Psychology of Men & Masculinity

The Intersection of Race and Gender: Asian American Men's Experience of Discrimination

Tao Liu and Y. Joel Wong

CITATION

Liu, T., & Wong, Y. J. (2016, November 10). The Intersection of Race and Gender: Asian American Men's Experience of Discrimination. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity*. Advance online publication. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/men0000084

The Intersection of Race and Gender: Asian American Men's Experience of Discrimination

Tao Liu and Y. Joel Wong
Indiana University Bloomington

Asian American men's experience of discrimination, based on the intersection of their gender and race, has gained research attention in past decades. However, the application of an intersectionality perspective in this area of research has been somewhat inconsistent. Therefore, this article presents 3 intersectionality conceptual paradigms that can be applied to the study of Asian American men's experience of discrimination based on race and gender: (a) the Cumulative Disadvantage Paradigm, (b) the Subordinate Male Target Hypothesis Paradigm, and (c) the Intersectional Fusion Paradigm. In this article, we provide a description of these paradigms, a review of the empirical research supporting these paradigms, and an evaluation of the extent to which these paradigms are applicable to Asian American men's experience of discrimination. We hope that this article can provide theoretical guidance to researchers and assist them in generating new study questions to address Asian American men's experience of discrimination.

Keywords: Asian American men, intersectionality, conceptual paradigms

Since its first appearance in academic research, intersectionality has gained increasing attention in the fields of law, public health, sociology, psychology, and other disciplines. Grounded in feminism and critical race theory, "intersectionality" was coined by Kimberle Crenshaw (1991) to refer to women of color's experiences of multiple marginalizations in the feminist and antiracist movements. Crenshaw critiqued identity politics by arguing that because of Black women's experiences of multiple forms of subordination based on both race and gender, violence against them was marginalized in both feminist (primarily White) and antiracist (primarily male) movements. As gender and race are the most visible social identities by which human groups segregate and oppress others (Alcoff, 2006), the first generation of intersectionality studies focused on the interface of racism and sexism[1] and women of color's experiences of oppression.

Subsequent studies on intersectionality focused on foregrounding multiple forms of oppression (e.g., racism, sexism, classism, and homophobia). With the advancement of intersectionality research, the definition of intersectionality has evolved. McCall (2005) defined intersectionality as "the relationships among multiple dimensions and modalities of social relations and subject formations" (p. 1771). In contemporary research, intersectionality not only refers to a content area that describes intersecting identities, but also as a research paradigm to examine the interplay of multiple categories of difference (Hancock, 2007; Wong, Liu, & Klann, in press). For example, Cole observed that as a result of the intersection of multiple identities, people often experience oppression and prejudice in one way, and privilege and advantage in another; for example, middle-class women and Black men (Cole, 2009). Reflecting this interest, Bowleg (2012) defined intersectionality as

> a theoretical framework that posits that multiple social categories (e.g., race, ethnicity, gender, sexual orientation, socioeconomic status) intersect at the micro level of individual experience to reflect multiple interlocking systems of privilege and oppression at the macro, social-structural level (e.g., racism, sexism, heterosexism). (p. 1267)

Consistent with this emphasis on women of color's experiences, applications of intersectionality research to Asian American people initially focused on understanding Asian American women's experience of discrimination (e.g., Chan, 1988; Kim, Anderson, Hall, & Willingham, 2010; Patel, 2007). In contrast, Asian American men have, until recently, been at the margins of intersectionality research. Including Asian American men in intersectionality research is important for several reasons. First, researchers can study the complex interface of power, privilege, and oppression (Cole, 2009), since Asian American men potentially occupy dual positions of privilege and marginalization as men and racial minority, respectively. Second, intersectionality research can help turn the spotlight on Asian American men's distinct experiences of gendered racism, arising from the interface of gender and race (Essed, 1990), a phenomenon we discuss in greater detail later in this article. Third, intersectionality research

Tao Liu and Y. Joel Wong, Department of Counseling and Educational Psychology, Indiana University Bloomington.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Tao Liu, Department of Counseling and Educational Psychology, Indiana University Bloomington, 201 North Rose Avenue, Rm 4052 Bloomington, IN 47405-1005. E-mail: liu323@indiana.edu

[1] Following Sue (2003), we use the term *racial discrimination* to refer broadly to any form of race-based discrimination, regardless of the race of the perpetuator, and the term *racism* to refer only to racial discrimination perpetuated by Whites against people of color on the basis of the former's societal power and privileges. Similarly, we use the term, *gender discrimination* to refer broadly to any form of gender discrimination, regardless of the sex of the perpetuator, and the term *sexism* to refer only to gender discrimination perpetuated by men against women on the basis of the former's societal power and privileges.

helps us understand how Asian American men negotiate their masculinity in relation to hegemonic masculinity, defined as "a culturally idealized form of masculine character" that includes the dominance of men over women and of privileged men over marginalized men (Demetriou, 2001).

Against this backdrop, several scholars have called for more research on Asian American men's experiences of discrimination from an intersectionality perspective (Iwamoto & Liu, 2009; Lewis & Grzanka, 2016; Liang, Rivera, Nathwani, Dang, & Douroux, 2010). Nevertheless, recent psychological studies on Asian American men were characterized by two limitations: they either did not explicitly state the guiding theoretical perspective (e.g., Cheng, McDermott, Wong, & La, 2016), or were not specific about the type of intersectionality perspective when it was applied (Wong, Owen, Tran, Collins, & Higgins, 2012). As will be shown in our review of the literature below, the intersectionality perspective is not a unitary viewpoint but can be categorized into at least three conceptual paradigms, each with differing emphases. Some of these conceptual paradigms have been used as theoretical frameworks in empirical research on men and women of color, although, with only a few exceptions (Ghavami & Peplau, 2013), they have not been explicitly applied to empirical research on Asian American men.

Therefore, the purpose of this article is to advance research by presenting conceptual paradigms[2] that can be applied to understand Asian American men's experience of discrimination at the intersection of race and gender. The experience of discrimination is an important topic for Asian American individuals because of its deleterious impact on well-being (Iwamoto, Liao, & Liu, 2010) and its prevalence (about one in five report being treated unfairly in the past year because of their race; Pew Research Center, 2013). We identify three conceptual paradigms that investigate the intersection of Asian American men's gender and race: (a) the Cumulative Disadvantage Paradigm, (b) the Subordinate Male Target Hypothesis Paradigm, and (c) the Intersectional Fusion Paradigm. We want to clarify that our categorization of the conceptual paradigms is not exhaustive, and thus some studies may not be accounted by any of the paradigms (see Table 1 for illustrations of research foci and questions for each conceptual paradigm). Also, although we review three intersectionality paradigms, we intent to critique the first two paradigms and encourage researchers to utilize the Intersectional Fusion Paradigm to design conceptually strong intersectionality studies.

A review of literature in the three paradigms could serve a few purposes for research on Asian American men. First, our review will reveal gaps in the literature on Asian American men and assist scholars in generating new research questions. Second, our discussion of the three conceptual paradigms can help researchers better articulate and strengthen their conceptual basis of future research on Asian American men. In addition, our review can enhance the visibility of research on Asian American men in psychology and related disciplines. Accordingly, what follows is a description of these paradigms, a review of the empirical research supporting these paradigms, and an evaluation of the extent to which these paradigms are applicable to Asian American men's experience of discrimination.

Cumulative Disadvantage Paradigm

The Cumulative Disadvantage Paradigm examines individuals' social marginalization based on the cumulative effects of their multiple social identities (Beale, 1979; Crenshaw, 1993). Although scholars disagree on whether the Cumulative Disadvantage Paradigm is best characterized as an intersectionality approach (Hancock, 2007), we follow Cole's (2009) and Crenshaw's (1989) classification of intersectionality as encompassing individuals' experience of cumulative disadvantage arising from their multiple identities. Within this paradigm, there are two different models that examine multiple forms of oppression and multiple marginalized identities: the additive model and the multiplicative/interactive model.

Additive Model

The additive model was developed by earlier scholars who coined the term "double jeopardy" (Beale, 1979) to examine the added experiences of gender prejudice beyond the racial prejudice experienced by African American women. Later the term "triple jeopardy" (Greene, 1994) was used to examine oppression based on sexual orientation as the third dimension of jeopardy and classism as the fourth (Smith, 1983). The additive model draws parallels between racism and sexism. Scholars adopting this model argued that because individuals experience parallel oppression associated with each of their subordinate identities, the total experiences of subordination based on different social identities could be summed together (Grollman, 2012, 2014).

