

UC Riverside

UC Riverside Electronic Theses and Dissertations

Title

The Relationship Between Adherence to Dominant Masculine Ideologies and Rape Myth Acceptance Among College Men

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/9h85r86r>

Author

Marg, Logan Zachary

Publication Date

2016

Peer reviewed|Thesis/dissertation

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
RIVERSIDE

The Relationship Between Adherence to Dominant Masculine Ideologies and Rape Myth
Acceptance Among College Men

A Thesis submitted in partial satisfaction
of the requirements for the degree of
Master of Arts

in

Sociology

by

Logan Zachary Marg

June 2016

Thesis Committee:

Dr. Ellen Reese, Chairperson

Dr. Tanya Nieri

Dr. Sharon Oselin

The Thesis of Logan Zachary Marg is approved:

Committee Chairperson

University of California, Riverside

ABSTRACT OF THE THESIS

The Relationship Between Adherence to Dominant Masculine Ideologies and Rape Myth Acceptance Among College Men

by

Logan Zachary Marg

Master of Arts, Graduate Program in Sociology
University of California, Riverside, June 2016
Dr. Ellen Reese, Chairperson

The relationship between adherence to dominant masculine ideologies (i.e., hegemonic masculinity) and rape myth acceptance is not well known. Most rape myth research uses largely middle-class, white college student samples, making it difficult to explore the relationship between race/ethnicity, class, and rape myth acceptance. This study begins to fill these gaps by exploring the relationship between adherence to dominant masculine ideologies and rape myth acceptance among a racially, ethnically, and socioeconomically diverse sample of 456 American college men through survey methods. Results indicate that non-Latino Asian men had significantly higher rape myth acceptance and adherence to dominant masculine ideologies compared to Latino and non-Latino white men. Additionally, there was a significant positive relationship between adherence to dominant masculine ideologies and rape myth acceptance. These findings suggest the need for culturally relevant and culturally sensitive intervention and educational programs. Future research is needed to explore whether specific dimensions of dominant masculine ideologies are more important than other dimensions in predicting

rape myth acceptance. Special attention must be made to study diverse samples, as the present research shows significant racial/ethnic variation in adherence to dominant masculine ideologies and attitudes toward rape.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>Section</u>	<u>Page</u>
Introduction	1
Literature Review	4
Rape Myth Prevalence	4
Methodological Issues in Rape Myth Research	6
Masculinity Ideologies and Hegemonic Masculinity	9
Methodological Issues in Masculinity Research	12
Hypotheses	18
Methods	19
Results	26
Discussion	29
References	39
Tables	49

LIST OF TABLES

<u>Table</u>	<u>Page</u>
1. Descriptive and Bivariate Statistics	49
2. Multiple Regression Predicting Participants' Rape Myth Acceptance	50

Introduction

Sexual violence against women remains a significant health and safety concern. Despite numerous public service campaigns as well as campus- and state-wide policies aimed at reducing sexual violence against women, the rate at which sexual violence against women occurs has not declined in 50 years (Jozkowski and Peterson 2013). Of the approximately 1 in 5 women who will experience rape during their life, nearly 80 percent will experience rape primarily by a man they know before they are 25 years old (Breiding et al. 2014). Young women on college campuses face an even higher risk of experiencing rape when compared to the general female population of the United States (Krebs et al. 2009).

An extensive and influential body of research has shown rape myth acceptance among men to be significantly related to an array of affective, behavioral, and cognitive factors that are important for understanding the persistence of sexual violence against women. Indeed, rape myth acceptance has been shown to predict men's perpetration of sexual violence (Edwards et al. 2011; Loh et al. 2005). Rape myths are highly prevalent prejudiced, stereotyped, and generally fallacious beliefs about rape, rape survivors, and rapists that function to blame survivors of rape and legitimize sexual violence against women (Burt 1980; Edwards et al. 2011). Some examples of rape myths include: "husbands cannot rape their wives," "women enjoy rape," "women ask to be raped," "women lie about being raped," "rape happens when a guy's sex drive is out of control," and "if a girl doesn't physically resist, she can't say it was rape" (McMahon and Farmer 2011; Payne, Lonsway and Fitzgerald 1999). The ideal of the "genuine" or "real" rape

victim is also widespread. The “real” rape victim is seen as a woman who is virginal, unacquainted with her rapist, fought back as much as possible, and reported the rape to the police almost immediately (Page 2008; Spohn and Horney 1996). Despite the fictitiousness of these statements and ideals, a substantial portion of the population endorses them and they prevail throughout various levels of society, including the general public, men and women college students, and the criminal justice and legal system (Du Mont and Parnis 1999; Edwards et al. 2011).

Factors linked to rape myths include stereotyped notions of women’s behavior (Burt 1980); the belief that sexual relations are inherently adversarial (Burt 1980); acceptance of interpersonal violence (Burt 1980); the likelihood of labeling rape “rape” (Burt and Albin 1981); an unwillingness to convict and strictly sentence rapists among the general public (Burt and Albin 1981); self-reported sexual aggression (Muehlenhard and Linton 1987); stereotyped notions of male sexuality (Cowan and Quinton 1997); the self-reported likelihood of perpetrating rape (Bohner et al. 1998); and being male (see Lonsway and Fitzgerald 1994; Edwards et al. 2011 for reviews of this literature). Thus, college men are the focus of this study because much research finds that they consistently have higher rape myth acceptance than women, men account for the majority of incidences of sexual violence against women, and because many rape myths contain assumptions about masculinity and power over women.

While the current body of research regarding rape myths has highlighted their importance and shed light on the United States’ pervasive rape culture, very little research has examined the rape myth acceptance among racially, ethnically, and

socioeconomically diverse populations. Previous research has examined largely homogenous white, middle class, men and women college students (e.g., Hinck and Thomas 1999; Johnson, Kuck, and Schander 1997; Kalof and Wade 1995; Lutz-Zois, Moler, and Brown 2015). There is little research that points to a consistent relationship between race, ethnicity, social class and rape myth acceptance. Indeed, it is difficult to identify any research that examines the relationship between social class and rape myth acceptance. The few studies examining racial/ethnic variation in rape myth acceptance draw divergent conclusions. Some research finds that Asian men have higher rape myth acceptance compared to white men (Mori, Bernat, Glenn, Selle, and Zarate 1995), other research finds that African American men are more accepting of rape myths than white men (Dull and Giacomassi 1987; Giacomassi and Dull 1986), and still other studies find that Latino men are more accepting of rape myths than white men (Fischer 1987). As a result, we are left with a lack of clarity regarding the ways in which race/ethnicity is associated with such attitudes.

Additionally, the role of dominant masculine ideologies—such as those found within contemporary notions of hegemonic masculinity—in the transmission of rape myths and their acceptance remains unclear. Hegemonic masculinity provides criteria for men to meet to achieve masculine status and informs dominant cultural notions of what it means to be a man (Connell and Messerschmidt 2005). It is not clear how adopting dominant masculine ideologies and striving to attain hegemonic masculinity might serve as a vehicle for rape myth acceptance. Previous research has examined the relationship between *endorsing* dominant masculine ideologies and rape myth acceptance (among

mostly homogenous populations). Endorsing dominant masculine ideologies refers to the degree that men support or agree with attitudes and/or behaviors associated with hegemonic masculinity. Little research has examined the relationship between *adherence* to dominant masculine ideologies and rape myth acceptance among a racially, ethnically, and socioeconomically diverse population. Adherence to dominant masculine ideologies refers to the degree that men affectively conform (i.e., feelings of pride or happiness when conforming and feeling shame if not conforming), behaviorally conform (i.e., behaving in ways that meet societal expectations of men), and cognitively conform (i.e., believing what men and women are expected to believe) to dominant masculine ideologies. In other words, adherence to dominant masculine ideologies is the extent that men enact hegemonic masculinity.

To fill these gaps in the literature, the present research seeks to answer the following research questions: (1) What is the relationship between adherence to dominant masculine ideologies and rape myth acceptance among college men? (2) To what extent does rape myth acceptance differ by race/ethnicity and socioeconomic status among college men?

Rape Myth Prevalence

The concept of rape myths, developed through the groundbreaking work of Schwendinger and Schwendinger (1974), Brownmiller (1975), and Burt (1980), has been used extensively in sexual violence research (Suarez and Gadalla 2010). Rape myths are widely regarded by feminist scholars as an underlying force that fuels violence against

women and informs negative societal reactions against rape survivors (Du Mont and Parnis 1999).

Much research has demonstrated the prevalence of rape myths among the general public, youth, and college students. Using various scales to measure rape myths, most research finds that between 25 and 35 percent of male and female respondents agree with the majority of these myths (Edwards et al. 2011; Lonsway and Fitzgerald 1994). Burt (1980) surveyed 598 Minnesotans and found that more than half endorsed rape myths about a rape survivor's moral character and propensity to lie, meaning that most believed it necessary to be suspicious of rape survivors and whether they lied about being raped. In a national telephone survey Basile (2002) found that 85 percent of the sample believed women could not be raped by their husbands or boyfriends (Edwards et al. 2011).

Research also shows that rape myths remain pervasive among youth and college students in the United States. Kershner (1996) surveyed 122 West Virginian adolescents between ages 14-19 and found more than half strongly agreed that some women fantasize about being raped and provoke men into raping them. Johnson, Kuck, and Schander (1997) surveyed 149 college students and found that 15-16 percent of men believed women secretly want to be raped, compared to between one and four percent of women, and that 27 percent of men believed that women provoke rape, compared to 10 percent of women. More recently, Kahlor and Morrison (2007) administered surveys to 96 college women and found that, on average, the participants believed 19 percent of rape accusations to be false. McMahon (2010) surveyed 2,338 college students and found that 53 percent believed a woman's actions (i.e., drinking, clothing, dancing) influenced her

assault. Through open-ended survey questions, Buddie and Miller (2001) found that among 241 college students, 66 percent endorsed at least some combination of rape myths.

