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Abstract

Intimate partner violence (IPV) by men against women is a devastating social problem that is experienced by over a quarter of women in their lifetimes (Tjaden & Thoennes, 2000). IPV in Asian American communities is a prevalent problem that is likely influenced by both patriarchal gender role norms as well as culturally salience factors that are distinct to Asian Americans. Given the influence of norms and values on gendered power dynamics and racial power dynamics in the U.S., it is important to understand the intersections of gender and culture in Asian American men’s masculine role norms and IPV perpetration. This dissertation therefore examines the influence of culture on Asian American men’s conceptions of masculinity and the associations between gender and culture in their IPV perpetration. Three studies are presented from a program of research spanning five years on the intersections of culture, gender, and IPV perpetration for Asian American men. The first study (Chapter 2) examines Asian American men’s perspectives on ideal masculine characteristics using qualitative methods. It finds that Asian American men report ideal masculinity traits that overlap with Asian cultural constructs such as collectivism as well as traditional masculinity themes associated that in the literature are associated with negative outcomes psychological and social outcomes including IPV perpetration. The second study (Chapter 3) reviews the literature on gendered and cultural predictors of American men’s IPV perpetration. It finds that while patriarchal gender role norms consistently predict IPV perpetration, the role of Asian cultural factors on IPV is unclear. The third study (Chapter 4) examines the association between several culturally relevant risk and
protective factors and Asian American men’s IPV perpetration, including the unique and moderating effects of patriarchal gender role norm adherence. It finds that Asian American men’s risk for IPV perpetration was not significantly predicted by levels of patriarchal gender role norms, culturally relevant predictors, or their interactions in a sample of Asian American community men from the NLAAS. Implications for operationalization of masculinity and culturally relevant constructs are discussed. Together, this program of research provides a comprehensive and multi-method understanding of the intersections of gender, cultural factors, and violence against women for Asian American men.
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Chapter 1: Introduction

Intimate partner violence by men against women is a devastating social problem that is experienced by over a quarter of women in their lifetimes (Tjaden & Thoennes, 2000). Current interventions for men who are found to be abusive to a female partner often include group psychoeducational treatment programs rooted in the theoretical framework that men are socialized (e.g., in their families, schools, and national culture) to believe in the legitimacy of a hierarchical social system that entitles them to positions of power, including over women (Gondolf, 2002, pp. 9-13; Pence & Paymar, 1993, pp. 1-15). Research supports the association between men’s endorsement of patriarchal gender role norms and their greater risk for IPV perpetration (Moore & Stuart, 2005). However, little attention has been paid to the influence of other aspects of men’s identities, such as culturally relevant norms, values, and experiences, in the association between masculinity and IPV perpetration.

While all men in the U.S. are socialized in a system that entitles men and subordinates women, not all men endorse or adhere to the same masculinity ideology, nor do they all benefit equally or in the same ways from the gendered privileges of patriarchal society (Connell & Messerschmidt, 2005). Some evidence suggests that Asian American men identify with and value gendered characteristics differently than do European American men (Chua & Fujino, 1999) and also differently experience strain from masculine gender role expectations (Eguchi & Starosta, 2012). Asian American men’s experiences related to discrimination and their Asian cultural norms, attitudes, and values are found to influence their conceptions of and experiences around masculinity.
Given the distinct intersection of race and gender at which Asian American men are socially positioned (Liu & Wong, 2018), it is likely that the ways in which masculinity and gender role norms are associated with IPV perpetration for them are in part influenced by culturally salient factors and experiences (Hall & Barongan, 1997).

This dissertation examines Asian American men’s culturally distinct masculinities and how the intersections of culture and gender for Asian American men are associated with IPV perpetration. Three studies are presented from a program of research spanning six years on Asian American masculinities and the intersection of Asian culturally relevant factors and masculinity on Asian American men’s IPV perpetration. The first study (Chapter 2) describes Asian American men’s conceptions of ideal masculinity. Specifically, this paper presents qualitative thematic findings on Asian American men’s responses to the question, “What does it mean to be a real man?” The second study (Chapter 3) reviews the literature of studies examining the influence of masculinity and Asian cultural factors on IPV perpetration. This paper identifies predictors of IPV perpetration by Asian American men that find robust support in the literature, phenomena with mixed support, potential mechanisms (e.g., moderators and mediators) that may help explain inconsistent findings, and future directions for the literatures. Finally, the third study (Chapter 4) tests an intersectional model of Asian American men’s IPV perpetration that builds on the findings of the first two studies to examine the unique and conditional effects of culturally relevant and gendered predictors on IPV. Analyses examine how patriarchal gender role norms and culturally relevant factors are associated
with IPV perpetration as well as how the effect of Asian cultural factors may depend on the degree to which Asian American men adhere to patriarchal gender role norms. Together, these studies increase our understanding of Asian American men’s distinct culturally influenced masculinities and how intersections of power and subordination and interactions among cultural norms, attitudes, and values are associated with IPV perpetration.

**IPV in Asian American communities**

National estimates IPV prevalence are largely based on predominantly European-American samples. Among the few studies that report the prevalence of IPV among Asian Americans, figures vary substantially. Nationally representative studies of the general U.S. population that include Asian Americans (often administered in English only) find that Asian Pacific Islander Americans women have lower rates of lifetime IPV (15% total victimization) than other ethnic groups including European American women (24.8% total victimization; Tjaden & Thoennes, 2000). However, several Asian cultural factors, including valuing perseverance despite suffering, avoiding loss of face for the family, and lack of comfort with (e.g., fear based on immigration status) or ability to (e.g., language barriers) interact with the criminal justice system likely leads to low reporting by Asian American IPV survivors (Nguyen, 2007, pp. 4-5).

Community-based studies that reduce the impact of some cultural factors influencing of low-reporting (e.g., conducted surveys in Asian languages) find much higher rates of IPV. A community-based random sample study of Japanese American women in Los Angeles found an 80% prevalence of lifetime IPV (61% prevalence rate of
lifetime perceived abuse; Yoshihama, 1999), and a review of studies with Korean American community samples found that prevalence of abuse ranged from 35% to 60% (Rhee, 1997). These rates are much higher than both the Asian American and general U.S. population prevalence rates found in national studies. In contrast, an analysis data from the National Latino and Asian American Study (NLAAS; Alegria et al., 2004), a nationally representative survey of Asian Americans and Latinos, found 10.8% prevalence of physical IPV victimization among Asian American women in their most recent relationship (Cho, 2012). While reported prevalence rates of IPV in Asian American communities are not consistent, most findings based on culturally responsive studies (e.g., multilingual surveys) that capture multiple forms of IPV (i.e., not just physical violence) suggest that Asian Americans experience IPV at similar or higher rates than the general U.S. population.

Theory and empirical evidence support the association between men’s endorsement and adherence to patriarchal forms of masculinity and their increased risk for IPV perpetration in Asian American communities (Nguyen, 2007, p. 7). Additionally, Asian cultural norms and values (Liu & Iwamoto, 2006), as well as experiences related being Asian American (e.g., acculturation, discrimination; Kim et al., 1996) are shown to influence Asian American men’s endorsement of and experiences with patriarchal gender role norms. The influence of culturally relevant values and experiences of discrimination on Asian American men’s masculinities likely influence their intimate relationships and risk for IPV perpetration.
Asian American Masculinity

Asian American men’s beliefs and expectations about their role as men are the product of multiple values and norms from both mainstream U.S. culture and their heritage Asian and Asian American culture and are influenced by their culturally relevant experiences, including discrimination. In a study comparing U.S.-born and immigrant Asian American and European American men, Chua and Fujino (1999) found that Asian American men were more likely to report a willingness to participate in domestic tasks than European American men, were less likely to perceive themselves as sexually exciting, physically attractive, outgoing, sociable, and emotive (i.e., that they share their feelings), and rated themselves lower on masculinity. Additionally, while masculinity was negatively associated with femininity for European American men, this was not the case for Asian American men (Chua & Fujino, 1999). Asian American men have also been found to experience stress related to masculinity characteristics that align with model minority stereotypes of intelligence, diligence, and interpersonal and physical attractiveness deficits (Lu & Wong, 2013; Wong et al., 2012).

Asian American men who endorse patriarchal forms of male role norms experience negative psychological and social outcomes. Psychological and emotional consequences include higher levels of depression (Iwamoto et al., 2010), somatic symptoms (Liu et al., 2018), and greater marijuana use (Liu & Iwamoto, 2007), which are compounded by dysfunctional methods of coping (Liu & Iwamoto, 2007) and negative perceptions of psychological help-seeking (Vogel et al., 2011). Evidence also suggests that Asian American men’s endorsement of patriarchal gender role norms are associated
with greater enculturation, or identification with Asian cultural norms, values, and practices. Specifically, greater enculturation is found to be associated with endorsement of traditional gender role attitudes (Goldberg et al., 2012; Tummala-Nara et al., 2017) and patriarchal masculinity norms (Iwamoto et al., 2010; Liu & Iwamoto, 2007). However, there is some evidence that Asian cultural values specifically (i.e., traditional marital values, women’s roles, and lifestyle practices) and not cultural community participation or practices (e.g., diet, dress, language) account for this association (Yoshihama et al., 2014). Considering the inclusion of violence, dominance, and the rejection of femininity in the concept of patriarchal male role norms, it is no surprise that greater endorsement of and adherence to these norms is associated with greater risk for Asian American men’s violence against women. This effect is found across diverse samples of Asian American men including university men (Hall et al., 2005), men in treatment for abuse perpetration (Jin et al., 2007), and immigrant community men (Bui & Morash, 1999; Kim & Sung, 2000; Morash et al., 2007).

**Cultural influences on Asian American men**

Several Asian cultural factors are also relevant to understanding Asian American men’s masculine gender role ideology and their risk for perpetrating violence against women. One of the most often studied and salient cultural factors theorized to meaningfully distinguish Asian and European American cultures is collectivism. Collectivism is the social orientation that prioritizes interdependence and family and group harmony over individual expression and success (Markus & Kitayama, 1991). In more independent cultures, where the pursuit of individual goals is highly valued, adages
such as “the squeaky wheel gets the grease” hold important social meaning and weight. Conversely, in collectivist cultures where group harmony and interdependence are prioritized, the more salient social lesson is that “the nail that stands out gets the hammer.” As it applies to deviant social behavior such as IPV, collectivism is thought to protect Asian American men from perpetration for fear of bringing shame on the family (i.e., losing face; Hall & Barongan, 1997). However, it has also been asserted that the prioritization of social and familiar harmony and preventing loss of face can also serve to hide and minimize IPV (Nguyen, 2007, pp. 4-6). It is likely that phenomena more conceptually proximal to IPV perpetration, such as patriarchal norms that subordinate women, play a role in explaining the role of culturally relevant factors such as collectivism.

In addition to the influences of psychosocial cultural factors on Asian American men’s lives and intimate relationships, culturally relevant experiences such as acculturation and discrimination have important impacts on their sense of masculinity and risk for IPV perpetration. Acculturation, or one’s socialization into their host culture (e.g., U.S. mainstream culture), and enculturation, or one’s socialization into their heritage culture (Ward & Geeraert, 2016), is one such factor. Acculturation and enculturation are commonly conceptualized along multiple dimensions including cultural behaviors (e.g., friendship choice, participation in cultural activities), values (e.g., attitudes and beliefs about social relations or gender roles), knowledge (e.g., culturally specific information and language proficiency), and identification (Kim & Alamilla, 2017). Acculturation and enculturation are thought to modify the impact of other social
norms, values, and experiences, including masculinity (Ahrold & Meston, 2010), on outcomes such as IPV perpetration (Kim & Sung, 2016; Nguyen, 2007, pp. 7-8).

Given the salience of gendered power and subordination in both gender role norms and perpetration of IPV against women, it is also relevant to consider the role of race-based power and subordination when understanding Asian American masculinity and IPV. Racial discrimination against Asian Americans have influenced Asian American men’s ability to live up to male gender role norms and expectations. Specifically, U.S. government sanctioned discrimination (e.g., immigration, labor, and property laws), racist media depictions, and private discrimination have functioned to limit Asian American men’s access to employment, property ownership, and family building (Ancheta, 2006, pp. 19-41; Shek, 2006). Asian American men may respond to racial discrimination by altering their valuation, pursuit, and demonstrations of less accessible aspects of masculinity in lieu of those that are available. It is possible that Asian American men who experience racial subordination in society may seek to reassert their masculinity by subordinating their female partners through physical and emotional abuse (Espiritu, 1997).

Theoretical Orientations

Hegemonic masculinity theory. This dissertation in large part is grounded in the theory that society is hierarchically structured based on gender, where men who adhere to societally sanctioned and celebrated characteristics, or hegemonic masculinity, are privileged with and actively maintain social power over women and other men (Connell & Messerschmidt, 2005). Reinforcement of this patriarchal order is established through
devaluing femininity (e.g., categorizing and devaluing some work as “women’s work”) and non-dominant forms of masculinity as well as through discriminatory and oppressive policy and law (Cheng, 1999). So, while men in general have power because of their maleness, their access to gendered power varies depending on intersecting social circumstances such as income, education, race/ethnicity, sexuality, immigration status, and physical ability (Espiritu, 1997). Men who do not align with or successfully perform hegemonic masculinity norms and roles (i.e., men of subordinate masculinities) are likely to find themselves negotiating their masculinity in relation to the contexts of their ethnicity, sexuality, physical ability, and economic status in impactful ways (Liu & Wong, 2018). While men of subordinated masculinities, such as Asian American men, are clearly harmed by the hegemonic masculinity hierarchy, they are also vulnerable to perpetuating harm against other subordinated men and women in the absence of challenging the gendered power structure (Espiritu, 1997). For instance, while some Asian American men may incorporate traditionally feminine norms such as cooking and cleaning into their non-hegemonic masculinity, others may attempt to recover their lost sense of masculinity through abusing and subordinating their partners at home.

**Human diversity theory.** Research focused on understanding the challenges and issues of minority groups (e.g., by ethnicity, gender, or class) can make the mistake of solely examining them as recipients of oppression or as exotic others. My focus on people in context through the lens of human diversity theory begins with the perspective that everyone has a culture (including European American or “White” people), that human differences are valuable and good, and that it is important and beneficial to
elevate the voices and positive aspects of people and their cultures. This human diversity perspective shifts focus from the unidimensional group identity of people to the shared and different contexts, circumstances, and upbringing that influence and are influenced by all people (Trickett et al., 1993). In the specific analysis of the influences of both gender and culture, of both power and subordination, as it relates to Asian American men’s masculinity and IPV perpetration, I am also incorporating concepts of intersectionality (Crenshaw, 1989; Liu & Wong, 2018) that understand that multiple identities and social contexts do not operate in isolation but are intersecting and compounding in distinct and impactful ways.

Given the power dynamics inherent to racial and gendered oppression (e.g., discrimination and IPV) and the importance of attending to cultural factors when examining ethnic cultural communities, the human diversity perspective is particularly useful in understanding Asian American men’s gender role norms and IPV perpetration. According to Watts (1992), four theoretical perspectives are relevant to human diversity analyses. First, the population-specific perspective affirms a population’s distinctive worldview (e.g., interdependence) and explores the implications of that worldview. Second, the sociopolitical perspective addresses systems of power and oppression. Third the cross-cultural perspective complements the population-specific perspective in that it seeks to understand both unique and universal cultural characteristics and their correlates. Finally, the ecological perspective emphasizes the interdependence between individuals and their settings and as such is compatible with the other three perspectives. These four
perspectives weave in and out of the three subsequent chapters in both content and method (e.g., qualitative analysis in study 2).

**Present Investigation**

The present investigation is a multi-method program of research examining gender, culture, and their association with IPV perpetration for Asian American men. The three studies that make up this dissertation employ qualitative thematic analysis (study 1), quantitative analysis of both quantified text data (study 1) and survey data (study 3), and integrative review of the literature (study 2) to understand the phenomena of interest using multiple approaches that leverage the strengths of each method.

The first study (Chapter 2) is a mixed methods examination (i.e., qualitative and quantitative) of Asian American men’s perspectives on ideal masculine characteristics to better understand both culturally distinct and cross-culturally shared ideology about male gender role norms. Asian American men were found to discuss culturally distinct masculinity norms and values far more often than those captured in measures of traditional masculinity ideology. The second study (Chapter 3) is an integrative literature review of studies that examine gendered and cultural predictors of IPV perpetration for Asian American men. Robust evidence was found for the effect of adherence to and endorsement of patriarchal gender role norms on IPV perpetration for Asian American men, but findings were mixed on the role of culturally relevant factors such as acculturation and enculturation. The third study (Chapter 4) is a quantitative analysis of NLAAS data (Alegria et al., 2004) that responds to the findings from the first two studies to fill the gaps in the literature regarding the role of several culturally relevant risk and
protective predictors on Asian American men’s IPV perpetration and the unique and moderating effects of patriarchal gender role norms. Null findings on the associations between Asian American men’s physical IPV perpetration and adherence to patriarchal gender role norms, culturally relevant factors, and their interactions, reveal important limitations and clarifications to our current conceptualization and operationalization of culturally relevant constructs, masculinity, and IPV perpetration.
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Chapter 2: Study One – What does it mean to be a real man?: Asian American men’s masculinity ideology

Note: This manuscript has previously been published in the Psychology of Men and Masculinities. The citation for that article is as follows:


Abstract

The majority of research on masculinity ideology has been conducted using quantitative measures developed with predominantly European American samples. The cultural homogeneity embedded in these measures’ development brings into question their validity and reliability when applied to other populations of men such as Asian American men. This study aims to address this gap in the literature by examining the characteristics that Asian American men identify when describing ideal masculinity. Heterosexual Asian American university men (N = 89) were asked, “What does it mean to be a real man?” Themes deduced from normative masculinity expectations and inductive themes were applied to participants’ responses to identify themes reflecting a widely used measure of traditional masculinity ideology as well as those that may be unique and/or particularly relevant to Asian American men. Participant responses included more themes that are not covered by the standard measure of traditional
masculinity ideology than those that are. Future studies should investigate the distribution (e.g., clustering or normality) of traditional and culturally specific male role norm beliefs, examine masculinity ideology in combination with other Asian cultural factors (e.g., loss of face, acculturation/enculturation), and develop culturally responsive quantitative measures of masculinity ideology for Asian American men.
Introduction

Since the 1990s, much progress has been made in examining the perceptions and experiences of Asian American men, including in relation to their masculinity. Studies have quantitatively described Asian American men’s perceptions of male role norms (Chua & Fujino, 1999) and experiences of gender role conflict and stress (Lu & Wong, 2013), and examined their associations with mental health (Iwamoto, Liao, & Liu, 2010; Liu & Iwamoto, 2006), acculturation (Kim, O’Neil, & Owen, 1996), and attitudes and violent behaviors towards women (Tummala-Narra, Houston-Kilnik, Sathasivam-Rueckert, & Greeson, 2017; Yoshihama, Blazevski, & Bybee, 2014).

Despite this progress, few studies (see Lu & Wong, 2013; Pompper, 2010) apply qualitative methods to elicit Asian American men’s own perceptions and experiences. Instead, most studies examining Asian American men’s masculinity ideology use structured quantitative measures that have been developed and standardized with samples of predominantly European American men. It is likely that Asian American men may conceptualize and experience masculinity in culturally specific ways that are different than European American men. As such, culturally specific aspects of Asian American men’s gender role norms may be under-detected by existing measures of masculinity ideology. To address this gap in our knowledge, we examined Asian American college men’s perceptions of ideal male characteristics by analyzing their responses to the question, “what does it mean to be a real man?”

Masculinity Ideology Theory and Measurement among Asian Americans
Researchers generally study and measure masculinity ideology in relation to the degree to which men endorse “traditional” male role norms. This traditional masculinity ideology can be seen as reflective of “hegemonic masculinity,” or the construction of masculinity that supports the power structure of white heterosexual men over women and all other men of subordinate masculinities (e.g., ethnic minorities, non-heterosexual men) (Connell & Messerschmidt, 2005) term. As such, men who do not align with traditional masculine norms and roles are likely to find themselves negotiating and updating their masculinity ideology in relation to the contexts of their ethnicity, sexuality, physical ability, and economic status in impactful ways (Wong, Liu, & Klann, 2017). Societal pressures related to racial and cultural identity likely interact with gendered pressures in influencing Asian American men’s identities, values, and behaviors. Asian American men, who through media representations have been restricted from demonstrating and identifying as romantically and sexually desirable, may pursue relative functionalism by reverting to identifying with and pursuing career and financial success as a means of demonstrating aspects of masculinity that more available to them (Sue & Okazaki, 1990).

From the lens of discrepancy strain (Pleck, 1995), Asian American men, as targets of generations-long emasculating discrimination, may find relief from their gender role strain by changing their behavior, by changing their reference group, or by updating their valuation of particular male gender role norms. This latter response is most relevant to the measurement of masculinity ideology beliefs. Evidence suggests that Asian American men employ multiple coping and adjustment responses to prolonged discrepancy strain and discrimination en route to developing Asian American specific masculinity
ideologies. For instance, some Asian American men may incorporate traditionally feminine norms such as cooking and cleaning into their norms for taking care of their families (Chua & Fujino, 1999; Lu & Wong, 2013). However, others may attempt to regain their masculinity that is subordinated in society through abusing and subordinating those who are more vulnerable, such as their female partners (Espiritu, 1997; Hall & Murakami, 2011; Liu & Concepcion, 2010).

Studies that have examined Asian American men’s perceptions of their own masculinity find evidence of culturally specific Asian American masculinities. Chua and Fujino (1999) explored Asian American (both U.S. and foreign born) and European American men’s self-endorsement of traditionally masculine and feminine characteristics. They found that U.S. born Asian American men were the only group who reported that they would do domestic tasks while European American men were the only group who listed themselves as sexually exciting, physically attractive, outgoing, sociable, and emotive (i.e., that they share their feelings). European American men also rated themselves higher on the masculine characteristic than did both groups of Asian American men. While masculinity was negatively associated with femininity for European American men, this was not the case for neither U.S. nor foreign born Asian American men (Chua & Fujino, 1999). These findings suggest cultural differences between Asian American and European American men, particularly in relation to the integration of masculine and feminine traits and norms.

**Cultural Limitations of Masculinity Ideology Measures.** Studies conducted to develop measures of traditional masculinity ideologies have for the most part been
limited to samples of predominantly European American men. While the methods for creating these measures do not necessarily mean they do not apply to diverse samples, it is likely that the samples to which they can generalize are limited. Indeed, even in studies with samples of men who are similar to those used to develop traditional masculinity ideology measures (i.e., European American men), there seem to be differences in the endorsement of some male role norms between men born in the 1950s and men born after 1980 (Thompson & Pleck, 2015). Additionally, mean scores of male role norm endorsement are found to be relatively low (i.e., hovering around the midpoint of a Likert-type scale). This suggests that there may be limits to the generational and cultural range of men for which these measures have relevance.

Representation of Asian American participants is minimal in the psychometric studies of traditional masculinity ideology measures reviewed by Thompson & Bennett (2015) (see Appendix A). Of the 24 studies with demographic information, three were based in another country (i.e., South Africa, Russia, and Jamaica) and thus were not appropriate for this analysis (though none included or reported participants of Asian descent), two had no Asian American participants, four did not report demographic information on non-white participants, three did not report demographic information on Asian Americans but did report on a non-specified “other” group which may or may not have included Asian Americans, two lumped Asian Americans into an “other” category, and 10 reported the proportion of the sample that self-identified as Asian American. Of the 10 studies in this last grouping, the representation of Asian American participants
ranged from 1.9% to 23% of the sample, with a mean representation of 7.66% (SD = 7.05%), and a median of 4.85%.

While measures of masculinity ideology are developed with mostly European American samples, findings on the associations between masculinity ideology and outcomes such as physical health, mental health, and aggression are often applied to men in general. This inconsistency leaves us without much knowledge about how well these operationalizations and findings of masculinity ideology apply to Asian American men. While the development of Euro-centric measures of masculinity ideology did not consider the masculinities of Asian American men, it is not clear whether the dimensions captured in these measures universally apply to all men, including Asian American men.

