ABSTRACT

Title of Dissertation:   EXPLORING THE LIVES OF ASIAN AMERICAN MEN:

RACIAL IDENTITY, MALE ROLE NORMS, GENDER

ROLE CONFLICT, AND PREJUDICIAL ATTITUDES

William Ming Liu, Doctor of Philosophy, 2000

Dissertation directed by:       Dr. Donald B. Pope-Davis, Professor,
Department of Counseling and Personnel Services

Much of the literature on masculinity has focused on the lives of White men.
The literature assumed that White male experiences were ubiquitous for all men.
Although some literature has begun to explore the lives of men of color, no empirical
studies could be found that investigated the experiences of Asian American men from
a racial identity perspective.  Using racial identity to examine the lives of Asian
American men was important since Asian American men, historically and
contemporarily, encounter racism, yet no studies could be found that examined racism
specifically among Asian American men.  The purpose of this study was to examine
the relationships between racial identity, male role norms, gender role conflict, and
prejudicial attitudes.

323 Asian American men were surveyed from public, private, and community
colleges on the East and West coast.  Participants were given the People of Color
Racial Identity Attitude Scale (POCRIAS, Helms, 1995), Gender Role Conflict Scale
(GRCS, O'Neil et al., 1986), Male Role Norms Inventory (MRNI, Levant et al., 1992),
Quick Discrimination Index (QDI, Ponterotto et al., 1995), and a demographic form.

Results from correlations show small relationships between Conformity, Internalization, and prejudicial attitudes. Similarly, relationships between GRCS and MRNI subscale and total scores show some small to modest relationships. A two-way ANOVA showed differences in prejudicial attitudes between those who had never taken a multicultural education course and those who had taken two or more courses. Finally, two hierarchical multiple regressions were conducted. In the first regression, the GRCS total score was the criterion and the predictors were POCRIAS subscales and prejudicial attitudes. Dissonance, Immersion/Resistance, and Internalization subscales were significant predictors. In the second regression, the MRNI Traditional Masculine Attitude score was the criterion and POCRIAS and prejudicial attitudes were predictors. Immersion/Resistance, Internalization, and prejudicial attitudes were significant predictors. Because the variance accounted for in the correlations and regressions were small, results suggest that potentially, other variables such as Asian cultural values and age may be playing a role in the experiences of Asian American men.

The strengths and limitations, counseling implications, and recommendations for future research are also presented.

EXPLORING THE LIVES OF ASIAN AMERICAN MEN:

RACIAL IDENTITY, MALE ROLE NORMS, GENDER

ROLE CONFLICT, AND PREJUDICIAL ATTITUDES

by

William Ming Liu

Dissertation submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate School of the
University of Maryland, College Park in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy
2000

Advisory Committee:

Professor, Donald B. Pope-Davis, Chair
Associate Professor Vivian S. Boyd
Associate Professor Seung-kyung Kim
Associate Professor Marylu K. McEwen
Associate Professor Karen M. O'Brien

DEDICATION

I would like to dedicate this work to my family. Through their support and generosity, I have been able to realize my ambitions. Also, it was through my family that I learned the necessary qualities to be an Asian American man. I would especially like to recognize Rossina, my mother Judy, and grandmother. To them, I dedicate this work and my life's work. I hope to honor them in the best way possible, passing on their love and kindness to future generations of Asian American men.

## ACKNOWELEGEMENTS

The completion of this dissertation would not have been realized without the support and guidance of several people. First, I would like to acknowledge my chair, advisor, mentor, and friend, Don Pope-Davis. Through his support and friendship, I was able to complete this step in my professional journey. With his guidance and mentorship, I have been able to finish my graduate experience and am prepared for the next stage in my professional life. Thank you also for showing me the need to balance my personal and professional life and how to be a man of color in our profession.

Second, I would like to acknowledge my committee members, Drs. Vivan Boyd, Seung-kyung Kim, Marylu McEwen, and Karen O'Brien. With their help, commitment, and emotional support, this experience has been positive and rewarding. I would like to recognize that Drs. Seung-kyung Kim and Marylu McEwen have also been important mentors and friends to me, personally, and as a new professional. Thank you for all your guidance and friendship.

I would also like to acknowledge my family. My mother, grandmother, brothers, David and Joe, and my loving partner Rossina. She has been my constant companion, my source of strength, my loving confidant, and greatest supporter. Moving back and forth across the U.S., Rossina has been my foundation. It is through her love that I was able to find the energy to complete this work.

I would also like to express my gratitude to the students in the Asian American Student Union (AASU) and the Asian American Studies Program (AASP) at the University of Maryland. My involvement with both these groups shaped my worldview on race, class, and gender and showed me the dire need for people to teach students from a caring perspective. My work with these groups revealed to me the need to carry on the work of civil rights for those who may not have a voice. I humbly work for them.

I would also like to recognize Gloria Bouis. Working so many years to establish the AASU and AASP, Gloria has been a constant friend, colleague, and voice of reason. She has guided my vision that a different society, a better society, can exist through vigilant effort. Finally, with too many names to mention, I would like to acknowledge the many friends I have made in my travels that have added to the richness of my life. I hope that our paths will cross again.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS (continued)

TABLE OF CONTENTS (continued)

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER I

Introduction

As one of the fastest growing racial groups in the United States today (S. Chan, 1991; Takaki, 1989), Asian Americans are also one of the most complex. The complex image of Asian Americans is derived from their long and significant presence in American society and their continued characterization as newcomers (S. Chan, 1991; Takaki, 1989). Throughout American history, Asian Americans have been framed as laborers, social parasites, and sexual deviants (e.g., prostitutes) (Fung, 1998; Hamamoto, 1994; Harvard Law Review, 1993). Contemporary images such as the model minority also re-capitalize on the antecedent notions that Asian Americans are "different" than White Americans (S. Chan, 1991; Takaki, 1989). The problem for Asian Americans it seems, is defining a sense of self within all these externally imposed images that constantly mark them as "different."

It would seem that, even if Asian Americans are considered different than White Americans, they are still minorities, and therefore they should be able to find a sense of community among other minority groups. But for Asian Americans, even their place as a minority group is sometimes difficult to decipher (Okihiro, 1994). Imagined as the exemplary minority group because of their economic and educational achievements (S. Chan, 1991; Takaki, 1989; Wong, Lai, Nagasawa, & Lin, 1998), other minority groups such as African and Latino Americans are challenged to mirror this "silent" success (i.e., no political activities such as civil rights) (Wong et al.,

1998). But the success that is championed by Asian Americans is very narrow and problematic because, when economics is the measure of success, Asian Americans are sometimes positioned as "near-White" and elevated as a racial minority success paradigm (S. Chan, 1991; Takaki, 1989; Wong, Lai, Nagasawa, & Lin, 1998). But when Asian Americans are in direct competition with Whites, their status as a racial minority, similar to other minority groups, becomes abundantly evident (e.g., in affirmative action).

The model minority myth highlights the inherent racial and class conflicts within the image, but alludes to potentially other problematic visages of Asian Americans as well. While seemingly a positive image of Asian Americans, the model minority image carries a particular raced and gendered taint, that for Asian American men, manifests as both emasculating and desexualizing (J.W. Chan, 1998; J.P. Chan, et al., 1991; Cheung, 1993; Tucker & Mitchell-Kernan, 1995). Thus, for Asian American men to fully understand themselves and the challenges they must overcome, it is important for Asian American men to understand themselves simultaneously as raced, classed, and gendered individuals (Ting, 1998).

It is also extremely important for those working with the Asian Americans to understand the Asian American community as a multi-dimensional (e.g., acculturation and ethnic diversity) and complex group. While much of the current literature on the Asian Americans focuses on mental health issues (e.g., Sue & Sue, 1990), much of the within-group diversity of the Asian American community has yet to be fully explored,

such as the issue of gender (e.g., Stillson, O'Neil, & Owen, 1991). Because of the apparent paucity of empirical research on Asian American men, service providers (i.e., counselors) may often rely on literature built primarily on White men. Consequently, counseling services, outreach activities, and co-curricular programs may suffer from the limited research literature.

## Statement of the Problem

Since many issues mark the lives of Asian Americans, discourse on Asian Americans must be within the framework of race, class, and gender (Messner, 1997). Any dialogue about Asian American men for instance, must move beyond essentialism that focuses on prescribed roles for men and women or reductionism that argues gender is socially constructed and therefore is not as important as race or class (Messner, 1997). Instead, research should also focus on multiple dimensions of Asian American men. But previous studies have usually focused on racial or ethnic identity (e.g., Kohatsu, 1992), acculturation (Sodowsky, Lai, & Plake, 1991), gender (e.g., E.J. Kim, O'Neil, & Owen, 1996; Levant et al., 1996; Sue, 1990), or attributes about being an Asian American man (Chua & Fujino, 1999). There seem to be no empirical studies to date that focus on the issue of race, racism, prejudice, masculine demands, and the conflicts of masculinity for Asian American men.

The purpose of this study was to examine how Asian American men struggle with being racialized as "Asian," and how they address issues of racism and prejudice in their lives as men. Because racism, in varying degrees, pervades the lives of Asian

American men, the study also explored the attitudes toward self and other as a consequence of contending with racism. Additionally, this research project explored how Asian American men construct a sense of masculinity that seems to be premised upon a White "maleness" and tends to both emasculate Asian American men and encourage traditional "Asian" gender roles. The study attempted to understand the ways Asian American men negotiate the demands of dominant and native (i.e., Asian) notions of masculinity. Finally, this study investigates how Asian American men's sense of racial identification and prejudicial attitudes (i.e., racism and sexism) affect, and are related to, their subscription to male gender role expectations and gender role conflict.

No study to date has examined their racial identity, subscription to masculine role norms and expectations, gender role conflicts, and the prejudicial beliefs of Asian American men. For instance, based on racial identity theory (Helms, 1990; Helms & Cook, 1999), one may infer that, as Asian American men resolve issues surrounding their racial identification, they should also begin to resolve issues of oppression in other areas of their lives. If such is the case, then one may also infer that an Asian American man who is in Internalization should also be less homophobic, less sexist, and less ageist, to name a few, than someone who is in Conformity or Immersion statuses. Yet it is not clear, from the empirical literature, if racial identification and gender conformity are necessarily resolved in a similar way or simultaneously. Hence, this study seeks to understand the racial identity among Asian American men,

as well as the ways Asian American men struggle with issues such as gender role conformity and sexism.

Because much of the masculinity research has yet to focus on the lives of men of color (Cazenare, 1984; Conway-Long, 1994; Lazur & Majors, 1995; Kimmel, 1996; Stillson et al., 1991), it is unclear how Asian American men subscribe to notions of masculinity. If research on African American men can provide a glimpse into the experiences of Asian American men, then Asian American men may also be experiencing (a) pressures of dominant masculinity to act like all other men, (b) conflicts between White and racial-cultural notions of masculinity, and (c) masculinity conflicts associated with varying levels of racial identity (Wade, 1996).

Also unclear are the differential effects of racial identity and prejudicial attitudes on both masculine role norms and gender role conflict. For instance, what is the relationship between men who subscribe to dominant notions of race and race-blindness and their subscription to dominant male gender expectations? How is racism related to masculinity? How do Asian American men balance a sense of self within a society that values their industriousness and intelligence, but also devalues their sexuality (J.W. Chan, 1998; J.P. Chan, et al., 1991; Cheung, 1993; Halberstam, 1998; Moss, 1991)?

Because race and racism are such potent aspects within the lives of Asian American men, this study attempted to specifically answer the following questions:

1. What are the relationships between racial identity statuses and prejudicial attitudes?

2. What are the relationships between gender role conflict and male role norms among a sample of Asian American men?

3. What is the role of ethnicity and exposure to diversity issues in one's racial identity, and how do these characteristics affect gender role conflict and male role norms subscription?

4. Can racial identity statuses and prejudicial attitudes predict gender role conflict?

5. Can racial identity statuses and prejudicial attitudes predict male role norm subscription?

To carry out this study, racial identity were used to measure the salience of race and the sense of understanding race and racism within the lives of Asian American men. In examining masculinity, two measures were used. The first explores the degree of affiliation with dominant gender expectations (i.e., masculine role norms), and the second examines the problems that exist as a result of this affiliation (i.e., gender role conflict). However, because there are no instruments that assess the nexus of race and gender simultaneously, it is necessary to use multiple instruments to explore the experience of Asian American men. One potential limitation in using the two measures of masculinity, however, is that the instruments and items tend to be race neutral in examining the lives of men. Thus, it is unclear how Asian American

men will respond to items that tend to privilege White masculine experiences even though the premise of the instruments are supposed to tap into common "masculine" experiences.

Finally, a measure of prejudicial attitudes will be used to examine the subtle discriminatory attitudes and perceptions that may exist as Asian American men try to understand the role of race, racism, and masculinity in their lives. Using the four instruments allows the researcher to examine how the salience of race and an understanding of racism (i.e., different statuses of racial identity) are related to various forms of male gender role norms, gender role conflict, and subtle prejudicial attitudes. This study hopes to provide a profile of how issues of racism affect Asian American men's lives, how these men contend with masculine pressures, and the conflicts they may endure.

## Overview of the Introduction

This section provides a brief overview of the study's major domains. First, the masculine issues facing Asian Americans are discussed and links are made to the historic and contemporary treatment of Asian American men. Second, racial identity and racism are discussed to examine the gender coping strategies used by Asian American men. Third, the role of prejudicial beliefs is covered, since these attitudes and beliefs may reveal the subtle ways Asian American men deal with racism and sexism in their lives. Finally, this section concludes with the purpose of this study.

Asian American Masculinity

While many of the negative images of Asian Americans have implications for the entire Asian American community (e.g., the model minority), some are especially pernicious depending on one's gender and class. For instance, the model minority image of Asian Americans being educationally and financially successful (S. Chan, 1991; Takaki, 1989) also implies an "asexual" quality for Asian American men (J.W. Chan, 1998; J.P. Chan, et al., 1991; Cheung, 1993; Tucker & Mitchell-Kernan, 1995). That is, as a model minority man, the focus of time and energy is on career and work at the expense of one's personal relationships and sexuality.

Unlike other disciplines such as literature and cultural studies which have extensively addressed the image of Asian American men as ersatz men or "not-quite" men (J.W. Chan, 1998; J.P. Chan, et al., 1991; Cheung, 1993; Lee & Saul, 1987; Moss, 1991), only a few empirical studies have investigated the lives of Asian American men. Typically, the current literature on men of color covers only cultural constructions of men of color (Signorielli, 1989), the development of stereotypes (Delgado & Stefancic, 1995; Farquhar & Doi, 1978; Mok, 1998), the response by men of color and White men, and/or the perpetuation of a pejorative image of men of color (Cash & Brown, 1989; Davis, 1990; Fung, 1998; Helgeson, 1994). These areas may have consequences for Asian American men's psyche and mental health, but no

studies to date have sought to investigate these domains simultaneously or the experiences of Asian American men as raced and gendered individuals.

Dominant images of Asian American such as the industrious laborer, sexual deviant, and model minority (Yee, 1992; Wong et al., 1998) are carried into contemporary perceptions of Asian Americans. Numerous job discrimination cases (e.g., Riccardi, 1999) and glass-ceiling problems (Wong, 1996) for Asian Americans can be traced to perceptions predicated upon the model minority image. For some, stereotyped perceptions set the stage for research (e.g., Rushton, 1996) to further certain perceptions. For instance, to understand the perceived achievement orientation of Asians, Asian intelligence has been linked to their low sexual drive when compared to Whites (Rushton, 1996). Blacks, those with the highest sexual drive, were described as the least intelligent when compared to Whites, who were more intelligent than Blacks, but less intelligent than Asians (Ruston, 1996). Rushton's research shows the difficulty in identifying specific negative images of Asian American men (i.e., the Asian American man as servant, sexless, effeminate, perpetual foreigner, and asexual) (Harvard Law Review, 1993; Mok, 1998) especially when these images are constantly reinterpreted in a fluid socio-historical context (Hamamoto, 1994). What manifests in one era as a supposedly "positive" image of Asian Americans (e.g., the model minority) is nothing more than a recapitulation of the industrious foreigner image of Asian laborers.

Currently, Asian American men are perceived to be new "trophy boyfriends" (Nakamura, 2000, p. B5) and contratyped (i.e., a contemporary stereotype that appears contrary to historical stereotypes) as "sexy" and "cool" (Pan, 2000). These current "contratypes" are meant to disrupt the historical significance of Asian Americans as the newcomers, perpetual foreigners, and sexless (S. Chan, 1991; Takaki, 1989) by relying on and emphasizing "exoticism" and "difference" from the norm (Pan, 2000). But in this new construction, the Asian American men are relegated to the exoticized position that Asian American women have long endured as the love interest for White consumption (S. Chan, 1991; Takaki, 1989). Thus, even in this reinterpretation of the Asian American man as a love interest and supposedly normal, the archetype of the feminized man lingers. Additionally, foreignness is not discarded because it is the outsider quality, the "not-like-other-White-men," that is the attraction. Hence, regardless of how popular culture tries to reinvent Asian American men, they are still heavily perceived as foreigners (Kang, 2000a).

The focus on stereotypes is necessary to emphasize the various issues Asian American men negotiate in forging a sense of self. Since identity development is an interplay between internal psychic structures and external contingencies, stereotypes may often be salient hurdles Asian American men must contend with. Stereotypes are also important for non-Asian Americans because it is an important way for non-Asian Americans to understand Asian Americans because many non-Asian Americans may have infrequent interaction with an Asian American (Henderson-King & Nisbett,

1996; Stangor & Lange, 1994). Stereotypes are powerful because observers often use stereotypes to guide attributions (i.e., behavior due to disposition or external causes) (Bogart, 1998), predictions, evaluations (Jackson, Sullivan, & Hodge, 1993), and to explain unconscious reactions to certain groups (Fazio, Jackson, Dunton, & Williams, 1995). The problem with stereotypes though is that, even if individuating (i.e., non-stereotypical) information is provided, the person stereotyping may still transform this information into data that support the stereotype (Dunning & Sherman, 1997). For instance, the fact that all Asian Americans are not model minorities and that many live in poverty, are on welfare, and have low incomes may not fully disrupt the salience of the image (S. Chan, 1991). Instead, people may focus on the fact that "some" Asian Americans are educationally and economically successful and reinforce the model minority image. Hence, a consistent stereotype image of the individual continues to exist, regardless of countermanding evidence (Deaux & Lewis, 1984). For some, stereotypes have a negative impact on one's sense of self and performance (e.g., not being able to live up to expectations) (Steele & Aronson, 1995; Toupin & Son, 1991). In other instances, stereotypes recapitulate historical and contemporary images of a particular group. For example, assuming no previous contact with Asian Americans, a sample of 178 college students were asked to give descriptors of Asian Americans. The adjectives "intelligent, industrious, gentle, selfish, nationalistic, and passive" (Stangor, Sullivan, & Ford, 1991, p. 364) given seem to support particular stereotypes, such as the silent model minority or the perpetual foreigner.

J.W. Chan (1998) argued that Asian American men are faced with a choice when confronted with the White masculine norm. For many Asian American men, it is, either emulate and be like the dominant White male, or "accept the fact we are not men" (J.W. Chan, 1998, p. 94). This middle ground is a difficult position for Asian American men since they must simultaneously accept and repudiate the White masculine norm in search of alternative definitions of masculinity (J.W. Chan, 1998).

Faced with pejorative comments like "Oriental faggots" (Commission on Civil Rights, 1992, p. 42) that serve to remind Asian American men of their marginal position, Asian American men's attempts to produce an alternative masculinity have been problematic. That is, the popular counter-images (e.g., the action hero) are often founded on a re-assertion of the patriarchal position or an appeal to dominant images of masculinity (Eng, 1997; E.H. Kim, 1982). For instance, in one attempt to re-assert Asian American masculinity, the production of an Asian American men's calendar supposedly repudiates the "nerdy" and "geeky" stereotype by mirroring "beef-cake" poses (e.g., shirtless poses that accentuate pectoral and abdominal musculature) (Wong, 1993). This is a problem since new masculinities are not formed, but old masculine ideals are rescued and recuperated for contemporary use (E.H. Kim, 1982, 1990). Another example can be found in community politics. Asian American activism has often privileged the viewpoint of the men while relegating women to a subservient position (Chun, 2000; E.H. Kim, 1982, 1990). Some women even tolerate the men's sexism and rationalize their subservience, in the short-term, as a positive

contribution to Asian American political power (Chun, 2000; E.H. Kim, 1982, 1990). Consequently, Asian American men's attempts to re-create themselves tend only to reinforce other forms of oppression.

As one may infer, the struggle to define a sense of masculinity for Asian American men may be difficult when faced with hurdles such as historic and contemporary negative images. Not being seen as a "total man" when compared to the White male norm, as well as being effeminized and emasculated, leaves Asian American men with few models of masculinity. The psychological literature has only started to touch upon the domain of Asian American masculinity (E.J. Kim et al., 1996; Levant et al., 1996; Sue, 1990). One example of not having a full understanding of Asian American men is the tendency to assume no within-group diversity. Michael P. Andronico's book (1996), Men in Groups, is evidence of this mistaken belief of no-within group diversity, because the discussion on Asian American men is in the section entitled, "Homogenous All-Male Groups," and is the only chapter in this section that deals with race. Chapters that discuss African, Latino, and Gay men are in another section entitled, "Heterogenous All-Male and Mixed-Gender Groups" (Andronico, 1996).

Thus, this study examined how Asian American men cope with issues of race and racism in their lives as well as being a minority man in a society which values "White masculinity." Asian American men are assumed to be in the group of "men of color," since to some degree, it is assumed that Asian American men experience a

similar condition to that of African, Latino, and Native American men. Men of color will be used throughout the dissertation as a means of denoting the marginalized status of men who are not customarily acknowledged as "White."

Racial Identity

Race is one of the most significant categories that people inhabit in America (Carter, 1995; Helms & Cook, 1999). For this study, racial identity refers to the perception held by Asian Americans that they belong to a group with a common heritage (Carter, 1995; Helms, 1990). The belief that one belongs to a larger group with a common heritage is mediated by the way the individual confronts and copes with racism (i.e., oppression). The extent to which the person deals with race and racism in his/her life results in different ways of understanding (i.e., cognitive schemas). Thus, for an individual who may not recognize race, or does not believe that race is salient in his/her life, he/she may have attitudes and beliefs that are similar to those of the dominant (i.e., White) group. Others who may see race as the most salient issue may valorize minority cultures while denigrating the dominant group's culture.

Racial identity is supposed to be different from ethnic identity (e.g., Phinney, 1996). Whereas racial identity refers to an identification with a larger group and a struggle with oppression, Sodowsky, Kwan, and Pannu (1995) define ethnic identity as the individual's identification with a cultural group's values, assumptions, roles, and heritage. The most distinguishing feature between racial and ethnic identity is the role of racism and oppression in determining a person's identification with a

group. For Asian Americans, the role of racial and ethnic identity may not be orthogonal. Instead, some have posited that among the Asian American community, there may be a parallel process of ethnic and racial identity that lead to various experiences and worldviews depending on the situation and salience of race and ethnicity in a person's life (Alvarez, Kohatsu, Liu, & Yeh, 1996).

Within the model of racial identity, Kohatsu (1992) notes in his study of Asian American racial identity that Helms' (1990) racial identity theory is a three-factor model. The first factor is the reference group orientation or the group which the individual chooses to guide his/her behavior, attitudes, and feelings. The second factor is the personal identity or the "personality characteristics that all people are assumed to possess although at varying degrees" (p. 6). Finally, the third factor is the ascribed identity or the commitment and affiliation that a person has toward a particular group.

The degree to which an individual chooses a group should be influenced by the individual's gender experiences. In particular, given the history of how Asian American men have been constructed in American society, racism is not only about race, but also about gender. Consequently, an Asian American man who feels marginalized as a result of his gender, may carry those feelings and beliefs into the way he conceptualizes race.

As men of color in America, and as men who are relegated to the margins of masculinity, Asian American men face the simultaneous challenge of forging an

identity and a sense of masculinity. Thus, Asian American men must define a social position for themselves, or risk being re-marginalized because of their limited social mobility.

Prejudicial Attitudes

Asian American men's attitudes toward racism and sexism in society were also examined. Liu, Pope-Davis, Nevitt, and Toporek (1999) speculated that as a person acculturates into White society, prejudicial beliefs (e.g., sexism) are nurtured and perpetuated. While the results from Liu et al.'s study do not support this hypothesis, it did indicate that, regardless of acculturation level, Asian American men were more prejudiced than Asian American women.

One may argue that Asian American men, living in a White dominant patriarchal society, are symbolic threats to the White order (Connell, 1995; Kimmel, 1994). Because of their marginal status, men of color are continually seeking acceptance. This acceptance may come at the price of subscribing to dominant beliefs about women and minorities.

This study investigated the role prejudicial beliefs and attitudes have in the lives of Asian American men. Liu et al.'s (1999) study points to differences in gender on prejudicial beliefs and attitudes, such that Asian American men tend to have more prejudicial attitudes than women. The study however, was not able to explain what variables contributed to these prejudicial beliefs. Expanding on this study (i.e., Liu et al., 1999), this investigation also used a racial identity measure rather than an

acculturation instrument. Selecting a racial identity measure was based on Kohatsu's work (1992), in which he found that acculturation was not as powerful as racial identity in explaining anxiety, assertiveness, and cultural mistrust among a sample of Asian Americans. Since gender role conflict and masculine role ideals theoretically elicit anxiety and feelings of distress, one may infer that racial identity may be a better construct than acculturation.

<center>Purpose of the Study</center>

The purpose of this study was to examine race and gender in the lives of Asian American men. The study focused on the processes of racial identity and prejudicial attitudes on the subscription to masculine gender role expectations and gender role conflict. An examination was conducted on the degree to which Asian American men subscribe to dominant male role norm expectations, and the possible conflict they may experience as a consequence of their subscription. The use of two masculinity instruments was important to this study. The Masculine Role Norms Inventory (MRNI) assesses the degree to which an individual subscribes to the dominant culture's definition of masculinity. The Gender Role Conflict Scale (GRCS) assesses the conflicts (i.e., dysfunctional behaviors) men encounter as a result of their subscription to the dominant masculine ideology and norms. While similar, both theories and instruments investigate different domains within masculinity and allow the investigator to understand two ways men come to see themselves as masculine.

Additionally, what seems nonexistent in the current empirical literature, but written extensively about in Asian American studies, are the lives of Asian American men and the complications they experience due to racism and masculinity (J.W. Chan, 1998; J.P. Chan, et al., 1991; Cheung, 1993; Moss, 1991). This study examined the ways prejudicial beliefs are related to an Asian American man's sense of masculinity and racial identity. The intent was to understand how Asian American men introject sexist and racist attitudes as a consequence of being racialized and gendered in the U.S., and how that is connected to the ways they see themselves as Asian American and as a man. The premise is that, as minority men, they accept and internalize prejudicial attitudes as their way of coping as minority men in the U.S. Thus, understanding only their racial identity does not provide a full examination of prejudicial attitudes that they may harbor as a minority man. It is hoped that this study will provide another means to understand the lives of Asian American men that will help to construct counseling programs and interventions for this community.

CHAPTER II

Review of the Literature

The purpose of this study is to examine the raced and gendered experiences of Asian American men, and to understand the role that prejudicial beliefs and attitudes play in the intersection of race and gender. While some research has focused on Asian Americans, little empirical research has focused specifically on the issue of masculinity and race among Asian Americans. Little is known about how Asian American men construct a racial and gendered sense of self, as well as how they deal with issues of societal and internalized oppression and racism. To understand the meaningfulness of masculinity, race, and racism in the lives of Asian American men, a context needs to be developed prior to outlining specific theories, measures, and research questions. To contextualize the domains to be studied, this section has three major parts: Masculinity, Racial Identity, and Prejudicial Attitudes.

The first section on masculinity provides a brief discussion on dominant masculinities, hegemonic masculinity, the historic context of men of color, and the impact these masculinities have on the lives of Asian American men. Hegemonic masculinity is discussed as a means to comprehend the oppressions (i.e., sexism and homophobia) Asian American internalize and subscribe to, even if it is to their detriment, as a means of coping. This section also discusses the feminization and emasculinization of Asian American men and how these issues are related to their self-image, interpersonal issues, and Asian cultural notions of masculinity. Finally, this

section presents the theories of masculinity, which includes a discussion of the major theories used in this study. Specifically, this section addresses counseling issues that affect men, and in particular Asian American men, and specific concerns related to men's avoidance of therapy. Considerations for working with Asian American men will also be provided.

The second major section discusses racial identity. This section includes a presentation on previous typology models of ethnic and racial identity for Asian Americans. These typology models set the foundation for current racial identity "stage/status" models such as the Minority Identity Development Model (Atkinson, Morten, & Sue, 1993). This brief overview includes a description of the different statuses investigated in this study and a presentation of previous research using the racial identity paradigm.

Finally, this section provides a brief overview of prejudicial attitudes and how experiences with racism and other types of oppression may lead to internalized forms of oppression (i.e., racism and sexism). Understanding prejudicial attitudes is a means to illuminate the various oppressions that Asian American men reject and accept in developing a coherent sense of self. In other words, these internalized prejudicial beliefs and attitudes are a good reflection of how individuals cope with oppressive experiences in their lives.

## Masculinity

The ideals of American manhood appear to fluctuate with the historical and social changes of an era (Connell, 1995; Kimmel, 1994, 1996; Savran, 1998). However, there seems to be two consistent features of American masculinity: (a) its resiliency in staving off attacks that would radically reconfigure its definition (Kimmel, 1996), and (b) its foundation in Whiteness. In America, masculinity, Whiteness, and citizenship have been so conflated and propertied (i.e., Whiteness was given value as a type of social commodity) that the two are often assumed to be one entity (Harris, 1995; Jacobson, 1998; Lott, 1998; Lowe, 1996; Mosse, 1996; Nagel, 1998). Thus, Whiteness often represents what is ideally an "American" - the White middle-class male (Kimmel, 1996; Nagel, 1998).

The White male existed in privilege since his color, citizenship, and manhood were conflated terms that were codified in legislation. Whiteness and citizenship was imbued with value and currency (Harris, 1995; Jacobson, 1998; Lott, 1998; Lowe, 1996; Mosse, 1996), and it determined who could own property and who could be property (Jacobson, 1998; Lowe, 1996). Whiteness was so important to define, that the American legal system went through several contortions to restrict White privileges to a select group of land-owning aristocrats (Thandeka, 1999). As a result, early America was likened more to a racialized plutocracy than a democracy (Thandeka, 1999).

Even though class privileges were reserved for the White aristocracy of the time, for most others, Whiteness was still an important marker of "belonging" that was envied. For instance, in 1922 Ozawa vs. the United States, the Supreme Court agreed that, even though a Japanese man had "white-looking" skin, he was not of the "Caucasian" race and therefore not "White" (Ancheta, 1998). A year later in United States vs. Thind, the Supreme Court further refined the meaning of "White" by stating that, even though Thind was racially "Caucasoid," he did not meet the common understanding of a "White" person (i.e., Aryan features and culture) (Ancheta, 1998). These two court cases proved that "Whiteness" and its privileges (i.e., citizenship) had to be protected against non-Whites. Even the early "founding fathers" were aware of this need, and as early as 1790, citizenship was being restricted to only White males (Ancheta, 1998). And although African Americans were given the semblance of citizenship years later, Asian Americans were denied these rights until the mid-1900s (Ancheta, 1998; Lowe, 1996).

Men of color were historically excluded from the benefits of citizenship and "manhood" since citizenship and manhood were historically one in the same. Men of color could not participate in citizenship because it would mean that they could participate in the economic and political growth of America. One means to exclude men of color from citizenship was to require citizens to participate in quelling potential slave rebellions and repelling Indian attacks (Jacobson, 1998). Thus,

citizenship meant that African and Native American men would be conscripted into participating in the genocide of their own peoples.

The codification of Whiteness and manhood, and the exclusion of men of color set the process of continuing marginalization among men of color who were determined to be enemies of the burgeoning nation state (Jacobson, 1998). For Jewish men in the nineteenth century, this marginalization meant being feminized (e.g., their bodily features were compared to women) because they were considered to be part of an inferior race and a threat to the homogeneity of America (Gilman, 1998). Thus, the early control of defining masculinity was important since it would set the precedent for subsequent iterations of masculinity. Latter definitions of masculinity rested upon the earlier definitions that continually fastened together color (i.e., Whiteness), masculinity, citizenship, miscegenation, and privilege for the benefit of White men (Harris, 1995; Jacobson, 1998; Lott, 1998; Mosse, 1996; Yu, 1999).

It should be clarified that not all White men were privy to "Whiteness" and manhood (Jacobson, 1998). Class status also influenced who was eligible for the privileges of manhood (Thandeka, 1999). Typically, those ineligible for White manhood due to race, ethnicity, or class were relegated to the status of men of color and as undesirable White ethnics (e.g., Jews, Irish, Italians) (Jacobson, 1998). However, while White ethnics could eventually ascend into the White race (Jacobson, 1998), men of color could not. Consequently, the focus of hostility stabilized on the body of the man of color (Fine, Weis, & Addelston, 1998) and the gay male because

each offered a challenge to the definition and ideals of masculinity (Kimmel, 1994, 1996). Thus, to be considered for manhood, all things feminine needed to be repudiated, and any connections with persons deemed "gay" were to be terminated (Kimmel, 1994). It was clear that manhood in America had no position for gays and men of color except in the marginal spaces of society where their behavior worked to reinforce "normative masculinity" (Kimmel, 1994). For those who sought acceptance in society, some level of subscription and adoption of "normative masculinity" was necessary even if it was to the subscribers' detriment.

## Hegemonic Masculinity and Internalized Oppression

To help explain the complex structures that continually nurture and support a dominant form of masculinity, the theory of hegemonic masculinity is employed. Hegemonic masculinity appears to be a particular configuration of masculinity that is dominant and accepted, and the focus of critique, if masculinity is to be understood (Hondagneu & Messner, 1997). In many ways, hegemonic masculinity establishes the male role norms that are related to gender role conflicts. This dominant form of masculinity usually offers legitimacy to patriarchy and reinforces patterns of gender relations such that men are dominant, women are subordinate (Connell, 1995; Halberstam, 1998; Kimmel, 1994), and gayness is an aberration of masculinity (Donaldson, 1993). The power and acceptability of hegemonic masculinity is that it appears to be reasonable and natural within a given society so that adherence to the standards dictated by hegemonic masculinity is expected (Connell, 1995). For

instance, when 80 White, middle-class college students were asked about their expectations of men, they overwhelmingly reported that the man should be family-oriented, assertive and the provider for the family (England, 1992). What is unremarkable about this finding is that it appears to be a seemingly reasonable (i.e., normative) expectation of men. While this sample does not reflect the diversity of opinions on the male role, these attitudes do reflect and give support to the norms proffered by hegemonic masculinity.

While it may appear that hegemonic masculinity is in fact an oppressive totality, men may actively negotiate particular elements of masculinity that are beneficial to them. The idea is that men are not "completely" oppressed, and conversely, there are no perfect resistances to hegemony (Kondo, 1990). These acts of negotiation could be termed hegemonic bargains (Kandiyoti, 1988) and may manifest as small and subtle forms of internalized oppressions (e.g., homophobia, racism, sexism). That is, masculinity offers different opportunities at certain times. Yet, because all hegemonic masculinity is, at some level, married to a particular ideology and social structure that favors men, acceptance of any one element in the bargain means that the overall masculine standard is strengthened. The theory posits that men, within the bargain, cannot fully appreciate or resist "all" the problems that masculinity offers. As an example, a man can fight against sexism, yet simultaneously be less knowledgeable about and less aggressive toward homophobia or pornography. Kandiyoti (1988) would argue that the bargain is a result of the man receiving benefits

from retaining his homophobic attitudes and viewing pornography, but not for his sexist attitudes.

Hegemonic masculinity then is a dominant form of masculinity that articulates, in a reasonable and normative fashion, the primary position of the man and the subservient position of the woman. The dominant form of masculinity is not totally coercive, but exists through the complicity and consent of men. Hegemonic masculinity offers men the semblance of resistance (e.g., fighting against sexism), but men negotiate this resistance by consciously or unconsciously supporting other forms of masculine oppression. Thus, even though some men of color may feel a sense of acceptance within the dominant masculine order, it comes at some cost to them and those around them. Consequently, for many men of color, hegemonic masculinity is simultaneously a goal and a curse that they have struggled with historically as well as contemporarily (J.W. Chan, 1998).

## Historical Context for Men of Color

From the very inception of the American colonies, the ideology of American manhood faced challenges that threatened to expose its shortcomings (Kimmel, 1996; Savran, 1998). For instance, the image of the "self-made" American man was poignantly exposed as flawed when the influx of "colored" male laborers were not able to achieve a higher social status through diligent work (Kimmel, 1996). Instead, their labor was exploited and their economic position deteriorated over time. What

became apparent was the significant function of skin color in social mobility, status attainment, and cultural privilege.

One such privilege reserved for White men was sexuality. Men of color suspected of encroaching on the sexual territory (e.g., White women) of White men (Kimmel, 1996) soon faced anti-miscegenation laws that were instituted to deny men of color access of White women, but allowed White men the privilege of exploiting women of color's bodies (Okihiro, 1994; Pascoe, 1999; Yu, 1999). For White men, the anti-miscegenation laws (i.e., the prohibition against inter-racial marriages, contact, and unions) legitimated their exploitation as normal White virility and codified punishment for any man of color daring to incur on the sexual territory of the White male (e.g., lynchings) (Pascoe, 1999). The need to protect White women from the "savage" man of color became a rational prejudice that could still carry forward today.

While much of the hysteria was fueled by the importation of Black and Asian men, even American Indians and Mexicans, who originally settled on the land colonized by American expansionism, were constructed as "savage" hordes (Jacobson, 1998; Nagel, 1998). It did not matter that Mexican and American Indians were natives to the land. They existed outside the boundaries of White civilization and therefore were construed as "savages" and sexual deviants (Takaki, 1990). As colonized subjects saw their culture change as a result of colonization (e.g., gender role behaviors and model of attractiveness) (Schien, 1994; Takaki, 1990), indigenous

men suddenly found themselves characterized as infantile and savage, while the colonizer became the paternal civilized figure (Connell, 1995; Jacobson, 1998; Merry, 2000; Takaki, 1990). Thus, if you were not White, you were consistently positioned as either the infantile man who needed to be civilized or the sexual aggressor to the White woman who needed to be tamed and eradicated (Connell, 1995; Kimmel, 1994, 1996). What also contributed to the perpetual notion of men of color as savage was the constant repositioning of the White female as the subservient figure. By consistently relegating White women to a "weak" position, the regulation and surveying of men of color was easily rationalized as a necessity of a civilized society (Jacobson, 1998).

Men of color were necessary in reifying the normativeness of White masculinity (B.L.C. Kim, 1998; Narayan, 1995; Pang, 1994) because the men of color's deviant masculinity (i.e., femininity) and aberrant sexuality (i.e., hypersexual appetites) (Koch, 1995) could be constantly deployed whenever White masculinity faltered (Kimmel, 1994, 1996; Kunda & Olson, 1995, 1997; Mosse, 1996). For instance, among the early Chinese migrant laborers working on the transcontinental railroad, their industriousness and courage to work in climates and conditions which most White workers rejected, contributed to destabilizing the primacy of White masculinity (Takaki, 1990). But as their image as working men improved, they also became more visible targets for harassment and discrimination. Their queue, or braided long hair with shaved forehead, signifying their submission to the emperor in China, as well as their employment in perceived women's roles such as laundry and

cooking, helped to solidify the stereotype of Asian Americans as submissive, weak, and dependent (Chen, 1996). This feminization of Asian American laborers conveyed the image of them as easy targets for harassment and discrimination. Consequently, numerous incidents of murder, violence, and harassment ensued (S. Chan, 1991; Takaki, 1989).

Asian American Men in History

The stereotype that Asian American men are not masculine may be traced to a history of immigration exclusion and citizenship denials that lasted until 1952 (Lowe, 1996). For instance, Asian American men faced immigration exclusion under the 1882 Chinese Exclusion Act that limited the migration of male laborers (S. Chan, 1991a). Furthermore, Asian American men were denied naturalization as citizens in America, and White women often faced threats to their citizenship if they married men who were ineligible for citizenship (i.e., 1922 Cable Act) (S. Chan, 1991a; Parrenas, 1998).

At first, the influx of early Chinese and Japanese migrant workers was met with celebration. Their arrival coincided with the debate over continuing slavery and allowed a new labor force to be exploited to buttress a foundering American economy (Almaguer, 1994; Kimmel, 1996; Takaki, 1990). Eventually however, in many parts of the United States, especially in California, there was an over-representation of Asians, Blacks, and poor Whites (usually Irish) at the bottom tier of the economic ladder (Almaguer, 1994). Later, as the economic conditions continued to deteriorate,

men of color became a simultaneous threat to White labor and to White women

(Almaguer, 1994; Kimmel, 1996). In a short time, men of color were targeted for

labor exclusion. To White supremacists, labor should be guaranteed only to Whites

(Almaguer, 1994; Jacobson, 1998; Kimmel, 1996), thus, many skilled and semi-

skilled jobs became reserved solely for Whites. States that were able to legislate this

kind xenophobia (e.g., California) quickly became "White masculinist preserve[s] for

European-American men" (Almaguer, 1994, p. 32,).