Methodological Issues in Rape Myth Research

Rape Myth Acceptance Measurement

Most research on rape myths has used either Burt's (1980) Rape Myth Acceptance Scale (RMAS) or the Illinois Rape Myth Acceptance Scale (IRMAS; Payne, Lonsway, and Fitzgerald 1999). It is now well established that Burt's RMAS and related scales measure basic hostility toward women, rather than rape myth acceptance. Additionally, the RMAS and related scales are gender biased, since they only address acceptance of violence toward women and cannot be reliably used with both male and female populations. Moreover, Buhi (2005) revealed the lack of consistency on reliability between studies that used Burt's RMAS and related measures (Suarez and Gadalla 2011). These issues raise questions about the overall strength and interpretations of findings in previous literature that used these measures. It is among these reasons that the "psychometrically elegant" (Forbes, Adams-Curtis, and White 2004: 241) Illinois Rape Myth Acceptance Scale (IRMAS; Payne, Lonsway, and Fitzgerald 1999) was developed. However, recent research continues to use outdated measures of rape myth acceptance, such as the RMAS (e.g., Hockett et al. 2009), which is puzzling due to the aforementioned flaws and the availability of much more precise and reliable measures.

McMahon and Farmer (2011) developed the updated Illinois Rape Myth Acceptance Scale to account for words and phrases that have become outdated, especially among

contemporary college students. For example, an item used on the original IRMAS (Payne, Lonsway, and Fitzgerald 1999) was “When women go around wearing low-cut tops or short skirts, they’re just asking for trouble,” this was updated to “When girls go to parties wearing slutty clothes, they are asking for trouble.” The new item more accurately reflects current discourse on contemporary university campuses in the United States, and this was the goal for all of the changes (McMahon and Farmer 2011). Furthermore, the RMAS and similar (outdated) measures that are still widely used to assess rape myth attitudes fail to capture subtler and more covert rape myths. Because many high schools and colleges now implement some form of education about issues of sexual violence, students are more aware that some traditional rape myths are not socially acceptable (Frazier, Valtinson, and Candell 1994; McMahon and Farmer 2011). Along these lines, Hinck and Thomas (1999) found that college students were less likely to adhere to rape myth beliefs when previously exposed to rape prevention and awareness education. However, the researchers suggested that this finding might be due to the conspicuous phrasing of most rape myth measurement items. It is for these reasons that the present research will use the updated IRMAS, as it is psychometrically sound, accounts for subtler rape myths, uses contemporary language appropriate for college students, and can be used with women and men.

Overwhelmingly Homogenous Populations

Aside from measurement issues, most research on rape myths comes from largely middle class white populations, including the population used to develop the updated IRMAS (McMahon and Farmer 2011). Indeed, in reviewing the literature it is difficult to

identify recent studies (within the last 10 years) that meaningfully explore or demonstrate racial, ethnic, or socioeconomic differences in rape myth acceptance, because of the largely homogenous populations used in most rape myth research. Even studies that claim to investigate sociodemographic characteristics of rape myth acceptance use overwhelmingly white populations, do not account for social class, and can seldom suggest meaningful differences by race or ethnicity because of the comparatively small minority sample size (i.e., Johnson, Kuck, and Schander 1997; Kalof and Wade 1995). In their review of rape myth literature, Lonsway and Fitzgerald (1994) show three studies that demonstrate racial/ethnic differences in rape myth acceptance, which reported that African-American (Dull and Giacomassi 1987; Giacomassi and Dull 1986) and Hispanic students (Fischer 1987) were more accepting of rape myths than White students. However, as described in the previous section, research in this area has not been systematic, and these studies use instruments with similar methodological issues as those described in the previous section (e.g., Geiger, Fischer, and Eshet 2004; Kalof and Wade 1995; Mori et al. 1995). Most studies on rape myth acceptance address the dearth of research with diverse populations in the over 30-year body of rape myth literature and call for more research with racially, ethnically, and socioeconomically diverse populations (e.g., Edwards et al. 2011; Hinck and Thomas 1999; Lutz-Zois, Moler, and Brown 2015; McDermott et al. 2015). Significant gaps remain regarding demographic, sociocultural, and behavioral determinants of rape myth acceptance (Suarez and Gadalla 2011). The present study will begin to fill this gap by examining the distribution of rape myth acceptance in a diverse college population.

Masculinity Ideologies and Hegemonic Masculinity

While it is important to understand the relationship between demographic variables and rape myth acceptance, it is not enough to merely describe the characteristics of those who endorse rape myths. It is also necessary to uncover the mechanisms of rape myth acceptance to better understand what fuels a thriving rape culture in the United States (Chapleau and Oswald 2013). Rape culture is “a set of values and beliefs that provide an environment conducive to rape” (Boswell and Spade 1996: 133). Dominant masculine ideologies are a central component to the United States’ rape culture, sexual violence against women, and rape myth acceptance.

Masculinity ideologies are internalized beliefs about the meanings of manhood that drive overt and covert behavioral performances of masculinity (Blazina et al. 2007; Thompson and Pleck 1995). In other words, masculinity ideologies refer to the collection of proscriptive and prescriptive social norms that penalize or reward certain men and certain presentations of masculinity. Masculinity ideologies influence individuals’ thoughts, feelings, and behaviors in gender-salient situations and points of concern. While masculinity ideologies are varied depending on historical era, location, social institutions, and groups of men (Thompson and Bennett 2015), there is a cluster of common standards and expectations associated with being a man in the United States. These common standards and expectations of masculinity are known as dominant masculine ideologies and reflect what Connell (1995) terms hegemonic masculinity, which highlights the dominance of white heterosexual men and the subordination of women along with racial, ethnic, and sexual minorities (Levant and Richmond 2007).

Dominant masculine ideologies correspond to hegemonic masculinity and uphold existing gender-based power structures (see Gallagher and Parrott 2011; Levant et al. 2010; Murnen 2015). Hegemonic masculinity is the ideal form of masculinity to which men aspire. It perpetuates patriarchy through the promotion of men's dominance and women's subordination. It provides criteria for men to meet in order to achieve masculine status and informs dominant cultural notions of what it means to be a man, such as the importance of physical strength, aggression, sexual prowess, and domination over women (Connell and Messerschmidt 2005). Additionally, there are local, regional, and global hegemonic masculinities (Connell and Messerschmidt 2005). This study examines a regional hegemonic masculinity, which is constructed at the society-wide level of the United States (i.e., dominant masculine ideologies; [Gallagher and Parrott 2011; Messerschmidt 2012; Murnen 2015]). In describing hegemonic masculinity upon its recent conceptual development, Donaldson writes, "It is exclusive, anxiety-provoking, internally and hierarchically differentiated, brutal, and violent. It is...tough, contradictory, crisis-prone, rich, and socially sustained" (1993:645). While most men cannot perform hegemonic masculinity, most men benefit from it because of its connection to institutions of male dominance. So while most men endorse characteristics associated with hegemonic masculinity, they are rarely granted status as "hegemonically masculine." However, many men still endorse and strive to attain hegemonic masculinity because it benefits them (Donaldson 1993). A fundamental element of contemporary hegemonic masculinity is the perception that women exist as sexual objects (Carrigan, Connell, and Lee 1985). Thus, it is no surprise that the endorsement of dominant

masculine ideologies within contemporary hegemonic masculinity is linked to many aspects of sexual violence against women.

Dominant masculine ideologies have been shown to involve many components related to sexual violence against women, including acceptance of hegemonic patriarchal society, avoidance of femininity, hatred of homosexuality, achievement, aggression and violence, restricted emotionality, and dominance (Levant et al. 2007; Pleck, Sonenstein, and Ku 1993; Walker, Tokar, and Fisher 2000;). They have also been positively associated with violence in romantic relationships (Jakupcak, Lisak, and Roemer 2002) and controlling beliefs about women's bodies (Ward, Merriwether, and Caruthers 2006). Additionally, Thompson and Cracco (2008) found that greater endorsement of dominant masculine ideologies predicted sexually aggressive behaviors among college-age males.

Much research has shown that men who internalize and endorse a number of characteristics associated with contemporary notions of hegemonic masculinity in the United States are at greater risk of committing sexual aggression toward women. The main purpose of these dominant masculine ideologies within hegemonic masculinity is to promote men's dominance and women's subordination (Smith et al. 2015). Of most relevance for the present study, dominant masculine ideologies have been frequently investigated as a predictor of rape myth acceptance (Lutz-Zois, Moler, and Brown 2015; Murnen, Wright, and Kaluzny 2002). In one of the earliest studies investigating the role of masculinity in rape myth acceptance, Bunting and Reeves (1983) utilized David and Brannon's (1976) framework of masculinity, which describes four dimensions of the traditional male gender role: No Sissy Stuff (men should avoid doing feminine things),

The Big Wheel (men should strive for status and achievement), The Sturdy Oak (men should be independent and avoid showing weakness), and Give ‘em Hell (men should seek adventure, even if violence or aggression is required) [Levant and Richmond 2007; Murnen, Wright, and Kaluzny 2002]). They found a significant association between traditional masculinity and rape myth acceptance. In another study, Good et al. found that “the most powerful and consistent predictor of men’s violence supporting beliefs and behaviors” (1995:4) was men’s beliefs and expectations about masculinity. While much research has examined the role of masculinity in many factors related to sexual aggression and sexual violence against women, including rape myth acceptance, this research is plagued by a number of methodological issues, namely instrumentation and population (described more fully below), which the present study seeks to address.

Methodological Issues in Masculinity Research

Instrumentation

Over the past three decades many measures of masculinity and masculinity ideologies have been utilized. I argue that these measures of masculinity have been too global or unidimensional, measure only extreme versions/aspects of masculinity (i.e., macho personality or hypermasculinity), conceptualize masculinity as consisting of only a few dimensions, or merely measure endorsement of (i.e. support or agreement) dominant masculine ideologies rather than adherence to them.

The Bem Sex Role Inventory (BSRI; Bem 1974) and Psychological Attributes Questionnaire (PAQ; Spence and Helmreich 1978) are prominent examples of measures that ignore the multiple dimensions of masculinity and assess masculinity (or gender role)

unidimensionally. The development of these measures was informed by the trait approach to masculinity and gender identity (Thompson and Pleck 1995). Within the trait approach to masculinity is a group of socially desirable traits that theoretically differentiate men and women, which are measured via self-concept ratings. This approach assumes that individuals differ in the degree to which they exemplify idealized masculinity and femininity. From this perspective, one's gender identity or orientation is a property of the individual, where there is a standard, idealized form of a masculine or feminine gender identity. Despite their differences, the BSRI and PAQ essentially measure the degree to which men or women report instrumental and expressive gender-related and socially desirable traits, which are thought to be descriptive of their personalities. Thus, the masculinity scale in the BSRI and PAQ assesses whether individuals possess a single, socially desirable trait for men (i.e., instrumentality or personal goal-directedness; [Good and Sherrod 2001]). However, masculinity cannot be assessed via a single personality trait found within individuals. Masculinity and gender as a whole is far more complex; any attempt to describe a single conception of masculinity ideology, such as dominant masculine ideologies, requires multiple dimensions (Thompson and Pleck 1995).