Quantitative studies based on the additive model have produced conflicting results. Some studies reported corroborating results for this model—compared to more privileged counterparts, adults with multiple disadvantaged identities experienced more forms of as well as more frequent and chronic discrimination and in turn, appraised these experiences as more distressing (Grollman, 2012, 2014). These studies demonstrated that the accumulation of forms and chronicity of discrimination compromises individuals' well-being. In contrast, other studies found no difference in health or mental health status between those who have multiple disadvantaged identities and their privileged counterparts (e.g., Consolacion, Russell, & Sue, 2004; Ferraro & Farmer, 1996; McLeod & Owens, 2004).

Applied to the study of Asian American individuals' experience of discrimination based on gender and race, the additive model predicts that Asian American men would experience lower levels of overall discrimination than Asian American women because the latter occupy two subordinate identities on the basis of race and gender, whereas Asian American men's gender reflects a privileged status in society. Additionally, the model proposes that the mental health and health outcomes of Asian American women would be worse than Asian American men.

To date, very few studies on Asian American psychological research were grounded in the Additive Model because gender differences in overall perceived discrimination have not been a key focus. The only quantitative study that we found examining overall

---

[2] The focus of this article is on intersectionality conceptual paradigms rather than on methodological paradigms. For a review of intersectionality methodological paradigms, refer to Wong, Liu, and Klann (in press).

Table 1

Intersectionality Conceptual Paradigms for Studying Asian American Men's Experiences of Discrimination Based on Race and Gender: Illustrative Research Questions and Methods

Research paradigm	Focus	Illustrative research questions
Cumulative disadvantage paradigm		
Additive model	Group comparison in discrimination based on cumulative marginalized identities	Do Asian American men experience lower levels of overall discrimination than Asian American women?
Multiplicative/Interactive model	Multiplicative effects of different types of discrimination based on multiple social identities	Does the interaction effect between racism and gender discrimination uniquely and significantly influence Asian American men's well-being?
Subordinate male target hypothesis paradigm	Group comparison in discrimination based on men's prototypically of their racial group	Do Asian American men experience higher levels of racial discrimination than Asian American women?
Intersectional fusion paradigm		
Racist-gender stress model	Stressful impact of racism on gender-related variables	How does the experience of racism affect Asian American men's experience of masculinity threat, gender role stress, and gender role conflict?
Gendered racism model	Fused and unique discriminatory experiences arising from the interface of gender and race	What are the specific dimensions of Asian American men's experience of gendered racism?

discrimination among Asian American men and women reported that the effects of discrimination on chronic health conditions did not differ between Asian American men and women (Gee, Spencer, Chen, Yip, & Takeuchi, 2007).[3]

In general, support for the Additive Model is weak, and studies focusing on Asian American people's overall experience of discrimination, rather than on racism alone, are limited. Studies that focus only on gender differences in Asian American people's experiences of racism cannot provide support for the Additive Model since the model is premised on the cumulative effects of multiple forms of discrimination (e.g., sexism and racism). Thus, the effects of multiple subordinate social identities on perceived discrimination and well-being is largely unknown among Asian American individuals.

Multiplicative/Interactive Model

Alternatively, scholars who adopt the Multiplicative/Interactive Model argue that the relationship between social identities are interactive and multiplicative (King, 1988; Settles, 2006). The term *multiplicative* refers to the phenomenon that not only do individuals experience multiple types of oppression simultaneously, but also that the effects of multiple identities depend on their interactions with each other. Translating this model to empirical research, studies have examined how an outcome is predicted by the interaction effects between two or more forms of social identities or discrimination, in addition to the main effects of various types of discrimination alone. For example, if poor Asian American men experience two types of oppression based on race and socioeconomic status, the effects of racism on their well-being may be moderated by or conditional on their experiences of classism.

The Multiplicative/Interactive Model has been applied to several people of color groups, especially women of color. With regard to African American women, two quantitative studies have shown that the interactive effect of racism and sexism on mental health was not significant. Moradi and Subich (2003) examined the effects of racism and sexism, as well as their interaction on

psychological distress among African American women, but found that only the experience of sexism contributed to the outcome, not the interaction between the two forms of discrimination. Buchanan and Fitzgerald (2008) examined the effects of sexual and racial harassment experienced by African American women at the workplace, and found that the interaction between these two types of harassment significantly predicted supervisor satisfaction and perceived organizational tolerance of harassment, but not psychological well-being.

Applying the Multiplicative/Interactive Model to the study of Asian American individuals, the theory would predict that not only do gender and race impact Asian American individuals' experiences of subordination independently and separately, but also that the interaction effects between race and gender, as well as with other social identities, would shape their experiences of discrimination. To our knowledge, no published articles have studied the interaction effects of race- and gender-based discrimination among Asian American men.

Evaluation of the Cumulative Disadvantage Paradigm

Despite the differences in quantifying intersectional oppression, both the Additive and Interactive Models focus on the cumulative effects of constructs associated with multiple identities. The Cumulative Disadvantage Paradigm has drawn attention to experiences of discrimination by those with multiple oppressed identities. However, as shown in the abovementioned literature review, studies based on this paradigm have produced conflicting results or null effects (Consolacion et al., 2004; Ferraro & Farmer, 1996; Grollman, 2012, 2014; McLeod & Owens, 2004).

In contrast to the large volume of literature on discrimination based on multiple identities in other people of color groups, especially African Americans (e.g., Buchanan & Fitzgerald, 2008), there are limited studies centering on Asian American individuals'

---

[3] The Gee et al. (2007) study did not report gender differences in the experience of discrimination.

experiences of marginalization based on their social identities. Within Asian American psychology, studies have either focused on racism among Asian American people in general or sexism among Asian American women alone, but have not examined the two types of discrimination and their interaction.

Overall, we argue that the Cumulative Disadvantage Paradigm is limited in its conceptualization of Asian American men's experiences of discrimination. In this paradigm, experiences related to different social identities (e.g., race and gender) are compartmentalized. Although the Multiplicative/Interactive Model includes a focus on the relationship between different types of oppression associated with corresponding identities, it focuses on the added contribution of the interaction between gender and racial variables, rather than unpacking how experiences associated with several social groups are inherently intertwined. Focusing on the interaction effect between racism and gender discrimination does not provide insight into understanding the unique experiences arising from the interface of these two experiences of discrimination. Thus, Dill and Kohlman (2012) referred to this conceptualization as "weak intersectionality."

Subordinate Male Target Hypothesis Paradigm

The Subordinate Male Target Hypothesis (SMTH), grounded in the Social Dominance Theory, argues that subordinate men, rather than women, are the main target of oppression because of their social identity of men as the dominant gender (Sidanius & Pratto, 1999). According to the SMTH, because racism tends to be conceptualized in terms of prototypical group members, intergroup oppression is directed more at subordinate men rather than subordinate women (Sidanius & Pratto, 2003). Due to androcentrism, men are represented as prototypes of their social group and thus bear the brunt of discrimination and prejudice (Purdie-Vaughns & Eibach, 2008). In contrast, subordinate women with two or more subordinate identities are rendered invisible, and this invisibility partially protects them from bearing the brunt of prejudice and oppression. For this reason, it is hypothesized that the deleterious impact of racism would likely be greater for men of color versus women of color (Sidanius & Pratto, 2003).

The SMTH also contends that both men and women participate in prejudice primarily targeted at outgroup men based on different underlying motivations. For men, the fundamental purpose is to maintain their dominant status by impeding subordinate men from obtaining material and symbolic resources. For females, their motivation is to avoid danger by outgroup men, especially perceived vulnerability to sexual coercion. For this reason, intergroup oppression is directed more at minority men rather than at minority women (Pratto, Sidanius, & Levin, 2006; Sidanius & Pratto, 2003). We consider the SMTH an intersectionality paradigm because it examines the interplay of privilege and oppression based on advantaged and disadvantaged social identities experienced by men of color, a core concept recognized in intersectionality scholarship (Derous, Ryan, & Nguyen, 2012; Goff & Kahn, 2013). The SMTH paradigm is unique in that it goes beyond a gender comparative approach (Lewis & Grzanka, 2016) to provide specific hypotheses on men of color's experiences of oppression; in so doing, it foregrounds the social mechanisms of men of color's experiences of oppression and privilege. Moreover, we are not the first scholars to classify the SMTH as an intersectional perspective. A number of

other scholars have also cited Sidanius and Pratto's (1999) SMTH and framed it as an intersectional perspective (Derous et al., 2012; Goff & Kahn, 2013).

Empirical Evidence for the SMTH

Various types of empirical evidence showing that men of color are the primary targets of intergroup discrimination support the SMTH. For example, a study found that national stereotypes resemble more stereotypes of men than of women (Eagly & Kite, 1987). A nationally representative sample of adults found that men of color experience double the frequency of discrimination based on race than women of color (Puhl, Andreyeva, & Brownell, 2008). A similar result was found in another study using a college sample (Landrine, Klonoff, Corral, Fernandez, & Roesch, 2006). Additionally, compared to their female counterparts, Asian American men are less preferred by women of all racial groups in romantic partner selections (Fisman, Iyengar, Kamenica, & Simonson, 2008).

