

Sexual Identity Self-Labeling, Developmental Statuses, and Traditional Gender Norms
Among Latino Men Who Have Sex with Men: Criterion Related Validity Estimates for
the Measure of Sexual Identity Exploration and Commitment (MoSIEC)

by

Beth Ann Rosenberg

A Thesis Presented in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Master of Arts

Approved January 2021 by the
Graduate Supervisory Committee:

Frank Dillon, Chair
Ashley Randall
Lindsey Buckman

ARIZONA STATE UNIVERSITY

May 2021

ABSTRACT

Latino men who have sex with men (LMSM) may repress gay, bisexual identities due to internalized homophobia and other sociocultural influences. The impact of Latino traditional gender roles, machismo and caballerismo, have not been examined with LMSM who may or may not identify as gay or bisexual. The purpose of the present study is to examine relations between self-labeled sexual identity, sexual identity developmental status, and traditional gender norms among Latino men who have sex with men (LMSM). The sample consisted of 499 LMSM, ($M_{age} = 30.79$), who endorsed engaging in same-sex sexual behavior. Results suggest evidence of concurrent validity of The Measure of Sexual Identity Exploration and Commitment (MoSIEC) with LMSM. Also, men who identified as heterosexual reported relatively higher levels of machismo and caballerismo. Implications for sexual identity development theory and research with LMSM is provided.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES	iv
CHAPTER	
1. INTRODUCTION	1
Sexual Orientation Identity	1
Latino Gender Norms	3
Self Identity Exploration and Commitment	4
Current Study	5
2. METHOD	7
Participants	7
Procedure	8
Measures	9
3. ANALYTIC PLAN	12
4. RESULTS	14
MANOVA of Sexual Identity and Sexual Identity Developmental Status ..	14
MANOVA of Sexual Identity and Traditional Latino Gender Norms	16
Correlations between Sexual Identity Developmental Status and Traditional Latino Gender Norms	17
5. DISCUSSION	18
Uncertainty	18
Exploration	19
Commitment	21

CHAPTER	Page
Synthesis	22
Traditional Masculine Gender Norms and Self-Identified Sexual Labels ...	23
Traditional Masculine Gender Norms and Sexual Identity Development Status.....	24
Strengths, Limitations, and Future Research	25
REFERENCES	27
 APPENDIX	
A PSYCHOMETRIC PROPERTIES OF THE MAJOR STUDY	
VARIABLES	31
B DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS & CORRELATIONS.....	33
C IRB APPROVAL	35

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1.	Psychometric Properties of the Major Study Variables	32
2.	Descriptive Statistics and Correlations for Study Variables	34

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Identity development is a complex process that once was thought to only occur in adolescents (ages 12-18, Erikson, 1950). However, more recently, identity development has been applied well into adulthood (e.g., Arnette, 2000; Schwartz, 2001). Sexual orientation identity exploration is a key aspect of identity development (Moreira et al., 2015). For the purposes of this study, sexual orientation identity (also referred to as sexual identity) is defined as an individual's conscious acknowledgement and internalization of sexual orientation (Dillon et al., 2011). This process of sexual identity development is posited to be universal to all individuals regardless of one's sexual orientation identity (Dillon et al., 2011; Worthington et al., 2008).

Moreira et al. (2015) and Rosario et al. (2004) found that Latinx cultural gender norms impact sexual identity development particularly in relation to more negative mental health outcomes. However, no research has explored the ways in which Latinx culture might affect aspects of sexual identity development (uncertainty, exploration, commitment, and synthesis) who do and do not identify as a bisexual or gay. The purpose of the present study is to examine relations between self-labeled sexual identity, sexual identity developmental status, and gender norms among heterosexual, bisexual, and gay-identified Latino men who reported having sex with men (LMSM) in the past year – an eligibility criterion of the present study.