Another body of research examines the relationship between extreme aspects of masculinity, sexual aggression, and rape supportive attitudes. The Hypermasculinity Inventory (Mosher and Sirkin 1984) is a prominent example of a masculinity measure designed to tap into extreme or exaggerated aspects of masculinity. Specifically, the Hypermasculinity Inventory assesses the "macho personality," which is characterized by rigid adherence to three exaggerated aspects of masculinity; these include calloused

sexual attitudes, violence as manly, and danger as exciting. While much research links extreme or exaggerated aspects of masculinity (i.e., hypermasculinity) to sexually aggressive behaviors and rape supportive attitudes, these measures do not explain or demonstrate the relationship between a multidimensional “mainstream” masculinity, sexually aggressive behaviors, and rape supportive attitudes. Naturally, instruments meant to measure extreme forms of masculinity neglect less extreme, though salient aspects of masculinity, such as self-reliance or emotional control. By focusing on extreme aspects of masculinity, these measures inherently fail to assess the multidimensional nature of masculinity. Thus, while the extreme aspects of masculinity are important for understanding the cause of sexual violence and rape supportive attitudes, they do not fully explain the complex relationship between hegemonic masculinity (i.e., dominant masculine ideologies) in the United States (arguably more profuse than hypermasculinity or the “macho personality”), rape myth acceptance, and the perpetration of sexual violence more generally.

In an attempt to move away from the trait approach of masculinity and gender, many newer instruments recognize masculinity as socially constructed and multidimensional. These instruments, termed “first generation” measures of masculinity ideologies (Thompson and Bennett 2015), include widely used instruments in contemporary research, such as the Male Role Norms Scale (MRNS; Thompson and Pleck 1986) and Male Role Norms Inventory (MRNI; Levant et al. 1992; Levant and Fischer 1998). These first generation measures advanced 20-30 years ago assess individuals’ agreement with and endorsement of dominant cultural standards of what masculinity is and should be

(Thompson and Bennett 2015). The MRNS and MRNI typically tap into three to four dimensions of masculinity (i.e., status norms, toughness norms, anti-femininity norms, work/family norms; this varies depending upon the research), which is an improvement from unidimensional, global measurements of masculinity. However, by only assessing a small number of potentially salient masculine norms, these instruments are unable to examine the considerable variability in how men think about and enact masculinity (Mahalik et al. 2003). Moreover, because these measures examine the degree to which individuals agree with or endorse certain masculine norms, they do not assess the degree to which individuals affectively, behaviorally, and cognitively conform to masculine norms. In other words, they do not assess adherence to or enactment of dominant masculine ideologies. The MRNS and MRNI predict sexually aggressive behaviors and rape-supportive attitudes (Gale 1996; Gallagher and Parrott 2011; Good et al. 1995; Pleck, Sonenstein, and Ku 1993; Truman, Tokar, and Fischer 1996). Yet, they do not provide information about the relationship between men's *adherence* to hegemonic masculinity, sexually aggressive behaviors, and rape-supportive attitudes. Rather, they provide information about the relationship between men's agreement with, or endorsement of, aspects of hegemonic masculinity, sexually aggressive behaviors, and rape-supportive attitudes.

To address the instrumentation issues of previous research, the present research will measure adherence to dominant masculine ideologies using the Conformity to Masculine Norms Inventory (CMNI; Mahalik et al. 2003). The CMNI moves away from only measuring cognitive conformity or approval of dominant (hegemonic) masculine

ideologies. In addition to assessing affective conformity (i.e., feelings of pride or happiness when conforming and feeling shame if not conforming), the CMNI also assesses behavioral conformity (i.e., behaving in ways that meet societal expectations of men) and cognitive conformity (i.e., believing what men and women are expected to believe) to dominant masculine ideologies. This broader assessment is important because men might perform behaviors in line with certain dominant masculine ideologies, but might feel cognitively and/or affectively uncomfortable with those behaviors (Mahalik et al. 2003; Thompson and Bennett 2015). Additionally, while most measures of masculinity ideologies include three or four dimensions of masculinity, the CMNI includes 11 dimensions of masculinity. Thus, the CMNI is far more multidimensional than previous instruments (e.g., the MRNI and MRNS). This is important because understanding the complex relationship between hegemonic masculinity and rape myth acceptance requires the inclusion of as many aspects of masculinity as possible. Additionally, hegemonic masculinity is multidimensional and best measured with an instrument with the ability to capture its multidimensional nature (Gallagher and Parrott 2011). The CMNI is also unique with regard to its ability to measure conformity and nonconformity to dominant masculine ideologies, such that conformity and nonconformity exist on two opposite ends of a spectrum. Thus, scores on the CMNI range from extreme nonconformity to extreme conformity, which allows for a more complex understanding of the relationship between hegemonic masculinity and rape myth acceptance.

Population

Research on masculinity most often uses samples that are homogenous and/or are predominantly non-Latino white, and there are frequent calls for research with more diverse populations (e.g., Levant and Richmond 2007; Lutz-Zois, Moler, and Brown 2015; McDermott et al. 2015). There is some research that demonstrates ethnic and racial differences in the endorsement of dominant masculine ideologies (e.g., Abreu et al. 2000; Levant et al. 2003; Levant and Majors 1997; Levant, Majors, and Kelly 1997; Liu 2002). For example, using the MRNI Levant and Majors (1997) found that African American men endorsed dominant masculine ideologies to the greatest degree compared to European men. A follow-up study by Levant, Majors, and Kelly (1997) found that geographic region of residency (i.e., Northern vs. Southern U.S.) moderated the effect of race on endorsement of dominant masculine ideologies. In another study, Levant et al. (2003) found again that African American men tended to endorse (or support) dominant masculine ideologies to a greater degree than Latino and European American men, and that Latino men endorsed dominant masculine ideologies more than European American men. However, the extent to which there are racial and ethnic differences in adherence to dominant masculine ideologies is not well known. In other words, the degree to which racial and ethnic minority men affectively, behaviorally, and cognitively conform to hegemonic masculine norms is not clear. Thus, the present research will contribute to this literature by utilizing a racially, ethnically, and socioeconomically diverse population in investigating whether there are significant differences in the degree that men adhere to hegemonic masculinity.

While some masculinities are marginalized and subordinated (Connell 2005), the production of hegemonic masculinity is cross-racial (Nemoto 2008). I do not expect to see significant ethnic, racial, or socioeconomic differences in men's adherence to hegemonic masculine norms because hegemonic masculinity influences members of the dominant group as well as ethnic and racial minority men. While minority men may not achieve the status of being hegemonically masculine, they must still meet the standards of hegemonic masculinity that are set by white, middle to upper class, heterosexual men. Additionally, ethnic and racial minority men experience acceptance or rejection from the majority, which is partially based on adherence to the dominant group's brand of masculinity. As Donaldson writes, "What most men support is not necessarily what they are" (1993: 646). In other words, though minority men cannot achieve status as hegemonically masculine because they are not members of the dominant group, most of them are still motivated to support hegemonic masculinity because it benefits them by legitimizing and granting their own power to control women.

Hypotheses

Previous research has shown endorsement of dominant masculine ideologies as a significant predictor of rape myth acceptance. Controlling for other factors, *I hypothesize (H1) that adherence to dominant masculine ideologies will be positively associated with rape myth acceptance. The more college men adhere to dominant masculine ideologies, the greater their rape myth acceptance will be.*

Few studies meaningfully explore racial or ethnic differences in rape myth acceptance using rigorous methods. Of the little research that has examined racial/ethnic variation in

rape myth acceptance, and depending on the study, Asian, Latino, or African American men have higher rape myth acceptance than white men. Further, due to the use of largely homogenous samples of middle class college students, there has been almost no investigation of the role of socioeconomic status on rape myth acceptance. Therefore, because of mixed and few findings regarding the role of race/ethnicity and socioeconomic status on rape myth acceptance there is no hypothesis to present regarding the extent that rape myth acceptance differs by race/ethnicity and socioeconomic status.

Methods

Participants and Procedure

Using convenience sampling, 1,678 participants were recruited from a large southwestern university, of which 1,152 are women, 505 are men, and 21 identify as a gender other than man or woman. A campus-wide email that included a link to the survey instrument was used to recruit participants. The campus-wide email indicated that participants would be completing a 10-15 minute online survey about sexual attitudes and experiences and how those attitudes impact sexual experiences and behaviors. The email also indicated that participants would be entered into raffle for a \$50 Amazon gift card upon completion of the survey. The survey link included in the campus-wide email sent participants to the Qualtrics online survey system. Upon accessing the survey link, participants first provided informed consent where they were given a general explanation about the study and informed that they needed to be at least 18 years old. Participants were also required to agree to be contacted for a potential in-depth interview before they

could participate in the survey. If they did not agree to be contacted for a potential in-depth interview, they were precluded from taking the survey.

The final sample consisted of 456 college men ages 18 to 69 ($M = 22.72$, $SD = 4.81$). Women and people who did not identify as men were excluded from this analysis ($n = 1,173$). Forty-nine men were dropped from the sample because they did not complete most of the survey; the majority of whom terminated their participation about 33 percent into the survey when they arrived at the portion asking about sexual attitudes and beliefs. The sample's racial/ethnic distribution closely resembles that of the campus's population. Non-Latino whites made up 20 percent of the sample, 35 percent were Hispanic/Latino, 38 percent were non-Latino Asian or Pacific Islander, 3 percent were non-Latino African American/Black, and 4 percent were mixed race or another race (i.e., Middle Eastern, Native American, etc.). The campus's population is 34 percent Hispanic or Latino, 33 percent Asian, about 16 percent white, and nearly 4 percent Black or African American.

