculturative stress, F (4, 261) = 4.709, p = .003, R^2 = .057 (see Table 4). Gender role conflict, adherence to traditional masculine role norms, and acculturative stress explained 5.7% of the variance in sexual aggression. For the first step, an examination of the beta weights indicated that neither gender role conflict (β = .039, p = .607) nor acculturative stress (β = -.037, p = .586) were significant predictors of sexual aggression. However, adherence to traditional masculine role norms significantly predicted sexual aggression (β = .213, p = .002) in this step. The addition of social dominance orientation and hostile and benevolent sexism to the prediction of sexual aggression in the second block did not lead to a statistically significant change in R^2 (ΔR^2 = . 008, ΔF (8, 257) = .696, p = .555).

Research Question 3: Does reported sexual aggression differ by ethnic group membership.

       Hypothesis 3. Given the exploratory nature of this research question, no direction was hypothesized.

       In this study, adherence to traditional masculine role norms emerged as the only significant predictor of sexual aggression. Moderation analysis was undertaken to further explore the relationship between race, traditional masculine role norm adherence, and sexual aggression. This relationship is exploratory, as little empirical information is available about how race may impact adherence to traditional masculine role norms. Due to group size, groups included in the moderation analysis were Hispanic ($n = 77$) and Asian ($n = 122$).

       Aiken and West's (1991) guidelines for testing moderation were used in assessing Research Question 3. First, the continuous predictor variable (traditional masculine role norm adherence) was centered. For each racial group included in this analysis (i.e. Asian and Hispanic), the categorical race variable was dummy coded so that Asian or Hispanic participants were coded as '1' and other participants were coded as '0' on the race variable. Multiracial participants ($n = 34$) were excluded from this portion of the analysis. Next, a product term of the centered continuous predictor variable and the dummy coded race variable were added. Then, a hierarchical multiple regression equation was created by entering the standardized predictor and moderator variables (traditional masculine role

norm adherence and race) in the first block, followed by their product term in the second block. The regression equation tested whether identification as either Hispanic or Asian moderated the relationship between traditional masculine role norm adherence and sexual aggression. Table 4 summarizes the results of this regression analysis.

In interpreting the moderation analysis, I tested whether identification as Hispanic or Asian moderated the relationship between traditional masculine role norm adherence and sexual aggression. For analysis of the effect of Hispanic or Asian racial identification on traditional masculine role norm adherence, a hierarchical multiple regression was conducted to assess the increase in variance explained by the addition of an interaction term between traditional masculine role norm adherence and Hispanic or Asian racial identification to a main effects model. Hispanic or Asian racial identification did not moderate the effect of masculine role norm adherence on sexual aggression, as evidenced by a non-statistically significant beta weight for the interaction term (ΔF[4,261] = .787, p = .502; β=-.007, p = .850). See Table 4.

Chapter 5: Discussion

The current study sought to evaluate how social dominance orientation and ambivalent sexism are related to sexual aggression in ethnic minority college men, and whether or not gender role conflict, adherence to traditional masculine role norms, and acculturative stress would explain self-disclosed sexual aggression in this sample. To my knowledge, there are no other quantitative studies examining the influence of acculturative stress and gender role conflict on self-reported sexual aggression in ethnic minority men. The field has called for research on these issues that addresses sociocultural variables in more depth and includes higher numbers of ethnic minority men in samples (Wong, 2017). This study was conducted in an effort to address this gap. This section includes a summary of key findings and discusses results in the context of existing literature. Following the discussion of findings, limitations and implications are addressed.

Associations among Study Variables: General Discussion

While several significant correlations were found in this study that will be expanded upon later in this discussion section, since there were fewer significant predictors than correlations it is likely that suppression was in effect in the regression equation. Several of the constructs in this study overlap at least slightly. For example, adherence to traditional masculine role norm ideology and gender role conflict likely explain a lot of the same variability in sexual aggression because men who have higher levels of adherence to traditional masculine role norms are also more likely to experience

higher levels of gender role conflict. The total effect of all constructs in the study may therefore appear smaller than the partial effects. While an examination of tolerance values discussed earlier in the paper found none to meet cutoffs for problematic values, they still indicate that there was some redundancy in variability explained by predictors, suggesting that suppression was indeed in effect. This would explain at least in part the large number of correlations and the single predictive construct.

Associations among Study Variables: Social Dominance Orientation

This study found that adherence to traditional masculine role norms was the only significant predictor of self-reported sexual aggression in this sample, but some interesting associations also emerged as significant and worthy of further discussion. Social dominance orientation was found to be significantly and positively correlated with every other variable of interest in this study (i.e. acculturative stress, masculine role norm adherence, gender role conflict, hostile sexism, benevolent sexism, and sexual aggression – see Table 3). The positive association between social dominance orientation and acculturative stress is somewhat surprising, and to my knowledge no previously published studies have explored the relationship between the two constructs in minority group members. Very little research examines the relationship between stress of any kind and social dominance orientation. One study examining physiological stress responses to the 2008 U.S. presidential election found that social dominance orientation was a better predictor of physiological stress responses than political party affiliation (Trawalter, Chung, DeSantis, Simon, & Adam, 2012). These results are not well understood, but it is

hypothesized that the physiological stress response in individuals higher in social dominance orientation may be due to their increase their attempts to regain dominance in the presence of a perceived threat (Trawalter et al., 2012). The factor that differentiates acculturative stress from other types of stress is its source – the process of acculturation (Berry et al., 1987). Its physiological and psychological impacts on individuals are similar to other types of stress (Berry et al., 1987). It may be that individuals with higher levels of social dominance orientation are more likely to experience higher levels of acculturative stress as they are more attuned to potential threats to their social status due to immigration or the acculturation process. The directionality of this relationship should be explored further in future studies.

The positive correlations between social dominance orientation and the remaining variables of interest in this study (i.e. masculine role norm adherence, gender role conflict, hostile and benevolent sexism, and sexual aggression) are less surprising as they are in line with a large body of research demonstrating the relationship between social dominance orientation, and sexist attitudes (Bates & Heaven, 2001; Feather & McKee, 2012; Russell & Trigg, 2004; Sibley et al., 2007). Social dominance orientation has even been demonstrated to predict women's benevolent sexism towards other women (Radke, Hornsey, Sibley, & Barlow, 2018). Given that individuals higher in of social dominance orientation have demonstrated beliefs about the superiority of one social group over other social groups in many different contexts, results from this study are consistent with existing literature.

Associations among Study Variables: Acculturative Stress

Acculturative stress was associated with higher levels of adherence to traditional masculine role norms, gender role conflict, and benevolent sexism in this study. No relationship was found between acculturative stress and hostile sexism or sexual aggression. Although to my knowledge no published studies examine the relationship between acculturative stress and adherence to traditional masculine role norms, the association between the two constructs may be understood in several ways. First, men who are acculturating into mainstream American culture are also likely to feel pressure to be socialized into hegemonic masculine role norms (Chae & Chae, 2011). Therefore, men who adhere more strictly to traditional masculine role norms at the outset of the acculturation process may experience more acculturative stress because of conflict between their personally held views of what it means to be a man and their perception of what mainstream US masculinity is. In other words, a man with more strongly held traditional masculine role norms may find he experiences pressure to attenuate his views and behaviors during acculturation which could create additional or heighten existing acculturative stress. No published acculturative stress scales attend to stress due to gender role attenuation. This may be an important component of acculturation that should be incorporated into future acculturative stress scales.

Another possible explanation for the association between acculturative stress and adherence to traditional masculine role norms is that men who experience higher levels of acculturative stress work harder to retain the values and beliefs they have about masculinity through the process of acculturation. To my knowledge no published studies

have examined the relationship between acculturation and adherence to traditional masculine role norms. Further research in this area is needed in order to better understand these relationships.

Although to my knowledge only one study has been published directly exploring the relationship between gender role conflict and acculturation (Kim, O'Neil, & Owen, 1996), many other studies have outlined the negative effects of men's gender role conflict on a wide range of domains (O'Neil, 2015). It would follow logically that gender role conflict would be associated with higher levels of acculturative stress. The dual socialization process (i.e. not only into mainstream US culture but also into mainstream US masculinity) may be more stressful for men whose personal or cultural expressions of masculinity are further from the mainstream (Chae & Chae, 2011). Again, more research into the impact gender role socialization has on acculturation for men will help better contextualize results from this study.

The positive association between acculturative stress and benevolent sexism is underexplored in the literature. It may be that men who have more strongly held benevolent sexist attitudes than the mainstream at the outset of the acculturation process experience greater stress as they experience pressure to attenuate these beliefs. The opposite could also be true: men acculturating to the US mainstream could have less sexist attitudes that they then experience pressure to adjust to be more sexist, causing stress. Overall, the positive associations between acculturative stress and adherence to traditional masculine role norms, gender role conflict, and benevolent sexism highlights the need for further scholarship examining the complex interplay of gender role

socialization, beliefs about gender role norms, and sexist attitudes for men who experience the process of acculturation.

Associations among Study Variables: Traditional Masculine Role Norm Ideology

Adherence to traditional masculine role norm ideology was positively associated with gender role conflict, hostile and benevolent sexism, and sexual aggression in this study. Adherence to traditional masculine role norms and gender role conflict have been shown to be correlated in other studies (Graef, Toka, & Kaut, 2010; McDermott, Smith, Borgogna, Booth, Granato, & Sevig, 2018). The relationship between the two constructs is to be expected, as men experiencing gender role conflict will have some level of adherence to traditional masculine role norms by definition (O'Neil, 2015). This finding also supports the gender role conflict theory that stronger adherence to traditional masculine role norm ideology is associated with more negative outcomes (O'Neil, 2015).

The positive relationships between adherence to traditional masculine role norm ideology, hostile, and benevolent sexism are supported in the literature (Wong, Burkley, Bell, Wang, & Klan, 2017). The avoidance of femininity component of the construct of traditional masculine role norm ideology overlaps theoretically with hostile sexism (Levant, Hall, & Rankin, 2013). There is also some theoretical overlap between the toughness component of traditional masculine role norm ideology and benevolent sexism in the domain of toughness. Therefore the relationships noted in this study between adherence to traditional masculine role norm ideology, hostile, and benevolent sexism are to be expected.

The positive relationship between adherence to traditional masculine role norm ideology and sexual aggression found in this study has also been seen elsewhere in the literature (Murnen, Wright, & Kaluzny, 2002; Sheffield, 1987; Smith, Parrott, Swartout, & Tharp, 2015). Prior research suggests that adherence to traditional masculine role norm ideology plays an important part in understanding men's sexual aggression towards women (Malamuth et al., 1996; Smith, Parrott, Swartout, & Tharp, 2015).

Associations among Study Variables: Gender Role Conflict and Ambivalent Sexism

The positive associations between gender role conflict and hostile and benevolent sexism found in this study are also supported in the extant literature (Jones & Heesacker, 2012; Vandello & Bosson, 2013). The concept of gender role conflict encompasses the negative consequences of adherence to masculine gender role on others (Jones & Heesacker, 2012). The gender bias captured by ambivalent sexism may be one of these negative consequences.

Both hostile and benevolent sexism were positively associated with sexual aggression in this study. Ambivalent sexism has been linked to rape myth acceptance (Connor, Glick, & Fiske, 2016). The role rape myth acceptance plays in predicting sexually aggressive behavior remains underexplored. While the association between ambivalent sexism and sexual aggression has been demonstrated in the literature, the reason for this association also remains unclear. It is unknown whether or not sexist attitudes develop after sexually aggressive behaviors have already taken place or if they are held by individuals before sexual aggression takes place. Precarious manhood theory informed the research questions and methods used in this study (Vandello & Bosson,

2013). This theory focuses on illuminating how men may use physical aggression in attempts to regain status that they perceived to be lost when their masculine identity is threatened. To this author's knowledge, empirical evidence in studies supporting this theory has focused on public displays of aggression or violence; researchers have devoted less attention to intimate partner violence and sexual aggression, which are generally more likely to take place in private. It is possible that the precarious manhood theory fails to explain sexual aggression as a response to perceived threats to masculinity because it focuses on violence and aggression in the public domain and not in the more private realm of sexual aggression.

Measurement Limitations

This study did not measure identity but rather ethnic identification. While there are benefits to examining ethnic identity identification (Phinney, 1992; Phinney & Ong, 2007), this demographic approach is not without limitations. The study captured information from participants about the racial or ethnic group with which they identified, but it did not collect any information about men's experiences of these identities, which may have been important to address racial or ethnic identity. For example, while the study attempted to collect data from a wide range of broadly defined ethnic minority men, it failed to collect information about participants' ethnic identity exploration or commitment (Phinney & Ong, 2007), or their perceptions of the salience or centrality of their ethnic and racial identities in their personal lives. Both constructs may be relevant to

understanding how ethnic minority men experience masculinity, and what (if any) relationships these experiences have to sexually aggressive behavior.

The current study found that the only significant predictor of self-disclosed sexual aggression in the sample was adherence to traditional masculine role norms. Higher levels of adherence to traditional masculine role norms predicted higher levels of self-reported sexual aggression. This result is consistent with previous research that found that men with higher levels of adherence to traditional masculine role norms are more aggressive towards their partners (Lisco et al., 2015) and display more physically aggressive behaviors overall (Bosson et al., 2009). Adherence to traditional masculine role norms in this study was measured using the Male Role Norms Inventory – Short Form (MRNI-SF; Levant et al., 2013). The MRNI-SF measures all three components of hegemonic masculinity: status, toughness, and antifemininity. It also measures adherence to several other masculine role norms, including self-reliance through mechanical skill and restrictive emotionality. An overall mean score is used to calculate participants' adherence to general traditional masculinity ideology, making it difficult to further delineate relationships between adherence to traditional masculinity ideology and self-reported sexual aggression. While overall higher levels of adherence to traditional masculinity ideology were positively associated with higher levels of self-reported sexual aggression, it remains unknown whether this relationship is stronger in some domains of adherence to traditional masculine role norms (e.g. antifemininity) than in others (e.g. self-reliance through mechanical skill). The MRNI-SF is a better overall measure of adherence to traditional masculinity ideology. More robust surveys may be used in the

85

future to better capture which, if any, specific components of traditional masculinity are most associated with self-reported sexual aggression.

Discussion: Acculturation, Acculturative Stress, and Sexual Aggression

Acculturative stress, which was theorized in Hypothesis 1b to have a significant positive association with sexual aggression, had no significant relationship with sexual aggression. While it has been hypothesized in that aggression against women may be caused by displacement of the negative effects of discrimination in some ethnic minority men (Comas-Diaz, 1995), the current study provides no evidence to support this view. Further, in this study, racial identification as Hispanic or Asian had no effect on the relationship between adherence to traditional masculine role norms and self-reported sexual aggression. In other words, this study found that racial identification as either Hispanic or Asian was not relevant to explaining the relationship between sexual aggression and adherence to traditional masculine role norms. Evidence from the current study does not support the idea that ethnic minority men who are in greater danger of perpetrating sexual assault against women do so because of racial/ethnic identification or acculturative stress. While the stress of acculturation has been shown to be positively correlated with gender role conflict in one study (Kim et al., 1996), many other studies identify racial and ethnic minorities as being at greater risk for being victims of sexual assault than whites (Coulter, Mair, Miller, Bloscnich & Matthews, 2017; Coulter & Rankin, 2017; Thompson, McGee, & Mays, 2012). Less is known about perpetrators of

this violence; in many cases, readers are left to make assumptions about the identities of the perpetrators of sexual aggression against women. Angela Davis wrote in 1981 about the "myth of the black rapist," a stereotype that persists today and has been bolstered by recent political events in the United States and Europe (Carroll, 2017). In some settings, this myth also extends beyond men of African descent, perpetuating the idea that non-white men in general are sexually threatening. It has been argued that a myth of an immigrant rapist was invented following the 2015 influx of non-white refugees to Germany and Scandinavia that then became a tool used by governments to advocate for paternalist protection of white women from the perceived sexual aggression of non-white men following the 2015 influx of non-white refugees to Germany and Scandinavia (Carroll, 2017).