Applying the SMTH to research on the intersection of race and gender among Asian American individuals, this paradigm would hypothesize that (a) Asian American men experience higher levels of racism than Asian American women; and that (b) the negative impact of racism is greater for Asian American men than for Asian American women. Regarding the first hypothesis, research has produced inconsistent results. Thus far, two measures have been developed to assess Asian American individuals' experiences of racism—the Subtle and Blatant Racism Scale for Asian Americans (SABR-A[2]; Yoo, Steger, & Lee, 2010) and the Asian American Racism Related Stress Inventory (AARRSI; Liang, Alvarez, Juang, & Liang, 2007). In the SABR-A[2], blatant racism refers to explicit forms of racism and is measured by items such as being called names, questioned about English skills, physically assaulted, and made fun of. In contrast, subtle racism addresses more implicit forms of racism and is measured by items such as being treated differently, viewed suspiciously, overlooked, and facing barriers in society. Three separate studies using the SABR-A[2] have produced different results; results demonstrated that either Asian American men experienced higher levels of subtle and overall racism (Yoo et al., 2010) or higher levels of blatant racism than Asian American women (Burrola, 2012), or no gender difference (Yoo et al., 2010). Similarly, research on the AARRSI also found different results in different samples. While one study using the AARRSI in a sample of Asian American college students from two West and East Coast universities reported higher levels of racism-related stress among men than women (Liang et al., 2007), another study using a sample of college students in a mid-Atlantic university (Liang & Fassinger, 2008) reported no gender differences.

In addition, studies using general racism measures that are applicable to all racial minorities also reported conflicting findings. Some studies found that Asian American men experienced higher levels of racism measured by the Perceived Discrimination Scale (Lee, 2005) and direct racism (but not vicarious or collective racism) and microaggression, as measured by the Racial and Life Experiences Scale (Alvarez, Juang, & Liang, 2006). Another group of studies found that Asian American men and women did not differ in their perceived structural racism as measured by the Color-Blind Racial Attitude Scale (Tawa, Suyemoto, & Roemer, 2012), past and lifetime racism assessed by the Schedule of Racist

Events (Concepcion, personal communication, April 8, 2015; Concepcion, Kohatsu, & Yeh, 2013), general discrimination as measured by the General Ethnic Discrimination Scale (Hwang & Goto, 2009), a single question (Goto, Gee, & Takeuchi, 2002; Lam, 2007), and an author-developed multiitem measure (Greene, Way, & Pahl, 2006). These studies also varied in their choices of sample, with diversity in age, student status, and geographical location.

The SMTH's prediction that Asian American men are worse off than Asian American women has also received mixed support. Some researchers found no significant gender difference in self-reported depressive symptoms, anxiety symptoms, somatic symptoms among Asian American men and women (Chen, Szalacha, & Menon, 2014). In another study (Yoo & Lee, 2005), gender was not related to negative affect or life satisfaction among Asian American individuals but was related to positive affect—Asian American women reported higher levels of positive affect.

The SMTH's proposal that men of color are more prototypical of their racial group than women of color was challenged by several recent studies that examined Asian male prototypicality in the intersection of race and gender (Johnson, Freeman, & Pauker, 2012; Schug, Alt, & Klauer, 2015; Wilkins, Chan, & Kaiser, 2011). Schug et al. (2015) found that Asian American men were perceived by participants in a White-dominated sample as less prototypical of their race compared to Asian American women. Through a Who-Said-What memory task and a free story writing activity, the results showed that compared to Asian American women, Asian American men's speeches were less memorized or less written about in a spontaneous writing exercise about Asian American people. Thus, the authors concluded that unlike African American men who are regarded as the prototype of their racial group, Asian American men are not the representative gender of their racial group. Similarly, Johnson and his colleagues (2012) found that the combination of race and gender categories for Black women and Asian men were experienced by college students as atypical and less representative of their respective racial groups. These results contradict the prototypicality hypothesis and suggest that Asian American men bear more intersectional invisibility than Asian American women; thus, they may be more likely overlooked and ignored than Asian American women.

Evaluation of the SMTH Paradigm

In contrast to the Cumulative Disadvantage Paradigm's focus on cumulative negative effects associated with multiple subordinate identities, the SMTH focuses on subordinate men's role as primary targets of oppression. This paradigm not only provides possible explanation of Asian American men's greater vulnerability to outgroup discrimination, but also an interpretation of the differential underlying motivations that produce dominant men's and women's outgroup discrimination. One contribution of this paradigm is that it examines individuals' privileges and disadvantages simultaneously. The SMTH foregrounds the experiences of discrimination among men of color based on the intersection of race and gender: men are regarded as the major targets of discrimination because they belong to the privileged gender subgroup in their racial group. Thus, the SMTH recognizes Asian American men's experiences of discrimination are not necessarily buffered by their male privilege. However, when applied to Asian American men, this paradigm suffers from several limitations.

As shown in the abovementioned literature review research, one limitation is that the evidence for the SMTH's applicability to Asian American men has been mixed. Several assumptions within the SMTH Paradigm have not been supported by studies on Asian American men. For example, the SMTH argues that the underlying motivation for women to engage in discrimination toward outgroup men is to avoid potential sexual coercion (Sidanius & Pratto, 2003). However, this hypothesis might be most relevant to African American men (Goff & Kahn, 2013). The hypothesis that men of color are perceived as sexual aggressors by White women were mainly confined to studies involving samples of Black men (Haley, Sidanius, Lowery, & Malamuth, 2004; Navarrete, Fessler, Fleischman, & Geyer, 2009; Navarrete, McDonald, Molina, & Sidanius, 2010). There is no empirical evidence showing that this stereotype is also applicable to Asian American men in contemporary American society. As shown in our literature review in the next section, Asian American men are less preferred in romantic partner selection because they are perceived as physically weak and sexually unattractive (Fisman et al., 2008), rather than because they are perceived as physically or sexually threatening.

In addition, the representative prototypicality hypothesis as applied to Asian American men for their race has not received empirical support, as described in the abovementioned review of research (Johnson et al., 2012; Schug et al., 2015; Wilkins et al., 2011). Thus, the underlying assumption that subordinate men are targets of racism due to their prototypicality may not apply to Asian American men. Research findings conflict with the Social Dominance Theory's contention that arbitrary-set groups should be viewed as male-gendered social categories (Haley et al., 2004). In fact, studies have shown that Asian American men experience invisibility as a form of discrimination (Ho, 2011), rather than as a way to escape discrimination. In a study on individuals' perceptions of perpetrators and targets of racism (Goff & Kahn, 2013), respondents were asked to imagine a person who was a target of racism. The researchers found that although 79% of respondents reported that their imagined target of racism was a man (as was consistent with the SMTH), 100% of these targets of racism were imagined to be Black. This finding underscores the invisibility of Asian American men in individuals' conceptualizations of racism.

Finally, the SMTH's focus on a quantitative comparison of discrimination between men and women is an oversimplification of Asian American men's life experiences. This approach does not aid researchers in understanding when and how gender operates as a system of oppression or as an aspect of identity (Alvarez et al., 2006; Concepcion et al., 2013; Goto et al., 2002; Greene et al., 2006; Hwang & Goto, 2009; Lam, 2007; Tawa et al., 2012). Researchers who studied the SMTH primarily used gender and race as categorical variables in their statistical analysis (Haley et al., 2004; Navarrete et al., 2009, 2010). Although the theory explains the motivation of those who engage in discrimination toward outgroup men, it fails to explain the psychological mechanisms of perceived discrimination in Asian American men. That is, the SMTH only explains the motivation of discrimination from the perpetrator's point of view, but not from the perceiver's point of view. For example, questions unanswered by the SMTH include how heterosexual Asian American men experience discrimination in dating experiences by women from a racially privileged background, that is, White women.

Intersectional Fusion Paradigm

In contrast to both the Cumulative Disadvantage Paradigm and the SMTH Paradigm, several intersectionality scholars emphasize that the intersection of social identities engenders unique experiences and that meanings of race and gender cannot be fully understood without considering one another (Stewart & McDermott, 2004; Shields, 2008). This perspective has been simply referred to as intersectionality by some scholars (Cole, 2009; Lewis & Grzanka, 2016). However, because the other conceptual paradigms discussed in this article are also rooted in the intersectionality perspective, we use the term *Intersectional Fusion* to distinguish it from other conceptual models and describe the paradigm that emphasizes the mutually constitutive and inherently connected nature of social identities as well as experiences related to these identities.