Anti-Miscegenation

The other attack on men of color, usually targeting laborers, came through

anti-miscegenation laws. Anti-miscegenation became such a virulent form of

xenophobia, that eventually fourteen states specifically outlawed marriages "between

Whites and Chinese or 'Mongolians'" (Yu, 1992, p. 21). Except for the Mexicans,

Asians and Blacks were typically barred from inter-racial marriage (H.C. Kim, 1986).

Protecting White women from men of color was an easy strategy for White

supremacists to determine who was "good" and who were "evil" (Jacobson, 1998;

Kimmel, 1994, 1996; Marable, 1998; Staples, 1998). In restricting the type of

relationships that were allowed to happen, supremacists were also articulating "White"

male identity and privilege (Ferber, 1998; Jacobson, 1998; Kimmel, 1996). Almaguer

(1994) offers, "[Like] blacks, the 'china boys' were infantalized and summarily

relegated to a subordinate status in relation to 'White men.' While White immigrants

arrogantly viewed themselves as rational, virtuous, civilized, libidinally controlled,

and Christian. The Chinese were perceived as irrational, morally inferior, savage, lustful, and heathen" (p. 159).

Because of the prohibition on interacting with White women, enormous pressures to fulfill filial responsibilities left many of the men feeling emasculated (Espiritu, 1997). Some men were involved as non-biologically related uncles in families with children such that they became one uncle among twenty or more uncles (S. Chan, 1991b). In other instances, the lack of Asian women prompted an economy for Asian gay prostitution as well as leading to some "homosexual" relationships among Asian laborers (Friday, 1994). Even though homosexuality existed in Asian cultures (Leupp, 1995), discussion of the topic was considered "taboo" among the laboring class in America (Friday, 1994). As a result, documentation for these male patterns of behavior was difficult to uncover (Friday, 1994).

Besides pressing Asian American laborers into "taboo" behaviors, anti-miscegenation laws helped to further refine White masculinity, and regulated men and women of color migration (S. Chan, 1991b; Espiritu, 1997; Leonard, 1992; Matsumoto, 1993; Parrenas, 1998; Takaki, 1989; Tong, 1994). Thus, while men of color became the paramours to White women, White men were perceived to be busily building a nation. Characterizing the men of color as savage and uncivilized allowed the White male to strategically retain his position as the normative masculine exemplar.

So far, the literature covered has set the foundation for understanding Asian American masculinity in a historical context. Generations of experiences with immigration exclusion, labor exploitation, and anti-miscegenation give a glimpse into the struggles Asian American men have had in surviving as men in American society. What is missing though is an explication of the intra-psychic determinants that make up the worldview of the Asian American man today. While historical references provide an excellent context from which to understand race, class, and gender for Asian American men, our knowledge of Asian American men, as well as other men of color is somewhat limited. Therefore, it is necessary to delve into the ways masculinity is constructed and operationalized for Asian American men.

### Multiple Determinants of Masculinity

The information used to understand men of color is still limited (Cazenare, 1984; Conway-Long, 1994; Lazur & Majors, 1995; Kimmel, 1996; Stillson et al., 1991) and premised on mostly White men (O'Neil, Egan, Own, & Murry, 1993). The problem is then, the inevitable comparison of men of color with the experiences of White men. Thus, with the growing need to understand the experiences of all men, it seems that our current research has only scratched the surface (Kimmel, 1996; Lazur & Majors, 1995; Pleck, 1981). For men of color, other variables also affect the worldviews of men of color besides race. Even though many variables could be conceptually important in the construction of masculinity, the literature is just

beginning to examine what may affect masculinity. The following are areas from which literature has been found.

Age

We know that there are a number of salient issues that impact the lives of men. For instance, male gender role conflicts vary according to age and life situation (O'Neil & Egan, 1992; O'Neil et al., 1995). Thus, for a college student, success and power may be salient dimensions that trigger conflicts (O'Neil, 1995), while for a middle-aged man, work and family represent areas of potential gender role conflict (Cournoyer & Mahalik, 1995). Race may also have a significant function with age. Between African and White men, ideals of masculinity were similar at age 18, but began to diverge afterwards (Harris, Torres, & Allender, 1994). The discrepancy between masculine ideas may be rooted in the racial position of White and African American men. That is, because White men make up the dominant group and set the standards of masculinity, the acquisition of these ideals, or at least the sense of acquisition, may lead these men to believe that the masculine ideals are not problematic, but normative and acquirable (Harris et al., 1994). As for African American men, the ideals of masculinity are racialized (i.e., White), such that the routes for attainment are reserved for members of certain races (Harris et al., 1994). As a result, African American men have to find alternative masculinities, as well as develop different masculine trajectories throughout their lives to obtain any sense of masculinity.

Families

Among men of color, families serve as an important buffer and socializing agent into a racist world. It may be that the parents' determination, participation in the lives of men, discipline, nurturance, and a sense of connectedness to the community take on added meaning for men who have to act against countervailing effects of racism and masculinity (Maton et al., 1998). Hence, for African American men, masculinity may be a shared experience with the family and community. Family is also an important component in the lives of Asian American men, but this will be further discussed later in the literature review.

Social Class

Gender and social class are important dimensions of investigation (Wright, 1997). Among men of color, social class is an important variable since, for many, one's skin color determines social mobility and income (Duleep & Sanders, 1992; Sakamoto, Liu, & Tzeng, 1998). Social class also allows discussion of the class tensions that may exist and manifest as discrimination and racism (Marusza, 1997). Finally, social class also allows one to understand the within and between group. For instance, in an African American upper-class group, African American families reflected many of the cultural attitudes of the elite Whites (Williams, 1999). The biggest difference between these upper-class African Americans and upper-class White seems to be the connection African American elite have with their community (Williams, 1999). Even though "snobbery" (i.e., classism) exists between those with

old money and those with new money, the one constant seems to be the consideration given to up-lifting others of their race that is not specifically addressed among upper-class White families (Williams, 1999).

In another investigation on masculine ideology and economic setting, African American men in the south (Levant, Majors, & Kelley, 1998) and those who participated in church activities (Hunter & Sellers, 1998) were found to adhere to the traditional masculine ideology more than White men in the same setting. It appeared that, depending on where the African American men lived (i.e., rural versus urban), their endorsement of traditional masculine attitudes varied accordingly. African American men living in a metropolitan area, where there are multiple conceptions of gender roles, appeared to endorse more liberal conceptions of gender roles, while those in more rural settings tended to endorse more traditional gender roles (Hunter & Sellers, 1998). These multiple gender roles are a classed ideal, and reflect the freedom to experiment with these gender roles.

In examining multiple variables related to sex role perceptions among 325 African American men, Cazenare (1984) found that social class was a significant variable. Cazenare (1984) speculates that for White college men, it is less necessary to attain the masculine ideal than it is for their African American counterparts. The African American men must negotiate the primary issues of race, racism, and social class without the luxury of exploring the secondary issues gender role alternatives (Cazenare, 1984). One could infer then, that for men of color, it may come down to

choosing which environmental contingency they want to deal with at a given time in order to ensure a sense of psychological security. This exemplifies the hegemonic bargain that men of color need to negotiate. That is, men are struggling with the primary issues of racism while allowing, at some level, the issue of patriarchy to exist.

Among Asian American men, social class is an important denominator in their experience. Chiefly residing in major metropolitan areas such as San Francisco, New York, Chicago, and Los Angeles (S. Chan, 1991), many Asian Americans find themselves with high median household incomes that appear to be higher than White households. However, because the cost of living is higher in these metropolitan areas, the household incomes tend to be inflated and a true comparison with Whites becomes complicated (S. Chan, 1991). Adding to the complexity of social class in the lives of Asian American men is the model minority myth that presupposes their economic success. For many, tension exists as they attempt to live up to these expectations (Toupin & Son, 1991). The problem with fully understanding the impact of social class on the lives of Asian American men is the lack of empirical research and support that could illuminate the intersection of race, class, and gender.

Hence, there seems to be a number of variables men struggle with when forging a sense of masculinity (e.g., race, class, family). Many of these issues, at times, present men with contradictory messages about masculinity. Consequently, it is important to examine as fully as possible, the many ways cultures (e.g., race, class, and family) and masculinity intersects.

## Culture, Conflict, and Masculinity

To be a man of color in the U.S. implies the problematic negotiation of society's demands (i.e., individuality) with one's ethnic identity and cultural expectations (Lazur & Majors, 1995). In each culture, the negotiation of these conflicts may result in outcomes that are congruent with the overall expectations of the indigenous culture. For Asian American men, resolution of conflicts is usually private in order to save face, with the individual likely to cede "personal autonomy to family obligations" (Lazur & Majors, 1995, p. 338). Thus, in the case of an Asian American man, family and group needs supercede individual needs.

But not everyone understands the contortions Asian American men often go through. Sometimes, behaviors and attitudes that are congruent with the non-dominant culture are viewed in the dominant culture as dysfunctional. Illustrative of this statement is the belief that in counseling, emotional expression is always preferable over emotional restriction. However, for some men of color, emotional restrictiveness is not specifically tied to masculinity, but may be a form of protection (i.e., a behavioral manifestation of a protection mechanism that allows the individual to keep a minimal profile to avoid any potential conflicts). Therefore, while the problem of alexithymia (i.e., an inability to feel or articulate one's affect) has negative consequences for the man, it is important to distinguish between what may be protective behaviors against racism and what may be masculine ideals.

Racism is one example of how men learn behaviors through their socialization. Other behaviors are also learned. For instance, White boys who are taught to compete and compare ones self with others (Bergman, 1995) may find themselves in conflicts with boys from another culture that values harmony in relationships or finds little problem with "femininity." For instance, in a study of 104 Japanese men and 161 Japanese women, results showed that the men and women both scored higher in the Bem Sex Role Inventory's Femininity Scale than on the Masculinity Scale (Sugihara & Katsurada, 1999). White boys, with a cognitive scheme that positions anything feminine as negative, and who are unable to understand the different cultural definitions of masculine behavior and expectations, may easily label boys from the other culture as non-masculine. The labeling of the "other" boys reinforces the gender scheme used to position the "other" boys as feminine, and protects the White boys from questioning their gender roles and masculine ideals. In either case, it may mean that the "White" child does not have to question his sense of race and masculinity while the child of color is left to cope with the cultural conflict.

Since culture appears to influence the definition of masculinity, a man moving between cultures may face different expectations that are sometimes at odds with his cultural belief and value system. The "Scylla and Charybdis" for the man of color is choosing to either affiliate with a dominant form of masculinity that excludes him, or continue to subscribe to a sense of non-dominant masculinity that exposes him to ridicule. This may be a meaningful problem for the Asian American man who must

struggle with this decision while simultaneously combating social processes that continue to emasculate him.

<div align="center">Struggling to Define Asian American Masculinity</div>

For Asian American men, there seems to be a number of different issues that affect their sense of masculinity and their subscription to dominant male norms. Because they are men of color, they are not part of the masculine norm (i.e., aesthetics). As such, Asian American men face masculine pressures that seemingly invites and repudiates them simultaneously. Thus, becoming part of the "normal" group becomes difficult within a patriarchal climate that values one's "maleness" but demeans one's race.

"Fitting in" is important, especially in reference to gender role behaviors. Positive and negative attributions are often made toward those who fit or deviate from expected gender roles (Helgeson, 1994). Men who display feminine characteristics are ascribed characteristics such as being gay, weak, and insecure (Fung, 1998; Helgeson, 1994). Men quickly learn that ideal masculinity often means the opposite of femininity (e.g., emotional restrictiveness, confidence, fearlessness, and control) (Helgeson, 1994; Kimmel, 1996). Yet for Asian American men, effeminization is perceived as a constant threat because of their race.

Feminization and Emasculinization

Historically, a consistent theme with masculinity has been the continual recuperation of White masculinity through the use of men of color as the foil. The

positioning of the White male as the epitome of the masculine, symbolically left the White man in possession of the "good" (i.e., civilized) phallus (Fung, 1998). As antithesis to the White man, men of color possessed a distorted phallus (i.e., hypersexed or hyposexed). In the case of Asian American men, they possessed no phallus or sexual agency (i.e., asexual) (Fung, 1998). The issue of regaining the phallus has been part of the discourse about men in Asian American studies because, as Addelston (1999) argues, men who are marginalized because of their race or culture often revert to the most powerful symbol of masculinity, the penis.

Reclaiming the phallus, as a racial and gender project for Asian American men, seems like an imperative that has been ongoing for some time. Various cases can be referenced that have been used to feminize and emasculate Asian American men (Espiritu, 1998; Ling, 1997). For instance, the domestic work that employed many Asian American men as cooks and launderers helped to reinforce their position within "feminine" labor (Espiritu, 1997, 1998). Moreover, the living arrangements and lifestyle within the Japanese Internment camps left many Japanese American fathers without their traditional role in the family and contributed to their feelings of emasculinization (Espiritu, 1997, 1998).

One important issue in the discourse over Asian American men is the problematic use of "feminization" as a negative characterization of Asian American men. "Feminization," is used as a pejorative description, but posits "femininity" as undesirable (i.e., problem) for men. Hence, it may be safer to argue that racism works

41

as one barrier to deny the full range of masculinities among Asian American men, and therefore, Asian American men are emasculated because they cannot create their own sense of masculinity (Ling, 1997). In addition, they may be perceived as ersatz men, who because they are not real men, must therefore be women (i.e., feminine).

Physical Appearance

Physical appearance is another dimension that seems to position Asian American men outside the norm. Uba (1994) argues that Asian Americans tend to have "lower self-concepts than Euro-Americans when it comes to physical appearance" (p. 83). This "lower self-concept" may be attributable to their cultural codes of conduct which emphasize modesty (Uba, 1994). Thus, for some Asian American men, to focus on the body, the self, and appearance may be antithetical to their cultural norms. Yet, even if they did not want to focus on their bodies, other people's perceptions of them may compel them to deal with their physical appearance, since people may treat them according to how they look (Ling, 1997). For example, in one study of stereotypes of various racial groups, Asian Americans were described as intelligent, short, achievement-oriented, soft-spoken, and hardworkers (Niemann, Jennings, Rozelle, Baxter, & Sulivan, 1994). No surprise that most of the descriptors favored the model minority image, but the only salient physical characteristic was height when compared to the assumed population average.

Being able to negotiate the dominant masculine ideals and aesthetic forms and expectations becomes an important intra- and inter-cultural survival skill (Boston,

1998). For some Asian Americans, negotiating these dominant aesthetic expectations can mean appropriating a style of dress (Boston, 1998), while for others it may mean a change of physical features (Accinelli, 1996; Yamamoto, 1999). While sartorial style can easily be changed, physical appearance invites entirely new issues into the discussion of race and normality.

Even before the inception of cosmetic surgery in Europe in the early nineteenth century, beauty has mostly been associated with good mental health (Gilman, 1998). For some, feeling good about oneself means being seen as normal within a particular society, which in turn means mirroring the physical attributes of a particular community (Gilman, 1998). Thus, for Asian Americans, approximating White features (i.e., getting epicanthic folds to the eyelids) can be construed as symptomatic of internalized racism (Accinelli, 1996). But aesthetic surgery could also reflect the capacity of an individual to "take charge" and re-define "race" outside the current societal parameters (Yamamoto, 1999) and attempts to fit in (Gilman, 1998). In either case, the individual undergoes a physical transformation that tends to disrupt racial categorization predicated upon phenotype.

The problem of trying to fit-in physically is that, even within a given society, ideal body types are laced with contradictions and conflicts (Koff & Benavage, 1998; Mishkind et al., 1986). Often the apotheosis of an ideal body type is applicable to such a small group of people within a community that mimicking the social ideal is virtually impossible (Angier, 1998). Often, the racial minority who tries to mimic the

White ideal within American society does not realize that many Whites are dissatisfied with their body type and appearance and seek to redefine themselves according to a cultural ideal (Fraser, 1999). Consequently, physical changes may constantly be demanded to maintain normalcy within a cultural group that is constantly dissatisfied with the way they look.

Interpersonal and Dating Issues

How one looks is related to a number of interpersonal issues such as economic success, positive interpersonal relationships, and relationship reciprocity (Helgeson, 1994; Mulford, Orbell, Shatto, & Stockard, 1998). "Not looking the part," especially in corporate environments, can be detrimental to one's business success. For example, Asian American men who may not fit the ideal masculine image may face a career "glass ceiling" because they may not be perceived as effective leaders (Fernandez, 1998; Rospenda et al., 1998; Wu, 1997). But when Asian American men do speak their minds, they may be perceived as over-aggressive by those who expect a demure posture, passivity, or dependence (Chua & Fujino, 1999; Jo, 1998). For Asian Americans, the passive demeanor is congruent with the perceptions of them as the model minority. It is a model of racial success that non-Asians are familiar with, and when confronted with behaviors and attitudes incongruent with the model minority, non-Asians are sometimes confused (Jo, 1998).

The model minority, with its focus on academic and economic success, infers that Asian Americans are also socially inept or underdeveloped. In other words,

because Asian Americans are focusing their energies on success, socially, they are "nerds." The criteria for being a "nerd," (i.e., having a high I.Q.), doing well in math and sciences (Kendall, 1999), seems to describe the stereotypes of Asian American men. Yet, the stereotype of the "nerd" is also gendered feminine in that, "nerdy" men cannot play sports, have small body size, and lack sexual relationships with women (Kendall, 1999). Contrarily though, these racist stereotypes though are not grounded in reality. Liu and Sedlacek (1999) found that Asian American men are actively involved in student organizations, some as leaders and potential leaders, but are also regularly involved in athletic activities. The reality seems to be that, at least among Asian American men, one can be academically, athletically, and socially successful.

But the constant bombardment of demeaning stereotypes of Asian American men as "not-quite" men (Farquhar & Doi, 1978; Liu, Campbell, & Condie, 1995; Marchetti, 1993) eventually has some effect. While Asian American men focus on recuperating their "masculinity," some argue that the demeaning portrayal of Asian American men has Asian American women to reject Asian partners for White partners (Fujino, 1997). However, for many, these racist pressures combined with cultural pressures to date and marry within the "Asian" culture only exacerbate the relational conflicts (Heyamoto, 1999).

For Asian American women, the complaint has been that Asian American men are too "old fashioned" and patriarchal, and thus, they have to opt for non-Asian men who are perceived to be less sexist than Asian American men (Chua & Fujino, 1999;

S.J. Lee, 1996; Nguyen, 1998). Perhaps for some Asian American women, the traditionality of Asian American men becomes salient when they participate in student and community organization. Some authors have found that Asian American women avoid Asian American organizations because they found the men to be too traditional and chauvinistic (Chun, 2000; Kibria, 1999). Though some women can rationalize their participation in such groups, others may find them too suffocating and reminiscent of their families (Kibria, 1999). As a result, another stereotype of Asian American men as "traditional" and "chauvinistic" emerges.

The effect of having stereotypes of Asian American men as both "not-quite" men and being "chauvinistic" creates a perceived pressure among Asian American women to date and marry out of the Asian "race" (Fujino, 1997). Various arguments have been proffered as to why Asian American women tend to date and marry non-Asians, but Fujino (1997) argues that out-dating and marriage may be less about internalized racism than about propinquity and environment (Fujino, 1997). In essence, out-dating (i.e., dating outside ones racial and/or ethnic group) and marriages may occur more out of infrequent contact between Asian American men and women than through an internalized racist choice (Fujino, 1997). In actuality, the rates of Asian American "out-marriage" have decreased over the past twenty years (i.e., census periods between 1980 and 1990), and the frequency of inter-ethnic marriages has increased (Lee & Fernandez, 1998). Hence, while some Asian American women

may subscribe to stereotypes of Asian American men, it seems more likely that other environmental contingencies dictate dating and marriage patterns.

It seems that Asian American men do contend with a number of meaningful issues that affect their sense of masculinity. These issues are derived from a historical context and are constantly being recuperated and used to define Asian American men as non-men or marginal men. The need to define themselves as men often leave Asian American men in the position of comparing themselves with the White norm. Evaluating themselves against a model that they, and most other men, cannot achieve may lead to self-hating behaviors and attitudes. Efforts to derive a sense of masculinity that counter the stereotypical images of Asian American men also lead to problematic images. However, completely eschewing the dominant culture's definition of masculinity may not mean that there are always healthy alternative masculinities within the Asian culture. Thus, some understanding of how Asian cultures define masculinity would be helpful in illuminating the pressures that Asian American men feel within American society.

### Asian American Cultural Notions of Masculinity

Masculinity varies between and within cultures (Doss & Hopkins, 1998). However, there seems to be some common elements of masculinity for men of a particular racial and ethnic group (Doss & Hopkins, 1998). This is particularly true for Asian American men (Chung, 1999; Jeong, 1999; R. Kim, 1999; Nghe & Mahalik, 1998). Results from one study showed that Asian American men tended to see their

masculinity different than White men, in that, Asian American men did not necessarily see their masculinity in opposition to femininity (Chua & Fujino, 1999). For Asian American men, masculinity was tied to being polite, obedient, and a willingness to do domestic tasks, where as White men endorsed a more traditional notion of masculinity that avoided those attributes listed by Asian American men (Chua & Fujino, 1999). While it appears that this study reveals a greater variability of masculinity among Asian American men than possessed by White men, the participants were 55 Asian immigrant men and 90 U.S. born Asian American men, all Chinese and Japanese. Problematically of course, the limitation of the sample and the near ethnic homogeneity of the sample raised questions about the representation of these views among other Asian ethnic men. The study also focused on descriptors of masculinity and did not use a measure of manhood or masculinity or any measure of acculturation or racial identity. Thus, questions about subscription to dominant masculine and cultural norms were left unexplored. However, the Chua and Fujino (1999) study allowed some discussion about how Asian American men cope with sometimes competing cultural notions of masculinity.

Asian American men are brought up under stringent gender role expectations, such that violation of these expectations could be met with social ostracization. Certain cultural values are imperative, such as a focus on group harmony and filial piety (Burke & Yeh, 1999), as well as prominence in the family (Tang, 1997), risk taking, and courageous behavior (Gilmore, 1990; Nghe & Mahalik,

1998; Sethi & Allen, 1984). These social pressures to inculcate and maintain specific gender role behaviors may lead some Asian men, especially those in their native countries, to endorse "traditional" gender roles more than Asians in America (Levant et al., 1996; Nghe & Mahalik, 1998; Sethi & Allen, 1984). Additionally, traditional gender role expectations not only affect the man, but also the Asian woman in that, they may not be attracted to Asian men who display non-traditional gender role behaviors (Chia, Moore, Lam, Chuang, & Cheng, 1994).

For other Asian American men, keeping the adoration and admiration of the family entails fulfilling their filial duties such as carrying on their family name, conforming to the expectations of the parents (S.J. Lee, 1996; Stopes-Roe & Cochrane, 1990), and advancing the culture (Tang, 1997). Often, the need to please parents and the parental pressure to succeed lead to academic stress, poor self-image, poor performance, and interpersonal dysfunctions (Pang, 1991). Men who are conflicted about their masculinity may trigger a male hysteria such as "koro" where feelings of anxiety and discomfort manifest as well a fear that one's penis will shrivel-up or retract into one's body (Gilmore, 1990). This fear that one's manhood is "taking flight" (Gilmore,1990, p. 173), seems to afflict the young and adolescent men with dependent (i.e., weak) personality types (Gilmore, 1990; Pang, 1991).

Among older men, especially Asian American fathers, threats to their patriarchal position (i.e., a loss of masculinity; stress and frustration; inability to be the "breadwinner") within the family may result in a re-assertion of control over the

family through physical abuse (Chow, 1998; Lum, 1998; Rimonte, 1991). For some men, domestic violence is justified or dismissed as a culturally congruent means to reinforce cultural and patriarchal structures (Rimonte, 1991). Thus, some Asian American men believe that women play a pivotal role in reinforcing cultural notions of masculinity. Unfortunately, many Asian American women living within these patriarchal boundaries believe that they deserve the abuse and rationalize the abuse as a means to keep the family together (Lum, 1998). Research is needed among Asian American men to understand the causes of domestic violence because much of the current literature has been on the women in these relationships (Lum, 1998).

A common element among many of the Asian ethnic communities is the important role, positive and negative, that Asian women play in the culture. Asian women are considered to be the cornerstones of the Asian family structure (Smith-Hefner, 1999). But marriage seems to serve several functions within a society. For the Khmer (Cambodian ethnic group), marriage to a virgin is a significant symbol of the man's masculinity as well as a guarantee that the family will flourish with children (Smith-Hefner, 1999). Like many other Asian cultural groups, marriage functions as a socially recognized union between families, tribes, and communities. To ensure that a marriage will take place, the parents will often remind the children of the parents' age and the shame that would result from not marrying (Smith-Hefner, 1999). Marriages also help to regulate the perceived lasciviousness of women's sexuality, and therefore, reinforce the patriarchal power of the males in the Khmer society (Smith-Hefner,

1999). Today, many of these cultural notions of family, gender, and masculinity have been challenged for Southeast Asians because of their refugee experience and their residence in the United States.

Southeast Asians (e.g., Vietnamese, Cambodians, Laotians) who flee the political and economic turmoil in their homelands often found themselves unprepared for a new culture and life as expatriates (Kibria, 1993). As a consequence, Southeast Asian men were left with a distinct feeling of isolation from America as well as their homeland (Kibria, 1993). Many of these men have lost their families, their jobs and earning ability, status and authority, community, and loved ones. Arrival to the U.S. typically meant the need for women to find work, which dissolved the patriarchal position of the male. A similar effect occurred among Japanese American men in the internment camps when they lost their ability to be providers and struggled with their sense of masculinity and loss of power (Nagata, 1998). For Southeast Asian men, because a sense of powerlessness and depression often follow these changes, efforts to regain their masculinity were often brutal explosions of domestic violence or jealous outbursts that center on the "American" man's (i.e., White) money as well as their sexual prowess (Kibria, 1993). The end result tends to drive away loved ones and further magnify their marginal status as men in America.

Not all the conflicts over masculinity for Southeast Asians exist among adults. Masculinity was also an issue for boys and adolescents, who after losing a father, were faced with acculturation, racism, and post-traumatic stress without much familial

support or guidance (Long, 1996). This is the case among many Viet Namese boys who have lived their lives in America with no father, and who may have had a history of trauma. Typically, these young boys and adolescents turn to gangs because they long for paternal figures that mimic the "powerful, masculine allure" (Long, 1996, p. 70). Gangs represent quintessential male domains because women are usually excluded from the same organization but used as sexual objects (e.g., in gang rapes) to intensify the man's sense of masculinity (Chin, 1996). Without the father to offer discipline and guidance, and living within the context of poverty (Chin, 1996; Zhou & Bankston, 1998), gang life often offers the elements of stability: the promise of material benefits as well as a sense of family (Long, 1996; Zhou & Bankston, 1998). Consequently, many of these boys are socialized into a hypermasculine and violent environment that is difficult to leave (Long, 1996; Zhou & Bankston, 1998).

These cultural notions of masculinity point to some of the common links between "Asian" ideas of masculinity and those of the dominant group. Apparently, patriarchal privilege and power are artifacts within masculinity that many men struggle to retain or regain. Yet, even with knowledge that there are commonalties as well as differences in masculine ideologies, the understanding of how racism and class function in determining an Asian American man's sense of self is not well understood in psychology. Hence, even though there are different theories of masculinity, the lives of Asian American men may not be well understood through the experiences of dominant culture men.

Summary

Predicating American masculinity on Whiteness establishes a system of expectations among men of color to live up to and subscribe to a "maleness" that may not only be foreign to them, but tends to exclude them as well. While all men are expected to live up to the codes and expectations developed from this White masculine norm, men of color may find additional conflicts because of the apparent disregard for their race, history, and culture in the construction of White masculinity. Another problem arises among men of color who attempt to approximate these expectations but are faced with the daunting task of overcoming the exclusion from masculinity because of their race. Unaware, for the most part, that much of American history for men has revealed itself as the privileged domain for White-upper-class men, men of color may valorize an ideal that never included them.

For Asian American men, who are a raced and gendered group in America, and have historically faced immigration exclusion and prohibitions against interracial unions, developing a sense of masculine self means contending with issues of racism and masculine exclusion/marginalization. They, along with other men of color, have often been used as the deviant prototypes of masculinity as a means to buttress the normalcy of White masculinity. In order to regulate their marginal status, citizenship, immigration, voting rights, and judicial privileges have been either restricted or curtailed among the Asian American community. Some would argue (Kandiyoti, 1988) that the normalcy of White masculinity has prospered, not only because of its

codification in society, but because many men "buy" into the idea of "White" masculinity (i.e., hegemonic masculinity). This agreement with dominant male norms, not only helps to perpetuate the "White masculine norm" but also instills the values and beliefs of the dominant into those of the minority group. Consequently, men of color at times harbor prejudicial and discriminatory attitudes that reflect the dominant belief system.

However, regardless of how much men of color subscribe to the dominant belief system, men of color are still relegated to the margins of masculinity. To marginalize Asian American men, standards of beauty, attractiveness, and maleness have all been framed around the "White" aesthetic, thereby marking Asian American men as "not-quite" men. Salient to Asian American men are the continually problematic caricature of being effeminate or non-masculine (demasculinized). These historical contingencies seem to be continually recapitulated in one form or another such that in one century, the Asian male is the sexual deviant, and in another century, the Asian male is the asexual deviant. What is apparent is the important function race and racism play in masculinity.

Does race play a role in all masculine formations? The answer seems to be possibly yes and no. Throughout many Asian cultures, Asian men have defined a sense of masculinity for themselves apart from the White male norm. Issues such as saving face, continuing the family name, and maintaining control over the women in their family appear to be important elements in the lives of Asian American men.

Many of these issues are further complicated by the individual's acculturation level and, quite possibly, their racial identity. Other issues not typically explored when discussing masculinity for Asian American men is the issue of violence (e.g., gang and domestic violence) that seems to pervade some men's lives. Yet, what seems to link each of the Asian standards of masculinity together is patriarchy, which at some level, seems to allow Asian American men to be connected to the dominant "White" American standard of masculinity.

The formation of masculinity in the United States has been contentious for White men and men of color. This literature review provided a foundation from which to understand the multiplicity of issues men of color face. However, from a psychological point of view, there seems to be a lack of empirical research that examines the lives of men of color. Some literature touched on the intra-psychic elements of masculinity for men of color, but to fully understand the complexity of masculinity in the U.S., several theories have been developed that prompt discussions. These theories provide a means to comprehend the ways men construct masculinities in their lives. While the theories do not explicitly expound on race and racism, current theories at least provide a way to talk about race and masculinity.

### Theories of Masculinity

Theories about masculinity have changed and evolved. Depending on the historic and social context, the standards of masculinity have been either valorized or condemned (Coltrane, 1994). As masculinity's definition evolves, men adapt as well

by "changing behavior, by changing their perceptions of gender role norms or by disengaging from them, or by changing their reference group" (Pleck, 1995, p. 14). As codes of masculinity change, as men find new ways to adapt to these changes, and as new masculinities are created, different avenues of approaching the study of masculinity have been used. Today, the theories used to understand contemporary masculinity contain frameworks and artifacts from previous critiques.

The application of feminist discourse and methodologies has been used to understand American masculinity (Coltrane, 1994). Feminist discourse examined the norms of masculinity such as status seeking, toughness, and anti-femininity (Thompson & Pleck, 1986). By examining the masculine mystique, or the "values and beliefs that define optimal masculinity in a given society…[which] are based on unproven sex differences and sex role stereotypes that are assumed to have value but may have negative outcomes for men, women, and children" (O'Neil, 1981, p. 64), men were challenged to "avoid reproducing patriarchal consciousness…[and consider] the ways that men create and sustain gendered selves with the ways that gender influences power relations and perpetuates inequality" (Coltrane, 1994, p. 43-44). As a result of using a feminist approach, a set of theories about masculinity in America developed with the common link of critiquing masculinity and examining the ways men understand themselves in relation to others and society.

In general, the theories examined the masculine standards in society and the belief, among many men, that living up to these expectations would be easy and

without incongruencies or contradictions (Mosher & Tompkins, 1988). Some aspects of masculinity can be conceptualized as positive attributes such as putting one's family first, protecting and taking care of others, as well as being loyal and dedicated (Levant, 1995). However, as men attempted to live up to all the masculine expectations, and as they were socialized into the dominant culture's definition of masculinity, psychological strain resulted from their attempts to fulfill these expectations. Feminist discourse provided masculinity theorists a tool to investigate the psychological strain and coping mechanisms of men within a society that demanded compliance.

Pleck (1995), in response to the strain that men were experiencing, proposed three types of strain related to fulfilling masculine expectations: discrepancy-strain, dysfunction-strain, and trauma-strain. In discrepancy strain, the person "fails to live up to one's internalized manhood ideal" (Levant, 1996, p. 261). Inventories such as the Male Gender Role Conflict Scale (GRCS) (O'Neil et al., 1986) and the Masculine Gender Role Stress (MGRS) (Eisler & Skidmore, 1987) reflect this type of gender role strain. Dysfunction-strain describes someone who fulfills the expectations of contemporary masculinity, but experience negative effects because the expectations for men are often psychologically toxic (Levant, 1996). Some of the toxic effects of fulfilling masculine expectations include (a) violence, especially spousal abuse, rape, and sexual assault; (b) promiscuity and "sexual excess" (Levant, 1996, p. 262); (c) irresponsible actions such as drug and alcohol abuse, and risk-taking behaviors; and

(d) problematic relationships (Brooks & Silverstein, 1995; Levant, 1996). Finally, Trauma-strain refers to the "male socialization process...which is recognized as inherently traumatic" (Levant, 1996, p. 261). The result of this traumatic socialization is estrangement from their affective life, and development of sexual feelings and attitudes toward women to replace "caring emotions" (Levant, 1996, p. 263). The objectifying attitudes towards women also reflect an impaired ability of men to achieve emotional intimacy with women (Brooks, 1998a). Through these three types of strain, Pleck (1995) provided a developmental profile of masculine experiences that men struggle through and the dysfunctional relational patterns that result from adherence to society's masculine expectations.

In measuring masculinity, Thompson and Pleck (1995) found that most inventories tap either into (a) ideologies about masculinities, or (b) the way men experience their gender. Many of the measures also approach the study of masculinity either through the trait or normative perspective (Thompson & Pleck, 1995). The trait perspective posits a real gender difference between men and women which makes gender orientation possible, since masculinity becomes an "individual property" (Thompson & Pleck, 1995, p. 130). Within the trait perspective, the individual either has the masculine attribute, or is deficient. The normative perspective assumes no actual gender difference, but instead, assumes that there is a socially desirable masculine ideal with concomitant gender-specific characteristics, which men either endorse or deny (Thompson & Pleck, 1995). Research into the normative aspects of

masculinity center on the different cultural manifestations of masculinity, the social and cultural institutions that perpetuate these types of masculinity, and the problems of endorsing any particular masculinity (Thompson & Pleck, 1995). Within the normative approach, one may ask, "what men should be like" (Thompson & Pleck, 1995, p. 133), or the descriptive question, "what men actually are like" (p. 133). These considerations are important when constructing new theories of masculinity since either approach asks different questions and will lead to distinct conclusions (Thompson & Pleck, 1995).

The distinctions within the many masculinity theories are crucial in research and clinical practice. Eschewing the trait perspective, many of the current theorists are investigating the kinds of expectations and standards society has of men. Among the theories, a brief overview is provided for the Gender Role Conflict theory, the Masculine Ideology theory, Male Reference Group theory, and the Bem's Sex Role theory. Each theory takes a slightly different perspective on the normative approach to masculinity and offers unique insights into the issues facing men.

Gender Role Conflict Paradigm

Before the normative approach to investigating masculinity, much of the literature focused on masculine traits. In his book, The Myth of Masculinity (1981), Joseph Pleck suggested that the gender role identity (GRI) paradigm (i.e., trait) did not, and could not, explain the multitude of issues facing men. It was Pleck's (1981)

opinion that the gender role identity paradigms reinforced, rather than critiqued, gender roles.

The GRI paradigm proposed that people need to have a gender role identity, and that this identity was related to the degree to which the individual subscribed to that gender role. Gender roles were basically "behaviors, expectations, and values defined by society as masculine and feminine" (O'Neil, 1990, p. 24). The process of adopting a gender role was itself strenuous, conflicted, and had negative effects on the man (Pleck, 1995). However, failure to define one's gender role identity could lead to homosexuality, hypermasculinity, and negative attitudes toward women.

Pleck (1981) proposed an alternative theory of masculinity: gender role conflict. He believed that gender roles are fluid, inconsistent, and often have contradictory expectations for men. O'Neil, Good, and Holmes (1995) further clarified gender role conflict as the "psychological state in which socialized gender roles have negative consequences on the person or others" (O'Neil et al., 1995, p. 166). Conflicts are expected as a result of the gender role journey that brings a man from traditional masculinity through ambivalence, confusion, anger and fear, to personal and professional advocacy (O'Neil, 1995). The conflicts affect the person's cognitions, emotional life, behaviors, and unconscious experiences, and can be brought on by others, the self, or expressed toward others (O'Neil et al., 1995).

Gender role conflict is triggered when one (a) deviates from gender role norms, (b) tries, and meets or fails, gender role norms, (c) experiences a discrepancy between

the real and ideal selves related to gender role norms, (d) personally devalues, restricts, or violates oneself, (e) experiences from others devaluation, restrictions, and violations, and (f) devalues, restricts, or violates others because of gender role stereotypes (O'Neil et al., 1995, p. 167). In an attempt to further understand gender role conflict, an instrument was developed that reflected six patterns of gender role conflict arising from a fear of femininity and the negative consequences for those who deviate from the prescribed masculine role. The six theoretical patterns (i.e., domains) of gender role conflict measured in the GRCS are (a) restrictive emotionality, (b) control, power and competition, (c) homophobia, (d) restrictive sexual and emotional behavior, (e) an obsession with achievement and success, and (f) health problems resulting from gender role socialization (O'Neil et al., 1995, p. 171). In developing the instrument, a study with a sample of 527 college men found that, of the six domains, there were actually four interpretable domains including (a) success, power, and competition, (b) restriction of emotions and a lack of emotional responsiveness, (c) homophobia, and (d) a restriction of affect toward other men (O'Neil et al., 1986).

In one study using the GRCS, men who were found to use "primitive," immature, and neurotic defenses were also likely to endorse many of the domains within gender role conflict (Mahalik et al., 1998). The domains reflected inflexibility in needing to be successful, restraint of emotions, and being competitive. The mostly White sample of 115 men were also described as having vengeful and destructive behaviors when gender role conflict was high. The results also supported the notion

that "gender role rigidity…is associated with personal restriction, devaluation, and violation of others and self" (Mahalik et al., 1998, p. 253). Thus, those who are deeply wedded to a particular cognitive style (i.e., rigid) may also have problems in their interpersonal relationships.

In another study that investigated cognitive styles and GRCS, Wade (1996) used the GRCS along with the Black Racial Identity Attitude Scale (BRIAS) with 95 African American men with ages ranging from 23-80 years. Results showed that pre-encounter, encounter, and immersion/emersion statuses were positively correlated with gender role conflict patterns (Wade, 1996). Among the patterns, he found that immersion/emersion correlated with "achievement, success, authority or control over others and struggling against others for personal gain" (Wade, 1996, p. 28). Additionally, pre-encounter attitudes were related to struggles with "balancing work, family, leisure, and heath needs" (Wade, 1996, p. 29). Those men with externally defined racial identity (i.e., pre-encounter), were also likely to be uncomfortable with emotional self-disclosure (Wade, 1996). Wade (1996) argued that African American men's gender role strain may be related to the reference group (i.e., Black or White), and that the strain is a product of mainstream society's pressure on men to adhere to masculine and racial norms.

Asian Americans have also been given the GRCS. Prior to the E.J. Kim et al. (1996) study, the author reported no other empirical study of Asian Americans and the GRCS. Rather, many previous studies focused on gender roles, acculturation, or how

Asian Americans differed from Caucasians (E.J. Kim et al., 1996). In her study, 125

Asian Americans (age ranging from 18 to 38) were given the GRCS and the Suinn-

Lew Asian Self-Identity Acculturation Scale (SL-ASIA). Results generally showed no

differences in acculturation scores along four patterns of gender role conflict (E.J. Kim

et al., 1996). In a canonical correlation, the gender role conflict domains

corresponding with higher acculturation scores were success, power, and competition.

Acculturation was related to lower scores on restrictive emotionality (E.J. Kim, et al.,

1996). The authors contend that restricting emotions is one of the costs that Asian

American must deal with in their success. Acculturation was another important

variable since the Asian American men may have felt freer to display their emotions

because American society generally has a more liberal notion on the expression of

affect than in typical Asian societies (E.J. Kim, et al., 1996). The problem with this

study is in the use of an acculturation instrument rather than a racial identity

instrument that could explicitly address the effects of race and racism. Kohatsu (1992)

has shown that acculturation tends not to provide any significant explanatory power

over racial identity, and that research wanting to investigate the issue of "race" in the

lives of Asian Americans should use the racial identity scale. Moreover, there are

concerns about the construct validity of the SL-ASIA and the population with which it

is valid (Ponterotto, Baluch, & Carielli, 1998). Consequently, the results of the E.J.

Kim et al. (1996) study are problematic in terms of applicability and explanatory

power.

Gender role conflict and the GRCS are important steps in understanding the effects of normative pressure among men. As the studies and authors have demonstrated, men, regardless of race, experience gender role conflict. What is not completely clear is the direct role that race and racism play in the lives of men of color, since research using the GRCS and racial identity instruments are limited (e.g., Wade, 1996). Thus, future studies investigating the role of race and racism would benefit from using racial identity theories as a means to understand the interplay of gender and race. Also, other theories and research methods may provide additional understanding into the conflict that men cope with in trying to fulfill the masculine expectations in society.