Sexual Orientation Identity

When discussing sexual identity, it is important to note that not all men who have sex with men (MSM) identify as gay or bisexual (Montgomery et al., 2003; Wolitski et

al., 2006). In fact, some self-labeled straight and gay individuals may exhibit seemingly “bisexual behavior,” but do not categorically identify themselves as bisexual (e.g., Carrillo & Hoffman, 2018; Dillon et al., 2011; Ward, 2008; Ward, 2015). For the purposes of this study, bisexual behavior is defined as sexual attraction and sexual behavior with different and same sex partners. However, only recent research has begun to examine the exploration of sexual behavior of straight/heterosexual identifying individuals. This phenomenon of self-identified straight individuals has been mainly studied in relation to women (Diamond, 2000; 2003; 2008) with some cross over to men of color, typically Black men (Bond et al., 2009; Millet et al., 2005). However, most research involving straight identified men has been in relation to HIV and drug research (Bond et al., 2009; Millet et al., 2005). This could be due to the taboo nature of straight men questioning or exploring their sexual identity, something that is significantly less taboo and at times encouraged for women (Diamond, 2000; 2003; 2008). With that being said, recent research has begun exploring a *heteroflexible* identity in white, straight identifying MSM (Carrillo & Hoffman, 2018; Vrangalova & Savin-Williams, 2012; Ward, 2008; Ward, 2015). Yet, this has yet to cross over to straight identifying LMSM. Some men may view their “bisexual behavior” as experimentation, sexual fluidity, and/or as a general expansion of the spectrum of sexual orientation (Carrillo & Hoffman, 2018; Vrangalova & Savin-Williams, 2012; Ward, 2008; Ward, 2015; Worthington & Reynolds, 2009). Others may identify as heterosexual so as to reject and/or repress their true identity for fear of internal and external repercussions (Bond et al., 2009; Millet et al., 2005; Zea et al., 2003). Suppression of a non-straight identity could be due to many factors, but one main factor that has only been explored minimally in research is

traditional gender norms in Latino culture (Moreira et al., 2015; Rosario et al., 2004; Zea et al., 2003).

Research has noted that sexual identity for Latinx males is often contingent on factors such as having an attraction to women, having sex with women, only engaging in penetrating the other man (i.e., an insertive role) when having sex with men, and having sex with effeminate men (Magana & Carrier, 1991; Zea et al., 2003; Zellner et al., 2009). Therefore, this contingency appears to allow LMSM the ability to continue maintaining their appropriate sense of masculinity, as well as, still identify as heterosexual (Magana & Carrier, 1991; Zellner et al., 2009). In Latinx culture, homophobic stigma is still very prominent; therefore, LMSM may feel a need to appear heterosexual in order to be accepted by society and in their culture as a “man” (Wolitski et al., 2006; Zea et al., 2003; Zellner et al., 2009). This prejudice is related to the conservative nature of Latinx culture, as well as, the emphasis of traditional gender norms regarding masculinity and manhood.

Latino Gender Norms

A widely studied traditional Latinx gender norm is called machismo. *Machismo* is a cultural dynamic that encourages the projection of “(a) masculinity that is not noticeably gay or effeminate and (b) keep their sexual identity private” (Sánchez et al., 2016; Zellner et al., 2009 as cited in Dillon et al., 2018, p. 240). Machismo is the macho man identity that may lead to unhealthy repression of one’s sexual identity and hinder sexual identity development of LMSM (Dillon et al., 2018). Those with higher machismo ideals have been linked with higher rates of homophobia, even among gay Latinx men (Dillon et al., 2018; Sánchez et al., 2016; Zellner et al., 2009). This may be one of the

many reasons that LMSM have higher rates of sexual identity suppression, however no research has examined LMSM levels of machismo in relation to their sexual identity.

The other side of traditional Latinx gender norms is called *caballerismo*. Sometimes called positive machismo, *caballerismo*, is characterized by emotional connectedness, healthy coping skills, social responsibility, connectedness, and positive ethnic identity (Arciniega et al., 2008; Dillon et al., 2018; Ojeda & Piña-Watson, 2014). This softer side of masculinity is different than the traditional *man's man of machismo*. *Caballerismo* is more about being responsible to one's family and being in touch with one's emotions so as to better be connected with one's family and culture. Ojeda and Piña-Watson (2014) even found that *caballerismo* may buffer the detrimental effects of toxic masculinity. Unfortunately, there is not a lot of research that compares machismo and *caballerismo* with sexual identity. What little the research examines LGBT+ identity and traditional Latinx gender norms mainly focus on its relation to HIV risk and prevention, rather than one's sexual identity and sexual identity development (Dillon et al., 2018; Zellner et al., 2009). With that being said, due to the distinction between the vastly different traditional Latinx gender norms, machismo and *caballerismo*, it is necessary for research to examine both sides of this cultural facet. Because culture impacts every facet of life, it is important for more research to examine sexual identity developmental status within the context of cultural gender norms.