A fundamental assumption of this paradigm is that intersectional identities and related experiences are defined in relation to one another. In contrast to both the Cumulative Disadvantage Paradigm and the SMTH Paradigm, the Intersectional Fusion Paradigm claims that experiences of discrimination based on the intersection of race and gender are interdependent and cannot be reduced to either gender or racial discrimination only (Cole & Zucker, 2007). Put differently, the joint experiences arising from multiple identities are mutually constitutive and nonadditive. Rather than focusing on the quantitative additions of different types of discrimination, the Intersectional Fusion Paradigm emphasizes the qualities of discrimination at different intersectional positions. Applied to Asian American men, it implies that their experiences of discrimination cannot be understood simply by adding the experiences of being Asian American to being a man. It is not meaningful to assess whether stereotypes of Asian American men's lack of masculinity is more harmful than stereotypes about Asian American women's hypersexuality (Shields, 2008)—both experiences deserve to be studied in their own right. This emphasis shifts the focus of research from examining whether Asian American men or women experience greater disadvantages to identifying salient features of gendered racism for each group. Under this paradigm, we propose two conceptual models: the Racist-Gender Stress Model and the Gendered Racism Model.

Racist-Gender Stress Model

Several scholars have proposed theoretical conceptualizations about how racism affects men of color's gender identity and stress. Hammond, Fleming, and Villa-Torres (2016) proposed an integrated biopsychosocial model explaining how everyday racism threatens and challenges the masculine social self for African American men. They specified that when the significance and meaning of everyday racism exceeds the resources to overcome them, racism elicits negative evaluations or internal judgments about the core aspects of African American men's identity. In the same vein, O'Neil (2015) proposed a multicultural model in which oppressive macrolevel factors (e.g., racism) impact microlevel multicultural variables (e.g., negative racial identities), which then exacerbate men of color's gender role conflict.

Based on the abovementioned conceptual models, we propose the Racist-Gender Stress Model, which states that racism is experienced by men of color as a threat or challenge to their manhood, resulting in gender-related stress. The impact of racism on gender-related stress is expressed in several ways. First, racism puts pressure on men of color to adhere to hegemonic masculine ideals that impose dominant White masculine norms on men of color. Nonadherence to these ideal masculine norms creates masculine stress at the individual level (Iwamoto & Liu, 2009). For example, Asian American men who do not conform to White hegemonic masculine norms that emphasize athletic abilities might be perceived by others as less masculine (Wong, Horn, & Chen, 2013). Second, experiences of social rejection, alienation, and marginalization related to racism threatens men of color's power and sense of self as men (Liu, 2002). Third, racism placed men of color at the margin for resource competition, thus affecting their ability to perform masculine gender roles, such as providing for their families (Hammond et al., 2016).

Empirical evidence. Several studies provide support for the Racist-Gender Stress Model. Utilizing a disguised experimental design, Goff, Di Leone, and Kahn (2012) examined how racism threatened Black men's masculinity. Both Black and White men were asked to engage in a creativity task and were given either racially discriminatory or neutral feedback to the task. Black men, but not White men, engaged in more compensatory masculine behavior (i.e., more pushups) after being exposed to racial discrimination. Additionally for Black men, the researchers found that the effect of racial discrimination on the compensatory masculine behavior was mediated through greater vigilance to masculinity threat cues: the more vigilant Black men were to masculine threat cues, the more pushups they performed after the racism exposure. However, this mediation pathway was not found among White men. In another study, Liang and his colleagues (Liang, Salcedo, & Miller, 2011) examined interactions between racism and Latino masculine ideologies in predicting Latino men's gender role conflict. Perceived racism accentuated the positive relationship between Latino masculine ideologies and gender role conflict, thus underscore the link between racism and gender-related stress. In a similar fashion, perceived racism was positively associated with gender role conflict among Latino day workers (Arellano-Morales, Liang, Ruiz, & Rios-Oropeza, 2016). Also, consistent with the Multiplicative/Interactive Model, perceived racism moderated the relationship between gender role conflict and life satisfaction, such that greater gender role conflict was related to decreased life satisfaction only when perceived racism was high. The authors explained that in the context of economic exploitation, Latino day workers' experience of racism may interfere with their ability to succeed financially and provide for their family, which is a prescribed masculine gender norm.

To our knowledge, only one study has applied the Racist-Gender Stress Model to Asian American men. Wong, Tsai, Liu, Zhu, and Wei (2014) found that perceived racism positively predicted Asian male international students' subjective masculinity stress, although this association was significant only when masculine identity centrality was high, but not low. When being a man was a central component of participants' identities, perceived racism became relevant to their gender, and thus exacerbated their experiences of subjective masculinity stress. Following Wong et al. (2014), more studies are needed to examine whether the effects of racism on Asian American men's gender-related stress are conditional on another masculinity variable. For example, future research could examine the moderating effects of conformity to masculine norms (Mahalik et al., 2003), gender role conflict

(O'Neil, Helms, Gable, David, & Wrightsman, 1986), and masculine ideology (Levant, Rankin, Williams, Hasan, & Smalley, 2010).

The Racist-Gender Stress Model provides a theoretical framework to examine the unique interplay between privilege and marginalization for men of color: that is, the privilege and power associated with being a man is threatened because of discriminatory experiences associated with his devalued group membership. In contrast to the SMTH Paradigm, the Racist-Gender Stress Model explains how men of color's privilege and power are adversely affected due to their racial minority status. We encourage future researchers to use this model to investigate the interplay of racial, gender, and other social variables, (e.g., immigration and age), that contributes to the unique stresses of manhood for Asian American men. A plausible hypothesis is that the impact of racism on gender-related stress is stronger for U.S.-born as well as younger, emerging adult Asian American men than for their immigrant and older counterparts. This is because race might be a more central identity for U.S.-born versus immigrant men, while emerging adults might be more engaged in exploring their identities and are therefore more sensitive to threats to their social identities (Arnett, 2000). Conversely, we hypothesize that a positive ethnic identity might serve as a protective factor that buffers the impact of racism on Asian American men's gender-related stress. In addition, we also hypothesize that a positive racial identity might buffer the deleterious effects of racism on gender-related stress, as racial identity pertains to one's understanding of racial superiority or inferiority (Chen, Lephuoc, Guzman, Rude, & Dodd, 2006; Cokley, 2005; Iwamoto et al., 2010).

Gendered Racism Model

The unique combination of gender and race create distinct experiences of discrimination, namely, gendered racism (Essed, 1990). The term "gendered racism" was first coined by Essed to refer to "the racial oppression of Black women as structured by racist and ethnicist perception of gender roles" (Essed, 1990, p.31), although, more recently, it has also been applied to men of color (Schwing, Wong, & Fann, 2013), including Asian American men (Liang et al., 2010). In contrast to the Racist-Gender Stress Model, which focuses on how racism contributes to gender stress, the Gendered Racism Model explains how the content of racism is unique for specific combinations of racial and gender groups. Specifically, experiences of racism are qualitatively different among men and women from the same racial group. To illustrate, Asian American men's experiences of discrimination are grounded in the interlocking nature of race and gender and are therefore qualitatively different from the experiences of men of color from other racial groups and Asian American women.

Empirical evidence. A cluster of studies have focused on identifying the salient dimensions of intersectionality for minorities, particularly in terms of how they are perceived (e.g., Donovan, 2011; Goff, Thomas, & Jackson, 2008). One study that examined the gender, race, and gender-by-race stereotypes of Asian, Black, Latinos, and Middle Eastern Americans found that, in general, not only are racial stereotypes gendered, but gender stereotypes are also racialized. The authors identified unique race-by-gender stereotypes for each combination of race and gender (Ghavami & Peplau, 2013). For example, unique stereotypes about

Asian American men that were different from other racial and gender groups include being effeminate, small build, and having small penises. Other studies have identified the dimensions of gendered racism for racial minorities. Such studies include scale development projects to measure gendered racism for African American men (Schwing et al., 2013) and African American women (Lewis & Neville, 2015). For instance, Schwing et al. (2013) developed a scale with three dimensions of gendered racism stress that were relatively unique to African American men: violence, absent fatherhood, and sports. The effects of gendered racism stress on African American men's psychological distress were also unique from what could be explained by general racism and masculine gender role stress alone.

Stereotypes of Asian American men. A number of studies focused mostly on unique or salient stereotypes about Asian American men. Our review of the literature identified at least seven potential stereotypes that speak to Asian American men's experience of gendered racism in the United States.

First, Asian American men are perceived as innately good at martial arts. Research based on individual interviews (Ho, 2011) and open-ended responses (Wong et al., 2012) have shown that Asian American men are sometimes perceived as martial art experts and gangsters.