Masculine Ideology

Masculine ideology continued the belief that masculinity is socially constructed, and men endorse an ideology rather than possess traits (Thompson & Pleck, 1995). There are particular masculine standards (Pleck, 1995), which may be defined as (a) men should always succeed, (b) never show weakness, (c) be adventurous and risk takers, and (d) never be feminine (David & Brannon, 1976). In one study of male role norms, 656 college students were given the Male Role Norms Scale (Thompson & Pleck, 1986), and results showed four factors: Status/Rationality (i.e., the importance of rationality and gaining respect), Anti-femininity (i.e., the importance of denying things feminine), Tough Image (i.e., maintaining a veneer of independence and toughness), and Violent Toughness (i.e., the importance of fist-

fighting) (Fischer, Tokar, Good & Snell, 1998). This research points out common elements that appear in studying male role norms such as the theme of avoiding femininity, focusing on success and achievement, and maintaining a "tough" exterior. For many men, subscribing or not subscribing to these expectations hold consequences. Other scales such as the Male Role Inventory (MRI) are also predicated on masculine ideology and have tapped into the domains of restricted emotions, preoccupation with success, and inhibited affection, and are a way of assessing the potential consequences these men face (Snell, 1986).

Levant et al.'s (1992) Male Role Norms Inventory (MRNI) delineated these areas of traditional masculine ideology in a scale. The MRNI consists of seven dimensions (a) avoid all things feminine, (b) be emotionally restrictive, (c) be tough and aggressive, (d) be self-reliant, (e) be successful, (f) objectifying attitudes toward sexuality, and (g) fear and hatred of homosexuals. Given to a sample of 287 participants, the MRNI seemed to tap into stable male role norms as well as those that change over time (Levant et al., 1992).

Several subscales of the MRNI are correlated with the GRCS subscales. The MRNI subscale of restrictive emotionality correlated with the GRCS Restrictive Emotionality scale ($r = .40$, $p = .000$). Aggression and Status subscale also correlate with GRCS Success, Power, and Competition subscale ($r = .35$, $p = .000$). Finally, the MRNI subscale of Rejection of Homosexuals correlated with GRCS Restrictive

Affectionate Behavior Between Men subscale ($r$ = .49, $p$ = .000) (Levant & Fischer, in press).

In one study of 371 African and 320 White American men and women given the MRNI, African American men endorsed the traditional masculine ideology higher than the other groups (Levant & Majors, 1997). White women were least likely in the sample to endorse the traditional masculine ideology; African American women were less likely than the African American men to endorse traditional masculine ideology, but more likely than the White women; and the White men were less likely than the African American women to endorse traditional masculine ideology (Levant & Majors, 1997). One may infer that White women have the least to gain from endorsing traditional masculine attitudes. African American men and women, as a reflection of class status and region, may reflect traditional masculine attitudes because they have not been exposed to non-traditional gender roles frequently, and it is consonant with their culture. The MRNI, because it can be given to men and women, attempts to examine the ideologies of masculinity that men must subscribe to, that perhaps, is similar across cultures (e.g., patriarchy, homophobia, and restriction of emotions). Although this approach is similar to the GRCS, it is unclear how race and racism fully function in the formation of masculinity among men of color. In the Levant and Majors' (1997) study, no assessment was made on the African Americans cultural affiliation (e.g., racial identity), hence, it is unclear what referent group the African Americans were using when responding to the masculine ideology items.

Male Reference Group Identity

In an effort to investigate the lives of men and understand why they adhere to some ideological elements of masculinity while neglecting others, Wade (1998) developed a theory of Male Reference Group Identity Dependence (MRGID). The impetus behind the MRGID was based on the speculation that demographic variables (i.e., race) were insufficient in providing a "causal explanation as to why a man socialized within a particular cultural context may or may not identify with the group of men to which he is demographically connected" (Wade, 1998, p. 351). The MRGID rests on the principle that a person, regardless of group membership (i.e., race), may find certain groups appealing and will psychologically orient him or herself toward that group (Singer, 1992; Wade, 1998). As a result, the referent group helps establish an array of psychological and behavioral parameters to which the person aspires (Singer, 1992).

MRGID model is predicated on the psychological (i.e., ego) readiness of the individual, the meaningfulness of the referent group, and the sense of internally directed when participating in gender roles (Wade, 1998). The ego is important since its strength and resiliency help determine the man's flexibility toward gender roles and toward the group with whom he orients. Thus, the greater the ego maturity, the more likely the individual will resist conforming to conventional interpretations of gender roles and traditional groups (Wade, 1998).

To provide empirical evidence for this theory, the Reference Group Identity Dependency Scale (RGIDS) was developed (Wade & Gelso, 1998). A sample of 344 undergraduates were given the RGIDS, and results provided four general factors that accounted for 42.2% of the total variance. The four factors included (a) No Reference Group – defined as feelings of disconnectedness from other males; (b) Reference Group Nondependent Diversity – defined as appreciation of differences in males; (c) Reference Group Nondependent Similarity – defined as feelings of connectedness with all males; and (d) Reference Group Dependent – defined as feelings of connectedness with some males and not others (Wade & Gelso, 1998, p. 395, 397). The final scale consisted of 30 items in four subscales with internal reliabilities ranging from .70 to .78, but with low test-retest reliability (Wade & Gelso, 1998). What was not clear from the theory and scale are the effects of multiple referent groups and which referent group the individual was using when responding to scale items (Eisler, 1998). While the psychometric properties of the RGIDS are moderate, further development will add promise to the scale and another dimension in the investigation of masculinities.

The MRGID theory is an important step in understanding the role that different groups have in mediating a man's sense of masculinity. The MRGID suggests that individuals may orient themselves toward a particular sense of masculinity depending on their cognitive resources and the salience of a certain group. Men are allowed, even within the same racial group, to subscribe to different notions of masculinity.

The RGIDS allows for measurement of these different notions of masculinity, but because it is a new instrument with limited validity and reliability data, further research is needed to improve its psychometric properties. Additionally, there are other standard instruments that measure gender and sex roles (i.e., the Bem Sex Role Inventory), but they may also present problems when investigating men of color's cultural backgrounds.

The Applicability of the Bem Sex Role Inventory in Studying Asian American Men

Researchers often use the Bem Sex Role Inventory (BSRI) to assess an individual's sex role orientation (Harris, 1994). The BSRI allows people to be feminine, masculine, or androgynous in their sex role orientation. However, because sex roles are contingent upon the culture and environment, it is not clear how well the BSRI assesses the nuances of cultural change. For instance, because of its social class position within society, a college environment may have different (e.g., liberal) gender role notions (DeLeon, 1993), and these gender role notions may change over time. Hence, it is important that measuring cultural forms of masculinity is valid and reliable.

One study questioned the cross-cultural validity of the BSRI. Harris (1994) used the BSRI among 500 African, 500 Caucasian, and 500 Latino men along with 500 African, 500 Caucasian, and 500 Latinas with ages ranging from 30 to 39 years. The research investigated the capacity of the BSRI to measure sex roles and definitions of masculinity and femininity across cultures. The results tended to show

that the BSRI reflects a White middle-class definition of sex roles, masculinity, and femininity. However, the problem with the BSRI is that, in different cultures, certain behaviors and attitudes reserved for one gender may be expected and acceptable in the other gender. Consequently, because notions of masculinity and femininity are not always constructed from the same behaviors across cultures, the BSRI may be questionable in its validity.

Additionally, socialization has much to do with how gender roles are communicated, and Harris (1994) argued that acculturation (i.e., socialization) into the dominant culture may be significant in establishing gender roles. The BSRI does not specifically address the possible conflicts arising from acculturation. Thus, potential conflicts in gender roles may result from labeling an individual within a category that does not fit him or her (e.g., androgynous). Additionally, this research presents the need to develop culture-specific inventories of gender roles that are sensitive to the nuances within that group (Harris, 1994).

The BSRI has also been criticized for its potential inability to measure the changes in gender roles over time (Holt & Ellis, 1998). However, in a study replicating the original validation study of Bem's, Holt and Ellis (1998) found that the BSRI was able to measure gender roles despite the changes that have occurred with gender roles. Holt and Ellis' (1998) study showed the ability of a culture-specific instrument to pick up nuances within one culture, however, it is not known if the BSRI could be as sensitive within another (i.e., not American) culture across time.

Thus, while the BSRI is a popular instrument to investigate one's subscription to sex roles, it does not necessarily provide an understanding of one's adherence to gender expectations. Furthermore, the BSRI does not allow researchers to investigate the potential conflicts that arise as a result of one's subscription to dominant gender expectations. Because of these limitations, this study would not be able to understand the degree to which Asian American men adhered to certain gender expectations and comprehend the conflicts that arise from this subscription.

Summary

Men's studies literature has evolved greatly over a relatively short period of time. Initially, gender was thought of as something one has or does not have, but gender identity theories have been critiqued as too rigid and procrustean, and for not being able to explain the various masculinities that are created among men. It seems that, even though a particular masculine ideal is propagated within American society, trying to adhere to the standards of that ideal leaves many men in conflict. As a result, as men struggle with the conflict arising from their subscription to masculine standards, they also tend to manifest behaviors and attitudes that are deleterious to their interpersonal relationships and consequently, isolate themselves from others. A number of different theories have attempted to examine the conflicts with which men cope. Gender role conflict is a way to examine the tensions men experience as they attempt to fulfill the gender role expectations in their community. Male Role Norms is another means to examine the areas of masculinity that men try to fulfill

(i.e., the norms they believe are important to be a man in America). Both are theoretical approaches to understanding masculinity in America, and both assume that all men in America experience similar tensions from the dominant society to behave and think in a certain fashion. Yet, the issue of race seems to be missing from the current approaches to masculinity. While latently subsumed within the theories, future masculinity theories may need to be more explicit about how race and racism function directly with gender. For this study, racial identity will account for race, but to fully incorporate race and racism within a study of gender, future instruments and theories may need to ask questions of race and gender within the same measure.

Current theories and measures offer researchers and practitioners a way to talk about masculinity and the issues that men contend with in their lives. When men come to counseling and seek help, research and theory provide clinicians an avenue to explore the client's struggles. But what are men like when they come to counseling? How should clinicians prepare to work with men? The next section is a brief overview of literature for men that allow clinicians some insight into men and counseling.

<div align="center">Counseling Issues Among Men</div>

It seems likely that the mental health profession has a race, class, and gender bias (Katz, 1985) when the ideal of mental health reflects the same characteristics given to a mature White middle-class man (Broverman et al., 1970; Long, 1986; Malmquist, 1985). And when "masculine" qualities are equated with high self-esteem and high self-acceptance (Broverman et al., 1970; Long, 1986), it seems even more

necessary to understand how these biases affect counseling practice with men of color (Helms & Cook, 1999; Katz, 1985). But even though these biases seem to favor a select group of men, our general understanding of men in counseling still seems to be somewhat limited. Thus, an overview of the counseling literature for men is needed to understand how clinicians approach counseling with men today.

Why Men Avoid Therapy

The belief that men should be self-reliant may cause reluctance in some men to seek out medical help (J. Kim, 1999; Marquis, 2000; Nishioka, 1999). Thus, it should be of no real surprise that the current literature also recognizes that men tend not to seek counseling help (Lott et al., 1999; Robertson & Fitzgerald, 1992) because of masculine expectations for men to be strong and self-reliant (Barbee, et al., 1993). When it comes to counseling, traditional men will "do almost anything to avoid a therapist's office" (Brooks, 1998b, p. 84). According to Pollack and Levant (1998) the factors that contributed to men's reluctance to seek outside help is "a code of masculinity that requires them to be: aggressive, dominant, achievement oriented, competitive, rigidly self-sufficient, adventure seeking, willing to take risks, emotionally restricted, and constituted to avoid all things, actions, and reactions that are potentially 'feminine'" (p. 1). Counseling, because of its perceived focus on emotions, is relegated to femininity and therefore out-of-bounds for some men. These codes of behavior which are rigid and absolute (Mooney, 1998), are congruent with

the masculine conflict men experience (Pleck, 1981), and often position men psychologically in a no-win situation when it comes to their health.

Of the many factors that may attribute to the underuse of psychological services by men, Pollack and Levant (1998) identified six of them. The first is that men typically do not admit to a problem. Second, men have difficulty asking for assistance. The third, similar to the problem of alexithymia, is that men have "difficulty in identifying and processing vulnerable and caring emotions" (p. 2). Fourth, men's "fear [of] intimacy" (p. 2) limits their participation. Fifth, men often sexualize intimate feelings with women, which lead to problems with female therapists (Mooney, 1998; Pollack, 1998). Moreover, men have to combat homophobic barriers that may be a hindrance when working with male therapists. Finally, the sixth issue is that many therapists do not have appropriate intervention tools and strategies to work with men.

For the man, therapy signals weakness (Brooks, 1998a), and for the therapist, the man's prototypical relationship style may be incompatible with counseling and the therapeutic relationship (Wilcox & Forrest, 1992). Counselors should be aware that the inability to measure up to these masculine standards and expectations could lead to depression (Pollack & Levant, 1998), anger (Pollack & Levant, 1998), and alexithymia (i.e., no access to feelings) (Levant, 1998). Moreover, those men who do subscribe heavily to the male role norm tend to have interpersonal relationships that suffer (e.g., unilateral in their decision-making styles and to use avoidance strategies

when confronted with unwelcome requests from his partner) (Snell, Hawkins, & Belk, 1988). All these barriers seem to contribute to men's reluctance to pursue therapy, but also describe potential problems that counselors may encounter in counseling. Without recognizing the way men approach counseling, clinicians may find themselves frustrated and unable to deal with clients who seem to be defensive and reticent in therapy.

But what will bring men into counseling and what should happen once the men are there? To present counseling as a time of emotional expression may lead some men to eschew therapy all together (Wisch, Mahalik, Hayes, & Nutt, 1995). However, there may be some strategies that do work with men. It is suggested that the counselor learn to develop the strengths the man has, seek preventative interventions, and be careful that men are not blamed for feeling defensive about counseling (Kelly & Hall, 1992). Brooks (1998a) provided some additional guidelines for therapy with men. First, be alert to resistance to therapy. Second, approach men with empathy and compassion. Third, view men's distress through the context of gendered experiences. Fourth and fifth, be fluent in the way men relate, as well as aware of their psychic pain. Finally, sixth, be sensitive to the transgenerational patterns of masculinity.

Men will also likely respond positively to psychological communications that are congruent with their "masculine socialization process" (Robertson & Fitzgerald, 1992) such as using "classes, workshops, and seminars, rather than personal counseling" (p. 244-245). Other strategies in working with men may be (a) appealing

to their "fix it" frame of mind by using diagrams to show how psychological processes work; (b) using "locker room" talk to help men express anxiety over sexuality issues; (c) letting the male clients have a feeling of "superiority" over the counselor during times the men feel dis-empowered; (d) using a movie to talk about feelings (Freiberg & Sleek, 1999). All these strategies are meant to help the counselor "join" with the client and build a strong working relationship and to help the male client feel empathized with rather than judged and condemned. The hope is that through the working alliance, the counselor will be able to offer interventions and build insight in a manner that allows the man to accept them without feeling attacked.

These tactics and strategies are important for many men in counseling, since the difficulty seems to come when they are asked to challenge their typical ways of relating to and expressing their affect. Emotional expressiveness is usually discouraged among men since this is a display of weakness. Suppressing this emotion, however, will lead to other intrapsychic as well as interpersonal problems. Counselors need to be aware of the prohibition men are faced with when expressing affect. Yet, many counselors may be surprised that anger is the one affect that men are allowed to express without reservation.

The Socialization of Anger and Emotional Restrictiveness Among Men

Anger seems to be the most easily expressed emotion for men. Accounts of domestic violence arising from problems such as marital discord (Warren, 1999) and economic and job problems (Marquis, 1999) often have tragic consequences for

spouses and other family members. Thus, in counseling men, therapists often find that anger typically is the most readily available emotion for men (Levant, 1998; Pollack & Levant, 1998). Pollack (1998a) believes that the catharsis of anger reflects the deep "vulnerability, powerlessness, and…pain in their search for safety" (p. 24), and anger seems to be the common expression of these feelings for men. It is hoped that as boys grow into men, that they learn to better cope with anger. For instance, among adolescents, physical expressions of anger among male youths is expected and "normative" (Deffenbacher & Swaim, 1999). But for older men, a positive strategy employed to cope with anger throughout their lives was correlated with positive mental health later in life (Westermeyer, 1998).

Even though anger is readily available for most men, immediately confronting men about anger and other "masculine" issues may be counter productive (Pollack, 1998a). Instead, Pollack (1998a) contends that men should be allowed to maintain their illusion of "self-sufficiency" (p. 26), until such time that the men's egos are stable and strong enough to withstand the therapist's queries and challenges. While anger seems to be the most advantageous way to help men express other emotions, counselors may find their interventions rebuffed if they are not cognizant of why men express anger.

For many men of color, anger may stem from racism as well as masculine conflicts (Brooks, 1998; Franklin, 1998). That is, the anger arises from the "frustrations over the difficulty to fulfill gender role expectations because of prejudice

and discrimination" (Franklin, 1998, p. 240). Anger is an expression of not only male marginalization, but may arise from racist encounters and gender role conflict. The main problem seems to be the lack of effective psychotherapeutic models that incorporate a full understanding of race and masculinity (e.g., Thorn & Sarata, 1998).

What seems to be on the opposite end of the continuum from anger are men's inability to articulate feelings (alexithymia) and their emotional restrictiveness. These common coping mechanisms of avoidance and denial of anxious affect are additional problems when working with men (Krugman, 1995). However, men were not born alexithymic, and emotional restrictiveness is not innate. The reality is that boys are quite emotional in infancy (i.e., more reactive and expressive), and that the containment of emotions is socialized through parents, peers, and other institutions (Brooks, 1998a; Levant, 1998).

Just because men cannot express emotions does not mean that feelings are not present. Rather, boys and men who are socialized to suppress emotions may (a) form non-relational sexuality, or the objectification of women as sexual objects and the transformation of "tenderness" (p. 43) into sexuality; and (b) action empathy, or the ability to understand another person for the purpose of exploitation and personal gain. In regard to the formation of non-relational sexuality, vulnerable feelings are transfigured into anger, and tender feelings are manipulated into feelings of sexuality. In effect, feelings of vulnerability are transfigured into emotions that appear under the

control of the man. Thus, "tender feelings" are perceived as sexual and instrumental rather than only emotive.

In regard to developing a sense of empathy, action empathy is different from empathy since action empathy is in the service of the self and seeks an understanding of the other person's subjective experience for the benefit of the perceiver. As a result of socialization into the dominant masculine norms, boys learn how to express emotions, how to relate to females, and how to look for ways to win. Similar to the transformation of vulnerable feelings into sexual feelings, action empathy allows the man a sense of control over his emotional life.

Both types of emotional expression come from a life long process of socialization where boys learn quickly what is acceptable and unacceptable. Thus, from the initial assignment of a "sex" among infants, subsequent behaviors of the child toward a particular "sex" are encouraged and reinforced (Malmquist, 1985). Boys are encouraged to introject standards of masculinity (Brooks, 1998a; O'Neil, 1981). These standards, or gender labels and expectations, remain stable life-long schemas from which the individual perceives and understands himself and others (Biernat, 1991). Boys learn quickly that their family and peers will receive any hint of femininity with hostility or marginalization (Brooks, 1998a; McGuffey, 1999; O'Neil, 1981). Not surprisingly, early displays of feminine characteristics are challenged among boys for fear that they become lifelong traits (Berndt & Heller, 1986). For instance, when a group of 251 pre-adolescent boys (11-12 years old) were shown a

boy playing a game with girls (i.e., jump rope), the observed boy was attributed feminine qualities and seen as unpopular (Lobel, 1994). In general, popularity was reserved for those boys who played with other boys and in masculine games such as soccer (Lobel, 1994). Essentially then, boys and girls understand that "fitting in" and being acceptable to one's peer group means maintaining certain gender role standards regardless of the potential conflicts that may arise (Nuwer, 1999; Sweet, 1999).

In college, the gender role socialization may continue in the form of ritualized hazing in fraternal organizations (Taff & Boglioli, 1993). For instance, a recent hazing incident within an Asian American fraternity, in which two pledges were hospitalized due to over-exertion and dehydration, illustrates the extent that masculinity, in some environments, is overemphasized (Ito, 1998; Kalof, & Cargill, 1991; Kerkstra, 1998). In follow-up interviews with fraternity members, reporters found that most of the members interviewed thought that hazing was a normal and natural ritual for men to participate in (Ito, 1998; Kerkstra, 1998). One may infer that for many of those experiencing hazing, the event is just another in a long line of other ritualized forms of abuse which men accept in their development.

But the ways boys learn to relate to other men and women is not only through their peer interactions. Parents also play an important role in socializing the boy and teaching him how to relate to other men and women. In a study of 195, mostly White college men, significant gender role conflicts in early life with the parents framed the perception of women as "demeaning and as usurping their independence and sense of

competence" (Fischer & Good, 1998, p. 350). Conflicts with parents were also related to an over concern with appearing masculine, being sexually virile, having good athletic abilities, and an ability to consume alcohol (Fischer & Good, 1998). It may be that an unstable or conflicted environment where the boy is unable to feel a secure attachment with the parental figures is related to less sophisticated ways of relating to others (Malmquist, 1985). That is, traditional notions of men and women's gender roles may be related to not feeling secure about oneself and the way one will interact with others. Yet, while both parents serve an important role in socializing the boy, the father may play the crucial role in the way a boy understands his masculinity.

The Father

When discussions of fatherhood take place, it is usually about the missing father (Brownstein, 1999). It is about missing fathers because of the potential impact fatherlessness has on the developing self-image of the child, especially a male child (Balcom, 1998; Combs & Heger, 1996). For those boys whose father's are absent, a masculine over-compensation (i.e., hypermasculine) may arise from an insecure identification with the father (Malmquist, 1985). Studies of children without fathers reveal that they have difficulty in forming intimate attachments with others, recognizing their feelings, and being affectionate and expressive around intimate others (Balcom, 1998). Boys without fathers often experience anger, sadness, loneliness, and feelings of alienation that may manifest as aggression, silence, over-activity, and substance abuse (Combs & Heger, 1996). Most problematic of all is the

probability that these boys will also create families without fathers (Brownstein, 1999). Consequently, a vicious cycle develops wherein fatherless children develop emotional and interpersonal problems that work to recreate their same fatherless environment for their children.

For those boys who are able to have prolonged and intimate contact with their fathers, they may perhaps, learn what it means to be a "man" in American society. Among these boys, they may learn from their fathers how to manage one's emotions, deal with conflict, and relate to work (Pollack, 1998a). Regarded as one of the most important elements in a boy's life, the relationship with the father sets into motion the future relationships the boy will have with women, himself, and other men (Fischer & Good, 1998). However, this ideal is premised on fathers being able and willing to engage their children. Because, even though the role of the father is crucial, some fathers believe they are at a disadvantage to the mothers since they are not equipped with the necessary tools to be "responsive to [his]son's emotional needs" (Mooney, 1998, p. 77). The reality is that parenting roles are interchangeable, and the most important facet of children's lives is to have "at least one responsible, caretaking adult who has a positive emotional connection to them and with whom they have a consistent relationship" (Silverstein & Auerbach, 1999, p. 397-398).

For these boys who must deal with an absent or an inattentive father, manhood is marked with a "father wound or father hunger" (Mooney, 1998, p. 78). This father wound and hunger reflects the void they feel as a consequence of not receiving the

needed love and affection from their fathers (Mooney, 1998). Hence, men who persist

with the father wound or hunger will constantly seek ways to fulfill that void

(Mooney, 1998). This may come from behaving in hypermasculine ways (e.g., overly

aggressive), from overwork, or from being sexually promiscuous (Mooney, 1998).

However, the void may still persist, and for many men, this sense of emptiness results

in feelings of alienation or depression.

Depression and Suicide

Depression, to varying extents, seems to mark the lives of men.

Problematically, men may not see themselves as depressed since this is incongruent

with the male self-sufficient image, and they may be unable to identify their own

depression (Pollack, 1998b). Because men do not see themselves as depressed,

depression often goes under-reported and under-treated (Pollack & Levant, 1998). For

those men who come to counseling, depression is difficult to detect since men usually

guard their emotional expressions and vacillations (Pollack, 1998b).

However, one way to detect depression may be through understanding a man's gender

role conflict (Heesacker & Prichard, 1992). In a study of 139, mostly White (84%)

men in two university counseling centers, gender role conflict was associated with

depression, interpersonal problems, and psychological distress (Good et al., 1996).

Thus, if counselors are able to conceptualize the affective experience of men through

gender role conflict, clinicians may provide avenues to approach and deal with men's

depression.

Unfortunately, when men feel depressed and do not seek out help, their inability to effectively cope with their feelings may lead to deadly consequences. Thus, while depression goes under-reported and under-treated among men, men have no problem carrying out one consequence of their depression which is suicide (Krugman, 1998; Pollack, 1998). Suicide becomes an option when men feel the shame arising from the toxic effects of the normative masculine expectations (Krugman, 1998), or when they believe gender role changes leave them without any position and clear role (Clarity, 1999). In one case, a Korean American man working in a Japanese run business faced constant slurs, discrimination, and prejudice because of his ethnicity (Kang, 2000b). The animosity between the Korean American and his Japanese employers also included sexist jokes about his wife. Eventually, because of the shame he felt for not being able to defend his wife and not being able to be a good provider, the Korean American man chose suicide rather than living in shame (Kang, 2000b). Thus, suicide may represent the "final face-saving defense against the shame of failing to live up to one's perfectionistic ideals" (Pollack, 1998, p. 159). But how do men experience shame as a function of their masculinity, and why would shame be such a powerful affective experience for some men?

Shame

Shame is an important element, not only in men's psychology but also in Asian American mental health. Within the men's literature, shame is elicited from not being able to meet the male role expectations and is used to "coerce men into stereotyped

gender behavior" (Krugman, 1995, p. 93). Men who do not meet these demands typically are plagued with feelings of "inadequacy and inferiority, of emotional neediness and insecurity" (Krugman, 1995, p. 93). For many men of color, shame arising from their inability to meet the male role expectations, is compounded by the effects of racism and discrimination (Krugman, 1995).

Theoretically, shame is a painful self-awareness arising from a feeling that the individual has failed to live up to some external ideal (Krugman, 1995; Tangney, 1990, 1995). Shame manifests as (a) an autonomic arousal (e.g., blushing, sweating), (b) a negative self-appraisal that results in lowered self-esteem, or (c) a heightened self-consciousness (Krugman, 1995, p. 96). Guilt on the other hand seems to elicit less autonomic responses and is connected to a specific action rather than a self-disposition (Tangney, 1990, 1995). In other words, guilt seems to be a recognition that "I did something wrong" (i.e., an act), where as, shame is a sense that "I am wrong" (i.e., the individual). The recognition that one is inherently bad elicits the feeling of needing to hide.

Shame experiences are so significant that they are rated as more intense than guilt experiences (Tangney, 1995). Sometimes, when the shame is too overwhelming, these negative feelings need to be compartmentalized to effectively cope with them (i.e., split-off from the individual) (Krugman, 1995). Thus, while people are likely to confess their guilty feelings, they are likely to hide from their shame (Krugman, 1995). It is important to note however, these two constructs are not orthogonal, and

can co-occur within the same event. A discussion of the two constructs as seemingly separate phenomena are to illustrate the depth of feelings each triggers, and the extent to which people maneuver to cope with these feelings.

The concept of shame is especially important within the Asian American community since it may be used to keep people from deviating from the cultural norm (Szeto-Wong, 1997). One particular form of shame has been speculated to exist within the Asian American community: Transfer shame. Transfer shame is the feeling of shame that an Asian American individual may get for others close to them (Szeto-Wong, 1997). That is, among Asian Americans, shaming behavior from a person who is relationally close to the Asian American observer, is likely to be vicariously experienced as shame by the Asian American observer. One may posit that, growing up in a community that values a collectivistic identity renders the Asian American individual prone to feel transfer shame (Szeto-Wong, 1997). Results from an Asian American and White American sample showed that, not only were Asian Americans more prone to shame than guilt when compared to the White sample, but they also reported greater levels of transfer shame than the White sample (Szeto-Wong, 1997). Higher acculturation was also shown to be related to higher scores on shame, but not transfer shame (Szeto-Wong, 1997). The implications from these results are that, if shame can lead to depression and other negative emotional experiences, then among Asian Americans, shame-inducing events can be triggered from peer, parental, or other significant relationships. In counseling, this would mean that, for Asian

Americans experiencing shame and depression, speaking of the actions from another is congruent with their shame experience and not about being psychologically defensive or interpersonally deflective. Thus, it is imperative that the counselor considers culture in the conceptualization of Asian American men.

<u>Cultural Considerations When Counseling Asian American Men</u>

In counseling, it is important to remember the cultural context of masculinity (Nhge & Mahalik, 1998). Nghe and Mahalik (1998) note, for example, that emotional restraint is a valued behavior in Asian societies, and rather than being a dysfunctional affective style, emotional restraint serves to preserve the much-valued harmony in interpersonal relationships. Emotional restraint often translates into a perceived "silence," which is judged to be non-dominant and a dysfunctional passive voice (Cheung, 1993). However, silence can be interpreted as a legitimate type of "voice" and agency among Asian Americans (Cheung, 1993) that is consonant with cultural values (Nhge & Mahalik, 1998).

The cultural values of Asian Americans may be traced to the parents who are the main socializing agent of these values (Gecas, 1992; E. Lee, 1996; Serafica, 1992; Sue, 1989). The values and behaviors typically associated with Asian Americans include (a) collectivism or being group oriented (Gudykunst et al., 1992), (b) deference to authority (Sue, 1989), and (c) keeping family conflicts within the family (Sue, 1989). Along with cultural values, acculturation is another salient issue in Asian Americans lives and the way they approach mental health services (Atkinson et al.,

1993; Kohatsu, 1992; Sodowsky, Lai, & Plake, 1991). For instance, Sodowsky et al. (1991) found that Asian Americans who tended to be highly acculturated to the dominant society also had more positive perceptions about counseling.

To many Asian Americans, the use of mental health services is stigmatizing (Root, 1993) and contributes to their underuse of mental health services (Uba, 1994). If an Asian American does seek counseling, it is likely that the individual will present with educational/vocational issues versus emotional/social issues (Sue & Sue, 1990). It has been argued that seeking treatment under the guise of educational/vocational issues (e.g., practical) is less stigmatizing than seeking counseling for emotional/social issues (e.g., intrapsychic) (Tracey, Leong, & Glidden, 1986). Other benefits of seeking vocational counseling is its structured nature, which helps to alleviate anxiety that may arise from the perceived non-structured social/emotional counseling, and a sense that vocational counseling is more practical than emotional/social counseling (Atkinson & Matsushita, 1991).

Counselors need to be aware of the cultural context of Asian American clients since the context may affect how the Asian American clients are perceived in counseling. Sex role socialization, for instance, among Asian American men may also mean a whole host of issues such as restricted emotions, difficulty in acculturation (Brandon, 1991), and presenting as passive, introverted, and self-restrained (Sue, 1990). These behaviors, along with being less self-assertive and a tendency toward deferring to authority figures, are culturally consonant acts (Sue, 1990), that if not

taken in cultural context, may leave the Asian American man look seemingly dysfunctional (Zane, Sue, Hu, & Kwon, 1991). Taking these cultural considerations into account when doing therapy means that the counselor is effective and is able to intervene in culturally congruent ways (Sue, 1990, 1996).

Asian American Gay Men

Another cultural consideration, and one of the ways that the Asian American group varies from within, is through sexual orientation. Counseling gay Asian American men needs to be approached carefully, however, there seems to be little literature in the area. In one study, C.S. Chan (1989) studied gay and lesbian Asian Americans and focused on the development of identity. Her study found that many participants did identify with the "gay" and "lesbian" identity, which may not be too surprising since she surveyed those at gay and lesbian events (e.g., retreats and film showings) (C.S. Chan, 1989). The study did not reveal the often tumultuous coming out process for gay Asian American men, the threats of "disownment" from the family, or the life lived in secrecy (Hom, 1996; E.L.H. Lee, 1996; Wat, 1996). The study peripherally acknowledged the hostility toward "homosexuality" in the Asian American community that is derived from the strong patriarchal system that governs many families (Sue, 1990). Homosexuality, for Asian Americans, is not only a threat to patriarchy, but also symbolizes the possible dissolution of their family lineage. Counselors should be aware of these cultural issues when working with Asian American gay men.

The importance of understanding homosexuality in the therapy setting extends beyond just Asian Americans and clients, however. For male clinicians who are unaware of their "issues" with gay clients, therapy may not be successful. One study investigating the biases of clinicians used the GRCS and focused on the gender roles exhibited by clients in a clinical vignette (Wisch & Mahalik, 1999). The investigators looked at the clinical judgements of clinicians in relation to areas of gender role conflicts. Results show that gender role conflict and certain emotional expressions (i.e., sad, angry, or restrained) combined with certain gender roles (i.e., homosexual or heterosexual) are related to the clinician's tendency to either over-pathologize or under-pathologize (Wisch & Mahalik, 1999). The study pointed out the need for clinicians to be aware of their gender role conflicts. They found angry homosexuals were over-pathologized by clinicians who scored high in gender role conflict, and sad homosexuals were under-pathologized by clinicians who scored low in gender role conflict (Wisch & Mahalik, 1999). Thus, effective counseling implies that the counselor is also aware of his homophobia and how that may manifest.

Summary

In counseling men, it is imperative that the clinician understands men's resistance to counseling. Based on the literature, the resistance to counseling is a common issue regardless of culture or race. Therapy often is seen as anathema to a man's self-image since asking for help also implies that the man is weak. Additionally, counseling may make men feel vulnerable and exposing feelings that

they have worked diligently to suppress. The only affect that counselors may encounter readily is anger. Typically socialized to suppress any emotion except anger, men learn quickly that expression of emotions is a feminine quality. From fathers, parents, and peers, boys and men quickly understand what is acceptable in the masculine norm. Yet, in living up to the expectations of the masculine norm, men often feel alienated and marginalized. These feelings of isolation may result in depression, and if left untreated, suicidal behavior.

In treatment, men, regardless of culture or race, have difficulty accessing their emotions since. Difficulty accessing feelings may be attributed to the fear feelings are associated with femininity, but also that feelings, especially those of vulnerability, are shameful. Growing up, boys learn that feelings are to be instrumental (e.g., action empathy and sexuality) or to be hidden. This is especially true of fatherless men who believe that a rigid dichotomy is the best way to deal with feelings even if this strategy leaves men feeling depressed and anxious. For men who have not had the benefit of role modeling by their fathers, emotions can seem overwhelming and frightening. Thus, denial of their feelings is easier to accept than struggling with their feelings alone.

Even though many men share similar characteristics, working with certain men means that the clinician needs to be cognizant of these various issues. To name a few, race, racism, class, and sexual orientation, are salient identities that help shape the man's interpretation of masculinity. For some men, these issues of race and racism

are much more salient than for others. For instance, many men of color are socialized into particular cultural notions of masculinity that are sometimes congruent with the dominant groups' masculinity, and at other times, are in opposition. The clinician must not only be aware of how these cultural contexts are related to masculinity for the client, but also be aware of his or her own biases in working with diverse populations. Effective therapeutic experiences result from the interaction of these multiple considerations. Unfortunately, there seems to be little empirical literature that investigates the lives of men of color, especially Asian American men, and little literature that ties research to counseling. Thus, while clinicians are admonished to be cognizant of culture and race in the lives of men of color, service providers may have little to reference. Therefore, it is imperative that more research be conducted on the lives of men of color and to tie this research into practical considerations for service providers (Stillson et al., 1991).

## Racial Identity

Much of the discussion so far has focused on the need to consider race and racism when discussing issues of masculinity among Asian American men. What seems to be evident is the many ways masculinity has been conceptualized and the problematics around thinking about masculinity as a singular construct. The same can be said about race and the way race has been studied in psychology (Yee et al., 1993). Race and racial attitudes are not static, but change over time (Thornton & Taylor, 1988). Gotunda (1991) proposed that race has served as a proxy for (a) political and

economic socialization patterns, (b) different cultural values, and (c) psychological characteristics inferred from physical characteristics. With all the confusion over race, the one constant seems to be that race is a social construction that is contingent upon, and defined by, specific sociohistorical moments (Helms, 1995; Omi & Winant, 1994; Pope-Davis & Liu, 1998). Thus, the assessment of racial identity is seen as contextual (state versus trait), or a fluid sense of self that is contingent upon a number of factors and environment (Frable, 1997; Lemon & Waehler, 1996).

In examining race as a social construction and as an intra-psychic phenomena, racial identity theories seem to best account for the fluidity and within group differences of race among a particular group of people. Racial identity theories were originally developed to explain the manner in which African Americans dealt with issues of racism (Helms, 1990). The pervasive effect of race and racism on the lives of African Americans (Klonoff & Landrine, 1999) was also assumed to be the case for other people of color. Cross' (1971) original theory has been expanded to include other minority groups through such theories as the Minority Identity Development Model (Atkinson et al., 1993).

Research on Asian Americans and their experiences with race and racism has also evolved through the introduction of the racial identity paradigm. Precursors to the study of Asian Americans' racial identity have typically been predicated on typology models rather than racial identity models (Kohatsu, 1992). These typology models usually assume specific attitudes, behaviors, and values according to the type.

The following are a number of different Asian American typologies that serve as the foundation to investigating Asian American racial identity.

Typology Models

Model of Chinese American Personality. This typology theory, advanced by Sue and Sue (1971), posited three types of personalities. First, the traditionalist is someone who subscribes strongly to Chinese values and behaviors (e.g., filial piety, harmony in relationships). Guilt is a typical consequence of not being able to fulfill one's duty and responsibilities. Racism and discrimination are not dealt with well, and failures are attributed to the White society and the self. The second type is the marginal man. This individual identifies strongly with the White culture, eschews Chinese culture, and as a result, is caught in between two cultures. Failures in achieving parity in the White culture leads to self-hate and denigration. And finally, the third type is the Asian American. The Asian American is defined by his/her ability to incorporate both cultures to construct a new sense of self. The ideal result from this type is the bicultural individual.

Concerns about this model are its limited validity and generalizability because of its focus on negative consequences. While attempting to explain the responses to racism, the theory does not illuminate the ways in which people develop these personality types. Another shortcoming of this theory is its apparent lack of empirical support to evince these types (Kohatsu, 1992).

Model of Japanese American Ethnic Identity. Kitano (1982) developed a four-type model of Japanese American identity development. The premise of the theory was posited upon choices that Japanese Americans make in their identification to Japanese and/or White culture. The result is a matrix that reflects the four consequences.

The first cell represents a positive-positive identification with Japanese and White cultures. There are no conflicts, and this cell reflects the healthiest of identifications. The second cell represents a rejection of White culture and a strong adherence to Japanese culture. In this cell, there is a role conflict that arises as the Japanese American person seeks solace in their ethnic community. The third cell reflects a rejection of Japanese culture and a strong adherence to White culture. In this cell, the individual seeks acceptance in the White culture while rejecting, and at times, denigrating Japanese culture. Finally, the fourth cell represents a rejection of both cultures. It is likely that there are multiple role conflicts and attempts to develop an identity outside of their ethnicity and race.

Similar to the Sue and Sue (1971) model, the Kitano (1982) model has limited generalizability and validity due to a lack of empirical testing (Kohatsu, 1992). Since this is a typology model, it is unclear as to how the individual moves between types. Finally, typology models are problematic since they do not account for deviations within the type (i.e., within group differences).

F. Lee's Model of Ethnic Identity. F. Lee (1991) attempted to integrate both Sue and Sue (1971) and Kitano's (1982) model into a new configuration. This new configuration would try to explain the cognitive, affective, and behavioral aspects that earlier models did not. Moreover, this new configuration contended that affiliation with the White and Asian culture could exist independent of each other. In effect, these new dimensions of identity were orthogonal structures that had both negative and positive identifications within each. As a result, there appeared to be four types in F. Lee's (1991) model.

The first is the Asian identified person who subscribes to Asian cultural norms and believes in the superiority of Asian culture over White. The second identity is the American identity, which infers that the individual values White culture over Asian, and seeks acceptance in the White culture through acculturation and assimilation. The third is the Asian American identity which describes someone who values both cultures equally. Finally, the fourth identity is the Ambiguous identity, or someone who is confused about their identification with either culture, and is characterized by isolation from both cultures.

F. Lee's (1991) model uses a continuum that attempts to move away from the problems inherent in typology models. Change occurs from environmental and psychological triggers that may be idiosyncratic. The problem with F. Lee's (1991) model is that people's position within each type is not fully explained. Kohatsu (1992) critiqued F. Lee's (1991) model for not explaining the possibility of people

having neutral feelings for either culture, and that F. Lee's model seems more akin to acculturation than identity models.

Stage Models

The early models exemplified epigenetic-like models. That is, the models posited stages that corresponded with certain developmental level (i.e., cognitive processing capacity). Each stage represents a higher order of processing (Helms, 1990), but as each person moves through the stages, progress is not always linear. Re-theorizing about the significance of one stage representing the racial identity attitude of the individual, theorists (Helms, 1990) have offered the possibility that people may reflect different stages simultaneously, but to different degrees (Kohatsu, 1992). Thus, all stages are represented within the individual, but at any given time, one stage is prominent while the others are in an auxiliary position (Helms, 1995).