While we suspect that failing to include Asian American representation in the development of masculinity ideology measures substantially limits their relevance and appropriateness for Asian American men, to our knowledge this has not yet been empirically examined. To address this gap in our understanding, we used qualitative and quantitative methods to examine 1) what characteristics Asian American men use to describe what a real man is, 2) whether Asian American men report masculinity ideals other than those assessed in commonly used masculinity ideology measures, and 3) how well conventional measures of masculinity ideology capture the masculine ideals reported by Asian American men.
Method

Participants

Participants in this study were self-identified heterosexual Asian American college men who had ever been in a romantic relationship ($N = 89$) attending a university in Southern California. This eligibility criteria came from the larger study from which these data were collected, that focused on intimate partner violence (IPV) perpetration which is most commonly occurring from heterosexual males against female partners. The studies were approved by the institutional review boards of the respective universities at which they were conducted. In order of prevalence, participants identified as having Chinese (22%), Korean (22%), Vietnamese (14%), Filipino (12%), Taiwanese (4%), Japanese (3%), Pakistani (1%), Thai (1%), Hmong (1%), Cambodian (1%), and non-specified Asian American (1%) ethnic ancestry. Additionally, 11% of the sample either identified as both Asian American and non-Asian American (4%) or as belonging to multiple Asian American ethnic groups (7%). The mean age for participants was 21 years ($SD = 1.7$ years), with 25.8% of participants being in their first year at university, 15.7% in their second year, 27% in their third year, 28.1% in their fourth year, and 3.4% in graduate school. Participants varied in their generation of residency in the United States with 24.7% being first generation Americans (i.e., the first in the family to immigrate to the U.S.), 52.8% being second (parents immigrated to the U.S.), 10.1% being third (grandparents immigrated to the U.S.), 3.4% being fourth (great grandparents immigrated to the U.S.), 2.2% being fifth (great-great-grandparents immigrated to the U.S.), and 6.7% being sixth generation American or more.
Procedure

Participants were recruited using the student research pool for extra course credit in their university course and completed a survey asking questions about IPV, IPV attitudes, gender beliefs, and emotions using the online Qualtrics platform. To capture participants’ global conceptions of ideal male characteristics including both self-referent as well as other-referent traits we asked the question “What does it mean to be a real man?” We used this wording to elicit Asian American men’s perceptions of ideal male characteristics as “what does it mean…” questions have proven useful in generating rich qualitative information from under-represented groups (e.g., men of color) about constructs including masculinity (Adegbosin, Plummer, Yau, Franklin, Cordier, & Sun, 2019; Meyer, 2017). Only data from this open-ended question about ideal male characteristics were included in our analyses, and no masculinity or gender-related measures appeared before this question.

Responses were coded using two qualitative analysis methods. First, a theory driven coding scheme was developed based on the content of a well-established, very commonly used measure of masculinity ideology, the Revised Male Role Norms Inventory (MRNI-R; Levant, Smalley, Aupont, House, Richmond, & Noronha, 2007). The subscales of this specific measure cover most of the canonical dimensions of existing masculinity ideology measures (Thompson & Bennett, 2017). The content of the MRNI-R was used to deductively identify content from participant responses that corresponded to its dimensional subscales. Second, an inductive process of coding was used to identify emergent masculinity themes not covered by normative masculinity expectations.
operationalized in the MRNI-R. Both the deductive and inductive coding methods were applied to all cases. An open-ended, qualitative survey question was used because it gives Asian American men the opportunity to express their conceptions of ideal male characteristics without the European American framing of structured quantitative measures. This unstructured approach also allows for examination of themes deduced from normative masculinity expectations that were relevant to Asian American men without priming bias from structured items, and the opportunity for identifying emergent themes that are otherwise undetected. Both the theory-driven deductive and emergent inductive codebook development and coding were conducted using Atlas.ti software.

**Codebook Development.** Our codebook for analyzing masculinity themes was developed after an initial reading of all data by the first author. A systematic analysis of the masculinity concepts in participants responses started with a deductive coding scheme informed by the 7 subscales of the MRNI-R. The coding scheme development began with a content analysis of the items of each subscale of the MRNI-R to determine the core aspects of each subscale. For instance, the items in the “dominance” subscale prescribed that men should be leaders, should be the disciplinarian in the family, and should be the main provider. The codebook definitions for themes deduced from normative masculinity expectations were based on the constructs that emerged from the content analysis of the MRNI-R items. Additionally, inclusion criteria, exclusion criteria, and examples were developed based on the data and added to the codebook.

The inductive theme section of the codebook was developed from an analysis of participants’ responses that was not guided by preconceived theoretical concepts. Initial
stages of inductive coding focused on identifying discrete codes that were relatively small units of masculinity related textual content. Discrete codes that were related to each other under a larger construct were iteratively aggregated into overarching themes. During inductive codebook development, we repeatedly discussed and reviewed the developing codes and themes on a weekly basis for several months. Specifically, when grouping discrete codes (e.g., that men “take responsibility for their actions” and “take responsibility for their mistakes”) into larger masculinity themes (e.g., responsibility) we decided whether groupings of codes were unique enough to warrant their own theme or whether they should be combined with other codes to create more comprehensive masculinity themes. After multiple readings of all data and discussion of all cases, we came to agreement on 10 final inductive themes with definitions, inclusion criteria, exclusion criteria, and examples drawn from the data.

After the codebook was created, the first author trained an undergraduate research assistant on the use of the codebook. Through asking clarifying questions and discussion with the first author, the research assistant identified gaps, assumptions, and points of confusion in definitions and inclusion and exclusion criteria and worked with the first author to improve the codebook. The final codebook was mutually understood and agreed upon (see Appendix B). Throughout this process, the research assistant was not made aware that one set of codes were developed from the MRNI-R and the other set of codes was developed inductively by the first author, nor were they aware that the study sample was made up of only heterosexual Asian American men.
**Collaborative and Independent Coding.** Once the first author and the research assistant were able to review the full codebook with complete agreement on definitions and inclusion and exclusion criteria, the two coded 10 cases together to calibrate their application of the codes to participant responses. For each of the first 10 cases, this calibration was done systematically by considering each code in the codebook individually and deciding whether or not the participant’s response warranted application of that code. This continued until a decision was reached on all codes for each response. When this decision was not obvious, discussion ensued until an agreement was reached. In some cases, a minor change in the wording of the codebook was made to allow for agreement. Following complete agreement on 10 collaboratively coded cases, the dataset of 89 cases was split in half to facilitate two coding sessions with the first containing 45 (Session I) cases and the second containing 44 (Session II) cases. The first author and the research assistant independently coded the first 45 cases, tallied agreements and disagreements, then reconciled disagreements. A satisfactory Kappa statistic of .91 was achieved on the first 45 cases. Following the same post-coding procedures, a Kappa of .77 was obtained for the second set of 44 cases, which was lower yet still satisfactory. The total Kappa statistic for Sessions I and II combined was .84.

**Findings**

**Qualitative Descriptions of Real Men**

To answer the first research question about what characteristics are used by Asian American men to describe a real man, we examined and described all of the participants’ responses to the open-ended question, “What does it mean to be a real man?” Our multi-
method qualitative analysis identified themes deduced from normative masculinity expectations (i.e., the subscales of the MRNI-R), as well as inductive themes that contained aspects of masculinity ideology beyond the scope of that measure.

**Themes Deduced from Normative Masculinity Expectations.** Participants endorsed only three of the seven possible themes deduced from normative masculinity expectations. In descending order of prevalence, 24% of participants endorsed aggression, 16% endorsed dominance, and 9% endorsed self-reliance (see Table 2.1).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deductive Theme</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Prevalence n (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aggression</td>
<td>Men should be aggressive, emotionally and physically tough, and be able to protect loved ones.</td>
<td>21 (23.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominance</td>
<td>Men should be the leader, the decision maker, the disciplinarian, and the major provider.</td>
<td>14 (15.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Reliance</td>
<td>Men should be able to rely upon themselves without help from others and despite pain or illness.</td>
<td>8 (9.0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Participant responses that were captured by the “aggression” theme varied in the specific aspect of aggression they were describing. This variation reflects the diversity of aggression subscale items from the MRNI-R used to develop the codebook, which include prescription of protection (e.g., “Men should get up to investigate if there is a strange noise in the house at night”), physical toughness (e.g., “I think a young man should try to be physically tough, even if he’s not big”), and explicit aggression (e.g., “If another man flirts with the women accompanying a man, this is a serious provocation and the man should respond with aggression”). Participants’ aggression response included the
concept of protection through being “tough and protective,” in general as well as specifically with regards to one’s “friends and loved ones,” “partner,” and “lover.” Other aggressive responses captured the masculine prescription for real men to be “strong” and “have the physique [of] an average manual labor[er].”

Participants’ descriptions of real men’s “dominance” were consistent with the wording of items from the MRNI-R which prescribes that men should be leaders (e.g., “Men should be the leader in any group”), should be the disciplinarian in the family (e.g., “A man should provide the discipline in the family”), and should be the main provider (e.g., “A man should always be the main provider in the family”). Participants asserted that men should be financial providers or “breadwinners” and leaders. Dominance was conveyed through assertions that “to be a real man, one must provide for themselves and for their family.” Endorsement of men as leaders included explicit notions that “a real man is a leader,” descriptions that were prefaced with role justifications that “every relationship needs a leader,” and more specific expectations of “taking initiative,” “making assertive decisions when times are tough,” and “not be[ing] just a leader, but an intelligent one.”

“Self-reliance”, defined in the MRNI-R as the belief that men should be able to rely upon themselves without help from others (e.g., “A man must be able to make his own way in the world” and “Men should not borrow money from friends or family members”), and despite pain or illness (e.g., “A man should be able to perform his job even if he is physically ill or hurt”), was generally found in responses as a vague notion about living life and performing at work without the support of others. For instance, one
participant offered that to be a real man is “to be self-sufficient and possess the ability to walk on through life alone, yet productive[ly]” and another wrote that a real man “goes on his own path.” Some participants simply stated that to be a real man is to, “be independent.”

**Inductive Qualitative Responses.** Next, to answer our second research question, we identified and described themes in men’s responses not covered by a common masculinity ideology measure (i.e., the MRNI-R). Ten themes about what it means to be a real man were created from and endorsed in the inductive coding process. These ten themes, in order of prevalence were responsibility (33%), being respectful (26%), taking care of others (22%), having a moral code (19%), rigidity (18%; i.e., in one’s conceptualization of what it means to be a man), never harming women (11%), being cognitively disciplined (10%), identifying many forms of masculinity (9%), being a gentleman (5%), and lastly being successful (3%; see Table 2.2). Qualitative responses illustrative of the three most prevalent themes (i.e., responsibility, being respectful, and taking care of others) are presented here.

**Table 2.2 Prevalence of Emergent Inductive Themes with Definitions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inductive Theme</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Prevalence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>Men should be responsible in general and also take responsibility in particular for one’s actions and one’s mistakes.</td>
<td>29 (32.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect</td>
<td>Men should be respectful.</td>
<td>23 (25.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Take Care of People</td>
<td>Men should “take care” of their family, partner, and/or friends.</td>
<td>20 (22.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moral Code</td>
<td>Men should have morals and principles, stand up for what he believes in, and be just.</td>
<td>17 (19.1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Rigidity: There are very strict rules one must follow to be a real man. 16 (18.0)

Never Harms Women: Men should never physically, sexually, or emotionally harm women. 10 (11.2)

Cognitively Disciplined: Real men are problem solvers, logical, and disciplined. 9 (10.1)

Many Masculinities: A real man is someone who has good qualities and traits and happens to be a male. 8 (9.0)

Gentleman / Chivalrous: A real man should be chivalrous and gentlemanly. 4 (4.5)

Successful: Men should be successful in their jobs leading to financial success. 3 (3.4)

Responsibility was coded when participants indicated that a real man should be responsible in a general sense (n = 12) as well as when they more specifically reported that a real man takes responsibility for his actions and mistakes (n = 17). Respondents reported that a real man “knows his responsibility[ies],” that he is “responsible,” and that he “own[s] up to [his] responsibilities.” Taking responsibility for actions and mistakes were captured through descriptions that a real man “take[s] responsibility [for] [their] own actions” and specifically “when [they] are at fault for something.”

The respect theme was frequently identified in participants’ responses. Participants asserted that real men should display a general sense of respect as well as respect for specific people in their lives. For instance, the requirement of general respectfulness was expressed through responses that prescribed that a real man should be “respectful to others” or to “everyone.” More specifically directed respect was expected toward “women,” “peers,” “yourself,” and in one instance, “all living things.” While being respectful in general and being respectful specifically to women were both coded
as reflecting the same male role of being respectful, they seem to be two distinct prescriptions for being a real man. The former suggests that men have the character trait of being a respectful person regardless of with whom one is interacting. The latter suggests that men should be respectful to specific people, and most often to women. That women are identified as a particular group deserving of care can be interpreted to reflect a benevolent masculinity ideology that imagines women to be special in their need for and/or deserving of particularly gentle treatment.

The theme “take care of people” included response that referred to “taking care of loved ones” without reference to the specific method of “taking care” as well as to more specific descriptions of “providing emotional support.” Several participants reported that real men “take care of all [of their] loved ones,” “take care of [their] family,” and specifically, that they “take care of [their female partner].” Taking care of others through the provision of emotional support was captured in participants’ responses that real men “provide for [their] family emotionally,” “show genuine love and care,” and are “always supportive of their significant other.” During codebook development, the first and second authors had a difficult time reconciling the conflicts between these two dimensions of care provision into one cohesive theme. While taking care of loved ones has an undertone of benevolent patriarchal leadership or dominance, the second dimension reflects an emotive nurturing form of support. However, despite the differences in the emotional content, we concluded that overall, it is fair to say that both dimensions suggest that one aspect of men’s roles is to provide care for others.
These qualitative findings answer our first two research questions, that is, what characteristics Asian American men attribute to “real men,” and whether Asian American men identify ideal male characteristics other than those captured by normative masculinity expectations (i.e., the MRNI-R). To answer our third research question about the relative prevalence of Asian American men’s endorsement of themes deduced from normative masculinity expectations and inductive masculinity themes, descriptive quantitative analyses were conducted.

**Quantitative Comparison of the Prevalence of Deductive and Inductive Themes.**

We summed the total number of endorsed themes that were deduced from normative masculinity expectations and that emerged from inductive coding for each participant and compared their distributions (see Figure 2.1). Regarding themes deduced from normative masculinity expectations, 61% of participants were coded with none of the three themes, 30% of participants’ responses were coded with one theme, and 9% of participant responses were coded with 2 deductive themes. No participants had responses that were coded with more than 2 deductive themes. Overall, the average number of themes deduced from normative masculinity expectations was .5 themes ($SD = .66$) per participant. Looking at the total number of inductive themes endorsed by each participant, only 11% of participants endorsed no theme, 44% of participants endorsed one theme, 27% of participants endorsed 2 themes, 10% of participants endorsed 3 themes, and 7% of participants endorsed 4 of the inductive themes. No participants had responses that were coded with more than 4 inductive themes. Overall, the average number of inductive theme endorsements was 1.56 themes ($SD = 1.04$) per participant.
Figure 2.1 Distribution of Deductive and Inductive Masculinity Theme Endorsement per Participant

Note. The number of themes identified (i.e., x-axis values) refers to the number of masculinity themes endorsed in each participant response by type of theme (i.e., deductive and inductive themes). Percentages of deductive and inductive theme endorsement are independent of one another, and percentages within theme type add up to 100. \( N = 89 \).

Discussion

The purpose of this study was to gain an emic perspective on the dimensions of Asian American men’s masculinity ideology. Participants’ descriptions comprised more themes that are not covered by a widely used measure of traditional masculinity ideology (MRNI-R; Levant et al., 2007) than those that are. When unprompted by European American-centric masculinity dimensions, Asian American college men identify many ideal male role norms and characteristics that are unique to their experiences and identities as Asian American men. Specifically, they identify being responsible, being
respectful, taking care of others, having a moral code, never harming women, and being
cognitively disciplined as ideal male traits. Additionally, a little less than one fifth of
participants had responses that suggested a rigid or strict definition of masculinity (e.g., a
man “must” and/or “always” adhere to norms). A smaller proportion of men’s responses
(about one in ten) described flexible definitions of ideal masculinity that suggested
acknowledgement of diverse ways of being a real man.

The meaning and implications of these findings must be considered within several
limitations of the study design. First, participants responses were potentially influenced
by first responding to questions about intimate partner violence. Indeed, 11% of
respondents mentioned that real men never harm women. However, Song and Liang
(2019) found that Chinese male nationals also reported expecting men to be nonviolent,
yet without the confounding influence of IPV measures before their qualitative questions,
suggesting that it is possible participants would have reported the “never harm women”
theme even without our measure of IPV.

Second, although the sample was ethnically diverse, it was limited to heterosexual
men, which limits the relevance of our findings to other men. It is likely that findings
from our study are also influenced by the relatively high SES (i.e., college students),
socially and politically liberal community and generation, and high heteronormativity of
the sample. We are left with the question of how heterosexual Asian American male
students at a Southern California university differ in their conceptions of masculinity
from their gay and bisexual peers, their lower SES peers, and those from other, possibly
less-diverse regions of the U.S. We are also left with the question of how different older
generations of Asian American men, who were socialized in a U.S. that was much different socially and politically, are in their beliefs about characteristics of ideal masculinity from this sample.

Finally, the ethnically diverse sample creates challenges in interpretation. We present Asian American men’s conceptions of ideal male characteristics as if they were a single racialized group of Asian American men when men from South Asia, Southeast Asia, and East Asia are represented in the sample. Because little was previously known about Asian American men’s conceptions of ideal masculinity outside of the bounds of standardized measures such as the MRNI-R, we decided to gather stories to develop a general picture of Asian American men’s conceptions of ideal male characteristics and let our findings inspire additional research questions, possibly including the differences across Asian ethnic groups of men. We are not able to determine the relation between unique cultural and sociopolitical experiences (e.g., fleeing war or genocide, immigrating with a professional workers visa, cultural marriage norms) and men’s conceptions of ideal masculinity. By elevating the sense of community shared by men from diverse Asian cultural backgrounds a general image is created of shared experiences of Asian American men as a racialized group in the United States. This image can be used as a reference point for more culturally specific examinations of Japanese American, Hmong American, or Cambodian American men and their masculinities.

The themes we identified in Asian American college men’s masculinity ideology overlap with Chinese nationals’ descriptions of their masculine gender role expectations (Song & Liang, 2019). Specifically, of the eight “domains” identified, being responsible,
caring, respectful and nonviolent, and rational overlapped with our findings of Asian American men’s reports of real men being responsible, taking care of others, being respectful, never harming women, and being cognitively disciplined. The finding of diverse and relatively prevalent masculinity themes not found in the MRNI-R subscales supports the intersectional uniqueness paradigm (Wong et al., 2017) that is interested in exploring the unique experiences of men of color. The intersectional uniqueness paradigm addresses the comparative and additive limitations of other paradigms used to study diverse masculinities. Specifically, similar to this study, the intersectional uniqueness paradigm understands that the contributions of ethnicity and gender on the experiences and psychology of men of color are interdependent and cannot be accurately or appropriately dissected into independent regression coefficients. In our study, endorsement of emergent masculinity themes was more prevalent and more diverse than that of MRNI-R based themes and just under 90% of participants endorsed at least one emergent theme. However, since only 33% of participants identified the most prevalent theme, responsibility, it is unclear how well these findings might generalize to other samples of Asian American men. We suspect that if these themes were developed into a quantitative measure that specifically prompted the content of these emergent themes, higher rates of endorsement would be found.

Several themes found in this study also replicate findings from previous research on Asian American men’s perceptions and experiences of stress relating to their masculinity and others’ stereotypes about Asian American men. First, Chua and Fujino (1999) found that unlike European American men, Asian American men did not define
their masculinity in direct opposition to femininity (e.g., would do domestic tasks), and that they did not identify themselves as physically and sexually desirable and exciting. In this study, being respectful and taking care of others were two of the top three most prevalent themes reported by Asian American men. Similar to Chua and Fujino’s (1999) findings, this suggests that traditionally feminine characteristics like deference and caretaking are not conceptualized as non-masculine traits by Asian American men, and instead were elevated as masculine ideals. In our study, Asian American men did not identify ideal masculinity themes related to being sexually, physically, or romantically desirable, but they did identify characteristics that overlap with the model minority stereotypes of responsibility, morality, and discipline. Wong, Owens, Tran, Collins, and Higgins (2012) found that Asian American men perceived that others view them as having intelligence, intense diligence, unflattering physical attributes, and sexual/romantic adequacies, among other stereotypes. The agreement between the emic perspectives of Asian American men in our study and those of Wong et al. (2012) suggest a dialogue between the discriminatory stereotypes applied to Asian American men and their own perceptions of ideal masculinity.

Two explanations are useful in making sense of the overlap between perceived stereotypes of Asian American men from the literature and their reporting of ideal masculinity in this study. First, Asian American men’s internalization of the stereotypes that society attributes to them may subconsciously guide their own conceptions of ideal masculinity in a top-down process. Alternatively, in response to experiencing gender role strain from discriminatory stereotypes and traditional male role norms, Asian American
men may actively respond to generational discrimination by adjusting their valuation of norms based on whether they are more and less available to them. From this lens, it is possible that because Asian American men have been denied the opportunities to be viewed and celebrated as sexually, romantically, and physically desirable men, they have adjusted their expectations and conceptions of what it is to be a real Asian American man. Working hard and pursuing academic and career success are avenues for demonstrating masculinity that have not been completely shut off for them. The idealization of characteristics such as responsibility, morality, and discipline found in this study may reflect Asian American men’s generational adjustment in the valuation and pursuit of performing domains of masculinity based on their accessibility.

Adjusting one’s expectations, norms, and ideals in response to societal restrictions may have its benefits, but there are likely negative consequences as well. For instance, Asian American men’s embrace of model minority norms may place heightened value and stakes on academic and career success. Indeed, Lu and Wong (2013) found that Asian American men experience masculinity-related stress particularly from attempting to live up to work-related role-expectations of providing and achieving. Perhaps because some avenues of masculine demonstration are less available to Asian American men, academic and career success become so important and expected that pursuit of this male role norm ends up being the source of heightened masculinity stress. Lu and Wong (2013) found that additional stress was reported by Asian American men from having to sacrifice personal and family time in pursuit of academic and career success. Given the importance of “taking care of people” (particularly family) for Asian American men, as
reported in this study, the focus on pursuing available enactments of masculinity is potentially a double-edged sword.

While Asian American men reported more unique masculinity themes than themes based on the MRNI-R, their identification of the MRNI-R themes of aggression, dominance, and self-reliance must be considered as well. In this study, Asian American men reported that ideal male traits include being tough, strong, and protective, being providers and leaders in work and family, and being independent men without need for support from others. Endorsement of these traditional male role norms identified in the MRNI-R may be indicative of a form of Asian American masculinity that rejects emasculating stereotypes of Asian American men and instead digs its heels into traditional masculinity ideology. There are potentially negative consequences for Asian American men who endorse these traditional norms. Lu & Wong (2013) found Asian American men reported experiencing heightened masculinity stress from trying to live up to the masculine ideal of toughness (e.g., courageous, confident, dominant), restrictive emotionality, and heterosexuality (e.g., successful in dating and romance), particularly because they did not perceive themselves as having the requisite characteristics of size, strength, and whiteness. Additionally, following Espiritu’s (1997) suggestion that some men respond to discrimination in society by perpetuating domestic subordination against their wives and children, Asian American men who respond to abuse from society by increasing their valuation of and expectations around toughness, dominance, and aggression may experience heightened masculinity stress which may lead to attempts to alleviate this stress by abusing their partners.
Implications

In addition to replicating findings from prior research on Asian American masculinity, this study brings to the forefront the complex negotiations between culture and masculine subordination in Asian American men’s conceptualizations of manhood. It is one of few studies to demonstrate the diverse and intersecting masculinity themes perceived by Asian American men as ideal male traits. Our findings have implications for both future research on Asian American masculinity as well as clinical work with Asian American men.