Second, Asian American men are perceived as sexually unattractive and undesirable romantic partners. Studies based on interviews (Ho, 2011), content analysis (Lu & Wong, 2013), and quantitative analysis (Ghavami & Peplau, 2013) have shown that Asian American men are perceived as asexual, having smaller penises, and having unflattering physical attributes that make them less desirable romantic partners than men from other races.

Third, Asian American men are perceived as effeminate, psychologically emasculated, and physically inferior. Multiple studies have identified this stereotype of Asian American men through qualitative, quantitative, and media studies (Chua & Fujino, 1999; Do, 2006; Guo & Harlow, 2014; Ho, 2011; Phua, 2007; Wilkins et al., 2011; Wong, 2008; Wong et al., 2013). Using free responses, Niemann, Jennings, Rozelle, Baxter, and Sullivan (1994) documented perceptions of feminine attributes (e.g., speak softly, shy, and caring) for Asian American men. Other studies have shown Asian American men were portrayed as nonathletic (Ho, 2011; Liu, Iwamoto, & Chae, 2011), lacking in physical ability (Wong et al., 2013), weak, and frail (Do, 2006).

Fourth, Asian American men are perceived as nerdy, unsociable, and lacking in leadership skills. They are stereotyped as unsociable, lacking social skills, and socially inept in empirical studies (Do, 2006; Ho, 2011; Mok, 1999; Niemann et al., 1994; Wong, 2008). Relatedly, Asian American men are characterized as computer geeks in social media (Paek & Shah, 2003). In two quantitative studies (Wong, 2008), Asian American men were shown to be perceived as lacking leadership compared to White men. Specifically, they were viewed as meek, stoic, shy, inarticulate, emotionally distant, and submissive. Although this stereotype might also apply to Asian American women, it is particularly salient for Asian American men because the stereotype of passivity contradicts hegemonic masculine norms in U.S. society that emphasize dominance and assertiveness (Mahalik et al., 2003). This perceived deviance leads to the devaluation of Asian American men's leadership abilities. Indeed, Cheng's (1996a) study (as cited in Cheng, 1996b) found that because individuals tended to prefer leaders who

possess masculine traits, Asian American men were the least likely to be chosen as leaders.

Fifth, Asian American men are stereotyped as untrustworthy. They are more likely to be perceived as villains, vile, cunning, or scheming, according to both qualitative and quantitative studies (Chen, 1999; Do, 2006; Ho, 2011). Scholars suggest that the notion of Asian American individuals being duplicitous and untrustworthy can be traced to historical accounts of Asians in American as a "yellow peril" and a national threat and thus cannot be trusted (Ho, 2011; also, see Espiritu's (1996) historical review of this stereotype in the context on how Asian American people's lives have been gendered and racialized).

Sixth, Asian American men are perceived as overly competitive. In a qualitative study using free responses to elicit participants' stereotypes toward a few racial and gender groups (Niemann et al., 1994), "achievement oriented" was shown as a top 20% of synonyms used for Asian American men. In another qualitative study (Ho, 2011), Asian American male participants reported that they were perceived as competitive threats in terms of jobs (Ho, 2011).

Seventh, Asian American men are perceived to strongly endorse traditional gender roles (Chua & Fujino, 1999). Chua and Fujino found that when asked about their perceptions of Asian American men, White women viewed more than 80% of Asian American men as valuing traditional gender roles, different from how they perceived White men as valuing equal gender roles.

In addition to published research that identified salient dimensions of gendered racism relevant to Asian American men, two dissertation studies (Do, 2006; Wong, 2008) developed measures to assess Asian American men's endorsement of stereotypes about them. Do (2006) developed the Asian American Male Stereotype Inventory (AAMSI) to assess Asian American men's endorsement of stereotypes pertaining to their race and gender. The AAMSI is unidimensional and consists of 16 items. The AAMSI was found to be significantly negatively related to self-esteem and ethnic identity achievement. Similarly, Wong (2008) developed the Stereotypes of Asian American Men Endorsement Scale (SAAMES) to measure endorsement of stereotypes about Asian American men as a group (SAAMES-Group) and the self (SAAMES-Self) separately. The SAAMES-Group has 33 items in four dimensions: (a) introverted, socially inept, and effeminate stereotype; (b) model minority stereotype; (c) perpetual foreigner stereotype; and (d) patriarchal stereotype. The SAAMES-Self has 27 items in 3 dimensions: (a) introverted, socially inept, and effeminate stereotype; (b) model minority stereotype; and (c) perpetual foreigner and asexual stereotypes. However, neither of these two measures focused on perceived gendered racism (e.g., Asian American men's experience of other people stereotyping them); rather, they focused on internalization of stereotypes about Asian American men. Another common limitation of these two studies relates to the dimensionality of the constructs measured by both scales. Specifically, Do (2006) did not examine the factor structure of the AAMSI. Although Wong (2008) explored the factor structure of the SAAMES, some distinct concepts (e.g., perpetual foreigner and asexual stereotype) were confounded within the same factors.

Evaluation of the Intersectional Fusion Paradigm

A key contribution of the Intersectional Fusion Paradigm is that it provides a different framework to study intersectionality. Unlike the Additive Model in the Cumulative Disadvantage Paradigm and the SMTH Paradigm, which focus on gender differences in experiences of discrimination, the Intersectional Fusion Paradigm deepens our understanding of how gender and race are interlocking and mutually reinforcing experiences for Asian American men. Thus, it shifts researchers' focus from which group suffers more to how each group suffers differently from others. Accordingly, the Intersectional Fusion Paradigm can be characterized as a form of "strong intersectionality," in which the conceptual and methodological focus is on examining identity in relation to one another (Dill & Kohlman, 2012).

Guided by the Intersectional Fusion Paradigm, future studies can move beyond gender comparisons to understand how the intersection of race and gender creates unique discriminatory experiences for Asian American men. For example, future qualitative research based on the Intersectional Fusion Paradigm could involve interviews with Asian American men about their experiences of gendered racism as well as positive coping strategies using resources such as racial identity, cultural identity, and ethnic bonding. Following McCall's (2005) suggestions, we also encourage researchers to conduct case studies, which can reveal complexity, diversity, and heterogeneity in experiences of gendered racism that are not addressed by quantitative research. For example, it is possible that some Asian American men might be aware of gendered racist stereotypes and hegemonic masculinity norms, yet refuse to conform to these norms and stereotypes and instead create a more flexible masculinity that is nurturing and gender egalitarian (Chua & Fujino, 1999).

One weakness of research based on the Intersectional Fusion Paradigm is the lack of measures that operationalize the dimensions of Asian American people's experience of gendered racism. Although two measures that address the internalization of stereotypes concerning Asian American men have been developed (Do, 2006; Wong, 2008), there is currently no measure that addresses Asian American men's perceived gendered racism based on other people's stereotypes about them. We therefore suggest that researchers develop a gendered racism scale for Asian American men, which can be used to explore how perceived gendered racism is related to other psychological outcomes. Moreover, although our review of the empirical literature identified eight stereotypes concerning Asian American men, not all these stereotypes might be equally salient. For example, the stereotype that Asian Americans are psychologically emasculated does not apply to Asian American women, whereas the stereotype concerning the untrustworthiness of Asian American men might potentially apply to Asian American women, too (Kim & Chung, 2005). Hence, it is important that researchers identify the most salient dimensions of stereotypes in future scale development studies on Asian American men's experience of gendered racism.

Another limitation of research based on the Intersectional Fusion Paradigm is that, thus far, studies have not emphasized ethnic differences in the experiences of gendered racism experienced by Asian American men. For example, the stereotype that Asian American men are untrustworthy is based on historical perceptions of East Asian men (Berdahl & Min, 2012), rather than South Asians. Thus, it is not clear if this stereotype is applicable to South Asian American men. Future studies can address ethnic differences in the types of gendered racism experienced, or how the link

between racism and gender-related stress might be different for diverse Asian American ethnic groups.

Practical Implications

The current review of the literature, particularly the Intersectional Fusion Paradigm, provides a few implications for practitioners and policymakers. In addressing Asian American people's experiences of discrimination, it is important not to neglect salient dimensions of discrimination that are particularly relevant to Asian American men. One prominent component of perceived discrimination is that Asian American men are stereotyped as psychologically emasculated. As this stereotype is not consistent with hegemonic masculine ideals, Asian American men's understanding of themselves as men may be compromised. They might cope by either attempting to emulate the hegemonic masculine ideal, or internalizing the effeminate stereotype (Liang et al., 2010). Either of these efforts may harm Asian American men's development of healthy racial identity or exacerbate their experience of gender role stress (Liu, 2002; Nghe, Mahalik, & Lowe, 2003). Thus, mental health professionals should be aware of Asian American men's experience of discrimination and its impact on their masculine identity. It is important for clinicians to inquire Asian American male clients' experiences of racism, and how it affects their personal meaning of manhood and their role as men. Clinicians may use group therapy to help Asian American men cope with gendered racism. In group settings, participants can strengthen their racial and/or ethnic identity through building alliances with other individuals who have similar experiences (Chang & Yeh, 2003).