To explain the racial identity development of Asian Americans, there have been several models proposed (Atkinson et al., 1993; Helms, 1995; J. Kim, 1981; S.R. Lee, 1988; Sue & Sue, 1990). Of these, Helms' (1995) People of Color (POC) racial identity model is used for this study. A brief overview of two models specifically addressing Asian American racial identity development will be provided before explaining the Minority Identity Development (MID) and POC theories.

J. Kim (1981) Model

J. Kim's (1981) model consists of four stages including (a) Ethnic Awareness, (b) White identification, (c) Awakening to socio-political consciousness, and (d)

Redirection to Asian American consciousness. Kohatsu (1992) notes that J. Kim's model is distinct from other racial identity models because it posits an ethnic awareness as the first step toward racial awakening rather than denial or unawareness of race at the first stage. Thus, the Asian American in this model reacts first to his/her ethnicity rather than White society (Kohatsu, 1992).

S. R. Lee (1988) Model

Kohatsu (1992) notes that this model attempts to address racial identity and acculturation simultaneously. S. R. Lee's (1988) model has four stages including (a) Ethnic identification, (b) Marginal, (c) Social-Political activism, and (d) Integration. While coping with racism is not explicitly emphasized, the stage of social-political activism does reflect behaviors, attitudes, and affect of someone working against racism or some kind of oppression. Kohatsu's (1992) review of S. R. Lee's (1988) model mentions that this stage of social-political activism did not "appear to be a salient and/or viable identity choice to the participants" (p. 23-24).

Atkinson et al.'s (1993) Minority Identity Development (MID) Theory

Theoretically similar to previous stage models, Atkinson et al.'s (1993) MID and Helms' (1995) POC models attempt to explain how racial minorities in the U.S. deal with race and racism. Extending the work of Cross (1971), the models have five stages from which people think about, feel, and act toward racism in their lives. The major difference between Atkinson et al.'s (1993) and Helms' (1995) POC model is the use of status in Helms' model. Helms (1995) elects to describe her model as

statuses because she believes each domain is permeable and fluid, rather than static and rigid as described in stage models. A more fluid definition of the theory allows the possibility that different statuses could be reflected simultaneously within the individual (Helms, 1995).

The first status is Conformity. In this status, the person idealizes the values, beliefs, and culture of the White dominant society and denigrates his/her own race and culture (Atkinson et al., 1993; Helms, 1990, 1995). The internalization of racism and racial hatred into the lives of the racial minority manifests as hatred and negative attitudes toward others of his/her same race and culture. Typically, a person in this status believes he/she enjoys the advantages of being in the White group. This individual is also likely to act negatively toward other racial minorities.

The second status is Dissonance. In this status, the person struggles with conflicting attitudes toward the White and minority groups. Encountering an experience or information that changes his/her perception (i.e., positive toward minority group and negative toward White group), this individual is coming to terms with race and racism in his/her life. The previously held beliefs (i.e., stereotypes) of minorities are questioned as well as their affiliation toward the White dominant group.

The third status represents two interdependent processes. Resistance and Immersion represent the individual's attempt to fully plumb the effects of racism in his/her life. Consequently, the reaction typically exemplified in this status is anger and hostility toward those of the White group. Guilt, anger, and shame are salient

effects in this status. In an effort to purge "Whiteness" and racism from his/her life, the cognitive stance usually positions anything connected to Whiteness as evil and bad, while anything of the minority culture is good and true.

The fourth status is Introspection. This status reflects the minority individual's attempt to be introspective over the choices he/she has previously made. With the amount of incongruent information and feelings of conflict in his/her life, the individual is attempting to mete out a sense of consistency, such that aspects of the dominant (i.e., White) culture are allowed examination for its positive aspects. Again, a sense of confusion may pervade the individuals as he/she struggles with feelings of affiliation and allegiance to minority and dominant values. There is a burgeoning understanding that a dichotomous worldview that posits minority culture as all "good" and White culture as all "bad" is too simplistic.

The final status is Synergetic Articulation and Awareness (Atkinson et al., 1993). The principle motivation in this status is the work against racism. At this point, the individual is supposed to have a better sense of self and no need to denigrate any group, individual, or culture. Ideally, the multicultural person is reflected in this status.

Racial identity has been studied in several studies. Morten and Atkinson (1983) assessed 169 African Americans on their preferences for a counselor's race. The results showed that those in Resistance and Immersion preferred racially similar counselors while those in Synergetic Articulation and Awareness did not.

Problematically though, this study only employed these two statuses and did not investigate other statuses, so it is unknown how preference for counselor race would have varied according to racial identity.

In another study on racial identity, Kohatsu (1992) used the Cultural Identity Attitudes Scale (Helms & Carter, 1990) among 267 Asian American college students. Results of a multiple regression showed that racial identity was able to predict anxiety, assertiveness, and awareness of interpersonal and political racism. The regression analyses showed that racial identity was able to explain personal and ascribed identity more than acculturation. Kohatsu (1992) also found that Asian American men tended to be more aware of racism than women. In post hoc analyses, Kohatsu discovered that Vietnamese men, specifically, were more aware of racism than Korean, Chinese, and Japanese females (Kohatsu, 1992). A possible intrapsychic explanation for this result may be the differences in acculturation among the various groups with Vietnamese participants having lower levels of acculturation when compared to Chinese, Japanese, or Korean participants. Because of their lower levels of acculturation, they may have also experienced prejudice and discrimination from Chinese, Japanese, and Korean peers who were more highly acculturated and are disparaging of those less acculturated. Kohatsu (1992) believes that the use of racial identity to research the Asian American population is warranted since acculturation does not explicitly address issues of race and racism in the lives of Asian Americans.

Toya (1996) also used the People of Color Racial Identity Attitudes Scale (Helms, 1995) among a sample of 125 Asian American students at a large East coast public university to study career attitudes. Results from his study showed that Asian American students who had traditional career choices tended also to score high in Resistance and Immersion. Additional analyses showed no correlation between career aspirations and ethnicity, sex, generation, or career certainty (Toya, 1996). Results seem to suggest that ethnocentrism may mean that the individual is likely to adhere to parental or familial pressures toward traditional careers (e.g., engineering and medicine).

Summary

A need to understand the role of race, racism, and internalized racism in the lives of people of color (Helms & Cook, 1990) built the foundation for the development of racial identity models (e.g., Cross, 1971). Cross' (1971) model of racial identity was a paradigm shift from the previous typology models because these earlier models were unable to describe the fluid process of identification and the triggers that created transitions among the types.

As a way to capture the dynamism of race in peoples' lives, racial identity theory seemed like a radical shift from typologies. In developing and refining racial identity theory, Helms (1990) and Atkinson et al. (1993) provide us with an operational model of racial identity that could be used with any person of color population. It was their (Atkinson et al., 1993; Helms,1990) premise that the stages are

fluid dimensions of racial identification that, at any given time, could change according to the situation. This fluidity allowed researchers to investigate possible triggers that move people from status to status. Previous studies have shown the viability of such instruments to measure the experience of non-Whites with racism and how their coping is related to their identification with their racial group.

Racial identity theory also allowed researchers and clinicians an understanding of how people cope with racism (Helms & Cook, 1999). Some people choose to defend against it or vigilantly fight against racism. Others may find themselves internalizing the racist beliefs as a means of coping. In either case, the manner in which racist and other oppressive beliefs are inculcated and expressed is an important reflection of the individual's experience of racism and oppression. The assessment of racial identity is one means of understanding these conflicts, while another way of assessing these internalized beliefs is through a measure of prejudicial beliefs. This study employs both assessments in order to investigate the subtle racist and sexist beliefs that people may harbor.

Prejudicial Attitudes

One of the deleterious effects of living in an environment that is laden with prejudicial attitudes, is the possible inculcation of these prejudiced beliefs (i.e., internalized racism) (Helms & Cook, 1999). For Asian American men who live in a culture that seems to consistently denigrate their race and masculinity, some men may opt to introject these attitudes rather than fight against them. Thus, in some Asian

American men, there may be a relationship between one's racial identification and different levels of prejudicial beliefs (Ponterotto & Pedersen, 1993).

In one study that tested this hypothesis among 289 Asian American college students, researchers found that different levels of prejudicial beliefs varied according to gender and acculturation (Liu et al., 1999). The researchers assessed the prejudicial attitudes using the Quick Discrimination Index (QDI) (Ponterotto et al., 1995), and acculturation using the Asian and Anglo Acculturation Scale (Kohatsu, 1992) and the Suinn-Lew Asian Self-Identity Acculturation Scale (Suinn et al., 1987, 1992, 1995). Contrary to their initial hypothesis that acculturation into the dominant society would be related to higher prejudicial attitudes, results showed that Asian American college students who were highly acculturated and those who were Asian-Identified, tended to have lower prejudicial attitudes. Another significant finding was that men tended to have higher prejudicial attitudes than women regardless of the level of acculturation. Results point to the possibility that Asian American men have many issues that they have to contend with other than their racial identification or cultural affiliation.

Another potential benefit from understanding the role of subtle prejudicial and discriminatory beliefs and attitudes is understanding the potential "hegemonic" bargains and compromises that Asian American men make. That is, in an effort to secure a semblance of being "mainstream" or part of the "normal" group, Asian American men may harbor certain homophobic and sexist beliefs to fit in. One may see this as another interpretation of "internalized racism and oppression," but these

discriminatory attitudes may also function as a coping mechanism that functions, not

on self-hate, but on negative attitudes and beliefs about others, regardless of race.

Thus, if Asian American men experience racism and marginalization due to their race,

they can always identify with the dominant group through objectification or

denigration of women and homosexuals.

Thus, Asian American men may be struggling with multiple issues in their

lives that constrain their capacity to value diversity in their own lives. The Liu et al.

(1999) study was descriptive in its analysis and did not investigate the possible

predictors of these prejudicial beliefs (e.g., racial identity, class orientation, and

masculine conflicts). Hence, future research needs to further examine how prejudicial

beliefs function in the lives of men of color.

<p style="text-align:center">Summary of Literature Reviewed</p>

From the outset in America, it seems that much of the gender and racial ideals

were established around the White middle-class male. Codification of this standard

was easily legislated since those in control mirrored the prototypical standard.

Immigration exclusion, labor exploitation, and anti-miscegenation laws worked in

concert to reinforce the marginal status of not only Asian American men, but of any

man of color, gay man, or lower-class man. Economic, political, and sexual privilege,

were reserved for those who reflected the masculine norm. All others were relegated

to the peripheries of society, and any violation of their position was typically met with

Typically, when it came to feelings, anger seems the most accessible. In American society, anger is one affect that is perceived as natural and normative for men to express. All other feelings are to be suppressed since any other affect is believed to be of little instrumental value to men. Consequently, many of the feelings that men may have are never defined and nurtured, and as a result, many men lose touch with their ability to detect and articulate feelings (e.g., alexithymia). As men lose touch with their feelings, their ability to connect interpersonally with others becomes strained. Typically, if men are able to relate to those around him, emotions are used to control (e.g., sexual feelings or action empathy) rather than relate.

Yet, the potential to arrest emotional restrictiveness is possible if the caretakers of boys (i.e., fathers) could model emotional expression and positive relationships. Unfortunately, it seems that many boys grow up in an environment that is either fatherless, or with a father who tends to reinforce traditional notions of masculinity and emotional expression. Outside the home, boys are further reinforced by their peer interactions and learn quickly that non-compliance to these masculine expectations are unacceptable and an invitation for aggression. Sometimes, for men who attempt to cope with the tensions of being a masculine exemplar, the tension becomes too great and depression sets in. Unable to navigate out of these pressures, some men may even opt for suicide rather than live in shame of not being seen as a man in society.

Oddly, for some men of color, not being seen as a man in American society seems to be the experience that marks their lives. This sense of marginalization from

masculinity has been argued as the foundation from which Asian American men construct their sense of self. Yet, the current masculinity theories seem to be missing a thorough examination of race and gender intersecting. Hence, the current method of understanding such an intersecting experience is through the use of multiple instruments and theories.

One theory used along with the masculinity theories is that of racial identity. Racial identity is being used to examine the experience that Asian American men have with race and racism. Acculturation theory was not chosen because it does not explicitly target race and racism for examination. Acculturation theory also does not allow one to inspect the within group variation that occurs within a given community. Racial identity, on the other hand, posits various statuses that try to account for how a man identifies race and racism in his life, how he sees himself as a racialized being, and how he interacts with others from another minority group and those from the dominant group. The use of the racial identity theory is a means to understand how one group of men of color experience themselves as racialized and gendered "others" in American society.

Since race and gender are inscribed upon the lives of Asian American men, various ways of coping with these ascriptions develop. For some men, repudiation of oppression in every facet they can plumb is a reasonable way to fashion themselves as men of color. Yet for other men, some oppressions are accepted while others are rejected. In the eyes of some men of color, in this case Asian American men, some

oppressions are obvious (e.g., racism) while others provide them a semblance of masculine acceptance and control in their environment (e.g., sexism). In other cases, some oppressions are reasonable to maintain since it legitimates their sense of masculinity to the exclusion of others (e.g., homophobia). These internalized oppressions (i.e., prejudices) are an important dimension to examine since masculine behaviors and attitudes are not always consonant with each other. Thus, to understand the experiences of Asian American men, it is not only important to measure masculinity, but also their sense of being a racialized "other," and the prejudicial attitudes they struggle with as they construct a sense of self in a society that constantly seeks to marginalize them.

Hence, this study examines these three elements: masculinity, racial identity, and prejudicial attitudes. The intent of the study is to investigate the various ways masculine attitudes and gender role conflict are affected by the varying statuses of racial identity. Moreover, the study examines the role prejudicial attitudes play in the lives of men who are trying to understand themselves as racial and gendered people.

CHAPTER III

Method

Participants

A total of 500 surveys were distributed. 336 surveys were returned and 323 surveys were usable. Seven surveys were not filled in correctly and women filled in the other six surveys. The overall return rate for this study was 65%. The participants were recruited from four different higher educational institutions. Participants were from a large East Coast public university ($n = 167$); a small West Coast community college ($n = 21$); a medium sized public West Coast university ($n = 120$); and a medium-sized private, West Coast university ($n = 15$). Participants were recruited from introductory psychology courses (west coast), Asian American studies courses (east coast), fraternity meetings (west coast), and a fraternity alumni e-mail list. There were ($n = 167$) participants from an introductory Asian American studies course at the East Coast university. A snow-ball sampling procedure was used with the participants in this course and from the seventy-five students enrolled, 167 surveys were returned. There were 35 students enrolled in an introductory to psychology course on a small West Coast community college, and ($n = 21$) participated for a response rate of 60%. One hundred out of 102 members of an Asian American fraternity at a public institution participated for a response rate of 98%. An Asian American fraternity at a private institution was also sampled. From the 45 members, ($n = 15$) participated for a response rate of 27%. Finally, alumni members of an Asian American fraternity were

contacted via an email list. Of the 103 members listed, $n = 32$ agreed to participate and ($n = 20$) returned surveys for a response rate of 19%.

The sample for this study had a mean age of 21.07 ($\underline{SD} = 4.09$). Of the participants, 86 were freshmen, 73 sophomores, 69 juniors, 47 seniors, 15 graduate students, 24 were college graduates, and nine did not report any status. There was also a wide range of ethnicities reported. Chinese made up 33% ($n = 108$), Korean 23% ($n = 75$), Japanese 8% ($n = 26$), Filipinos 11% ($n = 34$), Vietnamese 5% ($n = 15$), Taiwanese 3% ($n = 10$), Asian Indians 3% ($n = 11$), Pakistani .9% ($n = 3$), Laotian .3% ($n = 1$), Thai .9% ($n = 3$), Hmong .3% ($n = 1$), and Mien .3% ($n = 1$). There were $n = 12$ bi-racial (White and Asian), $n = 1$ (Black and Asian), $n = 1$ (Latino and Asian), $n = 11$ mixed ethnicity (Asian and Asian) participants, and 2.2% ($n = 7$) did not report any ethnicity information.

In an effort to collapse the ethnicity data to make meaningful categories for analyses, the Office of Management and Budget's Revisions to the Standards for the Classification of Federal Data on Race and Ethnicity (Federal Register, 1997) were used as a guide. In the guide, the document refers to individuals from the "Far East" (p. 58786) to reflect Chinese, Korean, and Japanese persons. Those from the "Indian Subcontinent" or South Asia (p. 58786) are those peoples from India, Pakistan, and Sri Lanka, to name a few. People from "Southeast Asia" (p. 58786) are individuals from Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia, to name a few. Filipino individuals have been referred to as Pacific Islanders (Chan, 1991a), and in this study, was the only ethnicity that fell

into the "Pacific Islander" domain. Therefore, Filipinos in this study were construed to be a separate group. From these standards, seven categories were formed: Chinese ($\underline{n}$ = 118), Korean ($\underline{n}$ = 75), Japanese ($\underline{n}$ =26), Filipino ($\underline{n}$ =34), South Asian ($\underline{n}$ =15), Southeast Asian ($\underline{n}$ =23), and bi-racial and bi-ethnic ($\underline{n}$ =25). Seven individuals reported no ethnicity data. The mean age for the Chinese was 21.5 ($\underline{SD}$ = 4.7), Korean was 20.9 ($\underline{SD}$ = 4.4), Japanese was 20.3 ($\underline{SD}$ = 3.2), Filipino was 20.9 ($\underline{SD}$ = 2.4), South Asians was 21.6 ($\underline{SD}$ = 5), Southeast Asians was 20 ($\underline{SD}$ = 2.3), Bi-racials was 21.2 ($\underline{SD}$ = 3.7), and those reporting no ethnicity was 21 ($\underline{SD}$ = 1.1). For a full demographic description of the sample, see Appendix A.

Instruments

Demographic questionnaire. This form attempts to profile the participants in the study. Standard questions pertaining to age, class year, major, and ethnicity were asked. The form also asked participants to describe their current occupation, parent(s) occupation, political affiliation, and their experience with multicultural topics and courses. (See Appendix B).

People of Color Racial Identity Attitude Scale (POCRIAS) (Helms, 1995). The POCRIAS (Helms, 1995; Helms & Parham, 1984) is a 50-item inventory that measures four of the five statuses from Helms' (1995) racial identity theory. The POCRIAS is built upon the Atkinson et al. (1993) MID, as well as Cross' (1971) Nigrescence model. The POCRIAS was developed to assess the racial identity

attitudes of African, Asian, Latino, and Native Americans (Helms, 1995). (See Appendix C).

The four statuses measured are: Conformity, Dissonance, Resistance and Immersion, and Internalization. The instrument uses a five point Likert scale (1 = strongly disagree and 5 = strongly agree). To obtain subscale scores, items corresponding to each subscale are summed. Higher scores in each subscale indicate a strong attitude for each status.

Originally a 43-item measure, subsequent iterations of the POCRIAS resulted in a 35-item measure, and the current 50-item measure. Low reliabilities, or Cronbach alphas, among the initial 131 people of color participants prompted the researchers to reduce the scales in the measure from five to four (Helms & Carter, 1990). Reliabilities varied according to the racial group sampled. Among the 28 African Americans in the sample, the reliabilities ranged from .62 to .87; among the Asian, Latino, and Native American sample ($\underline{n}$ = 103), the reliabilities ranged from .72 to .82. Kohatsu's (1992) study among Asian Americans had the following Cronbach's alphas: .71 for Conformity; .76 for Dissonance; .74 for Resistance and Immersion; and .67 for Integrative Awareness. Toya (1996) used the POCRIAS among Asian Americans and found the following Cronbach's alphas: .70 for Conformity; .74 for Dissonance; .79 for Resistance and Immersion, and .77 for Internalization. Other research using the POCRIAS have found the following reliabilities for the instrument: .70 for Pre-Encounter, .33 for Encounter, .75 for Immersion/Emersion, and .48 for Internalization

2dd2d4d9e0c4d7c7

(Lemon & Waeher, 1996); .63 for Pre-Encounter, .37 for Encounter, .72 for Immersion/Emersion, and .37 for Internalization (Ponterotto & Wise, 1987). In this study, the Cronbach alphas were the following: .80 for the full-scale, .78 for Conformity, .72 for Dissonance, .75 for Immersion and Resistance, and .86 for Internalization.

Helms and Carter (1990) found for an African American sample, the Conformity and Dissonance statuses were significantly negatively related to Integrative Awareness. Among the Asian, Latino, and Native American sample, the Conformity, Dissonance, and Resistance/Immersion statues were all positively inter-related. Results from the Kohatsu (1992) study found that, among a sample of Asian Americans, Conformity was significantly correlated with Dissonance ($r = .49$), and significantly correlated with Integrative Awareness ($r = -.31$). Dissonance was significantly correlated with Resistance and Immersion ($r = .18$) and Integrative Awareness ($r = -.17$). Resistance and Immersion were also correlated with Conformity ($r = .13$), Dissonance ($r = .18$), and Integrative Awareness ($r = -.26$).

Wording on the POCRIAS was adapted to reflect the participant's race. Thus, wording generally referring to "race" was revised to read "Asian American."

Gender Role Conflict Scale (GRCS; O'Neil et al., 1986). The GRCS (O'Neil et al., 1986) is a 37-item instrument designed to assess dimensions of gender role conflict. Specifically, a "pattern of gender role-conflict is defined as a set of values, attitudes, or behaviors learned during socialization that causes negative psychological

effects on a person or on other people" (Stillson, O'Neil, & Owen, 1991, p. 460). The instrument uses a 6-point Likert scale (1 = strongly disagree to 6 = strongly agree). To obtain subscale scores, items corresponding to each subscale are summed and divided by the number of items in the subscale. To obtain a total score, the scores on the total number of items are summed and divided by 37. Higher scores indicate higher levels of gender-role conflict.

O'Neil et al. (1986) found in a common factor analysis, using oblique rotation, that there were four factors: Success, Power, and Competition (SPC); Restrictive Emotionality (RE); Restrictive Affectionate Behavior Between Men (RABBM); and Conflicts Between Work and Family Relations (CBWFR). For the first factor, SPC (13 items), success refers to a man's focus on wealth and accomplishments as a means of gaining self-worth; power implies the need for the man to have authority over another person; and competition refers to the man's need to "win" over another individual. The second factor, RE (10 items), is defined as a man's inability to express his emotions, while simultaneously denying others their right to emotions. The third factor, RABBM (8 items), refers to a man's difficulty (i.e., limited ways) of expressing intimacy, sexuality, and affection toward men and women. Finally, the fourth factor, CBWFR (6 items), refers to a man's inability to balance the demands of work and home (i.e., family). (See Appendix D)

The instrument had adequate internal consistency from .80 to .87 (Good et al., 1995; O'Neil et al., 1986). In the Good et al. (1996) study sampling 130 mostly

White men, the coefficient alphas were .92 for the total scale score, .88 for SPC, .89 for RE, .92 for RABBM, and .79 for CBWFR. Internal consistency estimates for each factor have ranged from .78 to .92, and test-retest reliabilities after four weeks have ranged from .72 to .86. Good and Mintz (1990) found internal consistency estimates for the GRCS ranging from .78 to .88. For this study, the reliabilities were for the full scale .90, for SPC .84, for RE .82, for RABBM .81, and for CBWFR .77.

The Male Role Norms Inventory (MRNI; Levant et al., 1992). The MRNI (See Appendix E) is a measure designed to assess the degree to which men adhere to culturally sanctioned norms for male behavior (e.g., traditional male behavior) (Levant & Fischer, 1996). The instrument is a 57-item measure that consists of eight subscales. Participants respond to a 7-point Likert scale (1 = Strongly Disagree to 7 = Strongly Agree). Higher scores indicate an endorsement of those subscales.

To obtain subscale scores, items for each subscale are first added and then the total is divided by the number of items per subscale. To obtain a total score on Traditionality, the raw scores along seven domains (excluding the subscale on Non-Traditional Attitudes Toward Masculinity) are summed and divided by 57. The subscales are: Avoidance of Femininity, Rejection of Homosexuals, Self-Reliance, Aggression, Achievement/Status, Attitudes Toward Sex, Restrictive Emotionality, and Non-Traditional Attitudes Toward Masculinity.

Studies using the MRNI have shown adequate reliability for the instrument. In the first study, 320 Caucasian and 371 African American men and women were given

the MRNI (Levant & Majors, 1996). Cronbach alphas were .76 for Avoidance of Femininity, .54 for Rejection of Homosexuals, .54 for Self-Reliance, .52 for Aggression, .67 for Achievement/Status, .69 for Attitudes Toward Sex, .75 for Restrictive Emotionality, .57 for Non-Traditional Attitudes Toward Masculinity, and .84 for the Total Scale.

The second study compared 399 Americans with 394 Chinese from the People's Republic of China (Levant et al., 1996). The Cronbach alphas for this study were: .82 for Avoidance of Femininity, .58 for Rejection of Homosexuals, .51 for Self-Reliance, .65 for Aggression, .69 for Achievement/Status, .81 for Attitudes Toward Sex, .81 for Restrictive Emotionality, .56 for Non-Traditional Attitudes Toward Masculinity, and .88 for the Total Scale. Cronbach alphas for the current study were the following: .89 for the MRNI full scale, .69 for Avoidance of Femininity, .45 for Rejection of Homosexuals, .73 for Self-Reliance, .65 for Aggression, .66 for Achievement/Status, .69 for Attitudes Toward Sex, .63 for Restrictive Emotionality, .59 for Non-Traditional Attitudes Toward Masculinity, and .91 for Traditional Attitudes.

The Quick Discrimination Index (QDI; Ponterotto et al., 1995). The QDI (See Appendix F) was designed to measure subtle racist and sexist attitudes. The instrument has 30-items that are answered on a five-point Likert scale (1 = Strongly Disagree and 5 = Strongly Agree). A total score is computed by summing the responses to each item. Scores can range from 30 to 150. Low scores are indicative of

low sensitivity to race and gender issues and reflect higher prejudicial attitudes. High scores are indicative of greater sensitivity to race and gender issues and reflect low prejudicial attitudes.

The QDI has three general factors that measure (a) cognitive attitudes toward diversity and multiculturalism, (b) affective attitudes about racial diversity in one's own life, and (c) attitudes about equality for women. Examples of items that reflect prejudicial attitudes are, "I am against affirmative action programs in business, and "In the past few years there has been too much attention directed towards multicultural or minority business issues." Examples of items that reflect less prejudicial attitudes are, "My friendship network is very racially mixed," and "I would feel okay about my son or daughter dating someone from a different race."

Ponterotto et al. (1995) report a Cronbach alpha of .88 for the full scale. Successful criterion-related validity studies have predicted different racial attitudes among various racial groups (Ponterotto et al., 1995; Ponterotto & Pedersen, 1993). The QDI has also been correlated with The New Racism Scale (Ponterotto et al., 1995). In a previous study using the QDI and the Suinn-Lew Asian Self Identity Acculturation Scale of acculturation on a sample of 289 Asian American college students, Liu et al. (1999) reported a Cronbach alpha of .82. For this study, the reliability for the QDI was .69.

Procedure

Participants who were solicited in the introductory psychology and Asian American studies courses were given extra credit for filling out the packet. In the Asian American studies course, non-Asian American males in the course were given surveys for Asian American male friends to fill out. Participants in the Asian American studies course were given extra credit for each survey they returned.

Each participant was given an informed consent form (Appendix G). They were informed, either verbally (when the surveys are administered in person) or in a cover letter (when the surveys are mailed), what informed consent was, and that they must sign the informed consent form when returning the survey (Appendix H). All participants who filled out the surveys were given a debriefing letter following the completion of the survey packet (Appendix I). The debriefing letter informed the participant of the true nature of the study. Those participants who were solicited by friends from the Asian American studies course were provided the debriefing form as an attachment to the survey. Those who were sent the surveys were given the debriefing form as part of the survey packet.

Credit for taking the survey was dependent upon the instructor. Other participants were solicited during campus organization/club meetings. Everyone who agreed to participate was entered into a drawing for a first prize of $50 and a second prize of $25 (Appendix J). Participants entered into the drawing by filling out the personal contact information on the consent form. Participants were informed by,

either the principal investigator or the course instructor, that it would take approximately 45 minutes to complete the survey packet. Also, the participants were informed that the consent forms were separated immediately after receiving the survey packet in order to insure confidentiality and anonymity of responses. Participants were also given the opportunity to receive results after the completion of the study (Appendix J).

Alumni members of a fraternal organization were solicited via email. Those agreeing to participate were sent survey packets with return envelopes to fill out. For those not returning the survey packets within a specified period of time (e.g., two weeks), a reminder post-card was sent (Appendix K).

The survey packet consisted of the informed consent form, the demographic questionnaire, the POCRIAS, GRCS, QDI, and the MRNI. The survey packets were counter-balanced. That is, the GRCS and MRNI were separated in all packets by at least one other survey to limit any kind of carry-over effect that may occur as a result of one instrument. The other measures were randomly distributed within the instrument packet.

Hypotheses and Data Analyses

Although masculinity issues in counseling are becoming an important consideration in practice (Levant & Pollack, 1998), what is known about masculinity among men of color is still limited (Cazenare, 1984; Conway-Long, 1994; Lazur & Majors, 1995; Kimmel, 1996; Stillson et al., 1991). What we do know about Asian

American men comes mostly from theoretical papers (e.g., D.W. Sue, 1990), and the empirical papers found (e.g., Kim et al., 1996; Levant et al., 1996) tended to only examine masculinity but not race and culture meaningfully (i.e., race and culture were used as categorical variables) (e.g., Levant et al., 1996). Typically, acculturation with gender role conflict was examined (Kim et al., 1996), or race and masculinity examined, but sometimes, validated masculinity measures were not used (e.g., Chua & Fujino, 1999). Missing was an understanding of the effects of race and racism upon the lives of Asian American men, and how racism affects gender role conflicts and masculine role subscription (e.g., Wade, 1996).

It was proposed that various racial identity statuses and prejudicial attitudes interact with gender role conflict and masculine role norm subscription. Wade's (1996) study hypothesized that if one's racial identity was externally defined (e.g., Conformity), one was likely to experience gender role conflict. In this study for instance, Conformity status individuals, because of a subscription to dominant (i.e., external) notions of race (i.e., color blindness or favoring Whiteness), may harbor dominant (i.e., White) notions of masculinity (Wade, 1996) as well as dominant notions of racial relationships and women's roles (as measured by the QDI). These dominant notions of masculinity, as measured by the MRNI, are things such as Avoiding all things Feminine, Rejection of Homosexuals, being Self-Reliant, focus on Achievement, and Restrictive Emotionality. Because of this speculated relationship between racial attitudes and subscription to male role norms, the Asian American man

may experience high levels of gender role conflict (as measured by the GRCS). These gender role conflict areas are Success, Power, and Competition (SPC), Restrictive Emotionality (RE), Restrictive Affectionate Behavior Between Men (RABBM), and Conflicts Between Work and Family Relations (CBWFR).

In the Dissonance Status, an Asian American man is likely to experience feelings of conflict about previously held beliefs on race and himself as a racial being. Because he starts to question his racially held beliefs, it may also be possible that he starts to question other attitudes in areas such as gender. Thus, several things may occur as a result of his feeling conflicted about issues of race. First, he may start to re-evaluate his beliefs about women's roles and his QDI score may be higher than in Conformity. Second, he may also reconsider what it means to be a man of color and his scores along the four dimensions of the GRCS and the seven dimensions of the MRNI may be lower than in the Conformity status. The one dimension of the MRNI, Non-Traditional Attitudes Toward Masculinity, may increase as he begins to re-evaluate issues of masculinity in his life.

In the Resistance and Immersion status, the individual experiences a period of ethnocentrism. In other words, the Asian American man begins to see the world as "anything White is wrong." In this status, the Asian American man may begin to become more active in challenging stereotypes of Asian American men, and the perceived negative images of Asian American men (e.g., J.W. Chan, 1998; J.P Chan et al., 1991). It may be possible that, because of a paucity of positive Asian American

men in his life, he may begin to subscribe to hyper-masculine notions of masculinity (e.g., Long, 1996; Mooney, 1998). Consequently, the Asian American man's attitudes toward women become more patriarchal, and he experiences more gender role conflict than in his Conformity status. This would lead to a lower score on the QDI. Furthermore, the Asian American man in the Resistance and Immersion status subscribes more heavily to the male role norms (e.g., Restrictive Emotionality, Avoidance of Femininity, and Rejection of Homosexuals) and experiences more gender role conflict than in his Conformity status.

Finally, in the Internalization status, the individual begins to take on a more balanced idea of himself and what it means to be a person of color in the U.S. He may also begin to actively work against issues of racism and oppression in his life and in his community. As a result, this man may work against attitudes of prejudice in his life and may have less prejudicial attitudes (i.e., higher QDI score) toward women and people of color. Moreover, this individual, because he is attempting to forge a better sense of himself, may have lower scores on gender role conflict than in any other previous status. He may also have lower scores on his subscription to male gender role norms, except for the scale on Non-Traditional Attitudes Toward Masculinity, where he may experience a higher score than in any previous status.

This study also proposed that racial identity status and prejudicial attitudes can predict the degree to which one is experiencing gender role conflict. Furthermore, the investigator believes that racial identity status and prejudicial attitudes can predict the

degree to which one subscribes to dominant notions of masculinity. Another area of examination is the potential differences in racial identity, gender role conflict, masculine role norm subscription, and prejudicial attitudes according to one's ethnicity (e.g., Kibria, 1993; Long, 1996; Smith-Hefner, 1999). Delineating specific differences among ethnicities within the study will help to illuminate the within group variation that may exist and help to control for the effect of ethnicity in the study.

Another speculated effect may come from one's exposure to multicultural issues. This exposure may occur through courses or workshops, but it may be possible that an understanding of diversity issues affects one's racial identity, reduces prejudicial attitudes, and interacts with one's subscription to gender role norms and the consequences (e.g., gender role conflict). Again, it would be important to investigate the effects of multicultural education/exposure in this study.

In this study, the primary independent variables consisted of the racial identity statuses and prejudicial attitudes. The primary dependent variables in this study consisted of the gender role conflict and masculine role norm subscales and total scores. Prior to conducting the analyses for main hypotheses of this study, a Multivariate Analysis of Variance (MANOVA) will be conducted on the ethnic groups to determine if there are any difference between ethnicity and the independent and dependent variables. If significant differences are found, then the ethnic groups will not be collapsed. However, if no differences are found for ethnicity and the independent and dependent variables, ethnicity will not be controlled for in the

124

hierarchical multiple regressions. With these considerations in mind, this study tested the following hypotheses:

Examining the Relations Among the Independent and Dependent Variables

Hypothesis 1: There will be significant relationships between racial identity statuses and prejudicial attitudes. Scores on prejudicial attitudes will be significantly negative in relation with Conformity, Dissonance, and Resistance and Immersion, and significantly positive in association with Internalization. That is, prejudicial attitudes scores will be lowest in Conformity, Dissonance, and Resistance and Immersion, and highest in Internalization. Thus, to investigate the relations between racial identity and prejudicial attitudes, and between Gender Role Conflict and Male Role Norms, Pearson Product correlations will be conducted.

Hypothesis 2: There will be significant relations between the Gender Role Conflict subscale and total scores and the Male Role norms subscales and Traditional Attitudes Toward Masculinity total score. The Gender Role Conflict subscale and total scores will be significantly positive in association with the Male Role Norms subscales scores. Only Non-Traditional Attitudes Toward Masculinity, a subscale of the Male Role Norms Inventory, will be significantly negatively associated with the Gender Role Conflict subscale and total score. Non-Traditional Attitudes Toward Masculinity will also be significantly negative in association with the Male Role Norms Inventory subscale scores and Traditional Attitudes Toward Masculinity total score. Again, Pearson Product correlations will be provided.

Examining the Differences Among Ethnicity, Multicultural Exposure, Racial Identity, Prejudicial Attitudes, Gender Role Conflict, and Male Role Norms.

Hypothesis 3: There will be differences according to ethnicity and multicultural exposure on racial identity, prejudicial attitudes, gender role conflict, and male role norms.

To investigate the differences among ethnicity, multicultural exposure, racial identity, prejudicial attitudes, gender role conflict, and traditional male role norms, and explore potential interactions, a series of two-way analyses of variance (ANOVA) were conducted. In these analyses, the independent variables were ethnicity and multicultural education. Ethnicity variables were determined by examining all the meaningful categories of ethnicity reported in the study. Those categories with a small number of participants were grouped into larger categories. For instance, if only two people responded as Laotian, the investigator created an aggregate category of "Southeast Asian" to facilitate the analyses. The dependent variables for the ANOVAs were the four subscales of racial identity, total score on the QDI, total score on Gender Role Conflict, and Traditional Attitudes Toward Masculinity total score on the Male Role Norms Inventory.

Controlling for potential Type I errors (i.e., false positives) was important for this study. Because of the number of analyses conducted, and in order to control for Type I error, a Bonferroni adjustment was made to the significance level (.05/7 = .007). If no Bonferroni adjustment were made, there would be a 30.17% chance of

finding significant differences by chance alone. Tukey honestly significant

differences (HSD) were used to make pairwise comparisons because it is a stringent

test that is more powerful than Scheffe's and Dunnett's tests (Shavelson. 1988).

Because no complex comparisons are being made, Tukey HSD represents the best post

hoc test for pairwise mean comparisons (Shavelson, 1988).

Predicting Gender Role Conflict and Male Role Norms Subscription.

Hypothesis 4: Racial identity and prejudicial attitudes scores will significantly predict

gender role conflict total score.

To investigate the predictiveness of racial identity and prejudicial attitudes on

gender role conflict, a hierarchical multiple regression analysis was conducted. The

first step consist of entering ethnicity variables to control for ethnic group differences.

On the second step, multicultural exposure is entered. The third step consists of

entering the four racial identity and prejudicial attitudes total scores to investigate the

influence of racial identity and prejudicial attitudes on gender role conflict above and

beyond the effects of ethnicity and multicultural exposure.

Hypothesis 5: Racial identity and prejudicial attitudes scores will significantly predict

male role norms total score.

In the hierarchical multiple regression, the first step consists of entering

ethnicity variables to control for ethnic group differences. Multicultural educational

exposure enters on the second step of the analysis. The third stage consist of entering

the four racial identity and prejudicial attitudes total scores to investigate the influence

of racial identity and prejudicial attitudes on male role norms above and beyond the effects of ethnicity and multicultural exposure.

Reliability analyses were conduced on the POCRIAS, QDI, GRCS, and MRNI. Cronbach alphas from the reliability analyses are provided. One important and novel aspect of this study is examining the reliability of these masculinity instruments on an Asian American population. Results may provide clues about the validity of using these instruments in future studies.

## CHAPTER IV

### Results

Four instruments were used in this study. Racial identity was examined through the POCRIAS consisting of four subscales: Conformity, Dissonance, Immersion/Resistance, and Internalization. High scores in each subscale represent an endorsement of attitudes within that specific subscale. Prejudicial attitudes were measured through the QDI. High scores on the QDI indicate an openness toward others and diversity. Of the two measures of masculinity used in this study, the GRCS is an instrument that examines the participants' conflicted attitudes over subscription to male gender role norms. The second measure of masculinity, the MRNI, was used to investigate the extent to which participants subscribed to masculine gender role norms. The MRNI also has a measure of Non-Traditional Masculine Attitudes as well as a Traditional Masculine Attitudes score. The latter score is comprised of all items except for those on the Non-Traditional Masculine Attitudes subscale. On both scales, higher scores indicate either greater gender role conflict and/or a greater subscription to gender role norms. In Table 1, means and standard deviations are provided reflecting participants in this study with those in other studies using the GRCS. Similarly, Table 2 shows means and standard deviations for participants in this study and those in other studies using the MRNI.

Table 1

Means and Standard Deviations for Participants on the GRCS in Current Study and

Previous Studies

| Scale | Current | E.J. Kim et al. (1996) | | | Wade (1996) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | ChA | JaA | KoA | African Americans |
| GRCS | | | | | |
| SPC | | | | | |
| M | 3.85 | 4.24 | 3.66 | 4.02 | 3.61 |
| SD | (.82) | (.93) | (.94) | (.88) | (.88) |
| RE | | | | | |
| M | 3.21 | 3.16 | 2.99 | 3.23 | 2.92 |
| SD | (.84) | (1.04) | (.84) | (.98) | (.93) |
| RABBM | | | | | |
| M | 3.37 | 3.79 | 3.35 | 3.51 | 3.18 |
| SD | (.95) | (1.17) | (1.02) | (1.01) | (1.00) |
| CBWF | | | | | |
| M | 3.60 | 3.76 | 3.96 | 3.47 | 3.39 |
| SD | (.98) | (1.02) | (.92) | (.88) | (1.09) |
| Total | | | | | |
| M | 3.53 | N/A | N/A | N/A | 3.28 |
| SD | (.65) | | | | (.34) |

Note.   N/A = data not available from this study; Current refers to the current study; E.J. Kim et al. (1996) study of 125 Asian American men. ChA = Chinese American (n = 42); JaA = Japanese American (n = 41); KoA = Korean American (n = 42); Wade's (1996) study of 95 African American men; SPC = Success, Power, and Competition; RE = Restricted Emotionality; RABBM = Restricted Affectionate Behavior Between Men; and CBWF = Conflicts Between Work and Family.