Future research should address four main questions that arose from our findings. First, whether Asian American men who endorse traditional male role norms of aggression, dominance, and self-reliance represent a separate cluster of men than those who endorse the norms of responsibility, respectfulness, and taking care of others (among other characteristics) is still not known. While an analysis of how themes may cluster within persons was beyond the scope of this paper, we did observe some evidence for theme co-occurrence. Specifically, responses that reflected Asian American men’s rigidity in the characteristics of real men (e.g., participants who reported that men “must” embody specific traits) often co-occurred with the inductive themes of taking care of others and never doing harm to women, as well as the MRNI-R dominance theme. The ways in which norms cluster have implications for how Asian American men may respond to discrimination, stereotypes, and masculinity strain.

Second, future studies can increase our understanding of the processes involved in Asian American men’s development of culturally specific masculinity ideologies by
examining the influence of acculturation. It is important to understand how Asian American men’s masculinity development relates to their integration of Asian heritage and mainstream U.S. cultural norms and how this is related to experiences such as discrimination.

Third, future studies should explore the development of quantitative measures of Asian American masculinity ideology. An important limitation of studies employing the intersectional uniqueness paradigm is the dearth of quantitative scale development for constructs specific to men of color, such as Asian American masculinity ideologies (Wong et al., 2017). Future studies can fill the gap in culturally specific measures for Asian American men by using the themes found in this study to psychometrically develop a scale of Asian American masculinity ideology.

Developing culturally specific measures of masculinity for Asian American men are particularly important when considering the use of measures of masculinity ideology on outcomes such as health and mental health. Griffith, Gunter, and Watkins (2012) reviewed articles examining correlates of masculinity for men of color and report a couple of findings relevant to our results. First, surprising associations were found between masculinity ideology and substance use for Asian American men. Specifically, the masculinity dimensions of risk-taking and emotional control were actually negatively associated with alcohol consumption for Asian American men. This finding suggests that either pathways between masculinity and health and mental health outcomes are different for Asian American men, or that the aspects of masculinity captured by masculinity measures are tapping into different or less salient aspects of masculinity for Asian
American men. Second, Griffith and colleagues (2012) reported several studies with Latino samples that found differential associations between Machismo (i.e., traditional masculinity) and Caballerismo (i.e., masculinity that exhibits responsibility and respect for family and community) masculinities and health and mental health outcomes. Some of the emergent themes (e.g., taking care of others, responsibility, respect) we found may belong to an alternative more communal interdependent form of masculinity similar to Caballerismo for Latino men. Development of culturally specific masculinity measures would help to identify both culturally salient dimensions and constellations of masculinity for Asian American men.

Finally, while this study reports findings on the sample as racialized group of Asian American men, participants had cultural ties to at least ten unique Asian ethnic groups. Asian American men from different ethnic groups are influenced by whether they were immigrants or refugees to the U.S., by experiences of colonization by Western or other countries, not to mention by their generational history in the U.S. among other factors (Liu & Concepcion, 2010). For instance, refugee men are less likely to be prepared to move to a new setting and as such may experience masculinity stressors related to new sets of gender role norms, loss of status, and unemployment. Future studies should examine ethnic group variability in Asian American men’s perceptions of ideal male characteristics.

The findings also suggest important implications for practice relating to culturally responsive counseling and interventions with Asian American college men. The unique masculinity themes that emerged from participant responses invite counselors to consider
alternative constellations of masculinity characteristics (e.g., themes of responsibility, respectfulness, and taking care of others) when analyzing the etiologies of Asian American college men’s issues. A university counselor using traditional Euro-centric frameworks of masculinity may not associate shortcomings in providing emotional care to family or friends as a cause of psychological or emotional distress. However, Asian American men may hold the characteristic of taking care of others in high regard and perceived failures in this masculinity domain may be the source of immense pain. Given the high prevalence of responsibility and respectfulness we identified, it is possible that Asian American men’s masculinity traits are more interpersonal and communal than those of European American men. Counselors may need to consider this interpersonal aspect of Asian American men’s conception of masculinity when discussing their concerns and problems.

Finally, mental health counselors intervening in gender-related challenges such as Asian American college men’s substance use, mental health challenges, or dating violence should consider the unique contributions of culture and history to men’s issues that are often associated with masculinity ideology and gender role strain. Normative college pressure to achieve may be augmented for an Asian immigrant student who feels the masculine pressure of being the breadwinner, the model minority expectations of excelling academically, and the weight of his family’s financial and emotional investment in his future. Underlying what seems like simple Type-A student stressors in Asian American college students, may be a complex dynamic of cultural, gendered, and immigration pressures requiring culturally responsive programming or treatment.
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### Appendix A1

**Asian American Men in Psychometric Studies of Masculinity Ideology Measures**

Table 2.3 Prevalence of Asian American Participants in Studies Reviewed in Thompson & Bennett (2015)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>% European American</th>
<th>% Asian American</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Attitudes Toward Men Scale (Iazzo, 1983)</td>
<td>104 women from university, city college, and businesses</td>
<td>67.3%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Brannon Masculinity Scale (Brannon &amp; Juni, 1984)</td>
<td>Manuscript Unavailable</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2a. BMS Short Form (Thompson, et al., 1985)</td>
<td>233 university women (NE)</td>
<td>96.0%</td>
<td>Not Reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Male Role Norms Scale (Thompson &amp; Pleck, 1986)</td>
<td>400 university men (NE)</td>
<td>96.0%</td>
<td>Not Reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3a. Condensed Male Role Norms Scale 12-itemn (Thompson &amp; Barnes, 2013)</td>
<td>132 community men (NE)</td>
<td>96.9%</td>
<td>Not Reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3b. Masculinity Ideology Scale – 21 (4 cluster MRNS; Fischer &amp; Good, 1998)</td>
<td>217 undergraduate university men</td>
<td>91.0%</td>
<td>3.0% API</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3b. Masculinity Ideology Scale – 21 (Fischer, Tokar, et al., 1998)</td>
<td>460 undergraduate and graduate university men</td>
<td>88.6%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Male Role Norms Inventory (Levant, et al., 1992)</td>
<td>287 university men and women</td>
<td>81.1%</td>
<td>Not Reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not Reported</td>
<td>Not Reported</td>
<td>Not Reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4a. Revised Male Role Norms Inventory (Levant, et al., 2007)</td>
<td>170 undergraduate and graduate men and women</td>
<td>50.6%</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4a. Male Role Norms Inventory Revised Robust (Levant, et al., 2010)</td>
<td>593 undergraduate men and women</td>
<td>83.0%</td>
<td>Not Reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4b. Male Role Norms Inventory Short Form (Levant, et al., 2013)</td>
<td>1017 undergraduate men and women</td>
<td>82.9%</td>
<td>Not Reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Male Role Attitudes Scale (Pleck, et al., 1993a;1993b;1994)</td>
<td>1880 community men (oversampling for African American and Hispanic)</td>
<td>40.2%</td>
<td>Not Reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Multicultural Masculinity Ideology Scale (Doss &amp; Hopkins, 1998)</td>
<td>769 undergraduate men and women</td>
<td>36.8%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Conformity to Masculine Norms Inventory (Mahalik, et al., 2003)</td>
<td>752 university men</td>
<td>85.0%</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7a. Conformity to Masculine Norms Inventory – 46 (Parent &amp; Moradi, 2009)</td>
<td>229 undergraduate men (Canada)</td>
<td>59.0%</td>
<td>23.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7b. Conformity to Masculine Norms Inventory – 11 (Mahalik, et al., 2007)</td>
<td>140 community men</td>
<td>80.7%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7c. Conformity to Masculine Norms Inventory – 22 (Burns &amp; Mahalik, 2008)</td>
<td>234 community men</td>
<td>91.0%</td>
<td>Not Reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7d. Conformity to Masculine Norms Inventory – 55 (Owen, 2011)</td>
<td>522 university men and women at the counseling center</td>
<td>55.6%</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Male Attitude Norms Inventory – II (Luyt, 2005)</td>
<td>339 undergraduate and graduate men (South African)</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>Not Reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Adolescent Masculinity Ideology in Relationships Scale (Chu, et al., 2005)</td>
<td>65 schoolboys aged 12-18</td>
<td>92.0%</td>
<td>Not Reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Traditional Attitudes About Men (McCreary, et al., 2005)</td>
<td>527 university men from all-male college in MW</td>
<td>92.0%</td>
<td>Not Reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Male Role Norms Inventory-Adolescent (Levant, et al., 2008)</td>
<td>172 schoolboys and girls aged 11-15</td>
<td>89.0%</td>
<td>Not Reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11a. Male Role Norms Inventory-Adolescent-revised (Levant, et al., 2012)</td>
<td>323 middle school boys and girls (racially diverse)</td>
<td>66.5%</td>
<td>Not Reported (Other = 2.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Measure</td>
<td>Sample Description</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Machismo Measure (Arciniega, et al., 2008)</td>
<td>154 diverse men of Mexican heritage</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Meanings of Adolescent Masculinity Scale (Orlansky &amp; Fisher, 2009)</td>
<td>193 7th – 10th grade boys</td>
<td>51.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Macho Scale (Anderson, 2012)</td>
<td>1,141 Jamaican fathers under 60</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Russian Male Norms Inventory (Janey et al., 2013)</td>
<td>432 Russian men</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Measure of Men’s Perceived Inexpressiveness Norms (Wong, et al., 2013)</td>
<td>410 university and online men</td>
<td>77.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. API = Asian Pacific Islander, MW = Midwest, NE = Northeast, O = Oriental*
Appendix A2

Qualitative Codebook of Deductive and Inductive Masculinity Themes

Table 2.4 Qualitative Codebook

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code and Definition</th>
<th>Scope</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Avoidance of Femininity</strong></td>
<td><em>Includes:</em> Masculinity defined in opposition to femininity in behavior, appearance, activities, and other domains. <em>Excludes:</em> Effeminate behavior directly labeled as “gay.”</td>
<td>“A real man should not wear makeup or act, you know… girly.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Self-Reliance</strong></td>
<td><em>Includes:</em> Not needing the help of others. Ability to perform their job through pain and illness. Having car/house repair and improvement skills. <em>Excludes:</em> Sacrificing one’s wellbeing in service of one’s partner, family, or friends (see Rigidity).</td>
<td>“To be self-sufficient and possess the ability to walk on through life alone yet productive[ly].” “A real man gets the job done even if he has a cold, or flu, or like if he is hurting in any way.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Aggression</strong></td>
<td><em>Includes:</em> Physical strength, athleticism, physical/aggressive protection of loved ones, emotional and physical toughness (as a trait), and risk taking. <em>Excludes:</em> Toughness that is required for specific task completion.</td>
<td>“… should have the physique for average manual labor.” “A real man protects his loved ones, specifically in a physical manner.” “To be… tough…”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dominance</strong></td>
<td><em>Includes:</em> Being the decision maker. Being the disciplinarian and financial provider in the family.</td>
<td>“A real man is a leader…” “To be a real man, one must provide… for their family.” “… make[s] assertive decisions when times are tough.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Includes:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Excludes:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Restrictive</strong></td>
<td>Emotionally distant.</td>
<td>Sickness or physical limitation getting in the way of performance (see Self-Reliance).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Emotionality</strong></td>
<td>Doesn’t communicate/express feelings of care or hurt.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Non-Relational</strong></td>
<td>Strong sex drive, focused on own sexual pleasure and orgasm, assertive and/or coercive about sex.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attitudes Toward</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sex</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fear &amp; Hatred of</strong></td>
<td>Homosexual people should have less rights, restrictive behavior toward other men, avoids gay men, and behaviors that may seem gay.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Homosexuals</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Effeminate behaviors that are not directly labeled as a gay male attribute.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Responsibility</strong></td>
<td>Being responsible in general. Taking responsibility or accepting consequences for your actions and mistakes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Many Masculinities</strong></td>
<td>Based only on self-identification. There are many ways to be a man. There’s no such thing as a “real man.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Many Masculinities**
A real man is someone who has good qualities and traits and happens to be a male.
| **Respectful** | Includes: Men should be respectful in general and to women specifically. Explicit use of “respect.” | “… being respectful to everyone.”  
“... being respectful to everyone with … respect.” |
| **Moral Code** | Includes: Being principled and honest. Behaving in accordance with their promises. Standing up for what they believe in. Excludes: Use of the word “Responsible.” | “A real man has morals.”  
“Stands up for what he believes in.”  
“To keep your word.” |
| **Rigidity** | Includes: Must/should live up to a many masculine ideals. Must live up to ideals even if unsafe or harmful. Must always conform to ideal and never fail to conform. Excludes: Adherence to personal morals. | “He must ____ , he must ____ , he must ____.”  
“Are there … for their partners regardless of the circumstances.” |
| **Cognitively Disciplined** | Includes: Critical thinker, logical, disciplined. | “Being a real man is personally confronting confrontations…” |
| **Never Harms Women** | Includes: Explicitly declares men should never hurt/harm women. Excludes: Being kind or nice to women without specific mention of not harming women. | “A real man should never hurt is woman.” |
| **Take Care of People** | Includes: Non-specific references to “taking care of” loved ones. Providing emotional support. Excludes: Specific references to financially providing for people (see Dominance). Non-paternalistic references to niceness or kindness. | “Take care of your family.”  
“Taking care of other people.”  
“Putting your family first.” |
| **Successful.** | **Includes:** Financial success. Has material possessions. Successful at his job. | “… be a rich man because [money] = success.” |
| **Men should be successful in their jobs leading to financial success.** | **Excludes:** Emotional or relational success. Success outside of work. |
| **Gentleman / Chivalrous.** | **Includes:** Explicitly using words “gentleman” and “chivalrous” to describe a real man. | “To be a gentleman to women.” |
| **A real man should be chivalrous and gentlemanly.** | | |
Chapter 3: Study Two – A human diversity analysis of culture and gender in Asian American men’s intimate partner violence perpetration

Note: This manuscript has previously been published in the Journal of Community Psychology. The citation for that article is as follows:


Abstract

This integrative literature review aims to fill the gap in our understanding of the cultural and gendered predictors of intimate partner violence (IPV) perpetration by Asian American men. A comprehensive search using PsycINFO returned N = 24 peer-reviewed journal articles that examine Asian American men's IPV perpetration and patriarchal gender role norms and that met inclusion criteria. Patriarchal gender role norms consistently predicted IPV perpetration. However, the associations between acculturation/enculturation and IPV perpetration were less clear. Greater enculturation (Asian cultural identification) was associated with more patriarchal gender role norms while greater acculturation (mainstream US cultural identification) was associated with more masculine gender role strain. Additionally, violence in the family of origin consistently predicted later IPV perpetration as an adult. Results suggest that integrating
multiple dimensions of human diversity (e.g., culture, gender, and power) in intersectional models may best explain Asian American men's IPV perpetration.
**Introduction**

Intimate partner violence (IPV) defined as sexual violence, stalking, physical violence, and psychological aggression by a person against their intimate partner (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, 2018) is a devastating social problem affecting individual victims, child witnesses, local communities, and society at large. Victims experience both immediate physical consequences (e.g., pain, broken bones, and death; Campbell & Lewandowski, 1997), chronic physical conditions (e.g., musculoskeletal and neurological; Coker et al., 2000), and long-term mental health issues (e.g., greater risk for post-traumatic stress disorder; Campbell & Lewandowski, 1997). Children exposed to IPV experience poorer socioemotional outcomes (Harding et al., 2013) and are at greater risk for perpetrating and being victimized by IPV as adults (Franklin & Kercher, 2012). Additionally, IPV victimization negatively impacts the well-being of co-workers and organizations (Swanberg et al., 2005), and has both direct (e.g., medical services, mental health services) and indirect (e.g., lost productivity at work and at home) economic costs to society (Max et al., 2004).

Women experience a greater prevalence of IPV victimization than men, with 24.3% of women experiencing severe physical violence (13.8% of men), 10.7% experiencing stalking (2.1% of men), 48.4% experiencing at least one psychologically aggressive behavior (48.8% of men), and 25.3% experiencing sexual violence (including rape; 10.2% of men) by an intimate partner during their lifetime (Breiding et al., 2014). Among the few studies that report the prevalence of IPV among Asian Americans, figures vary substantially, depending on the sampling techniques and survey methods.
used. Specifically, rates of Asian American women's IPV victimization of any form (i.e., physical, sexual, psychological, stalking) range from 15% based on a nationally representative study of the general US population (Tjaden & Thoennes, 2000) to anywhere between 33% (Rhee, 1997) and 80% (Yoshihama, 1999) based on studies focused on Asian American women's victimization specifically.

Given the lack of studies on the prevalence of IPV victimization of Asian American women, it is unsurprising that relatively little is also known about the predictors of IPV perpetration by Asian American men. The literature on predictors of IPV perpetration among the general US population finds that beliefs and attitudes tied to traditional masculinity ideology are consistently associated with violence against women (Moore & Stuart, 2005). However, given the differences in male norms (e.g., aggression) even among northern and southern US men with similar European ancestry (Vandello et al., 2008), it seems likely that Asian American men's masculinity ideology and IPV perpetration are influenced by cultural factors. Indeed, risk and protective factors associated with Asian American culture (e.g., collectivism) and with common experiences of people of color (e.g., discrimination) have been found to influence risk for perpetrating sexual aggression (Hall & Barongan, 1997).

Hegemonic masculinity theory provides a framework for understanding diverse men's development of masculinity ideologies. Connell and Messerschmidt (2005) describe how men with subordinated masculinities negotiate their relationship with traditional masculinity in relation to the dimensions that are more or less accessible to them. This negotiation can be influenced by stereotyping, structural subordination (e.g.,
employment legislation), and discordance with heritage conceptions of masculinity. The ways in which Asian American men may construct their masculinities include complying with subordinating model minority expectations (i.e., unassertive, self-reliant providers), adopting greater egalitarianism in their gender role ideology, or perpetuating patriarchal gendered hierarchies that lead them to dominate their female partners at home in response to experiences of racial subordination in society (Espiritu, 1997).

Efforts to prevent and intervene in IPV are founded substantially on theory and empirical relationship that demonstrates the associations between IPV perpetration and men's attitudes about gender roles, men's attitudes about masculinity, and men's gender role stress and conflict. For example, traditional attitudes about men's and women's roles are found to be associated with teen dating violence (Reyes et al., 2016), and traditional masculinity ideology, or men's adherence to traditional male norms and roles, are associated with psychological, sexual, and physical abuse against women (Santana et al., 2006). Additionally, gender role conflict and stress (i.e., negative psychological experiences in relation to traditional male role norms) consistently predict greater physical, psychological, and sexual violence toward women (Moore et al., 2008; O'Neil, 2008).

**Problem Definition and Research Questions**

While much is known about the association between patriarchal gender role norms and IPV prevalence and predictors in the general US population, the literature on how patriarchal gender role norms and culture are related to IPV perpetration by Asian American men has not been integratively reviewed. Kim and Schmuhl (2018) recently
examined the correlates of IPV in Asian American communities; however, their review focused primarily on IPV victimization (100% of studies) and the associations between IPV and demographic variables (96.2% of studies), not on the effects of patriarchal gender role norms on both IPV perpetration and victimization (only 26.9% of studies examined this effect). The current review aims to fill this need by focusing on studies that examine cultural and gendered predictors of IPV perpetration by Asian American men. A core intention of this review is to avoid attending to characteristics of IPV victim/survivors who are not responsible for their abusers' violence, and to focus attention and analysis on characteristics of male perpetrators who are responsible for perpetrating abuse. Embedded is the value and assumption, that to intervene in and prevent IPV perpetration, it is necessary to specifically examine perpetrator correlates, and to not confuse correlates of victimization as predictors of perpetration.

Our review addresses three questions: (1) How are patriarchal gender role norms (e.g., masculinity ideology, sexist attitudes toward women) associated with IPV perpetration among Asian American men? (2) How are other, culturally relevant risk and protective factors (e.g., acculturation, enculturation) associated with IPV perpetration among Asian American men? and, (3) How are patriarchal gender role norms related to culturally relevant IPV risk and protective factors among Asian American men?

To assist us in organizing and integrating the evidence we found addressing these questions, we drew, in particular, on community psychology frameworks of human diversity (Watts, 1992) and ecological levels of analysis (Bronfenbrenner, 1992; Rappaport, 1977). The threads that connect the phenomena under examination in this
review are power and culture. Human diversity theory helped us situate associations in the literature between power and culture by elevating population-specific (affirms a population's distinctive worldview), sociopolitical (addresses systems of power and oppression), cross-cultural (examines both unique and universal cultural characteristics), and ecological (emphasizes the interdependence between individuals and their settings) aspects of the findings (Watts, 1992). The levels of analysis framework allowed us to better integrate and conceptualize relationships among factors that span multiple levels, identify areas within peoples' social ecology that are underexamined, and provide recommendations for intervention based on the literature at the appropriate and most effective level of analysis. We also draw on theoretical models of IPV risk and protective factors (Edelson & Tolman, 1992; Heise, 1998) in general and those specific to Asian American populations (e.g., Hall & Barongan, 1997) to bring our analysis closer to the phenomena of gender role norms, IPV, and cultural factors in this population.

Method

An integrative literature review was conducted to understand how patriarchal gender role norms are associated with IPV among Asian American men, and to identify the role of other culturally relevant risk and protective factors in this association. We conducted our integrative literature review with two sets of search terms to address these distinct but interrelated questions. The first search for peer-reviewed papers on Asian American IPV perpetration used combinations of three categories of search terms in the PsycINFO database queries: (1) ethnic group terms (i.e., Asian, Bangladeshi, Cambodian, Chinese, Filipino, Japanese, Korean, South Asian, and Vietnamese), (2) the terms
“American” or “immigrant” to differentiate studies conducted in Asian countries or with Asian nationals, and (3) terms relating to violence between intimate partners (i.e., partner violence, domestic violence, spouse abuse, sexual violence, conjugal violence, batterer). Ethnic group search terms were based on East, Southeast, and South Asian countries. Additional ethnic group terms (i.e., Hong Kong, Macau, Mongolia, Taiwan, Afghanistan, Bhutan, Maldives, Nepal, Sri Lanka, Brunei, Myanmar, Indonesia, Laos, Malaysia, Singapore, Thailand, and Timor-Leste) were used but did not return any studies.

The second set of search terms, on Asian American patriarchal gender role norms, were used to identify studies that may help explain associations found in the literature on IPV perpetration and patriarchal gender role norms for Asian American men. Specifically, we used combinations of the terms “Asian” and “gender role” or “gender norm.” The term “Asian” and not “Asian American” was used to identify articles in this literature because some research articles on Asian Americans and particularly South Asian Americans used the terms Asian immigrants or South Asians in the United States. Our intention for this search was to identify moderating or mediating constructs that help explain associations between patriarchal gender role norms and IPV for Asian American men. To this end, our search was kept broad and did not include narrowing search terms (e.g., culture, IPV) to return a wide and diverse body of studies that examined constructs that we may not have thought to consider.