The second implication is that practitioners can increase their multicultural competence by learning about the different dimensions of gendered racism experienced by Asian American men. Gaining knowledge of clients' cultural backgrounds and recognizing the social structures that contributed to clients' presenting issues is an important component of multicultural competence (APA, 2002). Gaining knowledge of Asian American men's unique experiences of gendered racism could help mental health practitioners avoid invalidation of client experiences. For example, an Asian American male client who has trouble finding romantic partners may feel that he is not attractive enough and cannot meet mainstream masculine norms. It is important for counselors to understand the interplay of racism and masculinity stress on mental health and explicitly discuss the intersection of race and gender with clients, as clients may not be aware of how discrimination and gender role strain contribute to their mental health concerns. As Asian American individuals tend to attribute mental health problems to internal causes and physiological factors (Leong & Lau, 2001), counselors could educate Asian American male clients on the possibility that external and systemic factors, such as gendered racism, might contribute to their mental health symptoms. Another implication is that clinicians can help Asian American men externalize stereotypes based on the intersection of their race and gender. Previous studies showed that some Asian American men internalize racist stereotypes about them (Pyke & Dang, 2003), and that their awareness and focus on certain stereotypes concerning Asian American men might have a deleterious impact on their mental health (Wong et al., 2012). Thus, mental health professionals can help them confront gendered racial stereotypes, rather than accept them. Contesting such stereotypes can help Asian American men combat the hegemonic masculine gender ideal and enhance positive racial identities. From a social justice point of view, counselors may also help Asian American male clients identify how systematic racial inequality and hegemonic masculinity mask individual presenting concerns and to unlearn internalized conceptualizations of racial inferiority as well as hegemonic masculine norms.

Last but not least, we recommend that media professionals, policymakers, and administrators gain awareness of gendered racism experienced by Asian American men. In the media, Asian American men have either been invisible or presented as one-dimensional characters that reinforce stereotypes about them (Ho, 2011). For example, in the media, Asian American men have been portrayed either as hypermasculine (e.g., a martial arts expert) or hypomasculine, but consistently asexual in both portrayals (Liang et al., 2010). Practitioners can engage in advocacy work to educate media professionals on the need to avoid stereotypical portrayals of Asian American individuals in the media.

Conclusions

In this article, we reviewed three intersectionality conceptual paradigms that can guide future research on Asian American men's experiences of discrimination rooted in the interface of race and gender. Throughout this article, we evaluated the strengths and limitations as well as the empirical support for each of these paradigms. Both the Cumulative Disadvantage Paradigm and Subordinate Male Target Hypothesis oversimplify Asian American men's experiences of discrimination and the empirical support for these two paradigms is relatively weak. In contrast, our review of the literature suggests that the Intersectional Fusion Paradigm might offer a more sophisticated conceptual framework because it draws attention to the interlocking nature of race and gender in Asian American men's experiences of discrimination.

One overarching limitation in the extant empirical literature on perceived discrimination among Asian American men is the lack of theoretical grounding. Researchers do not consistently rely on intersectionality to frame their research questions and even when they do, it is not always clear which specific intersectionality conceptual paradigm is used in their research. Therefore, our hope is that this article will contribute to future research on Asian American men by helping researchers to understand the complexities of intersectionality, expand the types of research questions they address, and better articulate the conceptual paradigms that guide their research.

References

Alcoff, L. M. (2006). *Visible identities: Race, gender, and the self*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press. http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/0195137345.001.0001

Alvarez, A. N., Juang, L., & Liang, C. T. H. (2006). Asian Americans and racism: When bad things happen to "model minorities". *Cultural Diversity & Ethnic Minority Psychology, 12,* 477–492. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/1099-9809.12.3.477

American Psychological Association. (2002). *Guidelines on multicultural education, training, research, practice, and organizational change for psychologists*. Retrieved from http://www.apa.org/pi/oema/resources/policy/multicultural-guidelines.aspx

Arnett, J. J. (2000). Emerging adulthood. A theory of development from the late teens through the twenties. *American Psychologist, 55,* 469–480. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.55.5.469

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

Beale, F. (1979). Double jeopardy: To be Black and female. In T. Cade (Ed.), *The Black woman* (pp. 90–100). New York, NY: New American Library.

Berdahl, J. L., & Min, J. A. (2012). Prescriptive stereotypes and workplace consequences for East Asians in North America. *Cultural Diversity & Ethnic Minority Psychology, 18,* 141–152. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0027692

Bowleg, L. (2012). The problem with the phrase women and minorities: Intersectionality—An important theoretical framework for public health. *American Journal of Public Health, 102,* 1267–1273. http://dx.doi.org/10.2105/AJPH.2012.300750

Buchanan, N. T., & Fitzgerald, L. F. (2008). Effects of racial and sexual harassment on work and the psychological well-being of African American women. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 13,* 137–151. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/1076-8998.13.2.137

Burrola, K. S. (2012). *Perceived racial discrimination and psychological distress among Asian American adolescents: Moderating roles of family racial socialization and nativity status* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Full Text. (Accession No. 2013–99040-102)

Chan, C. S. (1988). Asian-American women: Psychological responses to sexual exploitation and cultural stereotypes. *Women & Therapy, 6,* 33–38. http://dx.doi.org/10.1300/J015V06N04_05

Chang, T., & Yeh, C. J. (2003). Using online groups to provide support to Asian American men: Racial, cultural, gender, and treatment issues. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice, 34,* 634–643. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0735-7028.34.6.634

Chen, A. C-C., Szalacha, L. A., & Menon, U. (2014). Perceived discrimination and its associations with mental health and substance use among Asian American and Pacific Islander undergraduate and graduate students. *Journal of American College Health, 62,* 390–398. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/07448481.2014.917648

Chen, A. S. (1999). Lives at the center of the periphery, lives at the periphery of the center: Chinese-American masculinities and bargaining with hegemony. *Gender & Society, 13,* 584–607. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/089124399013005002

Chen, G. A., Lephuoc, P., Guzmán, M. R., Rude, S. S., & Dodd, B. G. (2006). Exploring Asian American racial identity. *Cultural Diversity & Ethnic Minority Psychology, 12,* 461–476. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/1099-9809.12.3.461

Cheng, C. (1996a). *"Nerds" need not apply: Masculinity and racial discrimination against Asian and Asian American men in an assessment center laboratory* (Unpublished manuscript). University of Southern California, Los Angeles.

Cheng, C. (1996b). "We choose not to compete": The "merit" discourse in the selection process, and Asian and Asian American men and their masculinity. In C. Cheng (Ed.), *Masculinities in organizations* (pp. 177–200). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Cheng, H., McDermott, R. C., Wong, Y. J., & La, S. (2016). Drive for muscularity in Asian American men: Sociocultural and racial/ethnic factors as correlates. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity, 17,* 215–227. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/men0000019

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

Cokley, K. O. (2005). Racial(ized) identity, ethnic identity, and Afrocentric values: Conceptual and methodological challenges in understanding African American identity. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 52,* 517–526. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0022-0167.52.4.517

Cole, E. R. (2009). Intersectionality and research in psychology. *American Psychologist, 64,* 170–180. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0014564

Cole, E. R., & Zucker, A. N. (2007). Black and White women's perspectives on femininity. *Cultural Diversity & Ethnic Minority Psychology, 13,* 1–9. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/1099-9809.13.1.1

Concepcion, W. R., Kohatsu, E. L., & Yeh, C. J. (2013). Using racial identity and acculturation to analyze experiences of racism among Asian Americans. *Asian American Journal of Psychology, 4,* 136–142. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0027985

Consolacion, T. B., Russell, S. T., & Sue, S. (2004). Sex, race/ethnicity, and romantic attractions: Multiple minority status adolescents and mental health. *Cultural Diversity & Ethnic Minority Psychology, 10,* 200–214. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/1099-9809.10.3.200

Crenshaw, K. (1989). Demarginalizing the intersection of race and sex: A Black feminist critique of antidiscrimination doctrine, feminist theory, and antiracist politics. *University of Chicago Legal Forum, 43,* 139–167.