The relationship between acculturation, acculturative stress, and sexual aggression remains underexplored in the literature. While existing literature suggests that there may be empirical evidence for a link between acculturative stress and increased interpersonal violence (Cainkar & Del Toro, 2010), to my knowledge there have been no empirical studies published to date supporting a link between acculturative stress and sexual aggression. It may be that other factors, such as exposure to childhood sexual abuse and risky sexual behavior, are more relevant to the prediction of sexual aggression than acculturative stress. A study on pathways to sexual aggression in adolescents and young adults found that the experience of childhood sexual aggression was significantly associated with a greater likelihood of perpetrating sexual aggression (Krahe & Berger, 2017). Precarious manhood theory suggests that men who believe that they are at risk of

losing the status associated with being a man in a patriarchal society will likely use violence to regain or retain their power and control (Vandello et al., 2008). Some studies have provided empirical support for this theory (Lisco et al., 2015; Bosson et al., 2009). However, precarious manhood theory focuses on aggression in public settings. It may be that intimate partner violence and sexual aggression, which occur out of the public eye, do not have the same function as publicly visible aggressive behavior. It is also possible that the base rate of sexual aggression in this sample was too low to detect a significant relationship between acculturative stress and sexual aggression.

Discussion: Gender Role Conflict Theory

Gender role conflict was hypothesized to have a significant positive correlation with self-reported sexual aggression. This hypothesis was supported; participants in this sample who endorsed higher levels of gender role conflict also endorsed higher levels of sexual aggression. This result is consistent with prior empirical research that has also demonstrated a positive association between sexual aggression and gender role conflict (Rando et al., 1998). Gender role conflict theory (O'Neil, 1982) implies that socialized gender roles can cause cognitive, emotional, and/or behavioral problems for men in patriarchal societies. Strict adherence to masculine gender roles is theorized to lead to conflict for men in a variety of contexts (O'Neil, 2015). While gender role conflict has been shown to be positively associated with hostile sexism (O'Neil, 2015), and higher levels of rape myth acceptance (Kassing, Beesley, & Frey, 2005), to my knowledge no studies published to date have indicated a predictive relationship between self-reported sexual aggression and levels of gender role conflict. Gender role conflict theory suggests

that the construct captures behavioral problems caused by socialization into sexist societies (O'Neil, 2015). The behavioral component of gender role conflict theory encompasses how gender role socialization impacts how men respond and interact with others (O'Neil, 2015). Men are theorized to experience gender role conflict when they either violate gender role norms, try but fail to meet male gender role expectations, experience significant discrepancies in their real and ideal self-concepts, or personally devalue others because they deviate from or conform to masculinity ideology norms (O'Neil, 2015). It could be that the positive correlation between gender role conflict and sexual aggression found in this study is due to the inner conflict men may feel if they believe, for example, that "good men aren't sexually aggressive" but have themselves been sexually aggressive. This discordance may lead to gender role conflict. The experience of behaving in a sexually aggressive way may cause significant distress as it could represent a discrepancy in a man's real and ideal self-concepts, which may also explain the positive association between gender role conflict and sexual aggression.

Discussion: Ambivalent Sexism

Hostile and benevolent sexism, known collectively as ambivalent sexism, have been linked to a wide range of evaluations of men's aggression toward women. In this study, however, neither hostile nor benevolent sexism had a relationship with self-reported sexual aggression. Hostile sexism has been found to be positively associated with men's affinity for a male in a male-to-female sexual assault scenario (Abrams et al., 2003; Masser et al., 2005), men's self-reported sexual harassment of women (Begany & Milburn, 2002; Russell & Trigg, 2004), and men's self-reports of sexual coercion toward

89

women (Parrott et al., 2012; Forbes & Adams-Curtis, 2001). Hostile sexism has also been shown to be positively associated with attitudes that support spousal abuse (Glick et al., 2002). Benevolent sexism has been linked positively with a tendency to blame female victims in physical and sexual assault scenarios (Yamawaki, Ostenson, & Brown, 2009; Abrams et al., 2003; Duran & Megias, 2011). Both hostile and benevolent sexism have been theorized to facilitate aggression when women violate traditional feminine gender roles (Glick & Fiske, 1997). While several studies have shown empirical support for relationships between hostile and benevolent sexism and a host of negative and sexist attitudes towards women, fewer studies have demonstrated an empirical connection between self-reported sexual aggression and the two. A study of couples demonstrated that men who endorsed higher levels of hostile sexism perceived their female partners' behaviors more negatively, and these negative perceptions were found to mediate the relationship between hostile sexism and men's behaving more negatively toward their partners (Hammond & Overall, 2013). Studies that have assessed men's self-reported violence towards women retroactively (e.g., Parrott et al., 2012) have failed to account for whether or not the female target was perceived as violating a traditional feminine gender role norm. These studies are therefore less able to explain the role that the perception of a woman as challenging a man's power may have had in the self-reported violent interactions. The current study did not assess for the relationships between hostile and benevolent sexism and violence between couples. A relationship between either hostile or benevolent sexism and violence in couples may have been found had the couples relationship been a component of this study.

90

While hostile and benevolent sexism did not predict sexual aggression, support was found for the hypothesis that there would be a significant positive correlation between hostile and benevolent sexism and sexual aggression. In this sample, participants who endorsed higher levels of both hostile and benevolent sexism also reported higher levels of sexual aggression. This is consistent with prior research in which the same positive association between sexual aggression and hostile and benevolent sexism was found (Lisco et al., 2012; Masser et al., 2006; Bosson et al., 2015). As with the association in this sample between sexual aggression and social dominance orientation, it remains to be discovered whether or not attitudes endorsing sexism towards women develop as post-hoc justifications of sexually aggressive behavior, or whether these attitudes precede and serve as pathways for the behavior.

Discussion: Social Dominance Orientation

Social dominance orientation was also hypothesized to have a significant positive impact on men's self-reported sexual aggression based on prior research that empirically demonstrates a positive relationship between social dominance orientation and rape myth acceptance (Sussenbach & Bohner, 2011), as well as a positive relationship between social dominance orientation and the belief that men should dominate women sexually (Rosenthal, Levy, & Earnshaw, 2012). Prior research has focused on the impact of social dominance orientation on attitudes towards women and sexual aggression. To my knowledge, no studies have examined the influence of social dominance orientation on

retroactively self-reported sexual aggression. The hypothesis that social dominance orientation and self-reported sexual aggression would be positively linked was not supported. Had this study investigated the impact of social dominance orientation on attitudes towards sexual aggression, an empirical link may have been demonstrated. Instead, this study relied on individual participants to disclose previous sexually aggressive behavior. A survey of attitudes towards sexual aggression or a hypothetical case scenario that asked participants to determine whether or not behavior of a third party was sexually aggressive would have yielded a higher response rate, allowing for the demonstration of a relationship between social dominance orientation and attitudes towards sexual aggression.

Although social dominance orientation did not significantly predict sexual aggression, social dominance orientation and sexual aggression were positively associated with one another. Stronger endorsement of attitudes supporting social dominance orientation was associated with higher levels of self-reported sexual aggression. In studies investigating attitudes related to sexual aggression, social dominance orientation was found to be significantly positively correlated with rape myth acceptance (Sussenbach & Bohner, 2011) and hostile sexism (Camas & Mese, 2016). In a study of college student men's social dominance orientation and attitudes to sexual harassment, men higher in social dominance orientation were also higher in tolerance of sexual harassment (Pina & Page, 2011). This study used the Likelihood to Sexually Harass Scale (Pryor, 1987) and showed that social dominance orientation was a significant predictor of the likelihood to sexually harass (Pina & Page, 2011). The

Likelihood to Sexually Harass Scale measures sexual exploitation or the men's readiness to use social power for sexual gain (Pryor, 1987). In this scale, men are asked to imagine themselves in the role of the protagonist in each of ten scenarios in which a man has the power to sexually exploit a woman without experiencing any consequences (Pryor, 1987). While the Pina and Page (2011) study suggests that there is a relationship between social dominance orientation and the likelihood that men would rate themselves as more likely to engage in sexually exploitative behaviors in scenarios on the Likelihood to Sexually Harass scale, it provides no evidence that men who actually engage in sexually exploitative behaviors also hold higher levels of social dominance orientation. The correlation between social dominance orientation and sexual aggression in this study suggests that there men higher in social dominance orientation may actually be more likely to engage in sexually aggressive behaviors. It remains unknown whether men who engage in sexually aggressive behaviors hold higher levels of social dominance orientation before they engage in the behaviors, or whether social dominance orientation increases as a way to justify sexually aggressive behavior. Evidence suggests that social dominance orientation can change as a function of social context and is not fixed over time (Kteily, Ho, & Sidanius, 2012; Sibley, Wilson, & Duckitt, 2007). Men who behave in sexually aggressive behaviors may have at least some awareness that their behavior is an ethical violation and therefore a threat to the moral self (Shalvi, Gino, Barkan, & Ayal, 2015). Men who admit to sexually aggressive behavior could then endorse the dominance of men over women as the natural order as a way to justify their behavior, protecting themselves from the threat their moral selves face when confronted with the fact of their

unethical behavior (Shalvi et al., 2015). Justifications like attitudes endorsing the dominance of men over women may help men manage the gap between behavior they may view as immoral and the desire they have to maintain a positive self-image and view themselves as moral (Shalvi et al., 2015). An important concept that was not explored in this study that may inform future research on sexual aggression is moral disengagement, or the extent to which individuals detach themselves from their immoral actions (Shalvi et al., 2015).

This study also investigated what social dominance orientation and ambivalent sexism could add to the prediction of sexual aggression above and beyond what could be explained by gender role conflict, adherence to traditional masculine role norms, and acculturative stress. Also examined were the unique contributions of each of these variables to the prediction of sexual aggression. It was predicted that dominance orientation and ambivalent sexism would account for a significant portion of the variability in the prediction of the endorsement of sexual aggression above and beyond what was predicted by gender role conflict, traditional masculine role norm adherence, and acculturative stress. The following paragraphs clarify what relationships were found between these constructs in this study.

Discussion: Statistical Methods

Overall, only traditional masculine role norm adherence was found to be a significant predictor of sexual aggression. Higher levels of adherence to traditional masculine role norms predicted higher levels of self-reported sexual aggression in this sample. Gender role conflict, acculturative stress, social dominance orientation, and

ambivalent sexism did not significantly predict variance in sexual aggression. To this investigator's knowledge, this is the first empirical study to examine the effects of adherence to traditional masculine role norms on sexual aggression in ethnic minority men. The construct of gender role conflict overlaps with adherence to traditional masculine role norms and while there was no evidence of multicollinearity in the Variance Inflation Factors in this study, gender role conflict and adherence to traditional masculine role norms were moderately correlated. In order to experience gender role conflict, men must adhere at least in part to traditional masculine role norms. Gender role conflict is a measure of the negative consequences men experience as a result of their adherence to traditional masculine role norms, and the two constructs are inherently linked to one another. The correlation between gender role conflict and adherence to traditional masculine role norms may be overinflating standard errors in this study and making some variables that should be significant insignificant in the regression equation.

Results of this study indicate that traditional masculine role norm predicts increased sexual aggression. Results also indicate that while factors such as gender role conflict, acculturative stress, hostile and benevolent sexism, and social dominance orientation are related to sexual aggression, the current study was unable to detect whether or not these factors influence it. While not collinear, the correlation between gender role conflict and adherence to traditional masculine role norms described in the previous paragraph may be suppressing significant effects of hostile and benevolent sexism and social dominance orientation on sexual aggression. Acculturation was linked to increased risk for perpetration of intimate partner violence in a longitudinal study of

Hispanic men (Caetano, Ramisetty-Mikler, Caetano Vaeth, & Harris, 2007). The nonsignificance of acculturative stress as a predictor of sexual aggression in the current study suggests several possibilities. First, the baseline level of acculturation for the sample, English-speaking undergraduate students enrolled at a large public university in the United States, may be too high to detect levels of acculturative stress that would be problematic for men. While acculturative stress was present in the sample, it could be expected to be much more prevalent in a more diverse community sample that included men of different ages, different levels of English ability to include non-English speakers, and more varied levels of education. While the inverse relationship between acculturative stress and acculturation has been demonstrated many times in the literature (e.g., Amer & Hovey, 2005; Caetano et al., 2007; Goforth, Oka, Leong, & Denis, 2014; Sirin, Ryce, & Rogers-Sirin, 2013), the nonsignificance of acculturative stress as a predictor of sexual aggression in this study may be a function of relatively high levels of acculturation in the sample.

Hostile and benevolent sexism did not predict sexual aggression in this study. This study did not measure sexual aggression specifically in the context of intimate partnerships and asked instead whether men had ever used sexually aggressive strategies in any interaction with women. A study measuring broader psychological aggression in the context of intimate partnerships found that men who endorsed hostile sexism were also more aggressive towards their female partners but only when the women were perceived to be uncommitted to the relationship (Cross, Overall, Hammond, & Fletcher, 2017). The authors theorize that men who feel insecure in their relationships due to low

96

commitment on the part of their partners are psychologically aggressive in these relationships in an attempt to regain status and power (Cross et al., 2017). An important component of hostile sexism is the maintenance of men's status and power which Cross et al. (2017) point out is particularly at risk in intimate relationships that demand dependence and cooperation. Had the current study targeted men's sexual aggression within the context of relationships as opposed to any sexually aggressive behavior in any interaction, hostile sexism may have played a stronger role in predicting sexual aggression. While benevolent sexism did not predict sexual aggression in this study, the small correlation between the constructs suggest there may be a component of men's sexually aggressive behavior that relies on attitudes that indicate endorsement of gender inequality. Men and women who endorse benevolent sexist attitudes blame female victims of sexual aggression for inviting sexual advances (Viki & Abrams, 2002). While benevolent sexism may not predict sexual aggression, men who have behaved in sexually aggressive ways may deflect blame for their unethical behavior onto female victims through benevolent sexism.

Discussion: Race as Moderator

The final exploratory research question sought to examine whether race moderated the relationship between adherence to traditional masculine role norms and sexual aggression. Findings did not differ based on racial group membership. Racial identification was tested in the two largest groups in this study: Asian and Hispanic. Identification as Hispanic or Asian had no impact levels of adherence to traditional masculine role norms. A previous study conducted using a different masculine role norm

97

adherence scale, the Masculine Role Norms scale, found significant differences between adherence to status, antifemininity, and toughness norms among African American, Latino, and White men (Gordon et al., 2013). In that study, racial group identification moderated the relationship between masculine role norm adherence and health-promoting or health-undermining behaviors (Gordon et al., 2013). Health-promoting behaviors included exercise, while health-undermining behaviors included eating junk food and using drugs. The study did not assess for the impact of socially-desirable responding on respondents, and it is reasonable to assume that even if socially-desirable responding may have impacted response rates on this study, participants would still have been more forthcoming about health behaviors than they would have been on a questionnaire about sexually aggressive behavior. Should a moderating effect of race on traditional masculine role norm adherence and sexual aggression exist, socially-desirable responding and a low base rate of sexually aggressive behavior may make it difficult to detect. Given the irrelevance of race to the prediction of sexual aggression, the current study would have been better served by sample men from all ethnic and racial backgrounds. Evidence from this study suggests that racial and ethnic identification have no impact on the prediction of sexually aggressive behavior. A study conducted on a community sample of black and white men using path modeling to show the effects of adherence to male gender role norms on aggression towards sexual minorities found no differences in model estimates between the two racial groups (Parrott, Peterson, & Bakeman, 2011). Given that the current study and previous literature provide no evidence that racial or ethnic

identification have any value in predicting men's aggressive behavior, future studies should include white men in their samples and aim to be more representative.