Sexual Identity Exploration and Commitment

The Measure of Sexual Identity Exploration and Commitment (MoSIEC) is a way to compare one's self-labeled sexual identity with theorized sexual identity developmental statuses (uncertainty, exploration, commitment, & synthesis; Dillon et al.,

2011; Worthington et al., 2008). The MoSIEC is based on Marcia's (1966) model of ego identity development, which includes one's process of exploration and commitment to identity. The MoSIEC is based on four distinct factors: exploration, commitment, sexual orientation identity uncertainty, and synthesis/integration (Worthington et al., 2008). Through the development of the MoSIEC, Worthington et al. (2008) found that the exploration and commitment propelled identity development through two exploration pathways (exploration and sexual orientation uncertainty) and two commitment pathways (commitment and synthesis/integration). The MoSIEC has been validated and reliability tested with both LGB and heterosexual individuals. However, little research has examined the MoSIEC with ethnic/racial minority populations, like LMSM. No research has linked the MoSIEC with other factors hypothesized to influence one's sexual identity development, such as traditional gender norms related to one's culture (i.e., Latino machismo and caballerismo). Further criterion-related validation of a scale, such as the MoSIEC, is necessary for appropriate further research to be conducted with culturally and ethnic/racially diverse samples.

Current Study

Based on aforementioned literature (e.g., Montgomery et al., 2003; Dillon et al., 2011; Worthington et al., 2008; Worthington & Reynolds, 2009), the current study first examined how self-identified sexual identity group membership is related to the different subscales of the MoSIEC among LMSM. Second, also based on the aforementioned literature (e.g., Dillon et al., 2018; Ojeda & Piña-Watson, 2014; Sánchez et al., 2016; Zellner et al., 2009), this study examined whether and how (a) self-identified sexual identity group membership and (b) MoSIEC scores relate with traditional Latino gender-

norms (machismo and caballerismo). Hypothesizes for this study were (1) LMSM who reported as *exclusively heterosexual*, *mostly heterosexual*, or *mostly homosexual* would report lower levels of sexual identity commitment and synthesis and higher levels of sexual identity uncertainty and exploration than *bisexual* and *exclusively homosexual* self-labeled LMSM. *Mostly homosexual* identified men are hypothesized to report lower uncertainty and exploration, but higher commitment and synthesis than *exclusively* or *mostly heterosexual* self-labeled LMSM. (2.a.) LMSM who self-labeled as *exclusively homosexual*, *mostly homosexual*, and *bisexual* would indicate less machismo and caballerismo than men identifying as *exclusively* or *mostly heterosexual*. (2.b.) LMSM who indicated higher machismo and caballerismo beliefs would report relatively lower levels of sexual identity exploration, commitment, and synthesis and would report higher levels of uncertainty.