Variables

Dependent Variable

McMahon and Farmer's (2011) updated Illinois Rape Myth Acceptance Scale (IRMAS) was used to measure rape myth acceptance attitudes, which is the dependent variable. It contains 22 items and four subscales labeled, (1) "She asked for it," (2) "He didn't mean to," (3) "It wasn't really rape," and (4) "She lied." Each of the 22 items is scored between 1 to 5, with the lowest value representing "strongly agree" and the highest value representing "strongly disagree." The scores are totaled for a cumulative score ranging from 22 to 110. For the present purposes each scale item was reverse coded

and all items were summed so that higher scores represent greater rape myth acceptance. McMahon and Farmer (2011) analyzed the psychometric properties of the updated IRMAS and demonstrated sufficient reliability and validity using a sample of primarily white college students.

Independent Variables

The key independent variables are participants' race/ethnicity, socioeconomic status, and adherence to dominant masculine ideologies. Participants were asked whether they were Hispanic or Latino and then, which response option(s) best described their race: American Indian or Alaska Native, Asian, Black or African American, Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander, White, and Other race. This method is identical to the U.S. Census (2010).

Participants' socioeconomic status was assessed by measuring their mother's and father's highest level of education completed. Response options ranged from "no school or less than one year" to "doctorate." Categories were collapsed to achieve a more normal distribution so that no schooling through grade 8 is coded as 1, some high school is coded as 2, high school is coded as 3, some college or an associate's degree is coded as 4, bachelor's degree is coded as 5, master's degree is coded as 6, and professional or doctorate degree is coded as 7.

Adherence to dominant masculine ideologies was measured using the Conformity to Masculine Norms Inventory-22 (CMNI-22; Hamilton and Mahalik 2009). The measure is a validated, abbreviated version of the 94-item CMNI that assesses conformity to 11 dominant cultural norms of masculinity in the United States labeled: Winning, Emotional

Control, Risk Taking, Violence, Dominance, Playboy, Self-Reliance, Primacy of Work, Power over Women, Disdain for Homosexuals, and Pursuit of Status (Mahalik et al. 2003). The CMNI-22 correlates at .92 with the 94-item CMNI and uses the two highest loading items for each of the 11 factors (norms), yielding a total masculinity score. Item response options range from “strongly disagree” to “strongly agree” on a four-point Likert scale. Higher scores reflect greater adherence to dominant masculine ideologies. The CMNI-22 includes prescriptive statements that assess conformity to dominant, broad masculinity norms (e.g., “It is best to keep your emotions hidden”). Most items are written as self-reports about behaviors, feelings, and intentions to examine affective, behavioral, and cognitive conformity (e.g., “I love it when men are in charge of women” and “I would feel good if I had many sexual partners”). The respondent is the focal point in these items.

Control Variables

A variety of questions were used as control variables because other research has suggested that they may be related to rape myth acceptance. In addition to controlling for participants’ age in years, sexual orientation, and academic class standing (year in college), fraternity affiliation, sports participation, and military service were controlled for because research suggests that participation in male dominated organizations is related to men’s attitudes toward rape and sexual aggression (e.g., Bleecker and Murnen 2005; Koss and Dinero 1988; Koss and Gaines 1993; Lackie and de Man 1997; Locke and Mahalik 2005). Likewise, religiosity and pornography use were controlled for because some research shows they are related to rape myth acceptance (e.g., Allen,

Emmers, Gebhardt, and Giery 1995; Foubert, Brosi, and Bannon 2011; Freymeyer 1997). Lastly, attendance at a rape awareness/prevention workshop was controlled for because previous research finds that those who attend such workshops hold less rape myth acceptance (Hinck and Thomas 1999).

Participants were asked to select which sexual orientation best described them. Because of a low number of respondents in every category besides “straight/heterosexual,” categories were collapsed so that “straight/heterosexual” is coded as 1 and “not straight/heterosexual” is coded as 0.

Academic class standing ranged from “freshman” to “graduate student.” Categories were combined where “freshman” and “sophomore” form “lower division” (coded as 1), “junior” and “senior” form “upper division” (coded as 2) and “graduate student” remains a separate category (coded as 3).

Fraternity affiliation was measured using a scale whose original response categories were 0 (no affiliation), 1 (rushed a fraternity), 2 (pledged a fraternity), and 3 (fraternity member) (Koss and Gaines 1993; Lackie and de Man 1997). Categories were collapsed because of a low number of participants selecting any of the fraternity affiliation categories, so that for this analysis “no affiliation” is coded as 0 and “any affiliation” is coded as 1. Sports participation was measured with participants’ responses to whether they play an organized sport with people of their own gender (i.e., not co-ed), where “no” is coded as 0 and “yes” is coded as 1. Military experience was measured with participants’ responses to whether they served in the military, where “no” is coded as 0 and “yes” is coded as 1.

Religiosity was measured with participants' responses to how often they attend religious services. Response options ranged from "never" to "several times a day" (General Social Survey 2014). Categories were collapsed to achieve a more normal distribution, so that "never" remains coded as 1, "less than once a year," "once a year," and "several times a year" were combined into "occasional attendance" (coded as 2) and "about once a month," "two to three times a month," "nearly every week," "every week," "more than once a week," "once a day," and "several times a day" were combined into "regular attendance" (coded as 3).

Participants' pornography use was measured with their responses to how often they use pornography if they indicated that they used it. Response options ranged from "never" (1) to "daily" (7), where "less than once a month" is coded as 2, "once a month" is coded as 3, "two to three times a month" is coded as 4, "once a week" is coded as 5, and "two to three times a week" is coded as 6.

Participants were also asked whether they ever attended a rape awareness/prevention workshop (0 = no, 1 = yes).

Analysis

The statistical analysis was conducted using the STATA software, version 13. Following other rape attitudes studies (e.g., Edwards et al. 2014), preliminary analysis began by using the Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale short form (MCSD-SF; Reynolds 1982) to assess whether participants provided socially desirable responses, because they were asked to share sensitive personal information about their sexual attitudes and beliefs. Scores on the MCSD-SF were checked for correlations with the

IRMAS and CMNI-22. If there are moderate to high correlations, then social desirability might be impacting responses on those items. Results were that the MCSD-SF was not correlated with any items of the IRMAS or CMNI, indicating that participants did not exhibit any significant bias in reporting.

Further preliminary bivariate analyses were conducted to identify which variables were significantly related to rape myth acceptance and to determine which control variables would be retained in the multivariate analysis. There were no significant bivariate relationships between rape myth acceptance and frequency of pornography use, fraternity affiliation, organized sports participation, mother's educational attainment, father's educational attainment, and mother's and father's combined educational attainment. Therefore, these measures were dropped from the analysis. Additional bivariate analyses involved one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) to examine racial/ethnic differences in rape myth acceptance and adherence to dominant masculine ideologies.

Multiple linear regression was conducted to examine the multivariate relationship between adherence to dominant masculine ideologies and rape myth acceptance, net of controls. Because the dependent variable is a continuous ratio variable, a multiple linear regression is an appropriate method of analysis. Participants with missing data were dropped from the multivariate analysis, resulting in a slightly reduced sample size ($n = 435$). The normality of the dependent variable was tested by plotting it in a histogram and checking for a normal curve, which showed positive skewness and suggests abnormally distributed residuals. To further test for normality the studentized residuals of the

dependent variable were examined and they were normally distributed, however outlier studentized errors were observed (i.e., 4 under -2 and 16 over 2). To examine whether the data are sensitive to the outlier studentized residuals a robust regression was conducted. The robust regression takes all residual values and weights the observations by its residuals (Hamilton 2013). This model indicates that it is similar to the linear regression model, where there were no changes in relationships or significance values, and the overall model fitness is significant. Because there were no significant differences between the linear regression and robust regression models, the results of the linear regression are reported below.

Results

Descriptive Statistics

Descriptive statistics are presented in Table 1. Participants' rape myth acceptance scores range from 22 to 93, with an average score of 44.42 (SD = 14.43), indicating that, on average, participants' rape myth acceptance is relatively low. Adherence to dominant masculine ideologies scores range from 11 to 59, with an average score of 29.39 (SD = 6.15), indicating that, on average, participants have moderate adherence to dominant masculine ideologies.

Among the control variables, fraternity affiliation among this sample is moderate, where 80 percent have no affiliation. About 18 percent of the sample indicated their participation in organized sports. The sample is moderately religious, with 42 percent of participants occasionally attending religious services and 23 percent regularly attending religious services, which suggests less religiosity than the U.S. population (PEW 2015).

This may be related to educational levels, age, and/or generational differences, as only 17 percent of people age 18-29 among the U.S. population attend religious services at least once a week and 25 percent attend once a month or a few times a year (PEW 2015). Pornography use is common among the sample, with 38 percent using pornography between two to three times per week and 18 percent using it daily. Lastly, about 30 percent of the sample indicated they attended some type of rape awareness/prevention workshop.

Bivariate Analyses

Pearson's correlation coefficients are shown in Table 1. Statistically significant positive relationships were found (at the 0.05 level or below) between rape myth acceptance, adherence to dominant masculine ideologies, and being non-Latino Asian. Statistically significant negative relationships were found between rape myth acceptance and being either Latino or non-Latino white. There were no significant relationships between rape myth acceptance and being non-Latino Black, mixed race, or some other race.

Racial/Ethnic Differences in RMA and Adherence to Dominant Masculine Ideologies

To investigate the extent that rape myth acceptance differs by race/ethnicity, a one-way ANOVA was performed on participants' scores on the IRMAS between race/ethnic groups. There was a statistically significant difference between groups, $F(4, 444) = 10.37, p = 0.00$. Post hoc comparisons using the Bonferroni multiple-comparisons test indicated that the mean score for non-Latino Asians ($M = 49.44, SD = 14.12$) was significantly higher compared to non-Latino whites ($M = 39.23, SD = 12.49$) and Latinos

($M = 42.10$, $SD = 14.18$). There were no significant differences in scores on the IRMAS between non-Latino whites, non-Latino Blacks, Latinos, and others. These results suggest that non-Latino Asian college men have greater rape myth acceptance than non-Latino white and Latino college men.