Limitations

   This study of pathways to sexual aggression in ethnic minority college students is not without limitations. These limitations are reviewed here in order to better understand the generalizability of this study's findings and to inform future research. First, the results of this study are likely to be significantly impacted by the self-report nature of the data collected. Self-report questionnaires distributed online are accessible and inexpensive, but they also present significant challenges to researchers as they rely on participant honesty, introspection, attention, and self-disclosure. Participants may either deliberately or accidentally report data that is inaccurate. For example, the Sexual Strategies Scale used in this study asks men to report if they have ever used any sexually aggressive strategies. It is possible that respondents may simply not remember having engaged in a sexually aggressive behavior, and therefore, they may not report it. Other respondents may be limited in their ability to seriously reflect on their attitudes and beliefs; this limitation can potentially hinder them from providing inaccurate information on measures such as the Social Dominance Orientation Scale, Masculine Role Norms Inventory – Short Form, and Ambivalent Sexism Inventory.

   A large number of respondents to this study scored at or near the lower limit of potential responses to the Sexual Strategies Scale, resulting in very low scores on the SSS overall and indicating that there was a floor effect. Low base rates and floor effects make it difficult to detect significant results and require large effect sizes to reach sufficient

power. This study attempted to address the issue of low base rate disclosure of sexual aggression by using a scale that measures not only physical coercion, but also emotional manipulation and verbal aggression. Other studies have demonstrated that participants have higher rates of disclosure on the SSS than on other scales of sexually aggressive behavior (Strang et al., 2013; Strang & Peterson, 2017; Testa et al. 2015), but a large number of participants in this study reported no sexual aggression.

The current study attempted to assess the impact of attitudes on behaviors. While we may assume that attitudes influence a wide number of human behaviors, this assumption has generated significant controversy in the field. In the study of sexual aggression, it is as yet unclear which attitudes are most strongly correlated with behavior and in which contexts. Several factors that are not attitudes have been identified as influencing sexually aggressive behavior in men; these include childhood victimization, social deviance, and personality (Abbey et al., 2004; Parrot, Peterson, & Bakeman, 2011). An evaluation of 140 primary prevention programs aimed at reducing sexual violence by increasing knowledge or changing attitudes found that none of these programs were effective in reducing sexual violence (DeGue, Valle, Holt, Massetti, Matjasko, & Tharp, 2014). A longitudinal study of sexual aggression in a non-criminal sample of college men found that men who reported single offenses were higher in adverse childhood experiences, while men who reported multiple offenses were higher in antisocial personality traits (Zinzow & Thompson, 2014). Men in both the single and repeat offender groups in this study were also higher in rape supportive attitudes and hostility toward women (Zinzow & Thompson, 2014). This study suggests that while

attitudes play some role in predicting behaviors, they are by no means able to fully explain when individuals will behave in sexually aggressive ways.

The behaviors on the Sexual Strategies Scale are very specific, while attitudes measured on inventories like the Ambivalent Sexism Inventory and the Gender Role Conflict Scale are much broader. This makes it difficult to determine whether a specific attitude predicts a specific behavior. Future studies of sexual aggression seeking to link attitudes to behaviors in this population should attempt to measure both with the same level of specificity. Greater measurement specificity would allow for better detection of a relationship between the attitudes and behaviors of interest (Frymier & Nadler, 2017). Perceived behavioral control is also an important factor that can influence behavior (Frymier & Nadler, 2017), but this factor has largely been absent from research studies on sexual aggression, including the current study. Future studies should attempt to measure participants' perceived control over their sexually aggressive behavior, not only in order to identify pathways to this behavior, but also to gather valuable information that can support the development of more effective prevention programs.

Another limitation of this study was that it failed to account for the accessibility of the attitudes being measured on sexual aggression. The study asked participants to identify any past sexually aggressive behavior and also measured participants' current attitudes and beliefs about women and masculinity. It remains unknown how accessible or relevant the identified attitudes were to the measured behaviors. Future research should attend to perceived accessibility and the relevance of attitudes, in addition to the impact of attitudes themselves, on sexually aggressive behavior.

This study has additional limitations with regard to sample size and demographics. The study surveyed a narrow band of respondents. The majority of respondents were young adults, heterosexual, and upper middle-class students at a predominantly White university in the Southwest. While research on ethnic minority masculinity is lacking, the results of studies conducted on samples such as this one are limited in their generalizability beyond men who do not fit this profile of identity and context. This study's sample was drawn from a university subject pool. All participants were enrolled in a psychology course. It is possible that men who are enrolled at this institution, choose to take a psychology course, and choose to participate in a study subject pool are different from the broader population of ethnic minority men in an important way. It should also be noted that the final sample consisted largely of Asian and Hispanic men, which further limits the generalizability of the study's findings. Asian and Hispanic men in other social contexts, with different levels of support and life stressors, may have different relationships with their masculine identities—and different beliefs and attitudes about social dominance—than those found in this study. Generalizability, even in the college student population, is therefore limited. Future studies can address this limitation through more targeted sampling of men of only one racial or ethnic group. This sampling approach would increase the likelihood that findings of future studies could be generalized to a more specific population.

The Sexual Strategies Scale used in this study asks participants to disclose whether or not they have used any of the sexually aggressive strategies at any point in their lives, while the scales used to measure independent variables asked participants

about currently held attitudes, beliefs, and experiences. Because of this, it is difficult to determine the degree to which currently held attitudes may have influenced past behaviors, or the ways participants' attitudes may have evolved over time. This information may be especially relevant for researchers attempting to make inferences about identity and behavior in populations of young adult men. Young adult men are generally experiencing changes in identity as they build autonomy and a sense of self (Benson & Elder, 2011). Future studies may address this limitation by further limiting eligibility to participants in emerging adulthood who disclose sexually aggressive behavior within the past few weeks.

Implications

In spite of the limitations noted above, this study contributes both to the field's understanding of sexually aggressive behavior in young men and to future research and interventions relating to men's sexually aggressive behavior. First, the field of research on men and sexual aggression has been dominated by an abundance of studies that focus on White men. Very few quantitative studies have considered the experiences of men who acculturate into dominant hegemonic masculinity. This study contributes to the field in its investigation of the relationships between acculturative stress, masculinity, and sexual aggression explicitly in men of color.

Specifically, results from this investigation contribute to the literature by demonstrating that racial group identification does not moderate the relationship between traditional masculine role norm adherence and sexual aggression in Asian or Hispanic men. While a number of studies demonstrate disparities in experiences of sexual

103

aggression, with higher prevalence rates in ethnic minority communities and college student samples (Thompson, McGee, & Mays, 2012; Coulter & Rankin, 2017), results from this study suggest that race does not explain why these differences occur. Future researchers would benefit from studying variables more proximal than race in attempts to understand these disparities. They would also benefit from attending, when possible, not only to the race or ethnicity of victims, but also to that of perpetrators, so that spurious conclusions about perpetrators' identities can be avoided. The variables posited by this study to be more likely to explain sexually aggressive behavior in ethnic minority men were not significant predictors of sexual aggression, but they provide important clues for what researchers might focus on in the future. Future samples in studies of the impact of masculinity on sexual aggression should include representative samples and not just samples of ethnic minority men as there is no evidence to support that ethnic or racial identification has any impact on men's sexually aggressive behavior. Researchers may also benefit from including personality traits at the individual level, rather than at the cultural level, in future investigations of sexual aggression.

Conclusion

The current study sought to address the gap in the literature on masculinity, acculturative stress, and sexual aggression in ethnic minority men in several ways. First, this study examined various sociocultural factors related to ethnic minority men's sexual aggression, with a focus on the combined experiences of acculturative stress and social dominance orientation. Previous research on this group has failed to investigate the

nuances associated with being a non-white man adhering to traditional hegemonic

masculine role norms.

Table 1

Participant Demographics

Race/Ethnicity	Frequency	Percent
Black	27	9.3
Latino	85	29.3
Middle Eastern/ North African	6	2.1
American Indian	1	.3
Asian	129	44.5
Other	1	.3
Multiracial	41	14.1

Academic Classification		
Freshman	46	15.8
Sophomore	80	27.6
Junior	64	22.1
Senior	99	34.1

Sexual Orientation		
Straight/Heterosexual	267	92.1
Queer	1	.3
Gay	6	2.4
Bisexual	10	3.4
Questioning	5	1.7
Other	1	.3

International Students		
International Students	23	7.9
Non-international Students	267	92.1

Perceived Socioeconomic Status		
Working Class	60	20.7
Middle Class	124	42.8
Upper Middle Class	94	32.4
Upper Class	9	3.1
Other	3	1.0

Participants Reporting Sexual Aggression

Race/Ethnicity	Frequency	Percent
Black	13	12.7

106

Latino	36	35.3
Middle Eastern/ North African	2	2.0
American Indian	0	0
Asian	35	34.3
Other	0	0
Multiracial	15	15.7

Academic Classification

Freshman	13	12.7
Sophomore	25	24.5
Junior	22	21.6
Senior	42	41.2

Sexual Orientation

Straight/Heterosexual	96	94.1
Nonheterosexual	6	5.9

International Students

International Students	7	6.9
Non-international Students	95	93.1

Perceived Socioeconomic Status

Working Class	22	21.6
Middle Class	46	45.1
Upper Middle Class	30	29.4
Upper Class	4	3.9

Note. n=267.

Table 2

Descriptive Statistics for Main Analysis Variables

Variable	Range	M	SD
1. Self-deceptive enhancement	1.0-7.0	4.02	0.85
2. Impression management	1.0-6.6	3.95	0.83
3. Social dominance orientation	1.0-7.0	2.46	1.12
4. Acculturative Stress	1.0-4.0	1.75	0.53
5. Masculine Role Norm Adherence	1.0-7.0	2.95	1.16
6. Gender Role Conflict	1.0-4.0	2.03	0.54
7. Hostile Sexism	1.0-5.0	3.44	1.05
8. Benevolent Sexism	1.0-5.0	3.78	0.93
9. Sexual Aggression	0-0.55	0.05	0.10

Table 3

Correlations Among Variables of Interest

Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
1. Self-deceptive enhancement	(.65)	.37*	.01	-.21*	.04	-.25*	-.11	-.05	-.02
2. Impression management		(.61)	-.13*	-.09	-.08	-.25*	-.09	-.08	-.06
3. Social dominance orientation			(.93)	.24*	.48*	.26*	.38*	.18*	.18*
4. Acculturative Stress				(.82)	.17*	.46*	.08	.16*	.07
5. Masculine Role Norm Adherence					(.95)	.43*	.53*	.40*	.23*
6. Gender Role Conflict						.(87)	.34*	.34*	.12
7. Hostile Sexism							(.86)	.47*	.18*
8. Benevolent Sexism								(.75)	.12*
9. Sexual Aggression									(.85)

*Note. *p<.05*

Table 4

Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis for Sexual Aggression (Hispanic/Asian Racial Identification)

Variable	B	Standard Error B	β	sr^2
Step 1				
Race (Hispanic/Asian)	-.002	.013	-.011	.005
Gender Role Conflict	.007	.036	-.039	.001
Masculine Role Norm Adherence	.018	.006	.213**	.036
Acculturative Stress	-.007	.012	-.037	.000
$F(4, 261)$	4.709**			
R^2	.057			
Step 2				
Social Dominance Orientation	.006	.006	.065	.003
Hostile Sexism	.006	.007	.061	.002
Benevolent	.002	.007	.022	.000
Race x MRNI	.000	.010	-.007	.000
$F(8, 257)$	2.695**			
R^2	.059			

**$p<.01$

Appendices

Social Dominance Orientation Scale

Which of the following objects or statements do you have a positive or negative feeling toward? Select the number that represents the degree of your positive or negative feeling. Scoring is reversed for the starred (*) items.

1-----------------2-----------------3----------------4----------------5----------------6----------------7

| **Very Negative** | **Negative** | **Slightly Negative** | **Neither Positive Nor Negative** | **Slightly Positive** | **Positive** | | **Very Positive** |

#	Statement							
1.	Some groups of people are simply not the equals of others.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
2.	In getting what you want, it is sometimes necessary to use force against other groups.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
3.	It's OK if some groups have more of a chance in life than others.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
4.	To get ahead in life, it is sometimes necessary to step on others.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
5.	If certain groups stayed in their place, we would have fewer problems.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
6.	It's probably a good thing that certain groups are at the top and other groups are at the bottom.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
7.	Inferior groups should stay in their place.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
8.	Sometimes other groups must be kept in their place.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
9.	It would be good if groups were equal.*	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
10.	Group equality should be our ideal.*	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
11.	All groups should be given an equal chance in life.*	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
12.	We should do what we can to equalize conditions for different groups.*	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
13.	Increased social equality is beneficial to society.*	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
14.	We would have fewer problems if we treated people more equally.*	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

| 15. | We should strive to make incomes as equal as possible.* | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 16. | No one group should dominate society.* | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

Social, Attitudinal, Familial, and Environmental Acculturation Stress Scale

Rate how stressful the items below are for you using the following scale.

1	2	3	4	5
Not at all stressful	Slightly stressful	Somewhat stressful	Very stressful	Extremely stressful

1. I often feel ignored by people who are supposed to assist me.

2. It bothers me when people pressure me to assimilate.

3. Many people have stereotypes about my culture or ethnic group and treat me as if they are true.

4. Because I am different I do not get enough credit for the work I do.

5. Because of my ethnic background, I feel that others often exclude me from participating in their activities.

6. People look down upon me if I practice customs of my culture.

7. I don't have any close friends.

8. People think I am unsociable when in fact I have trouble communicating in English.

9. Loosening the ties with my country is difficult.

10. I often think about my cultural background.

11. Close family members and I have conflicting expectations about my future.

12. It bothers me that family members I am close to do not understand my new values.

13. My family does not want me to move away but I would like to.

Masculine Role Norms Inventory – Short Form

Indicate the degree to which you agree with the statements below using the following scale

1----------------2----------------3----------------4----------------5----------------6----------------7

| **Strongly disagree** | **Disagree** | **Slightly disagree** | **Neither agree nor disagree** | **Slightly agree** | **Agree** | **Strongly Agree** |

1. Homosexuals should never marry. (NT)

2. The President of the U.S. should always be a man. (Do)

3. Men should be the leader in any group. (Do)

4. Men should watch football games instead of soap operas. (AF)

5. All homosexual bars should be closed down. (NT)

6. Men should have home improvement skills. (SR)

7. Men should be able to fix most things around the house. (SR)

8. A man should prefer watching action movies to reading romantic novels. (AF)

9. Men should always like to have sex. (IS)

10. Boys should prefer to play with trucks rather than dolls. (AF)

11. A man should not turn down sex. (IS)

12. A man should always be the boss. (Do)

13. Homosexuals should never kiss in public. (NT)

14. A man should know how to repair his car if it should break down. (SR)

15. A man should never admit when others hurt his feelings. (RE)

16. Men should be detached in emotionally charged situations. (RE)

17. It is important for a man to take risks, even if he might get hurt. (T)

18. A man should always be ready for sex. (IS)

19. When the going gets tough, men should get tough. (T)

20. I think a young man should try to be physically tough, even if he's not big. (T)

21. Men should not be too quick to tell others that they care about them. (RE)

MRNI-SF Subscales and Items

Restrictive Emotionality (RE) – Items 15, 16, 21

Self-Reliance through Mechanical Skills (SR) – Items 6, 7, 14

Negativity toward Sexual Minorities (NT) – 1, 5, 13

Avoidance of Femininity (AF) – Items 4, 8, 10

Importance of Sex (IS) – Items 9, 11, 18

Dominance (Do) – Items 2, 3, 12

Toughness (T) – Items 17, 19, 20

Overall general traditional masculinity ideology – All items (1 through 21)

Gender Role Conflict Scale – Short Form

1. Affection with other men makes me tense. (RABBM)

2. Talking about my feelings during sexual relations is difficult for me. (RE)

3. I have difficulty expressing my emotional needs to my partner. (RE)

4. Men who touch other men make me uncomfortable. (RABBM)

5. Finding time to relax is difficulty for me. (CBWFR)

6. I have difficulty expressing my tender feelings. (RE)

7. Hugging other men is difficult for me. (RABBM)

8. Winning is a measure of my value and personal worth. (SPC)

9. My needs to work or study keep me from my family or leisure more than I would like. (CBWFR)

10. I strive to be more successful than others. (SPC)

11. I do not like to show my emotions to other people. (RE)

12. My work or school often disrupts other parts of my life (home, health, leisure, etc.). (CBWFR)

13. Being very personal with other men makes me feel uncomfortable. (RABBM)

14. Being smarter or physically stronger than other men is important to me. (SPC)

15. Overwork and stress, caused by a need to achieve on the job or in school, affects/hurts my life. (CBWFR)

16. I like to feel superior to other people. (SPC)

GRCS-SF Subscales and Items

Restrictive Affectionate Behavior Between Men (RABBM) – Items 1, 4, 7, 13

Restrictive Emotionality (RE) – Items 2, 3, 6, 11

Conflict between Work and Family Relations (CBWFR) – Items 5, 9, 12, 15

Success, Power, and Competition (SPC) – Items 8, 10, 14, 16

Sexual Strategies Scale

Since you were age 14, which if any of the following have you used to convince a woman to have sex (oral, anal, or vaginal intercourse) after she initially said no? Check all that apply.