CHAPTER 2

METHOD

Participants

Inclusion criteria for the present study consisted of (a) identifying as a Latino man, (b) endorsed sex (oral or anal) with at least one male-identified person during the 12 months prior to assessment, (c) HIV negative or of unknown HIV status, and (d) age 18 years or older. The sample consisted of 499 adults ($M_{age} = 30.79$; $SD = 6.27$) who identified as the following Latino ethnicities: Mexican (50.0%), Cuban (17.7%), Colombian (10.4%), Puerto Rican (7.8%), Dominican (3.8%), Argentinian (3.0%), and Bolivian (1.2%). Nine other ethnicities (Venezuelan, Chilean, Ecuadorian, El Salvadorian, Guatemalan, Nicaraguan, Paraguayan, Peruvian, and Uruguayan) each represent less than 1% of the sample. All participants identified as a Hispanic or Latino man, 74.2% ($n = 368$) of the sample self-identified as *White, Hispanic/Latino*, and 25.8% ($n = 128$) of the sample self-identified as *Black, Hispanic/Latino*. The median reported education level was bachelor's degree. The median yearly income was \$75,000 to \$99,000. The median descriptor of participants sexual orientation was 4 = *Mostly Homosexual* on a rating from 1 = *Exclusively Heterosexual* to 5 = *Exclusively Homosexual*. In terms of relationships status, 46.8% were single, 26.7% were married, 21.5% were cohabiting with a partner, 3.0% were divorced, 1.2 were separated, and 0.8% were widowed. Of participants, 97.3% were U.S. citizens by birth or naturalization, whereas 3.6% were documented immigrants. The 45 Latino immigrants indicated living in the United States for an average of 18.04 years ($SD = 9.63$).

Procedure

This study is a secondary data analysis using baseline data, collected in 2016, from a longitudinal study of social and cultural determinants of HIV testing among LMSM (Dillon et al., 2018). The institutional review board of a public university in New York approved the study. Targeted Internet-based recruitment venues were used, such as e-mail listservs and forums on social media sites (e.g., Facebook groups) designed to invite traffic from LMSM and community-based agencies serving LMSM in upstate New York and New York City and four urban centers where HIV prevalence among Latino men is highest in the United States: Miami, Los Angeles, Chicago, and Houston (Wejnert et al., 2016). Other recruitment methods included announcing the study via community centers, health care organizations, and bars/nightclubs that attract Latinx and sexual minority populations. Approximately 97% of participants indicated learning about the study via an Internet-based platform, whereas the remaining 3% learned about the study from a community agency.

Eligible individuals who wished to access the survey were directed to a website that immediately linked to an informed consent page in both English and Spanish. Consenting participants were then directed to study measures. Measures were simultaneously presented in English and Spanish to all participants. Participants who submitted a valid survey received an incentive in the form of a \$15 Amazon.com e-gift certificate, which was sent to the e-mail address voluntarily provided by the participant. Upon completion of the survey, participants were asked to forward the survey to eligible peers. The debriefing statement included a link to a website maintained by the CDC

(<https://gettested.cdc.gov/Reasons/>) that allows users to search for local HIV testing venues using their zip code.

Measures

Sexual Identity

Participants self-reported their sexual orientation a Kinsey type, 1 to 5 scale (1 = *Exclusively Heterosexual*, 2 = *Mostly Heterosexual*, 3 = *Bisexual*, 4 = *Mostly Homosexual*, and 5 = *Exclusively Homosexual*). The median response was 4 = *Mostly Homosexual*. The breakdown of participants self-reported sexual identity are as follows: 21 (4.3%) reported as *Exclusively Heterosexual*, 99 (20%) reported as *Mostly Heterosexual*, 57 (11.5%) reported as *Bisexual*, 120 (24.3%) reported as *Mostly Homosexual*, and 197 (39.9%) reported as *Exclusively Homosexual*. 5 men reported “I don’t know.”

Machismo and Caballerismo

The Machismo and Caballerismo Scale (Arciniega, Anderson, Tovar-Blank, & Tracey, 2008) assessed traditional Latino masculine gender role beliefs. This 20-item scale measures both theorized risk (machismo) and protective (caballerismo) aspects of traditional Latino male gender norms. The two subscales of this measure, Traditional Machismo and Caballerismo, each ask participants to rate the extent to which they agree with statements reflecting these respective constructs on a 7-point scale (1 = *very strongly disagree* to 7 = *very strongly agree*). Both subscales yielded appropriate internal consistency estimates in a previous sample of Latino men in the United States: traditional machismo ($\alpha = .85$), caballerismo ($\alpha = .93$) (Arciniega et al., 2008). Evidence of construct validity via confirmatory factor analysis and the discriminant and convergent

validity of both subscales were found in the same sample (Arciniega et al., 2008).

Cronbach's α for the current study sample was .89 for Traditional Machismo and .88 for Caballerisimo.