PsycINFO queries using search terms relating to Asian American IPV and patriarchal gender role norms returned $N = 221$ research articles. Articles were retained if participants were in the United States at the time of the study, if they included data on
either IPV perpetration by or gender role norms of Asian American men, and if they were based on an empirical research study (qualitative or quantitative). One hundred and ninety-nine papers were excluded from the full literature review because they did not meet content or methodological inclusion criteria or if they were duplicate papers. Specifically, papers were excluded for content if they did not report findings on IPV perpetration by Asian American men (e.g., were about interpersonal violence in general or were about the victimization of Asian American women and perpetrator race was not identified) or if they did not report findings on Asian American men’s gender role norms (e.g., no male participants, did not disaggregate findings to report on Asian American men specifically, compared a nongendered outcome by gender only). Papers were excluded for methodological reasons if they were a review paper, a media content analysis, a case study, a book review, had <5% Asian American men in their sample, or were not empirical for other reasons (e.g., described a conceptual framework without empirical data). Additionally, two papers (Iwamoto et al., 2010; W. M. Liu & Iwamoto, 2007) from the author’s collection that directly addressed the research questions but surprisingly had not been identified in the database by the search terms were added to the study. As these pieces of literature are relatively new, no restrictions on the year of publication were implemented for inclusion in the review. The final sample included $N = 24$ unique empirical research articles on the prevalence and correlates of IPV perpetration and/or patriarchal gender role norms by Asian American men (see Table 3.1).
Table 3.1 Literature Review Papers and Exclusion Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Asian American Men’s IPV Perpetration</th>
<th>Asian American Men’s Gender Role Norms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Query Articles Returned</strong></td>
<td><strong>Query Articles Returned</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(N = 154)</td>
<td>(N = 67)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Exclusion Criteria</strong></td>
<td><strong>Exclusion Criteria</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not about IPV perpetration</td>
<td>Not in the U.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duplicate</td>
<td>No male participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review paper</td>
<td>Not about gender roles norms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not empirical</td>
<td>No AA men data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violence other than IPV</td>
<td>Not about AAs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not in the U.S.</td>
<td>Review Paper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No perpetrator race</td>
<td>&lt; 5% AAs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Book Review</td>
<td>Not empirical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case study</td>
<td>Media analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IPV Articles Excluded:</td>
<td>Descriptive Only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IPV Articles Retained:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gender Role Articles Excluded:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gender Role Articles Retained:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gender Role Norms Articles Added from</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>First Author’s Collection(^a)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total Articles Excluded:               | Total Articles Retained:                |
|                                      |                                        |
|                                      | 199                                     |
|                                      | 24                                      |

\(^a\) Two articles were added from the author’s collection that were not retrieved by the search.

Note. AA = Asian American; IPV = intimate partner violence.

Empirical research papers that met inclusion criteria were thematically coded by the first author based on the primary constructs under examination. Themes deduced from these papers related to IPV (e.g., IPV perpetration, witnessing parental violence), masculinity (e.g., traditional masculinity ideology, gender role egalitarianism), and Asian cultural factors (e.g., loss of face) and experiences (e.g., discrimination, immigration). Many papers included analysis of multiple intersecting constructs of interest. As such,
findings from a study that examines multiple constructs are reported in each relevant results subsection. For instance, findings from a paper that examines the contributions of both patriarchal gender role norms (i.e., masculinity theme) and loss of face (i.e., Asian cultural theme) on IPV perpetration by Asian American men are reported in the results subsections of both patriarchal gender role norms and Asian cultural factors, with each phenomenon being elevated in the appropriate subsection.

Results

Among papers specifically addressing Asian American men’s IPV perpetration, studies were grouped into four domains depending on the key phenomena they examined:

1. patriarchal gender role norms ($n = 10$, 71.4%),
2. acculturation and enculturation ($n = 6$, 42.9%),
3. cultural factors ($n = 4$, 28.6%) and
4. violence in the family of origin (i.e., witnessing parental violence, experiencing child abuse; $n = 4$, 28.6%). Since multiple studies examined more than one of these constructs, percentages exceed 100.

Additionally, ten papers that address Asian American men’s gender role norms, but not Asian American men’s IPV perpetration, also examine acculturation and/or enculturation. We review, integrate, and situate the findings across these domains of literature in four sections below.

1. Asian American Men’s IPV Perpetration and Patriarchal Gender Role Norms

Patriarchal gender role norms account for the majority of phenomena examined in the literature on IPV perpetration by Asian American men. Among these studies ($n = 10$), patriarchal gender role norms were primarily conceptualized as men’s beliefs about male
and female gender roles or as power dynamics (including changes in power dynamics post-immigration) between intimate partners.

Individual level beliefs about men’s and women’s gender role norms (e.g., hostile attitudes toward women, patriarchal beliefs) have been found generally to positively predict IPV perpetration for diverse samples of Asian American men. More permissive attitudes toward wife beating are predictive of more verbal and physical IPV for Chinese immigrant men, are significantly higher for Chinese immigrant batterers compared with non-violent community controls, and partially explain the effects of experiencing childhood physical abuse on IPV perpetration (Jin, Eagle, & Yoshioka, 2007). Additionally, qualitative analysis revealed that Vietnamese, Laotian, and Khmer American refugee men living in the U.S. use more physical violence than Chinese refugee men, the latter of which hold negative attitudes toward physical IPV and thus use more verbal and emotional controlling tactics (Ho, 1999). Hostile masculinity (i.e., hostile, adversarial, and sexually dominating attitudes toward women) predicts greater sexual aggression for Asian American college men (Hall, Teten, DeGarmo, Sue, & Stephens, 2005), and patriarchal beliefs (i.e., attitudes toward male dominance over women, non-egalitarianism) are positively correlated with emotional and physical abuse based on partner report of Vietnamese immigrant husbands (Bui & Morash, 1999).

Relationship level predictors of IPV perpetration by Asian American men focus on the context of the intimate relationship in which the abuse occurs. One way that the context of the intimate relationship is examined in relation to IPV is through measurement of both subjective and materialized power structures among partners.
Subjective power includes non-material resources like decision-making dominance in a relationship while materialized power includes objective resources such as employment, education, and income (Jin & Keat, 2010). The literature examines power dynamics in intimate relationships based on relative levels of power between intimate partners and changes in those relative levels post-immigration (e.g., relatively less decision-making power after immigration).

Five studies have examined the association between subjective power dynamics and IPV perpetration using measures of male dominance in decision making. Male dominance in decision making was found to positively predict physical and verbal abuse by Vietnamese immigrant men (based on partner reports; Morash, Bui, Zhang, & Holtfreter, 2007) and is greater in relationships with physically abusive Vietnamese immigrant husbands compared with non-violent husbands (Bui & Morash, 1999). In relationships where men are dominant in decision making, Korean American men perpetrate more physical violence compared to those with egalitarian structures (Kim & Sung, 2000). Additionally, in a study comparing Chinese American batterers in treatment with non-violent community controls, losses in decision-making power are correlated with more permissive IPV attitudes for violent men, but the opposite was found for non-violent men (Jin & Keat, 2010). While a study with a nationally representative sample based on partner reports found that male dominant decision making is not uniquely predictive of greater physical IPV, when husbands in male dominant households made equal or less money than their wives, there is actually lower risk for IPV than if they made more less money and were not dominant in decision making (Chung, Tucker, &
Takeuchi, 2008). This suggests that in relationships where women have greater materialized power, there is less risk for IPV when men are dominant in subjective power, perhaps alleviating their felt need to reaffirm a lost sense of masculinity through IPV.

Materialized power in intimate relationships has been operationalized in the literature in terms of education, income, and employment. Some studies found that men’s lower relative materialized power serves a protective role and others found increased risk effects in part depending on the type (e.g., education, income, employment) and operationalization (i.e., independent of or relative to partner) of power examined. Independently (i.e., not in relation to their partner’s materialized power), women’s employment is associated with more than a 4-fold increase and men’s higher education was associated with more than a 3.5-fold increase in odds of men’s sexual IPV perpetration, but women’s income, education, and legal status serve protective roles (Kim & Sung, 2016). The positive association between women’s employment and men’s sexual IPV perpetration may be attributed to male partners’ reactions to women’s increased interactions with other men due to participation in the workplace, as has been found in qualitative studies (Bui & Morash, 2008). The protective role of women’s income, education, and legal status may be due to the protective role of higher familial wellbeing, or of women’s materialized power being balanced with husbands’ greater subjective power.

When materialized power has been operationalized as the ratio of power between men and women in an intimate relationship, similar risk is found. Men who have lower
incomes than their wives (Chung et al., 2008) or are unemployed when their wife is employed (Morash et al., 2007) are more likely to perpetrate IPV. Additionally, for men who make equal to or less income than their wives, their risk for IPV perpetration increases if they also make less decisions in the family but decreases if they do more housework compared than their wives. However, families with husbands who do most of the housework are notably rare (.05% of families; Chung et al., 2008). Findings from these studies suggest that when men have less power in their intimate relationships, and particularly when they have less materialized and subjective power, they are more likely to perpetrate IPV.

Several studies have examined how the degree of the change in power from immigration effects Asian American men’s IPV perpetration. The two studies that use this operationalization of relative power find that Asian American men’s losses and insufficient gains in subjective and materialized power from immigration predict greater IPV perpetration. Specifically, Jin and Keat (2010) found that, compared with non-violent controls, batterers have significantly less gains in materialized power but similar losses in decision making power. In other words, while both batterers and non-violent community controls experience some reduction in decision making power compared with their wives after immigration, batterers do not experience greater relative increases in income compared with their wives. A qualitative study of partner reports revealed that Vietnamese abused immigrant women’s increased economic movement paired with their husbands decreased social and economic status at times led their husbands to use violence to reinforce their dominant position in the family (Bui & Morash, 2008).
Additionally, abused women report that working outside the home leads husbands to perceive a loss in control over their interactions with other men, (paired with fears of being less attractive than American men) which at times leads to conflict and violence as a way for men to assert their power over women’s sexual exclusivity. Given the small sample size of studies examining the influences of changes in power through immigration on Asian American men’s IPV perpetration \((n = 2)\), it is still unclear how this dynamic would perform in future replications. Nonetheless, these findings suggest that the absence of relative gain in materialized power post-immigration (gains that are likely expected) paired with changes in women’s employment may play an important role in Asian American immigrant men’s IPV perpetration.

2. IPV Perpetration and Acculturation-Enculturation

The associations among IPV perpetration, acculturation, and enculturation for Asian American men have been examined in six studies. This literature accounts for the second largest category of studies on Asian American men’s IPV perpetration. The phenomenon of acculturation refers to the degree to which a person identifies with mainstream U.S. culture and participates in its norms and customs. Enculturation, on the other hand, refers to the degree to which a person identifies with their heritage culture (in this case men’s Asian culture of origin) and participates in its norms and customs. Conceptually, as someone becomes more acculturated to U.S. mainstream culture, they do not necessarily lose identification with their culture of origin. Indeed, it is possible to be highly acculturated while also being highly enculturated (Jin et al., 2007).
Acculturation. Four studies have examined the association between acculturation (at the individual level) and IPV perpetration by Asian American men. One study used a psychological measure of acculturation (i.e., the degree to which one identifies with mainstream U.S. culture in the areas of entertainment, friendship, marriage, and value orientation.), and four studies used the sociodemographic characteristics of nativity (i.e., foreign born or U.S. born), years in the U.S., legal status, and English language proficiency as proxies for acculturation. Acculturation is found to be protective of Asian American men’s risk for physical and emotional IPV perpetration when the number of years he lived in the U.S. is measured among a nationally representative sample of Korean American men (Kim & Sung, 2000), and among a community sample of Chinese immigrant batterers in treatment (Jin et al., 2007). However, in a nationally representative sample of Asian American men in general (i.e., not disaggregated by ethnic background), neither the number of years in the U.S. nor being born in the U.S. were significantly associated with physical violence perpetration (Chang, Shen, & Takeuchi, 2009). Further, neither English language proficiency nor legal status predict the seriousness, frequency, or duration of physical, emotional/psychological, or sexual abuse by Chinese immigrant abusive men, based on partner report (Kim & Sung, 2016). The only study that has examined a psychological measure of acculturation found no significant effects on IPV in a group of Chinese immigrant batterers in treatment (Jin et al., 2007). Across these studies, greater acculturation is either associated with less IPV perpetration or the effect is non-significant. No studies have found that greater acculturation increases risk for IPV.
**Enculturation.** Only three studies have examined the association between enculturation and IPV perpetration by Asian American men. Among these studies, no enculturation measures were based on sociodemographic variables and two used multidimensional measures of enculturation, the latter of which is more proximal to the psychological phenomenon under study. Enculturation (individual level) was operationalized as the degree to which respondents identify with their heritage culture, are proficient in their heritage cultural language, and participate in cultural customs and activities. Findings on the effects of enculturation on IPV are mixed. In a university sample, while a main effect for enculturation was not detected, moderation analysis revealed that enculturation plays a protective role against sexual aggression for mainland Asian American men but can augment risk among Hawaiian Asian American men (Hall et al., 2005). Qualitative analysis with Vietnamese immigrant men (who had higher enculturation than their wives) found that the frequency of marital conflicts about changing norms and values with wives is attributable to greater physical and emotional abuse (Bui & Morash, 1999). However, enculturation was not significantly correlated with verbal or physical IPV for Chinese immigrant batters in treatment (Jin et al., 2007). Overall, these findings suggest that enculturation can play a protective or augmentative risk role for IPV perpetration by Asian American men depending, in part, on sample characteristics such as whether or not they are ethnic minorities in their communities (Asian Americans are a majority ethnic group in Hawaii).
3. Patriarchal Gender Role Norms and Acculturation-Enculturation

The reviewed literature provides insight into the effects of patriarchal gender role norms on IPV and the effects of acculturation and enculturation on IPV perpetration by Asian American men. However, little is known about how acculturation, enculturation, and patriarchal gender role norms relate to each other in their prediction of IPV. Only one of the four studies included measures of both enculturation and patriarchal gender role norms in the prediction of IPV and tested their combined effect directly. Hall et al. (2005) found that the combined effect of ethnic identity (i.e., enculturation) and hostile masculinity (i.e., patriarchal gender role norms) did not significantly predict sexual aggression for mainland or Hawaiian American university men.

To address the third possible association between the three central phenomena examined in this review, we now turn our attention to reviewing findings about the effects of acculturation and enculturation on patriarchal gender role norms. Findings are analyzed together with those from the previous two sections in order to facilitate development of an integrative model that might better predict and explain Asian American men’s IPV perpetration. Studies in the current section examined patriarchal gender role norms using measures of patriarchal attitudes towards women, masculinity ideology, traditional gender role norms, egalitarianism, patriarchal IPV attitudes (e.g., rape myths, permissive IPV attitudes), and men’s gender role conflict.

**Acculturation.** Of the ten studies that examine the effect of acculturation and/or enculturation on patriarchal gender role norms for Asian American men, four of them assess acculturation. In these studies, the degree to which Asian American men identify
with and participate in mainstream U.S. culture was captured using psychological measures and sociodemographic proxies. Psychological measures operationalized acculturation as psychological acculturation, individualism (a western social orientation), and racial conformity (i.e., idealizing mainstream U.S. culture and denigrating heritage culture). The sociodemographic proxy of acculturation was measured using parents’ nativity (i.e., whether U.S. or foreign born).

Findings suggest that acculturation influences Asian American men’s beliefs about patriarchal gender role norms differently than it does their experiences of gender role stress and conflict in relation to those norms. Specifically, Asian American men’s acculturation does not predict their attitudes toward gender role traditionality in sexual relationships (Ahrold & Meston, 2010) or endorsement of traditional male role norms (e.g., avoidance of femininity, restrictive emotionality; Liu, 2002), however, it does predict greater levels of masculine gender role conflict and stress. Higher acculturation predicted greater conflict from the “success, power, and competition” patriarchal male role norm (Kim, O’Neil, & Owen, 1996) and greater general masculine gender role stress, and higher individualism (a European American interpersonal orientation) predicted greater gendered racism related stress (Liu, Wong, Maffini, Goodrich Mitts, & Iwamoto, 2018). Interestingly, the association between acculturation and gender role conflict from restrictive emotionality was negative in a study using a unidimensional measure of acculturation (Kim et al., 1996) and was positive when a sociopolitical racial identity measure was used (Liu, 2002).
Enculturation. Of the nine studies that examine the effect of enculturation on patriarchal gender role norms, eight operationalized enculturation using the psychological measures of Asian values, enculturation (including values, behaviors, and community involvement), ethnic identity, racial immersion and resistance, Asian American male identity centrality, and collectivism. One study operationalized enculturation using the sociodemographic measure of parents’ nativity (i.e., at least one parent born outside the U.S.).

In all nine studies, enculturation predicted greater endorsement of patriarchal gender role norms for Asian American men. Enculturation predicts greater endorsement of patriarchal gender role norms and less egalitarianism (Ahrold & Meston, 2010; Goldberg, Kelly, Matthews, Kang, Li, & Sumaroka, 2012; Tummala-Nara, Houston-Kolnik, Sathasivam-Rueckert, & Greeson, 2017; Yoshihama, Blazevski, & Bybee, 2014), as well as more negative views on the effects of maternal employment on children (Goldberg et al., 2012), more patriarchal IPV attitudes (Yoshihama et al., 2014), and more traditional attitudes toward male role norms (Iwamoto, Liao, & Liu, 2010; Liu, 2002; Liu & Iwamoto, 2007). Two studies also identified the specific dimensions of patriarchal gender role norms that are predicted by enculturation. Asian values are correlated with the traditional male role norms of restrictive emotionality and homophobia, and less risk taking (Liu & Iwamoto, 2007). The racial identity category of immersion-resistance (i.e., idealizing one’s Asian culture of origin and rejecting European American culture) is positively correlated with the male role norms of
homophobia, achievement/status, non-relational attitudes toward sex, and restrictive emotionality and also predicts greater total traditional masculinity ideology (Liu, 2002).

Whether enculturation predicts patriarchal gender role norms may depend on the dimensions of enculturation under consideration. Yoshihama et al. (2014) clarified the specific relationships among the enculturation dimensions of values, behaviors, and community participation. They found that having more traditional enculturation values positively predicted patriarchal attitudes toward women and patriarchal IPV attitudes (as mediated by patriarchal gender role attitudes), but the same effect was not found for enculturation behaviors or community participation. Community participation was actually negatively associated with IPV supportive attitudes, providing evidence for the differing impacts of specific aspects of enculturation on patriarchal gender role norms. Whether these important distinctions can be replicated in future studies will determine how we understand the relationship between enculturation and IPV perpetration as it relates to patriarchal gender role norms.

In the reviewed studies, Asian American men’s greater enculturation was also associated with greater experiences of conflict and stress in relation to male gender role norms. Specifically, racial immersion and resistance (Liu, 2002) and Asian values (Liu & Iwamoto, 2006) positively predict all domains of gender role conflict. In addition, Asian American male identity centrality was positively correlated with masculine gender role stress, and collectivism was positively correlated with gendered racism related stress (Liu et al., 2018). Examining Asian American men’s racial identity, Liu (2002) found that racial identity dissonance (i.e., struggle with integrating mainstream and heritage
cultures) predicted greater gender role conflict and internalization (i.e., successful integration) positively predicted both endorsement of traditional male role norms and gender role conflict (Liu, 2002). This finding suggests that being an Asian American man in mainstream U.S. culture leads to psychological conflict about masculinity whether one is struggling with or has successfully integrated their racial identity.

Taken together, Asian American men’s greater enculturation, operationalized through a variety of measures, is associated with more patriarchal attitudes and beliefs about gender role norms as well as greater experiences of masculine gender role conflict and stress. Evidence also suggests that Asian values specifically (as opposed to behaviors and community participation) are associated with greater patriarchal gender role norms, while Asian community participation actually is associated with less endorsement of patriarchal gender role norms, specifically patriarchal attitudes toward IPV.

4. IPV Perpetration, Asian Cultural Factors, and Violence in the Family of Origin

While the literature on Asian American men’s IPV perpetration predominantly has examined contributions of acculturation, enculturation, and patriarchal gender role norms, two additional noteworthy phenomena emerge in our analysis. Specifically, Asian cultural factors and experiencing and witnessing abuse as a child were each examined in four studies as predictors of IPV perpetration in this population. To examine the correlates of Asian American men’s IPV at the familial (i.e., small group) and cultural (i.e., community/institutional) levels of analysis, we now turn our attention to reviewing findings about the effects of Asian cultural factors and violence in the family of origin on IPV perpetration.
**IPV perpetration and Asian cultural factors.** Asian cultural factors have been operationalized using psychological measures of loss of face (Hall et al., 2005) and independence/interdependence self-construals (Kim & Zane, 2004), as well as measures of cultural norms such as the acceptability of physical violence (Ho, 1990) and sending remittances back to one’s Asian country of origin (Bui & Morash, 2008). Self-construals are the degree to which individuals assume that they are autonomous and unique (independent) vs. interconnected (interdependent) in relation to others in their families, communities, and society. The concept of loss of face is the threat or loss of one’s and/or one’s family’s social integrity. This concept is most salient in interdependent cultures concerned with interpersonal harmony including Asian cultures (Markus & Kitayama, 1991).

Despite Asian American men’s relatively low levels of independent self-construals, this seems to be a more salient risk factor for their IPV than for European American men (Kim & Zane, 2004). Specifically, evidence suggests that for Korean American batterers in treatment, having greater independent self-construals is associated with less control of anger, which is also associated with increased risk for IPV. Conversely, for European American batterers in treatment, anxious attachment may be a more salient risk factor for their IPV perpetration (compared with independent self-construals; Kim & Zane, 2004).

Findings on the effect of loss of face on IPV perpetration among Asian American men are mixed. In a study of both Asian American and European American university students, greater salience of loss of face was found to have a main protective effect for
sexual aggression perpetration for Asian American men, but not for European American men (Hall et al., 2005). However, Asian American men in Hawaii who were high in both loss of face and sexual experience had increased risk for sexual aggression, despite the protective main effects of both phenomena.

Taken together, these findings indicate that Asian cultural norms seem to influence the methods of abuse perpetration by Asian American men but not clearly the risk for IPV. Sending remittances back to family in one’s country of origin is a normative practice for many immigrants to the U.S. including Asian Americans. Bui and Morash (2008) found that Vietnamese immigrant women who were abused reported that their Vietnamese immigrant abusive husbands controlled the amount of and the recipients of remittances to Vietnam. The men sent more money than the family could afford and only sent money back to their own and not their partners’ families (and in some instances to their extramarital girlfriends). When women contested this control over remittance sending, the abusive men used violence to reassert their dominance. These patterns of remittance sending were interpreted by female participants as a way for abusive men who had lost social and economic status in the U.S. to demonstrate their masculinity overseas and assert dominance over their wives in the U.S (Bui & Morash, 2008). Further evidence comes from a qualitative study with Asian American refugees in which Chinese American values and norms against physical violence in general influenced the ways in which abusive Chinese American men controlled their partners (Ho, 1990). While participants from all groups described men’s domination and control over women, Chinese American men reported using more nonviolent coercive control tactics against
their partners than other groups of refugee men who reported physically abusive behaviors. Based on these findings, different Asian cultural psychological factors (e.g., loss of face, interdependence) appear to protect or augment the risk for IPV perpetration – no general pattern for such a broad construct was identified. Asian cultural norms, on the other hand, influence the forms of abuse perpetrated by Asian American men and not necessarily the risk for perpetration. These patterns are also consistent with research on the role that cultural factors play in IPV perpetration among men belonging to other culturally-specific immigrant populations in the U.S. (e.g., Galvez, Mankowski, McGlade, Ruiz, & Glass, 2011).

**IPV perpetration and violence in the family of origin.** Research connecting violence in the family of origin to later perpetration of IPV generally pulls from social learning theories of aggression (Bandura, 1978) that posit that aggressive and controlling behaviors between adults that are witnessed by children are likely to be learned and repeated by children when they become adults. In the studies reviewed for this paper, violence in the family of origin was operationalized as experiencing abuse (e.g., physical, emotional, and/or sexual) and/or witnessing violence between parents as a child.

Across four studies, consistent support is found for the effect of family of origin violence on later IPV perpetration for Asian American men. Experiencing child abuse predicted IPV perpetration for Chinese immigrant batterers in treatment (Jin et al., 2007), witnessing parental violence predicted IPV for South Asian batterers (Sabri, Simonet, & Campbell, 2018), and a combination of childhood abuse and witnessing parental violence predicted sexual aggression for Hawaiian and mainland Asian American university men.
(Hall et al., 2005). Additionally, childhood emotional abuse was correlated with overt hostile partner attributions and witnessing parental violence was correlated with covert hostile partner attribution for Chinese immigrant batterers in treatment but not for non-violent community controls (Jin, Eagle, & Keat, 2008). However, witnessing parental violence did not predict IPV perpetration in a combined sample of Chinese immigrant batterers in treatment and community controls (Jin et al., 2007). It is possible that this null finding is due at least in part to the high rates of family of origin violence across all participants. Overall, the main effect of child abuse and witnessing parental violence on IPV perpetration for Asian American is consistently supported.