1. Continuing to touch and kiss her in the hopes that she will give in to sex.

2. Telling her lies (e.g., saying "I love you" when you don't).

3. Using your older age to convince her.

4. Getting her drunk/high in order to convince her to have sex.

5. Threatening to tell others a secret or lie about her if she doesn't have sex (i.e., blackmail).

6. Asking her repeatedly to have sex.

7. Blocking her if she tries to leave the room.

8. Threatening to harm her physically if she doesn't have sex.

9. Taking advantage of the fact that she is drunk/high.

10. Threatening to harm yourself if she doesn't have sex.

11. Using a weapon to frighten her into having sex.

12. Taking off her clothes in the hopes that she will give in to sex.

13. Taking of your clothes in the hopes that she will give in to sex.

14. Using physical restraint.

15. Threatening to break up with her if she doesn't have sex.

16. Questioning her sexuality (e.g., calling her a lesbian).

17. Using your authority to convince her (e.g., if you were her boss, her supervisor, her camp counselor, etc.).

18. Harming her physically.

19. Tying her up.

20. Questioning her commitment to the relationship (e.g., saying "if you loved me, you would").

21. Accusing her of "leading you on" or being "a tease."

22. Slipping her drugs (e.g., GHB or "Roofies") so that you can take advantage of her.

23. I have never used ANY of the above strategies.

Ambivalent Sexism Inventory

Below is a series of statements concerning men and women and their relationships in contemporary society. Please indicate the degree to which you agree or disagree with each statement using the following scale: 0 = disagree strongly; 1 = disagree somewhat; 2 = disagree slightly; 3 = agree slightly; 4 = agree somewhat; 5 = agree strongly.

1. No matter how accomplished be is, a man is not truly complete as a person unless he has the love of a woman (B)
2. Many women are actually seeking special favors, such as hiring policies that favor them over men, under the guise of asking for "equality." (H)
3. In a disaster, women ought not necessarily to be rescued before men. (B)
4. Most women interpret innocent remarks or acts as being sexist. (H)
5. Women are too easily offended. (H)
6. People are often truly happy in life without being romantically involved with a member of the other sex. (B)
7. Feminists are not seeking for women to have more power than men. (H)
8. Many women have a quality of purity that few men possess. (B)
9. Women should be cherished and protected by men. (B)
10. Most women fail to appreciate fully all that men do for them. (H)
11. Women seek to gain power by getting control over men. (H)
12. Every man ought to have a woman whom he adores. (B)
13. Men are complete without women. (B)
14. Women exaggerate problems they have at work. (H)
15. Once a woman gets a man to commit to her, she usually tries to put him on a tight leash. (H)
16. When women lose to men in a fair competition, they typically complain about being discriminated against. (H)
17. A good woman should be set on a pedestal by her man. (B)
18. There are actually very few women who get a kick out of teasing men by seeming sexually available and then refusing male advances. (H)
19. Women, compared to men, tend to have a superior moral sensibility. (B)
20. Men should be willing to sacrifice their own well being in order to provide financially for the women in their lives. (B)
21. Feminists are making entirely reasonable demands of men. (H)
22. Women, as compared to men, tend to have a more refined sense of culture and good taste. (B)

Hostile Sexism subscale items (H) – 2, 4, 5, 7, 10, 11, 14, 15, 16, 18, 21

Benevolent Sexism Subscale items (B) – 1, 3, 6, 8, 9, 12, 13, 17, 19, 20, 22

References

Abbey, A., Jacques-Tiura, A. J., & LeBreton, J. M. (2011). Risk factors for sexual aggression in young men: An expansion of the confluence model. *Aggressive Behavior, 37*(5), 450-464. doi:10.1002/ab.20399

Abbey, A., & McAuslan, P. (2004). A longitudinal examination of male college students' perpetration of sexual assault. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 72*(5), 747-756. doi:10.1037/0022-006X.72.5.747

Abbey, A., McAuslan, P., & Ross, L. T. (1998) Sexual assault perpetration by college men: The role of alcohol, misperception of sexual intent, and sexual beliefs and experiences. J*ournal of Social and Clinical Psychology*, *17*, 167-196.

Abrams, D., Viki, G. T., Masser, B., & Bohner, G. (2003). Perceptions of stranger and acquaintance rape: The role of benevolent and hostile sexism in victim blame and rape proclivity. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 84*(1), 111-125. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.84.1.111

Ahmad, F., Ali, M., & Stewart, D. E. (2005). Spousal abuse among Canadian immigrant women. *Journal of Immigrant Health, 7*(4), 239-246. doi:10.1007/s10903-005-5120-4

Aiken, L. S., & West, S. G. (1991). *Multiple regression: Testing and interpreting interactions*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Akrami, N., & Ekehammar, B. (2006). Right-wing authoritarianism and social dominance orientation. *Journal of Individual Differences, 27*(3), 117-126. doi:10.1027/1614-0001.27.3.117

Allen, C. T., Swan, S. C., & Raghavan, C. (2009). Gender symmetry, sexism, and intimate partner violence. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 24*(11), 1816-1834. doi:10.1177/0886260508325496

Allison, J., & Kilmartin, C. (2007). *Men's violence against women:Theory, research, and activism*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Altemeyer, B. (1999). To thine own self be untrue: Self-awareness in authoritarians. *North American Journal Of Psychology, 1*(2), 157-164.

Amato, F. (2012). The relationship of violence to gender role conflict and conformity to masculine norms in a forensic sample. *The Journal of Men's Studies, 20*(3), 187-208. doi:10.3149/jms.2003.187

Amato, F., & MacDonald, J. (2011). Examining risk factors for homeless men: Gender role conflict, help-seeking behaviors, substance abuse and violence. *The Journal of Men's Studies, 19*(3), 227-235. doi:10.3149/jms.1903.227

Amer, M.M., & Hovey, J.D. (2005). Examination of the impact of acculturation, stress, and religiosity on mental health variables for second-generation Arab Americans. *Ethnicity & Disease, 1*(supplemental), 111-112.

American Psychological Association (2017). Psychology of men and masculinity. Retrieved from http://www.apa.org/pubs/journals/men/

Anderson C. A., & Bushman B. J. (2002). Human aggression. *Annual Review of Psychology,* 53, 27–51. doi:10.1146/annurev.psych.53.100901.135231

Anderson, E. (2009). *Inclusive masculinity: the changing nature of masculinities*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Andreou, E., Alexopoulos, E. C., Lionis, C., Varvogli, L., Gnardellis, C., Chrousos, G. P., & Darviri, C. (2011). Perceived Stress Scale: Reliability and Validity Study in Greece. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, *8*(8), 3287–3298. doi:10.3390/ijerph8083287

Arbona, C., Olvera, N., Rodriguez, N., Hagan, J., Linares, A., & Wiesner, M. (2010). Acculturative Stress among documented and undocumented Latino immigrants in the United States. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences, 32*(3), 362-384. doi:10.1177/0739986310373210

Arciniega, G. M., Anderson, T. C., Tovar-Blank, Z. G., & Tracey, T. J. G. (2008). Toward a fuller conception of Machismo: Development of a traditional Machismo and Caballerismo Scale. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 55*(1), 19-33. doi:10.1037/0022-0167.55.1.19

Arellano-Morales, L., Liang, C. T. H., Ruiz, L., & Rios-Oropeza, E. (2016). Perceived racism, gender role conflict, and life satisfaction among Latino day laborers. *Journal of Latina/o Psychology, 4*(1), 32-42. doi:10.1037/lat0000049

Baron, R. M., & Kenny, D. A. (1986). The moderator–mediator variable distinction in social psychological research: Conceptual, strategic, and statistical considerations.

Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 51(6), 1173-1182. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.51.6.1173

Bates, C.,& Heaven, P. C. L. (2001). Attitudes to women in society: The role of social dominance orientation and social values. *Journal of Community and Applied Psychology,* 11, 43-49.

Baugher, A. R., & Gazmararian, J. A. (2015). Masculine gender role stress and violence: A literature review and future directions. *Aggression and Violent Behavior, 24*, 107-112. doi:10.1016/j.avb.2015.04.002

Begany, J. J., & Milburn, M. A. (2002). Psychological predictors of sexual harassment: Authoritarianism, hostile sexism, and rape myths. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity, 3*, 119–126. doi:10.1037/1524-9220.3.2.119

Bentler, P. M., & Chou, C.-P. (1987). Practical issues in structural modeling. *Sociological Methods & Research, 16*(1), 78-117. doi:10.1177/0049124187016001004

Berger, J. M., Levant, R., McMillan, K. K., Kelleher, W., & Sellers, A. (2005). Impact of gender role conflict, traditional masculinity ideology, alexithymia, and age on men's attitudes toward psychological help seeking. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity, 6*(1), 73-78. doi:10.1037/1524-9220.6.1.73

Berke, D. S., Reidy, D. E., Gentile, B., & Zeichner, A. Masculine discrepancy stress, emotion-regulation difficulties, and intimate partner violence. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*. doi:10.1177/0886260516650967

Berke, D. S., Wilson, L., Mouilso, E., Speir, Z., & Zeichner, A. (2015). Isolating the gendered component of men's physical aggression. *Sex Roles, 72*(11-12), 509-520. doi:10.1007/s11199-015-0488-7

Berry, J. W. (2006). Contexts of acculturation. In D. L. Sam & J. W. Berry (Eds.), *Cambridge handbook of acculturation psychology* (pp. 27-42). New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Berry, J. W., Kim, U., Minde, T., & Mok, D. (1987). Comparative studies of acculturative stress. *The International Migration Review, 21*(3), 491-511. doi:10.2307/2546607

Birman, D., & Tran, N. (2008). Psychological distress and adjustment of Vietnamese refugees in the United States:Association with pre- and postmigration factors. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 78*(1), 109-120. doi:10.1037/0002-9432.78.1.109

Bizer, G. Y., Hart, J., & Jekogian, A. M. (2012). Belief in a just world and social dominance orientation: Evidence for a mediational pathway predicting negative attitudes and discrimination against individuals with mental illness. *Personality and Individual Differences, 52*(3), 428-432. doi:10.1016/j.paid.2011.11.002

Blashill, A. J., & Vander Wal, J. S. (2010). Gender role conflict as a mediator between social sensitivity and depression in a sample of gay men. *International Journal of Men's Health, 9*(1), 26.

Blazina, C., & Kogan, L. (2016). Introduction. In C. Blazina & L. Kogan (Eds.), *Men and their dogs: A new understanding of man's best friend* (pp. 1-10). Switzerland: Springer.

Blazina, C., & Watkins, C. E. J. (1996). Masculine gender role conflict: Effects on college men's psychological well-being, chemical substance usage, and attitudes toward help-seeking. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 43*(4), 461-465. doi:10.1037/0022-0167.43.4.461

Bogart, L. M., Wagner, G. J., Galvan, F. H., Landrine, H., Klein, D. J., & Sticklor, L. A. (2011). Perceived discrimination and mental health symptoms among Black men with HIV. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology, 17*(3), 295-302. doi:10.1037/a0024056

Bosson, J. K., Parrott, D. J., Swan, S. C., Kuchynka, S. L., & Schramm, A. T. (2015). A dangerous boomerang: Injunctive norms, hostile sexist attitudes, and male-to-female sexual aggression. *Aggressive Behavior*, *41*(6), 580-593. doi:10.1002/ab.21597

Bosson, J.K., Vandello, J.A., Burnaford, R.M., Weaver, J.R., & Wasti, S.A. (2009). Precarious manood and displays of physical aggression. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 35*(5), 623-635. doi:10.1177/0146167208331161

Bourey, C., Williams, W., Bernstein, E. E., & Stephenson, R. (2015). Systematic review of structural interventions for intimate partner violence in low- and middle-income countries: organizing evidence for prevention. *BMC Public Health, 15*, 1165-1183. doi:10.1186/s12889-015-2460-4

Bowleg, L., Teti, M., Massie, J. S., Patel, A., Malebranche, D. J., & Tschann, J. M. (2011). "What does it take to be a man? What is a real man?": Ideologies of masculinity

and HIV sexual risk among Black heterosexual men. *Culture, Health, and Sexuality, 13*(5), 545-559. doi:10.1080/13691058.2011.556201

Brandt, M. J. (2011). Sexism and gender inequality across 57 societies. *Psychological Science, 22*(11), 1413-1418. doi:10.1177/0956797611420445

Brown, S. D., Unger Hu, K. A., Mevi, A. A., Hedderson, M.M., Shan, J., Quesenberry, C. P., & Ferrara, A. (2014). The Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure-Revised: Measurement invariance across racial and ethnic groups. *Journal of Counseling Psyhcology*, *61*(1), 154-161. doi:10.1037/a0034749

Byrne, B. M. (2006). *Structural equation modeling with EQS : Basic concepts, applications, and programming* (2nd ed.). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Cainkar, L., & Del Toro, S. (2010). *Barriers, resources, and best practice strategies for working with domestic violence cases in Arab and Muslim American communities*. Chicago, IL: Arab American Action Network.

Caetano, R., Ramisetty-Mikler, S., Caetano Vaeth, P. A., & Harris, T. R. (2007). Acculturation stress, drinking, and intimate partner violence among hispanic couples in the U.S. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 22*(11), 1431-1447. doi:10.1177/0886260507305568

Calasanti, T., Pietila, I., Ojala, H., & King, N. (2013). Men, bodily control, and health behaviors: The importance of age. *Health Psychology, 32*(1), 15-23. doi:10.1037/a0029300

Calhoun, K. S., Bernat, J. A., Clum, G. A., & Frame, C. L. (1997). Sexual coercion and attraction to sexual aggression in a community sample of young men. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 12,* 392-406. doi:10.1177/088626097012003005

Camas, G. G., & Mese, G. (2016). Social hierarchy: Understanding sexual aggression myths. *Turkish Journal of Psychology, 31*(78), 62-78.