Table 2

Means and Standard Deviations for Participants on the MRNI in Current Study and

Previous Studies

| Scale | Current | Levant, Wu, & Fischer (1996) | | Levant and Majors (1997) | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| | | US | China | White | African American |
| MRNI | | | | | |
| AvFem | | | | | |
| M | 3.97 | 3.89 | 5.08 | 3.97 | 3.77 |
| SD | (1.01) | (1.15) | (.85) | (1.19) | (1.11) |
| Homo | | | | | |
| M | 3.64 | 4.06 | 4.81 | 4.05 | 4.39 |
| SD | (1.09) | (1.28) | (.96) | (1.33) | (1.20) |
| SelRe | | | | | |
| M | 4.44 | 4.51 | 4.90 | 4.51 | 5.08 |
| SD | (.99) | (.83) | (.74) | (.79) | (.87) |
| Aggre | | | | | |
| M | 4.50 | 4.79 | 5.58 | 4.86 | 4.78 |
| SD | (1.03) | (.85) | (.87) | (.80) | (.98) |
| Stat | | | | | |
| M | 3.79 | 3.68 | 4.22 | 3.65 | 4.00 |
| SD | (.93) | (.90) | (.85) | (.89) | (.99) |
| Asex | | | | | |
| M | 3.46 | 2.94 | 4.68 | 2.88 | 3.49 |
| SD | (.90) | (.86) | (.81) | (.81) | (.99) |
| ReEm | | | | | |
| M | 3.63 | 3.09 | 4.34 | 3.05 | 3.71 |
| SD | (.89) | (.95) | (.87) | (.93) | (.99) |
| NonTrad | | | | | |
| M | 3.93 | 4.17 | 3.68 | 4.17 | 3.95 |
| SD | (.70) | (.67) | (.55) | (.71) | (.71) |
| Trad | | | | | |
| M | 3.91 | 3.77 | 4.76 | 3.77 | 4.11 |
| SD | (.74) | (.72) | (.55) | (.72) | (.70) |

Note. Current refers to the current study; Levant, Wu, and Fischer (1996) study of 232 mainland Chinese males and 135 American males; Levant and Majors (1997) study of 371 African American males and 320 White American males; AvFem = Avoidance of Femininity; Homo = Rejection of Homosexuals; SelRe = Self-Reliance; Aggre = Aggression; Stat = Achievement and Status; Asex = Attitudes Toward Sex; ReEm = Restrictive Emotionality; NonTrad = Non-Traditional Attitudes Toward Masculinity; and Trad = Traditional Attitudes Toward Masculinity.

There are five hypotheses in this study. The first two hypotheses focused on the relationships among the variables. Because of the size of the correlation matrix for the independent and dependent variables in this study, Appendix L, contains the entire correlation matrix. The third hypothesis examines differences on the dependent variables. The fourth and fifth hypotheses examine the predictiveness of racial identity and prejudicial attitudes on masculinity measures.

Analysis for Ethnic Group Differences

Prior to collapsing the ethnic groups into the seven categories, a one-way multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was conducted to examine the differences between the independent variable, ethnic group, and the dependent variables, racial identity, GRCS, and MRNI. The results indicated a non-significant omnibus effect of ethnic groups on the combined dependent variables, Wilks' Lambda = .31, $F$ (19, 323) = 1.05, $p$ > .05. Since there were no significant differences on the racial identity, GRCS, and MRNI scales, the ethnic groups were collapsed into seven categories. Furthermore, because no significant differences were found, ethnicity was not controlled for in the regression analyses.

Hypothesis 1: There will be a significant relationship between racial identity statuses and prejudicial attitudes.

Pearson product moment correlation analyses were conducted on the variables of racial identity statuses and prejudicial attitudes, as measured by the QDI. See Table 3 for the correlation matrix. A significant negative relationship was found between

Conformity attitudes and prejudicial attitudes ($r$ = -.14, $p$< .05). Although the size of

the relationships are small, results suggest that prejudicial attitudes increase (i.e., a

lower score on the QDI) as endorsement of Conformity attitudes increases. There was

also a significant positive relationship between Internalization attitudes and prejudicial

attitudes ($r$ = .22, $p$ < .01). Thus, participants who endorsed Internalization attitudes

were likely to have less prejudicial attitudes than those who scored high in

Conformity. The variance shared between Conformity and prejudicial attitudes was

2%. The variance shared between Internalization and prejudicial attitudes was 5%.

Because the variance accounted for was small, there was some support for hypothesis

1.

Table 3

Correlational Coefficients for Racial Identity Subscales and QDI

| Variable | CONF | DISS | Imm/Res | INTERN | QDI |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| CONF | 1.00 | .45** | .27** | -.29** | -.14* |
| DISS | | 1.00 | .33** | -.01 | -.07 |
| IMM/RES | | | 1.00 | -.07 | -.04 |
| INTERN | | | | 1.00 | .22** |
| QDI TOTAL | | | | | 1.00 |

Note.   * p < = .05; ** p < = .01; CONF = Conformity; DISS = Dissonance;

IMM/RES= Immersion and Resistance; INTERN = Internalization; and QDI = Quick

Discrimination Index.

Hypothesis 2:  There will be a significant relationship between the Gender Role Conflict subscales and total score and the Male Role norms subscales and Traditionality total score.

Pearson Product Moment Correlation was conducted on GRCS total and subscale scores with MRNI subscale and Traditionality total score (Table 4). Traditionality is defined as the total Traditional Attitudes Toward Masculinity score on the MRNI.  Significant relationships were found.  The GRCS total score was significantly positively associated with MRNI Avoidance of Femininity ($r = .37$, $p < .01$) , Rejection of Homosexuals ($r = .28$, $p < .01$), Self-Reliance ($r = .46$, $p < .01$), Aggression ($r = .36$, $p < .01$), Achievement/Status ($r = .39$, $p < .01$), Attitudes Toward Sex ($r = .19$, $p < .01$), Restrictive Emotionality ($r = .34$, $p < .01$), Non-Traditional Masculine Attitudes ($r = .20$, $p < .01$), and Traditional Masculine Attitudes ($r = .46$, $p < .01$).  The variance shared between the GRCS total score and with the MRNI subscale Avoidance of Femininity was 14%, with Rejection of Homosexuals was 8%, with Self-Reliance was 21%, with Aggression was13%, with Achievement/Status was 15%, Attitudes Toward Sex was 4%, with Restrictive Emotionality was 12%, with Non-Traditional Masculine Attitudes was 4%, and with Traditional Masculine Attitudes was 21%.  Results appear to suggest that participants who endorsed MRNI subscales, tend to subscribe to masculine gender expectations such as Self-Reliance and Traditional Masculine Attitudes, and were also likely to

experience feelings of conflict. In other words, if men were to behave according to masculine gender norms, they also had a related experience of conflict.

Gender Role Conflict subscale of Success, Power, and Competition was also significantly associated with all MRNI subscales. The subscale of Success, Power, and Competition was significantly positively related to Avoidance of Femininity ($r = .34$, $p < .01$), Rejection of Homosexuals ($r = .24$, $p < .01$), Self-Reliance ($r = .56$, $p < .01$), Aggression ($r = .45$, $p < .01$), Achievement/Status ($r = .40$, $p < .01$), Attitudes Toward Sex ($r = .11$, $p < .01$), Restrictive Emotionality ($r = .27$, $p < .01$), Non-Traditional Masculine Attitudes ($r = .27$, $p < .01$), and Traditional Masculine Attitudes ($r = .44$, $p < .01$). The variance shared between Success, Power, and Competition and with the MRNI subscale of Avoidance of Femininity was 12%, with Rejection of Homosexuals was 6%, with Self-Reliance was 31%, with Aggression was 20%, with Achievement/Status was 16%, with Attitudes Toward Sex was 1%, with Restrictive Emotionality was 7%, Non-Traditional Masculine Attitudes was 7%, and with Traditional Masculine Attitudes was 19%. Thus, those who endorsed Success, Power, and Competition as a masculine attitude, or who believed that power and control over others and accomplishments were a measure of self-worth, were also likely to endorse certain masculine attitudes congruent with male role norms. The results suggest avoidance of feminine things, rejection of homosexuals, self-reliance, aggression, being goal oriented and status seeking, having traditional masculine attitudes toward sex, restricting emotional expression, and having both traditional and

non-traditional masculine attitudes were related to the participants' feeling of being successful and powerful over others.

Restrictive Emotionality subscale of the GRCS was significantly positively associated with several MRNI subscales. The results showed that Restrictive Emotionality was positively related to Avoidance of Femininity ($r = .25$, $p < .01$), Rejection of Homosexuals ($r = .15$, $p < .01$), Self-Reliance ($r = .16$, $p < .01$), Aggression ($r = .13$, $p < .05$), Achievement/Status ($r = .22$, $p < .01$), Attitudes Toward Sex ($r = .17$, $p < .01$), Restrictive Emotionality ($r = .29$, $p < .01$), and Traditional Masculinity Attitudes ($r = .27$, $p < .01$). The variance shared between Restrictive Emotionality and with the MRNI subscale Avoidance of Femininity was 6%, with Rejection of Homosexuals was 2%, with Self-Reliance was 3%, with Aggression was 2%, with Achievement/Status was 5%, with Attitudes Toward Sex was 3%, with Restrictive Emotionality was 8%, and with Traditional Masculine Attitudes was 7%. Results suggested that participants who restricted their emotions were also likely to endorse masculine role expectations of avoiding feminine things, rejecting homosexuals, being self-reliant, aggressive, goal-oriented and status seeking, having traditional masculine attitudes toward sex, and harboring traditional masculine attitudes. All subscales in the MRNI, except Non-Traditional Attitudes, reflect the tendency to deny expression of emotions of self and others.

The GRCS subscale of Restrictive Affectionate Behavior Between

Men – Homophobia (RABBM) subscale was positively associated with Avoidance of Femininity ($r = .32$, $p < .01$), Rejection of Homosexuals ($r = .33$, $p < .01$), Self-Reliance ($r = .24$, $p < .01$), Aggression ($r = .16$, $p < .01$), Achievement/Status ($r = .28$, $p < .01$), Attitudes Toward Sex ($r = .20$, $p < .01$), Restrictive Emotionality ($r = .31$, $p < .01$), and Traditional Masculinity Attitudes ($r = .35$, $p < .01$). The variance shared between Restrictive Affectionate Behavior Between Men – Homophobia and with the MRNI subscale Avoidance of Femininity was 10%, with Rejection of Homosexuals was 11%, with Self-Reliance was 6%, with Aggression was 3%, with Achievement/Status was 8%, with Attitudes Toward Sex was 4%, with Restrictive Emotionality was 10%, and with Traditional Masculine Attitudes was 12%. Thus, endorsing the subscales of the MRNI (e.g., rejection of homosexuals and attitudes toward sex), except Non-Traditional Attitudes, was congruent with the inability of these men to express intimacy, sexuality, and affection for men and women in healthy ways.

The final subscale of the GRCS, Conflict Between Work and Leisure – Family Relations (CBWL) was significantly positively related with Avoidance of Femininity ($r = .16$, $p < .01$), Rejection of Homosexuals ($r = .14$, $p < .01$), Self-Reliance ($r = .32$, $p < .01$), Aggression ($r = .26$, $p < .01$), Achievement/Status ($r = .22$, $p < .01$), Restrictive Emotionality ($r = .13$, $p < .05$), Non-Traditional Masculine Attitudes ($r = .23$, $p < .01$), and Traditional Masculine Attitudes ($r = .24$, $p < .01$). The variance shared between Conflict Between Work and Leisure – Family Relations and with the

MRNI subscale Avoidance of Femininity was 3%, with Rejection of Homosexuals was 2%, with Self-Reliance was 10%, with Aggression was 7%, with Achievement/Status was 5%, with Restrictive Emotionality was 2%, with Non-Traditional Masculine Attitudes was 5%, and with Traditional Masculine Attitudes was 6%. Thus, those men who experienced conflict between their work and leisure were also likely to subscribe to masculine gender role expectations. In other words, men who experienced difficulty balancing the demands of work, family, and home were likely support certain notions of male role norms.

There were also three non-significant correlations. CBWL was not significantly associated with MRNI Attitudes Toward Sex ($\underline{r} = .07$, $\underline{p} > .05$). RE was not significantly related to MRNI Non-Traditional Attitudes ($\underline{r} = .07$, $\underline{p} > .05$). Also, RABBM was not significantly correlated with MRNI Non-Traditional Attitudes ($\underline{r} = .05$, $\underline{p} > .05$).

These results partially support hypothesis 2. See Appendix M for the correlation matrix between the GRCS total and subscale scores and MRNI subscale scores. Significant positive associations were found between most GRCS and MRNI scores except for two relationships. No significant negative relationships were found between the GRCS and MRNI scores.

Table 4

Correlation Matrix Between GRCS Subscale and Total Score and MRNI Subscale

Scores.

| Scale | GRCS Total | SPC | RE | RABBM | CBWL |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| MRNI AF | .37** | .34** | .25** | .32** | .16** |
| MRNI RH | .28** | .24** | .15** | .33** | .14** |
| MRNI SR | .46** | .56** | .16** | .24** | .32** |
| MRNI AGG | .36** | .45** | .13* | .16** | .26** |
| MRNI Ach/Stat | .39** | .40** | .22** | .28** | .22** |
| MRNI Att-Sex | .19** | .11* | .17** | .20** | .07 |
| MRNI Re | .34** | .27** | .29** | .31** | .13* |
| MRNI Non-Trad | .20** | .27** | .07 | .05 | .23** |
| MRNI Traditional | .46** | .44** | .27** | .35** | .24** |

Note.      * $p <= .05$; ** $p <= .01$. GRCS = Gender Role Conflict Scale; SPC = Success, Power, Competition; RE = Restrictive Emotionality; RABBM = Restrictive Affectionate Behavior Between Men – Homophobia; CBWL = Conflict Between Work and Leisure – Family Relations; MRNI = Masculine Role Norms Inventory; AF = Avoidance of Femininity; RH = Rejection of Homosexuals; SR = Self-Reliance; AGG = Aggression; Ach/Stat = Achievement/Status; Att-Sex = Attitude Toward Sex; Re = Restrictive Emotionality; and Non-Trad = Non-Traditional Attitudes.

Hypothesis 3: There will be differences according to ethnicity and multicultural education exposure on racial identity subscales, prejudicial attitudes, gender role conflict total score, and male role norms traditionality score.

In order to control for Type I error due to the seven analyses that were conducted, a Bonferroni adjustment was made (.05/7 = .007). If the analyses were significant, Tukey's Honestly Significant Difference (HSD) post hoc tests were conducted to examine whether there were any significant differences between the means. Means and standard deviations for each dependent variable by ethnic group and multicultural education are presented. Table 5 presents the results from the two-way ANOVA analyses. To account for homogeneity of variances, the Levene's Test for Equality of Variances was conducted on each dependent variable by ethnic group and multicultural education. The Levene's Tests were all non-significant and the null hypothesis that the variances for the dependent variables were equal was accepted.

The two-way ANOVA analyses on the dependent variable of prejudicial attitudes produced one significant main effect. All other two-way ANOVAs were non-significant. A main effect for multicultural education and prejudicial attitudes was found, $F$ (3, 309) = 8.68, $p$ = .000. Table 6 presents the means and standard deviations. Tukey's HSD post hoc tests revealed that the means of those participants who never took a multicultural course were significantly different from those who completed two or more multicultural or cross-cultural courses. Thus, those who never took any courses tended to have higher prejudicial attitudes than those who had taken

two or more multicultural or cross-cultural courses. There was also a significant difference between those who only covered multicultural or cultural issues in a course and those who took two or more multicultural or cross-cultural courses. That is, those who only covered these topics in a course tended to have more prejudicial attitudes than those who took two or more multicultural or cross-cultural courses.

Table 5

Two-Way Analysis of Variance for Racial Identity Subscales, QDI Total Score,

GRCS Total Score, and MRNI Traditional Total Score by Ethnicity and Multicultural

Education

| Variable and Source | SS | df | MS | F | Sig. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **GRCS Total Score** | | | | | |
| Ethnic Group (E) | 4385.77 | 1 | 730.96 | 1.36 | .23 |
| Multicultural Education (M) | 333.74 | 6 | 111.25 | .21 | .89 |
| M X E | 7038.29 | 18 | 391.02 | .73 | .78 |
| **MRNI Traditional Total Score** | | | | | |
| Ethnic Group (E) | 7356.84 | 6 | 1226.14 | 1.19 | .31 |
| Multicultural Education (M) | 621.39 | 3 | 207.13 | .20 | .90 |
| M X E | 15884.06 | 18 | 882.45 | .86 | .63 |
| **QDI Total Score** | | | | | |
| Ethnic Group (E) | 1158.57 | 6 | 193.10 | 2.64 | .02 |
| Multicultural Education (M) | 1904.41 | 3 | 634.80 | 8.68 | .00*** |
| M X E | 1894.35 | 18 | 105.24 | 1.44 | .11 |
| **Conformity** | | | | | |
| Ethnic Group (E) | 207.03 | 6 | 34.51 | .91 | .49 |
| Multicultural Education (M) | 8.52 | 3 | 2.84 | .08 | .97 |
| M X E | 557.55 | 18 | 30.98 | .82 | .68 |
| **Dissonance** | | | | | |
| Ethnic Group (E) | 253.80 | 6 | 42.30 | .82 | .56 |
| Multicultural Education (M) | 44.41 | 3 | 14.80 | .29 | .84 |
| M X E | 593.38 | 18 | 32.97 | .64 | .87 |
| **Immersion & Resistance** | | | | | |
| Ethnic Group (E) | 296.31 | 6 | 49.39 | 1.20 | .31 |
| Multicultural Education (M) | 142.66 | 3 | 47.55 | 1.59 | .33 |
| M X E | 953.50 | 18 | 52.97 | 1.29 | .19 |
| **Internalization** | | | | | |
| Ethnic Group (E) | 624.94 | 6 | 104.16 | 2.01 | .06 |
| Multicultural Education (M) | 368.33 | 3 | 122.78 | 2.37 | .07 |
| M X E | 486.89 | 18 | 27.05 | .52 | .95 |

Note.    *** $p < .007$; SS = Sum of Squares; df = degrees of freedom; MS = Mean
Squares; GRCS = Gender Role Conflict Scale; MRNI = Masculine Role Norms
Inventory; QDI = Quick Discrimination Index; Error df = 281; and
Total df = 309.

Table 6

Means and Standard Deviations for QDI Total By Multicultural Education

| MCED | M | SD |
|---|---|---|
| Never | $94.21^a$ | 1.30 |
| Covered Topics | $94.21^a$ | 1.31 |
| Completed One MC or CC Course | 100.23 | 1.58 |
| Completed Two or more MC or CC courses | $102.93^b$ | 1.66 |

Note.   *** $p < .007$; Higher mean scores on the QDI represent less prejudicial attitudes; Never = Never took a Multicultural or Cross-cultural course; MC = Multicultural; CC = Cross-cultural; and $^{a, b}$ represent significant differences between groups.

<u>Hypothesis 4</u>: <u>Racial Identity and prejudicial attitude scores will significantly predict</u>
<u>Gender Role Conflict total score.</u>

A hierarchical regression analysis was used to examine the relationships
between racial identity subscale scores, prejudicial attitudes, and gender role conflict
scores (Table 7). Predictor variables were racial identity and prejudicial attitudes
scores and the criterion variable was gender role conflict total score.

In the first step of the hierarchical regression, to control for multicultural
education, it was entered first. Step 1 was not significantly different from zero
$(R^2 = .00, \underline{F}(1, 313) = .27, \underline{p} = .60)$. The second step of the hierarchical regression
was significantly different from zero when racial identity subscale and prejudicial
attitude scores were entered
$(R^2 = .14, R^2 \text{ Adj.} = .12, \underline{F}(5, 308) = 9.67, \underline{p} = .00; R^2 \text{ chng} = .14; F \text{ chng} = 9.67; \text{Sig F}$
$\text{chng} = .00)$. Racial identity and prejudicial attitudes accounted for 14% of the
variance in gender role conflict. The two non-significant predictors were Conformity
(Beta = .05, $\underline{T} = .75$, $\underline{p} = .46$) and prejudicial attitudes scores
(Beta = .01, $\underline{T} = .17$, $\underline{p} = .87$). There were three significant predictors in this model:
Dissonance (Beta = .13, $\underline{T} = 2.08$, $\underline{p} = .04$), Immersion and Resistance
(Beta = .16, $\underline{T} = 2.76$, $\underline{p} = .01$), and Internalization (Beta = .30, $\underline{T} = 5.15$, $\underline{p} = .00$).
Hence, the more one endorsed racial identity attitudes of racial confusion,
ethnocentrism, and integration, the more one was likely to experience Gender Role
Conflict.

Table 7

Summary of Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analyses with Multicultural Education

Controlled for, Racial Identity Statuses and Prejudicial Attitudes as Predictors, and

Gender Role Conflict Scale Total Score as the Criterion

| Step and Predictor Variable | R | $R^2$Adj. | $R^2$ | $R^2$ Chg. | F Chg. | Sig. F | Beta | Sig. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Step 1 | .03 | -.00 | .00 | .00 | .27 | .60 | | |
| Multicultural Education | | | | | | | .03 | .60 |
| Step 2 | .37 | .12 | .14 | .14 | 9.67 | .00** | | |
| Multicultural Education | | | | | | | -.04 | .49 |
| Conformity | | | | | | | .05 | .46 |
| Dissonance | | | | | | | .13 | .04* |
| Immersion & Resistance | | | | | | | .17 | .01** |
| Internalization | | | | | | | .30 | .00*** |
| QDI Total | | | | | | | .01 | .87 |

Note. * $p$ < .05; ** $p$ < .01; *** $p$ < .001; QDI = Quick Discrimination Index.

<u>Hypothesis 5: Racial Identity and prejudicial attitude scores will significantly predict</u>

<u>Male Role Norms subscription.</u>

A hierarchical regression analysis was conducted to investigate the

relationships among racial identity subscales, prejudicial attitudes, and the MRNI

Traditional Masculinity total score (Table 8). The predictor variables were the racial

identity subscale scores and prejudicial attitudes scores, and the criterion variable was

the MRNI Traditional Masculinity total score.

To control for multicultural education, it was entered in the first step of the

hierarchical regression analysis. Step 1 was not significantly different from zero

($R^2$ = .00, $\underline{F}$ (1, 313) = .00, $\underline{p}$ = .97). When racial identity and prejudicial attitudes

were entered on the second step of the hierarchical regression analysis, the model was

significantly different from zero ($R^2$ = .13, $R^2$ Adj. = .11, $\underline{F}$ (5, 308) = 9.12, $\underline{p}$ = .00; $R^2$

chng = .13; F chng = 9.12; Sig F chng = .00). The four racial identity subscales and

the prejudicial attitudes score accounted for 13% of the variance in Traditional

Masculinity attitude scores. Thus, there was support for hypothesis 5. The two non-

significant predictors were Conformity (Beta = -.05, $\underline{T}$ = -.77, $\underline{p}$ = .44) and Dissonance

(Beta = .10, $\underline{T}$ = 1.62, $\underline{p}$ = .11).

There were three positive predictors of Traditional Masculinity attitudes. The

first two significant predictors were Immersion and Resistance scores

(Beta = .14, $\underline{T}$ = 2.48, $\underline{p}$ = .01) and Internalization scores

(Beta = .30, $\underline{T}$ = 5.10, $\underline{p}$ = .00). The direction of the beta weights appears to suggest that the endorsement of Traditional Masculine attitudes is positively related to endorsement of Immersion and Resistance or Internalization attitudes.

The third significant predictor was prejudicial attitudes. Prejudicial attitudes was a significant predictor of Traditional Masculinity Attitudes (Beta = -.16, $\underline{T}$ = -2.78, $\underline{p}$ = .01). The beta weight suggests that this predictor, while significant, was not a strong predictor of Traditional Masculine Attitudes. Thus, the direction of the beta weights appears to moderately suggest that, as one becomes open to diversity and others who are different, one is also not likely to endorse Traditional Masculinity attitudes.

Table 8

Summary of Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analyses with Multicultural Education

Controlled for, Racial Identity Statuses and Prejudicial Attitudes as Predictors, and

Masculine Role Norms Inventory Traditional Total Score as the Criterion

| Step and Predictor Variable | R | $R^2$Adj. | $R^2$ | $R^2$Chg. | F Chg. | Sig. F | Beta | Sig. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Step 1 | .00 | -.00 | .00 | .00 | .00 | .96 | | |
| Multicultural Education | | | | | | | .00 | .96 |
| Step 2 | .36 | .11 | .13 | .13 | 9.12 | .00** | | |
| Multicultural Education | | | | | | | -.02 | .69 |
| Conformity | | | | | | | -.05 | .44 |
| Dissonance | | | | | | | .10 | .11 |
| Immersion & Resistance | | | | | | | .14 | .01* |
| Internalization | | | | | | | .30 | .00*** |
| QDI Total | | | | | | | -.16 | .01* |

Note. * p < .05; ** p < .01; *** p < .001; QDI = Quick Discrimination Index.

CHAPTER V

Discussion

The primary purpose of this study was to examine the relationships among racial identity attitudes, gender role conflict, male role norm subscription, and prejudicial attitudes. The primary independent variables consisted of the racial identity statuses and prejudicial attitudes, and the primary dependent variables in this study consisted of the Gender Role Conflict and Male Role Norm subscales and total scores. To understand the relationships between race and racism and issues revolving around masculinity, the racial identity and prejudicial attitudes measures were correlated with gender role conflict and male role norms. Differences around racial identity, ethnicity, multicultural education, prejudicial attitudes, and masculinity were also examined. Finally, racial identity and prejudicial attitudes were used to predict Asian American men's gender role conflict and subscription to traditional male role norms. The sections that follow will discuss in greater detail the results from each hypothesis. In addition, this section provides a discussion on strengths and limitations of this study, implications for counseling, and considerations for future research.

Racial Identity and Prejudicial Attitudes

The hypothesis that there would be significant relationships between racial identity statuses and prejudicial attitudes was partially supported. Results from this study suggest that Asian American men who score high in the Conformity status are also likely to have high prejudicial attitudes (i.e., racist and sexist) and low openness

to diverse others. Conversely, the findings also suggest that those men who score high in Internalization status attitudes are likely to have low prejudicial attitudes and more openness to diverse others than those endorsing Conformity status attitudes. Thus, the results of this study suggest that Conformity status attitudes tend to be related to higher prejudicial attitudes (i.e., negative attitudes toward racial minorities and women) than Internalization status attitudes. This is somewhat congruent with Atkinson et al. (1993) and Helms' (1990, 1995) assertions that Conformity status attitudes tend to encompass a negative perception of the self and other racial ethnic minorities. That is, Conformity attitudes are supposed to represent a disavowal of one's culture because one's native culture is not consistent with the individual's pro-White cultural cognitive stance (Pope-Davis, Liu, Ledsma-Jones, & Nevitt, 2000).

In contrast to Conformity status attitudes, Internalization attitudes are supposed to be anti-racist. Potentially, those Asian Americans who are anti-racist are knowledgeable about and working against other forms of oppression such as sexism (Atkinson et al., 1993). Findings in this study suggest modestly that as Asian American men endorse Internalization attitudes, their prejudicial attitudes decrease.

Although the correlations were statistically significant, the amount of variance shared by Conformity and prejudicial attitudes was 2%, and Internalization and prejudicial attitudes was 5%. Because the shared variance between the two variables was very small, other factors are accounting for prejudicial attitudes among Asian American men. Primary among the many possible factors is the culture in which

Asian American men are raised. For many Asian American men, patriarchy (i.e.,

sexism and homophobia) is a common cultural thread that is valued and celebrated

(Sue, 1989; Uba, 1994). Because sexist beliefs inculcated through Asian culture are

not necessarily born from racist interactions, the racial identity measure may not be

able to account for all the prejudicial attitudes that Asian Americans have.

Gender Role Conflict and Male Role Norms

The hypothesis that there would be significant relationships between Gender

Role Conflict and Male Role Norms was supported. In a previous study, Levant and

Fischer (in press) showed that several of the MRNI and GRCS subscales were highly

correlated. The correlations found were between MRNI and GRCS Restrictive

Emotionality ($r$ = .40, $p$ = .000), MRNI Aggression and Status and GRCS Success,

Power, and Competition ($r$ = .35, $p$ = .000), and MRNI Rejection of Homosexuals and

GRCS Affectionate Behavior Between Men – Homophobia ($r$ = .49, $p$ = .000) (Levant

& Fischer, in press). From these relationships, it would seem that restricting emotions

would be related to conflict around constricted affect. Furthermore, one's need to be

aggressive and status seeking would be associated with conflicts around controlling

other people. Finally, an ideology of homophobia would be linked with rejecting

homosexuals. This study also found some significant correlations among these

subscales. It should be noted though, that some of the MRNI subscales that were

correlated with the GRCS subscales tended to have moderate Cronbach alphas (e.g.,

.45 Cronbach alpha for Rejection of Homosexuals). Only one subscale of the MRNI

(Rejection of Homosexuals) fell below the .54 median reliability found among other personality measures (Anastasi, 1982, 1988), which suggests that most of the MRNI subscales had adequate reliability.

The GRCS subscale of Success, Power, and Competition was correlated with all the MRNI subscales. O'Neil et al. (1986) define this subscale as a man's attempt to develop self-worth by focusing on wealth and accomplishments, to be in charge or have authority over others, and to "win" others over. To maintain such a "masculine" attitude, adherence to many of the male role norms may be high. Thus, the Asian American man may find that an endorsement of Success, Power, and Competition attitudes may also mean an ideological endorsement of avoiding feminine things, rejecting homosexuals, valuing aggressiveness, valuing self-reliance, being achievement and status oriented, restricting his affective expression, and having traditional attitudes toward sex. Conversely, an endorsement of masculine ideology may also imply an endorsement of Success, Power, and Competition attitudes.

However, in this study, all the MRNI subscales were not endorsed equally. Success, Power, and Competition shared the most variance with MRNI Self-Reliance, Aggression, and Traditional Masculine Attitudes (31%, 20% and 19% of the variance shared, respectively). That is, to be a successful man means subscribing to certain routes of success, and in this sample, it appears that being self-reliant, aggressive and having traditional masculine attitudes may be related to having feelings of conflict around success, power, and competition. The conflict and ideology of success may

reflect what the individual believes are the acceptable behaviors within his peer group at that time. This may be congruent with previous findings that suggest that mostly White college-aged men have conflicts over success while mostly White middle-aged men experience conflicts around work and family (e.g., Cournoyer & Mahalik, 1995; O'Neil, 1986, 1995). Although these results suggest that conflicts over success, power, and competition may be temporal, and that these conflicts change as the individual matures, it is difficult to compare this study's results with previous findings with a mostly White sample (e.g., Cournoyer & Mahalik, 1995). Thus, future research may want to focus on the potential Gender Role Conflict and Male Role Norms subscription that exists among different age groups of Asian American men.

On the GRCS subscales of Restrictive Emotionality and Restrictive Affectionate Behavior Between Men – Homophobia, all MRNI subscales were significantly correlated except for Non-Traditional Attitudes. O'Neil et al. (1995) define Restrictive Emotionality as, "having difficulty and fears about expressing one's feelings and difficulty finding words to express basic emotions" (p. 22), and Restrictive Affectionate Behavior Between Men – Homophobia as, "having limited ways to express one's feelings, thoughts, or touch of other men" (p. 23). Experiencing gender role conflict in affective expression is not surprising since Asian American men may become increasingly confined in expression to self and others because male role norms stipulate an adherence to a stoic masculinity that rejects feelings as signs of vulnerability, weakness, and femininity.

154

In Restrictive Emotionality, the Asian American man may be unable, and to some extent, unwilling to express emotions, and he disallows others the same experience. Likewise, if Asian American men find it difficult to express and articulate their feelings, they also may be unsure why they feel uncomfortable around other men. Consequently, Asian American men may endorse cognitive notions of rejecting homosexuals as a means to help them make sense of their feelings. While some of the difficulty that Asian American men experience in expressing affect can be attributed to subscription to dominant male role norms, subscription to male role norms only account for 2% to 8% of the shared variance in Restrictive Emotionality. Hence, other variables are contributing to the Asian American man's difficulty in expressing affect. For instance, Asian cultural values of affective restraint (Sue, 1989; Uba, 1994) could be playing a role in restricting Asian American men's affect.

In Restrictive Affectionate Behavior Between Men – Homophobia, the man is supposed to be unable to find constructive and psychologically healthy ways of experiencing intimacy, sexuality, and affection between himself and other men and women. It appears that an endorsement of traditional masculine ideology is related to difficulty with intimate relationships with other men. Men in this sample may be associating being deemed feminine and homosexual as part of expressing affect between men. This is congruent with previous research findings (e.g., Levant & Fischer, in press), and may be explained as a man's need to avoid and reject behaviors that are perceived as unmasculine (i.e., feminine). However, since the variance

accounted for between Gender Role Conflict and Male Role Norms ranged from 3% to 12%, much of the variance is not explained. Thus, Asian cultural values of homophobia (Leupp, 1995), among other variables, are also possibly working to restrict affective expression and that the measures used did not assess for the role of Asian cultural values in Asian American men's lives.

Finally, Asian American men also experience Conflict Between Work and Leisure – Family Relations, or conflicts over the man's ability to balance the demands of work and home. O'Neil et al. (1995) describes the man in this status as "experiencing difficulties balancing work and family relations resulting in health problems, overwork, stress, and a lack of leisure and relaxation" (p. 23). The highest relationship with MRNI subscales was with Self-Reliance (10% of the variance shared), which could result from focusing on self-efficacy and sufficiency in work such that they are unable, or do not know how to, allow themselves to relax (Levant, 1998; O'Neil et al., 1995). The other domains of male role norms (i.e., Avoidance of Femininity, Rejection of Homosexuals, Aggression, Achievement/Status, Restrictive Emotionality, Non-Traditional and Traditional Masculine Attitudes), while statistically significant, do not contribute much to explaining the conflicts that this sample experiences between work and leisure. Perhaps, the conflict among work, leisure, and family that Asian American men may be experiencing may also be related to cultural expectations of being successful (Uba, 1994). Since the sample is mostly college-aged students, success may revolve around the Asian value of academic success (Uba,

1994). And because Asian American students may aspire toward graduate or professional schools (Liu & Sedlacek, 1999), they may be focused on their career goals at the expense of their leisure activities or personal time. Thus, apart from gender role conflict and masculine role norms, Asian cultural values may be contributing toward conflicts that Asian American men experience around work and leisure.

## Ethnicity, Multicultural Education, Racial Identity, and Masculinity

The hypothesis that there would be differences on racial identity and masculinity according to ethnicity and multicultural education was not fully supported. No significant differences were found on the masculinity and racial identity scales according to ethnicity; however, findings suggested that prejudicial attitudes differed according to exposure to multicultural issues in classes. Specifically, the differences were between those who never took a multicultural course who were likely to harbor prejudicial and sexist attitudes, and those who did take two or more multicultural courses who were likely to have lower prejudicial attitudes than those who never took any courses. Those who took multicultural courses were significantly different from those who never took a course or only had these topics covered in a course.

While the results may suggest that there were differences in prejudicial attitudes and one's participation, or non-participation, in multicultural education, it is not clear if there is a direct relationship between taking courses and actual prejudicial attitude reduction. Rather, alternative explanations may be that, individuals who are

already predisposed toward lower prejudicial attitudes are more likely to take multicultural courses than those who have higher prejudicial attitudes. Maturation may also help explain the reduction in prejudicial attitudes. That is, participants become less prejudiced on their own (i.e., maturation), outside of any intervention by multicultural courses. Furthermore, participants who are less prejudiced may develop these attitudes through other campus or community involvement, or they could develop these attitudes spontaneously.

The results also showed no differences according to ethnicity. There may be two explanations for this result. First, this may be explained by the groupings done for analysis. While the groups were created according to the Federal Register (1997) and Chan (1991a), it may be possible that the potential differences among the ethnic groups did not appear because the categorization was not fully sensitive to ethnic differences. Census classifications are notoriously cumbersome and not always predicated upon legitimate ethnic similarities (Lee & Fernandez, 1998). Thus, possible ethnic differences that may have existed between Hmong or Thais are lost when particular ethnicities are lumped together with those of an entire region (e.g., South East Asian) without any basis other than geographical contiguity. Consequently, while ethnic differences were possible, the groupings used did not accentuate those differences. Moreover, because the sample size among the groups varied between 15 to 118 participants per category, the categories may not have had enough variance for a robust analysis. This result points to the need to recruit enough members of various

ethnic groups to conduct meaningful analyses across ethnicity. Otherwise, continued

grouping of these ethnicities in research to facilitate analyses may not fully illuminate

the ethnic differences that may exist along dependent variables.

Second, the conservative significance level set due to the number of analyses

conducted may have contributed to a Type II error (i.e., not finding significant

differences when there were some). However, in light of the possibility of achieving

significant results when there none (Type I error), this researcher believed it was better

to error toward Type II error. The result, even though not significant, allows

researchers to pursue gathering more data on these variables in the future and drawing

conclusions from substantial ethnic group data rather than on questionable data.

Racial Identity, Prejudicial Attitudes, and Gender Role Conflict

The hypothesis that Racial Identity and Prejudicial Attitudes would

significantly predict Gender Role Conflict was partially supported. Racial Identity

and prejudicial attitudes accounted for 14% of the variance. In predicting gender role

conflict attitudes in this study, the three statuses that were significant predictors,

Dissonance, Immersion/Resistance, and Internalization, all have the common element

of questioning previously held beliefs. As such, it may be possible that, as Asian

American men start to question their racial beliefs, they may also start questioning

their beliefs about gender. Thus, because Gender Role Conflict is a measure of

distress related to a person's gender role behaviors, the racial identity statuses of

Dissonance, Immersion/Resistance, and Internalization may also be assessing other aspects of distress revolving around racial attitudes.

Conformity may not have been a significant predictor because Conformity attitudes reflect a sense of foreclosure rather than an ongoing struggle, and Gender Role Conflict is a measure of distress and on-going struggle. Similarly, prejudicial attitudes may reflect another type of rigid schema about self and others that does not reflect the distress, conflict, and struggle that gender role conflict is measuring. Consequently, the variables that best predict Gender Role Conflict seem to reflect attitudes of questioning, critique, and struggle around subscribing to and not subscribing to dominant gender role attitudes.

Racial Identity, Prejudicial Attitudes, and Male Role Norms

The hypothesis that Racial Identity and prejudicial attitudes would predict Traditional Male Role Norms was partially supported. Racial Identity and prejudicial attitudes accounted for 13% of the variance in Male Role Norms. The three significant predictors were Immersion/Resistance, Internalization, and prejudicial attitudes. The significant racial identity predictors focus on achieving an internalized sense of self (i.e., away from an ascribed identity). However, in achieving an internalized racial identity, Asian American men must also negotiate what it means to be a "man of color" in a White dominant society.

In the regression analyses, results suggested that those who endorsed Immersion/Resistance and Internalization attitudes were also likely to endorse Male

Role Norms (i.e., Traditional total score). In Immersion/Resistance, the Asian American man attempts to find stability in his racial identity and seeks to define himself as an Asian American outside dominant White society's influences. He eschews all dominant notions of race and culture and adheres mainly to an "Asian" orientation. This re-orientation toward "Asian" culture allows the Asian American man to justify his behaviors and attitudes as congruent with Asian cultural values. This idealizing of Asian culture also translates to how the Asian American man relates to himself as a man (i.e., in a traditional ways). Thus, many of the Traditional Male Roles may be congruent with being a traditional Asian man, but the Asian American man is unaware that he may be endorsing both dominant and Asian notions of masculinity.

However, in Internalization, the achievement of an internalized racial sense of self may also infer an acceptance of other aspects of oneself (e.g., Atkinson et al., 1993; Helms, 1990). That is, rather than feeling conflicted over having traditional masculine roles, the Asian American man in Internalization comes to accept the positive and negative aspects of traditional male role norms (e.g., Levant, 1996). In coming to accept the positive and negative aspects of Asian and White culture, the Asian American man also is internalizing the positive and negative aspects of masculinity each culture expects from men. In this status, aspects of traditional masculinity may not be completely negative, but instead, may be useful for the Asian American man in negotiating issues of racism.

Prejudicial attitudes were also a significant negative predictor of Traditional Masculine Attitudes. This inverse relationship, where low scores on the QDI indicate high prejudicial attitudes and high scores indicate low prejudicial attitudes, can be interpreted as, those who had low scores were likely to endorse Traditional Masculine Attitudes while those who had high scores were less likely to endorse Traditional Masculine Attitudes. These findings appear to suggest that Traditional Masculine Attitudes encompass various prejudicial attitudes and behaviors such as rejection of femininity and homosexuals. As a result, adherence to Traditional Masculine Attitudes may also imply support for sexist attitudes. It may be possible that sexist attitudes are a necessary aspect of having Traditional Masculine Attitudes since it helps one to rationalize the supposed role of men. Moreover, having certain prejudicial attitudes, such as sexism, may facilitate a subscription to traditional male role norms.

## Strengths and Limitations

There were several strengths to this study. First, this was the first study to examine the intersection of race and masculinity among Asian American men. Wade (1996) had conducted a study with African American men, but no study was found that examined racial identity and masculinity among Asian American men. While E.J. Kim et al.'s (1996) study used an acculturation instrument, Kohatsu (1992) suggested that racial identity may be a better measure of the racialized experiences of Asian Americans than acculturation. Thus, this study not only examined the race and gender

experiences of Asian American men, but also helped provide an empirical foundation for examining the representativeness of the current masculinity theories. This study helped to show that, while racism may be an important element in masculinity for Asian American men, other elements are still to be explored. One such variable is the role of Asian cultural values and masculinity. As a result, this study was a step toward understanding to what extent theories such as Gender Role Conflict or Male Role Norms apply to Asian American men as well as other men of color.