A second one-way ANOVA was performed on participants' scores on the CMNI-22 between race/ethnic groups to investigate whether adherence to dominant masculine ideologies differs by race/ethnicity. There was a statistically significant difference between groups, $F(4, 451) = 5.15$, $p = 0.00$. Post hoc comparisons using the Bonferroni multiple-comparison test indicate that the mean score for non-Latino Asians ($M = 30.90$, $SD = 5.85$) was significantly higher compared to non-Latino whites ($M = 27.75$, $SD = 6.05$) and Latinos ($M = 28.60$, $SD = 6.26$). There were no significant differences in scores on the CMNI between non-Latino whites, non-Latino Blacks, Latinos, and others. These results suggest that non-Latino Asian college men adhere to dominant masculine ideologies to a greater degree than non-Latino white and Latino college men.

Multivariate Analysis

As indicated in Table 2, the regression results show that, controlling for other factors, there is a significant positive relationship between adherence to dominant masculine ideologies and rape myth acceptance. The more a male college student adheres to dominant masculine ideologies the greater his rape myth acceptance. Race/ethnicity is significantly related to rape myth acceptance as well. Because of the low number of non-Latino Black participants ($n = 13$), this category was combined with the mixed race and other race category. Compared to non-Latino Asian men, being Latino, non-Latino

White, or Black, mixed, or another race is associated with less rape myth acceptance. Therefore, non-Latino whites, Latinos, and non-Latino Blacks, mixed raced, or other races are more likely to have significantly less rape myth acceptance than non-Latino Asians.

Regarding control variables, there is a significant positive relationship between heterosexuality and rape myth acceptance, where being heterosexual is associated with greater rape myth acceptance compared to being something other than heterosexual. A significant negative relationship exists between attendance at a rape awareness/prevention workshop and rape myth acceptance, where attending such a workshop is associated with less rape myth acceptance. There are no significant relationships between rape myth acceptance and current frequency of religious attendance, academic class standing, or age.

This model performed well in predicting rape myth acceptance, as it accounts for approximately 24 percent of the variation in rape myth acceptance (adjusted $R^2 = 0.24$, $F = 16.28$, $p < 0.01$), which indicates good model fit.

Discussion

Adherence to Dominant Masculine Ideologies and Rape Myth Acceptance

The primary aim of this study was to investigate the relationship between adherence to dominant masculine ideologies and rape myth acceptance among a diverse sample of college men. This study found that adherence to dominant masculine ideologies significantly predicted rape myth acceptance. The more participants adhered to dominant masculine ideologies, the higher their rape myth acceptance, which confirms the main

hypothesis. This finding is supported by much literature that shows significant positive relationships between the endorsement or belief in dominant masculine ideologies and rape myth acceptance. This finding also advances the literature by showing that it is not just men's beliefs in or endorsement of masculine ideology that matters, but also the degree to which men affectively, behaviorally and cognitively conform to dominant masculine ideology. This is the first study to show such a relationship using a racially, ethnically, and socioeconomically diverse sample of college men.

Future research is needed to explore which and if specific dimensions of dominant masculine ideologies are more important than other dimensions in predicting rape myth acceptance and sexually aggressive behaviors among diverse samples. Future research might employ the full 94 item CMNI to better assess the degree to which of the 11 identified masculinity norms are related to rape myth acceptance and sexually aggressive behaviors. Since many rape myths involve notions about masculinity and men's dominance over women, masculinity norms about dominance and power over women may be particularly salient. Continuing to conceptualize and operationalize dominant masculine ideologies in the United States as highly multidimensional will allow for a fuller, more complex, and less ambiguous way for researchers to understand the relationship between masculinity and sexual aggression. Though consistent relationships have yet to be established, special attention must be made to study diverse samples, as the present research and other research shows significant cross-cultural and racial/ethnic variation in endorsement of, and adherence to, dominant masculine ideologies and rape supportive attitudes.

Race/Ethnicity and Rape Myth Acceptance

The secondary aim of this study was to examine the extent that rape myth acceptance differs by race/ethnicity and socioeconomic status. The results suggest that rape myth acceptance does not significantly vary by socioeconomic status. However, race/ethnicity appears to be a significant source of variation in both rape myth acceptance and adherence to dominant masculine ideologies. Non-Latino Asian men had significantly higher rape myth acceptance and adherence to dominant masculine ideologies compared to non-Latino white, Latino, and non-Latino Black, mixed race, or men of another race.

Some research also finds that Asian men have higher rape myth acceptance compared to white and/or non-Asian men. In a Canadian study, Kennedy and Gorzalko (2002) found that Asian men had significantly higher rape myth acceptance compared to non-Asian men and that increased length of residency in Canada attenuated this difference. Rape myth acceptance among Asian men decreased the longer they lived in Canada, which the authors suggest reflects increased exposure to Western culture or greater acculturation. In a study comparing Asian and white college men's attitudes toward rape, Mori, Bernat, Glenn, Selle, and Zarate (1995) also found that Asian college students had significantly higher rape myth acceptance than white college students. Further, using the Suinn-Lew Asian Self-identity Acculturation Scale, Mori et al. found that highly acculturated Asian men had significantly less rape myth acceptance compared to their low acculturation counterparts. Thus, length of exposure to Western culture or degree of acculturation may play a role in the present findings, though no such data were collected.

Mori et al. (1995) suggest Asian men may have higher rape myth acceptance due to Asian cultural traditions, which tend to endorse a patriarchal structure in which women's status is inferior to that of men (464). Future research is needed to understand the reasons for Asian men's higher rape myth acceptance and to understand the extent to which there is ethnic variation within Asian men's rape myth acceptance, such that one or more ethnic groups may be driving the strong rape myth acceptance among Asian men. For example, 92 percent of participants in Kennedy and Gorzalko (2002) were of Chinese ethnic origin, which means that differences found in rape myth acceptance between Asian and non-Asian men were likely driven by Chinese men's attitudes. A similar phenomenon may have occurred in the present study, though the population from which the present sample was drawn is highly diverse. Nonetheless, similar to Mori et al. and Kennedy and Gorzalko, the present findings suggest the need for specialized, culturally sensitive educational programs that target Asian college men as a potentially high-risk group, which may be helpful in reducing specious beliefs about rape and survivors. Indeed, the present findings show that men who attended a rape awareness/prevention workshop have significantly less rape myth acceptance than men who did not attend such a workshop.

The present findings contradict research that finds African American and Latino men as more accepting of rape myths than white men (e.g., Fischer 1987; Giacomassi and Dull 1986). There were no significant differences between non-Latino African American/Black, Latino, or non-Latino white men. However, whether there were differences between African American/Black men and men of other racial/ethnic

identities cannot be fully determined in the present study due to a low number of men who identified as African American/Black (n = 13). Yet when non-Latino African American/Black men were combined with mixed race and men of another race (i.e., other than white, Latino, Black, Asian) in the multivariate analysis, this combined racial/ethnic category of men had significantly less rape myth acceptance than Asian men.

Despite previous research supporting the present finding regarding Asian men's rape myth acceptance and contradicting findings regarding Latino and African American men, it should be noted that all of the aforementioned studies employed an outdated measure of rape myth acceptance which lacks consistent reliability estimates and has poor psychometric properties. Because the present study used the most updated, reliable, and psychometrically sound measure of rape myth acceptance to date, the relationship found between race/ethnicity and rape myth acceptance potentially carries more weight. Future research should further explore the relationship between race/ethnicity and rape myth acceptance to establish whether there is a consistent relationship using sound measures and racially/ethnically diverse samples. Future research should also explore whether immigrant status (i.e., first generation, second generation, etc.) influences ethnic variation in rape myth acceptance, so we might better understand the source of that variation.

Race/Ethnicity and Adherence to Dominant Masculine Ideologies

The relationship between rape myth acceptance and adherence to dominant masculine ideologies might be related to the high rape myth acceptance among non-Latino Asian men, as the results show that non-Latino Asian men also adhere to dominant masculine ideologies to a greater degree than non-Latino white men and Latino men. Interpreted

another way, this finding suggests that non-Latino Asian men conform to the ideals of hegemonic masculinity to a greater degree than non-Latino white men and Latino men in this sample. In addition to cultural influences, degree of acculturation, and/or immigrant status, greater conformity to hegemonic masculinity might be related to non-Latino Asian men's higher levels of rape myth acceptance. There is support for this finding in the literature, and the term "gendered racism" (Essed 1990) is useful in discussing how this finding is supported by previous research.

Essed (1990) used "gendered racism" to describe how women of color experience both sexism and racism independently and concurrently, but as Liang, Rivera, Nathwani, Dang, and Douroux (2010) argue, this term is also instructive for understanding the psychological well-being and functioning of Asian American men. With this view, non-Latino Asian participants in the present study should be understood in the context of how they might experience race, gender, and gender-based race stereotypes. The way that men experience their gender and race is influenced by how mainstream (i.e., white, Western) culture constructs stereotypes and controlling images of specific groups of men of color. In this way the attitudes, thoughts, and behaviors of men of color are a reflection of how they manage the manner in which the dominant group constructs their masculinity (Liang, Salcedo, and Miller 2011). For example, early stereotypes portrayed Asian American men as lascivious, menacing, and threats to the purity of white women. This image has transformed into one that portrays Asian men as sexless, feminine, and/or emasculated (Phua 2007). As Chen (1996) writes, "...they are seen as socially unskilled, grossly unathletic, and sexually unattractive when younger..." (590). So while the

content of specific stereotypes changes across time, the representation remains overwhelmingly negative.

Research shows that Asian men aim to better fit into hegemonic ideals in an attempt to cope with and/or resist dominant depictions of Asian men in mainstream society. For example, among her sample of Southeast Asian American boys, Lei (2003) found that they adopted markers of masculinity associated with African American culture in an effort to achieve toughness and "...to counteract the construction of them as masculine Other" (177). Lei suggests that the choice her participants made to adopt markers of Black masculinity enabled them to attain a tougher image because Black masculinity is stereotyped as hypermasculine and a threat to white male privilege (Ferguson 2000, cited in Lei 2003: 177). In doing so they resisted the negative production of themselves and their masculinity as degraded and less than. While the adoption of markers typically associated with Black masculinity still do not conform to hegemonic ideals, it still represents a "better fit" with hegemonic ideals, which emphasize toughness. Further, Levant et al. (2007) find that Asian American men endorse dominant masculine ideologies to a greater degree than European Americans. Additionally, studies comparing the endorsement of dominant masculine ideologies between Chinese and American college students found that Chinese students endorsed dominant masculine ideologies more than Americans (Levant, Wu, and Fischer 1996; Wu, Levant, and Sellers 2001). This previous research provides further support to the present findings, which should be considered in light of the fact that Asian men must negotiate the masculinity requirements of their own culture, masculinity requirements of the dominant culture, and

how their masculinity is portrayed in dominant culture when constructing and performing their masculinity (Lazur and Majors 1995), which may explain the high levels of adherence to dominant masculine ideologies among non-Latino Asian men in this study.