Caricati, L. (2007). The relationship between social dominance orientation and gender: The mediating role of social values. *Sex Roles, 57*(3-4), 159-171. doi:10.1007/s11199-007-9231-3

Carroll, C. (2017). The European refugee crisis and the myth of the immigrant rapist. *Europe Now*. Retrieved from https://www.europenowjournal.org/2017/07/05/untitled.

Carter, R. T., Williams, B., Juby, H. L., & Buckley, T. R. (2005). Racial identity as mediator of the relationship between gender role conflict and severity of psychological symptoms in Black, Latino, and Asian men. *Sex Roles, 53*(7), 473-486.

doi:10.1007/s11199-005-7135-7

Chae, M.H., & Chae, S.Y. (2011). Asian American men and fatherhood: An ecological systems perspective. In W.M. Liu, D.K. Iwamoto, & M.H. Chae (Eds.), *Culturally responsive counseling with Asian American men* (pp.131-148) New York: Routledge.

Cho, H. (2012). Racial differences in the prevalence of intimate partner violence against women and associated factors. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 27*(2), 344-363. doi:10.1177/0886260511416469

Christopher, A. N., & Wojda, M. R. (2008). Social dominance orientation, right-wing authoritarianism, sexism, and prejudice toward women in the workforce. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 32*(1), 65-73. doi:10.1111/j.1471-6402.2007.00407.x

Chua, P., & Fujino, D. C. (1999). Negotiating new Asian-American masculinities: Attitudes and gender expectations. *The Journal of Men's Studies, 7*(3), 391-413. doi:10.3149/jms.0703.391

Cohen, S., & Williamson, G. (1988). Perceived stress in a probability sample of the United States. In S. Spacapan & S. Oskamp (Eds.), *The social psychology of health: Claremont symposium on applied social psychology* (pp. 31-67) Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Cokley, K., Hall-Clark, B., & Hicks, D. (2011). Ethnic minority-majority status and mental health: The mediating role of perceived discrimination. *Journal of Mental Health Counseling, 33*(3), 243-263. doi:10.17744/mehc.33.3.u1n011t020783086

Comas-Diaz, L. (1995). Puerto Ricans and sexual child abuse. In L. A. Fontes (Ed.), *Sexual abuse in nine North American cultures: Treatment and prevention* (pp. 31–66). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Connell, R. W. (2000). *The men and the boys*. Berkeley and Los Angeles, CA: University of California Press.

Connell, R. W., & Messerschmidt, J. W. (2005). Hegemonic masculinity. *Gender & Society, 19*(6), 829-859. doi:10.1177/0891243205278639

Connor, R.A., Glick, P., & Fiske, S.T. (2016). Ambivalent sexism in the 21st century. In C.G. Sibley & F.K Barlow (Eds.), *Cambridge Handbook of the Psychology of Prejudice* (pp. 295-320) Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Contrada, R. J., Ashmore, R. D., Gary, M. L., Coups, E., Egeth, J. D., Sewell, A., … Chasse, V. (2001). Measures of ethnicity-related stress: Psychometric properties, ethnic group differences, and associations with well-being. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 31*, 1775-1820.

Coulter, R. W., & Rankin, S. R. (2017). College sexual assault and campus climate for sexual and gender-minority undergraduate students. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 17*(5), 1-16. doi:10.1177/0886260517696870

Coulter, R. W. S., Mair, C., Miller, E., Blosnich, J. H., Matthews, D. D., & McCauley, H. L. (2017). Prevalence of past-year sexual assault victimization among undergraduate students: Exploring differences by and intersections of gender identity, sexual identity, and race/ethnicity. *Preventive Science, 18*(6),726-736. doi:10.1007/s11121-017-0762-8

Courtenay, W. H. (2000). Constructions of masculinity and their influence on men's well-being: A theory of gender and health. *Social Science & Medicine, 50*(10), 1385-1401. doi:10.1016/S0277-9536(99)00390-1

Craig, A. N., Peterson, Z. D., Janssen, E., Goodrich, D., & Heiman, J. R. (2017). Affect and sexual responsivity in men with and without a history of sexual aggression. *Journal of Sex Research*, 1-10. doi:10.1080/00224499.2017.1301357

Cross, E. J., Overall, N. C., Hammond, M. D., & Fletcher, G. J. O. (2017). When does Men's hostile sexism predict relationship aggression? the moderating role of partner commitment.*Social Psychological and Personality Science, 8*(3), 331-340. doi:10.1177/1948550616672000

Cummings, A. M., Gonzalez-Guarda, R. M., & Sandoval, M. F. (2013). Intimate partner violence among Hispanics: A review of the literature. *Journal of Family Violence, 28*(2), 153-171. doi:10.1007/s10896-012-9478-5

Curun, F., Taysi, E., & Orcan, F. (2017). Ambivalent sexism as a mediator for sex role orientation and gender stereotypes in romantic relationships: A study in Turkey. *Interpersona, 11*(1), 55-69. doi:10.5964/ijpr.v11i1.229

Dardenne, B., Dumont, M., & Bollier, T. (2007). Insidious dangers of benevolent sexism: Consequences for women's performance. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 93*(5), 764-779. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.93.5.764

Davis, J. M., & Liang, C. T. H. (2015). A test of the mediating role of gender role conflict: Latino masculinities and help-seeking attitudes. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity, 16*(1), 23-32. doi:10.1037/a0035320

Dean, K. E., & Malamuth, N. M. (1997). Characteristics of men who aggress sexually and of men who imagine aggressing: Risk and moderating variables. *Journal Of*

Personality And Social Psychology, 72(2), 449-455. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.72.2.449.

Declaration on the elimination of violence against women. (1994). New York, NY: United Nations.

DeGue, S., Valle, L. A., Holt, M. K., Massetti, G. M., Matjasko, J. L., & Tharp, A. T. (2014). A systematic review of primary prevention strategies for sexual violence perpetration. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, *19*(4), 346-362. doi: [10.1016/j.avb.2014.05.004](10.1016/j.avb.2014.05.004)

Duckitt, J. (2006). Differential effects of right wing authoritarianism and social dominance orientation on outgroup attitudes and their mediation by threat from and competitiveness to outgroups. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 32*(5), 684-696. doi:10.1177/0146167205284282

Durán, M., Moya, M., & Megías, J. L. (2011). It's his right, it's her duty: Benevolent sexism and the justification of traditional sexual roles. *Journal of Sex Research, 48*(5), 470-478. doi:10.1080/00224499.2010.513088

Duriez, B., & Soenens, B. (2006). Personality, identity styles and authoritarianism: An integrative study among late adolescents. *European Journal of Personality, 20*(5), 397-417. doi:10.1002/per.589

Eisler, R. M., Franchina, J. J., Moore, T. M., Honeycutt, H. G., & Rhatigan, D. L. (2000). Masculine gender role stress and intimate abuse: Effects of gender relevance of conflict situations on men's attributions and affective responses. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity, 1*(1), 30. doi:10.1037/1524-9220.1.1.30

Eisler, R. M., & Skidmore, J. R. (1987). Masculine gender role stress. *Behavior Modification, 11*(2), 123-136. doi:10.1177/01454455870112001

Ekehammar, B., Akrami, N., & Araya, T. (2000). Development and validation of Swedish classical and modern sexism scales. *Scandinavian Journal of Psychology, 41*(4), 307-314. doi:10.1111/1467-9450.00203

Evans, J., Frank, B., Oliffe, J. L., & Gregory, D. (2011). Health, illness, men and masculinities (HIMM): A theoretical framework for understanding men and their health. *Journal of Men's Health, 8*(1), 7-15. doi:10.1016/j.jomh.2010.09.227

Falcaro, M., Pendleton, N., & Pickles, A. (2013). Analysing censored longitudinal data with non-ignorable missing values: Depression in older age. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series A (Statistics in Society), 176*(2), 415-430. doi:10.1111/j.1467-985X.2011.01034.x

Falicov, C. J. (2010). Changing constructions of machismo for Latino men in therapy: "The devil never sleeps." *Family Process, 49*(3), 309-329. doi:10.1111/j.1545-5300.2010.01325.x

Faul, F., Erdfelder, E., Buchner, A., & Lang, A.-G. (2009). Statistical power analyses using G*Power 3.1: Tests for correlation and regression analyses. *Behavior Research Methods*, *41*, 1149-1160. doi:10.3758/BRM.41.4.1149

Feather, N. T., & McKee, I. R. (2012). Values, right-wing authoritarianism, social dominance orientation, and ambivalent attitudes toward women. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 42*(10), 2479-2504. doi:10.1111/j.1559-1816.2012.00950.x

Fields, E. L., Bogart, L. M., Smith, K. C., Malebranche, D. J., Ellen, J., & Schuster, M. A. (2015). "I Always felt I had to prove my manhood": Homosexuality, masculinity, gender role strain, and HIV risk among young Black men who have sex with men. *American Journal of Public Health, 105*(1), 122-131. doi:10.2105/AJPH.2013.301866

Fiske, S. T., & Taylor, S. E. (2013). *Social cognition: From brains to culture*: London: Sage.

Fleming, P. J., Barrington, C., Maman, S., Lerebours, L., Donastorg, Y., & Brito, M. O. (2017). Competition and humiliation. *Men and Masculinities*, doi:10.1177/1097184X17715493

Fleming, P. J., Gruskin, S., Rojo, F., & Dworkin, S. L. (2015). Men's violence against women and men are inter-related: Recommendations for simultaneous intervention. *Social Science and Medicine, 146*, 249-256. doi:10.1016/j.socscimed.2015.10.021

Flood, M., & Howson, R. (2015). *Engaging men in building gender equality*. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Flores, E., Tschann, J. M., Dimas, J. M., Bachen, E. A., Pasch, L. A., & de Groat, C. L. (2008). Perceived discrimination, perceived stress, and mental and physical health among Mexican-origin adults. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences, 30*(4), 401-424. doi:10.1177/0739986308323056

Foels, R., & Reid, L. D. (2010). Gender differences in social dominance orientation: The role of cognitive complexity. *Sex Roles, 62*(9-10), 684-692. doi:10.1007/s11199-010-9775-5

133

Forbes, G. B., & Adams-Curtis, L. E. (2001). Experiences with sexual coercion in college males and females: Roles of family conflict, sexist attitudes, acceptance of rape myths, self-esteem, and the big-five personality factors. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 16*, 865-889. doi:10.1177/088626001016009002

Forbes, G. B., Adams-Curtis, L. E., & White, K. B. (2004). First- and second-generation measures of sexism, rape myths and related beliefs, and hostility toward women. *Violence Against Women, 10*(3), 236-261. doi:10.1177/1077801203256002

Fox, J., & Tang, W. Y. (2014). Sexism in online video games: the role of conformity to masculine norms and social dominance orientation. *Computers in Human Behavior, 33*, 314-320. doi:10.1016/j.chb.2013.07.014

Fragoso, J. M., & Kashubeck, S. (2000). Machismo, gender role conflict, and mental health in Mexican American men. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity, 1*(2), 87-97. doi:10.1037/1524-9220.1.2.87

Franchina, J. J., Eisler, R. M., & Moore, T. M. (2001). Masculine gender role stress and intimate abuse: Effects of masculine gender relevance of dating situations and female threat on men's attributions and affective responses. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity, 2*(1), 34-41. doi:10.1037/1524-9220.2.1.34

Frymier, A.B., & Nadler, M.K. (2013). *Persuasion: Integrating theory, research, and application* (4th ed.). Dubuque, IA: Kendall/Junt.

Fuertes, J., & D. Westbrook, F. (1996). Using the Social, Attitudinal, Familial, and Environmental (SAFE) Acculturation Stress Scale to assess the adjustment needs

of Hispanic college students. *Measurement and Evaluation in Counseling and Development, 29*(2), 67-76.

Gallagher, K. E., & Parrott, D. J. (2011). What accounts for men's hostile attitudes toward women? The influence of hegemonic male role norms and masculine gender role stress. *Violence Against Women, 17*(5), 568-583. doi:10.1177/1077801211407296

Garaigordobil, M., & Aliri, J. (2013). Ambivalent Sexism Inventory: Standardization and normative data in a sample of the Basque country. *Behavioral Psychology, 21*(1), 173-186.

Gardiner, J. K. (2005). *Handbook of studies on men & masculinities*. Thousand Oaks, California: Sage. doi:10.4135/9781452233833

Gaunt, R. (2013). Ambivalent sexism and perceptions of men and women who violate gendered family roles. *Community, Work & Family, 16*(4), 401-416. doi:10.1080/13668803.2013.779231

Gee, G. C., Spencer, M. S., Chen, J., & Takeuchi, D. (2007). A nationwide study of discrimination and chronic health conditions among Asian Americans. *American Journal of Public Health, 97*(7), 1275-1282. doi:10.2105/AJPH.2006.091827

Glick, P., & Fiske, S. T. (1996). The ambivalent sexism inventory: Differentiating hostile and benevolent sexism. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 70*(3), 491-512.

Glick, P., & Fiske, S. T. (2001). An ambivalent alliance: Hostile and benevolent sexism as complementary justifications for gender inequality. *American Psychologist, 56*(2), 109.

Glick, P., Fiske, S. T., Mladinic, A., Saiz, J. L., Abrams, D., Masser, B., … Lopez Lopez, W. (2000). Beyond prejudice as simple antipathy: hostile and benevolent sexism across cultures. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 79*(5), 763-775.

Glick, P., Sakallı–Ugurlu, N., Ferreira, M. C., & Aguiar de Souza, M. (2002). Ambivalent sexism and attitudes toward wife abuse in Turkey and Brazil. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 26*(4), 292-297. doi:10.1111/1471-6402.t01-1-00068

Goldenberg, T., Stephenson, R., Freeland, R., Finneran, C., & Hadley, C. (2016). "Struggling to be the alpha": Sources of tension and intimate partner violence in same-sex relationships between men. *Culture, Health, & Sexuality, 18*(8), 875-889. doi:10.1080/13691058.2016.1144791

Gomez, J., Miranda, R., & Polanco, L. (2011). Acculturative stress, perceived discrimination, and vulnerability to suicide attempts among emerging adults. *Journal of Youth & Adolescence, 40*(11), 1465-1476. doi:10.1007/s10964-011-9688-9

Goforth, A. N., Oka, E. R., Leong, F. T., & Denis, D. J. (2014). Acculturation, acculturative stress, religiosity and psychological adjustment among Muslim Arab American adolescents. *Journal of Muslim Mental Health*, *8*(2).

Good, J. J., & Sanchez, D. T. (2009). Communal stereotypes prime men's benevolent sexism: Implications for romance and family. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity, 10*(1), 88-94. doi:10.1037/a0013427

Goodman, M. B., & Moradi, B. (2008). Attitudes and behaviors toward lesbian and gay persons: Critical correlates and mediated relations. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 55*(3), 371-384.

Gordon, D. M., Hawes, S. W., Reid, A. E., Callands, T. A., Magriples, U., Divney, A., … Kershaw, T. (2013). The many faces of manhood: Examining masculine norms and health behaviors of young fathers across race. *American Journal of Men's Health, 7*(5), 394-401. doi:10.1177/1557988313476540

Gottert, A., Barrington, C., McNaughton-Reyes, H. L., Maman, S., MacPhail, C., Lippman, S. A., … Pettifor, A. (2017). Gender norms, gender role conflict/stress and HIV risk behaviors among men in Mpumalanga, South Africa. *AIDS and Behavior, 22*(6), 1858-1869. doi:10.1007/s10461-017-1706-9

Gough, B., & Flanders, G. (2009). Celebrating "obese" bodies: Gay "bears" talk about weight, body image and health. *International Journal of Men's Health, 8*(3), 235-253. doi:10.3149/jmh.0803.235

Graef, S.T., Tokar, D.M., & Kaut, K.P. (2010). Relations of masculinity ideology, conformity to masculine role norms, and masuline gender role conflict to men's attitudes roward and willingness to seek career counseling. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity, (11)*4

Green, J. D., Kearns, J. C., Ledoux, A. M., Addis, M. E., & Marx, B. P. (2015). The association between masculinity and nonsuicidal self-injury. *American Journal of Men's Health*, *12*(1), 30-40. doi:10.1177/1557988315624508

Griffith, D. M., Gunter, K., & Watkins, D. C. (2012). Measuring masculinity in research on men of color: Findings and future directions. *American Journal of Public Health, 102*(2), S187-S194. doi:10.2105/AJPH.2012.300715

Grossman, S. F., & Lundy, M. (2007). Domestic violence across race and ethnicity: Implications for social work practice and policy. *Violence Against Women, 13*(10), 1029-1052. doi:10.1177/1077801207306018

Hall, G. C., & Barongan, C. (1997). Prevention of sexual aggression: Sociocultural risk and protective factors. *American Psychologist, 52*(1), 5-14.