Related to the first strength, the second strength of this study was to suggest that current masculinity theories might need to be broadened to encompass the importance of minority culture in masculinity. Currently, theories such as Gender Role Conflict and Male Role Norms are predicated on dominant masculinity and the idea that most men in the U.S. must subscribe to a dominant gender role ideology. However, based on the Cronbach alphas from the MRNI in this study, it is not clear if this dominant definition of gender ideology is completely applicable for Asian American men. Thus, an ideology of masculinity may need to account for the role of Asian cultural values and masculinity. It is also not clear what role Asian cultural values play (e.g., B.S.K. Kim, Atkinson, & Yang, 1999) in the subscription to male role norms and experiences with gender role conflict. Results from this study seem to suggest that further investigation is necessary and that the current theories may not fully explain the experiences of Asian American men.

The third strength of this study was the high participation rate. Over 323 surveys were collected in classes, through mail, and in organization meetings. Many of those recruited, when first approached with the subject of the study, were highly interested in participating. Even though many were given extra-credit for participation or the possibility of winning a drawing for money, responses were generally in favor of such a study. The common verbal response, as well as email response, was the need to look at the experiences of Asian American men because they felt left out of the discussion on gender and race. Potentially then, other Asian American men may be interested in participating in an investigation about their experiences. This is especially the case for non-college aged Asian American men. Previous studies have found differences between college-aged and middle-aged White men (Cournoyer & Mahalik, 1995; O'Neil, 1995). Perhaps if recruited, middle-aged or older Asian American men would be similarly interested in discussing their experiences and conflicts, and comparisons can then be made between different age samples to examine how masculinity may change over time and between different cohort groups.

While there were a number of strengths in this study, there were also potential limitations. The potential limitations for the study include issues related to research using self-report measures. There may have been biases related to self-report such as social desirability. Thus, as participants answered the surveys, they may have attempted to guess what is being asked and try to answer in a manner that appeals to the researcher (i.e., answering well). Other participants may have attempted to answer

in a manner that is negative, and results may reflect this negativistic bias (i.e., answering badly). Others may have attempted to answer in a manner that makes them seem good as a means to regulate how others may see them. This may be a pertinent issue in assessing Asian American participants since managing self and other perceptions are a significant issue in regulating interpersonal relationships (Tanaka, Ebreo, Linn, & Morera, 1998; Uba, 1994).

There may also have been some participant fatigue associated with the number of questionnaires and items in the survey packet. This participant fatigue is somewhat accounted for by counter-balancing the surveys. The intent of counter-balancing is to ensure that instruments at the end of the survey packet are not consistently answered in an acquiescent way (i.e., writing in "3" throughout the remainder of the surveys).

Third, the population sampled (i.e., from an Asian American fraternal organization and Asian American studies courses) was convenience sampling, and may not be representative of the general population of Asian American men. The groups of individuals used were college educated, and their social class position (i.e., privilege) and experience may not reflect the entire population of Asian Americans. In addition, the Asian American men may reflect a limited racial identity range since they are participating in "Asian American" groups and courses. This again may mean a limitation in the generalizability of the study. Also, because two groups comprised a large part of the sample for this study, a comparison between these two groups should have been done. Because an analysis of potential differences between the groups on

the dependent variables was not done, collapsing the two groups together could have potentially affected the results.

Finally, the fourth limitation is the use of instruments that have moderate reliabilities within certain subscales (e.g., POCRIAS, MRNI, & GRSC). Wade (1996) mentioned low reliabilities in the POCRIAS as a potential limitation of his study. However, he cited Helms' (as cited in Wade, 1996) arguments that, "racial identity constructs presume curvilinearity, whereas classical test construction procedures rely on linear relationships among items. As such, it is not clear what reliability indices mean when they are low" (p. 30). Helms (1990) did not believe that the reliabilities in the POCRIAS should mean a disregard for the measure because the modest coefficients in the POCRIAS subscales were commensurate with the median reliability (e.g., .54) of other personality measures (Anastasi, 1982, 1988). In addition, consistent measurement of a phenomenon, such as race, is difficult since race is not a consistent construct (Helms, 1990). While the Cronbach alphas in previous studies may have been problematic, in this study the Cronbach alphas for the POCRIAS subscales are above the .54 median reliability cited by Helms (1990).

The GRCS Cronbach alphas for this study seemed to show some stability in measuring gender role conflict for Asian American men. The Cronbach alphas for the GRCS were .90 for the full scale, .84 for SPC, .82 for RE, .81 for RABBM, and .77 for CBWFR. The reliabilities for this study also reflect previous studies' reports, and thus, there seems to be some consistency between different racial groups when using

the GRCS. In other words, the GRCS seems to be reliable in assessing gender role conflict for Asian American men even though the measure does not address Asian American masculinity issues specifically.

As for the MRNI, moderate reliabilities among the subscales could potentially limit the applicability and generalizability of the results, however, as Helms (1990) noted, this does not necessarily mean one should discard the use of the MRNI. Again, the Cronbach alphas for the study were .89 for the full scale, .69 for Avoidance of Femininity, .45 for Rejection of Homosexuals, .73 for Self-Reliance, .65 for Aggression, .66 for Achievement/Status, .69 for Attitudes Toward Sex, .63 for Restrictive Emotionality, .59 for Non-Traditional Attitudes Toward Masculinity, and .91 for Traditional Attitudes Toward Masculinity. However, according to Anastasi (1982, 1988), most of the subscales, except for Rejection of Homosexuals, have adequate reliability (i.e., above the .54 median). The modest Cronbach alphas may point to the idea that Asian American men may have a different experience in regard to their adherence to dominant gender role expectations. That is, the items may be referencing experiences atypical of Asian American college men. Thus, the potential exists that another measure may be better able to assess the ways Asian American men negotiate their subscription to "dominant" gender role norms, and research may be needed to understand which "dominant" group they are gravitating toward.

The moderate Cronbach alphas among the MRNI subscales may also point to the need for a measure that assesses masculine ideology that is both culturally and age

specific. Because the sample consisted of college age students, age and social class may limit the type of responses and the generalizability of the results. Additionally, a scale may be needed that can illuminate the ideological pressures among Asian American college students since the expected attitudes and behaviors may be different from those of adults.

The QDI, a measure of prejudicial attitudes in previous research, produced relatively good Cronbach alphas (.82 -.88). However, in this study, the Cronbach alpha is .69, which may be considered acceptable (e.g., Helms, 1990), but raises questions about the QDI in this study. One issue that is pertinent for this study is the applicability and generalizability of the results involving the QDI to other Asian American men. While the QDI is intended to measure the prejudicial attitudes, Asian American men may not fully subscribe to some of the items listed and may have answered inconsistently to those items. For instance, "it upsets (or angers) me that a woman has never been President of the United States" may not make much sense to an Asian American college male, and so their responses may have reflected that disinterest. It may be that in order to fully tap into the prejudicial attitudes of Asian American men, items on the QDI may have to more accurately reflect their reality and experience as college-aged minority men rather than general prejudicial attitudes.

Implications for Counseling

Men avoid therapy for many reasons. Some reasons are fear of therapy (Brooks, 1998b) as well as counseling's threat to their masculinity (Pollack & Levant,

1998). Yet, these considerations in working with men are predicated upon the experiences of mostly White men. As a result, the theories on masculinity (e.g., Levant et al., 1992) and the recommendations for therapeutic interventions (e.g., Robertson & Fitzgerald, 1992) may be somewhat limited in their application with men of color. This study also touched upon the potential importance of understanding the intersection of multiple identities and cultures (Fukuyaman & Ferguson, 2000; Kiely, 1997). For instance, previous studies have shown that people use their identities instrumentally to coping to an environment (Pittinsky, Shih, & Ambady, 1999), and that counselors need to be aware of how these identities and cultures become salient for the individual (Pope-Davis & Coleman, 1997). Results from this study suggest that cultural issues should be considered when developing possible individual, group, and environmental interventions for Asian American men. Because some of the recommendations for counselors extend beyond the results and data in this study, future research is needed to continually explore how to best work with men in therapy.

Based on the results of this study, a common issue that counselors need to be aware of when working with Asian American men is the potential importance of culture in the ways masculinity is internalized and manifested among Asian American men. While current theories of masculinity are adept at outlining the dominant cultural expectations of men and the conflicts they experience, the theories may not fully take into account the salience of Asian culture in the life of Asian American men. For instance, many of the results in this study point to the modest role of race and

racism among Asian American men. The low variance accounted for in the two hierarchical multiple regression analyses (14% and 13%) seem to suggest that other variables, aside from racial identity, may be useful in explaining the masculinity issues among Asian American men. Even though Asian American men do experience gender conflict commensurate with non-Asian American men, what was not clear was the role of Asian cultural values in masculinity. Because Asian American men may already have grown up in an environment that values restricting affective expression, and the dominant culture only reinforces these values, it may be difficult for clinicians to distill apart the role of dominant and Asian culture in masculinity. Consequently, Asian American men may be struggling with dual pressures to restrict emotions for self and others. Counselor awareness that Asian American men come in with dual notions of affective reticence and behavior may alleviate counselor frustration when emotions are not forthcoming. One potential way of coping with these dual pressures in counseling may be to acknowledge to the client that the counselor is aware of these pressures and that ways to work around them will be discovered collaboratively. Hence, the counselor is not placed in the position of healer and the "all-knowing" and counseling becomes more collaborative (Chin, 1998; Lee & Zhan, 1998).

While not specifically a part of this study, counselors should also be aware of stereotypes they may carry into counseling. Stereotypes impact affective expression for men in session (Heesacker, Wester, Vogel, Wentzel, Mejia-Millan, & Goodholm, 1999), especially when men are perceived as potentially unable to express emotions.

This stereotype of retarded emotionality may compel some counselors to focus on affective expression as a goal. Meeting the resistances and defenses of men directly as a way to motivate them toward emotional expression may only cause reinforcement of these defenses against expression. From the results in this study, this affective reticence, or restricting of emotions, may play a role for Asian American male clients where cultural controls of shame and guilt (i.e., loss of face) (Leichty & Applegate, 1991; Mao, 1994) are used to control overt behavior but also emotional behavior (Brown, 1987; Song, 1999; Sue, 1999). So working to dismantle these Asian cultural expectations may be counter productive to therapy. Asian American male clients may anticipate some of these cultural conflicts and either avoid mental health treatment, or seek out counselors who reflect their racial, ethnic, and cultural heritage in hopes of finding clinicians that understand their cultural constraints (Fuertes & Gelso, 1998). Counselors may find it acceptable among Asian American men to delve into cognitive work and slowly begin to tie in affective components rather than tackling emotional expression as the primary goal. This implication for counseling is congruent with previous literature citing Asian American clients' willingness to focus on overt and objective issues (e.g., academic concerns) rather than vague affective concerns (Sue & Sue, 1990).

On college campuses and in college counseling centers, issues of race and ethnicity may be highlighted in clinical work because of student involvement in Asian American groups and organizations such as Asian American fraternities (Alsaybar,

1999; Chow, 1996; Gonzalves, 1995; Gupta, 1998; Kibria, 1999; Wong & Mock, 1997). While this counseling implication goes beyond the study and the data, the suggestion for clinicians is still warranted. Clinicians should be aware of the salience of race, ethnicity, and gender among men who participate in Asian American organizations because these students may have a greater sense of racial identity than their counterparts who are not involved in race-specific groups (Kimbrough, 1995; Taylor, Howard, & Mary, 1995). Hence, college counselors need to understand the potential race and gender struggles that Asian American men may present. For instance, many Asian American men grow up in homes that typically do not discuss issues of race (Alvarez et al., 1996). When they become involved in race-specific organizations where issues of race are constantly discussed, they may begin to struggle with their racial identity as well as other areas of identity and oppression (e.g., gender, sexuality, social class). For the college counselor, working with Asian American men may demand that the counselor have a good grasp of the Asian American student culture on campus (e.g., student protests, events, and programming) and be a participant in the students' culture. Hence, working effectively on campus may also mean planning workshops and outreach activities in the environment of the students (e.g., meetings) rather than bringing the students to the counseling center. This may help Asian American men talk about gender and race without needing to simultaneously cope with the stigma of being in the counseling center (Lee & Zhan, 1998; Sue & Sue, 1990).

Results from the current study show that these college-aged Asian American men also experience some difficulty in expressing affectionate behavior, which may be associated with male role norms such as homophobia, self-reliance, restriction of emotions, and avoidance of feminine behaviors. The correlation results seem to suggest that Asian American men who endorse Traditional Masculine Attitudes are also likely to experience gender role conflicts and have problems expressing emotions. For counselors, this may mean that interventions may need to be targeted toward affective and cognitive re-framing. Specifically, as counselors try to work with Asian American men to become comfortable in expressing affect and being affectionate, the exploration of the clients' resistances also need to focus on reinterpreting these behaviors (i.e., affective expression) as masculine congruent rather than incongruent (i.e., feminine or homosexual).

Another result with significance for counselors is the recognition that Asian American men may be achievement oriented and may also be experiencing conflicts with trying to balance personal and professional activities. The correlations between the GRCS and MRNI subscales seemed to suggest that conflicts in Success, Power, and Competition and trying to balance work and leisure are related to endorsing Traditional Masculine Attitudes. For this sample of young adults and professionals, the focus of their attention may be on becoming independent and self-reliant at the expense of interpersonal relationships (e.g., Cournoyer & Mahalik, 1995; O'Neil, 1995). The counselor's responsibility may be to acknowledge these challenges and

conflicts faced by Asian American men and to find alternative ways to be successful that do not rely totally on being aggressive or subscribing to traditional masculinity. Results do show that Asian American men may be open to non-traditional masculinity, and so the counselor may want to work at helping the Asian American man integrate these attitudes and behaviors. It may be helpful to employ the assistance of Asian American male mentors and role models to help Asian American men see how professional and personal success can happen, as well as to have other resources to call upon in case they feel in distress.

This study also examines the different ways Asian American men negotiate other masculine expectations in relation to their racial identity status. For instance, when working with an Asian American man who is experiencing dissonant, immersed/resistant, or internalized attitudes, the counselor could predict that the client may struggle with some traditional and non-traditional masculine attitudes and gender role conflict. The hierarchical regression results seem to suggest that gender role conflict can be predicted by Asian American men who endorse Dissonant, Immersion/Resistance, and Internalization attitudes. Similarly, the hierarchical regression results seem to suggest that Traditional Male Role Norm Attitudes can be predicted by men who endorse Immersion/Resistance and Internalization attitudes. Thus, the results appear to point out the possibility that, while the Asian American man struggles to define and understand himself racially, he will also likely to be struggling with issues of gender. Yet, the struggle may be contingent upon a counselor

who is willing to initiate, participate, and tolerate a discussion about gender issues. It is possible that the discussion during therapy may also be concomitant with course work that the individual is doing. The goal would be to allow the man the space to struggle, and to have him see the counselor as a source of stability so that he can question all the areas of oppression in his life.

In concluding this discussion around counseling implications, the research suggests that race and gender are simultaneously important dimensions that Asian American men negotiate. While this study did not investigate the specific roles of contemporary and historical stereotypes, clinicians nevertheless need to be aware of historical and contemporary Asian American masculinity issues to be perceived as competent for some clients. In the end, the primary issue for the clinician is to find avenues to connect and be empathic with the Asian American client that are rooted in the client's total experience of being an Asian American man. Also, the clinician needs to be aware of the biases he or she may carry into work with an Asian American client that may either cause under- or over-diagnosis because the clinician is unaware of the cultural and sociopolitical history of the Asian American male experience.

Future Research Considerations

This research attempts to investigate the lives and experiences of Asian American men by trying to understand these men as racialized and gendered individuals. It also assumes that the experience of racism and sexism in the dominant society leaves a residual, i.e., prejudiced beliefs and attitudes. Thus, this research

looks at these men as racial beings, and asks: "What are the masculine attitudes and gender role conflicts among Asian American men?"

Because we all live our lives at the intersection of multiple roles, identities, and expectations, it would seem advantageous to examine these multiple constructs simultaneously. The import of such research is to provide additional understanding upon a group that is not addressed frequently. Asian American men seem to be one of the least understood groups (Sue, 1990), and so it may be possible that counselors are ill-equipped to provide effective therapy because they have limited information. The application of such research is the improvement of counseling services, interventions, and programs. Additionally, this research could build a foundation to understand the multiple issues that confront men of color.

Consequently, this leads into the area of continuing research with the dimensions of race and gender. The current research paradigms and instruments that seek to understand the complexities of masculinity may be limited because they have not taken the role of racism and culture fully into account. Moreover, many of the items and domains may reflect a "White" masculine experience and may have limited validity for men of color. For this study, the MRNI may be a good illustration of this issue. Due to this limitation, it is necessary to continue investigating the validity of the current masculinity instruments with specific populations such as Asian American men. It may be also advisable to develop an instrument around the experience of

masculine role subscription among Asian American men as both a gender and a racial experience.

It may also be necessary to investigate different ways Asian American men cope with racism and how they relate to others around them through their cultural values. While much has been written about Asian cultural values (e.g., Sue, 1989; Uba, 1994), it may be interesting to examine how this constellation of values (e.g., harmony in relationships, filial piety, harmony in relationships) may be configured differently according to gender. For instance, anecdotally, the experience of Asian American women in regard to filial piety seems different than the pressures exerted upon Asian American men. The value of the son in Asian families and the patriarchal nature of relationships seem to place a certain burden upon Asian American men that may not be experienced by all Asian American women (Gecas, 1992; E. Lee, 1996; Serafica, 1992; Sue, 1989). Future research and clinical applications may want to consider how cultural values are experienced differently according to the gender of the individual.

An area of research that could be expanded is to examine the relationship of ethnic and racial identity (Alvarez et al., 1996). This study uses only the racial identity theory and measurement, but theoretically, ethnic and racial identity may play concomitant and salient roles in the lives of Asian Americans. One of the limitations in this study was the non-significant ethnic differences which may have been attributed to the groupings done to facilitate analyses. Perhaps if larger samples for

each ethnic group were recruited, differences between the ethnic groups could be studied. Along the same recommendation, it is also important to investigate the lives of Asian American men since the racialization process in the U.S. affects the way gender is perceived. Thus, in Levant et al.'s (1996) study of Chinese in the People's Republic of China, the findings have limited applicability to Asian Americans since the Chinese abroad may not face the intersecting pressures of race, racism, and gender in their lives.

For Asian Americans, because ethnic identity is constantly being reinforced within the Asian American community through immigration, there is the possibility that ethnic identity and racial identity are parallel processes (Alvarez et al., 1996). Given that there may be two processes occurring in the lives of Asian Americans, the salience of racial and ethnic identity for Asian American men may sometimes overlap (converge), remain parallel, or diverge. In one example (Alvarez et al., 1996), a Chinese American who experiences racism may not necessarily start a process of developing a greater pan-Asian American identity (i.e., internalization). Instead, it is also quite possible that the Chinese American eschews a greater pan-Asian American community and identifies with his or her Chinese American community. He or she may see racism directed only against Chinese and may not necessarily make the leap that his or her experience with racism is part of a greater anti-Asian sentiment. The opposite is also possible in that the Chinese American who experiences racism develops a pan-Asian American identity but does not ever develop an affinity toward

his or her Chinese community. Given the difficulty of extricating the exact roles race and ethnicity play, it is still necessary to examine the intersection of these two dimensions.

Finally, because much of the current research on Asian American men is done on college students, it is necessary to investigate the lives of Asian American men outside the collegiate environment. Many of the findings and recommendations for clinicians are premised upon college men and the possible resources they have in their lives and in their environment. Yet, what is not understood is how these issues of traditional and non-traditional masculinity, gender role conflicts, experiences with racism, focus on work, restraint of emotions, and rejection of homosexuals, to name a few, are salient in the lives of non-college aged men or those men who have never attended college. In examining the lives of non-college students, research would also be examining the model minority myth and illuminating the lives of men who are not economically and educationally successful.

In conclusion, the most novel aspect of this research is its investigation into the intersection of race and gender. Additionally, the population studied, Asian American men, appears to be infrequently investigated. If counselors are to be effective and multiculturally competent (e.g., Pope-Davis & Coleman, 1997), then it is crucial that they have information to work from when developing their interventions. It was the intent of this research to explore the lives of Asian American men and to understand how they negotiate the various issues in their lives.

# APPENDIX A

Descriptive Statistics for Chinese, Korean, Japanese, and Filipino American Participants

| Variable | Chinese | | Korean | | Japanese | | Filipino | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | $\underline{N}$ | $\underline{\%}$ | $\underline{N}$ | $\underline{\%}$ | $\underline{N}$ | $\underline{\%}$ | $\underline{N}$ | $\underline{\%}$ |
| Source of Data | | | | | | | | |
| ELPU | 50 | 42 | 58 | 77.3 | 5 | 19.2 | 16 | 47.1 |
| WCPU | 7 | 6 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 7.6 | 2 | 5.8 |
| WSCC | 17 | 14 | 1 | 1.3 | 1 | 3.8 | -- | -- |
| WAAF | 44 | 38 | 13 | 17.4 | 18 | 69.3 | 16 | 47.1 |
| Class Year | | | | | | | | |
| Freshmen | 33 | 28 | 22 | 29.3 | 10 | 38.5 | 7 | 20.6 |
| Sophomore | 23 | 19.5 | 16 | 21.3 | 2 | 7.7 | 5 | 14.7 |
| Junior | 17 | 14.4 | 18 | 24 | 9 | 34.6 | 11 | 32.4 |
| Senior | 20 | 16.9 | 10 | 13.3 | 4 | 15.4 | 6 | 17.6 |
| Graduate | 11 | 9.3 | -- | -- | 1 | 3.8 | 1 | 2.9 |
| Graduated | 10 | 8.5 | 8 | 10.7 | -- | -- | 2 | 5.9 |
| None Reported | 4 | 3.4 | 1 | 1.3 | -- | -- | 2 | 5.9 |
| Major | | | | | | | | |
| Religion | | | | | | | | |
| Atheist | 14 | 11.9 | 5 | 6.7 | 4 | 15.4 | -- | -- |
| Agnostic | 9 | 7.6 | 4 | 5.3 | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Buddhist | 13 | 11 | 1 | 1.3 | 11 | 42.3 | 1 | 2.9 |
| Christian | 30 | 25.4 | 31 | 41.3 | 2 | 7.7 | 8 | 23.5 |
| Protestant | 2 | 1.7 | 1 | 1.3 | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Hindu | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Baptist | 2 | 1.7 | 5 | 6.7 | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Catholic | 7 | 5.9 | 8 | 10.7 | 2 | 7.7 | 23 | 67.6 |
| Methodist | 6 | 5.1 | 3 | 4.0 | 1 | 3.8 | -- | -- |
| None | 13 | 11 | 5 | 6.7 | 4 | 15.4 | -- | -- |
| Presbyterian | 1 | .8 | 7 | 9.3 | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Taoist | 3 | 2.5 | 1 | 1.3 | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Shinto | -- | -- | -- | -- | 1 | 3.8 | -- | -- |
| Muslim | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Sikh | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Zorastricism | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Missing | 18 | 15.3 | 4 | 5.3 | 1 | 3.8 | 2 | 5.9 |

Note.    ELPU = East coast large public university; WCPU = West coast private university; WSCC = West coast community college; WAAF = West coast Asian American fraternity.

Descriptive Statistics for Chinese, Korean, Japanese, and Filipino American Participants (continued)

| | Chinese | | Korean | | Japanese | | Filipino | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Variable | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % |
| **Marital Status** | | | | | | | | |
| Single | 104 | 88.1 | 72 | 96 | 23 | 88.5 | 32 | 94.1 |
| Partnered | 7 | 5.9 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 7.7 | 2 | 5.9 |
| Married | 6 | 5.1 | -- | -- | 1 | 3.8 | -- | -- |
| Divorced | 1 | .8 | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| **Parental Status** | | | | | | | | |
| Divorced | 8 | 6.8 | 6 | 8 | 4 | 15.4 | 2 | 5.9 |
| Separated | 4 | 3.4 | 2 | 2.7 | 2 | 7.7 | 1 | 2.9 |
| Still Married | 99 | 83.9 | 65 | 86.8 | 20 | 76.9 | 31 | 91.2 |
| Father Deceased | 5 | 4.2 | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Mother Deceased | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Parents Deceased | 2 | 1.7 | 1 | 1.3 | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| **School & Work Status** | | | | | | | | |
| Full Time School | 80 | 67.8 | 58 | 77.3 | 20 | 76.9 | 22 | 64.7 |
| Part Time School | 1 | .8 | 1 | 1.3 | 1 | 3.8 | -- | -- |
| Full Time Work | 19 | 16.1 | 10 | 13.3 | 1 | 3.8 | 6 | 17.6 |
| Part Time Work | 4 | 3.4 | -- | -- | -- | -- | 1 | 2.9 |
| School & Work Full Time | 2 | 1.7 | -- | -- | -- | -- | 1 | 2.9 |
| School Part Time & Work Full | 1 | .8 | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| School Full Time, Work Part | 8 | 6.8 | 4 | 5.3 | 4 | 15.4 | 4 | 11.8 |
| School and Work Part Time | 2 | 1.7 | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Not Working or in School | 1 | .8 | 2 | 2.7 | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| **Social Class of Home** | | | | | | | | |
| Lower Class | 6 | 5.1 | 2 | 2.7 | 1 | 3.8 | -- | -- |
| Lower Middle Class | 12 | 10.2 | 5 | 6.7 | 2 | 7.7 | 2 | 5.9 |
| Middle Class | 50 | 42.4 | 34 | 45.3 | 19 | 73.1 | 21 | 61.8 |
| Upper Middle Class | 43 | 36.4 | 25 | 33.3 | 4 | 15.4 | 11 | 32.4 |
| Upper Class | 3 | 2.5 | 7 | 9.3 | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| High Class | 3 | 2.5 | 1 | 1.3 | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Missing | 1 | .8 | 1 | 1.3 | -- | -- | -- | -- |

Descriptive Statistics for Chinese, Korean, Japanese, and Filipino American Participants (continued)

| Variable | Chinese | | Korean | | Japanese | | Filipino | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % |
| **Father's Job Type** | | | | | | | | |
| Blue Collar | 19 | 16.1 | 14 | 18.7 | 3 | 11.5 | 7 | 20.6 |
| White Collar | 25 | 21.2 | 6 | 8 | 5 | 19.2 | 4 | 11.8 |
| Professional | 27 | 22.9 | 12 | 16 | 7 | 26.9 | 18 | 52.9 |
| Self-Employed | 35 | 29.7 | 37 | 49.3 | 11 | 42.3 | 2 | 5.9 |
| Not Applicable | 6 | 5.1 | 1 | 1.3 | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Missing | 6 | 5.1 | 5 | 6.7 | -- | -- | 3 | 8.8 |
| **Mother's Job Type** | | | | | | | | |
| Blue Collar | 16 | 13.6 | 7 | 9.3 | 2 | 7.7 | 3 | 8.8 |
| White Collar | 22 | 18.6 | 7 | 9.3 | 5 | 19.2 | 5 | 14.7 |
| Professional | 21 | 17.8 | 7 | 9.3 | 8 | 30.8 | 18 | 52.9 |
| Self-Employed | 26 | 22 | 33 | 44 | 6 | 23.1 | 5 | 14.7 |
| Not Applicable | 19 | 16.1 | 13 | 17.3 | 3 | 11.5 | 1 | 2.9 |
| Missing | 14 | 11.9 | 8 | 10.7 | 2 | 7.7 | 2 | 5.9 |
| **Current Social Class** | | | | | | | | |
| Lower Class | 6 | 5.1 | 5 | 6.7 | 1 | 3.8 | 2 | 5.9 |
| Lower Middle Class | 14 | 11.9 | 8 | 10.7 | 2 | 7.7 | 2 | 5.9 |
| Middle Class | 53 | 44.9 | 34 | 45.3 | 14 | 53.8 | 23 | 67.6 |
| Upper Middle Class | 34 | 28.8 | 19 | 25.3 | 8 | 30.8 | 7 | 20.6 |
| Upper Class | 4 | 3.4 | 6 | 8 | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| High Class | 5 | 4.2 | 1 | 1.3 | 1 | 3.8 | -- | -- |
| Missing | 2 | 1.7 | 2 | 2.6 | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| **My Political Position** | | | | | | | | |
| Conservative | 52 | 44.1 | 30 | 40 | 11 | 42.3 | 16 | 47.1 |
| Liberal | 54 | 45.8 | 40 | 53.3 | 15 | 57.7 | 15 | 44.1 |
| Middle | 2 | 1.7 | 1 | 1.3 | -- | -- | 2 | 5.9 |
| Neither | 6 | 5.1 | 1 | 1.3 | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Missing | 4 | 3.4 | 3 | 4 | -- | -- | 1 | 2.9 |
| **Friend's Political Position** | | | | | | | | |
| Conservative | 44 | 37.3 | 24 | 32 | 10 | 38.5 | 15 | 44.1 |
| Liberal | 65 | 55.1 | 45 | 60 | 16 | 61.5 | 16 | 47.1 |
| Neither | 3 | 2.5 | 1 | 1.3 | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Middle | 1 | .8 | 1 | 1.3 | -- | -- | 2 | 5.9 |
| Both | 1 | .8 | 1 | 1.3 | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Missing | 4 | 3.4 | 3 | 4 | -- | -- | 1 | 2.9 |

Descriptive Statistics for Chinese, Korean, Japanese, and Filipino American Participants (continued)

| Variable | Chinese | | Korean | | Japanese | | Filipino | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | $\underline{N}$ | $\underline{\%}$ | $\underline{N}$ | $\underline{\%}$ | $\underline{N}$ | $\underline{\%}$ | $\underline{N}$ | $\underline{\%}$ |
| Parent's Political Position | | | | | | | | |
| Conservative | 79 | 66.9 | 47 | 62.7 | 15 | 57.7 | 24 | 70.6 |
| Liberal | 25 | 21.2 | 23 | 30.7 | 11 | 42.3 | 8 | 23.5 |
| Both | 2 | 1.7 | -- | -- | -- | -- | 1 | 2.9 |
| Neither | 6 | 5.1 | 2 | 2.7 | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Missing | 6 | 5 | 3 | 4 | -- | -- | 1 | 2.9 |
| Multicultural Education Exposure | | | | | | | | |
| Never Covered Topics | 30 | 25.4 | 25 | 33.3 | 10 | 38.5 | 11 | 32.4 |
| Covered Topics | 28 | 23.7 | 11 | 14.7 | 3 | 11.5 | 5 | 14.7 |
| Completed one MC or CC course | 39 | 33.1 | 17 | 22.7 | 7 | 26.9 | 6 | 17.6 |
| Completed two or more MC or CC Courses | 21 | 17.8 | 18 | 24 | 5 | 19.2 | 12 | 35.3 |
| Missing | -- | -- | 4 | 5.3 | 1 | 3.8 | -- | -- |

Note.    MC = multicultural; CC = cross=cultural.

Descriptive Statistics for South Asian, South East Asian, Bi-Racial and Those Participants Reporting

No Ethnic Information

| Variable | South Asian N | South Asian % | South East Asian N | South East Asian % | Bi-Racial N | Bi-Racial % | No Ethnicity N | No Ethnicity % |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Source of Data** | | | | | | | | |
| ELPU | 14 | 93.4 | 11 | 47.8 | 9 | 36 | 4 | 57.1 |
| WCPU | -- | -- | -- | -- | 1 | 4 | 3 | 42.9 |
| WSCC | -- | -- | 2 | 8.7 | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| WAAF | 1 | 6.6 | 10 | 43.4 | 15 | 60 | -- | -- |
| **Class Year** | | | | | | | | |
| Freshmen | 3 | 20 | 6 | 26.1 | 3 | 12 | 2 | 28.6 |
| Sophomore | 5 | 33.3 | 9 | 39.1 | 11 | 44 | 2 | 28.6 |
| Junior | 3 | 20 | 5 | 21.7 | 4 | 16 | 2 | 28.6 |
| Senior | 3 | 20 | 1 | 4.3 | 3 | 12 | -- | -- |
| Graduate | -- | -- | 1 | 4.3 | 1 | 4 | -- | -- |
| Graduated | 1 | 6.7 | 1 | 4.3 | 2 | 8 | -- | -- |
| None Reported | -- | -- | -- | -- | 1 | 4 | 1 | 14.3 |
| **Major** | | | | | | | | |
| **Religion** | | | | | | 5 | 20 | | |
| Atheist | -- | -- | -- | -- | 1 | 4 | -- | -- |
| Agnostic | -- | -- | 4 | 17.4 | 2 | 8 | -- | -- |
| Buddhist | 1 | 6.7 | 8 | 34.8 | 5 | 20 | -- | -- |
| Christian | 1 | 6.7 | 1 | 4.3 | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Protestant | -- | -- | -- | -- | 1 | 4 | -- | -- |
| Hindu | 4 | 26.7 | 1 | 4.3 | 1 | 4 | -- | -- |
| Baptist | -- | -- | -- | -- | 4 | 16 | -- | -- |
| Catholic | 1 | 6.7 | 2 | 8.7 | 1 | 4 | -- | -- |
| Methodist | 1 | 6.7 | -- | -- | 3 | 12 | -- | -- |
| None | -- | -- | -- | -- | 1 | 4 | 1 | 14.3 |
| Presbyterian | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Taoist | -- | -- | 1 | 4.3 | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Shinto | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Muslim | 2 | 13.3 | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Sikh | 2 | 13.3 | 1 | 4.3 | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Zorastricism | 1 | 6.7 | -- | -- | 1 | 4 | 6 | 85.7 |
| Missing | 2 | 13.3 | 4 | 17.4 | | | | |

Note.   ELPU = East coast large public university; WCPU = West coast private university; WSCC = West coast community college; WAAF = West coast Asian American fraternity.

Descriptive Statistics for South Asian, South East Asian, Bi-Racial and Those Participants Reporting

No Ethnic Information (continued)

| Variable | South Asian | | South East Asian | | Bi-Racial | | No Ethnicity | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % |
| **Marital Status** | | | | | | | | |
| Single | 14 | 93.3 | 20 | 87 | 22 | 88 | 5 | 71.4 |
| Partnered | 1 | 6.7 | 3 | 13 | 2 | 8 | 1 | 14.3 |
| Married | -- | -- | -- | -- | 1 | 4 | -- | -- |
| Divorced | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Missing | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | 1 | 14.3 |
| **Parental Status** | | | | | | | | |
| Divorced | 3 | 20 | -- | -- | 7 | 28 | 1 | 14.3 |
| Separated | -- | -- | 3 | 13 | 1 | 4 | -- | -- |
| Still Married | 11 | 73.3 | 20 | 87 | 16 | 64 | 5 | 71.4 |
| Father Deceased | 1 | 6.7 | -- | -- | 1 | 4 | -- | -- |
| Mother Deceased | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Parents Deceased | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Missing | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | 1 | 14.3 |
| **School & Work Status** | | | | | | | | |
| Full Time School | 8 | 53.3 | 21 | 91.3 | 15 | 60 | 5 | 71.4 |
| Part Time School | 1 | 6.7 | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Full Time Work | 2 | 13.3 | 1 | 4.3 | 4 | 16 | -- | -- |
| Part Time Work | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| School & Work Full Time | -- | -- | -- | -- | 1 | 4 | 1 | 14.3 |
| School Part Time & Work Full | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| School Full Time, Work Part | 4 | 26.7 | 1 | 4.3 | 4 | 16 | -- | -- |
| School and Work Part Time | -- | -- | -- | -- | 1 | 4 | -- | -- |
| Not Working or in School | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Missing | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | 1 | 14.3 |
| **Social Class of Home** | | | | | | | | |
| Lower Class | 1 | 6.7 | 2 | 8.7 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 14.3 |
| Lower Middle Class | -- | -- | 4 | 17.4 | 1 | 4 | -- | -- |
| Middle Class | 6 | 40 | 13 | 56.5 | 9 | 36 | 2 | 28.6 |
| Upper Middle Class | 5 | 33.3 | 3 | 13 | 11 | 44 | 2 | 28.6 |
| Upper Class | 1 | 6.7 | 1 | 4.3 | 2 | 8 | 1 | 14.3 |
| High Class | 1 | 6.7 | -- | -- | 1 | 4 | -- | -- |
| Missing | 1 | 6.7 | -- | -- | -- | -- | 1 | 14.3 |

Descriptive Statistics for South Asian, South East Asian, Bi-Racial and Those Participants Reporting

No Ethnic Information (continued)

| Variable | South Asian N | % | South East Asian N | % | Bi-Racial N | % | No Ethnicity N | % |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Father's Job Type** | | | | | | | | |
| Blue Collar | 1 | 6.7 | 6 | 26.1 | 2 | 8 | 1 | 14.3 |
| White Collar | 5 | 33.3 | 3 | 13 | 7 | 28 | 1 | 14.3 |
| Professional | 4 | 26.7 | 5 | 21.7 | 14 | 56 | 1 | 14.3 |
| Self-Employed | 4 | 26.7 | 7 | 30.4 | 2 | 8 | 2 | 28.6 |
| Not Applicable | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Missing | 1 | 6.7 | 2 | 8.7 | -- | -- | 2 | 28.6 |
| **Mother's Job Type** | | | | | | | | |
| Blue Collar | 2 | 13.3 | 5 | 21.7 | 3 | 12 | -- | -- |
| White Collar | 1 | 6.7 | 2 | 8.7 | 4 | 16 | -- | -- |
| Professional | 5 | 33.3 | 5 | 21.7 | 12 | 48 | -- | -- |
| Self-Employed | 2 | 13.3 | 9 | 39.1 | 3 | 12 | 4 | 57.1 |
| Not Applicable | 5 | 33.3 | -- | -- | 1 | 4 | 1 | 14.3 |
| Missing | -- | -- | 2 | 8.7 | 2 | 8 | 2 | 28.6 |
| **Current Social Class** | | | | | | | | |
| Lower Class | 3 | 20 | 2 | 8.7 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 14.3 |
| Lower Middle Class | 2 | 13.3 | 5 | 21.7 | 2 | 8 | -- | -- |
| Middle Class | 6 | 40 | 11 | 47.8 | 10 | 40 | 2 | 28.6 |
| Upper Middle Class | 3 | 20 | 3 | 13 | 9 | 36 | 2 | 28.6 |
| Upper Class | 1 | 6.7 | 1 | 4.3 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 14.3 |
| High Class | -- | -- | -- | -- | 1 | 4 | -- | -- |
| Missing | -- | -- | 1 | 4.3 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 14.3 |
| **My Political Position** | | | | | | | | |
| Conservative | 3 | 20 | 6 | 26.1 | 10 | 40 | 2 | 28.6 |
| Liberal | 11 | 73.3 | 11 | 47.8 | 13 | 52 | 4 | 57.1 |
| Middle | -- | -- | 1 | 4.3 | 1 | 4 | -- | -- |
| Neither | -- | -- | 3 | 13 | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Missing | 1 | 6.7 | 2 | 8.6 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 14.3 |
| **Friend's Political Position** | | | | | | | | |
| Conservative | 1 | 6.7 | 5 | 21.7 | 9 | 36 | -- | -- |
| Liberal | 13 | 86.7 | 12 | 52.2 | 15 | 60 | 6 | 85.7 |
| Neither | -- | -- | 3 | 13 | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Middle | -- | -- | 1 | 4.3 | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Both | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Missing | 1 | 6.7 | 2 | 8.6 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 14.3 |

Descriptive Statistics for South Asian, South East Asian, Bi-Racial and Those Participants Reporting

No Ethnic Information (continued)

| Variable | South Asian | | South East Asian | | Bi-Racial | | No Ethnicity | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % |
| **Parent's Political Position** | | | | | | | | |
| Conservative | 8 | 53.3 | 12 | 52.2 | 18 | 72 | 3 | 42.9 |
| Liberal | 6 | 40 | 7 | 30.4 | 6 | 24 | 2 | 28.6 |
| Both | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Neither | -- | -- | 2 | 8.7 | -- | -- | 1 | 14.3 |
| Missing | 1 | 6.7 | 2 | 8.6 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 14.3 |
| **Multicultural Education Exposure** | | | | | | | | |
| Never Covered Topics | 4 | 26.7 | 8 | 34.8 | 2 | 8 | 3 | 42.9 |
| Covered Topics | 7 | 46.7 | 7 | 30.4 | 5 | 20 | 1 | 14.3 |
| Completed one MC or CC course | 1 | 6.7 | 6 | 26.1 | 9 | 36 | -- | -- |
| Completed two or more MC or CC Courses | 3 | 20 | 1 | 4.3 | 8 | 32 | 2 | 28.6 |
| Missing | -- | -- | 1 | 4.3 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 14.3 |

Note.  MC = multicultural; CC = cross=cultural.

# APPENDIX B

## DEMOGRAPHICS

**Gender:**     Male     Female

**Age:**_____

**Class Year:**     Freshmen     Sophomore     Junior    Senior
Graduate Student (Year):_____

**Major :**_____

**Religious Orientation** (e.g., Buddhist, Hindu, Christian, agnostic, atheist):_____

**Race:**     Asian American
Bi-Racial (Specify):_____

**Ethnicity (e.g., Chinese, Japanese, Korean) (Specify):**_____

**Your Marital Status:**     Single    Partnered     Married     Divorced

**Parent's Marital Status:**     Divorced     Separated     Still Married
    Father's Deceased
(CIRCLE ONE)     Mother's Deceased     Both Parents Deceased

**Current Status:**     Am currently in school     Am currently working full time

**I would consider the home I grew up in to be:**     Lower-class     Lower-Middle class
    Middle-Class
(CIRCLE ONE)     Upper-Middle Class     Upper-Class
    High-Class

**Father's Job:**_____
**I would consider my father's job as:**     Blue-collar     White-Collar     Professional

    Self-Employed

**Mother's Job:**_____
**I would consider my mother's job as:**     Blue-collar     White-Collar     Professional

    Self-Employed

**Currently, I would consider myself to be in the:**     Lower-class     Lower-Middle class
    Middle-Class
(CIRCLE ONE)     Upper-Middle Class     Upper-Class
    High-Class

**In general, I see myself as politically:** Conservative Liberal Other:_____
**In general, my friends are politically:** Conservative Liberal Other:_____
**In general, my parents are politically:** Conservative Liberal Other:_____

**Select One:**

_____ **Have never** completed a course on a multicultural topic, women's studies course, ethnic studies course, or other course related to a diversity topic.