These findings must be considered in the context of moderation and mediation effects found in the literature, which reveal important mechanisms implicated in the main effect of family of origin violence on IPV perpetration. For example, cross-cultural analysis reveals that the effect of family of origin violence on sexual aggression was stronger for European American than Asian American university men (Hall et al., 2005). Additionally, moderation analyses showed attenuation by cultural factors (i.e., loss of face and ethnic identity) for Asian American but not for European American men. Further, different risk factors explained the effect of family of origin violence on sexual aggression for mainland Asian American, Hawaiian Asian American, and European American university men (Hall et al., 2005). In a study with Chinese immigrant batterers in treatment, patriarchal gender role norms (i.e., positive attitudes toward violence against women) mediated the effect of experiencing child abuse on physical IPV perpetration (Jin et al., 2007).
Discussion

Several key findings emerge in our review of the research literature examining IPV perpetration, patriarchal gender role norms, acculturation, and enculturation (see Table 3.2) among Asian-American men. First, greater endorsement of and adherence to patriarchal gender role norms are associated with greater risk for IPV perpetration across multiple levels of analysis including at the small group (e.g., family) and institutional levels of analysis as well as across time (i.e., through immigration) (Bronfenbrenner 1992; Rappaport, 1977). Specifically, patriarchal beliefs and attitudes, male dominant marital structures, and men’s relative loss of mate material power from immigration are all associated with Asian American men’s IPV perpetration. We also found that greater identification with mainstream U.S. culture (i.e., acculturation; mostly measured using sociodemographic proxies) predicts less IPV perpetration or the association is not significant. Additionally, some evidence suggests that the protective effect of acculturation on IPV perpetration might be attributed to lower patriarchal gender role norms and less male dominant marital structures (see Figure 3.1). Third, greater identification with Asian heritage culture (i.e., enculturation; operationalized using psychological measures) is related in complex and inconsistent ways to IPV perpetration. Greater enculturation increased risk for Hawaiian Asian American university men, and reduced risk for mainland Asian American university men, but did not predict IPV perpetration in a community sample that included batterers in treatment. Fourth, compared to studies examining IPV perpetration, acculturation and enculturation are more consistently associated with patriarchal gender role norms. Acculturation does not
predict Asian American men’s patriarchal gender role norm beliefs and attitudes but does not predict their greater experiences of conflict and stress related to those norms. Finally, greater enculturation predicted greater endorsement of patriarchal gender role norms. However, this association did not hold when enculturation was disaggregated into the domain of ethnic/cultural community participation. In this case, community participation predicted less permissive attitudes toward IPV against women.

Table 3.2 Critical Findings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Topic</th>
<th>Summary of Findings</th>
<th>Citations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. IPV and Patriarchal Gender Role Norms</td>
<td>Across all ten studies, patriarchal gender role norms (operationalized at the individual level, relationship level, and across time) positively predicted IPV perpetration. Men’s beliefs about gender role norms, traditional masculinity attitudes, and attitudes toward wife beating were associated with greater risk for IPV perpetration. In relationships, male dominance and male threats to dominance in relationship structures also predicted greater IPV as did men’s losses in dominance across immigration.</td>
<td>Bui &amp; Morash (1999); Bui &amp; Morash (2008); Chung et al. (2008); Hall et al. (2005); Ho (1999); Jin et al. (2007); Jin &amp; Keat (2010); Morash et al. (2007); Kim &amp; Sung (2000); Kim &amp; Sung (2016)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. IPV and Acculturation</td>
<td>In four studies, acculturation was either associated with less IPV perpetration or the effect was non-significant. No studies found that acculturation was associated with an increased risk for IPV.</td>
<td>Chang et al. (2009); Jin et al. (2007); Kim &amp; Sung (2000); Kim &amp; Sung (2016)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. IPV and Enculturation</td>
<td>In three studies, no pattern emerged for the effect of enculturation on IPV perpetration as positive, negative, and null effects were found.</td>
<td>Bui &amp; Morash (1999); Hall et al. (2005); Jin et al. (2007)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Patriarchal Gender Role Norms and Acculturation</td>
<td>Greater acculturation was consistently associated with greater gender role conflict and stress for Asian American men but was not associated with patriarchal gender role norms themselves. Interestingly, the effect of acculturation</td>
<td>Ahrold &amp; Meston (2010); Kim et al. (1996); Liu (2002); Liu et al. (2018)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
specifically on conflict from the male role norm of restrictive emotionality were conflicting.

5. Patriarchal Gender Role Norms and Enculturation
In all 8 studies in this section, greater enculturation (e.g., racial identity, Asian values) was associated with more patriarchal gender role norms (e.g., less egalitarianism, IPV attitudes) for Asian American men. However, the one study that disaggregated enculturation it is analyses found that greater cultural community participation was associated with less patriarchal gender role norms. Additionally, all three studies that examined the effect of enculturation on gender role conflict and stress found an increased risk effect.

Ahrold & Meston, (2010); Goldberg et al. (2012); Iwamoto et al. (2010); Liu (2002); Liu & Iwamoto (2006); Liu & Iwamoto (2007); Liu et al. (2018); Tummala-Nara et al. (2017); Yoshihama et al. (2014)

6. IPV and Asian Cultural Factors
More studies are needed to clarify the findings from this literature. The salience of loss of face had a main protective effect on IPV, but the role of independence/interdependence is unclear. Asian cultural norms (e.g., sending remittances) likely influence the types of abuse perpetrated by Asian American men.

Bui & Morash (2008); Hall et al. (2005); Ho (1999); Kim & Zane (2004)

7. IPV and Violence in the Family of Origin
In three of the four studies, witnessing and/or experiencing abuse as a child was associated with greater risk for perpetrating IPV as an adult.

Hall et al. (2005); Jin et al. (2007); Jin et al. (2008); Sabri, et al. (2018)

Towards Integration of Predictors of IPV Perpetration
Considering the effects of acculturation and enculturation on patriarchal gender role norms in combination with the effects of patriarchal gender role norms on IPV perpetration, several avenues for integration across these domains are promising. While acculturation was either found to be non-significantly or negatively associate with IPV perpetration, it was consistently found to predict greater masculine gender role conflict and stress. This suggests that while greater identification with mainstream U.S. culture
might not necessarily lead to greater identification with U.S. male role norms or IPV perpetration directly, it does lead to greater conflict and stress from attempting to live up to those norms. While masculine gender role conflict and stress per se were not examined against IPV perpetration in this literature, the effects of men’s subjective and materialized power deficiency relative to their female partners were consistently found to be associated with greater IPV perpetration. Given the salience of financial success (materialized power) and demonstrating dominance and power (subjective power) to male role norms, it is likely that the effect of acculturation on IPV perpetration may depend on men’s masculine gender role conflict and/or stress. However, it is possible that greater identification with U.S. mainstream culture inherently leads to greater gender role conflict for Asian American men (e.g., because of experiences of discrimination in spite of acculturation), which in turn can lead to greater IPV perpetration (see Figure 3.1). The lack of clarity on this issue warrants future testing of these models.

Figure 3.1 Integrative Model of Acculturation/Enculturation, Gender, Asian Cultural Factors, and IPV
Overall, greater enculturation consistently predicted more patriarchal gender role norms, but inconsistently predicted IPV perpetration. It is likely that patriarchal gender role norms play a role in the effect of enculturation on IPV perpetration. Based on the inconsistent findings for the main effect of enculturation on IPV perpetration, it would be useful to examine both a moderation model whereby patriarchal gender role beliefs moderate the effect of enculturation on IPV perpetration and a mediation model whereby greater heritage cultural beliefs positively predicts patriarchal gender role norms which positively predict IPV perpetration (see Figure 3.1).

**Implications for Future Research and Assessment**

The findings of our review indicate that research on the effect of Asian cultural factors on IPV perpetration is relatively lacking; further, the available findings are mixed. One process by which Asian cultural factors influence IPV perpetration is through the protective effects of loss of face found by Hall et al. (2005). As reported above, there is robust evidence for the effect of patriarchal gender role norms, such as hostile masculinity, on verbal and physical IPV perpetration in samples of community men (Bui & Morash, 1999), court mandated batterers (Jin et al., 2007), and nationally representative samples (Kim & Sung, 2000). However, a main effect of hostile masculinity on sexual aggression was only detected for Hawaiian and not mainland Asian American men by Hall et al. (2005). It is possible that characteristics of the university sample as well as the operationalization of IPV only as sexual aggression (which is appropriate for a sample of university men) may have restricted detection of the main effect of patriarchal gender role norms on IPV perpetration more broadly. In samples
with community men and/or batterers in treatment, and when IPV is measured more broadly (i.e., emotional, psychological, physical, and sexual abuse), it is possible that Asian cultural factors (e.g., loss of face, collectivism, and other cultural norms and values) play a protective role in the effects of patriarchal gender role norms on IPV perpetration (see Figure 3.2).

Figure 3.2 Integrative Model of Gender, Asian Cultural Factors, and IPV

![Integrative Model Diagram](image)

Studies consistently find that witnessing parental IPV and/or experiencing abuse as a child are associated with greater IPV perpetration as an adult. Two studies also provide models by which this process may be integrated into the larger framework of patriarchal gender role norms, Asian cultural factors, and IPV perpetration. Jin et al. (2007) and Hall et al. (2005) found evidence to support a mediation model whereby witnessing and experiencing abuse as a child increases Asian American men’s patriarchal gender role norms which in turn increase their risk for IPV perpetration (see Figure 3.3). Hall et al. (2005) also found support for a protective model, whereby the effect of witnessing and experiencing abuse as a child on IPV perpetration is buffered by both loss of face and ethnic identity (see Figure 3.3). Further examination of these phenomena
(e.g., with community men, more comprehensive operationalizations of IPV, disaggregating witnessing and experiencing abuse as a child) would help to clarify these promising findings on the mechanisms that explain the effect of violence in the family of origin on IPV perpetration.

Figure 3.3 Integrative Model of Violence in the Family of Origin, Asian Cultural Factors, Gender, and IPV

![Integrative Model of Violence in the Family of Origin, Asian Cultural Factors, Gender, and IPV]

**Evaluation of Attention to Human Diversity in the Literature**

Drawing on conceptual frameworks for human diversity and culture (Hall & Barongan, 1997; Mankowski, Galvez & Glass, 2011; Watts, 1992), we noted that the empirical articles identified and reviewed in this paper varied in their contributions to our understanding of the risk and protective factors for IPV, and the diversity of contexts and circumstances in which patriarchal gender role norms may produce IPV, in Asian American populations. Studies included samples of diverse Asian ethnic men including Vietnamese, Chinese, Korean, and other Southeast Asian men, as well as immigrant and
U.S. born men. There also was good coverage of the sociopolitical perspectives of human diversity. The strongest demonstration can be found in studies that examined the effects of patriarchal gender role norms and family of origin violence on IPV perpetration among Asian American men. Additionally, several studies in this literature used qualitative methods to deconstruct the power structure of the researcher and the researched by including participants as experts of their own lived experiences who equally contribute to the building of knowledge. This collaborative, participatory, and reflexive approach is needed in future studies to protect against stereotyping and other harms that are more likely to occur when culturally specific populations lack a voice in how they are represented by research, particularly when the focus of that research is on negative behaviors such as IPV perpetration.

Despite the literature’s strong attention to the cross-cultural and sociopolitical perspectives of human diversity, relatively little attention was paid to population-specific psychological factors. Of the studies examining both patriarchal gender role norms and family of origin violence, only one (Hall et al., 2005) included measures of culturally specific phenomena. Further, there was a concerning imbalance between studies of the risk factors for IPV perpetration for Asian American men compared with protective factors. Finally, and importantly, no studies examined small group and community factors outside of the family unit of Asian American men. The gap in our knowledge on peer, extended family, and community member factors for these men are particularly limiting given their collectivist interdependent cultural background.

**Implications for Practice and Policy**
Findings from this review suggest important implications for practice and policy relating to culturally responsive prevention and interventions with Asian American men. Our review of the literature identified several cultural and gendered factors that may play distinct and important roles in the wellbeing of Asian American men. These include the protective effects of cultural community participation on patriarchal gender role norms, and of loss of face on IPV perpetration, and the risk effects of enculturation on patriarchal gender role norms, and of patriarchal gender role norms on IPV perpetration. These risk and protective effects suggest that counselors and treatment programs may reduce abusive men’s risk for IPV perpetration by addressing the stress and strain from changing cultural and gender role norms (e.g., breadwinning), promoting their participation in their cultural communities, and nurturing the communal and interdependent ties central to the loss of face norm that is protective against IPV perpetration. Based on findings on the association between acculturation, enculturation, and patriarchal gender role norms, treatment providers can clients identify the source of their gender role conflict and stress that may be contributing to their abuse for more acculturated Asian American men.

**Conclusion**

This review, together with related reviews of IPV in Asian American populations (e.g., Kim & Schmul, 2018), furthers our understanding of Asian American IPV with the ultimate goal of reducing violence against intimate partners in Asian American communities. Findings from this review identified predictors of IPV perpetration by Asian American men with robust and consistent support in the literature (e.g., the effect of patriarchal gender role norms) and other moderating factors and effects (e.g., the role
of Asian cultural factors) that are in need of further study. These findings inform future direction for research, as well as policy, and practice in this area of study are proposed. Our review took the unique approach of focusing on studies that examined predictors of IPV perpetration by Asian American men as opposed to correlates of partner violence victimization. This approach is rooted in the perspective that perpetration and its social ecology must be the focus for effective and ethical intervention and prevention efforts. It is our hope that this perspective and the findings from this literature review are useful to researchers, practitioners, and policy makers in reducing IPV in Asian American and all communities.
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Chapter 4: Study Three – Intersections of masculinity and culturally relevant factors in Asian American men’s intimate partner violence perpetration

Abstract

Intimate partner violence (IPV) in Asian American communities is a devastating social problem. While it is well understood that men’s endorsement of and adherence to gender role norms that promote men’s power and dominance over women increases their risk for IPV perpetration, less is known about the impact of other culturally relevant risk and protective factors for Asian American men. Evidence to date provide mixed findings on the impact of acculturation and enculturation on IPV perpetration, and the effect of collectivism and discrimination are not yet understood for Asian American men. Additionally, how gender and culturally relevant factors interact to predict IPV perpetration is not clear. The current study examines the impacts of risk factors of adherence to patriarchal gender role norms, enculturation, and perceived discrimination, and the protective factors of acculturation and social support on IPV perpetration in a nationally representative sample of Asian American community men (\(N = 998\)) using data from the National Latino and Asian American Study (NLAAS; Alegria et al., 2004). Multiple logistic regression analysis with interaction effects revealed a lack of association between acculturation, enculturation, social support, and discrimination and physical IPV perpetration. More surprisingly, adherence to patriarchal gender role norms was also not associated with physical IPV perpetration in bivariate or multivariate analysis. Findings have important implications for the construct validity and operationalization of adherence to patriarchal gender role norms, culturally relevant factors, and IPV perpetration.
**Introduction**

Intimate partner violence (IPV), defined as physical, sexual, or psychological aggression against a current or former romantic partner (Breiding et al., 2014), is a devastating societal issue leading to both short-term and long-term injury and illness for victims (Coker et al., 2002). In heterosexual relationships, perpetration by men against women is more frequent and more severe than abuse by women against men (Breiding et al., 2014). Women are not only more likely to be the victim of severe physical violence, stalking, rape and other sexual assault by an intimate partner compared to men, but they also experience more forms of violence than men and are more than twice as likely to experience significant short and long term Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD) symptoms and injury from IPV than men (Smith et al., 2018).

Interventions aimed at reducing IPV often draw on the theory that violence is used instrumentally by men to control and dominate their female partners (Pence & Paymar, 1993). In qualitative reporting, female victims (Ptacek, 2020) and male perpetrators (Peralta & Tuttle, 2013) have attributed IPV to the male role norms of dominance and control and to men’s response when those role norms are threatened. Quantitative evidence finds that men’s endorsement of patriarchal role norms that subordinate women, including dominance, are associated with greater IPV perpetration (Moore & Stuart, 2005). Indeed, even at the state level, more inequitable gender norms (i.e., reproductive health disadvantage, less empowerment, and lower labor market participation) are associated with higher rates of violence against women (Willie & Kershaw, 2019).
Despite our progress in understanding gendered predictors of IPV perpetration, little is still known about the influence of cultural factors in ethnic minority populations, including for Asian American men (Kyler-Yano & Mankowski, 2021). The following document is a study assessing the unique and combined contributions of several Asian cultural factors and the moderating role of adherence to patriarchal gender role norms on IPV perpetration by Asian American men.

**IPV in Asian American Communities**

In studies with Asian American participants, similar associations between patriarchal male role norms and IPV perpetration are found. Male dominance in household decision making (Kim & Sung, 2000), attitudes condoning violence against women (Jin et al., 2007), norms of male dominance (Ho, 1990), and hostile masculinity (Hall et al., 2005) are associated with Asian American men’s greater risk for perpetrating violence against women. The influence of patriarchal gender role norms on IPV perpetration even seem to operate when men are in relatively lower positions of power compared with their female partners. For instance, when Asian American women have greater relative power in terms of both family decision making and income, they are actually at greater risk for IPV victimization (Chung et al., 2008). This effect was suspected to occur through a process of husbands’ reasserting dominance in response to experiencing threats to their masculinity. Overall, endorsement of and adherence to patriarchal gender role norms, which range from expectations for women to take responsibility for household chores despite working outside of the home (Chung et al.,
to social and legal norms that permit wife beating (Nguyen, 2005), are primary contributors to IPV perpetration by Asian American men.

While gender role norms that promote men’s dominance over women consistently predict IPV perpetration by Asian American men, less clear are the roles of culturally relevant factors. It is likely that power/dominance and cultural norms and values are two dimensions along which culture and gender interact to increase or reduce Asian American men’s risk for IPV perpetration. Power and dominance shape both gender and race relations in the U.S., and so the unique intersection of Asian American men’s experiences of subordination from being non-White and of having greater gendered power as men may play a role in their IPV perpetration. For instance, the racial subordination that Asian American men experience in society may lead to compensatory motivated expressions of gendered power in their homes through IPV perpetration. There may be culturally relevant norms, values, or social orientations that function as protective or risk factors for IPV perpetration that influenced the effect of adherence to patriarchal gender role norms on Asian American men’s IPV. For instance, holding the social orientation of being interdependent as opposed to independent may protect many Asian American men from negative social and psychological outcomes including IPV perpetration, but that effect is less likely to hold for Asian American men who adhere to norms that prescribe male dominance over female partners. Considering both cultural risk and protective factors and the influence of men’s adherence to patriarchal gender role norms allows us to assess how gender and culturally based power, values, and norms interact to identify the most salient factors for intervention in Asian American men’s IPV perpetration.
Culturally Relevant Risk and Protective Factors

Culturally relevant factors that are conceptually or empirically implicated in Asian American men’s risk for IPV perpetration include social support, acculturation and enculturation, patriarchal gender role norms, and discrimination.

Table 4.1 Summary of Literature on Risk and Protective Factors for Asian American Men's IPV Perpetration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk Factor</th>
<th>Protective Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Patriarchal gender role norms:</strong> For Asian American men, greater endorsement of and greater adherence to patriarchal gender role norms that subordinate women are associated with greater risk for IPV perpetration.</td>
<td><strong>Social support:</strong> In the non-Asian American samples, social support, peer support, and religious service attendance protective against IPV perpetration. In Asian American samples, community participation is associated with less patriarchal gender role norms—a consistent risk factor for IPV perpetration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Enculturation:</strong> For Asian American men, the association between enculturation and IPV perpetration is mixed. However, enculturation is consistently associated with more patriarchal gender role norms—a consistent risk factor for IPV perpetration.</td>
<td><strong>Acculturation:</strong> In samples of Asian American men, greater acculturation (operationalized in various ways) is either associated with a reduction in risk for IPV perpetration or the effect is non-significant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Discrimination:</strong> In studies with Latino and African American men (but not Asian American men), greater perceived discrimination is associated with greater risk for IPV in moderation and mediation models. However, greater perceived discrimination is associated with greater masculine gender role strain for Asian American men—a consistent risk factor for IPV perpetration.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Social Support.** The salience and centrality of collectivism and interdependence (i.e., social orientations that prioritize community belonging and harmony over individual
expression and success) to Asian Americans suggests that belonging to a social group, including one’s family, peer group, and community, is a culturally relevant protective factor against negative psychological and interpersonal outcomes including intimate partner violence (Hall & Barongan, 1997; Yee et al., 2007). While studies have found evidence for the influence of support from family on the reduction of risk for IPV victimization of Asian American women (Cho, 2012) no studies to date have examined the protective effect of family or peer support on Asian American men’s IPV perpetration. Studies with samples of U.S. men in general provide some direction.

Social support has been found to function as a protective factor against IPV perpetration for U.S. men. Among a sample of U.S. Air Force active-duty servicemen, social support (including support from neighbors and organizational leadership) was associated with a reduction in odds of perpetrating severe IPV (Slep et al, 2015). Religious involvement was not associated with IPV among this military sample (Slep et al, 2015), and frequency of religious service attendance was not associated with IPV perpetration in a sample of community men (Cunradi et al., 2002). In a sample of active-duty army men, peer support was associated with a reduction in odds of perpetrating moderate to severe IPV (in relation to minor IPV; Rosen et al., 2003).

In addition to conceptual support for the protective effect of social support on Asian American men’s IPV perpetration, and the empirical evidence found in general U.S. populations, community support and peer influences are found to be associated with salient correlates of IPV perpetration for Asian American men. Yoshihama and colleagues (2014) found that Asian American men’s integration in their cultural
community was negatively associated with patriarchal gender role norms, a consistent predictor of greater IPV perpetration. Additionally, Asian American men uniquely show an increased risk for IPV perpetration if they also reported high rates of violence in their male social networks (Raghavan et al., 2009), suggesting a culturally unique effect of peer influence on IPV perpetration.

**Discrimination.** Intimate partner violence and patriarchal gender role norms function to support the dominance of those with more power in society over those who are more vulnerable. Race-based discrimination reflects a similar sociopolitical phenomenon in the domain of race and ethnicity instead of gender. Asian Americans have been subjected to centuries of discrimination in the U.S. including everyday discrimination of private citizens and organizations, government legislation designed to limit citizenship, employment, property ownership, and family building, and demeaning depictions in mass media (Ancheta, 2006, pp. 19-41; Espiritu, 1997; Shek, 2006). It is possible that race-based discrimination can lead to gender-based discrimination when Asian American men alleviate their feelings of powerless in society by exerting power and dominance at home against their female partner. While no studies to date have examined the influence of racial discrimination on IPV perpetration among Asian American men, evidence exists to support its further study. Racial discrimination is associated with greater masculinity stress for Asian American men whose identity as men is highly central (Liu et al., 2018; Wong et al., 2014). Considering that Asian American men’s gender role stress and conflict consistently predict greater risk for IPV perpetration (Kyler-Yano & Mankowski, 2021), it is likely that the influence of discrimination on IPV
perpetration is dependent on a third variable such as gender role norms or gender role conflict. Indeed, studies with Latino (Maldonado et al., 2020) and African American (Sutton et al., 2020) men suggest that positive associations between discrimination and IPV perpetration are often moderated or mediated by other salient factors (e.g., PTSS, substance abuse, nativity, anger and hostility bias, parental corporal punishment).