Halpern, C. T., Spriggs, A. L., Martin, S. L., & Kupper, L. L. (2009). Patterns of intimate partner violence victimization from adolescence to young adulthood in a nationally representative sample. *Journal of Adolescent Health, 45*(5), 508-516. doi:10.1016/j.jadohealth.2009.03.011

Hammer, J. H., Vogel, D. L., & Heimerdinger-Edwards, S. R. (2013). Men's help-seeking: Examination of differences across community size, education, and income. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity, 14*(1), 65-75. doi:10.1037/a0026813

Hammond, W. P. (2012). Taking it like a man: Masculine role norms as moderators of the racial discrimination-depressive symptoms association among African American men. *American Journal of Public Health, 102*(Suppl 2), S232-S241. doi:10.2105/AJPH.2011.300485

Harvey, I. S., & Alston, R. J. (2011). Understanding preventive behaviors among mid-Western African-American men: A pilot qualitative study of prostate screening. *Journal of Men's Health, 8*(2), 140-151. doi:10.1016/j.jomh.2011.03.005

138

Hebert, L. A. (2007). Taking 'difference' seriously: Feminisms and the "man question." *Journal of Gender Studies, 16*(1), 31-45. doi:10.1080/09589230601116141

Hellevik, Ottar. (2007). Linear versus logistic regression when the dependent variable is a dichotomy. *Quality and Quantity, 43,* 59-74. doi: 10.1007/s11135-007-9077-3

Hellmer, K., Stenson, J. T., & Jylha, K. M. (2018). What's (not) underpinning ambivalent sexism?: Revisiting the roles of ideology, religiousity, personality, demographics, and men's facial hair in explaining hostile and benevolent sexism. *Personality and Invidivual Differences, 122* (1), 29-37. doi:10.1016/j.paid.2017.10.001

Herd, D. (2015). Conflicting paradigms on gender and sexuality in rap music: A systematic review. *Sexuality & Culture, 19*(3), 577-589. doi:10.1007/s12119-014-9259-9

Hill Collins, P. (1990). *Black feminist thought : Knowledge, consciousness, and the politics of empowerment*: Boston, MA: Unwin Hyman, 1990.

Hill, M., & Fischer, A. (2001). Does entitlement mediate the link between masculinity and rape-related variables? *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 48,* 39-50. doi:10.1037/0022-0167.48.1.39.

Hirsch, J. S., Meneses, S., Thompson, B., Negroni, M., Pelcastre, B., & del Rio, C. (2007). The inevitability of infidelity: Sexual reputation, social geographies, and marital HIV risk in rural Mexico. *American Journal of Public Health, 97*(6), 986-996. doi:10.2105/AJPH.2006.088492

Hokoda, A., Galvan, D. B., Malcarne, V. L., Castaneda, D. M., & Ulloa, E. C. (2008). An exploratory study examining teen dating violence, acculturation, and acculturative

stress in Mexican-American adolescents. *Journal of Aggression, Maltreatment, & Trauma, 14*(3), 33-49. doi: 10.1300/J146v14n03_03

Hooper, D., Coughlan, J., & Mullen, M. R. (2007). Structural equation modeling: guidelines for determining model fit. *The Electronic Journal of Business Research Methods, 6*(1), 53-60.

Hsieh, F. Y. (1989). Sample size tables for logistic regression. *Statistics in Medicine, 8*, 795-802.

Hu, L. T., & Bentler, P. M. (1999). Cutoff criteria for fit indexes in covariance structure analysis: Conventional criteria versus new alternatives. *Structural Equation Modeling: A Multidisciplinary Journal, 6*(1), 1-55. doi:10.1080/10705519909540118

Hurtado, A., & Sinha, M. (2016). *Beyond machismo: Intersectional Latino masculinities*. Austin, TX: The University of Texas Press.

Isacco, A. J., & Wade, J. C. (2017). A review of selected theoretical perspectives and research in the psychology of men and masculinities. In R. Levant & J. Wong (Eds.), *The psychology of men and masculinities* (pp. 139-168). Washington D.C.: American Psychological Association.

Iwamoto, D. K., & Liu, W. M. (2009). Asian American men and Asianized attribution. In N. Tewari & A. Alvarez (Eds.), *Asian American psychology: Current perspectives* (pp. 211-232. New York, NY: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Jang, Y., & Chiriboga, D. A. (2010). Living in a different world: Acculturative stress among Korean American elders. *The Journals of Gerontology Series B:*

Psychological Sciences and Social Sciences, 65B(1), 14-21. doi:10.1093/geronb/gbp019

Jardin, C., Garey, L., Sharp, C., & Zvolensky, M. J. (2015). Acculturative stress and risky sexual behavior: The roles of sexual compulsivity and negative affect. *Behavior Modification, 40*(1-2), 97-119. doi:10.1177/0145445515613331

Jewkes, R., & Morrell, R. (2017). Hegemonic masculinity, violence, and gender equality: Using latent class analysis to investigate the origins and correlates of differences between men. *Men and Masculinities.* doi:10.1177/1097184X17696171

Jewkes, R., Morrell, R., Hearn, J., Lundqvist, E., Blackbeard, D., Lindegger, G., … Gottzén, L. (2015). Hegemonic masculinity: combining theory and practice in gender interventions. *Culture, Health, and Sex, 17*(2), 96-111. doi:10.1080/13691058.2015.1085094

John, O. P., & Srivastava, S. (1995). The big five trait taxonomy: History, measurement, and theoretical persepctives. In L. A. Pervin & O. P. John (Eds.), *Handbook of personality theory and research* (pp. 102-137). New York/London: The Guilford Press.

Joiner, Jr., T. E., & Walker, R. L. (2002). Construct validity of a measure of acculturative stress in African Americans. *Psychological Assessment, 14*(4), 462-466. doi:10.1037/1040-3590.14.4.462

Jones, D. J., Crump, A. D., & Lloyd, J. J. (2012). Health disparities in boys and men of color. *American Journal of Public Health, 102*(2), S170-S172. doi:10.2105/AJPH.2011.300646

Jones, R. W., & De Cecco, J. P. (1982). The femininity and masculinity of partners in heterosexual and homosexual relationships. *Journal of Homosexuality, 8*(2), 37-44. doi:10.1300/J082v08n02_05

Jones, K., & Heesacker, M. (2012). Addressing the situation: Some evidence for the significance of microcontexts with the gender role conflict construct. *Psychology of Men and Masculinity, 13*(3) 294-307. doi: 10.1037/a0025797

Jost, J. T., & Kay, A. C. (2005). Exposure to benevolent sexism and complementary gender stereotypes: Consequences for specific and diffuse forms of system justification. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 88*(3), 498-509.

Juang, L. P., & Cookston, J. T. (2009). Acculturation, discrimination, and depressive symptoms among Chinese American adolescents: A longitudinal study. *Journal of Primary Prevention, 30*(3-4), 475-496. doi:10.1007/s10935-009-0177-9

Kahn, J. S. (2009). *An introduction to masculinities*. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.

Kassing, L. R., Beesley, D., & Frey, L. L. (2005). Gender role conflict, homophobia, age, and education as predictors of male rape myth acceptance. *Journal of Mental Health Counseling, 27*(4), 311-328. doi:10/17744/mehc.27.4.9wfm24f52kqgav37

Kam, C. (2013). Probing item social desirability by correlating personality items with Balanced Inventory of Desirable Responding (BIDR): a validity examination. *Personality and Individual Differences, 54,* 513-518. doi:10.1016/j.paid.2012.10.017

Kim, B., Atkinson, R., & Yang, P. H. (1999). The Asian values scale: Development, factor analysis, validation, and reliability. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 46*(3), 342-352.

Kim, E. J., O'Neil, J. M., & Owen, S. V. (1996). Asian-American men's acculturation and gender-role conflict. *Psychological Reports, 79*(1), 95-104. doi:10.2466/pr0.1996.79.1.95

Krahe, B. & Berger, A. (2017). Gendered pathways from child sexual abuse to sexual aggression victimization and perpetration in adolescence and young adulthood. *Child Abuse and Neglect, 63*(1), 261-272. doi:10.1016/j.chiabu.2016.10.004

Kteily, N., Ho, A. K., & Sidanius, J. (2012). Hierarchy in the mind: The predictive power of social dominance orientation across social contexts and domains. *Journal Of Experimental Social Psychology*, *48*(2), 543-549. doi:10.1016/j.jesp.2011.11.007

Kulwicki, A., & Ballout, S. (2015). Post Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD) in Arab American refugee and recent immigrant women. *Journal of Cultural Diversity, 22*(1), 9-14.

Küpper, B., & Zick, A. (2011). Inverse gender gap in Germany: Social dominance orientation among men and women. *International Journal of Psychology, 46*(1), 33-45. doi:10.1080/00207594.2010.491121

Kwak, K. (2003). Adolescents and their parents: A review of intergenerational family relations for immigrant and non-immigrant families. *Human Development, 46*(2-3), 115-136.

Kwok, J., Atencio, J., Ullah, J., Crupi, R., Chen, D., Roth, A. R., & Brondolo, E. (2011). The perceived ethnic discrimination questionnaire—community version: Validation in a multiethnic Asian sample. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology, 17*, 271–282. doi:10.1037/a0024034

Lakey, P. (2003). Acculturation: A review of the literature. *Intercultural Communication Studies, 12*(2), 103-118.

Laurent, M. G. (1998). Gender role conflict, cultural identity, and self-esteem among African-American men. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Southern California.) Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 9835073)

Lauritsen, J. L., Heimer, K., & Lynch, J. P. (2009). Trends in the gender gap in violent offending: New evidence from the national crime victimization survey. *Criminology, 47*(2), 361-399. doi:10.1111/j.1745-9125.2009.00149.x

Lease, S. H., Hampton, A. B., Fleming, K. M., Baggett, L. R., Montes, S. H., & Sawyer II, R. J. (2010). Masculinity and interpersonal competencies: Contrasting White and African American men. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity, 11*(3), 195-207. doi:10.1037/a0018092

Lee, E. (2012). Review of the Psychometric Evidence of the Perceived Stress Scale. *Asian Nursing Research, 6*, 121-127. doi:10.1016/j.anr.2012.08.004

Lee, I. (2013). Endorsement of sexist ideology in Taiwan and the United States: Social dominance orientaiton, right wing authoritarianism, and deferential family norms. *International Journal of Psychology, 48* (3), 254-262. doi:10.1080/00207594.2011.645485

Lee, T. L., Fiske, S. T., Glick, P., & Chen, Z. (2010). Ambivalent sexism in close relationships: (Hostile) power and (benevolent) romance shape relationship ideals. *Sex Roles, 62*(7-8), 583-601. doi:10.1007/s11199-010-9770-x

León-Ramírez, B., & Ferrando, P. J. (2013). Assessing sexism in a sample of Mexican students: A validity analysis based on the Ambivalent Sexism Inventory. *Anuario de Psicología, 43*(3).

Levant, R. F., Hall, R. J., & Rankin, T. J. (2013). Male Role Norms Inventory-Short Form (MRNI-SF): Development, confirmatory factor analytic investigation of structure, and measurement invariance across gender. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 60*(2), 228-238. doi:10.1037/a0031545

Levant, R. F., Hirsch, L. S., Celentano, E., & Cozza, T. M. (1992). The male role: An investigation of contemporary norms. *Journal of Mental Health Counseling, 14*(3), 325-337.

Levant, R. F., Parent, M. C., McCurdy, E. R., & Bradstreet, T. C. (2015). Moderated mediation of the relationships between masculinity ideology, outcome expectations, and energy drink use. *Health Psychology, 34*(11), 1100-1106. doi:10.1037/hea0000214

Levant, R. F., & Powell, W. A. (2017). The gender role strain paradigm. In R. F. Levant & Y. J. Wong (Eds.), *The psychology of men and masculinities* (pp. 15-43). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Levant, R. F., & Wimer, D. J. (2014a). Masculinity constructs as protective buffers and risk factors for men's health. *American Journal of Men's Health, 8*(2), 110-120. doi:10.1177/1557988313494408

Levant, R. F., & Wimer, D. J. (2014b). The relationship between conformity to masculine norms and men's health behaviors: Testing a multiple mediator model. *International Journal of Men's Health, 13*(1), 22-41. doi:10.3149/jmh.1301.22

Levant, R. F., & Wong, Y. J. (2017). *The psychology of men and masculinities*. Washington, DC: APA.

Levant, R. F., Wong, Y. J., Karakis, E. N., & Welsh, M. M. (2015). Mediated moderation of the relationship between the endorsement of restrictive emotionality and alexithymia. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity, 16*(4), 459-467.

Liang, C. T. H., Salcedo, J., & Miller, H. A. (2011). Perceived racism, masculinity ideologies, and gender role conflict among Latino men. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity, 12*(3), 201-215. doi:10.1037/a0020479

Lilly, R. L. (2000). Gender role conflict among Black/African American college men: Individual differences and psychological outcomes.(Doctoral dissertation, University of Missouri - Columbia). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 9962540)

Lin, K., Sun, I. Y., Liu, J., & Chen, X. (2016). Chinese women's experience of intimate partner violence: Exploring factors affecting various types of IPV. *Violence Against Women*. doi:10.1177/1077801216671221

Lisco, C. G., Leone, R. M., Gallagher, K. E., & Parrott, D. J. (2015). "Demonstrating masculinity" via intimate partner aggression: The moderating effect of heavy episodic drinking. *Sex Roles, 73*(1), 73–81. doi:10.1007/s11199-015-0500-2

Lisco, C. G., Parrott, D. J., & Tharp, A. T. (2012). The role of heavy episodic drinking and hostile sexism in men's sexual aggression toward female intimate partners. *Addictive Behaviors, 37*(11), 1264-1270. doi:10.1016/j.addbeh.2012.06.010

Little, R. J., & Rubin, D. B. (2014). *Statistical analysis with missing data*. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons.

Liu, W. M., & Iwamoto, D. K. (2006). Asian American men's gender role conflict: The role of Asian values, self-esteem, and psychological distress. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity, 7,* 153-164. doi:10.1037/1524-9220.7.3.153.

Lu, A., & Wong, Y. J. (2013). Stressful experiences of masculinity among U.S.-born and immigrant Asian American men. *Gender & Society, 27*(3), 345-371. doi:10.1177/0891243213479446

Mahalik, J., Locke, B., Ludlow, L., Diemer, M., Scott, R. P. J., Gottfried, M., & Freitas, G. (2003). Development of the Conformity to Masculine Norms Inventory. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity, 4*(1), 3-25. doi:10.1037/1524-9220.4.1.3

Malamuth, N. M., & Hald, G. M. The confluence mediational model of sexual aggression. In D. P. Boer, A. R. Beech, T. Ward, L. A. Craig, M. Rettenberger, L. E. Marshall, & W. L. Marshall (Eds.), *The Wiley handbook on the theories, assessment, and treatment of sexual offending* (pp. 53-71). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley-Blackwell.