Crenshaw, K. (1991). Mapping the margins: Intersectionality, identity politics, and violence against women of color. *Stanford Law Review, 43,* 1241–1299. http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/1229039

Crenshaw, K. (1993). Beyond racism and misogyny: Black feminism and 2 Live Crew. In M. J. Matsuda, C. R. Lawrence, III, R. Delgado, & K. Crenshaw (Eds.), *Words that wound* (pp. 246–264). Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Demetriou, D. (2001). Connell's concept of hegemonic masculinity: A critique. *Theory and Society, 30,* 337–361. http://dx.doi.org/10.1023/A:1017596718715

Derous, E., Ryan, A. M., & Nguyen, H. D. (2012). Multiple categorization in resume screening: Examining effects on hiring discrimination against Arab applicants in field and lab settings. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 33,* 544–570. http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/job.769

Dill, B. T., & Kohlman, M. H. (2012). Intersectionality: A transformative paradigm in feminist theory and social justice. In S. N. Hesse-Biber (Ed.), *Handbook of feminist research: Theory and praxis* (pp. 154–174). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage. http://dx.doi.org/10.4135/9781483384740.n8

Do, V. T. (2006). *Asian American men and the media: The relationship between ethnic identity, self-esteem, and the endorsement of stereotypes* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses. (UMI No. 3220826)

Donovan, R. A. (2011). Tough or tender (dis) similarities in White college students' perceptions of Black and White women. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 35,* 458–468. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0361684311406874

Eagly, A. H., & Kite, M. E. (1987). Are stereotypes of nationalities applied to both women and men? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 53,* 451–462. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.53.3.451

Espiritu, Y. L. (1996). *Asian American women and men: Labor, laws, and love.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Essed, P. (1990). *Everyday racism: Reports from women of two cultures.* Claremont, CA: Hunter House.

Ferraro, K. F., & Farmer, M. M. (1996). Double jeopardy to health hypothesis for African Americans: Analysis and critique. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior, 37,* 27–43. http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/2137229

Fisman, R., Iyengar, S. S., Kamenica, E., & Simonson, I. (2008). Racial preferences in dating. *The Review of Economic Studies, 75,* 117–132. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-937X.2007.00465.x

Gee, G. C., Spencer, M., Chen, J., Yip, T., & Takeuchi, D. T. (2007). The association between self-reported racial discrimination and 12-month *DSM*–IV mental disorders among Asian Americans nationwide. *Social Science & Medicine, 64,* 1984–1996. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2007.02.013

Ghavami, N., & Peplau, L. A. (2013). An intersectional analysis of gender and ethnic stereotypes: Testing three hypotheses. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 37,* 113–127. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0361684312464203

Goff, P. A., Di Leone, B. A. L., & Kahn, K. B. (2012). Racism leads to pushups: How racial discrimination threatens subordinate men's masculinity. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 48,* 1111–1116. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2012.03.015

Goff, P. A., & Kahn, K. B. (2013). How psychological science impedes intersectional thinking. *Du Bois Review, 10,* 365–384. http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/0S1742058X13000313

Goff, P. A., Thomas, M. A., & Jackson, M. C. (2008). "Ain't I a woman?" Towards an intersectional approach to person perception and group-based harms. *Sex Roles, 59,* 392–403. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11199-008-9505-4

Goto, S. G., Gee, G. C., & Takeuchi, D. T. (2002). Strangers still? The experience of discrimination among Chinese Americans. *Journal of Community Psychology, 30,* 211–224. http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/jcop.9998

Greene, B. (1994). Lesbian women of color: Triple jeopardy. In L. Comas-Diaz & B. Greene (Eds.), *Women of color: Integrating ethnic and gender identities* (pp. 389–427). New York, NY: Guilford Press.

Greene, M. L., Way, N., & Pahl, K. (2006). Trajectories of perceived adult and peer discrimination among Black, Latino, and Asian American adolescents: Patterns and psychological correlates. *Developmental Psychology, 42,* 218–236. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0012-1649.42.2.218

Grollman, E. A. (2012). Multiple forms of perceived discrimination and health among adolescents and young adults. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior, 53,* 199–214. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/00221465 12444289

Grollman, E. A. (2014). Multiple disadvantaged statuses and health: The role of multiple forms of discrimination. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior, 55,* 3–19. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0022146514521215

Guo, L., & Harlow, S. (2014). User-generated racism: An analysis of stereotypes of African Americans, Latinos, and Asians in YouTube videos. *Howard Journal of Communication, 25,* 281–302. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/10646175.2014.925413

Haley, H., Sidanius, J., Lowery, B., & Malamuth, N. (2004). The interactive nature of sex and race discrimination: A social dominance perspective racial identity in context. In G. Philogene (Ed.), *Racial identity in context: The legacy of Kenneth B. Clark* (pp. 149–160). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/10812-009

Hammond, W. P., Fleming, P. J., & Villa-Torres, L. (2016). Everyday racism as a threat to the masculine social self: Framing investigations of African American male health disparities. In Y. J. Wong & S. R. Wester (Eds.), *APA handbook of men and masculinities* (pp. 259–283). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/14594-012

Hancock, A. M. (2007). When multiplication doesn't equal quick addition: Examining intersectionality as a research paradigm. *Perspectives on Politics, 5,* 63–79. http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S1537592707070065

Ho, H. K. (2011). *Negotiating the boundaries of (in)visibility: Asian American men and Asian/American masculinity on screen* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses. (UMI No. 3476446)

Hwang, W., & Goto, S. (2009). The impact of perceived racial discrimination on the mental health of Asian American and Latino college students. *Asian American Journal of Psychology, S,* 15–28. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/1948-1985.S.1.15

Iwamoto, D. K., Liao, L., & Liu, W. M. (2010). Masculine norms, avoidant coping, Asian values, and depression among Asian American men. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity, 11,* 15–24. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0017874

Iwamoto, D. K., & Liu, W. M. (2009). Asian American men and Asianized

attribution. In N. Tewari & A. Alvarez (Eds.), *Asian American psychology: Current perspective* (pp. 211–232). New York, NY: Erlbaum.

Johnson, K. L., Freeman, J. B., & Pauker, K. (2012). Race is gendered: How covarying phenotypes and stereotypes bias sex categorization. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 102,* 116–131. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0025335

Kim, C. L., Anderson, T. L., Hall, M. E. L., & Willingham, M. M. (2010). Asian and female in the White God's world: A qualitative exploration of discrimination in Christian academia. *Mental Health, Religion & Culture, 13,* 453–465. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13674670903384533

Kim, M., & Chung, A. Y. (2005). Consuming Orientalism: Images of Asian/American women in multicultural advertising. *Qualitative Sociology, 28,* 67–91. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11133-005-2631-1

King, D. K. (1988). Multiple jeopardy, multiple consciousness: The context of a Black feminist ideology. *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society, 14,* 42–72. http://dx.doi.org/10.1086/494491

Lam, B. T. (2007). Impact of perceived racial discrimination and collective self-esteem on psychological distress among Vietnamese-American college students: Sense of coherence as mediator. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 77,* 370–376. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0002-9432.77.3.370

Landrine, H., Klonoff, E. A., Corral, I., Fernandez, S., & Roesch, S. (2006). Conceptualizing and measuring ethnic discrimination in health research. *Journal of Behavioral Medicine, 29,* 79–94. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10865-005-9029-0

Lee, R. M. (2005). Resilience against discrimination: Ethnic identity and other-group orientation as protective factors for Korean Americans. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 52,* 36–44. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0022-0167.52.1.36

Leong, F. T., & Lau, A. S. L. (2001). Barriers to providing effective mental health services to Asian Americans. *Mental Health Services Research, 3,* 201–214. http://dx.doi.org/10.1023/A:1013177014788

Levant, R. F., Rankin, T. J., Williams, C. M., Hasan, N. T., & Smalley, K. B. (2010). Evaluation of the factor structure and construct validity of scores on the Male Role Norms Inventory–Revised (MRNI-R). *Psychology of Men & Masculinity, 11,* 25–37. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0017637

Lewis, J. A., & Grzanka, P. R. (2016). Applying intersectionality theory to research on perceived racism. In A. N. Alvarez, C. T. H. Liang, & H. A. Neville (Eds.), *The costs of racism for people of color: Contextualizing experiences of discrimination* (pp. 31–54). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/14852-003

Lewis, J. A., & Neville, H. A. (2015). Construction and initial validation of the Gendered Racial Microaggressions Scale for Black Women. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 62,* 289–302. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/cou0000062

Liang, C. T. H., Alvarez, A. N., Juang, L. P., & Liang, M. X. (2007). The role of coping in the relationship between perceived racism and racism-related stress for Asian Americans: Gender differences. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 54,* 132–141. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0022-0167.54.2.132

Liang, C. T. H., & Fassinger, R. E. (2008). The role of collective self-esteem for Asian Americans experiencing racism-related stress: A test of moderator and mediator hypotheses. *Cultural Diversity & Ethnic Minority Psychology, 14,* 19–28. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/1099-9809.14.1.19

Liang, C. T. H., Rivera, A. L., Nathwani, A., Dang, P., & Douroux, A. N. (2010). Dealing with gendered racism and racial identity among Asian American men. In W. M. Liu, D. H. Iwamoto, & M. H. Chae (Eds.), *Culturally responsive counseling with Asian American men* (pp. 63–81). New York, NY: Routledge.