_____ **Have never** completed a course on a multicultural topic, women's studies course, ethnic studies course, or other course related to a diversity topic, but have had these topics covered in other courses.

_____ **Have completed** <u>one</u> course on a multicultural topic, women's studies course, ethnic studies course, or other course related to a diversity topic:

If yes, please **indicate what kind** (choose one):

Women's Studies Course _____ Ethnic Studies Course _____
Multicultural Topic _____
Other: (Please Describe): _____

_____ **Have taken several courses** on a multicultural topic, women's studies courses, ethnic studies courses, or other course related to a diversity topics.

If yes, please indicate **what kind** and **how many courses taken:**

Women's Studies Course _____ Ethnic Studies Course _____
Multicultural Topic _____
Other: (Please Describe): _____

APPENDIX C

People of Color Racial Identity Scale (POCRIAS)

Instructions:    This questionnaire is designed to measure people's social and political attitudes concerning race and ethnicity. Since different people have different opinions, there are no right or wrong answers.  Be as honest as you can.  Circle the number that best represents how you feel.

| Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Uncertain | Agree | Strongly Agree |
|:---:|:---:|:---:|:---:|:---:|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

1. _____ In general, I believe that Anglo-Americans (Whites) are superior to other groups.

2. _____ I feel more comfortable being around Anglo-American (Whites) than I do being around Asian Americans.

3. _____ In general, Asian Americans have not contributed very much to American society.

4. _____ Sometimes, I am embarrassed to be Asian American.

5. _____ I would have accomplished more in life if I had been born an Anglo-American (White).

6. _____ Anglo-Americans (Whites) are more attractive than Asian Americans.

7. _____ Asian Americans should learn to think and act like Anglo-Americans.

8. _____ I limit myself to White activities.

9. _____ I think Asian Americans blame Anglo-Americans (Whites) too much for their problems.

| Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Uncertain | Agree | Strongly Agree |
|:---:|:---:|:---:|:---:|:---:|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

10. _____    I feel unable to involve myself in Anglo-American (White) experiences and am increasing my involvement in experiences involving Asian Americans.

11. _____    When I think about how Anglo-Americans (Whites) have treated Asian Americans, I feel an overwhelming anger.

12. _____    I want to learn more about my culture.

13. _____    I limit myself to activities involving Asian Americans.

14. _____    Most Anglo-Americans (White) are untrustworthy.

15. _____    American society would be better off if it were based on the cultural values of Asian Americans.

16. _____    I am determined to find my racial identity.

17. _____    Most Anglo-Americans (Whites) are insensitive.

18. _____    I reject all Anglo-American (White) values.

19. _____    My most important goal in life is to fight the oppression of Asian Americans.

20. _____    I believe that being Asian has caused me to have many strengths.

21. _____    I am comfortable wherever I am.

22. _____    People, regardless of their race, have strengths and limitations.

23. _____    I think Asian and White culture differ from each other in some ways, but neither group is superior.

24. _____    My Asian cultural background is a source of pride for me.

| Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Uncertain | Agree | Strongly Agree |
|:---:|:---:|:---:|:---:|:---:|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

25. _____ People of Asian culture and white culture have much to learn from each other.

26. _____ Anglo-Americans (Whites) have some customs that I enjoy.

27. _____ I enjoy being around people regardless of their race.

28. _____ Every racial group has some good people and some bad people.

29. _____ Asian Americans should not blame Anglo-Americans (Whites) for all of their problems.

30. _____ I do not understand why Anglo-Americans (Whites) treat Asian Americans as they do.

31. _____ I am embarrassed about some of the things I feel about Asian Americans.

32. _____ I am not sure where I really belong.

33. _____ I have begun to question my beliefs.

34. _____ Maybe I can learn something from people of my own race.

35. _____ Anglo-American (Whites) people can teach me more about surviving in this world than Asian Americans can, but Asian Americans can teach me more about being human.

36. _____ I don't know whether being Asian American is an asset or a deficit.

37. _____ Sometimes I think Anglo-Americans (Whites) are superior and sometimes I think they're inferior to Asian Americans.

38. _____ Sometimes I am proud to be Asian American and sometimes I am ashamed of it.

| Strongly Disagree 1 | Disagree 2 | Uncertain 3 | Agree 4 | Strongly Agree 5 |
|---|---|---|---|---|

39. _____ Thinking about my values and beliefs takes up a lot of my time.

40. _____ I'm not sure how I feel about myself.

41. _____ White people are difficult to understand.

42. _____ I find myself replacing old friends with new ones who are Asian American.

43. _____ I feel anxious about some of the things I feel about Asian Americans.

44. _____ When an Asian American does something embarrassing in public, I feel embarrassed.

45. _____ When both White people and Asian Americans are present in a social situation, I prefer to be with Asian Americans.

46. _____ My values and beliefs match those of Anglos (Whites) more than Asian Americans.

47. _____ They way Anglos (Whites) treat Asian Americans makes me angry.

48. _____ I only follow the traditions and customs of Asian Americans.

49. _____ When Asian Americans act like Anglos (Whites) I feel angry.

50. _____ I am comfortable being the race I am.

APPENDIX D

Gender Role Conflict Scale

Instructions: In the space, write in the number that best reflects the way you feel. There are no right or wrong answers.

| Strongly Disagree | | | | | Strongly Agree |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |

1. _____ Moving up the career ladder is important to me.

2. _____ I have difficulty telling others I care about them.

3. _____ Verbally expressing my love to another man is difficult for me.

4. _____ I feel torn between my hectic work schedule and caring for my health.

5. _____ Making money is part of my idea of being a successful man.

6. _____ Strong emotions are difficult for me to understand.

7. _____ Affection with other men make rne tense.

8. _____ I sometimes define my personal value by my career success.

9. _____ Expressing feelings makes me feel open to attack by other people.

10. _____ Expressing my emotions to other me is risky.

11. _____ My career, job, or school affects the quality of my leisure or family life.

| Strongly Disagree | | | | | Strongly Agree |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |

12. _____ I evaluate other people's value by their level of achievement and success.

13. _____ Talking (about my feelings) during sexual relations is difficult for me.

14. _____ I worry about failing and how it affects my doing well as a man.

15. _____ I have difficulty expressing my emotional needs to my partner.

16. _____ Men who touch other men make me uncomfortable.

17. _____ Finding time to relax is difficult for me.

18. _____ Doing well all the time is important to me.

19. _____ I have difficulty expressing my tender feelings.

20. _____ Hugging other men is difficult for me.

21. _____ I often feel that I need to be in charge of those around me.

22. _____ Telling others of my strong feelings is not part of my sexual behavior.

23. _____ Competing with others is the best way to succeed.

24. _____ Winning is a measure of my value and personal worth.

25. _____ I often have trouble finding words that describe how I am feeling.

| Strongly Disagree | | | | | Strongly Agree |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |

26. _____ I am sometimes hesitant to show my affection to men because of how others might perceive me.

27. _____ My needs to work or study keep me from my family or leisure more than I would like.

28. _____ I strive to be more successful than others.

29. _____ I do not like to show my emotions to other people.

30. _____ Telling my partner my feelings about him/her during sex is difficult for me.

31. _____ My work or school often disrupts other parts of my life (home, family, health, leisure).

32. _____ I am often concerned about how others evaluate my performance at work or school.

33. _____ Being very personal with other men makes me feel uncomfortable.

34. _____ Being smarter or physically stronger than other men is important to me.

35. _____ Men who are overly friendly to me, make me wonder about their sexual preference (men or women).

36. _____ Overwork and stress, caused by a need to achieve on the job or in school, affects/hurts my life.

37. _____ I like to feel superior to other people.

APPENDIX E

Masculine Role Norms Inventory

| Strongly Disagree 1 | Disagree 2 | Slightly Disagree 3 | No Opinion 4 | Slightly Agree 5 | Agree 6 | Strongly Agree 7 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

1. _____ It is disappointing to learn that a famous athlete is gay.

2. _____ If necessary a man should sacrifice personal relationships for career advancement.

3. _____ A man should do whatever it takes to be admired and respected.

4. _____ A boy should be allowed to quit a game if he is losing.

5. _____ A man should prefer football to needlecraft.

6. _____ A man should never count on someone else to get the job done.

7. _____ Men should be allowed to kiss their fathers.

8. _____ A man should not continue a friendship with another man if he finds out that the man is a homosexual.

9. _____ Hugging and kissing should always lead to intercourse.

10. _____ A man must be able to make his own way in the world.

11. _____ Nobody likes a man who cries in public.

12. _____ It is important for a man to take risks, even if he might get hurt.

13. _____ Men should make the final decision involving money.

14. _____ It is important for a man to be good in bed.

15. _____ It is o.k. for a man to ask for help changing a tire.

16. _____ A man should never reveal worries to others.

| Strongly Disagree 1 | Disagree 2 | Slightly Disagree 3 | No Opinion 4 | Slightly Agree 5 | Agree 6 | Strongly Agree 7 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

17. _____ Boys should be encouraged to find a means of demonstrating physical prowess.

18. _____ A man should try to win at any sport he participates in.

19. _____ Men should always be realistic.

20. _____ One should not be able to tell how a man is feeling by looking at his face.

21. _____ A man who takes a long time and has difficulty making decisions will usually not be respected.

22. _____ Men should be allowed to wear bracelets.

23. _____ A man should not force the issue if another man takes his parking space.

24. _____ In a group, it's up to the man to get things organized and moving ahead.

25. _____ A man should love his sex partner.

26. _____ It is too feminine for a man to use clear nail polish on his fingernails.

27. _____ Being called "faggot" is one of the worst insults to a man or boy.

28. _____ Jobs like firefighter and electrician should be reserved for men.

29. _____ When physically provided, men should not resort to violence.

30. _____ A man should be able to openly show affection to another man.

| Strongly Disagree 1 | Disagree 2 | Slightly Disagree 3 | No Opinion 4 | Slightly Agree 5 | Agree 6 | Strongly Agree 7 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

31. _____ A man doesn't need to have an erection in order to enjoy sex.

32. _____ When the going gets tough, men should get tough.

33. _____ Housework is women's work.

34. _____ It is not particularly important for a man to control his emotions.

35. _____ Men should not be too quick to tell others that they care about them.

36. _____ Boys should prefer to play with trucks rather than dolls.

37. _____ It's o.k. for a man to buy a fast, shiny sports car if he wants, even if he may have to stretch beyond his budget.

38. _____ A man should never doubt his own judgement.

39. _____ A man shouldn't have to worry about birth control.

40. _____ A man shouldn't bother with sex unless he can achieve an orgasm.

41. _____ A man should avoid holding his wife's purse at all times.

42. _____ There are some subjects which men should not talk about with other men.

43. _____ Men should always take the initiative when it comes to sex.

44. _____ Fathers should teach their sons to mask fear.

45. _____ Being a little down in the dumps is not a good reason for a man to act depressed.

| Strongly Disagree 1 | Disagree 2 | Slightly Disagree 3 | No Opinion 4 | Slightly Agree 5 | Agree 6 | Strongly Agree 7 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

46. _____ A man should always be ready for sex.

47. _____ Boys should not throw baseballs like girls.

48. _____ If a man is in pain, it's better for him to let people know than to keep it to himself.

49. _____ Men should get to investigate if there is a strange noise in the house at night.

50. _____ A man should think things out logically and have good reasons for what he does.

51. _____ For a man, sex should always be spontaneous, rather than a pre-planned activity.

52. _____ A man who has no taste for adventure is not very appealing.

53. _____ It is not important for men to strive to reach the top.

54. _____ For men, touching is simply the first step toward sex.

55. _____ A man should always be the major provider in his family.

56. _____ A man should be level-headed.

57. _____ Men should be detached in emotionally charged situations.

APPENDIX F

The Quick Discrimination Index (QDI)

Please respond to all items in the survey. Remember there are no right or wrong answers. The survey is completely anonymous.

| Strongly Disagree 1 | Disagree 2 | Not Sure 3 | Agree 4 | Strongly Agree 5 |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |

1. _____ I do not think it is more appropriate for the mother of a newborn baby, rather than the father, to stay home with the baby (not work) during the first year.

2. _____ It is as easy for women to succeed in business as it is for men.

3. _____ I really think affirmative action programs on college campuses constitute reverse discrimination.

4. _____ I feel I could develop an intimate relationship with someone from a different race.

5. _____ All American should learn to speak two languages.

6. _____ It upsets (or angers) me that a woman has never been President of the United States.

7. _____ Generally speaking, men work harder than women.

8. _____ My friendship network is very racially mixed.

9. _____ I am against affirmative action programs in business.

10. _____ I would feel okay about my son or daughter dating someone from a different race.

11. _____ Generally speaking, men seem less concerned with building relationships than women.

| Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Not Sure | Agree | Strongly Agree |
|:---:|:---:|:---:|:---:|:---:|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

12. _____ It upsets (or angers) me that a racial minority person has never been President of the United States.

13. _____ In the past few years there has been too much attention directed toward multicultural or minority issues in education.

14. _____ I think feminist perspectives should be an integral part of the higher education curriculum.

15. _____ Most of my close friends are from my own racial group.

16. _____ I feel somewhat more secure that a man, rather than a woman, is currently President of the United States.

17. _____ I think that it is (or would be) important for my children to attend schools that are racially mixed.

18. _____ In the past few years there has been too much attention directed towards multicultural or minority issues in business.

19. _____ Overall, I think racial minorities in America complain too much about racial discrimination.

20. _____ I feel (or would feel) very comfortable having a woman as my primary physician.

21. _____ I think the President of the United States should make a concerted effort to appoint more women and racial minorities to the country's Supreme Court.

22. _____ I think white people's racism toward racial minority groups still constitutes a major problem in America.

23. _____ I think the school system, from elementary school through college, should encourage minority and immigrant children to learn and fully adopt traditional American values.

| Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Not Sure | Agree | Strongly Agree |
|:-:|:-:|:-:|:-:|:-:|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

24. _____ If I were to adopt a child, I would be happy to adopt a child of any race.

25. _____ I think there is as much female physical violence towards men as there is male physical violence towards women.

26. _____ I think the school system, from elementary school through college, should promote traditional American values as well as the values representative of the diverse cultures in the class.

27. _____ I believe that reading the autobiography of Malcolm X would be of value.

28. _____ I would enjoy living in a neighborhood consisting of racially diverse populations (i.e., Asians, Blacks, Hispanics, Whites).

29. _____ I think it is better if people marry within their own race.

30. _____ Women make too big of a deal out of sexual harassment issues in the workplace.

# APPENDIX G

# CONSENT FORM

| | |
|---|---|
| PROJECT TITLE: | Exploring the Lives of Asian American Men at the Intersection: Racial Identity, Male Role Norms, Gender Role Conflict, and Prejudicial Attitudes |
| HUMAN SUBJECT #: | HSR #99EDCP27 |
| INVESTIGATOR: | William M. Liu, M.A. |
| PURPOSE: | The purpose of this study is to examine Asian American men's attitudes toward masculinity and gender roles, racial identity, and prejudicial beliefs. |
| PROCEDURES: | The procedure involves the completion of the questionnaire packet attached to this consent form. **The consent form must be signed and returned with the survey.** The questionnaire will take about <u>45</u> minutes to complete. Upon completion, return the survey packet to the principle investigator. If you are interested in entering into the drawing and/or receiving results from the study, please fill out the additional form and return it with the packet. *The informed consent form and requests will be separated immediately after receipt so that your answers are confidential and anonymous.* |
| CONFIDENTIALITY: | All information collected in this study is confidential. No identifying marks are made on the instruments. Your name will not be identified or used at any time. All surveys will remain with the investigator, and no one will have access to the surveys except the investigator and his advisor. |
| RISKS: | The risks are minimal in this study. If at anytime you feel uncomfortable, you may withdraw from this study without penalty. The principle investigator will provide you with written information to the counseling center if you feel that you require it. Also, even if you withdraw from the study, you will still be eligible to enter the raffle. |
| BENEFITS; FREEDOM TO WITHDRAW AND ASK QUESTIONS: | I understand that the study is not designed to help me personally, but that the investigator hopes to learn more about Asian American men's attitudes toward masculinity, race, racism, and prejudice. **I understand that I am free to ask questions or to withdraw from participation at any time without penalty.** |

**FACULTY ADVISOR:**
Donald B. Pope-Davis, Ph.D.
Counseling and Personnel Services Dept.
Benjamin Building
University of Maryland at College Park
College Park, MD 20742
(301) 405-2879

**PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR:**
William M. Liu, M.A.
Student Counseling Services
University of Southern California
857 W. 36th Place, YWCA-100
Los Angeles, CA 90089-0051
(213) 740-7711

_____          _____
Signature of the Participant                                        Date

**THANK YOU FOR PARTICIPATING IN THIS STUDY.**

APPENDIX H

COVER LETTER

Date

Dear Participant:

Thank you for agreeing to participate in this study. This study is part of a doctoral dissertation and will focus on the lives and experiences of Asian American men. Everything you will need to participate in this study is included. You should have the following:

1. Cover letter
2. Informed consent form
3. Surveys
4. Debriefing form
5. Raffle entry and results request
6. Return envelope

It is important that you read and sign the informed consent form attached to the front of the survey packet. The informed consent form, by reading and signing it, says that you are agreeing to participate in this study out of choice. The informed consent form, although it contains your name, will be immediately detached from the survey packet upon return so that your anonymity is guaranteed. The same will be done with the raffle entry and results request.

Once you are finished filling out the packet, please place the completed survey in the return envelope and mail back to me. Make sure you also fill out the attached form for the raffle entry and request for results. If you have any questions or comments, please feel free to contact me at (213) 740-9811 or at wliu_68@hotmail.com.

Thank you again for agreeing to participate. Your help is greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,


William Liu, MA

# APPENDIX I

## **DEBRIEFING STATEMENT**

The questionnaires that you just completed are part of a study on Asian American men. The questionnaires focus on masculine attitudes and conflicts that surround being an Asian American man in American society. Other questionnaires also focused on your attitudes toward race, racism, and prejudice. The intent of the study is to examine how attitudes relating to masculinity are related to racial identity, racism, and prejudicial attitudes. This study's intent is to develop research on Asian American men that may be used to better provide mental health services in the future. If you are interested in obtaining a summary of the results, please return the request form with the survey packet or you may contact me at (213) 740-7711 or at wliu@deans.umd.edu or wml@usc.edu. Thank you again for your participation.

APPENDIX J

**Entry for the Raffle and Request for Results of the Study**

Please check all that apply and return it with the survey:

_____I would like to **receive results from the study.**

_____I would like to **enter into the drawing.** The first prize is $50 and the second
prize is $25. *I understand that I will be contacted about the raffle following*
*the*    *completion of data gathering by the investigator.*

Name:_____

Address:_____

_____

Phone:_____

Email:_____

Thank you for participating in this study

APPENDIX K

## **Reminder Postcard**

Dear Participant:

Approximately 2 weeks ago, you were sent a survey packet and were asked to fill it out and return it. The survey was from a study that focuses on Asian American masculinity. If you have filled it out and returned it, thank you. If you have not filled out the surveys, please fill it out and return it in the envelope. If you have lost or misplaced the survey packet, please contact me at wliu@deans.umd.edu or (213) 740-7711 for another copy.

Sincerely,


William Liu, MA

# APPENDIX L

## Correlational Matrix of Dependent and Independent Variables

| Variable | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| GRCS TOTAL (1) | | .80** | .80** | .70** | .62** | .37** | .28** |
| GRCS SPC (2) | .80** | | .33** | .37** | .48** | .34** | .24** |
| GRCS RE (3) | .73** | .33** | | .56** | .30** | .25** | .15** |
| GRCS RABBM (4) | .70** | .37** | .56** | | .25** | .32** | .33** |
| GRCS CBWL (5) | .62** | .48** | .30** | .25** | | .16** | .14** |
| MNRI AF (6) | .37** | .34** | .25** | .32** | .16** | | .56** |
| MNRI RH (7) | .28** | .24** | .15** | .33** | .14** | .56** | |
| MNRI SR (8) | .46** | .56** | .16** | .24** | .32** | .45** | .37** |
| MNRI AGG (9) | .36** | .45** | .13* | .16** | .26** | .55** | .40** |
| MNRI Ach/Stat (10) | .39** | .40** | .22** | .28** | .22** | .63** | .56** |
| MNRI Att-Sex (11) | .19** | .11* | .17** | .20** | .07 | .56** | .49** |
| MNRI Re (12) | .34** | .27** | .29** | .31** | .13* | .54** | .50** |
| MNRI Non-Trad (13) | .20** | .27** | .07 | .05 | .23** | .06 | -.03 |
| MNRI Trad (14) | .46** | .44** | .27** | .35** | .24** | .82** | .71** |
| POC CONF (15) | .05 | -.07 | .17** | .06 | .08 | .04 | -.03 |
| POC DISS (16) | .20** | .08 | .24** | .14** | .18** | .10 | .10 |
| POC Imm/Res (17) | .19** | .05 | .18** | .23** | .19** | .16** | .16** |
| POC INTERN (18) | .27** | .43** | -.04 | .04 | .25** | .20** | .10 |
| QDI TOTAL (19) | .05 | .03 | -.03 | .01 | .11* | -.14* | -.10 |

Note.    GRCS = Gender Role Conflict Scale; SPC = Success, Power, Competition; RE = Restrictive Emotionality; RABBM = Restrictive Affectionate Behavior Between Men – Homophobia; CBWL = Conflict Between Work and Leisure – Family Relations; MRNI = Masculine Role Norms Inventory; AF = Avoidance of Femininity; RH = Rejection of Homosexuals; SR = Self-Reliance; AGG = Aggression; Ach/Stat = Non-Traditional Achievement/Status; Att-Sex = Attitude Toward Sex; Re = Restrictive Emotionality; Non-Trad = Non-Traditional Attitudes; Trad = Traditional Attitudes; POC = People of Color; Conf = Conformity; Diss = Dissonance; Imm/Res = Immersion and Resistance; INTERN = Internalization; and QDI = Quick Discrimination Index.

Correlational Matrix of Dependent and Independent Variables (continued)

| Variable | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| GRCS TOTAL (1) | .46** | .36** | .39** | .19** | .40** | .20** | .46** |
| GRCS SPC (2) | .56** | .45** | .40** | .11* | .27** | .23** | .44** |
| GRCS RE (3) | .16** | .13* | .22** | .17** | .29** | .07 | .27** |
| GRCS RABBM (4) | .24** | .16** | .28** | .20** | .31** | .05 | .35** |
| GRCS CBWL (5) | .32** | .26** | .22** | .07 | .13* | .23** | .24** |
| MNRI AF (6) | .45** | .55** | .63** | .56** | .54** | .06 | .82** |
| MNRI RH (7) | .37** | .40** | .56** | .49** | .50** | -.03 | .71** |
| MNRI SR (8) | | .68** | .53** | .23** | .50** | .36** | .71** |
| MNRI AGG (9) | .68** | | .56** | .33** | .41** | .35** | .72** |
| MNRI Ach/Stat (10) | .53** | .56** | | .59** | .55** | .10 | .84** |
| MNRI Att-Sex (11) | .23** | .33** | .59** | | .57** | -.05 | .73** |
| MNRI Re (12) | .50** | .41** | .55** | .57** | | -.01 | .77** |
| MNRI Non-Trad (13) | .36** | .35** | .10 | -.05 | -.01 | | .15** |
| MNRI Trad (14) | .71** | .72** | .84** | .73** | .77** | .15** | |
| POC CONF (15) | -.10 | -.04 | -.00 | .03 | .01 | -.10 | -.02 |
| POC DISS (16) | .06 | .08 | .13* | .14* | .09 | .10 | .14* |
| POC Imm/Res (17) | .01 | .07 | .13* | .21** | .15** | .02 | .15** |
| POC INTERN (18) | .48** | .41** | .19** | -.01 | .08 | .38** | .27** |
| QDI TOTAL (19) | .10 | .09 | -.18** | -.17** | -.09 | .21** | -.10 |

Note.    GRCS = Gender Role Conflict Scale; SPC = Success, Power, Competition; RE = Restrictive Emotionality; RABBM = Restrictive Affectionate Behavior Between Men – Homophobia; CBWL = Conflict Between Work and Leisure – Family Relations; MRNI = Masculine Role Norms Inventory; AF = Avoidance of Femininity; RH = Rejection of Homosexuals; SR = Self-Reliance; AGG = Aggression; Ach/Stat = Achievement/Status; Att-Sex = Attitude Toward Sex; Re = Restrictive Emotionality; Non-Trad = Non-Traditional Attitudes; Trad = Traditional Attitudes; POC = People of Color; Conf = Conformity; Diss = Dissonance; Imm/Res = Immersion and Resistance; INTERN = Internalization; and QDI = Quick Discrimination Index.

# APPENDIX M

Correlational Coefficients for GRCS Total and Subscale Scores and MRNI Subscale

Scores

| Variable | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| GRCS TOTAL (1) | | .80** | .80** | .70** | .62** | .37** | .28** |
| GRCS SPC (2) | .80** | | .33** | .37** | .48** | .34** | .24** |
| GRCS RE (3) | .73** | .33** | | .56** | .30** | .25** | .15** |
| GRCS RABBM (4) | .70** | .37** | .56** | | .25** | .32** | .33** |
| GRCS CBWL (5) | .62** | .48** | .30** | .25** | | .16** | .14** |
| MNRI AF (6) | .37** | .34** | .25** | .32** | .16** | | .56** |
| MNRI RH (7) | .28** | .24** | .15** | .33** | .14** | .56** | |
| MNRI SR (8) | .46** | .56** | .16** | .24** | .32** | .45** | .37** |
| MNRI AGG (9) | .36** | .45** | .13* | .16** | .26** | .55** | .40** |
| MNRI Ach/Stat (10) | .39** | .40** | .22** | .28** | .22** | .63** | .56** |
| MNRI Att-Sex (11) | .19** | .11* | .17** | .20** | .07 | .56** | .49** |
| MNRI Re (12) | .34** | .27** | .29** | .31** | .13* | .54** | .50** |
| MNRI Non-Trad (13) | .20** | .27** | .07 | .05 | .23** | .06 | -.03 |
| MNRI Trad (14) | .46** | .44** | .27** | .35** | .24** | .82** | .71** |

Note.    * p < = .05; ** p < = .01; GRCS = Gender Role Conflict Scale; SPC = Success, Power, Competition; RE = Restrictive Emotionality; RABBM = Restrictive Affectionate Behavior Between Men – Homophobia; CBWL = Conflict Between Work and Leisure – Family Relations; MRNI = Masculine Role Norms Inventory; AF = Avoidance of Femininity; RH = Rejection of Homosexuals; SR = Self-Reliance; AGG = Aggression; Ach/Stat = Achievement/Status; Att-Sex = Attitude Toward Sex; Re = Restrictive Emotionality; Non-Trad = Non-Traditional Attitudes; and Trad = Traditional Attitudes.

Correlational Coefficients for GRCS Total and Subscale Scores and MRNI Subscale

Scores (continued)

| Variable | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| GRCS TOTAL (1) | .46** | .36** | .39** | .19** | .40** | .20** | .46** |
| GRCS SPC (2) | .56** | .45** | .40** | .11* | .27** | .23** | .44** |
| GRCS RE (3) | .16** | .13* | .22** | .17** | .29** | .07 | .27** |
| GRCS RABBM (4) | .24** | .16** | .28** | .20** | .31** | .05 | .35** |
| GRCS CBWL (5) | .32** | .26** | .22** | .07 | .13* | .23** | .24** |
| MNRI AF (6) | .45** | .55** | .63** | .56** | .54** | .06 | .82** |
| MNRI RH (7) | .37** | .40** | .56** | .49** | .50** | -.03 | .71** |
| MNRI SR (8) | | .68** | .53** | .23** | .50** | .36** | .71** |
| MNRI AGG (9) | .68** | | .56** | .33** | .41** | .35** | .72** |
| MNRI Ach/Stat (10) | .53** | .56** | | .59** | .55** | .10 | .84** |
| MNRI Att-Sex (11) | .23** | .33** | .59** | | .57** | -.05 | .73** |
| MNRI Re (12) | .50** | .41** | .55** | .57** | | -.01 | .77** |
| MNRI Non-Trad (13) | .36** | .35** | .10 | -.05 | -.01 | | .15** |
| MNRI Trad (14) | .71** | .72** | .84** | .73** | .77** | .15** | |

Note.    * $p <= .05$; ** $p <= .01$. GRCS = Gender Role Conflict Scale; SPC = Success, Power, Competition; RE = Restrictive Emotionality; RABBM = Restrictive Affectionate Behavior Between Men – Homophobia; CBWL = Conflict Between Work and Leisure – Family Relations; MRNI = Masculine Role Norms Inventory; AF = Avoidance of Femininity; RH = Rejection of Homosexuals; SR = Self-Reliance; AGG = Aggression; Ach/Stat = Achievement/Status; Att-Sex = Attitude Toward Sex; Re = Restrictive Emotionality; Non-Trad = Non-Traditional Attitudes; and Trad = Traditional Attitudes.

Correlational Coefficients for GRCS Total and Subscale Scores and MRNI Subscale Scores (continued)

| Variable | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| GRCS TOTAL (1) | .06 | .20** | .19** | .27** | .05 |
| GRCS SPC (2) | -.07 | .08 | .05 | .43** | .03 |
| GRCS RE (3) | .17** | .24** | .18** | -.04 | -.03 |
| GRCS RABBM (4) | .06 | .14** | .23** | .04 | .01 |
| GRCS CBWL (5) | .08 | .18** | .19** | .25** | .11* |
| MNRI AF (6) | .04 | .10 | .08 | .20** | -.14* |
| MNRI RH (7) | -.03 | .10 | .16** | .10 | -.10 |
| MNRI SR (8) | -.10 | .06 | .01 | .48** | .10 |
| MNRI AGG (9) | -.04 | .08 | .07 | .41** | .09 |
| MNRI Ach/Stat (10) | -.00 | .13* | .13* | .19** | -.18** |
| MNRI Att-Sex (11) | .03 | .14* | .21** | -.01 | -.17** |
| MNRI Re (12) | .00 | .09 | .15** | .08 | -.09 |
| MNRI Non-Trad (13) | -.10 | .10 | .02 | .38** | .21** |
| MNRI Trad (14) | .46** | .14* | .15** | .27** | -.10 |
| POC CONF (15) | | .45** | .27** | -.29** | -.14* |
| POC DISS (16) | .20** | | .33** | -.01 | -.07 |
| POC Imm/Res (17) | .19** | .33** | | -.07 | -.04 |
| POC INTERN (18) | .27** | -.01 | -.07 | | .22** |
| QDI TOTAL (19) | .05 | -.07 | -.04 | .22** | |

Note.    GRCS = Gender Role Conflict Scale; SPC = Success, Power, Competition; RE = Restrictive Emotionality; RABBM = Restrictive Affectionate Behavior Between Men – Homophobia; CBWL = Conflict Between Work and Leisure – Family Relations; MRNI = Masculine Role Norms Inventory; AF = Avoidance of Femininity; RH = Rejection of Homosexuals; SR = Self-Reliance; AGG = Aggression; Ach/Stat = Achievement/Status; Att-Sex = Attitude Toward Sex; Re = Restrictive Emotionality; Non-Trad = Non-Traditional Attitudes; Trad = Traditional Attitudes; POC = People of Color; Conf = Conformity; Diss = Dissonance; Imm/Res = Immersion and Resistance; INTERN = Internalization; and QDI = Quick Discrimination Index.

REFERENCES

Accinelli, L. (1996, January 23). Eye of the beholder. Los Angeles Times, p. B8, B9.

Addelson, J. (1999). Doning the full monty with Dirk and Jane: Using the phallus to validate marginalized masculinities. Journal of Men's Studies, 7 (3), 337-352.

Almaguer, T. (1994). Racial fault lines: The historic origins of White supremacy in California. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Alsaybar, B.D. (1999). Deconstructing deviance: Filipino American youth gangs, "party culture," and ethnic identity in Los Angeles. Amerasia Journal, 25 (1), 116-139.

Alvarez, A., Kohatsu, E., Liu, W., & Yeh, L., (1996, February). Rethinking Asian Pacific American Racial Identity: Distinctions between Racial and Ethnic Identity. Paper presented at the meeting of the Winter Roundtable on Cross-Cultural Counseling and Psychotherapy, New York, NY.

Anastasi, A. (1982). Psychological testing (5th ed.). New York: MacMillan.

Anastasi, A. (1988). Psychological testing (6th ed.). New York: MacMillan.

Ancheta, A.N. (1998). Race, rights, and the Asian American experience. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.

Andronico, M.P. (1996) (Ed.). Men in groups: insights, interventions, psychoeducational work. Washington, D.C.: American Psychological Association.

Angier, N. (1998, December 22). Drugs, sports, body image and G.I. Joe. New York Times, D1, D4.

Atkinson, D.R., & Matsushita, Y.J. (1991). Japanese-American acculturation, counseling style, counselor ethnicity, and perceived counseling credibility. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 38, 473-478.

Atkinson, D.R., Morten, G., & Sue, D.W. (1993) (Eds.). Counseling American minorities: A cross-cultural perspective (4th Ed.). Dubuque, IA: Wm.C. Brown.

Balcom, D.A. (1998). Absent fathers: Effects on abandoned sons. Journal of Men's Studies, 6 (3), 283-296.

Barbee, A.P., Cunningham, M.R., Winstead, B.A., Derlega, V.J., Gulley, M.R., Yankeelov, P.A., & Druen, P.B. (1993). Effects of gender role expectations on the social support process. Journal of Social Issues, 49, 175-190.

Bergman, S.J. (1995). Men's psychological development: A relational perspective. In R.F. Levant & W. S. Pollack (Eds.), A new psychology of men (pp. 68-90). New York: Basic Books.

Berndt, T.J., & Heller, K.A. (1986). Gender stereotypes and social inferences: A developmental study. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 50, 889-898.

Biernat, M. (1991). Gender stereotypes and the relationship between masculinity and femininity: A developmental analysis. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 61, 351-365.

Bogart, L.M. (1998). The relationship of stereotypes about helpers to help-seeking judgements, preferences, and behaviors. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 24, 1264-1275.

Boston, L. (1998). Men of color: Fashion, history, fundamentals. New York: Artisan.

Brandon, P.R. (1991). Gender differences in young Asian Americans' educational attainments. Sex Roles, 25, 45-61.

Brooks, G.R., & Silverstein, L.S. (1995). Understanding the dark side of masculinity: An interactive systems model. In R.F. Levant & W.S. Pollack (Eds.), A new psychology of men (pp. 280-333). New York: Basic Books.

Brooks, G.R. (1998a). A new psychotherapy for traditional men. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Brooks, G.R. (1998b). Group therapy for traditional men. . In W.S. Pollack and R.F. Levant (Eds.), New psychotherapy for men (pp. 83-96). New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc.

Broverman, I.K., Broverman, D.M., Clarkson, F.E., Rosenkrantz, P.S., & Vogel, S.R. (1970). Sex-role stereotypes and clinical judgements of mental health. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 34, 1-7.

Brown, F. (1987). Counseling Vietnamese refugees: The new challenge. International Journal for the Advancement of Counseling, 10 (4), 259-268.

Brownstein, R. (1999, September 20). Program needs political parenting to break cycle of fatherless families. The Los Angeles Times, p. A 5.

Bryant, F.B., & Yarnold, P.R. (1995). Principal-components analysis and exploratory and confirmatory factor analysis. In L.G. Grimm & P.R. Yarnold (Eds.), Reading and understanding multivariate statistics (pp. 99-136). Washington, D.C.: American Psychological Association.

Burke, D., & Yeh, C.J. (1999, August). Asian-American male selves across relational domains. Poster session presented at the annual meeting of the American Psychological Association, Boston, MA.

Cash, T.F., & Brown, T.A. (1989). Gender and body images: Stereotypes and realities. Sex Roles, 21, 361-373.

Cazenare, N.A. (1984). Race, socioeconomic status, and age: The social context of American masculinity. Sex Roles, 11, 639-656.

Chan, C.S. (1989). Issues of identity development among Asian-American lesbians and gay men. Journal of Counseling and Development, 68, 16-20.

Chan, J.W. (1998). Contemporary Asian American men's issues. In L.R. Hirabayashi (Ed.) Teaching Asian America: Diversity and the problem of community (pp. 93-102). New York: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers.

Chan, S. (1991a). Asian Americans: An interpretive history. Boston, MA: Twayne.

Chan, S. (1991b). The exclusion of Chinese women 1870-1943. In S. Chan (Ed.) Entry denied: Exclusion and the Chinese community in America, 1882-1943 (pp. 94-146). Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Chan, J.P., Chin, F., Inada, L.F., & Wong, S. (1991). The big Aiiieeeee!: An anthology of Chinese American and Japanese American literature. New York: Meridian.

Carter, R.T. (1995). The influence of race and racial identity in psychotherapy: Toward a racially inclusive model. New York: John Wiley and Sons.

Chen, C.H. (1996). Feminization of Asian (American) men in the U.S. mass media: An analysis of the Ballad of Little Jo. Journal of Communication Inquiry, 20 (2), 57-71.

Cheung, K.K. (1993). Articulate silences: Hisaye Yamamoto, Maxine Hong Kingston, Joy Kogawa. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Chia, R.C., Moore, J.L., Lam, K.N., Chuang, C.J., & Cheng, B.S. (1994). Cultural differences in gender role attitudes between Chinese and American students. Sex Roles, 31, 23-30.

J. L. Chin (1998). Mental health services and treatment. . In L.C. Lee & N.W.S. Zane (Eds.) Handbook of Asian American psychology (pp. 485-504). Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Chin, K. (1996). Chinatown gangs: Extortion, enterprise, and ethnicity. New York: Oxford University Press.

Chow, C.S. (1998). Leaving deep water: The lives of Asian American women at the crossroads of two cultures. New York: Dutton.

Chow, E.N.L. (1996). The development of feminist consciousness among Asian American women. In E.N.L. Chow, & D.Y. Wilkinson (Eds.), Race, class, & gender: Common bonds, different voices (pp. 251-264). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

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.

Chun, G.H. (2000). Of orphans & warriors: Inventing Chinese American culture and identity. New Jersey: Rutgers University Press.

Chung, R. (1999). Reflections on a Korean American journey. In P.G. Min and R. Kim (Eds.) Struggling for ethnic identity: Narratives by Asian American professionals (pp. 59-68). Walnut Creek, CA: Alta Mira Press.

Clarity, J.F. (1999, March 14). Lost youth in Ireland: Suicide rate is climbing. The New York Times, p. A9.

Coltrane, S. (1994). Theorizing masculinities in contemporary social science. In H. Brod & M. Kaufman (Eds.) Theorizing masculinities (pp. 39-60). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Combs, D.C., & Heger, H.K. 91996). A gender/ethnic investigation of relationship closeness to the father and experience of grief. The Journal of Men's Studies, 4 (4), 341-353.

Commission on Civil Rights (1992). Civil rights issues facing Asian American sin the 1990's. Washington, D.C.: Author.

Connell, R.W. (1995). Masculinities. Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Conway-Long, D. (1994). Ethnographies and masculinities. . In H. Brod & M. Kaufman (Eds.) Theorizing masculinities (pp.61-81). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Cournoyer, R.J., & Mahalik, J.R. (1995). Cross-sectional study of gender role conflict examining college-aged and middle-aged men. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 42, 11-19.

Cross, W.E. (1971). The Negro-to-Black conversion experience. Black World, 20 (9), 13-27.

Davis, S. (1990). Men as success objects and women as sex objects: A study of personal advertisements. Sex Roles, 23, 43-50.

Deaux, K., & Lewis, L.L. (1984). Structure of gender stereotypes: Interrelationship among components and gender label. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 46, 991-1004.

Deffenbacher, J.L., & Swaim, R.C. (1999). Anger expression in Mexican American and White non-Hispanic adolescents. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 46, 61-69.

DeLeon, B. (1993). Sex role identity among college students: A cross-cultural analysis. Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences, 15, 476-489.

Delgado, R., & Stefancic, J. (1995). Minority men, misery, and the marketplace of ideas. In M. Berger, B. Wallis, & S. Watson (Eds.) Constructing masculinity (pp. 211-220). New York: Routledge.

David, D., & Brannon, R. (Eds.). (1976). The forty-nine percent majority: the male sex role. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Donaldson, M. (1993). What is hegemonic masculinity? Theory and Society, 22, 643-657.

Doss, B.D., & Hopkins, J.R. (1998). The multicultural masculine ideology scale: Validation from three cultural perspectives. Sex Roles, 38, 719-741.

Duleep, H.O., & Sanders, S. (1992). Discrimination at the top: American-born Asian and white men. Industrial relations, 31 (3), 416-432.

Dunning, D., & Sherman, D.A. (1997). Stereotypes and tacit inference. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 73, 459-471.

Eisler, R.M. (1998). Male reference group identity dependence: Another concept of masculine identity to understand men? The Counseling Psychologist, 26, 422-426.

Eisler, R.M., & Skidmore, J.R. (1987). Masculine gender role stress: Scale development and component factors in the appraisal of stressful situations. Behavior Modification, 11, 123-136.