**Acculturation.** The degree to which Asian American men are socialized into mainstream U.S. culture, or acculturated, has implications for the association between cultural and gendered factors on IPV perpetration. For instance, if one’s heritage cultural norms and attitudes include gender role norms that are more patriarchal than those in the U.S., acculturation may reduce the risk for IPV perpetration by way of a reduction in patriarchal gender role norms. Findings on the influence of acculturation (i.e., socialization into mainstream U.S. culture) on Asian American men’s IPV perpetration are mixed (Kyler-Yano & Mankowski, 2021). Greater acculturation is found to be protective against IPV perpetration for community Korean American men (Kim & Sung, 2000) and Chinese immigrant abusive men in treatment (Jin et al., 2007). However, several studies have also found no association between acculturation and IPV perpetration among Asian American men in community samples (Chang et al., 2009) and samples of participants in battering treatment programs (Kim & Sung, 2016). Still less is known about how acculturation and other cultural and gendered factors interact in their association with IPV perpetration.

Findings on the association between acculturation and gender role norms provide evidence to support their combined influence on risk for IPV perpetration. Greater
acculturation for Asian American men is associated with greater experiences of stress and conflict from attempting to adhere to patriarchal gender role norms. For instance, higher acculturation is found to predict greater gender role conflict specific to the “success, power, and competition” male role norm (Kim et al., 1996) and greater individualism is correlated with greater stress from gendered racism (Liu et al., 2018). It may be that findings on the association between acculturation and IPV perpetration are inconsistent in part because models have not incorporated the influence of gender role norms that promote male dominance over women, which are associated with both acculturation and IPV perpetration.

**Enculturation.** Findings on the association between enculturation (i.e., socialization into heritage culture) and IPV perpetration for Asian American men are similarly mixed. While enculturation served a protective role for mainland Asian American college men’s sexual aggression (Hall et al., 2005), it was reported as a key contributor to violence based on qualitative reports by Vietnamese immigrant women (Bui & Morash, 2008), and was found to augment risk for sexual aggression for Hawaiian Asian American college men (Hall et al., 2005). The mixed evidence for the association between Asian American men’s enculturation and their perpetration of IPV leaves room for the potential influence of additional factors that may account for the variation. The degree to which Asian American men endorse or adhere to gender role norms that support dominance over women is one potential moderating factor. Enculturation is consistently associated with greater endorsement of patriarchal gender role norms including more negative views on maternal employment (Goldberg et al., 2012), more
traditional attitudes toward male role norms (Liu, 2002), and more permissive attitudes toward violence against women (Yoshihama et al., 2014). As such, it is possible that enculturation is associated with greater risk for IPV perpetration only when (or particularly when) Asian American men endorse or adhere to patriarchal gender role norms.

**Summary**

Conceptually, the degree to which an Asian American man speaks the language and prefers the food of his heritage culture, and the degree to which he has experienced discrimination based on his race, would have little to do with whether or not he is abusive to his romantic partner. Considering his attitudes and behaviors around men’s entitlement to dominant positions in society and at home helps to close this conceptual gap. Indeed, while Asian values such as interdependence and family harmony may be protective against IPV for some, Ho (1990) found that they can also lead to minimization and hiding of IPV. It is possible that an important factor that differentiates the impact of Asian cultural values on IPV is Asian American men’s adherence to gender role norms that entitle men to positions of power over women. Evidence for the role of culturally relevant risk and protective factors in Asian American men’s IPV perpetration is either limited or mixed. However, the association between endorsement of and adherence to patriarchal gender role norms and increased risk for IPV perpetration is consistently supported. Additionally, consistent evidence is found for the influence of acculturation and enculturation on patriarchal gender role norms. Taken together, the evidence suggests that the testing of an intersectional model incorporating both culturally relevant and
gendered factors is supported and may better explain variance in IPV perpetration, than models examining either of these phenomena independently.

**The National Latino and Asian American Study**

The National Latino and Asian American Study (NLAAS) is one of few nationally representative studies with enough Asian American respondents to conduct culturally specific analyses for this group. The NLAAS was administered to Latino and Asian American community adults 18 years and older in the contiguous United States from May 2002 through November 2003. Surveys were translated into Chinese, Vietnamese, Tagalog, and Spanish to aid in completion of the survey by participants with limited English and were mostly conducted using laptop computer-assisted personal interview methods in respondent homes. While the main goal of the NLAAS was to describe the lifetime and 12-month prevalence of psychiatric disorders and the rates of mental health services use for Latino and Asian Americans (Alegria et al., 2004), also collected were measures of culturally relevant constructs (e.g., enculturation) and of family dynamics including IPV perpetration. The measures used in in the NLAAS include modified versions of standardized measures as well as items and measures developed specifically for the study. While data from the NLAAS were collected almost 20 years ago, they are still widely used (e.g., Lee et al., 2020, Sung et al., 2018). Despite its age, the NLAAS is still the most recent nationally representative study with Asian Americans, it was translated into several Asian languages increasing the diversity of Asian Americans able to respond to the survey, and it includes measures that are culturally salient and important for Asian Americans.
Study proposal and hypotheses

The current study aims to fill our gap in understanding the contributions of culturally relevant and gendered risk and protective factors associated with IPV perpetration for Asian American men using data from the NLAAS (Alegria et al., 2004). To do so, I examine the unique contributions of culturally relevant and gendered predictors on IPV perpetration as well as the effects of culturally relevant factors on IPV perpetration conditioned on the degree to which Asian American men adhere to patriarchal gender role norms. Specifically, the following hypotheses are tested:

H1: Risk factors of patriarchal gender role norms, enculturation, and discrimination will predict greater risk for IPV perpetration.

H2: Protective factors of acculturation and social support (i.e., family support, peer support) will predict reduced risk for IPV perpetration.

H3: In addition to uniquely predicting greater IPV perpetration, patriarchal gender role norms will also moderate the effect of other culturally relevant predictors on IPV perpetration.

In other words, protective factors (i.e., acculturation and social support) will be most protective against IPV perpetration at low levels of patriarchal gender role norm adherence, and risk factors (i.e., enculturation and discrimination) will be most predictive of IPV perpetration at high levels of patriarchal gender role norm adherence. The rationale for the hypothesized moderation effects is that while culturally relevant risk and protective factors are conceptually not directly related to IPV perpetration, the theoretical and empirical association between patriarchal gender role norms and male violence...
against women is clear and robust. Additionally, there are important intersections between culturally relevant factors and patriarchal gender role norms that may have implications for IPV perpetration. For instance, experiencing racial discrimination may be associated with negative psychological outcomes (e.g., depression) or even greater family and ethnic community cohesion and support in response to discrimination for many Asian American men, but for those who also believe men should be dominant and powerful over women, experiencing racial oppression may lead them to reassert their dominance at home against their female partner. Accounting for the conditional influence of patriarchal gender role norms is expected to better explain the influence of cultural predictors that are less proximal to violence against women (e.g., identification with mainstream U.S. culture) on IPV perpetration.

**Method**

To test the proposed hypotheses on risk, protective, and conditional effects of cultural and gendered variables on IPV perpetration, multiple logistic regression analysis with interaction effects are conducted using the sample of Asian American male participants in the NLAAS dataset.

**Sample**

In the total NLAAS sample \((N = 4,649)\), 46.1% were Asian American \((n = 2,095)\) and 45.7% were male \((n = 2,125)\). Asian American males, who are the sample of interest for the current study, were 47.6% of the Asian American participants \((n = 998)\). The ethnic backgrounds of Asian American male participants included Vietnamese \((24.4\%, n = 243)\), Filipino \((23.6\%, n = 235)\), Chinese \((28.5\%, n = 284)\), and other Asian ethnic
groups (23.7%, $n = 236$). Participants were predominantly living in the Western region of the U.S. (80.9%, $n = 807$), married (70.8%, $n = 707$), employed (74.0%, $n = 738$), had at least 16 years of education (46.2%, $n = 461$), and conducted the interview in English (67.0%, $n = 669$) (see Table 4.2). Participants’ age ranged from 19 to 95 years with a mean age of 41.26 years old ($SD = 15.11$).

Table 4.2 Demographic Characteristics of Asian American Male Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>$n$</th>
<th>Percent or $M$ ($SD$)</th>
<th>95% CI $[LL, UL]$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ethnic Group</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnamese</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>24.35%</td>
<td>[21.79%, 27.11%]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filipino</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>23.55%</td>
<td>[21.02%, 26.28%]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>28.46%</td>
<td>[25.74%, 31.33%]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Other Asian</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>23.65%</td>
<td>[21.12%, 26.38%]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>U.S. Region</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>7.92%</td>
<td>[6.40%, 9.76%]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midwest</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>4.91%</td>
<td>[3.73%, 6.43%]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>6.31%</td>
<td>[4.96%, 8.00%]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>807</td>
<td>80.86%</td>
<td>[78.30%, 83.18%]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Marital Status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married/Cohabiting</td>
<td>707</td>
<td>70.84%</td>
<td>[67.95%, 73.58%]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced/Separated/Widowed</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>5.11%</td>
<td>[3.91%, 6.66%]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never Married</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>24.05%</td>
<td>[21.50%, 26.80%]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Formal Education</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-11 years</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>12.42%</td>
<td>[10.52%, 14.62%]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 years</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>18.44%</td>
<td>[16.15%, 20.96%]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13-15 years</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>22.95%</td>
<td>[20.44%, 25.66%]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 or more years</td>
<td>461</td>
<td>46.19%</td>
<td>[43.12%, 49.29%]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Employment Status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed</td>
<td>738</td>
<td>73.95%</td>
<td>[71.14%, 76.58%]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Unemployed 63 6.31% [4.96%, 8.00%]
Not in labor force 197 19.74% [17.39%, 22.32%]

Language of Interview
English 669 67.03% [64.06%, 69.88%]
Language other than English 329 32.97% [30.12%, 35.94%]

Years in U.S.
Less than 5 years 140 14.06% [12.01%, 16.32%]
5-10 years 126 12.65% [10.71%, 14.83%]
11-20 years 253 25.40% [22.75%, 28.14%]
20+ years or U.S. born 477 47.89% [44.71%, 50.90%]

Age 998 41.26 (15.11) [40.32, 42.19]

Note. Languages other than English in which the NLAAS was administered includes Spanish, Mandarin, Cantonese, Tagalog, and Vietnamese.

Measures

**Dependent variable.** The prevalence of IPV perpetration are measured using a modified version of the Revised Conflict Tactic Scale’s (CTS-2; Straus et al., 1996) physical violence dimension. The CTS-2 is the most widely used measures of IPV perpetration and victimization and has demonstrated good internal consistency (subscale range from $\alpha = .79$ to .95) and construct validity (Straus et al., 1996). In its full form, the CTS-2 assesses the frequency of perpetration and victimization of physical violence (e.g., “pushed or shoved my partner”), sexual violence (e.g., “made my partner have sex without a condom”), psychological abuse (e.g., “insulted or swore at my partner”), and violence that results in injury (e.g., “my partner had a sprain, bruise, or small cut because of a fight with me”). In addition, it has a subscale on the frequency of positive conflict resolution methods (e.g., “I showed my partner I cared even though we disagreed”). The NLAAS modified the CTS-2 by including only the physical violence subscale and
reducing the number of physical violence items from 12 items on a frequency scale from 0 (this never happened) to 6 (more than 20 times in the past year) to two items that combined the items from the full subscale on a frequency scale from 1 (never) to 4 (often). Limitations of this modification are the reduction of the multi-dimensional IPV perpetration construct to a measure that only measures frequency of physical violence perpetration, and the reduction in variability across respondent scores which may impact the ability of bivariate and regression models to detect significant associations between independent variables and IPV perpetration.

In the current study, participants were asked about the frequency of their physical abuse perpetration against their current spouse/partner over the course of their relationship on a scale from 1 (never) to 4 (often). IPV perpetration includes having pushed, grabbed, shoved, thrown something, slapped, hit, spanked, kicked, bit, hit with a fist, “beat up”, choked, burned, scalded, or threatened with a knife or gun a current spouse/partner. As in previous studies using the revised CTS and data from the NLAAS, the ordinal physical IPV variable are transformed into a dichotomous IPV variable identifying whether or not participants perpetrated any violence against their female partner over the course of their relationship, suitable for use in logistic regression analyses. For correlation analyses (using Spearman’s rank correlation analysis), the ordinal scale of the dependent variable are retained (i.e., not dichotomized).

**Independent variables.** Patriarchal gender role norm adherence, acculturation (years in the U.S., English language proficiency), enculturation (psychological enculturation scale, Asian language proficiency), discrimination, and social support
(family support, peer support) are included as independent predictors of IPV perpetration. Several constructs are operationalized as composite variables based on multiple measures by averaging equally weighted z-scores (Song et al., 2013), as has been done in previous studies (e.g., Hall et al., 2005). Averaging z-scores of multiple measures allows for the combination of measures using different scales, such as the case when one measured variable in a composite uses a 4-point Likert-type scale while the other uses a 7-point Likert-type scale.

**Patriarchal gender role norms.** The patriarchal gender role norm adherence composite were formed from two items which measure decision-making power and responsibility for household tasks, two ways in which patriarchal norms are theorized to manifest in intimate relationships (Nguyen, 2005, pp. 7-9). The decision-making item asks, “When it comes to making major decisions, who has the final say – you or your (spouse/partner)?” on a 3-point scale (1 = respondent, 2 = both/it varies, or 3 = spouse/partner). The degree to which household tasks are shared between partners or the sole responsibility of female partners is an important dimension of gender role norms and is found to be associated with both gender ideology at the individual level and gender egalitarianism at the societal level (Lachance-Grzela & Bouchard, 2010). The household tasks item asks, “When it comes to household chores – like cleaning, cooking, childcare, grocery shopping – who has the most responsibility” on a 5-point scale (1 = only you, 2 = mostly you and sometimes your spouse/partner, 3 = you and your spouse/partner about the same, 4 = mostly your spouse/partner and sometimes you, 5 = only your spouse/partner). Items were reverse coded so that higher scores reflect greater adherence
to patriarchal gender role norms. The decision-making item and responsibility for household tasks item were z-scored and averaged to create the composite measure of adherence to patriarchal gender role norms.

**Acculturation.** The acculturation composite includes two demographic proxies that are commonly used to operationalize acculturation independently, but not often in combination. These are participants’ number of years in the U.S. and English language proficiency. The number of years participants have lived in the U.S. is measured on a 4-point Likert scale from 1 (*Less than 5 years*) to 4 (*20+ years or US born*). The English language proficiency scale was created for the NLAAS (Alegria et al., 2004) based on the Spanish language Cultural Identity Scales for Latino Adolescents (Felix-Ortiz et al., 1994) and contains three items ($\alpha = .96$). It measures English language proficiency using an average of three items capturing participants’ spoken, reading, and written English language proficiency on a scale from 1 (*poor*) to 4 (*excellent*). The number of years lived in the U.S. item and English language proficiency scale were be z-scored and averaged to create the composite measure of acculturation.

**Enculturation.** The enculturation composite includes one demographic proxy and one psychological measure of enculturation. The Asian language proficiency scale was created for the NLAAS (Alegria et al., 2004) similar to the English language proficiency scale based on the Spanish language Cultural Identity Scales for Latino Adolescents (Felix-Ortiz et al., 1994) and contains three items ($\alpha = .97$). Asian language proficiency is measured using the average of three items capturing participants’ spoken, reading, and written Asian language proficiency on a scale from 1 (*poor*) to 4 (*excellent*).
Psychological enculturation is measured using four items ($\alpha = .69$) assessing the degree to which participants identify with, feel close in ideas/feelings, want to spend time with, and place importance on people marrying others of the same racial/ethnic descent on 4-point Likert scales with higher scores reflecting greater identification with and socialization into heritage Asian culture. The Asian language proficiency scale and the psychological enculturation scale were be $z$-scored and averaged to create the composite measure of enculturation.

**Social Support.** The social support composite includes two equally weighted variables assessing participants’ rating of social support from family and peers. Family support was measured with a social support scale consisting of three items ($\alpha = .63$) that measure participants’ degree of emotional support from family members who do not live with them. Two items (i.e., “How much can you rely on relatives who do not live with you for help if you have a serious problem?”, and “How much can you open up to relatives who do not live with you if you need to talk about your worries?”) are measured on a 4-point Likert response scale ranging from 1 (not at all) to 4 (a lot), and one item (i.e., “How often do you talk on the phone or get together with family or relatives who do not live with you”) is measured on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (less than once a month) to 5 (most every day). To create the family support subscale score across items on different Likert scales, item scores were summed—to be on a scale from 1 to 13—and transformed into $z$-scores.

Peer support is measured with a social support scale consisting of three items ($\alpha = .74$) that measure participants’ degree of emotional support received from peers. Two of
the items (i.e., “How much can you rely on friends for help if you have a serious problem?”; and “How much can you open up to friends if you need to talk about your worries?”) are measured on a 4-point Likert response scale ranging from 1 (not at all) to 4 (a lot), and one item (i.e., “How often do you talk on the phone or get together with friends?”) is measured on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (less than once a month) to 5 (most every day). To create the peer social support score across items on different Likert scales, item scores were summed—to be on a scale from 1 to 13—and transformed into z-scores. Finally, the z-scored family support scale and peer support scale were averaged to create the composite measure of social support.

*Perceived ethnic discrimination.* The perceived ethnic discrimination scale (Vega et al., 1993) contains three items ($\alpha = .87$) that assess frequency of experiencing and witnessing discrimination based on participants’ Asian racial/ethnic background on a 4-point Likert scale from 1 (never) to 4 (often). The three items are “How often do people dislike you because you are Asian American?”, “How often do people treat you unfairly because you are Asian American?”, and “How often have you seen friends treated unfairly because they are Asian American?” For each item, the interviewer refers to participants’ previously reported primary Asian cultural background instead of “Asian American.”

**Analytic Plan**

Analyses were conducted in three phases. First, descriptive analysis was conducted for main study variables in their raw score scales before being z-scored and combined into composite variables (e.g., family support and peer support scores are
described instead of the z-scored social support scores; Table 4.3). Second, correlations were conducted for main study variables to examine bivariate associations (Table 4.4). Due to non-normal distributions of most variables of interest (i.e., based on visual examination of density plots and QQ-plots, and significant p-values of Shapiro-Wilk test of normality; see Appendix Figures 4.1 to 4.6), Spearman rank order correlations were used for bivariate analysis (Zimmerman & Zumbo 1993). Third, to test the proposed hypotheses of the main predictor risk (H1) and protective (H2) variables and the moderation effects of patriarchal gender role norms on the main cultural variables (H3), multiple logistic regression analysis were conducted. The first step of the multiple regression analysis includes the main risk and protective predictor variables, and the second step adds the interaction terms between patriarchal gender role norms and each of the other risk and protective variables (i.e., acculturation, enculturation, discrimination, and social support). Additionally, several robustness checks were conducted to examine whether the scale of the dependent variable influences the strength or significance of coefficients. Specifically, the full regression model was re-analyzed with the outcome variable retained as an ordinal variable (i.e., ordered levels: “never”, “rarely”, “sometimes”, and “often”) and as a continuous variable from 1 (never) to 4 (often), using ordinal logistic regression and OLS regression respectively.

Because the pattern of missing data was found to violate the assumption of missing completely at random (MCAR; $X^2(111) = 226, p < .001$), listwise deletion of incomplete cases would bias results (van Grinkel et al., 2020). As such, multiple imputation with the mice package (version 3.13.0) in R (version 4.0.4) was implemented
using the predictive mean matching (PMM) approach as it does not assume linear associations among covariates and restricts imputation to the observed values (van Buuren & Groothuis-Oudshoorn, 2011). Using the mice procedure, five completed datasets are imputed based on the PMM approach, then analyses are conducted for each of the five imputed datasets, and finally estimates are combined to create one pooled analysis output. All reported estimates for regression analyses are the results of the final pooled analysis, which combines the estimates of the five imputed datasets all while adjusting for the uncertainty generated from the imputed values. Univariate and bivariate analyses were conducted using the non-imputed datasets, employing listwise deletion to treat missing data.

The sample size for the full imputed dataset was found to be more than adequate to achieve adequate statistical power based on two methods for estimating power for logistic regression models. First, based on guidance from Peduzzi et al., (1996), a logistic regression model with nine predictor variables (five independent predictors and four interaction terms) and 16.5% events rate (i.e., IPV perpetration) on the binary dependent variable (as found in this study), would need a sample size of $n = 546.45$ to achieve adequate power. Based on post-hoc power analysis in the G*Power software application and effect sizes from Kim and Sung (2000), adjusting for the contributions of other covariates in the model (not reported but overestimated at $R^2 = .50$), their sample size of 256 was able to achieve a power of .99. The sample of 998 Asian American men in the full imputed dataset is at least 1.5-times larger than needed, depending on the methodology used for calculating statistical power for multiple logistic regression.
Results

To understand the average scores and bivariate associations among variables of interest, preliminary descriptive statistics and bivariate correlations were conducted. Following univariate and bivariate analyses, a multiple logistic regression analysis with two steps was conducted to test hypotheses one through three. Finally, robustness checks of the multiple regression analyses were conducted to confirm congruence or identify discrepancies across models based on the scaling (i.e., dichotomous, ordinal, or numeric) of the dependent variable.

Descriptive analysis based on raw (non-imputed) data (Table 4.3) were conducted to examine the characteristics of the sample in terms of the variables of interest. Regarding the dependent variable, only 14.7% \((n = 104)\) of participants with valid data had perpetrated physical IPV at least “rarely” in their most recent relationship. In terms of adherence to patriarchal norms, the largest share of participants reported having an egalitarian decision-making dynamic with their partner (45.7%, \(n = 321\)) closely followed by male dominance in decision making (42.6%, \(n = 299\)). In the area of household chore responsibility, the greatest share of couples were male dominant (i.e., female partners were responsible for most or all household chores; 45.6%, \(n = 320\)), and in only 9.2% \((n = 65)\) of participant relationships were men responsible for most or all household chores. The two demographic proxies for acculturation reveals that a majority of the sample had lived in the U.S. for at 11 years (73.3%, \(n = 730\)) and reported an average English language proficiency score that reflected a “fair” to “good” proficiency \((M = 2.86\) on a scale from one to four). Measures of enculturation describe a sample with
a “fair” to “good” proficiency in participants’ Asian heritage language \((M = 2.57\) on a scale from zero to four) and the average psychological enculturation score suggested that participant identified from “somewhat” to “very closely” with their Asian heritage culture \((M = 3.08\) on a scale from one to four). Average perceived discrimination scores reflected that the frequency of racial/ethnic discrimination experiences were between “never” to “rarely” \((M = 1.73\) on a scale from one to four), and family and peer support \((M_{\text{family}} = 8.49\) and \(M_{\text{peer}} = 8.37\)) were both well above the midpoint on a scale from one to 13.

Table 4.3 Descriptive Statistics for Variables of Interest

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>(n)</th>
<th>Percent or (M (SD))</th>
<th>95% CI [LL, UL]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IPV</td>
<td>702</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>599</td>
<td>85.3%</td>
<td>[82.1, 88.5]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rarely</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
<td>[2.0, 20.0]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>[-12.3, 19.5]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Often</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>[-79.2, 79.4]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years in U.S.</td>
<td>996</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 5 years</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
<td>[11.4, 16.8]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-10 years</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
<td>[9.9, 15.5]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-20 years</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>25.4%</td>
<td>[23.4, 27.4]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20+ years or U.S. born</td>
<td>477</td>
<td>47.9%</td>
<td>[46.4, 49.4]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final say in decision making</td>
<td>702</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female dominant</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
<td>[7.6, 15.8]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egalitarian</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>45.7%</td>
<td>[43.6, 47.8]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male dominant</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>42.6%</td>
<td>[40.5, 44.7]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household chore responsibility</td>
<td>703</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female dominant</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>[-2.9, 10.3]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female leaning</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>[0.1, 10.9]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egalitarian</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>45.2%</td>
<td>[43.3, 47.1]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Male leaning 193 27.5% [25.1, 29.9]
Male dominant 127 18.1% [15.1, 21.1]
Asian language proficiency 994 2.57 (1.41) [2.5, 2.7]
Perceived racial discrimination 981 1.73 (0.71) [1.7, 1.8]
English language proficiency 995 2.86 (1.00) [2.8, 2.9]
Psychological enculturation 986 3.08 (0.61) [3.0, 3.1]
Family support 989 8.49 (2.55) [8.3, 8.6]
Peer support 989 8.37 (2.68) [8.2, 8.5]

Note. N = 998. Data used for descriptive analysis of variables of interest are the raw (i.e., non-imputed) data. For categorical variables, the value of N for the variable name (e.g., IPV) refers to the number of cases with valid data for that variable.