Male Dominated Organizations and Rape Myth Acceptance

While some studies investigating the association between rape myth acceptance and fraternity affiliation find a significant positive relationship (Murnen and Kohlman 2007), this study found no relationship between rape myth acceptance, organized sports participation, or fraternity affiliation. This may be due to sampling, because while fraternity affiliation among this sample was moderate, fraternity membership was quite low (n = 56). Research that finds relationships between attitudes toward rape, sexually aggressive behaviors, and fraternity affiliation most often looks at fraternity members, where being affiliated through having only pledged or rushed a fraternity is not the same as membership and yields different effects (e.g., Boeringer 1996; Tyler, Hoyt, and Whitbeck 1998). While Lackie and de Man (1997) found a relationship between attitudes toward women, sexual aggression, and fraternity affiliation (as measured in the present study), 34 percent of their sample were fraternity members (compared to 12 percent in the present study). Further, organized sports participation was assessed with a single yes/no item, which may not be enough information to determine a relationship with rape myth acceptance. Other information such as which particular sports participants engage in, how often, whether participation is informal or formal, and how long participants have been involved in the sport may be important in understanding and establishing a relationship with rape myth acceptance. Future research that seeks to investigate the

relationship between male dominated organizations, rape supportive attitudes, and/or sexually aggressive behaviors should make special efforts to recruit research participants involved in those groups.

The lack of a finding regarding fraternity affiliation may also be due to the nature of the sample under study and the fact that fraternities are not homogenous (e.g., Boswell and Spade 1996). The university where this study took place enrolls high numbers of first generation and racial/ethnic minority students from diverse socioeconomic backgrounds, which is reflected in this study's sample. Meanwhile, most studies that investigate the relationship between fraternity affiliation and rape myth acceptance and/or sexual aggression mostly emanates from overwhelmingly white, middle class populations which may result in qualitatively different fraternity cultures. Since many students in the present sample might be first generation college students and are racial/ethnic minorities, they may experience more positive aspects of fraternity life in healthier, less hostile environments. White and middle class student experiences of fraternities may be more likely to occur at intersections of privilege and power, where rape myth acceptance and sexual aggression may be cultivated and reproduced to a higher degree. Future research should investigate the impact of first generation student status, race/ethnicity, and socioeconomic status in the relationship between fraternity affiliation and rape myth acceptance.

Limitations

It is important to note the limitations of this study. While this study is one of few that investigated the relationship between socioeconomic status and rape myth acceptance, it

did so using parents' educational attainment as a proxy, which may not have accurately accounted for socioeconomic status. Future research should use more precise measures of socioeconomic status. Additionally, while this sample is highly diverse the results may not generalize to other diverse young adult populations or geographic regions. Further, the use of an abbreviated instrument to measure adherence to dominant masculine ideologies (i.e., CMNI-22) potentially limits the interpretability of the results and precludes analysis of which specific dimensions of dominant masculine ideologies are associated with more or less variance in rape myth acceptance. Future research would benefit from using the full CMNI or less abbreviated versions, such as the CMNI-46 (Parent and Moradi 2011). Lastly, while rigid adherence to hegemonic masculinity has been linked to sexual assault perpetration, this study did not assess participants' sexually aggressive behaviors or perpetration of sexual assault. More research is needed investigating the relationship between dominant masculine ideologies and sexual assault perpetration, especially among diverse populations.

Despite these limitations, this study shed light on the relationship between adherence to dominant masculine ideologies and rape myth acceptance and on important racial/ethnic variation in rape myth acceptance. These findings may suggest the need for culturally relevant and culturally sensitive intervention and educational programs. A primary aim of such programs should be to reduce erroneous attitudes and beliefs about rape as well as harmful, limiting beliefs about masculinity among young men—all of which are instrumental in high rates of sexual violence against women—thereby enhancing women's and men's lives.

References

- Abreu, M., Rod Goodyear, Alvaro Campos, and Michael D. Newcomb. 2000. "Ethnic Belonging and Traditional Masculinity Ideology Among African Americans, European Americans, and Latinos." *Psychology of Men and Masculinity* 1(2): 75-86.
- Allen, Mike, Tara Emmers, and Lisa Gebhardt. 1995. "Exposure to Pornography and Acceptance of Rape Myths." *Journal of Communication* 45(1): 5-26.
- Basile, Kathleen. 2002. "Attitudes Toward Wife Rape: Effects of Social Background and Victim Status." *Violence and Victims* 17(3): 341-354.
- Bem, Sandra L. 1974. "The Measurement of Psychological Androgyny." *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology* 42(2): 155-162.
- Blazina, Christopher, Rachel Eddins, Andrea Backsheider Burrige, and Anna Settle. 2007. "The Relationship Between Masculinity Ideology, Loneliness, and Separation-Individuation Difficulties." *The Journal of Men's Studies* 15(1): 101-109.
- Bleecker, E. Timothy and Sarah K. Murnen. 2005. "Fraternity Membership, the Display of Degrading Sexual Images of Women, and Rape Myth Acceptance." *Sex Roles* 53(7): 487-493.
- Boeringer, Scot B. 1996. "Influences of Fraternity Membership, Athletics, and Male Living Arrangements on Sexual Aggression." *Violence Against Women* 2(2): 134-147.
- Bohner, Gerd, Marc-Andre Reinhard, Stefanie Rutz, Sabine Sturm, Bernd Kerschbaum, and Dagmar Effler. 1998. "Rape Myths as Neutralizing Cognitions: Evidence for a Causal Impact of Anti-Victim Attitudes on Men's Self-Reported Likelihood of Raping." *European Journal of Social Psychology* 28(2): 257-268.
- Boswell, A. Ayres and Joan Z. Spade. 1996. "Fraternities and Collegiate Rape Culture: Why Are Some Fraternities More Dangerous Places for Women?" *Gender & Society* 10(2): 133-147.
- Breiding, Matthew J., Sharon G. Smith, Kathleen C. Basile, Mikel L. Walters, Jieru Chen, and Melissa T. Merrick. "Prevalence and Characteristics of Sexual Violence, Stalking, and Intimate Partner Violence Victimization-National Intimate Partner and Sexual Violence Survey, United States, 2011." 2014. Atlanta, GA: National Center for Disease Control and Prevention.
- Brownmiller, Susan. 1975. *Against Our Will: Men, Women, and Rape*. New York, NY: Fawcett Books.

- Buddie, Amy M. and Arthur G. Miller. 2002. "Beyond Rape Myths: A More Complex View of Perceptions of Rape Victims." *Sex Roles* 45(3-4): 139-160.
- Buhi, Eric R. 2005. "Reliability Reporting Practices in Rape Myth Research." *Journal of School Health* 75(2): 63-66.
- Bunting, Alyce B. and Joy B. Reeves. 1983. "Perceived Male Sex Orientation and Beliefs about Rape." *Deviant Behavior* 4(3-4): 281-295.
- Burt, Martha R. 1980. "Cultural Myths and Supports for Rape." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 38(2): 217-230.
- Burt, Marth R. and Rochelle Semmel Albin. 1981. "Rape Myths, Rape Definitions, and Probability of Conviction." *Journal of Applied Social Psychology* 11(3): 212-230.
- Carrigan, Tim, Bob Connell, and John Lee. 1985. "Toward a New Sociology of Masculinity." *Theory and Society* 14(5): 551-604.
- Chapleau, Kristine M. and Debra L. Oswald. 2013. "Status, Threat, and Stereotypes: Understanding the Function of Rape Myth Acceptance." *Social Justice Research* 26(1): 18- 41.
- Chen, Anthony 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(5): 584-607.
- Connell, Raewyn W. 2005. *Masculinities*. Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- Connell, Raewyn W. and James W. Messerschmidt. 2005. "Hegemonic Masculinity: Rethinking the Concept." *Gender and Society* 19(6): 829-859.
- Cowan, Gloria and Wendy J. Quinton. 1997. "Cognitive Style and Attitudinal Correlates of the Perceived Causes of Rape Scale." *Psychology of Women Quarterly* 21(2): 227-245.
- David, Deborah S. and Robert Brannon (Eds.). 1976. *The Forty-Nine Percent Majority: The Male Sex Role*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Demetriou, Demetrakis Z. 2001. "Connell's Concept of Hegemonic Masculinity: A Critique." *Theory and Society* 30(3): 337-361.
- Donaldson, Mike. 1993. "What Is Hegemonic Masculinity?" *Theory and Society* 22(5): 643-657.

- Dull, R. Thomas and David J. Giacopassi. 1987. "Demographic Correlates of Sexual and Dating Attitudes: A Study of Date Rape." *Criminal Justice and Behavior* 14(2): 175-193.
- Du Mont, Janice and Deborah Parnis. 1999. "Judging Women: The Pernicious Effects of Rape Mythology." *Canadian Woman Studies* 19(1-2): 102-109.
- Edwards, Sarah R., Kathryn A. Bradshaw, and Verlin B. Hinsz. 2014. "Denying Rape but Endorsing Forceful Intercourse: Exploring Differences Among Responders." *Violence and Gender* 1(4): 188-193.
- Edwards, Katie M., Jessica A. Turchik, Christina M. Dardis, Nicole Reynolds, and Christine A. Gidycz. 2011. "Rape Myths: History, Individual and Institutional-Level Presence, and Implications for Change." *Sex Roles* 65(11-12): 761-773.
- Essed, Philomena. 1990. *Everyday Racism: Reports from Women of Two Cultures*. Claremont, CA: Hunter House.
- Ferguson, Ann Arnett. 2000. *Bad Boys: Public Schools in the Making of Black Masculinity*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Fischer, Gloria J. 1987. "Hispanic and Majority Student Attitudes Toward Forcible Date Rape as a Function of Differences in Attitudes Toward Women." *Sex Roles* 17(1): 93-101.
- Forbes, Gordon B., Leah E. Adams-Curtis, and Kay B. White. 2004. "First- and Second-Generation Measures of Sexism, Rape Myths and Related Beliefs, and Hostility Toward Women: Their Interrelationships and Association with College Students' Experiences with Dating Aggression and Sexual Coercion." *Violence Against Women* 10(3): 236-261.
- Foubert, John D. Matthew W. Brosi, and R. Sean Bannon. 2011. "Pornography Viewing among Fraternity Men: Effects on Bystander Intervention, Rape Myth Acceptance and Behavioral Intent to Commit Sexual Assault." *Sexual Addiction & Compulsivity* 18(4): 212-231.
- Frazier, Patrica, Gale Valtinson, and Suzanne Candell. 1994. "Evaluation of a Coeducational Interactive Rape Prevention Program." *Journal of Counseling and Development* 73(2): 153-158.
- Frey Meyer, Robert H. 1997. "Rape Myths and Religiosity." *Sociological Spectrum* 17(4): 473-489.