Sexual Identity Development Status

The Measure of Sexual Identity Exploration and Commitment (MoSIEC) measures sexual identity development and can be applied to people of any sexual orientation identity (Worthington et al., 2008). The MoSIEC is separated into 4 subscales: Commitment, Exploration, Sexual Orientation Identity Uncertainty (Uncertainty), and Synthesis/Integration (Worthington et al., 2008). These subscales were administered to measure conceptually distinct statuses of participants' sexual identity development. The 6 items of the Commitment subscale (e.g., "*I have a firm sense of what my sexual needs are*") measured participants' certainty in their sexual identity (Worthington et al., 2008). The 8 items of the Exploration subscale (e.g., "*I am actively trying to understand my sexual orientation*") assessed participants' general orientation toward or away from sexual exploration (Worthington et al., 2008). The 3 items of the Uncertainty subscale (e.g., "*My sexual orientation is not clear to me*") assessed participants' lack of commitment to a sexual identity (Worthington et al., 2008). The 5 items of the Synthesis/Integration subscale (e.g., "*My understanding of my sexual needs coincides with my overall sense of sexual self*") assessed participants' unified, cohesive commitment to sexual identity (Worthington et al., 2008). All 4 subscales used a 6-point Likert-type scale from 1 (*very uncharacteristic of me*) to 6 (*very characteristic of me*). Worthington et al. (2008) reported evidence for the convergent validity of both subscales in a diverse sample of adults via findings of relations with sexual conservatism, sexual

self-monitoring, sexual assertiveness, awareness of sexual appeal, age, gender, and sexual orientation identity. Appropriate test–retest reliability and internal consistency estimates also were reported for the subscales in other adult samples (Worthington et al., 2008; Worthington & Reynolds, 2009). Cronbach’s α for the current study sample was .76 for Commitment, .90 for Exploration, .63 for Uncertainty, and .90 for Synthesis.

CHAPTER 3

ANALYTIC PLAN

The analytic plan consisted of three main steps used SPSS for all study analyses.

First, I examined (a) the assumption of relative normality of distributions of continuous variables (± 3 and kurtosis was ± 8 ; Kline, 2010); (b) descriptive statistics (e.g., means, medians, standard deviations/proportions) for all variables (c) as well as assess level of missingness at the scale level. Participants missing a substantial proportion of data per study variable (i.e., greater than 80% of scale score per measure) were excluded from analyses (Schlomer, Bauman, & Card, 2010).

Second, I conducted a multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) to test hypotheses one (men who report as *exclusively heterosexual*, *mostly heterosexual*, or *mostly homosexual* would report lower levels of sexual identity commitment and synthesis and higher levels of sexual identity uncertainty and exploration than *bisexual* and *exclusively homosexual* self-labeled LMSM. In addition, *mostly homosexual* identified men would have uncertainty and exploration and higher commitment and synthesis than *exclusively and mostly heterosexual* self-labeled LMSM). The MANOVA was conducted with the five, Kinsey-type sexual identity labels as the independent variable and the four subscales of the MoSIEC.

For hypothesis 2.a. (Men who self-labeled as *exclusively homosexual*, *mostly homosexual*, and *bisexual* would indicate less machismo and caballerismo than men identifying as *exclusively heterosexual*, or *mostly heterosexual*), the MANOVA was conducted with the five, Kinsey-type sexual identity labels as the independent variable and the two subscales of the Machismo and Caballerismo Scale as the dependent

variables. The multivariate analysis tested for hypothesized significant differences as indicated by a Wilks' lambda (Λ) multivariate estimate of $p < .05$. If significant, then subsequent analyses of variance (ANOVAs) would examine hypothesized differences using Least Squares Difference (LSD) tests. Effect-size estimates were reported.

Second, to test hypothesis 2.b. (men who indicate higher *machismo* and *caballerismo* beliefs would report lower levels of sexual identity *exploration*, *commitment*, and *synthesis* and would report higher levels of *uncertainty*), a bivariate correlation matrix was computed to examine Pearson product-moment correlation coefficients between indicated measures. Significance ($p < .05$) and magnitude of correlation coefficients were reported and interpreted.