Next, correlation analyses were conducted to identify important bivariate associations among the variables of interest that would not be detected in hypothesis testing regression models (e.g., associations that don’t include the dependent variable).

Bivariate analysis based on Spearman’s rank order correlation of the non-normally distributed covariates revealed four significant associations. Enculturation was negatively associated with acculturation ($r_s = -0.47, p < .001$) and positively associated with patriarchal gender role norms ($r_s = 0.11, p < .01$). Social support was positively associated with acculturation ($r_s = 0.32, p < .001$) and negatively associated with enculturation ($r_s = -0.19, p < .001$). Surprisingly, no bivariate associations between IPV perpetration (ordinal scale) and any of the theorized risk or protective covariates were found at the $p < .05$ level of significance.

Table 4.4 Spearman’s Correlations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Acculturation</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Enculturation</td>
<td>-.47***</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
To test the hypotheses that IPV perpetration would be significantly associated with the risk factors of patriarchal gender role norms, enculturation, and discrimination (H1) and the protective factors of acculturation and social support (H2), risk and protective factors were entered into the first step of the multiple logistic regression analysis with IPV perpetration as the dependent variable (Table 4.5). These hypotheses were not supported. In step one of the multiple logistic regression model no risk or protective factors were significantly associated with odds of IPV perpetration and only 2% of variance in the dependent variable was explained by the included predictor variables (pseudo $R^2 = .01$). To test the hypothesis that patriarchal gender role norms would moderate the effect of risk and protective factors on IPV perpetration (H3), interaction terms between patriarchal norms and each of the culturally relevant predictors were introduced into second and final step of the logistic regression model (Table 4.5). H3 was not supported. In addition to the variables in step one of the model retaining their non-significant associations with IPV perpetration, the coefficients for all interaction terms between patriarchal gender role norms and risk and protective factors (e.g., patriarchal gender role norms * acculturation) were non-significant at the $p < .05$ alpha level. The addition of interaction in the second step did not significantly improve the model based on a non-significant Wald test ($Wald(4, 156.26) = .37, p = .827$) and
comparison of the $AIC$ across steps one and two (i.e., the full model) of the model ($AIC_{step1} = 852$, $AIC_{step2/full} = 857$). Additionally, omnibus goodness of fit indices suggests poor fit (e.g., $pseudo \ R^2_{step2/full} = .02$).

Robustness checks replicated the full model (i.e., that include both steps one and two of the multiple logistic regression model) to confirm that effect sizes and significance levels remained consistent when the dependent variable is treated as an ordinal variable (i.e., on a scale from Never to Often) and when treated as a numeric variable (i.e., on a scale from 1 to 4). Ordinal logistic regression analysis testing whether risk and protective predictor variables significantly increase odds of IPV perpetration from one level to the next (e.g., from Never to Rarely) with IPV perpetration retaining its ordinal scale supported the results of the original (binary) logistic regression model with similar coefficients and p-values (Appendix Table B1). Ordinary least squares regression analysis testing whether risk and protective factors significantly increased numeric IPV perpetration scores from one to four also confirmed the results of the main binary logistic regression model (Appendix Table B2).

Overall, the model did not fit the data. H1, which posited that risk factors of patriarchal gender role norms, enculturation, and discrimination will predict greater risk for IPV perpetration, was not supported. H2 which posited that protective factors of acculturation and social support (i.e., family support, peer support) will predict reduced risk for IPV perpetration, was also not supported. H3 which posited that, patriarchal gender role norms will moderate the effect of other culturally relevant predictors on IPV
perpetration, was also not supported. Finally, robustness checks treating the dependent variable on ordinal and numeric scales confirmed a lack of support for hypotheses.

Table 4.5 Multiple Logistic Regression Model Coefficients, ORs, and Fit Indices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Step 1</th>
<th></th>
<th>Step 2</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b (SE)</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>b (SE)</td>
<td>OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patriarchal gender role norms (PGRN)</td>
<td>0.094 (0.097)</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>0.082 (0.100)</td>
<td>1.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acculturation</td>
<td>-0.051 (0.146)</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>-0.052 (0.152)</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enculturation</td>
<td>-0.090 (0.125)</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>-0.094 (0.124)</td>
<td>0.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discrimination</td>
<td>0.153 (0.129)</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>0.150 (0.131)</td>
<td>1.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Support</td>
<td>0.189 (0.117)</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>0.188 (0.116)</td>
<td>1.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGRN*Acculturation</td>
<td>0.041 (0.126)</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGRN*Enculturation</td>
<td>0.008 (0.124)</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGRN*Discrimination</td>
<td>0.093 (0.093)</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGRN*Social Support</td>
<td>0.078 (0.100)</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Intercept)</td>
<td>-1.675 (0.112)</td>
<td>0.19***</td>
<td>-1.680 (0.114)</td>
<td>0.19***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Goodness of fit**

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(X^2)</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>14.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AIC</td>
<td>852</td>
<td>857</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pseudo R^2</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Significance levels: *** \(p < .001\). Wald test comparing step 1 and step 2 revealed no added variance explained from the addition of interaction terms, Wald(4, 156.26) = .37, \(p = .827\). Goodness of fit indices (i.e., AIC, and Pseudo R^2) were calculated by averaging across the indices of the five imputed models generated by the imputation algorithm.

**Post-hoc Exploratory Analysis**

I conducted post-hoc exploratory analyses to better understand the null association between adherence to patriarchal gender role norms and IPV perpetration. Specifically, the composite measure of adherence to patriarchal gender role norms was
decomposed into the two original measures of adherence to patriarchal norms in decision making and in household chore responsibility. In exploratory bivariate regression analysis regressing whether or not Asian American men perpetrated any physical IPV on the categorical variable of dominance in decision making, both male dominance ($OR = 1.73, p = .025$) and female dominance ($OR = 2.23, p = .027$) were associated with increased risk for IPV perpetration compared with egalitarianism. Interestingly, at the bivariate logistic regression level, household chore responsibility was not associated with risk for IPV perpetration.

**Discussion**

The current study is the first to examine the moderating effect of patriarchal gender role norms on the associations between Asian cultural factors and Asian American men’s IPV perpetration. While several studies have examined culturally relevant and gendered factors without conditional effects (e.g., Chang et al., 2009; Kim & Sung, 2016), no study to date specifically tests the hypothesis that patriarchal gender role norms will moderate the effects of cultural factors on IPV perpetration. Findings from the current study draw attention to the importance of proper definition and operationalization of culturally relevant and gendered constructs in testing these possible associations.

**Summary of Findings**

Findings from the current study contribute important information on the role of culturally relevant factors on Asian American men’s IPV perpetration, on the phenomenon of male dominance in relationships, and on the limitations of operationalizing complex constructs such as IPV, acculturation, and enculturation. For
instance, the null associations among culturally relevant factors and IPV perpetration suggest that the role of culture in Asian American men’s IPV perpetration may be indirect, and that operationalizing complex psychological cultural constructs such as acculturation and enculturation with demographic proxies may limit our understanding of their correlates, including masculinity and IPV. The null findings on the associations between patriarchal norms and IPV perpetration suggests limitations on the way in which both patriarchal norms and IPV perpetration were conceptualized and operationalized. It is likely that male dominance is not conceptually on one end of a spectrum with female dominance at the other end and egalitarianism lying in the middle, and that dominance vs. egalitarianism is perhaps the more appropriate conceptualization. It is also likely that IPV perpetration should be conceptualized as not only physical manifestations of coercive control but also as psychological, sexual, economical, and other culturally relevant forms of male dominance over women. Finally, bivariate results from the current study contribute to areas with little previous investigation in the literature, such as the associations among social support and acculturation and enculturation for Asian American men. Overall, findings from this study contribute important conceptual and methodological knowledge to the literature on culturally relevant and gendered predictors of Asian American men’s IPV perpetration.

While differences across samples of Asian American men in the literature (e.g., college men, community men, men in treatment programs for IPV perpetration) influence both the measurement of IPV perpetration (e.g., frequency of assumed IPV perpetration for men in treatment, whether or not any IPV was perpetrated for community and college
men) and the interpretation of study findings, comparisons across diverse studies are still informative. Bivariate analysis supported findings from previous studies on the correlates of enculturation and provided new insights into associations between social support and acculturation and enculturation. First, greater enculturation, or identification with one’s heritage culture, was positively correlated with adhering to patriarchal gender role norms in the form of male dominance in marital decision making and housework responsibilities, which is consistent with a study with a community sample of South Asian men (e.g., Yoshihama et al., 2014). Less established in the literature are the relations among acculturation, enculturation, and social support. In this study, greater social support (a combination of family support and peer support measures) was positively associated with acculturation and negatively associated with enculturation. In other words, Asian American men who identified more strongly with mainstream U.S. culture reported having greater social support, while Asian American men who identified more strongly with their Asian heritage culture reported having poorer social support. The reasons behind this association are unclear, and in the few studies that have examined this phenomenon, acculturation and social support were found to be uncorrelated for both Asian American college students (Ayers & Mahat, 2012) and Latinx high school students (Lopez et al., 2002). Given the associations between enculturation and patriarchal gender role norms for Asian American college men found in the literature (e.g., Ahrold & Meston, 2010; Iwamoto et al., 2010), further study into the additional role of social support would be helpful.
Based on the multiple logistic regression model, no support was found for the hypothesized effects of patriarchal gender role norms, acculturation, enculturation, discrimination, and social support or their interactions on Asian American men’s IPV perpetration. The lack of association between patriarchal gender role norms and IPV perpetration is particularly surprising given the robust evidence in the literature that endorsement of and adherence to patriarchal norms is associated with greater risk for IPV perpetration in diverse samples of Asian American men (Bui & Morash, 1999; Hall et al., 2005; Jin et al., 2007; Kyler-Yano & Mankowski, 2021). However, the conceptualization and construction of the patriarchal gender role norms variable used in the current study may contribute to this lack of association. The construct of adherence to patriarchal gender role norms was conceptualized as a unidimensional construct that ranges from female dominance to male dominance with egalitarianism existing at the midpoint. Categorical conceptions of adherence to male dominance in relationships may be more appropriate. Kim and Sung (2000) examined whether couples who adhered to male dominant, female dominant, and divided power structures had greater odds of husband-to-wife IPV compared with egalitarian couples. They found that couples with a male dominant power structure had 3.6 times greater odds of husband-to-wife IPV compared to egalitarian couples (using bivariate logistic regression). Additionally, Chung et al. (2008) found that egalitarianism compared with male dominance in household chore division was associated with significantly lower risk for male-to-female IPV among community men. It is possible that gendered power in relationships is more appropriately conceptualized categorically (e.g., between egalitarian vs. male dominant) as opposed to
being on a continuous or ordinal scale. Exploratory analyses in the current study are consistent with their findings and suggest a categorical operationalization of dominance in decision making.

Another promising avenue for testing the direct and moderating effect of patriarchal gender role norms on IPV perpetration is through measures of endorsement of patriarchal attitudes and beliefs. Measures of patriarchal norm endorsement capture men’s attitudes and beliefs about men’s and women’s gender roles, most often with higher scores reflecting more patriarchal perspectives. Patriarchal norm endorsement measures include measures of traditional masculinity ideology (e.g., MRNI-R; Levant et al., 2010), masculine gender role conflict (e.g., GRCS; O’Neil et al., 1986) and stress (e.g., MGRS; Eisler & Skidmore, 1987), hostile masculinity (Malamuth & Thornhill, 1994), and attitudes toward women (e.g., AWS; Spence & Hahn, 1997). Many studies have found direct associations between these measures of patriarchal attitudes and beliefs and IPV perpetration (Moore & Stuart, 2005) including with samples of Asian American college men (e.g., Hall et al., 2005). These measures also have the added benefit of using ordinal response scales (as opposed to categorical scales) which can allow for more complex SEM modeling or regression modeling with interaction terms.

More aligned with findings from previous research were the null results for the effects of acculturation, enculturation, discrimination, and social support on IPV perpetration. As discussed in the introduction, studies examining the associations among acculturation (see Chang et al., 2009; Kim & Sung, 2000) and enculturation (see Hall et al., 2005; Jin et al., 2007) on IPV perpetration for Asian American men have been mixed.
Additionally, in many studies, including the current study, acculturation has been measured using demographic proxies such as the number of years in the U.S. and English language proficiency. The current study intended to more closely approach the psychological construct of Asian American men’s identification with mainstream U.S. culture compared to using individual proxies, by combining two demographic proxies into a composite acculturation variable. These null findings suggest either that acculturation truly is not associated with IPV perpetration in this sample, or that the composite variable approach did not adequately measure the psychological construct. While the demographic proxies used in the study may be correlated with psychological measures of acculturation, the former is unable to capture respondents’ beliefs, behaviors, and preferences which are integral to the phenomenon of acculturation (Arends-Tóth & van de Vijver, 2006). Use of multidimensional psychological measures of acculturation such as the Vancouver Index of Acculturation (VIA; Ryder et al., 2000), the Asian American Acculturation Inventory (Flannery et al., 2001), or the Asian American Multidimensional Acculturation Scale (AAMAS; Chung et al., 2004), would be better suited to assess the association between specific aspects of acculturation and IPV, and bring greater clarity to the literature.

The enculturation composite variable used in this study combined measures of Asian cultural language proficiency and psychological enculturation, which specifically asked about enculturation identity, relationships, and marriage values. While it is possible that enculturation truly is not associated with IPV perpetration by Asian American men, it is also possible that a fuller, multidimensional measure of enculturation that includes
multiple aspects of identification with one’s heritage is more associated with IPV perpetration than the current study’s operationalization. For instance, Yoshihama and colleagues (2014) found that among community South Indian American men enculturation values positively predicted more permissive attitudes toward IPV while enculturation community participation predicted less permissive IPV attitudes. It also may be that enculturation is indirectly associated with IPV perpetration either through a mediation pathway (e.g., through masculinity ideology or rape myths) or moderation effect (similar to the moderation assessed in this study but with a different measure of patriarchal gender role norms).

Based on the findings from the current study, the effects of discrimination and social support on Asian American men’s risk for IPV perpetration were not supported. However, considering the bivariate associations among social support, acculturation, and enculturation it is possible that social support has an indirect or conditional association with IPV perpetration. Alternatively, since social support is one dimension of the culturally relevant norm and value of collectivism, it is possible that a multi-dimensional measure of collectivism would be either directly or indirectly associated with IPV perpetration. However, it is also possible that social support or collectivism (as well as other culturally relevant factors) may function as a moderating factor in the association between other independent variables and IPV perpetration. For instance, mental health challenges including alcohol abuse, substance abuse, and major depression have been found to be associated with Asian American men’s IPV perpetration (Chang et al., 2009). It is possible that Asian American men experiencing mental health challenges may have
increased risk for IPV perpetration if they do not have reciprocal relationships based on collectivist norms and values but have lowered risk if they prioritize the wellbeing of the group and its members, including their female partner.

The effect of discrimination on IPV perpetration may also be indirect or conditional. Findings from studies with Latino (Maldonado et al., 2020) and African American (Sutton et al., 2020) men suggest that the effect of discrimination on IPV perpetration may be moderated by social and family level covariates. It is also possible, that discrimination and social support are not associated with physical IPV perpetration but that they may be associated with other forms of IPV including psychological, emotional, sexual, and financial abuse.

**Limitations**

Several aspects of the current study limit the generalizability of findings, requires caveats to their interpretation, and restrict claims of causal relationships between the predictor and IPV outcome variables. Findings are limited in their generalizability to younger generations of Asian American men because these data were collected between 2002 and 2003. A child who was born in 2002 when their parent responded to the NLAAS survey would now be eligible to respond to the same survey today. Variables such as acculturation and enculturation are highly influenced by generation and cultural context. As such, it is possible that the associations among cultural factors, gender role norms, and violence against women are different for Asian American men whose gender role and cultural norms developed over the past 20 years than for respondents to the NLAAS. For example, social justice movements such as #metoo and “Black Lives
Matter” likely have impacted experiences closely related to several of the constructs and how they may be related to IPV. For instance, protest movements against the pervasive norms and values that allow powerful men and men in general sexually harass and assault women without social or legal consequences may influence men’s perspectives on male and female gender role norms and on partner violence, particularly sexual violence. Additionally, the racial consciousness and justice movements that are most widely recognized as the “Black Lives Matter” movement has ignited discussion, self-reflection, and even legislation around racial justice have increased our awareness of historical and contemporary systems of racial oppression and discrimination and may impact our perspectives on racial/ethnic hierarchies. It will be important for researchers to examine how findings from the current study may function in the contemporary and future generations of Asian American men.

Interpretation of findings from the current study require contextualization due to the measurement limitations of the patriarchal gender role norms, acculturation, enculturation, and social support variables, as discussed above. These limitations include an overreliance on demographic proxies to measure psychological constructs (i.e., acculturation and enculturation), measuring only one aspect (i.e., social support) of a multi-dimensional construct (i.e., collectivism), and measures that are constructed with a small number of items. These limitations bring into question the ability of measures to capture the intended construct (i.e., construct validity) and to obtain reliable measures across respondents and time (i.e., reliability). For instance, the patriarchal gender role norms composite measure is a combination of two items that capture dominance in
decision making and responsibility for household chores. The construct of patriarchal
gender norm adherence likely includes more dimensions than those measured, such as
child rearing and discipline, norms around work outside of the home, and financial
control, particularly in Asian American communities (e.g., control over sending
remittances back to Asia). As such there remain questions about validity of this measure
and its ability to reliably capture Asian American men’s adherence to patriarchal norms
when only assessing two dimensions using two items. Additionally, the lower variability
associated measures with small numbers of items may also have contributed to the null
findings in this study. More sensitive measures with multiple dimensions and larger
number of items may be better suited to identify significant predictors of IPV
perpetration.

There are also important limitations to the operationalization of IPV perpetration
in the study. IPV perpetration as measured in the NLAAS only included physical
violence against an intimate partner. This narrow scope of IPV fails to capture other
consequential forms of partner abuse, including sexual violence, psychological and
emotional abuse, and economic abuse, among others (e.g., stalking). Failure to collect
data on multiple forms of partner abuse impacts the interpretation of our findings in
several ways.

First only capturing non-sexual physical violence lowers the rate of IPV
perpetration measured in the sample and reduces variance in scores. Indeed, only 14.7%
of the sample reported having perpetrated any IPV in their most recent relationship. This
low rate of positive cases in logistic regression analysis may limit the ability of the
regression model to detect associations with independent variables. Second, and related to the reduction in variance of the dependent variable, effect sizes and effect significance are likely to be different than if NLAAS included measures of sexual violence and psychological and emotional abuse in the operationalization of IPV. Specifically, capturing multiple forms of abuse would both identify cases with IPV perpetration that are not captured by measuring only physical IPV perpetration, and would increase the variability of the dependent variable, allowing for greater ability to detect effects when the outcome variable is retained as ordinal. Finally, there is some evidence in the literature that suggest cultural norms influence the type of abuse that Asian American men perpetrate against their female partners. For instance, cultural differences in attitudes toward physical violence has been found to influence the form of abuse perpetrated by Asian American men across different ethnic groups (Ho, 1990), and some Asian immigrant men extend their controlling behaviors to the cultural/immigrant norm of sending remittances back to their country of origin by disallowing input from their wives and retaliating against protests through physical violence (Bui & Morash, 2008). It is possible that if this study employed a more appropriate and sensitive measure of IPV perpetration that included multiple forms of abuse (e.g., psychological abuse, sexual abuse, stalking), the multiple logistic regression model would be able to detect effects that were not detected in the current study because predictors are actually associated with sexual, psychological/emotional, or economical abuse and not physical abuse. As such, the null findings should be interpreted as referring specifically to physical IPV perpetration and not with partner abuse in its many other forms.
The construct of social support as operationalized is limited in its construct validity because it was intended to capture only one aspect of collectivism (which includes the importance of relationships with family and peers), and not the full construct. Hall and Barongan (1997) describe collective socialization as a social orientation dominant in collectivist cultures (including Asian cultures) where “(a) individual goals are subordinated to those of the group, (b) social support is high, (c) competitiveness is low, (d) interpersonal conflict and violence tend to be minimal, and (e) shame is a deterrent against crime” (p. 8). The composite measure of social support used in this study consists of items assessing both family support and peer support. These items map onto Hall and Barogan’s (1997) conceptualization of collectivist socialization. However, the measure does not assess participants’ psychological and social orientation toward interdependence, prioritization of group needs, or shame as a deterrent. There is still a need for further study of the effects of collectivism on Asian American men’s risk for IPV perpetration, particularly in interaction with patriarchal gender role norms.

Finally, findings from the current study are not to be interpreted as representing causal effects due in part to the cross-sectional research design of the NLAAS. This limitation is particularly relevant to the acculturation and enculturation measures, which are dependent on time and experience. A longitudinal design would have allowed for the estimation of the changes in variables such as acculturation and enculturation and effect of different kinds of change on IPV perpetration across time. As such, similar to all cross-sectional research, findings from the current study should be interpreted as reflecting
associations between independent variables and IPV perpetration and not directional causal relationships.

**Strengths**

The current study examines predictors of IPV perpetration using data from the NLAAS, which is one of the largest nationally representative datasets of Asian Americans. While examining similar phenomena in samples of college men contributes greatly to our understanding of Asian American men’s violence against women (e.g., Hall et al., 2005), the relative homogeneity of college men in their demographic characteristics (e.g., formal education achievement, family income), culturally relevant characteristics (English language proficiency, acculturation), and age dependent characteristics (e.g., relationship experience) leaves room for further examination. Expanding these analyses to men of diverse age, English language proficiency, education, SES, relationship experience, and acculturation and enculturation provides greater insight into phenomena that may generalize across diverse Asian American men. The use of the NLAAS subsample of Asian American community men enables better understanding of important demographic predictors of IPV perpetration (and potentially the processes and interactions underlying these demographic proxies.

**Research and practice implications**

This research highlighted the importance of operationalizing psychological constructs such as acculturation, enculturation, discrimination, and collectivism/interdependence using multi-dimensional psychological measures, and the consequences of failing to do so. Despite efforts to construct composite variables from
multiple measures available in the NLAAS dataset in order to more closely approach latent constructs (Song et al., 2013), the limitations of these variable operationalizations likely led to the lack of fit between the data and the hypothesized model. For instance, Chang and colleagues (2009) who also used NLAAS data did not find an association between years in the U.S. and minor or severe male-to-female IPV perpetration, and while Chung and colleagues (2008) found an interaction effect (with wife’s income relative to husband’s), they did not a main effect of marital decision making on male-to-female IPV victimization. These limitations also provide useful points of reference for implications for research. There is still a need for more study of how gendered factors, and more specifically men’s adherence to and endorsement of patriarchal gender role norms, interact with Asian cultural factors (e.g., acculturation/enculturation, discrimination, collectivism/interdependence, loss of face) to explain Asian American men’s risk for IPV perpetration against women. Findings from this study suggest that future research should test similar multiple regression moderation models, as well as structural equation models that model associations among latent constructs, with multidimensional and psychological measures of predictor variables, and with measures of IPV perpetration that account for the various ways in which coercion, control, and abuse can manifest.