- Gale, Steven R. 1996. "Male Role Norm Endorsement and Acquaintance Sexual Aggression Among College Students." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Psychological Association, Toronto, Ontario, Canada.
- Gallagher, Kathryn E. and Dominic J. Parrott. 2011. "What Accounts for Men's Hostile Attitudes Toward Women? The Influence of Hegemonic Male Role Norms and Masculine Gender Role Stress." *Violence Against Women* 17(5): 568-583.
- Giacopassi, David J. and Thomas Dull. 1986. "Gender and Racial Differences in the Acceptance of Rape Myths within a College Population." *Sex Roles* 15(1): 63-75.
- Good, Glenn E. and Nancy B. Sherrod. 2001. "The Psychology of Men and Masculinity: Research Status and Future Directions." Pp. 201-214 in *Handbook of the Psychology of Women and Gender*, edited by R.K. Unger. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Good, Glenn E., Mary J. Heppner, Theresa Hillenbrand-Gunn, and Li-Fei Wang. 1995. "Sexual and Psychological Violence: An Exploratory Study of Predictors in College Men." *The Journal of Men's Studies* 4(1): 59-71.
- Hamilton, Lawrence. 2013. *Statistics with STATA: Updated for Version 12*. Boston, MA: Brooks/Cole.
- Hamilton, Christopher J. and James R. Mahalik. 2009. "Minority Stress, Masculinity, and Social Norms Predicting Gay Men's Health Risk Behaviors." *Journal of Counseling Psychology* 56(1): 132-141.
- Hinck, Shelly Schaefer and Richard W. Thomas. 1999. "Rape Myth Acceptance in College Students: How Far Have We Come?" *Sex Roles* 40(9-10): 815-832.
- Hockett, Jericho M., Donald A. Saucier, Bethany H. Hoffman, Sara J. Smith, and Adam Craig. 2009. "Oppression Through Acceptance? Predicting Rape Myth Acceptance and Attitudes Toward Rape Victims." *Violence Against Women* 15(8): 877-897.
- Jakupcak, Matthew, David Lisak, and Lizabeth Roemer. 2002. "The role of Masculine Ideology and Masculine Gender Role Stress in Men's Perpetration of Relationship Violence." *Psychology of Men and Masculinity* 3(2): 97-106.
- Johnson, Barbara E., Douglas L. Kuck, and Patricia R. Schander. 1997. "Rape Myth Acceptance and Sociodemographic Characteristics: A Multidimensional Analysis." *Sex Roles* 36(11-12): 693-707.
- Jozkowski, Kristen N. and Zoe D. Peterson. 2013. "College Students and Sexual Consent: Unique Insights." *Journal of Sex Research* 50(6): 517-523.

- Kahlor, LeeAnn and Dan Morrison. 2007. "Television Viewing and Rape Myth Acceptance among College Women." *Sex Roles* 56(11-12): 729-739.
- Kalof, Linda and Bruce H. Wade. 1995. "Sexual Attitudes and Experiences with Sexual Coercion: Exploring the Influence of Race and Gender." *Journal of Black Psychology* 21(3): 224-238.
- Kennedy, Alexis M. and Boris B. Gorzalka. 2002. "Asian and Non-Asian Attitudes Toward Rape, Sexual Harassment, and Sexuality." *Sex Roles* 46(7): 227-238.
- Kershner, Ruth. 1996. "Adolescent Attitudes About Rape." *Adolescence* 31(121): 29-33.
- Koss, Mary P. 1998. "Hidden Rape: Sexual Aggression and Victimization in a National Sample of Students in Higher Education." Pp. 3-25 in *Rape and Sexual Assault, Vol. II*, edited by A.M. Burgess. New York, NY: Garland Press.
- Koss, Mary P. and Thomas E. Dinero. 1988. "Predictors of Sexual Aggression Among a National Sample of Male College Students." *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences* 528: 133-147.
- Koss, Mary P. and John A. Gaines. 1993. "The Prediction of Sexual Aggression by Alcohol Use, Athletic Participation, and Fraternity Affiliation." *Journal of Interpersonal Violence* 8(1): 94-108.
- Krebs, Christopher P., Christine H. Lindquist, Tara D. Warner, Bonnie S. Fisher, and Sandra L. Martin. 2009. "College Women's Experiences with Physically Forced, Alcohol- or Other Drug-Enabled, and Drug-Facilitated Sexual Assault Before and Since Entering College." *Journal of American College Health* 57(6): 639-649.
- Lazur, Richard F. and Richard Majors. 1995. "Men of Color: Ethnocultural Variations of Male Gender Role Strain." Pp. 11-32 in *A New Psychology of Men* edited by R. Levant and W. Pollack. New York: Basic Books Inc.
- Lei, Joy L. 2003. "(Un)Necessary Toughness?: Those 'Loud Black Girls' and Those 'Quiet Asian Boys.'" Pp. 158-181 in *Contemporary Asian American Communities* edited by L. T. Vo and R. Bonus. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Levant, Ronald F. and J. Fischer. 1998. "The Male Role Norms Inventory." Pp. 469-472 in *Sexuality-Related Measures: A Compendium* edited by C.M. Davis, W.H. Yarber, R. Bauserman, G. Schreer, and S.L. Davis. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Levant, Ronald F. and Richard G. Majors. 1997. "An Investigation into Variations in the Construction of the Male Gender Role Among African American and European American Women and Men." *Journal of Gender, Culture, and Health* 2: 33-43.

- Levant, Ronald F., Richard G. Majors, and Michelle L. Kelley. 1998. "Masculinity Ideology Among Young African American and European American Women and Men in Different Regions of the United States." *Cultural Diversity and Mental Health* 4(3): 227-236.
- Levant, Ronald F., Linda S. Hirsch, Elizabeth Celentano, Tracy M. Cozza, et al. 1992. "The Male Role: An Investigation of Contemporary Norms." *Journal of Mental Health Counseling* 14(3): 325-337.
- Levant, Ronald F. and Katherine Richmond. 2007. "A Review of Research on Masculinity Ideologies Using the Male Role Norms Inventory." *The Journal of Men's Studies* 15(2): 130-146.
- Levant, Ronald F., Katherine Richmond, Richard G. Majors, Jaime E. Inclan, Jeannette M. Rossello, George T. Rowan, Martin Heesacker, and Alfred Sellers. 2003. "A Multicultural Investigation of Masculinity Ideology and Alexithymia." *Psychology of Men and Masculinity* 4(2): 91-99.
- Levant, Ronald F., Thomas J. Rankin, Christine M. Williams, Nadia T. Hasan, and K. Bryant Smalley. 2010. "Evaluation of the Factor Structure and Construct Validity of Scores on the Male Role Norms Inventory—Revised (MRNI-R)." *Psychology of Men and Masculinity* 11(1): 25-37.
- Levant, Ronald F., K. Bryant Smalley, Maryse Aupont, A. Tanner House, Katherine Richmond, and Delilah Noronha. 2007. "Initial Validation of the Male Role Norms Inventory-Revised (MRNI-R)." *The Journal of Men's Studies* 15(1): 83-100.
- Levant, Ronald F., R. Wu and J. Fischer. 1996. "Masculinity Ideology: A Comparison Between U.S. and Chinese Young Men and Women." *Journal of Gender, Culture, and Health* 1: 217-220.
- Liang, Christopher T. H., Amanda L. Y. Rivera, Anisha Nathwani, Phillip Dang, and Ashley N. Douroux. 2010. "Dealing With Gendered Racism and Racial Identity Among Asian American Men." Pp. 63-81 in *Culturally Responsive Counseling with Asian American Men*, edited by W. M. Liu, D. Iwamoto, and M. Chae. New York: Routledge Press.
- Liang, Christopher T. H., Jime Salcedo, and Holly A. Miller. 2011. "Perceived Racism, Masculinity Ideologies, and Gender Role Conflict Among Latino Men." *Psychology of Men & Masculinity* 12(3): 201-215.