McCammon, H. J., Taylor, V., Reger, J., & Einwohner, R. L. (Eds.). (2017). *The Oxford handbook of U.S. women's social movement activism.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Malamuth, N. M., Linz, D., Heavey, C. L., Barnes, G., & Acker, M. (1995). Using the confluence model of sexual aggression to predict men's conflict with women: A 10-year follow-up study. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 69(2*), 353-369. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.69.2.353

Mancera, B. M., Dorgo, S., & Provencio-Vasquez, E. (2017). Risk factors for Hispanic male intimate partner violence perpetration. *American Journal of Men's Health, 11*(4), 969-983. doi:10.1177/1557988315579196

Manning, N. N. (2011). Gender role conflict among formerly incarcerated and college black males: The mediating effects of racial identity on psychological distress. (Doctoral dissertation, Seton Hall University). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 3472964)

Masser, B., Viki, G. T., & Power, C. (2006). Hostile sexism and rape proclivity amongst men. *Sex Roles, 54*(7), 565-574. doi:10.1007/s11199-006-9022-2

Mayeux, L. (2013). Understanding popularity and relational aggression in adolescence: The role of social dominance orientation. *Social Development, 23* (3), 502-517. doi:10.1111/sode.12054

McCammon, H. J., Taylor, V., Reger, J., & Einwohner, R. L. (Eds.). (2017). *The Oxford handbook of U.S. women's social movement activism.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

McDermott, R. C., Kilmartin, C., McKelvey, D. K., & Kridel, M. M. (2015). College male sexual assault of women and the psychology of men: Past, present, and future directions for research. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity, 16*(4), 355-366. doi:10.1037/a0039544

10.1037/a0039544.supp

McDermott, R. C., & Lopez, F. G. (2013). College men's intimate partner violence attitudes: Contributions of adult attachment and gender role stress. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 60*(1), 127-136. doi:10.1037/a0030353

McDermott, R. C., Naylor, P. D., McKelvey, D., & Kantra, L. (2017). College men's and women's masculine gender role strain and dating violence acceptance attitudes: Testing sex as a moderator. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity, 18*(2), 99-111. doi:10.1037/men0000044

McDermott, R. C., Schwartz, J. P., Lindley, L. D., & Proietti, J. S. (2014). Exploring men's homophobia: Associations with religious fundamentalism and gender role conflict domains. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity, 15*(2), 191-200. doi:10.1037/a0032788

McDermott, R.C., Smith, P.N., Borgogna, N., Booth, N., Granato, S., & Sevig, T.D. (2018). College students' cnformity to masculine role norms and help-seeking

intentions for suicidal thoughts. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity, 19*(3), 340-351. doi: 10.1037/men0000107

McMahon, S., & Farmer, G. L. (2011). An updated measure for assessing subtle rape myths. *Social Work Research, 35* (2), 71-81.

McVittie, C., & Willock, J. (2006). "You can't fight windmills": How older men do health, ill health, and masculinities. *Qualitative Health Research, 16*(6), 788-801. doi:10.1177/1049732306288453

Mejias, J. C. (2010). Male gender role conflict as seen through the muscularity concerns of self-identified Latino men. (Doctoral dissertation, City University of New York). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 3378600)

Mena, F. J., Padilla, A. M., & Maldonado, M. (1987). Acculturative stress and specific coping strategies among immigrant and later generation college students. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences, 9*(2), 207-225.

Moore, T. M., & Stuart, G. L. (2005). A review of the literature on masculinity and partner violence. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity, 6*(1), 46-61. doi:10.1037/1524-9220.6.1.46

Moore, T. M., Stuart, G. L., McNulty, J. K., Addis, M. E., Cordova, J. V., & Temple, J. R. (2010). Domains of masculine gender role stress and intimate partner violence in a clinical sample of violent men. *Psychology of Violence, 1*(S), 68-75. doi:10.1037/2152-0828.1.S.68

Mosso, C., Briante, G., Aiello, A., & Russo, S. (2013). The Role of Legitimizing Ideologies as Predictors of Ambivalent Sexism in Young People: Evidence from Italy and the USA. *Social Justice Research*, *26*(1), 1-17. doi:10.1007/s11211-012-0172-9

Mouilso, E. R., & Calhoun, K. S. (2013). The role of rape myth acceptance and psychopathy in sexaul assault perpatration. *Journal of Aggression, 22*(2), 159-174. doi:10.1080/10926771.2013.743937

Moyano, N., Monge, F. S., & Sierra, J. C. (2017). Predictors of sexual aggression in adolescents: Gender dominance vs. rape supportive attitudes. *The European Journal of Psychology Applied to Legal Context, 9*(1), 25-31. doi:10.1016/j.ejpal.2016.06.001

Murnen, S. K., Wright, C., & Kaluzny, G. (2002). If "boys will be boys," then girls will be victims? A meta-analytic review of the research that relates masculine ideology to sexual aggression. *Sex Roles, 46*(11), 359-375. doi:10.1023/a:1020488928736

Nagayama Hall, G. C., Teten, A. L., DeGarmo, D. S., Sue, S., & Stephens, K. A. (2005). Ethnicity, culture, and sexual aggression: Risk and protective factors. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 73*(5), 830-840. doi:10.1037/0022-006x.73.5.830

Norwalk, K. E., Vandiver, B. J., White, A. M., & Englar-Carlson, M. (2011). Factor structure of the gender role conflict scale in African American and European American men. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity, 12*(2), 128-143. doi:10.1037/a0022799

O'Neil, J. M. (1981). Patterns of gender role conflict and strain: Sexism and fear of femininity in men's lives. *The Personnel and Guidance Journal, 60*(4), 203-210. doi:10.1002/j.2164-4918.1981.tb00282.x

O'Neil, J. M. (2015). *Men's gender role conflict psychological costs, consequences, and an agenda for change*.Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

O'Neil, J. M., Helms, B. J., Gable, R. K., David, L., & Wrightsman, L. S. (1986). Gender-role conflict scale: College men's fear of femininity. *Sex Roles, 14*(5), 335-350. doi:10.1007/bf00287583

O'Neil, J. M., Wester, S. R., Heesacker, M., & Snowden, S. J. (2017). Masculinity as a heuristic: Gender role conflict theory, superorganisms, and system-level thinking. In R. F. Levant & Y. J. Wong (Eds.), *The psychology of men and masculinities* (pp. 75-103). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

O'Neil, J., & Harway, M. (1999). Revised multivariate model explaining men's risk factors for violence against women. In J. O'Neil & M. Harway (Eds.),*What causes men's violence against women*? (pp. 207-241). Los Angeles, CA: Sage.

Oberg, K. (1960). Cultural shock: Adjustment to new cultural environments. *Practical Anthropology, 7*(4), 177-182. doi:10.1177/009182966000700405

Ojeda, L., & Piña-Watson, B. (2013). Day laborers' life satisfaction: The role of familismo, spirituality, work, health, and discrimination. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology, 19*(3), 270-278. doi:10.1037/a0032961

Oppedal, B., Roysamb, E., & Heyerdahl, S. (2005). Ethnic group, acculturation, and psychiatric problems in young immigrants. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry, 46*(6), 646-660. doi:10.1111/j.1469-7610.2004.00381.x

Ovesey, L., & Person, E. (1973). Gender identity and sexual psychopathology in men: A psychodynamic analysis of homosexuality, transsexualism, and transvestism. *Journal of the American Academy of Psychoanalysis, 1*(1), 53-72. doi:10.1521/jaap.1.1973.1.1.53

Parrott, D. J., Peterson, J. L., & Bakeman, R. (2011). Determinants of aggression toward sexual minorities in a community sample. *Psychology of Violence, 1*(1), 41-52. doi:10.1037/a0021581

Parrott, D. J., Zeichner, A., & Stephens, D. (2003). Effects of alcohol, personality, and provocation on the expression of anger in men: A facial coding analysis. *Alcoholism: Clinical and Experimental Research*, 937-945. doi:10.1097/01.ALC.0000071923.78618.5B

Pascoe, E. A., & Smart Richman, L. (2009). Perceived discrimination and health: A meta-analytic review. *Psychological Bulletin, 135*(4), 531-554. doi:10.1037/a0016059

Passini, S., & Morselli, D. (2016). Blatant domination and subtle exclusion: The mediation of moral inclusion on the relationship between social dominance orientation and prejudice. *Personality and Individual Differences, 89*, 182-186.

Paulhus, D.L. (1991). Measurement and control of response bias. In J.P. Robinson, P.R. Shaver, & L.S. Wrightsman (Eds.), *Measures of personality and social psychological attitudes* (pp.17-59). New York, NY: Academic Press.

Pehrson, S., Carvacho, H., & Sibley, C. G. (2017). Group differences in the legitimization of inequality: Questioning the role of social dominance orientation. *British Journal of Social Psychology, 56*(1), 28-46. doi:10.1111/bjso.12167

Phelan, J. E., Sanchez, D. T., & Broccoli, T. L. (2010). The danger in sexism: The links among fear of crime, benevolent sexism, and well-being. *Sex Roles, 62*(1-2), 35-47. doi:10.1007/s11199-009-9711-8

Phinney, J. S., and Ong, A. D. (2007). Conceptualization and measurement of ethnic identity: Current status and future directions. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 54*, 271-281. doi:10.1037/0022-0167.54.3.271

Pina, A., & Page, T.E. (2011, March). *Sexual harassment proclivity in men: The influence of social dominance orientation, ambivalent sexism, and attitudes towards sexual harassment.* American Psychology- Law Society, European Association of Psychology and Law, and the New Zealand Association of Psychiatry, Psychiatry, and Law, Miami, FL.

Pieterse, A. L., Nicolas, A. I., & Monachino, C. (2016). Examining the factor structure of the Perceived Ethnic Discrimination Questionnaire in a sample of Australian university students. *International Journal of Culture and Mental Health, 10*(1), 97-107. doi:10.1080/17542863.2016.1265998

Pituch, K. A., & Stevens, J. (2016). *Applied multivariate statistics for the social sciences : Analyses with SAS and IBM's SPSS* (6th ed.). New York, NY: Routledge.

Pleck, J. H. (1995). *The gender role strain paradigm: An update.* In R. F. Levant & W. S. Pollack (Eds.), *A new psychology of men* (pp. 11-32). New York, NY: Basic Books.

Pleck, J. H. (2017). Foreword: A brief history of the psychology of men. In R. F. Levant & Y. J. Wong (Eds.), *The psychology of men and masculinities* (pp. 24-30). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Pleck, J. H., Sonenstein, F. L., & Ku, L. C. (1993). Masculinity ideology: Its impact on adolescent males' heterosexual relationships. *Journal of Social Issues, 49*(3), 11-29. doi:10.1111/j.1540-4560.1993.tb01166.x

Poteat, V. P., Espelage, D. L., & Green Jr., H. D. (2007). The socialization of dominance: Peer group contextual effects on homophobic and dominance attitudes. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 92*(6), 1040-1050. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.92.6.1040

Pratto, F., Liu, J. H., Levin, S., Sidanius, J., Shih, M., Bachrach, H., & Hegarty, P. (2000). Social dominance orientation and the legitimization of inequality across cultures. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 31*(3), 369-409. doi:10.1177/0022022100031003005

Pratto, F., Sidanius, J., & Levin, S. (2006). Social dominance theory and the dynamics of intergroup relations: Taking stock and looking forward. *European Review of Social Psychology, 17*(1), 271-320. doi:10.1080/10463280601055772

Pratto, F., Sidanius, J., Stallworth, L. M., & Malle, B. F. (1994). Social dominance orientation: A personality variable predicting social and political attitudes. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 67*(4), 741-763. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.67.4.741

Preacher, K. J., & Hayes, A. F. (2008). Asymptotic and resampling strategies for assessing and comparing indirect effects in multiple mediator models. *Behavior Research Methods, 40*(3), 879-891. doi:10.3758/brm.40.3.879

Radke, H. R., Hornsey, M. J., Sibley, C. G. and Barlow, F. K. (2018), Negotiating the hierarchy: Social dominance orientation among women is associated with the endorsement of benevolent sexism. *Australian Journal of Psychology,* 70: 158-166. doi:10.1111/ajpy.12176

Raj, A., & Silverman, J. G. (2003). Immigrant South Asian women at greater risk for injury from intimate partner violence. *American Journal of Public Health, 93*(3), 435-437.

Ramirez, J. L., & Badger, T. A. (2014). Men navigating inward and outward through depression. *Archives of Psychiatric Nursing, 28*(1), 21-28. doi:10.1016/j.apnu.2013.10.001

Rando, R. A., Rogers, J. R., & Brittan-Powell, C. S. (1998). Gender role conflict and college men's sexually aggressive attitudes and behavior. *Journal of Mental Health Counseling, 20*(4), 359-369.

Reilly, E. D., Rackley, K. R., & Awad, G. H. (2017). Perceptions of Male and Female STEM Aptitude: The Moderating Effect of Benevolent and Hostile Sexism. *Journal of Career Development*, *44*(2), 159–173. https://doi.org/10.1177/0894845316641514

Reilly, E. D., Rochlen, A. B., & Awad, G. H. (2014). Men's self-compassion and self-esteem: The moderating roles of shame and masculine norm adherence. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity, 15*(1), 22-28. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0031028

Reynolds, K. J., Turner, J. C., Haslam, S. A., & Ryan, M. K. (2001). The role of personality and group factors in explaining prejudice. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 37*(5), 427-434.

Rivera, E. T. (1996). Puerto Rican men, gender role conflict, and ethnic identity. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Connecticut). Retrieved from Dissertation Abstracts International.

Robinson, D. T., & Schwartz, J. P. (2004). Relationship between gender role conflict and attitudes toward women and African Americans. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity, 5*(1), 65-71. doi:10.1037/1524-9220.5.1.65

Rosenthal, L., Levy, S. R., & Earnshaw, V. A. (2012). Social dominance orientation relates to believing men should dominate sexually, sexual self-efficacy, and taking free female condoms among undergraduate women and men. *Sex Roles, 67*(11-12), 659-669. doi:10.1007/s11199-012-0207-6

Rucker, D. D., Preacher, K. J., Tormala, Z. L., & Petty, R. E. (2011). Mediation analysis in social psychology: Current practices and new recommendations. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass, 5*(6), 359-371. doi:10.1111/j.1751-9004.2011.00355.x

Ruiz-Perez, I., Plazaola-Castano, J., & Vives-Cases, C. (2007). Methodological issues in the study of violence against women. *Journal of Epidemiology and Community Health, 61* (S2), ii26-31. doi:10.1136/jech.2007.059907

Ruiz, J. A., Torrente, G., Rodriguez, A., & Ramirez, M. A. (2007). Estrés de aculturación en inmigrantes hispanoamericanos [Acculturative stress in Latin American

immigrants]. In C. L. Guillen & R. Guil (Eds.), *Psicología social: un encuentro de perseepectivas* (pp. 392-396). Cádiz: Asociación de Profesionales de la Psicología Social.

Russell, B. L., & Trigg, K. Y. (2004). Tolerance of sexual harassment: An examination of gender differences, ambivalent sexism, social dominance, and gender roles. *Sex Roles, 50*, 565-573. doi:10.1023/B:SERS.0000023075.32252.fd

Sakall, N. (2001). Beliefs about wife beating among Turkish college students: The effects of patriarchy, sexism, and sex differences. *Sex Roles, 44*(9), 599-610. doi:10.1023/a:1012295109711

Schmitt, M. T., & Wirth, J. H. (2009). Evidence that gender differences in social dominance orientation result from gendered self-stereotyping and group-interested responses to patriarchy. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 33*(4), 429-436.