Battering intervention programs (BIPs), one of the most prominent interventions for men who have been abusive to their female partners, are based on the gendered power and control theory of IPV perpetration (Pence & Paymar, 1993). Little research work has been done to inform interventions, such as BIPs, on how gendered norms that promote
men’s dominance over women intersects with Asian cultural factors including norms, values (e.g., collectivism, acculturation), and perceived discrimination. Future studies should qualitatively examine how Asian American men understand their masculinity, the culturally relevant risk and protective factors, their abuse against their partners, and how they all relate. While several studies have qualitatively examined Asian American survivors’ perspectives on victimization (e.g., Ho, 1990), and quantitatively tested effects of patriarchal norms and family of origin factors on IPV perpetration among Asian American abuse treatment participants (e.g., Jin et al., 2007), no study to date has used qualitative methods to understand the perspectives of gender, culture, and abuse of Asian American men in treatment or to understand their process of change in abuse treatment programs. This has been identified as an important gap in the literature with important implications for treatment with Asian American male IPV perpetrators (Kyler-Yano & Mankowski, 2021; Nguyen, 2007). Future studies like these have potential for disentangling the roles of patriarchal gender role norm adherence and cultural factors in Asian American men’s IPV perpetration and informing practitioners ability to provide culturally relevant and effective treatment for Asian American men who have been abusive to their female partners.
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Appendix B1

Normality Plots for Dependent and Independent Variables

Figure 4.1 Normality plots and Shapiro-Wilk test statistic for IPV perpetration variable (ordinal scale).

Note. A Shapiro-Wilk test showed departure from normality, $W(702) = 0.43, p < .001$.

Figure 4.2 Normality plots and Shapiro-Wilk test statistic for acculturation composite variable.

Note. A Note. Shapiro-Wilk test showed departure from normality, $W(993) = 0.93, p < .001$. 

Figure 4.3 Normality plots and Shapiro-Wilk test statistic for enculturation composite variable.

Note. A Note. Shapiro-Wilk test showed departure from normality, $W(982) = 0.96$, $p < .001$.

Figure 4.4 Normality plots and Shapiro-Wilk test statistic for patriarchal gender role norms composite variable.

Note. Shapiro-Wilk test showed departure from normality, $W(702) = 0.96$, $p < .001$. 
Figure 4.5 Normality plots and Shapiro-Wilk test statistic for social support composite variable.

Note. A Shapiro-Wilk test showed departure from normality, $W(986) = 0.98, p < .001$

Figure 4.6 Normality plots and Shapiro-Wilk test statistic for racial discrimination variable.

Note. A Shapiro-Wilk test showed departure from normality, $W(981) = 0.87, p < .001$. 
## Appendix B2

### Ordinal and Least Square Regression Robustness Checks

Table 4.6 Ordinal Logistic Regression of IPV Perpetration on Predictors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>OR</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Patriarchal gender role norms (PGRN)</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>.448</td>
<td>[-0.15, 0.34]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acculturation</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>-0.30</td>
<td>.764</td>
<td>[-0.32, 0.24]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enculturation</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>-0.39</td>
<td>.694</td>
<td>[-0.27, 0.18]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discrimination</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>.565</td>
<td>[-0.18, 0.33]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Support</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>.129</td>
<td>[-0.05, 0.42]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGRN*Acculturation</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
<td>.916</td>
<td>[-0.26, 0.23]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGRN*Enculturation</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>.979</td>
<td>[-0.27, 0.27]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGRN*Discrimination</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>.355</td>
<td>[-0.10, 0.29]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGRN*Social Support</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>.757</td>
<td>[-0.21, 0.29]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.7 OLS Regression of IPV perpetration on predictors.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Patriarchal gender role norms (PGRN)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>.868</td>
<td>[-0.03, 0.04]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acculturation</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>-1.11</td>
<td>.270</td>
<td>[-0.06, 0.02]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enculturation</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>.842</td>
<td>[-0.03, 0.04]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discrimination</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.319</td>
<td>[-0.02, 0.05]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Support</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>.454</td>
<td>[-0.02, 0.05]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGRN*Acculturation</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>.982</td>
<td>[-0.04, 0.04]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGRN*Enculturation</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>.993</td>
<td>[-0.04, 0.04]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGRN*Discrimination</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>.492</td>
<td>[-0.02, 0.04]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGRN*Social Support</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>.680</td>
<td>[-0.03, 0.05]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chapter 5: Conclusion

Intimate Partner Violence in Asian American Communities

In the U.S. almost a quarter of women experience physical violence (24.3%), one in ten experience stalking (10.7%), almost half experience psychological abuse (48.4%), and at least a quarter experience sexual violence (25.3%) by an intimate partner during their lifetime (Breiding et al., 2014). While IPV in Asian American communities is understudied, reported prevalence of any lifetime IPV victimization among Asian American women ranges from 15% (Tjaden & Thoennes, 2000) to 80% (Yoshihama, 1999). Studies examining predictors of IPV perpetration by Asian American men finds that adherence to and endorsement of patriarchal gender role norms is a risk factor, but little is known about how well measures of patriarchal norms apply to Asian American men or how salient Asian cultural factors (e.g., acculturation, interdependence, discrimination) might buffer or augment risk for IPV (Kyler-Yano & Mankowski, 2021). Despite the lack of study and knowledge on whether culturally distinct factors influence Asian American men’s masculinity and IPV perpetration, this body of research primarily conducted with samples of European American men is used to inform policy and treatment programs for IPV perpetration, including Asian American men.

The current dissertation presented three studies that responded to consequential gaps in our understanding about masculinity, IPV perpetration, and the influence of Asian cultural factors. Study 1 responded to the lack of information in the literature on how well conventional measures of traditional masculinity ideology map on to Asian American men’s conceptions of ideal masculinity. Guided by the values of human diversity and
community psychology, Study 1 utilized qualitative methods to elicit Asian American college men’s own perspectives of ideal masculinity characteristics free from the Eurocentric framing of item wording from existing measures. Study 2 responded to the need for a summation of our scientific knowledge on the gendered and cultural predictors of IPV perpetration by Asian American men by providing an integrative review of the literature. Finally, building on the findings and implications for research from Study 2, Study 3 empirically tested a model of Asian American men’s risk for IPV perpetration that included both cultural and gendered theorized risk and protective factors using quantitative methods. An intersectional model of Asian American men’s IPV perpetration was proposed and tested by examining the interactions between patriarchal gender role norms and several relevant Asian cultural factors.

Multiple research methods were employed to approach the phenomena of interest from multiple angles leveraging the strengths of each method. Specifically, the qualitative methods used in Study 1 are particularly well suited to understand the experiences and perceptions of people of color, particularly around a complex phenomenon that is not well understood (i.e., culturally distinct masculinity). Literature review methods used in Study 2 integrated findings from studies which used multiple methods (e.g., qualitative interview, quantitative) to provide a comprehensive understanding of growing literatures that had not yet been examined together. Finally, quantitative mediation modelling used in Study 3 are particularly well suited to produce generalizable knowledge testing research questions developed form the previous qualitative and literature review studies. Taken together this dissertation contributes
knowledge that captures the culturally distinct perspectives and experiences of little understood phenomenon (qualitative methods from Study 1), integrated summaries of growing literatures that had yet to be examined wholistically (literature review from Study 2), and generalizable effects by hypothesis testing research questions developed from the previous studies (quantitative methods from Study 3).

**Study 1**

It has become well established in the literature that when men adhere to or endorse patriarchal gender role norms that subordinate women, they are at a greater risk for perpetrating violence against their female partners. Fortunately, findings from this literature are being implemented in treatment programs for men’s violence against. Unfortunately, there is little in the literature to inform how masculinity might be defined and operate in distinct ways for specific groups of men such as Asian American men. Indeed, the median share of Asian American male research participants in psychometric studies used to develop the most commonly used measures of patriarchal masculinity ideology was only 4.85% (Kyler-Yano & Mankowski, 2020; Thompson & Bennett, 2015). Based on the lack of representation of Asian American men in the development of masculinity measures and studies that examine the associations between masculinity and IPV perpetration, it isn’t clear how well these measures and these studies reflect the phenomena for Asian American men. More importantly, it isn’t clear how Asian American men viewed their masculinity.

To address these gaps in the literature, Study 1 contributed to our knowledge of Asian American men’s conceptions of ideal masculinity characteristics by asking 89...
heterosexual Asian American college men the question, “what does it mean to be a real man?” Results indicated that Asian American men’s masculinities are constructed primarily from culturally distinct characteristics and secondarily from characteristics captured in measures of traditional masculinity ideology (Kyler-Yano & Mankowski, 2020). The three most widely reported culturally distinct characteristics, which include being responsible, being respectful, and taking care of others, are consistent with the central Asian cultural norm and value of collectivism. The interpersonal nature of each of these three themes reflects the collectivist value of placing importance of the group over individual needs. Additionally, the characteristics of being cognitively disciplined, having a moral code, and being successful have similarities to the stereotypical portrait of model minority Asian Americans. In response to generations of racist stereotypes and discriminatory legislation that have limited Asian American men’s pathways toward demonstrating successful masculinity, they may modify their valuation of ideal male characteristics to reflect those that are most available to them given the circumstances. Findings from this study show that Asian American men also endorse the characteristics of aggression, dominance, and self-reliance which are hallmarks of traditional masculinity ideology. The inclusion of these “traditional” themes suggest that Asian American men’s conceptions of ideal masculinity include patriarchal characteristics that have been found in diverse samples of men, are associated with negative psychological and social outcomes, including intimate partner violence.

Findings from Study 1 taught us that Asian American men’s conception of ideal masculinity includes both culturally distinct and traditional patriarchal characteristics (cf.,
Chua & Fujino, 1999; Eguchi & Starosta, 2012). These findings fill important gaps in our knowledge of Asian American men’s masculinities and provides an important foundation for researchers and practitioners. Since Asian American men’s conception of ideal masculinity include both culturally distinct and traditional patriarchal characteristics, researchers should further investigate how culture and masculinity norms are associated with negative interpersonal outcomes including intimate partner violence and individual psychological and emotional wellbeing (e.g., depression, sense of belonging). Practitioners can develop treatments with Asian American men that cultivate culturally relevant protective resources to promote healthy psychological and interpersonal outcomes.

**Study 2**

The results of Study 1 indicate that Asian American men construct culturally distinct masculinities that reflect influences from the Asian cultural value and norm of collectivism (see Hall & Barongan, 1997; Markus & Kitayama, 1991), generations of stereotyping and discriminatory legislation (see Ancheta, 2006), and patriarchal norms that have been linked to negative psychological (e.g., Iwamoto et al., 2010) and interpersonal outcomes including IPV perpetration (e.g., Hall et al., 2005). These findings suggest important intersections among cultural norms and values and masculinity that likely have implications for the effect of masculinity on IPV perpetration for Asian American men. Since the 1990s there has been a growing literature examining the predictors of IPV in Asian American communities. However, there existed no comprehensive review of the literature that looked specifically at Asian American men’s
IPV perpetration (as opposed to victimization of Asian American women; e.g., Kim & Schmuhl, 2018) and that focused on how gender role norms and masculinity are implicated in their violence against women.

Given the impact of patriarchal gender role norms to men’s IPV perpetration and findings from Study 1 that showed the importance of understanding the influence of cultural norms and values and experiences on Asian American men’s masculinities, a more intersectional synthesis of the current empirical evidence on Asian American men’s IPV perpetration was needed. Study 2 provided a review of our understanding of the impacts of masculinity and cultural factors on Asian American men’s IPV perpetration. An integrative review of papers (Kyler-Yano & Mankowski, 2021) examined predictors of IPV perpetration by Asian American men, with a focus on studies that tested the effects of patriarchal gender role norm adherence or endorsement and Asian cultural factors (e.g., acculturation, loss of face).

Study 2 found robust evidence for the impact of patriarchal gender role norms on Asian American men’s IPV perpetration, mixed findings on the effects of acculturation, enculturation, and other Asian cultural factors, and potential models for examining the how cultural factors and masculinity might interact. Studies that examined the effect of patriarchal gender role norms on IPV perpetration overwhelmingly found that greater adherence to and endorsement of patriarchal norms that subordinated women predicted greater risk for Asian American men’s IPV perpetration. Findings also revealed a need for greater clarity on the effects of Asian cultural factors in general, and specifically relating to acculturation, enculturation, loss of face, and interdependence, on risk for IPV
perpetration. However, findings from Study 2 on the effects of acculturation and
enculturation on patriarchal gender role norms provided a potential roadmap to
understanding the role of these cultural factors in Asian American men’s IPV
perpetration.

Previously, no literature review taking a distinctly gendered perspective had been
conducted to summarize our knowledge of Asian American men’s IPV perpetration (cf.
Kim & Schmuhl, 2018). Study 2 filled this gap by integrating findings from studies
examining the impacts of culturally relevant constructs such as acculturation (e.g., Kim &
Sung, 2000) and enculturation (e.g., Jin et al., 2007) with those that examined the effects
of patriarchal gender role norms (e.g., Bui & Morash, 1999; Morash et al., 2007) on IPV
perpetration by Asian American men. Findings from Study 2 provided clarity on the
robust evidence for the role of patriarchal gender role norms on IPV perpetration and for
the role of acculturation and enculturation on patriarchal gender role norms. It also that
identified areas in need of further research including the mixed findings on the effects of
acculturation and enculturation and IPV perpetration, and the lack of evidence for the role
of collectivism (cf. Kim & Zane, 2004) and discrimination (e.g., with Latino men;
Maldonado et al., 2020) on IPV perpetration. Additionally, it proposed potential
mechanisms that may play moderation or mediational roles (e.g., interaction between
enculturation and patriarchal gender role norms), providing a springboard for future
research.
Study 3

The third and final study in this dissertation built upon findings from Study 1 on Asian American men’s culturally distinct conceptions of masculinity, and from Study 2 that reviewed our knowledge of the gendered and cultural predictors of IPV perpetration, to empirically test a model of the independent and combined roles of cultural factors and masculinity in Asian American men’s risk for IPV perpetration. Prior to this study, there was sparse evidence on how Asian American men’s masculinity and culturally relevant norms, values, and experiences interact to influence IPV perpetration. Findings from Study 3, contrary to predictions, revealed that Asian American men’s risk for perpetrating IPV did not depend on their adherence to patriarchal gender role norm adherence or their levels of acculturation, enculturation, racial discrimination, or social support (and their interactions with patriarchal gender role norms). However, exploratory analysis revealed that when treated categorically as opposed to on a unidimensional scale from female dominant to male dominant (with egalitarianism in the middle), adherence to male dominance in decision making (as well as female dominance) is indeed associated with an increase in odds of Asian American men’s IPV perpetration.

Taken together, findings from Study 3 provide important implications for future research. First, it is important for future studies examining risk and protective predictors of IPV perpetration to include multi-dimensional measures of IPV including physical, emotional/psychological, sexual, and economic abuse. Second, culturally relevant factors, such as acculturation, enculturation, and collectivism should be operationalized using psychological measures as opposed to using demographic proxies, which has become a
convention in the literature. Finally, measures of endorsement of patriarchal gender role norms should be used to assess the conditional effect of culturally relevant factors on Asian American men’s IPV perpetration.

Integration of Findings

The three studies that make up this dissertation independently and collaboratively contribute to our understanding of Asian American men’s masculinity and IPV perpetration from a culturally responsive lens. Multiple methods are employed to understand the phenomena of interest from multiple approaches including qualitative, quantitative, and literature review methods, leveraging the strengths of each. This section will integrate findings from these studies and discuss how this program of research specifically responds to the following three questions: 1) how are Asian American men’s masculinities influenced culturally relevant factors, 2) how are patriarchal norms and culturally relevant factors independently and conditionally implicated in Asian American men’s IPV perpetration, and 3) how well do our current measures and operationalizations of culturally relevant and masculinity constructs capture and examine these phenomena for Asian American men.

Our current understanding of Asian American men’s masculinities lacks an intersectional perspective that accounts for both culture and gender. For instance, the literature on Asian American men’s masculinity ideology is informed by quantitative studies with measures of masculinity ideology developed with samples of predominantly European American men (Kyler-Yano & Mankowski, 2020). Studies 1 and 2 respond directly to this gap in the literature and improve our understanding of how culturally
relevant factors influence Asian American men’s masculinity ideology. For instance, Study 1 revealed that Asian American men’s conceptions of ideal masculinity characteristics far more often include culturally distinct masculinity themes that have roots in Asian American cultural norms and values than from measures of traditional masculinity ideology. Findings from Study 2 suggest that the degree to which Asian American men endorse or adhere to patriarchal gender role norms might help explain the mixed findings on the effects of Asian cultural factors on IPV perpetration.

Second, while studies have examined the associations between patriarchal norms and culturally relevant factors on Asian American men’s IPV perpetration independently, we knew little about how these phenomena interact. Studies 2 and 3 directly contributed to filling this gap in two ways. Study 2 found that while patriarchal norms consistently predicted IPV perpetration, the associations between culturally relevant factors (e.g., acculturation and enculturation) and IPV perpetration are inconsistent, and suggest that models that test moderation or mediational relations between gendered and culturally relevant predictors might better explain Asian American men’s risk for IPV perpetration. Findings from Study 3 show that acculturation, enculturation, social support, and racial/ethnic discrimination, as operationalized, are not independently associated with physical IPV perpetration. The surprising null association between adherence to patriarchal gender role norms and IPV perpetration provided important clarification that couples’ adherence to patriarchal norms might be best conceptualized as either male dominant, female dominant, or egalitarian, and not a unidimensional construct where
male dominance and female dominance exist on opposite ends of a spectrum with egalitarianism lying in between.

Third, it was unclear how well the current measures and operationalizations of culturally relevant and IPV perpetration used in the literature capture and test associations among these phenomena for Asian American men. Studies 2 and 3 brought attention to the limitations of current operationalizations of culturally relevant factors such as acculturation and enculturation and IPV perpetration in studies with Asian American men. Specifically, the null findings on the associations between both acculturation and enculturation on IPV perpetration in Study 3 may in part be to the limitations the demographic proxies (e.g., language proficiency and the number of years lived in the U.S.) so often used in the literature to operationalize these psychological constructs. Additionally, the null associations between physical IPV perpetration and gendered and culturally relevant predictors in Study 3, highlights the importance of measuring multiple forms of partner abuse similar to studies examining sexual abuse (Hall et al., 2005) and financial abuse (i.e., dominance in sending remittances; Bui & Morash, 2008).

**Implications**

**Research.** Findings from this dissertation have important implications for future research. There is a need and desire for a better understanding of Asian American men’s masculinity ideologies. For instance, while previous research finds that Asian American men’s masculinities are in less conflict with femininity than European American men (e.g., more willing to participate in domestic tasks; Chua & Fujino, 1999) and are associated with culturally relevant constructs such as enculturation (Tumala-Nara et al.,
2017) including their degree of cultural community integration (Yoshihama et al., 2014), little is still known about the intersections of culture and gender for Asian American men in general (for an exception see Liu et al., 2018). However, findings from a developing literature on Asian American masculinities, including Study 1, provide a valuable foundation from which to build qualitative studies with community men that will reveal more about Asian American masculinities in non-college samples, and quantitative studies to develop psychometrically rigorous measures of Asian American masculinity ideologies.

Future qualitative studies could ask Asian American community men how their masculinity norms and values are influenced by both their Asian cultural heritage and how those may or may not conflict with dominant American norms. One framework that may prove useful in this latter effort is based on culturally responsive work with Latino men (e.g., Griffith et al., 2012) that conceives of multiple masculinities, including Machismo (i.e., traditional masculinity) and Caballerismo (i.e., masculinity that exhibits responsibility and respect for family and community). Considering the diversity of distinct ethnic cultures and histories within the racialized group of Asian Americans, future studies could also explore ethnic cultural (e.g., norms and values) and experiential (e.g., reasons for migration, colonization) differences that may influence the risk and protective factors for Asian American men’s IPV perpetration. Researchers can leverage the strengths of qualitative inquiry to gain the perspectives and experiences of Asian American men of different ethnicities, and of quantitative large sample studies to compare coefficients for culturally relevant factors (e.g., psychological acculturation,
reason for migration, time in the U.S.) in regression models across ethnic groups of Asian American men.

Additionally, findings from the three studies in this dissertation may be relevant to other groups of Americans who have recent histories of immigration to the U.S., including Latino men. Given the salience of acculturation (Alvarez et al., 2020) to Latino men’s lives, the identification of culturally distinct Latino masculinities (Griffith et al., 2012), and the importance of collectivism in Latin cultures (Chang, 2015), future studies could test similar hypotheses and research questions with samples of Latino men (Manriquez, Forthcoming).

Study 2 found that the literature on the effect of culturally relevant factors and Asian American men’s IPV perpetration were mixed (Kyler-Yano & Mankowski, 2021). For instance, while enculturation was not significantly associated with verbal or physical IPV perpetration in a sample of Chinese immigrant men in treatment for IPV (Jin et al., 2007), it was found to be protective against sexual aggression for mainland Asian American college men but augmented risk for sexual aggression for Hawaiian Asian American college men in moderation analysis (Hall et al., 2005). More study is needed to explain the mixed findings in the literature and the null findings on the moderating role of patriarchal gender role norms on the association between culturally relevant norms and Asian American’s IPV perpetration found in Study 3. Specifically, future studies should use measures of endorsement of patriarchal gender role norms, psychological measures of acculturation, enculturation, collectivism, and other culturally relevant factors (e.g., discrimination, loss of face), and multidimensional measures of IPV perpetration.
Additionally, quantitative analyses should also leverage the power of structural equation models to model latent constructs from observed variables in the prediction of IPV perpetration.

**Practice.** Findings from this dissertation also have important implications for practitioners and program policy. The culturally distinct masculinity themes that emerged from Study 1 suggests that practitioners should consider the influence of Asian cultural norms, values, and experiences on Asian American men’s gender role norms when counseling them on their psychological and emotional challenges and developing culturally responsive treatment plans with them. Therapists and counselors should consider how the masculinity trait ideals among Asian American men, for example, responsibility, respectfulness, and taking care of others, may be more interpersonal and communal than those of European American men. For instance, a counselor taking a culturally responsive approach may identify close familial and interpersonal relationships as both a particular source of gender related strength as well as a potential source of psychological pain and masculinity stress and conflict for an Asian American male client if he perceives personal failures in this domain. Additionally, given the endorsement of some masculinity themes that have similarities to the model minority myth, practitioners can keep in mind that Asian American men’s perceived challenges or failures in academic and professional domains might have an added weight for Asian American men if they also perceive that other avenues for successfully demonstrating masculinity are not accessible to them.
Our review of the literature in Study 2 identified several cultural and gendered factors that may play distinct and important roles in the well-being of Asian American men. These include the protective effects of cultural community participation on patriarchal gender role norms, and of loss of face on IPV perpetration, and the risk effects of enculturation on patriarchal gender role norms, and of patriarchal gender role norms on IPV perpetration. These risk and protective effects suggest that counselors and treatment programs may reduce abusive men's risk for IPV perpetration by addressing the stress and strain from changing cultural and gender role norms (e.g., breadwinning), promoting their participation in their cultural communities, and nurturing the communal and interdependent ties central to the loss of face norm that is protective against IPV perpetration. Based on findings on the association between acculturation, enculturation, and patriarchal gender role norms, treatment providers can help clients identify the source of their gender role conflict and stress that may be contributing to abuse among more acculturated Asian American men.

Additionally, it may be important for treatment programs for IPV perpetration to consider the salience of collectivism by recruiting important members of Asian American men’s family, peer groups, and community in interventions, similar to the work of Creative Interventions in Berkeley, CA (Kim, 2011) and the Cultural Context Model in New Jersey (Almeida & Dolan-Delvecchio, 1999). These programs hold Asian American men accountable for their abusive behaviors as well as leverage the influence of important people in their lives to foster accountability to community. Future evaluation of
these programs and qualitative inquiry into perspectives of service providers, participants, and completers of these programs is warranted.

**Conclusion**

This dissertation filled important gaps in the literature concerning Asian American men’s masculinities, how they are influenced by culturally relevant factors such as acculturation and enculturation, and how both masculinity and culturally relevant factors are independently and conditionally associated with IPV perpetration. Qualitative, quantitative, and literature review methodologies were employed to leverage the strengths and values of each. It is my hope that the contributions of the three studies in this dissertation motivates further applied and community-based research that can inform practice and policy on Asian American masculinities and its relationship to IPV.
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