- Liu, William M. 2002. "Exploring the Lives of Asian American Men: Racial Identity, Male Role Norms, Gender Role Conflict, and Prejudicial Attitudes." *Psychology of Men and Masculinity* 3(2): 107-118.
- Locke, Benjamin D. and James R. Mahalik. 2005. "Examining Masculinity Norms, Problem Drinking, and Athletic Involvement as Predictors of Sexual Aggression in College Men." *Journal of Counseling Psychology* 52(3): 279-283.
- Loh, Catherine, Christine A. Gidycz, Tracy R. Lobo, and Rohini Luthra. 2005. "A Prospective Analysis of Sexual Assault Perpetration: Risk Factors Related to Perpetrator Characteristics." *Journal of Interpersonal Violence* 20(10): 1325-1348.
- Lonsway, Kimberly A. and Louise F. Fitzgerald. 1994. "Rape Myths: In Review." *Psychology of Women Quarterly* 18(2): 133-164.
- Lutz-Zois, Catherin J., Karisa A. Moler, and Mitchell J. Brown. 2015. "Mechanisms for the Relationship Between Traditional Masculine Ideologies and Rape Myth Acceptance Among College Men." *Journal of Aggression, Maltreatment and Trauma* 24(1): 84-101.
- Mahalik, James R., Benjamin D. Locke, Larry H. Ludlow, Matthew A. Diemer, Michael Gottfried, Ryan P.J. Scott, and Gary Freitas. 2003. "Development of the Conformity to Masculine Norms Inventory." *Psychology of Men and Masculinity* 4(1): 3-25.
- Malamuth, Neil M. 1989a. "The Attraction to Sexual Aggression Scale: Part One." *Journal of Sex Research* 26(1): 26-49.
- Malamuth, Neil M. 1989b. "The Attraction to Sexual Aggression Scale: Part Two." *Journal of Sex Research* 26(3): 324-354.
- McDermott, Ryon C., Christopher Kilmartin, Daniel K. McKelvey, and Matthew M. Kridel. 2015. "Toward Advancing Research on College Male Sexual Assault of Women and the Psychology of Men." *Psychology of Men and Masculinity* 16(4): 379-381.
- McMahon, Sarah. 2010. "Rape Myth Beliefs and Bystander Attitudes Among Incoming College Students." *Journal of American College Health* 59(1): 3-11.
- McMahon, Sarah and G. Lawrence Farmer. 2011. "An Updated Measure for Assessing Subtle Rape Myths." *Social Work Research* 35(2): 71-81.
- Messerschmidt, James W. 2012. "Engendering Gendered Knowledge: Assessing the Academic Appropriation of Hegemonic Masculinity." *Men and Masculinities* 15(1): 56-76.

- Mori, Lisa, Jeffrey A. Bernat, Patricia A. Glenn, Lynn L. Selle, and Mylene G. Zarate. 1995. "Attitudes Toward Rape: Gender and Ethnic Differences Across Asian and Caucasian College Students." *Sex Roles* 32(7-8): 457-467.
- Mosher, Donald L. and Mark Sirkin. 1984. "Measuring a Macho Personality Constellation." *Journal of Research in Personality* 18(2): 150-163.
- Muehlenhard, Charlene L. and Melaney A. Linton. 1987. "Date Rape and Sexual Aggression in Dating Situations: Incidence and Risk Factors." *Journal of Counseling Psychology* 34(2): 186-196.
- Murnen, Sarah K. 2015. "A Social Constructivist Approach to Understanding the Relationship Between Masculinity and Sexual Aggression." *Psychology of Men and Masculinity* 16(4): 370-373.
- Murnen, Sarah K. and Marla H. Kohlman. 2007. "Athletic Participation, Fraternity Membership, and Sexual Aggression Among College Men: A Meta-analytic Review." *Sex Roles* 57(1): 145-157.
- Murnen, Sarah K., Carrie Wright, and Gretchen Kaluzny. 2002. "If 'Boys Will Be Boys,' Then Girls Will Be Victims? A Meta-Analytic Review of the Research That Relates Masculine Ideology to Sexual Aggression." *Sex Roles* 46(11): 359-375.
- Nemoto, Kumiko. 2008. "Climbing the Hierarchy of Masculinity: Asian American Men's Cross-Racial Competition for Intimacy with White Women." *Gender Issues* 25(2): 80-100.
- Page, Amy Dellinger. 2008. "Gateway to Reform? Policy Implications of Police Officers' Attitudes Toward Rape." *American Journal of Criminal Justice* 33(1): 44-58.
- Parent, Mike C. and Bonnie Moradi. 2011. "An Abbreviated Tool for Assessing Conformity to Masculine Norms: Psychometric Properties of the Conformity to Masculine Norms Inventory-46." *Psychology of Men & Masculinity* 12(4): 339-353.
- Payne, Diana L., Kimberly A. Lonsway, and Louise F. Fitzgerald. 1999. "Rape Myth Acceptance: Exploration of Its Structure and Its Measurement Using the Illinois Rape Myth Acceptance Scale." *Journal of Research in Personality* 33(1): 27-68.
- PEW. 2015. "U.S. Public Becoming Less Religious: Modest Drop in Overall Rates of Belief and Practice, but Religiously Affiliated Americans Are as Observant as Before." Retrieved May 8, 2016 (<http://www.pewforum.org/2015/11/03/u-s-public-becoming-less-religious/>).

- Phua, Voon Chin. 2007. "Contesting and Maintaining Hegemonic Masculinities: Gay Asian American Men in Mate Selection." *Sex Roles* 57(11): 909-918.
- Pleck, Joseph H., Freya L. Sonenstein, and Leighton C. Ku. 1993. "Masculinity Ideology: Its Impact on Adolescent Males' Heterosexual Relationships." *Journal of Social Issues* 49(3): 11-29.
- Reynolds, William M. 1982. "Development of Reliable and Valid Short Forms of the Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale." *Journal of Clinical Psychology* 38(1): 119-125.
- Schwendinger, Julia R. and Herman Schwendinger. 1974. "Rape Myths: In Legal, Theoretical, and Everyday Practice." *Crime and Social Justice* 1(1): 18-26.
- Smith, Rachel M., Dominic J. Parrott, Kevin M. Swartout, and Andra Teten Tharp. 2015. "Deconstructing Hegemonic Masculinity: The Roles of Antifemininity, Subordination to Women, and Sexual Dominance in Men's Perpetration of Sexual Aggression." *Psychology of Men and Masculinity* 16(2): 160-169.
- Spence, Janet T and Robert L. Helmreich. 1978. *Masculinity & Femininity: Their Psychological Dimensions, Correlates, and Antecedents*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Spohn, Cassia and Julia Horney. 1996. "The Impact of Rape Law Reform on the Processing of Simple and Aggravated Rape Cases." *Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology* 86(3): 861-872.
- Suarez, Eliana and Tahany M. Gadalla. 2010. "Stop Blaming the Victim: A Meta-Analysis on Rape Myths." *Journal of Interpersonal Violence* 25(11): 2010-2035.
- Thompson, Edward H. and Elizabeth J. Cracco. 2008. "Sexual Aggression in Bars: What College Men Can Normalize." *The Journal of Men's Studies* 16(1): 82-96.
- Thompson, Edward H. and Joseph H. Pleck. 1986. "The Structure of Male Norms." *American Behavioral Scientist* 29(5): 531-543.
- Thompson, Edward H. and Joseph H. Pleck. 1995. "Masculinity Ideologies: A Review of Research Instrumentation on Men and Masculinities." Pp. 129-163 in *A New Psychology of Men*, edited by R.F. Levant and W.S. Pollack. New York: Basic Books.
- Thompson, Edward H. and Kate M. Bennett. 2015. "Measurement of Masculinity Ideologies: A (Critical) Review." *Psychology of Men and Masculinity* 16(2): 115-133.

- Truman, Dana M., David M. Tokar, and Ann R. Fischer. 1996. "Dimensions of Masculinity: Relations to Date Rape Supportive Attitudes and Sexual Aggression in Dating Situations." *Journal of Counseling and Development* 74(6): 555-562.
- Tyler, Kimberly A., Danny R. Hoyt, and Les B. Whitbeck. 1998. "Coercive Sexual Strategies." *Violence and Victims* 13(1): 47-61.
- Walker, Donald F., David M. Tokar, and Ann R. Fischer. 2000. "What Are Eight Popular Masculinity-Related Instruments Measuring? Underlying Dimensions and Their Relations to Sociosexuality." *Psychology of Men and Masculinity* 1(2): 98-108.
- Ward, Monique L. Ann Merriwether, and Allison Caruthers. 2006. "Breasts are for Men: Media, Masculinity Ideologies, and Men's Beliefs about Women's Bodies." *Sex Roles* 55(9): 703-714.
- Wu, R., Ronald F. Levant, and A. Sellers. 2001. "The Influence of Sex and Social Development on Masculinity Ideology of Chinese Undergraduate Students." *Chinese Psychological Society* 24: 365-366.

Table 1. Descriptive and Bivariate Statistics (N = 456)

Variable	Mean (SD)	Correlation with rape myth acceptance
Rape myth acceptance	44.42 (14.43)	1.00
Adherence to dominant masculine ideologies	29.39 (6.15)	0.37*
Race/ethnicity		
Latino	0.35 (0.48)	- 0.12*
Non-Latino Asian or Pacific Islander	0.38 (0.49)	0.27*
Non-Latino White	0.20 (0.40)	- 0.18*
Non-Latino Black	0.03 (0.17)	- 0.06
Mixed race or other race	0.04 (0.20)	0.02
Heterosexuality ¹	0.83 (0.37)	0.20*
Attended rape awareness/prevention workshop	0.29 (0.45)	- 0.15*
Current frequency of religious attendance	1.89 (0.75)	0.12*
Current frequency of pornography use	5.24 (1.42)	- 0.00
Academic class standing		
Lower division student	0.38 (0.49)	0.11*
Upper division student	0.45 (0.50)	0.05
Graduate student	0.17 (0.38)	- 0.22*
Age	22.71 (4.81)	- 0.20*
Fraternity affiliation ²	0.20 (0.40)	0.06
Organized sports participation ³	0.18 (0.38)	0.06
Mother's educational attainment	3.88 (1.59)	- 0.01
Father's educational attainment	4.08 (1.77)	0.04
Mother's and father's combined educational attainment	7.96 (3.06)	0.02
¹ Compared to other race		
² Compared to no fraternity affiliation		
³ Compared to no sports participation		
*p < 0.05		

Table 2. Multiple Regression Predicting Participants' Rape Myth Acceptance (n = 435)

Variable	b (std. err.)	B
Adherence to dominant masculine ideologies	0.70 (0.10)	0.30**
Heterosexuality ¹	6.23 (1.64)	0.16**
Attended rape awareness/prevention workshop ²	-3.90 (1.34)	-0.12**
Race/ethnicity ³		
Latino	-4.59 (1.43)	-0.15**
Non-Latino White	-5.22 (1.84)	-0.14**
Non-Latino Black, mixed race, and other race	-5.49 (2.55)	-0.10*
Current frequency of religious attendance	0.97 (0.80)	0.05
Academic class standing	-1.57 (1.14)	-0.08
Age	-0.24 (0.17)	-0.08
Intercept = 28.98		
R ² = 0.26		
Adjusted R ² = 0.24		
F = 16.28**		

¹ Compared to other

² Compared to no attendance

³ Compared to non-Latino Asian men

*p < 0.05, **p < 0.01