Eng, D. L. (1997). Out here and over there: Queerness and diaspora in Asian American studies. Social Text, 52/53, 31-52.

England, E.M. (1992). College student gender stereotypes: Expectations about the behavior of male subcategory members. Sex Roles, 27, 699-716.

Espiritu, Y.L. (1997). Asian American women and men. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Espiritu, Y.L. (1998). All men are not created equal: Asian men in U.S. history. In M.S. Kimmel & M.A. Messner (Eds.) Men's lives (pp. 35-44) (4th ed.). Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Farquhar, J., & Doi, M.L. (1978 Fall). Bruce Lee vs. Fu Manchu: Kung fu films and Asian American stereotypes in America. Bridge, 23-40.

Federal Register (1997, October 30). Office of management and budget: revisions to the standards for the classification of federal data on race and ethnicity. (Notices, Vol. 62, No. 210). Washington, D.C.: Author.

Ferber, A.L. (1998). Constructing whiteness: The intersections of race and gender in U.S. white supremacist discourse. Ethnic and Racial Studies, 21, 48-63.

Fine, M., Weis, L., & Addelston, J. (1998). On shaky grounds: Constructing white working-class masculinities in the late twentieth century. In D. Carlson & M.W. Apple (Eds.) Power/knowledge/pedagogy: The meaning of democratic education in unsettling times (pp. 149-173). Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Fischer, A.R., & Good, G.E. (1998). Perceptions of parent-child relationships and masculine role conflicts of college men. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 45, 346-302.

Fischer, A.R., Tokar, D.M., Good, G.E., & Snell, A.F. (1998). More on the structure of male role norms: Exploratory and multiple sample confirmatory analyses. Psychology of Women Quarterly, 22, 135-155.

Franklin, A.J. (1998). Treating anger in African American men. . In W.S. Pollack and R.F. Levant (Eds.), New psychotherapy for men (pp. 239-258). New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc.

Fraser, L. (1999, March/April). The hard body sell. Mother Jones, 31-33.

Friday, C. (1994). Organizing Asian American labor: The pacific coast canned salmon industry, 1870-1942. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.

Frieberg, P., & Sleek, S. (1999, March). New techniques help men uncover their hidden emotions. APA Monitor, p. 28.

Fuertes, J. N., & Gelso, C.J. (1998). Asian-American, Euro-American, and African-American students' universal-diverse orientation and preferences for characteristics of psychologists. Psychological Reports, 83, 280-282.

Fukuyama, M.A., & Ferguson, A.D. (2000). Lesbian, gay, and bisexual people of color: Understanding cultural complexity and managing multiple oppressions. In R.M. Perez, D.A. DeBord, & K.J. Bieschkle (Eds.), <u>Handbook of counseling and psychotherapy with lesbian, gay, and bisexual clients</u> (pp. 81-105). Washington, D.C.: American Psychological Association.

Fung, R. (1998). Looking for my penis: The eroticized Asian in gay video porn. In M.S. Kimmel & M.A. Messner (Eds.) <u>Men's lives</u> (pp. 495-504) (4th ed.). Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Fujino, D.C. (1993). Extending exchange theory: Effects of ethnicity and gender on Asian American heterosexual relationships (Doctoral dissertation, University of California at Los Angeles, 1993). <u>Dissertation Abstracts International, 53,</u> 4932B.

Fujino, D.C. (1997). The rates, patterns and reasons for forming heterosexual interracial dating relationships among Asian Americans. <u>Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 14,</u> 809-828.

Gecas, V. (1992). Contexts of socialization. In M. Rosenberg & R.H. Turner (Eds.) <u>Social psychology: Sociological perspectives</u> (pp. 165-199). New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers.

Gilman, S. (1998). <u>Creating beauty to cure the soul: Race and psychology in the shaping of aesthetic surgery.</u> Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Gilmore, D.D. (1990). Manhood in the making: Cultural concepts of masculinity. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Gonzalves, T. (1995). "The show must go on": Production notes on the Pilipino cultural night. Critical Mass, 2 (2), 129-144.

Good, G.E., & Mintz, L.B. (1990). Depression and gender role conflict. Journal of Counseling and Development, 69, 17-21.

Good, G.E., Robertson, J.M., Fitzgerald, L.F., Stevens, M., & Bartels, K.M. (1996). The relation between masculine role conflict and psychological distress in male university counseling center clients. Journal of Counseling and Development, 75, 44-49.

Good, G.E., Robertson, J.M., O'Neil, J.M., Fitzgerald, L.F., Stevens, M., Debord, K.A., Bartels, K.M., & Braverman, D.G. (1995). Male gender role conflict: Psychometric issues and relations to psychological distress. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 42, 3-10.

Gotunda, N. (1991). A critique of "Our constitution is color-blind." Stanford Law Review, 44 (1), 1-73.

Gudykunst, W.B., Gao, G., Schmidt, K.L., Nishida, T., Bond, M.H., Leung, K., Wang, G., Barraclough, R.A. (1992). The influence of individualism-collectivism, self-monitoring, and predicted-outcome value on communication in in-group and outgroup relations. Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 23, 196-213.

Gupta, A. (1998). At the crossroads: College activism and its impact on Asian American identity formation. In L.D. Shankar & R. Srikanth (Eds.), A part, yet apart: South Asians in Asian America (pp. 127-145). Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.

Halberstam, J. (1998). Female masculinity. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Hall, C.C.I. (1997). Cultural malpractice: The growing obsolescence of psychology with the changing U.S. population. American Psychologist, 52, 642-651.

Hamamoto, D.Y. (1994). Monitored peril: Asian Americans and the politics of tv representation. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

Harris, A.C. (1994). Ethnicity as a determinant of sex role identity: A replication study of item selection for the Bem Sex Role Inventory. Sex Roles, 31, 241-273.

Harris, C.I. (1995). Whiteness as property. In K. Crenshaw, N. Gotanda, G. Pella, & K. Thomas (Eds.) Critical race theory: The key writings that formed the movement (pp. 276-291). New York: The New Press.

Harris, I., Torres, J.B., & Allender, D. (1994). The responses of African American men to dominant norms of masculinity within the United States. Sex Roles, 31, 703-719.

Harvard Law Review (1993). Racial violence against Asian Americans. 106, 1926-1943.

Heesacker, M., & Prichard, S. (1992). In a different voice, revisited: Men, women, and emotion. Journal of Mental Health Counseling, 14, 274-290.

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

Helgeson, V.S. (1994). Prototypes and dimensions of masculinity and femininity. Sex Roles, 31, 653-682.

Helms, J.E. (1990). Black and White racial identity: Theory, research, and practice. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.

Helms, J.E., (1995). An update of Helms' White and People of Color racial identity models. In J.G. Ponterotto, J.M. Casas, L.A. Suzuki, & C.M. Alexander (Eds.) Handbook of multicultural counseling (pp. 181-198). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Helms, J.E., & Carter, R. (1990). A preliminary overview of the Cultural Identity Attitude scale. Unpublished manuscript.

Helms, J.E., & Cook, D.A. (1999). Using race and culture in counseling and psychotherapy: Theory and process. New York: Allyn & Bacon.

Helms, J.E., & Parham, T.A. (1984). The racial identity attitude scale. Unpublished manuscript.

Henderson-King, E.I., & Nisbett, R.E. (1996). Anti-black prejudice as a function of exposure to the negative behavior of a single black person. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 71, 654-664.

Heppner, M.J., Neville, H.A., Smith, K., Kivlighan, D.M., Gershuny, B.S. (1999). Examining immediate and long-term efficacy of rape prevention programming with racially diverse college men. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 46, 16-26.

Heyamoto, L. (1999, July 16). Is interracial dating still stigmatized? Young Asian Americans say yes and no. Northwest Asian Weekly, p. 5.

Holt, C.L., & Ellis, J.B. (1998). Assessing the current validity of the Bem Sex-Role Inventory. Sex Roles, 39, 929-941.

Hom, A.Y. (1996). Stories from the homefront: Perspectives of Asian American parents with lesbian daughters and gay sons. In R. Leong (Ed.) Asian American sexualities: Dimensions of the gay and lesbian experience (pp. 37-50). New York: Rutledge.

Hondagneu, S.P., & Messner, M.A. (1997). Gender displays and men's power: The "new man" and the Mexican immigrant man. In M. M. Gergen, & S.N. Davis (Eds.), Toward a new psychology of gender (pp. 503-520). New York: Routledge.

Hunter, A.G., & Sellers, S.L. (1998). Feminist attitudes among African American men and women. Gender and Society, 12, 81-99.

Ito, R. (1998, April 29). Asian fraternity in trouble: UCLA group suspended over hazing. Asian Week, p. 10.

Jackman, M.R., & Jackman, R.W. (1973). An interpretation of the relation between objective and subjective social class status. American Sociological Review, 38, 569-582.

Jackson, L.A., Sullivan, L.A., & Hodge, C.N. (1993). Stereotype effects on attributions, predictions, and evaluations: No two social judgements are quite alike. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 65, 69-84.

Jacobson, M.F. (1998). Whiteness of a different color: European immigrants and the alchemy of race. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Jeong, A. (1999). A handicapped Korean in America. In P.G. Min and R. Kim (Eds.) Struggling for ethnic identity: Narratives by Asian American professionals (pp. 68-74). Walnut Creek, CA: Alta Mira Press.

Jo, G. (1998). Examining the "white racist/black victim" stereotype. International Review of Victimology, 5 (3-4), 235-256.

Kalof, L., & Cargill, T. (1991). Fraternity and sorority membership and gender dominance attitudes. Sex Roles, 25, 417-423.

Kandiyoti, D. (1988). Bargaining with patriarchy. Gender and Society, 2, 274-290.

Kang, K.C. (2000a, March 2). U.S. Asians seen as "alien," study finds. The Los Angeles Times, p. A3, A22.

Kang, K.C. (2000b, March 27). Suicide is symbol of workplace prejudice. The Los Angeles Times, p. B1, B3.

Kelly, K.R., & Hall, A.S. (1992). Toward a developmental model for counseling men. Journal of Mental Health Counseling, 14, 257-273.

Kendall, L. (1999). "The nerd within": Mass media and the negotiation of identity among computer using men. Journal of Men's Studies, 7 (3), 353-369.

Kerkstra, P. (1998, April 4). "Boot camp" may be tied to UCLA frat injuries. The Los Angeles Times, B1.

Kibria, N. (1999). College and notions of "Asian American": Second generation Chinese and Korean Americans negotiate race and identity. Amerasia Journal, 25 (1), 29-52.

Kibria, N. (1993). Family tightrope: The changing lives of Vietnamese Americans. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Kiely, L.J. (1997). An exporatory analysis of the relationship of racial identity, social class, and family influence on Womanist identity development (Doctoral dissertation, University of Maryland at College Park, 1997). Dissertation Abstracts International, 58 (6-A), 2086A.

Kim, B.L.C. (1998). Marriages of Asian women and American military men: The impact of gender and culture. In M. McGoldrick (Ed.) Revisioning family therapy: Race, culture, and gender in practice. New York: Guildford Press.

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

Kim, E.H. (1982). Asian American literature: An introduction to the writings and their social context. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.

Kim, E.H. (1990). "Such opposite creatures": Men and women in Asian American literature. Michigan Quarterly Review, 29, 68-93.

Kim, E.J., O'Neil, J.M., & Owen, S.V. (1996). Asian-American men's acculturation and gender-role conflict. Psychological Reports, 79, 95-104.

Kim, J. (1999, May 31). Speaking of sex... A. Magazine, p. 60.

Kim, J. (1981). The process of Asian American identity development: A study of Japanese-American women's perceptions of their struggle to achieve personal identities as Americans of Asian ancestry. Dissertation Abstracts International, 42, 1551A. (University Microfilm No. 81-18010).

Kim, H.C. (1986). Dictionary of Asian American history. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.

Kim, R. (1999). My trek. In P.G. Min and R. Kim (Eds.) Struggling for ethnic identity: Narratives by Asian American professionals (pp. 49-58). Walnut Creek, CA: Alta Mira Press.

Kimbrough, W.M. (1995). Self-assessment, participation and value of leadership skills, activities, and experiences for Black students relative to their membership in historically Black fraternities and sororities. Journal of Negro Education, 64 (1), 63-74.

Kimmel, M.S. (1994). Masculinity as homophobia: Fear, shame and silence in the construction of gender identity. In H. Brod & M. Kaufman (Eds.) Theorizing masculinities (pp.119-141). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Kimmel, M. (1996). Manhood in America: A cultural history. New York: Free Press.

Kitano, H.L. (1982). Mental health in the Japanese American community. In E.E. Jones & S.J. Korchin (Eds.) Minority mental health (pp. 149-164). New York: Praeger.

Klonoff, E.A. , & Landrine, H. (1999). Cross-validation of the schedule of racist events. Journal of Black Psychology, 25 (2), 231-254.

Koch, L. W. (1995). Interracial rape: Examining the increasing frequency argument. The American Sociologist, 26, 76-86.

Koff, E., & Benavage, A. (1998). Breast size perception and satisfaction, body image, and psychological functioning in Caucasian and Asian American college women. Sex Roles, 38, 655-673.

Kohatsu, E. (1992). The effects of racial identity and acculturation on anxiety, assertiveness, and ascribed identity among Asian American college students. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Maryland, College Park). Dissertation Abstracts International, 54 (2), 1102B.

Kondo, D.K. (1990). M. Butterfly: Orientalism, gender, and a critique of essentialist identity. Cultural Critique, 16, 5-29.

Krugman, S. (1995). Male development and the transformation of shame. In R.F. Levant & W.S. Pollack (Eds.) Psychotherapy of men (pp. 91-126). New York: Basic Books.

Krugman, S. (1998). Men's shame and trauma in therapy. In W.S. Pollack and R.F. Levant (Eds.), New psychotherapy for men (pp. 167-190). New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc.

Kunda, Z., & Oleson, K.C. (1995). Maintaining stereotypes in the face of disconfirmation: Constructing grounds for subtyping deviants. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 68, 565-579.

Kunda, Z., & Oleson, K.C. (1997). When exceptions prove the rule: How extremity of deviance determines the impact of deviant examples on stereotypes. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 72, 965-979.

Lazur, R.F., & Majors, R. (1995). Men of color: Ethnocultural variations of male gender role strain. In W.S. Pollack and R.F. Levant (Eds.), New psychotherapy for men (pp. 337-358). New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc.

Lee, D.B. , & Saul, T.T. (1987). Counseling Asian American men. In M. Scher, M. Stevens, G. Good, & G.A. Eichenfield (Eds.), Handbook of counseling and psychotherapy with men (pp. 180-191). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Lee, E. (1996). Asian American families: An overview. In M. McGoldrick, J. Giodano, & J.K. Pearce (Eds.) Ethnicity and family therapy (pp. 227-248). New York: Guildford Press.

Lee, E.L.H. (1996). Breaking through the chrysalis: Hanh Thi Pham. In R. Leong (Ed.) Asian American sexualities: Dimensions of the gay and lesbian experience (pp. 65-70). New York: Rutledge.

Lee, F.Y. (1991). The relationship of ethnic identity to social support, self-esteem, psychological distress, and help-seeking among Asian American college students. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign.

Lee, S.J. (1996). Perceptions of panethnicity among Asian American high school students. Amerasia Journal, 22 (2), 109-125.

Lee, S.M., & Fernandez, M. (1998). Trends in Asian American racial/ethnic intermarriage: A comparison of 1980 and 1990 census data. Sociological Perspectives, 41, 323-342.

Lee, S.R. (1988). Self-concept correlates of Asian American cultural identity attitudes (Doctoral dissertation, University of Maryland, 1988). Dissertation Abstracts International, 49, 12B.

Lee, L.C., & Zhan, G. (1998). Psychosocial status of children and youths. In L.C. Lee & N.W.S. Zane (Eds.) Handbook of Asian American psychology (pp137-164). Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Leichty, G., & Applegate, J.L. (1991). Socio-cognitive and situational influences on the use of face-saving persuasive strategies. Human Communications Research, 17 (3), 451-484.

Lemon, R.L., & Waeher, C.A. (1996). A test of stability and construct validity of the Black Racial identity Attitude Scale, form B (RIAS-B) and the White Racial Identity Attitude Scale (WRIAS). Measurement and Evaluation in Counseling and Development, 29, 77-85.

Leonard, K.I. (1992). Making ethnic choices: California's Punjabi Mexican Americans. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.

Leupp, G.P. (1995). Male colors: the construction of homosexuality in Tokugawa Japan. Los Angeles, CA: University of California Press.

Levant, R.F. (1996). The new psychology of men. Professional Psychology: Research and Practice 27, 259-265.

Levant, R.F. (1998). Desperately seeking language: Understanding, assessing, and treating normative male alexithymia. In W.S. Pollack and R.F. Levant (Eds.), New psychotherapy for men (pp. 35-56). New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc.

Levant, R.F., & Fischer, J. (in press). The male role norms inventory. In C.M. Davis, W.H. Yarber, R. Bauserman, G. Schreer, & S.L. Davis (Eds.) Sexuality-related measures: A compendium (2nd Ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

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

Levant, R.F., & Majors, R.G., (1997). Masculine ideology among African American and European American college men and women. Journal of Gender, Culture, and Health, 2, 33-43.

Levant, R.F., Majors, R.G., & Kelley, M.L. (1998). Masculinity ideology among young African American and European American women and men in different regions of the United States. Cultural Diversity and Mental Health, 4, 227-236.

Levant, R.F., Wu, R., & Fischer, J. (1996). Masculine ideology: A comparison between U.S. and Chinese young men and women. Journal of Gender, Culture, & Health, 1, 207-220.

Ling, J. (1997). Identity crisis and gender politics: Reappropriating Asian American masculinity. In K.K. Chung (Ed.) An interethnic companion to Asian American literature (pp. 312-337). Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press.

Liu, J.H., Campbell, S.M., & Condie, H. (1995). Ethnocentrism in dating preferences for an American sample: The ingroup bias in social context. European Journal of Social Psychology, 25, 95-115.

Liu, W.M., Pope-Davis, D.B., Nevitt, N., & Toporek, R.L. (1999). Understanding the function of acculturation and prejudicial attitudes among Asian Americans. Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology, 5, 317-328.

Liu, W.M., & Sedlacek, W.E. (1999). Differences in leadership and co-curricular perception among entering male and female Asian Pacific American college students. Journal of the First-Year Experience, 11 (2), 93-114.

Lobel, T.E. (1994). Sex typing and the social perceptions of gender stereotypic and non-stereotypic behavior: The uniqueness of feminine males. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 66, 379-385.

Long, P.D.P. (1996). The dream shattered: Vietnamese gangs in America. Boston, MA: Northeastern University Press.

Long, V.O. (1986). Relationship of masculinity to self-esteem and self-acceptance in female professionals, college students, clients, and victims of domestic violence. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 54, 323-327.

Lorenzi-Cioldi, F. (1991). Self-stereotyping and self-enhancement in gender groups. European Journal of Social Psychology, 21, 403-417.

Lott, J.J. (1998). Asian Americans: From racial category to multiple identities. Walnut Creek, CA: Alta Mira Press.

Lott, J.K., Ness, M.E., Alcorn, J.S., & Greer, R.M. (1999). The impact of gender and age on referrals to psychological counseling. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 46, 132-136.

237

Lowe, L. (1996). Immigrant acts: On Asian American cultural politics. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Lum, J.L. (1998). Family violence. In C.C. Lee & N.W.S. Zane (Eds.) Handbook of Asian American psychology (pp. 505-526). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Mahalik, J.R., Cournoyer, R.J., Defranc, W., Cheny, M., & Napolitano, J.M. (1998). Men's gender role conflict and use of psychological defenses. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 45, 247-255.

Malmquist, C.P. (1985). Handbook of adolescence: Psychopathology, antisocial development, psychotherapy. New York: Jason Aronson, Inc.

Mao, L.R. (1994). Beyond politeness theory: "Face" revisited and renewed. Journal of Pragmatics, 21 (5), 451-486.

Marable, M.. (1998). The black male: Searching beyond stereotypes. In M.S. Kimmel, & M.A. Messner (Eds.) (4th Ed.). Men's lives (pp. 18-24). Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Marchetti, G. (1993). Romance and the yellow peril: Race, sex, and discursive strategies in Hollywood and fiction. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Marquis, J. (2000, March 14). Men tend to avoid health care, study says. The Los Angeles Times, pp. A1, A18.

Marquis, J. (1999, December 16). Alcohol, job woes cited in domestic violence. The Los Angeles Times, pp. A2, A26.

Marusza, J. (1997). Urban white working-class males and the possibilities of collective anger: Patrolling Riley road. Urban Review, 29 (2), 97-112.

Maton, K.I., Hrabowski, F.A., III, & Greif, G.L. (1998). Preparing the way: A qualitative study of high achieving African American males and the role of the family. American Journal of Community Psychology, 26, 639-668.

Matsumoto, V.J. (1993). Farming the home place: A Japanese American community in California 1919-1982. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Merry, S.E. (2000). Colonizing Hawai'i: The cultural power of law. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Messner, M.A. (1997). Politics of masculinities: Men in movements. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Mishkind, M.E., Rodin, J., Silberstein, L.R., & Striegel-Moore, R.H. (1986). The embodiment of masculinity: Cultural, psychological, and behavioral dimensions. American Behavioral Scientist, 29, 545-562.

Mok, T.A. (1998). Getting the message: Media images and stereotypes and their effect on Asian Americans. Cultural Diversity and Mental Health, 4, 185-202.

Mooney, T.F. (1998). Cognitive behavior therapy for men. . In W.S. Pollack and R.F. Levant (Eds.), New psychotherapy for men (pp. 57-82). New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc.

Morten, G., & Atkinson, D.R., (1983). Minority identity development and preference for counselor race. Journal of Negro Education, 52, 156-161.

Mosher, D.L., & Tompkins, S.S. (1988). Scripting the macho man: Hypermasculine socialization and enculturation. The Journal of Sex Research, 25, 60-84.

Moss, C. (1991). For the Asian American, Afro-American, Native American, and Mexican American filmmakers and their friends. In R. Leong (Ed.) Moving the image: Independent Asian Pacific American media arts (pp. 121-124). Los Angeles, CA: University of California at Los Angeles, Asian American Studies Center.

Mosse, G.L. (1996). The image of man: The creation of modern masculinity. New York: Oxford University Press.

Mulford, M., Orbell, J., Shatto, C., & Stockard, J. (1998). Physical attractiveness, opportunity, and success in everyday exchange. American Journal of Sociology, 103, 1565-1592.

Nagata, D.K. (1998). Internment and intergenerational relations. In C.C. Lee & N.W.S. Zane (Eds.) Handbook of Asian American psychology (pp. 433-456). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Nagel, J. (1998). Masculinity and nationalism: Gender and sexuality in the making of nations. Ethnic and Racial Studies, 21, 242-269.

Nakamura, D. (2000, February 27). The Asian advantage: Suddenly, it's great to be me. Washington Post, p. B5.

Narayan, U. (1995). "Male-order" brides: Immigrant women, domestic violence and immigration law. Hypatia, 10 (1) 104-119.

O'Neil, J.M. (1990). Assessing men's gender role conflict. In D. Moore & F. Leafgren (Eds.), <u>Problem solving strategies and interventions for men in conflict</u> (pp. 23-38). Alexandria, VA: American Counseling Association.

O'Neil, J.M., & Egan, J. (1992). Men's gender role transitions over the life span: Transformations and fears of femininity. <u>Journal of Mental Health Counseling, 14,</u> 305-324.

O'Neil, J.M., Egan, J., Owen, S.V., & Murry, V.M. (1993). The gender role journey measure: Scale development and psychometric evaluation. <u>Sex Roles, 28,</u> 167-185.

O'Neil, J.M., Good, G.E., & Holmes, S. (1995). Fifteen years of theory and research on men's gender role conflict: New paradigms for empirical research. In W.S. Pollack and R.F. Levant (Eds.), <u>New psychotherapy for men</u> (pp. 164-206). New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc.

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. <u>Sex Roles, 14,</u> 335-350.

Pan, E. (2000, February 16). <u>Why Asian guys are on a roll.</u> Available: http://www.newsweek.com/nw-srv/printed/us/so/a16374-2000feb13.htm.[1]

---

[1]. Reference for using web based materials was from Tozer, E.E., & McClanahan, M.K. (1999). Treating the purple menace: Ethical considerations of conversion therapy and affirmative alternatives. <u>The Counseling Psychologist, 27,</u> 722-742.

Pang, G.V. (1994). Attitudes toward interracial and interethnic relationships and intermarriage among Korean Americans: The intersections of race, gender, and class inequality. In F. Ng, J. Yung, S.S. Fugita, & E.H. Kim (Eds.) New visions in Asian American studies: diversity, community, power (pp. 111-124). Pullman, WA: Washington State University Press.

Pang, V.O. (1991). The relationship of test anxiety and math achievement to parental values in Asian-American and European-American middle school students. Journal of Research and Development in Education, 24, 1-10.

Parrenas, R.S. (1998). "White trash" meets the "little brown monkeys": the taxi dance hall as a site of interracial and gender alliances between white working class women and Filipino immigrant men in the 1920's and 30s. Amerasia Journal, 24 (2), 115-134.

Pascoe, P. (1999). Miscegenation law, court cases, and ideologies of 'race' in twentieth-century America. In M. Hodes (Ed.) Sex, love, race: Crossing boundaries in North American history (pp. 464-490). New York, NY: New York University Press.

Phinney, J.S. (1996). When we talk about American ethnic groups, what do we mean? American Psychologist, 51, 918-927.

Pittinsky, T.L., Shih, M., Ambady, N. (1999). Identity adaptiveness: Affect across multiple identities. Journal of Social Issues, 55 (3), 503-518.

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

Pleck, J.H. (1995). The gender role strain paradigm: an update. In R.F. Levant & W.S. Pollack (Eds.), <u>A new psychology of men</u> (pp. 11-32). New York: Basic Books. In W.S. Pollack and R.F. Levant (Eds.), <u>New psychotherapy for men</u> (pp. 13-34). New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc.

Pollack, W.S. (1998a). The trauma of Oedipus: Toward a new psychoanalytic psychotherapy for men. In W.S. Pollack and R.F. Levant (Eds.), <u>New psychotherapy for men</u> (pp.13-34). New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc.

Pollack, W.S. (1998b). Mourning, melancholia, and masculinity: Recognizing and treating depression in men. . In W.S. Pollack and R.F. Levant (Eds.), <u>New psychotherapy for men</u> (pp. 147-166). New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc.

Pollack, W.S., & Levant, R.F. (1998). Introduction: Treating men in the 21st century. In W.S. Pollack and R.F. Levant (Eds.), <u>New psychotherapy for men</u> (pp. 1-12). New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc.

Ponterotto, J.G., Baluch, S., & Carielli, D. (1998). The Suinn-Lew Asian self-identity acculturation scale (SL-ASIA): Critique and research recommendations. <u>Measurement and Evaluation in Counseling and Development, 31,</u> 109-124.

Ponterotto, J. G., Burkard, A., Rieger, B. P., Grieger, I., D'Onofrio, A., Dubuisson, A., Heenehan, M., Millstein, B., Parisi, M., Rath, J. F., & Sax, G. (1995).

Development and initial validation of the quick discrimination index (QDI). Educational and Psychological Measurement, 55, 1016-1031.

Ponterotto, J.G. & Pedersen, P.B., (1993). Preventing Prejudice. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Ponterotto, J.G., & Wise, S.L. (1987). Construct validity study of the Racial Identity Attitude Scale. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 34, 218-223.

Pope-Davis, D.B., & Coleman, H.L.K. (1997). (Eds.). Multicultural counseling competencies: Assessment, education and training, and supervision. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Pope-Davis, D.B., & Liu, W.M. (1998). The social construction of race: Implications for counseling psychology. Counseling Psychology Quarterly, 11, 151-161.

Pope-Davis, D.B., Liu, Lesdma-Jones, S., & Nevitt, J. (2000). African American acculturation and Black racial identity: A preliminary investigation. Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development, 28, 98-112.

Riccardi, N. (1999, December 8). Sheriff's staffer wins bias trial. The Los Angeles Times, pp. B1, B10.

Rimonte, N. (1991). A question of culture: Cultural approval of violence against women in the Pacific-Asian community. Stanford Law Review, 43, 1311-1362.

Robertson, J.M., & Fitzgerald, L.F. (1992). Overcoming the masculine mystique: Preferences for alternative forms of assistance among men who avoid counseling. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 39, 240-246.

Root, M.P.P. (1993). Guidelines for facilitating therapy with Asian American clients. In D.R. Atkinson, G. Morten, & D.W. Sue (Eds.), Counseling American minorities: A cross cultural perspective (pp. 211-224). Iowa: Wm. C. Brown.

Rushton, P.J. (1996). Race, genetics, and human reproductive strategies. Genetic, Social, and General Psychology Monographs, 122, 21-53.

Sakamoto, A., Liu, J., & Tzeng, J.M. (1998). The declining significance of race among Chinese and Japanese American men. Research in Social Stratification and Mobility, 16, 225-246.

Savran, D. (1998). Taking it like a man: White masculinity, masochism, and contemporary American culture. New Jersey: Princeton University Press.

Schein, L. (1994). The consumption of color and the politics of white skin in post-Mao China. Social Text, 12, 141-164.

Serafica, F.C. (1992). The development of ethnic identity: Insights from Asian American literature. In L.C. Lee (Ed.), Asian Americans: Collages of identities (pp. 155-164). Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Sethi, R.R., & Allen, M.J. (1984). Sex role stereotypes in northern India and the United States. Sex Roles, 11, 615-626.

Shavelson, R.J. (1988). Statistical reasoning for the behavioral sciences (2nd ed.). Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon, Inc.

Signorielli, N. (1989). Television and conceptions about sex roles: Maintaining conventionality and the status quo. Sex Roles, 21, 341-360.

Silverstein, L.B., & Auerbach, C.F. (1999). Deconstructing the essential father. American Psychologist , 54, 397-407.

Singer, E. (1992). Reference groups and social evaluations. In M. Rosenberg & R.H. Turner (Eds.) Social psychology: Sociological perspectives (pp. 66-93). New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers.

Smith-Hefner, N.J. (1999). Khmer American: Identity and moral education in a diasporic community. Los Angeles, CA: University of California Press.

Snell, W.E., Jr., (1986). The masculine role inventory: Components and correlates. Sex Roles, 15, 443-455.

Snell, W.E., Jr., Hawkins, R.C. III, & Belk, S.S. (1988). Stereotypes about male sexuality and the use of social influence strategies in intimate relationships. Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology, 7, 42-48.

Sodowsky, G. R., Kwan, K. L. K., & Pannu, R. (1995). Ethnic identity of Asian in the United States. In Ponterotto, J. G., Casas, J. M., Suzuki, L. A., & Alexander, C. M. (Eds.), Handbook of multicultural counseling (pp. 181-198). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Sodowsky, G.R., Lai, E.W.M., & Plake, B.S. (1991). Moderating effects of sociocultural variables on acculturation attitudes of Hispanic and Asian Americans. Journal of Counseling and Development, 70, 194-204.

Song, S.J. (1999). Using solution –focused therapy with Korean families. In K.S. Ng (Ed.), Counseling Asian families from a systems perspective. The family psychology and counseling series (pp. 127-141). Alexandria, VA: American Counseling Association.

Stangor, C., & Lange, J.E. (1994). Mental representations of social groups: Advances in understanding stereotypes and stereotyping. Advances in Experimental Social Psychology, 26, 357-416.

Stangor, C., Sullivan, L.A., & Ford, T.E. (1991). Affective and cognitive determinants of prejudice. Social Cognition, 9, 359-380.

Staples, R. (1998). Stereotypes of black male sexuality: The facts behind the myths. In M.S. Kimmel, & M.A. Messner (Eds.) (4th Ed.). Men's lives. (pp. 466-471). Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Steele, C.M., & Aronson, J. (1995). Stereotype threat and the intellectual test performance of African Americans. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 69, 797-811.

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, 458-464.

Stopes-Roe, M., & Cochrane, R. (1990). The child-rearing values of Asian and British parents and young people: An inter-ethnic and inter-generational comparison in the evaluation of Kohn's 13 qualities. British Journal of Social Psychology, 29, 149-160.

Sue, D. (1999). Counseling Asian American boys and adolescent males. In A.M. Horne & M.S. Kiselica (Eds.), Handbook of counseling boys and adolescent males (pp. 87-99). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Sue, D. (1996). Asian men in groups. In M.P. Andronico (Ed.) Men in groups: Insights, interventions, psychoeducational work (pp. 69-80). Washington, D.C.: American Psychological Association.

Sue, D.W., Ivey, A.E., & Pedersen, P.B. (1996). (Eds.), A theory of multicultural counseling and therapy. New York: Brooks/Cole Publishing.

Sue, D.W. (1989). Ethnic identity: The impact of two cultures on the psychological development of Asians in America. In D.R. Atkinson, G. Morten, & D.W. Sue (Eds.), Counseling American minorities: A cross cultural perspective (pp. 103-115). Iowa: Wm. C. Brown.

Sue, D.W. (1990). Culture in transition: Counseling Asian-American men. In D. Moore & F. Leafgren (Eds.) Problem solving strategies and interventions for men in conflict (pp. 153-165). Alexandria, VA: American Counseling Association.

Sue, S., & Sue, D.W. (1971). Chinese-American personality and mental health. Amerasia Journal, 1, 35-49.

Sue, D.W., & Sue, D. (1990). Counseling the culturally different: Theory and practice. (2nd Ed). New York, NY: John Wiley & Sons.

Sugihara, Y., & Katsurada, e. (1999). Masculinity and femininity in Japanese culture: A pilot study. Sex Roles, 40, 635-646.

Suinn, R. M., Ahuna, C., & Khoo, G. (1992). The Suinn-Lew Asian Self-Identity Acculturation Scale: Concurrent and factorial validation. Educational and Psychological Measurement, 52, 1041-1046.

Suinn, R. M., Khoo, G., & Ahuna, C. (1995). The Suinn-Lew Self-Identity Acculturation Scale: Cross-cultural information. Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development, 23, 139-148.

Suinn, R. M., Rickard-Figueroa, K., Lew, S., & Vigil, P. (1987). The Suinn-Lew Asian Self-Identity Acculturation Scale: An initial report. Educational and Psychological Measurement, 47, 401-407.

Sweet, S. (1999). Understanding fraternity hazing: Insights from symbolic interactionist theory. Journal of College Student Development, 40, 355-363.

Szeto-Wong, C. (1997). Relation of race, gender, and acculturation to proness to guilt, shame, and transferred shame among Asian and Caucasian Americans. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Maryland, College Park.

Taff, M.L., & Boglioli, L.R. (1993). Fraternity hazing revisited through a drawing by George Bellows. Journal of the American Medical Association, 269, 2113-2115.

Takaki, R. (1989). Strangers from a different shore: A history of Asian Americans. New York: Penguin Press.

Takaki, R. (1990). Iron cages: Race and culture in 19th-century America. New York: Oxford University Press.

Takaki, R. (1993). A different mirror: A history of multicultural America. Boston: Little Brown and Co.

Tanaka, J.S., Ebreo, A., Linn, N., & Morera, O.F. (1998). Research methods: The construct validity of self-identity and its psychological implications. In L.C. Lee & N.W.S. Zane (Eds.) Handbook of Asian American psychology (pp. 21-82). Thousand Oaks: Sage Publishers.

251

Tang, N.M. (1997). Psychoanalytic psychotherapy with Chinese Americans. In E. Lee (Ed.) Working with Asian Americans: A guide for clinicians. (pp. 323-341). New York: Guildford Press.

Tangney, J.P. (1990). Assessing individual differences in proness to shame and guilt: Development of the self-conscious affect and attribution inventory. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 59, 102-111.

Tangney, J.P. (1995). Recent advances in the empirical study of shame and guilt. American Behavioral Scientist, 38, 1132-1145.

Tatsuoka, M.M. (1988). Multivariate analysis: Techniques for educational and psychological research. (2nd ed.). New York: MacMillan Publishing.

Taylor, C.M., & Howard, H., & Mary, F. (1995). Student involvement and racial identity among African American males. Journal of College Student Development, 36, 330-336.

Thandeka (1999). Learning to be white: Money, race, and God in America. New York: Continuum.

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

Thompson, E.H., & Pleck, J.H. (1995). Masculinity ideology: a review of research instrumentation on men and masculinities. In R.F. Levant & W.S. Pollack (Eds.), A new psychology of men (pp. 129-163). New York: Basic Books.

Thorn, G.R., & Sarata, B.P.V. (1998). Psychotherapy with African American men: What we know and what we need to know. <u>Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development, 26</u> 240-253.

Thornton, M.C., & Taylor, R.J. (1988). Intergroup attitudes: Black American perceptions of Asian Americans. <u>Ethnic and Racial Studies, 11,</u> 474-488.

Ting, J.P. (1998). The power of sexuality. <u>Journal of Asian American Studies, 1</u> (1), 65-82.

Tong, B. (1994). <u>Unsubmissive women: Chinese prostitutes in nineteenth-century San Francisco.</u> Norman and London, OK: University of Oklahoma Press.

Toupin, E.S.W., & Son, L. (1991). Preliminary findings on Asian Americans: "the model minority" in a small private east coast college. <u>Journal of Cross cultural Psychology, 22,</u> 403-417.

Toya, G.J. (1996). <u>The relationship between career aspirations and racial identity development of Asian Pacific American college students by ethnicity, generation, gender, and career certainty.</u> Unpublished masters thesis, University of Maryland, College Park.

Tracey, T.J., Leong, F.T.L., & Glidden, C. (1986). Help seeking and problem perception among Asian Americans. <u>Journal of Counseling Psychology, 33,</u> 331-336.

Tucker, M.B. , & Mitchell-Kernan, c. (1995). Social structural and psychological correlates of interethnic dating. <u>Journal of Social and Psychological Relationship, 12,</u> 341-361.

Uba, L. (1994). <u>Asian Americans: Personality patterns, identity, and mental health.</u> New York: Guildford Press.

Wade, J.C. (1996). African American men's gender role conflict: The significance of racial identity. <u>Sex Roles, 34,</u> 17-33.

Wade, J.C. (1998). Male reference group identity dependence: A theory of male identity. <u>The Counseling Psychologist, 26,</u> 349-383.

Wade, J.C., & Gelso, C.J. (1998). Reference group identity dependence scale: A measure of male identity. <u>The Counseling Psychologist, 26,</u> 384-412.

Warren, J. (1999, December 6). Financial, cultural tensions preceded Sacramento tragedy. <u>The Los Angeles Times,</u> pp. A3, A24, A25.

Wat, E.C. (1996). Preserving the paradox: Stories from a gay-loh. In R. Leong (Ed.) <u>Asian American sexualities: Dimensions of the gay and lesbian experience</u> (pp. 71-82). New York: Rutledge.

Weinfurt, K.P. (1995). Multivariate analysis of variance. In L.G. Grimm & P. R. Yarnold (Eds.) <u>Reading and understanding multivariate statistics</u> (pp. 245-276). Washington, D.C.: American Psychological Association.

Westermeyer, J.F. (1998). Predictors and characteristics of mental health among men at mid life: A 32-year longitudinal study. <u>American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 68,</u> 265-273.

Wilcox, D.W., & Forrest, L. (1992). The problems of men and counseling: Gender bias or gender truth. <u>Journal of Mental Health Counseling, 14,</u> 291-304.

Williams, M. (1999, March 7). Is there a Black upper class? New York Times, p. ST1, ST2.

Wisch, A.F., Mahalik, J.R., Hayes, J.A., & Nutt, E.A. (1995). The impact of gender role conflict and counseling technique on psychological help seeking men. Sex Roles, 33, 77-89.

Wong, J. J. (1996). The psychological effects of the glass ceiling on Asian Americans: An attributional perspective. (Doctoral Dissertation, University of California at Los Angeles). Dissertation Abstracts International, 57 (6), 4073B.

Wong, L., & Mock, M.R. (1997). Asian American young adults. In E. Lee (Ed.), Working with Asian Americans: A guide for clinicians (pp. 196-207). New York: Guilford Press.

Wong, S.L.C. (1993). Subverting desire: Reading the body in the 1991 Asian Pacific Islander men's calendar. Critical Mass, 1 (1), 63-74.

Wong, P., Lai, C.F., Nagasawa, R., & Lin, T. (1998). Asian Americans as a model minority: Self-perceptions and perceptions by other racial groups. Sociological Perspectives, 41, 95-118.

Wright, E.O. (1997). Class counts: Comparative studies in class analysis. New York: University of Cambridge Press.

Yamamoto, T (1999). Masking selves, making subjects: Japanese American women, identity, and the body. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Yee, A.H. (1992). Asians as stereotypes and students: Misperceptions that persist. Educational Psychology Review, 4, 95-132.

Yee, A.H., Fairchild, H.H., Weizmann, F., & Wyatt, G.E. (1993). Addressing psychology's problems with race. American Psychologist, 48, 1132-1140.

Yu, H. (1999). Mixing bodies and cultures: The meaning of America's fascination with sex between 'orientals' and 'whites." In M. Hodes (Ed.) Sex, love, race: Crossing boundaries in North American history (pp. 444-464). New York, NY: New York University Press.

Yu, R. (1992). To save china, to save ourselves: The Chinese hand laundry alliance of New York. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.

Zane, N.W.S., Sue, s., Hu, L., & Kwon, J.H. (1991). Asian-American assertion: A social learning analysis of cultural differences. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 38, 63-70.

Zhou, M., & Bankston, C.L. III. (1998). Growing up American: How Vietnamese children adapt to life in the United States. New York: Russel Sage Foundation.