Liang, C. T. H., Salcedo, J., & Miller, H. A. (2011). Perceived racism, masculinity ideologies, and gender role conflict among Latino men.

Psychology of Men & Masculinity, 12, 201–215. http://dx.doi.org/10 .1037/a0020479

Liu, W. M. (2002). Exploring the lives of Asian American men: Racial identity, male role norms, gender role conflict, and prejudicial attitudes. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity, 3,* 107–118. http://dx.doi.org/10 .1037/1524-9220.3.2.107

Liu, W. M., Iwamoto, D. K., & Chae, M. H. (Eds.). (2011). *Culturally responsive counseling with Asian American men.* New York, NY: Routledge.

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

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

McCall, L. (2005). The complexity of intersectionality. *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society, 30,* 1771–1800. http://dx.doi.org/10 .1086/426800

McLeod, J. D., & Owens, T. J. (2004). Psychological well-being in the early life course: Variations by socioeconomic status, gender, and race/ ethnicity. *Social Psychology Quarterly, 67,* 257–278. http://dx.doi.org/ 10.1177/019027250406700303

Mok, T. A. (1999). Asian American dating: Important factors in partner choice. *Cultural Diversity & Ethnic Minority Psychology, 5,* 103–117. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/1099-9809.5.2.103

Moradi, B., & Subich, L. M. (2003). A concomitant examination of the relations of perceived racist and sexist events to psychological distress for African American women. *The Counseling Psychologist, 31,* 451–469. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0011000003031004007

Navarrete, C. D., Fessler, D. M. T., Fleischman, D. S., & Geyer, J. (2009). Race bias tracks conception risk across the menstrual cycle. *Psychological Science, 20,* 661–665. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9280.2009 .02352.x

Navarrete, C. D., McDonald, M. M., Molina, L. E., & Sidanius, J. (2010). Prejudice at the nexus of race and gender: An outgroup male target hypothesis. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 98,* 933–945. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0017931

Nghe, L. T., Mahalik, J. R., & Lowe, S. M. (2003). Influences on Vietnamese men: Examining traditional gender roles, the refugee experience, acculturation, and racism in the United States. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development, 31,* 245–261. http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/j .2161-1912.2003.tb00353.x

Niemann, Y. F., Jennings, L., Rozelle, R. M., Baxter, J. C., & Sullivan, E. (1994). Use of free responses and cluster analysis to determine stereotypes of eight groups. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 20,* 379–390. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0146167294204005

O'Neil, J. M. (2015). *Men's gender role conflict: Psychological costs, consequences, and an agenda for change.* Washington, DC: American Psychological Association. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/14501-000

O'Neil, J. M., Helms, B. J., Gable, R. K., David, L., & Wrightsman, L. S. (1986). Gender-role conflict scale: College men's fear of femininity. *Sex Roles, 14,* 335–350. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/BF00287583

Paek, H. J., & Shah, H. (2003). Racial ideology, model minorities, and the "Not-So-Silent Partner": Stereotyping of Asian Americans in U.S. magazine advertising. *Howard Journal of Communications, 14,* 225–243. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/716100430

Patel, N. R. (2007). The construction of South-Asian-American womanhood: Implications for counseling and psychotherapy. *Women & Therapy, 30,* 51–61.

Pew Research Center. (2013). *The rise of Asian Americans.* Retrieved from http://www.pewsocialtrends.org/files/2013/04/Asian-Americans-new-full-report-04-2013.pdf

Phua, V. C. (2007). Contesting and maintaining hegemonic masculinities: Gay Asian American men in mate selection. *Sex Roles, 57,* 909–918. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11199-007-9318-x

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

Puhl, R. M., Andreyeva, T., & Brownell, K. D. (2008). Perceptions of weight discrimination: Prevalence and comparison to race and gender discrimination in America. *International Journal of Obesity, 32,* 992–1000. http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/ijo.2008.22

Purdie-Vaughns, V., & Eibach, R. (2008). Intersectional invisibility: The distinctive advantages and disadvantages of multiple subordinate-group identities. *Sex Roles, 59,* 377–391. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11199-008-9424-4

Pyke, K., & Dang, T. (2003). 'FOB' and 'Whitewashed': Identity and internalized racism among second generation Asian Americans. *Qualitative Sociology, 26,* 147–172. http://dx.doi.org/10.1023/A:102295 7011866

Schug, J., Alt, N. P., & Klauer, K. C. (2015). Gendered race prototypes: Evidence for the non-prototypicality of Asian men and Black women. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 56,* 121–125. http://dx.doi .org/10.1016/j.jesp.2014.09.012

Schwing, A. E., Wong, Y. J., & Fann, M. D. (2013). Development and validation of the African American Men's Gendered Racism Stress Inventory. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity, 14,* 16–24. http://dx.doi .org/10.1037/a0028272

Settles, I. H. (2006). Use of an intersectional framework to understand Black women's racial and gender identities. *Sex Roles, 54,* 589–601. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11199-006-9029-8

Shields, S. (2008). Gender: An intersectionality perspective. *Sex Roles, 59,* 301–311. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11199-008-9501-8

Sidanius, J., & Pratto, F. (1999). *Social dominance: An inter-group theory of social hierarchy and oppression.* New York, NY: Cambridge University Press. http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139175043

Sidanius, J., & Pratto, F. (2003). Social dominance theory and the dynamics of inequality: A reply to Schmitt, Branscombe, & Kappen and Wilson & Liu. *British Journal of Social Psychology, 42,* 207–213. http://dx.doi.org/10.1348/014466603322127193

Smith, B. (Ed.), (1983). *Home girls: A Black feminist anthology.* New York, NY: Kitchen.

Stewart, A. J., & McDermott, C. (2004). Gender in psychology. *Annual Review of Psychology, 55,* 519–544. http://dx.doi.org/10.1146/annurev .psych.55.090902.141537

Sue, D. W. (2003). *Overcoming our racism: The journey to liberation.* San Francisco, CA: Wiley. http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/9780787979690

Tawa, J., Suyemoto, K. L., & Roemer, L. (2012). Implications of perceived interpersonal and structural racism for Asian Americans' self-esteem. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology, 34,* 349–358. http://dx.doi.org/10 .1080/01973533.2012.693425

Wilkins, C. L., Chan, J. F., & Kaiser, C. R. (2011). Racial stereotypes and interracial attraction: Phenotypic prototypicality and perceived attractiveness of Asians. *Cultural Diversity & Ethnic Minority Psychology, 17,* 427–431. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0024733

Wong, R. P. (2008). *Development and validation of the Stereotypes of Asian American Men Endorsement Scale (SAAMES)* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from Dissertation and Theses: Full text database. (Accession No. 2008–99200-566)

Wong, Y. J., Horn, A. J., & Chen, S. (2013). Perceived masculinity: The potential influence of race, racial essentialist beliefs, and stereotypes. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity, 14,* 452–464. http://dx.doi.org/10 .1037/a0030100

Wong, Y. J., Liu, T., & Klann, E. M. (in press). The intersection of race,

ethnicity, and masculinities: Progress, problems, and prospects. In R. F. Levant & Y. J. Wong (Eds.), *Psychology of men and masculinities*. Washington, DC: APA.

Wong, Y. J., Owen, J., Tran, K. K., Collins, D. L., & Higgins, C. E. (2012). Asian American male college students' perceptions of people's stereotypes about Asian American men. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity, 13,* 75–88. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0022800

Wong, Y. J., Tsai, P-C., Liu, T., Zhu, Q., & Wei, M. (2014). Male Asian international students' perceived racial discrimination, masculine identity, and subjective masculinity stress: A moderated mediation model. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 61,* 560–569. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/cou0000038

Yoo, H. C., & Lee, R. M. (2005). Ethnic identity and approach-type coping as moderators of the racial discrimination/well-being relation in Asian Americans. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 52,* 497–506. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0022-0167.52.4.497

Yoo, H. C., Steger, M. F., & Lee, R. M. (2010). Validation of the subtle and blatant racism scale for Asian American college students (SABR-A^2). *Cultural Diversity & Ethnic Minority Psychology, 16,* 323–334. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0018674