Schneider, B., & Pham, J. (2017). The turn toward socialist, radical, and lesbian feminisms. In H. J. McCammon, V. Taylor, J. Reger, & R. L. Einwohner (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of U.S. women's social movement activisim*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Schwartz, J. P., & Waldo, M. (2003). Reducing gender role conflict among men attending partner abuse prevention groups. *The Journal for Specialists in Group Work, 28*(4), 355-369. doi:10.1080/714860173

Schwartz, S. J., Unger, J. B., Des Rosiers, S. E., Lorenzo-Blanco, E. I., Zamboanga, B. L., Huang, S., … Szapocznik, J. (2014). Domains of acculturation and their effects on

substance use and sexual behavior in recent Hispanic immigrant adolescents. *Prevention Science, 15*(3), 385-396. doi:10.1007/s11121-013-0419-1

Seabrook, R. C., McMahon, S., & O'Connor, J. (2018). A longitudinal study of interest and membership in a fraternity, rape myth acceptance, and proclivity to perpetrate sexual assault. *Journal of American College Health, 66*(6), 510-518. doi:10.1080/07448481.2018.1440584

Shalabi, D., Mitchell, S., & Andersson, N. (2015). Review of gender violence among Arab immigrants in Canada: Key issues for prevention efforts. *Journal of Family Violence, 30*(7), 817-825. doi:10.1007/s10896-015-9718-6

Shalvi, S., Gino, F., Barkan, R., & Ayal, S. (2015). Self-serving justifications: Doing wrong and feeling moral. *Current Directions in Psychological Science, 24*(2), 125-130. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0963721414553264

Sheffield, C. J. (1987). *Sexual terrorism: The social control of women*. Los Angeles, CA: Sage.

Sibley, C. G., & Becker, J. C. (2012). On the nature of sexist ambivalence: Profiling ambivalent and univalent sexists. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 42*(5), 589-601. doi:10.1002/ejsp.1870

Sibley, C. G., & Liu, J. H. (2010). Social dominance orientation: Testing a global individual difference perspective. *Political Psychology, 31*(2), 175-207. doi:10.1111/j.1467-9221.2009.00748.x

Sibley, C. G., Wilson, M. S., & Duckitt, J. (2007). Effects of dangerous and competitive worldviews on right-wing authoritarianism and social dominance orientation over

a five-month period. *Political Psychology, 28*(3), 357-371. doi:10.1111/j.1467-9221.2007.00572.x

Sidanius, J., & Pratto, F. (1999). *Social dominance: An intergroup theory of social hierarchy and oppression*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Sidanius, J., Pratto, F., & Bobo, L. (1994). Social dominance orientation and the political psychology of gender: A case of invariance? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 67*(6), 41-67. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.67.6.998

Sidanius, J., Sinclair, S., & Pratto, F. (2006). Social dominance orientation, gender, and increasing educational exposure. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 36*(7), 1640-1653. doi:10.1111/j.0021-9029.2006.00074.x

Silva, D. D. (2002). A study of Latino and Latina university student's gender role expectations: Gender role conflict, acculturation, ethnic identity, and worldview. (Doctoral dissertation, New Mexico State University). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 3053648)

Simmons, A. L., Duffy, J. A., & Alfraih, H. S. (2012). Attitudes toward women managers: The influence of social dominance orientation and power distance on men in college. *Gender in Management: An International Journal, 27*(7), 482-498. doi:10.1108/17542411211273469

Sirin, S. R., Ryce, P., Gupta, T., & Rogers-Sirin, L. (2013). The role of acculturative stress on mental health symptoms for immigrant adolescents: A longitudinal investigation. *Developmental Psychology, 49*, 736-748. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0028398

Smiler, A. P. (2004). Thirty years after the discovery of gender: Psychological concepts and measures of masculinity. *Sex Roles, 50*(1), 15-26. doi:10.1023/B:SERS.0000011069.02279.4c

Smith-Hunter, R. M., Parrott, D. J., Swartout, K. M., & Tharp, A. T. (2015). Deconstructing hegemonic masculinity: The roles of antifemininity, subordination to women, and sexual dominance in men's perpetration of sexual aggression. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity, 16*(2), 160-169. doi:10.1037/a0035956

Spence, J. T., & Helmreich, R. L. (1978). *Masculinity and femininity: Their psychological dimensions, correlates and antecedents*. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.

Steinfeldt, J. A., Wong, Y. J., Hagan, A. R., Hoag, J. M., & Steinfeldt, M. C. (2011). A contextual examination of gender role conflict among college football players. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity, 12*(4), 311-323. doi:10.1037/a0023722

Stillson, R. W., O'Neil, J. M., & Owen, S. V. (1991). Predictors of adult men's gender-role conflict: Race, class, unemployment, age, instrumentality-expressiveness, and personal strain. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 38*(4), 458-464. doi:10.1037/0022-0167.38.4.458

Stober, J., Dette, D. E., & Musch, J. (2002). Comparing continuous and dichotomous scoring of the Balanced Inventory of Desirable Responding. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 78*(2), 370-389. doi: 10.1207/S15327752JPA7802_10

Stockman, J. K., Hayashi, H., & Campbell, J. C. (2015). Intimate partner violence and its health impact on ethnic minority women [corrected]. *Journal of Women's Health, 24*(1), 62-79. doi:10.1089/jwh.2014.4879

Strang, E., & Peterson, Z. D. (2017). Unintentional misreporting on self-report measures of sexually aggressive behavior: An interview study. *Journal of Sex Research*, 1-13. doi:10.1080/00224499.2017.1304519

Strang, E., Peterson, Z. D., Hill, Y. N., & Heiman, J. R. (2013). Discrepant responding across self-report measures of men's coercive and aggressive sexual strategies. *The Journal of Sex Research, 50*(5), 458-469. doi:10.1080/00224499.2011.646393

Suh, H., Rice, K. G., Choi, C., van Nuenen, M., Zhang, Y., Morero, Y., & Anderson, D. (2015). Measuring acculturative stress with the SAFE: Evidence for longitudinal measurement invariance and associations with life satisfaction. *Personality and Individual Differences, 89*, 217-222. doi:10.1016/j.paid/2015.10.002

Sun, C. J., Ma, A., Tanner, A. E., Mann, L., Reboussin, B. A., Garcia, M., … Rhodes, S. D. (2016). Depressive symptoms among Latino sexual minority men and Latina transgender women in a new settlement state: The role of perceived discrimination. *Depression Research and Treatment*. doi:10.1155/2016/4972854

Sussenbach, P., & Bohner, G. (2011). Acceptance of sexual aggression myths in a representative sample of German residents. *Aggressive Behavior, 37*(4), 374-385. doi:10.1002/ab.20390

Swan, S. C., Gambone, L. J., Caldwell, J. E., Sullivan, T. P., & Snow, D. L. (2008). A review of research on women's use of violence with male intimate partners. *Violence and Victims, 23*(3), 301-314.

Tabachnick, B. G. & Fidell, L. S. (2000). *Using multivariate statistics* (4th ed.). Boston, MA:Allyn & Bacon.

Tappis, H., Freeman, J., Glass, N., & Doocy, S. (2016). Effectiveness of interventions, programs and strategies for gender-based violence prevention in refugee populations: An integrative review. *PLoS Currents, 8*. doi:10.1371/currents.dis.3a465b66f9327676d61eb8120eaa5499

Testa, M., Hoffman, J. H., Lucke, J. F., & Pagnan, C. E. (2015). Measuring sexual aggression perpetration in college men: A comparison of two measures. *Psychology of Violence, 5*(3), 285-293. doi:10.1037/a0037584

Thompson, E. H., Jr., & Bennett, K. M. (2015). Measurement of masculinity ideologies: A (critical) review. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity, 16*(2), 115-133. doi:10.1037/a0038609

Thompson, M. P., Kingree, J. B. (Kip), Zinzow, H., & Swartout, K. (2015). Time-varying risk factors and sexual aggression perpetration among male college students. *The Journal of Adolescent Health*, *57*(6), 637–642. doi:10.1016/j.jadohealth.2015.08.015

Thompson, E. H., Jr., & Pleck, J. H. (1986). The structure of male role norms. *American Behavioral Scientist, 29*(5), 531-543.

Thompson, N. J., McGee, R. E., & Mays, D. (2012). Race, ethnicity, substance abuse, and unwanted sexual intercourse among adolescent females in the United States. *Western Journal of Emergency Medicine, 13*(3), 283-288. doi:10.5811/westjem.2012.3.11774

Thorpe, R. J., Duru, O. K., & Hill, C. V. (2015). Advancing racial/ethnic minority men's health using a life course approach. *Ethnicity & Disease, 25*(3), 241-244. doi:10.18865/ed.25.3.241

Todorova, I. L. G., Falcón, L., Lincoln, A. K., & Price, L. L. (2010). Perceived discrimination, psychological distress and health. *Sociology of Health & Illness, 32*(6), 843-861. doi:10.1111/j.1467-9566.2010.01257.x

Tran, T. D., Nguyen, H., & Fisher, J. (2016). Attitudes toward intimate partner violence against women among women and men in 39 low- and middle-income countries. *PLoS One, 11*(11), e0167438. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0167438

Trawalter, S., Chung, V. S., DeSantis, A. S., Simon, C. D., & Adam, E. K. (2012). Physiological stress responses to the 2008 U.S. presidential election: The role of policy preferences and social dominance orientation. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations,* 15(3), 333-345. doi:10.1177/1368430211428163

Vandello, J. A., & Bosson, J. K. (2013). Hard won and easily lost: A review and synthesis of theory and research on precarious manhood. *Psychology of Men and Masculinity, 14*(2), 101-113. doi:10.1037/a0029826

Vandello, J. A., Bosson, J. K, Cohen, D., Burnaford, R. M., & Weaver, J. R. (2008). Precarious manhood. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 95*, 1325-1339.

Varvel, S. J. (2009). Gender role conflict, problem-solving appraisal, and the psychological functioning of firefighters (Doctoral dissertation, University of Missouri-

Columbia, 2009). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 3458963)

Vecina, M. L., & Piñuela, R. (2017). Relationships between ambivalent sexism and the five moral foundations in domestic violence: Is it a matter of fairness and authority? *The Journal of Psychology, 151*(3), 334-344. doi:10.1080/00223980.2017.1289145

Vincent, W., Gordon, D. M., Campbell, C., Ward, N. L., Albritton, T., & Kershaw, T. (2016). Adherence to traditionally masculine norms and condom-related beliefs: Emphasis on African American and Hispanic men. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity, 17*(1), 42-53. doi:10.1037/a0039455

Vincent, W., Parrott, D. J., & Peterson, J. L. (2011). Combined effects of masculine gender-role stress and sexual prejudice on anger and aggression toward gay men. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 41*(5), 1237-1257. doi:10.1111/j.1559-1816.2011.00755.x

Wade, J. C. (1996). African American men's gender role conflict: The significance of racial identity. *Sex Roles, 34*(1), 17-33. doi:10.1007/bf01544793

Wade, J. C., & Rochlen, A. (2013). Introduction: Masculinity, identity, and the health and well-being of African American men. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity, 14*(1). doi:10.1037/a0029612.

Wahto, R., & Swift, J. K. (2014). Labels, gender-role conflict, stigma, and attitudes toward seeking psychological help in men. *American Journal of Men's Health, 10*(3), 181-191. doi:10.1177/1557988314561491

Walker, R. L., Wingate, L. R., Obasi, E. M., & Joiner, T. E. (2008). An empirical investigation of acculturative stress and ethnic identity as moderators for depression and suicidal ideation in college students. *Cultural Diversity & Ethnic Minority Psychology, 14*(1), 75-82. doi:10.1037/1099-9809.14.1.75

Wathen, C. N., & MacMillan, H. L. (2003). Interventions for violence against women: Scientific review. *JAMA, 289*(5), 589-600.

Wester, S. R., Kuo, B., & Vogel, D. (2006). Multicultural coping: Chinese Canadian adolescents, male gender role conflict, and psychological distress. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity, 7*(2), 83-100.

Wester, S. R., Vogel, D. L., O'Neil, J. M., & Danforth, L. (2012). Development and evaluation of the Gender Role Conflict Scale Short Form (GRCS-SF). *Psychology of Men & Masculinity, 13*(2), 199-210. doi:10.1037/a0025550

Wester, S. R., Vogel, D. L., Wei, M., & McLain, R. (2006). African American men, gender role conflict, and psychological distress: The role of racial identity. *Journal of Counseling & Development, 84*(4), 419-429. doi:10.1002/j.1556-6678.2006.tb00426.x

Whatley, M. A. (2008). The dimensionality of the 15-item Attitudes toward Women Scale. *Race, Gender & Class, 15*(1), 265-273.

Widman, L., & Olson, M. (2013). On the relationship between automatic attitudes and self-reported sexual assault in men. *Archives of Sexual Behavior, 42*(5), 813-823. doi:10.1007/s10508-012-9970-2

Wilson, M. S., & Liu, J. H. (2003). Social dominance orientation and gender: The moderating role of gender identity. *British Journal of Social Psychology, 42*(2), 187-198. doi:10.1348/014466603322127175

Wolf, E. J., Harrington, K. M., Clark, S. L., & Miller, M. W. (2013). Sample size requirements for structural equation models: An evaluation of power, bias, and solution propriety. *Educational and psychological measurement, 73*(6), 913-934. doi:10.1177/0013164413495237l

Wong, Y.J., Burkley, M., Bell, A.C., Wang, S., & Klann, E. (2017). Manly to the core: Measuring men's implicit masculine self-concept via the semantic misattribution procedure. *Personality and Individual Difference, 104*(2017), 320-325. doi:10.1016/j.paid.2016.08.026

Wong, Y. J., Ho, M. R., Wang, S. Y., & Miller, I. S. (2017). Meta-analyses of the relationship between conformity to masculine norms and mental health-related outcomes. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 64*(1), 80-93. doi:10.1037/cou0000176

Wong, Y. J., Liu, J., & Klann, E. M. (2017). The intersection of race, ethnicity, and masculinities: Progress, problems, and prospects. In R. F. Levant & Y. J. Wong (Eds.), *The psychology of men and masculinities* (pp. 261-288). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Wong, Y. J., Owen, J., & Shea, M. (2012). A latent class regression analysis of men's conformity to masculine norms and psychological distress. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 59*(1), 176-183. doi:10.1037/a0026206

Yamawaki, N., Ostenson, J., & Brown, R. C. (2009). The functions of gender role traditionality, ambivalent sexism, injury, and frequency of assault on domestic violence perception: A study between Japanese and American college students. *Violence Against Women*, 15, 1126-1142. doi:10.1177/1077801209340758

Yoon, E., Chang, C. T., Kim, S., Clawson, A., Cleary, S. E., Hansen, M., Bruner, J. P., Chan, T. K., & Gomes, A. M. (2013). A meta-analysis of acculturation/enculturation and mental health. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 60*(1), 15-30. doi:10.1037/a0030652

Yoon, E., Langrehr, K., & Ong, L. Z. (2011). Content analysis of acculturation research in counseling and counseling psychology: A 22-year review. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 58*(1), 83-96. doi:10.1037/a0021128

Yoshihama, M., Blazevski, J., & Bybee, D. (2014). Enculturation and attitudes toward intimate partner violence and gender roles in an Asian Indian population: Implications for community-based prevention. *American Journal of Community Psychology, 53*(3-4), 249-260. doi:10.1007/s10464-014-9627-5

Zinzow, H. M., & Thompson, M. (2015). A longitudinal study of risk factors for repeated sexual coercion and assault in U.S. college men. *Archives of Sexual Behavior, 44*(1), 213-222. doi:10.1007/s10508-013-0243-5