CHAPTER 4

RESULTS

For my results, skew was +/- 3 and kurtosis was +/- 8 (Kline, 2010). Table 1 includes descriptive statistics for all variables. Approximately 3% ($n = 16$) of participants provided incomplete data on one or more study variables. They were too few to consider missing data imputation (Schlomer et al., 2010). They were not included in the final analyses because of listwise deletion procedure.

MANOVA of Sexual Identity and Sexual Identity Developmental Status

For Hypothesis 1, the MANOVA resulted in a significant omnibus test for sexual identity self-labeling, *Wilks's Λ* = 0.731, $F(16, 1418.18) = 9.57, p < .001, \eta^2 = .075$.

Subsequent univariate ANOVAs revealed main effects of sexual identity labeling were significant ($p < .001$) for *uncertainty*: $F(4, 467) = 12.52, p < .001, \eta^2 = .10$, *exploration*: $F(4, 467) = 20.28, p < .001, \eta^2 = .15$, *commitment*: $F(4, 467) = 6.93, p < .001, \eta^2 = .06$, and *synthesis*: $F(4, 467) = 16, p < .001, \eta^2 = .12$.

Uncertainty

Post hoc analyses for *uncertainty* revealed that men self-labeled as *exclusively heterosexual* reported higher levels of *uncertainty* ($M = 3.36, SD = 0.86$) than men self-labeled as *exclusively homosexual* ($M = 2.77, SD = 1.13, p < .05$), as hypothesized. This analysis also revealed that *mostly heterosexual* self-labeled men reported higher levels of *uncertainty* ($M = 3.69, SD = 0.93$) than men self-labeled as *bisexual* ($M = 2.94, SD = 1.34, p < .001$), *mostly homosexual* ($M = 3.18, SD = 0.99, p = .001$) and *exclusively homosexual* ($M = 2.77, SD = 1.13, p < .001$), as hypothesized. Contrary to hypotheses, men who self-labeled as *mostly homosexual* had lower levels of *uncertainty* ($M = 3.18,$

$SD = 0.99$) than men self-labeled as *exclusively homosexual* ($M = 2.77, SD = 1.13, p = .001$).

Exploration

Post hoc analyses for *exploration* revealed that, as hypothesized, men who self-labeled as *exclusively heterosexual* indicated higher endorsement of *exploration* ($M = 4.85, SD = 0.74$) than *mostly homosexual* self-labeled men ($M = 4.27, SD = 0.79, p = .01$). Also, as hypothesized *mostly heterosexual* self-labeled men reported more *exploration* ($M = 5.19, SD = 0.58$) than *bisexual* ($M = 4.72, SD = 0.81, p = .001$) and *exclusively homosexual* ($M = 4.46, SD = 0.88, p < .001$). Also, contrary to hypotheses, self-identified *bisexual* men also endorsed higher *exploration* ($M = 4.72, SD = 0.81$) than *mostly homosexual* ($M = 4.27, SD = 0.79, p = .001$). Furthermore, contrary to hypotheses., men self-labeled as *mostly homosexual* had less *exploration* ($M = 4.27, SD = 0.79$) than *exclusively homosexual* ($M = 4.46, SD = 0.88, p < .05$).

Commitment

Post hoc analyses for *commitment* revealed *mostly heterosexual* self-labeled men indicated less *commitment* ($M = 3.89, SD = 0.72$) than *bisexual* ($M = 4.39, SD = 1.07, p = .001$) and *exclusively homosexual* men ($M = 4.33, SD = 0.97, p < .00$), as hypothesized. Also, self-labeled *bisexual* men had higher *commitment* ($M = 4.39, SD = 1.07$) than *mostly homosexual* self-labeled men ($M = 3.92, SD = 0.78, p < .01$), as hypothesized. Additionally, *mostly homosexual* self-labeled men had lower *commitment* ($M = 3.92, SD = 0.78$) than *exclusively homosexual* ($M = 4.33, SD = 0.97, p < .001$), as hypothesized.

Synthesis

Post hoc analyses for *synthesis* revealed, contrary to hypotheses, *mostly heterosexual* reported higher *synthesis* ($M = 5.15, SD = 0.59$) than *bisexuals* ($M = 4.65, SD = 1.00, p = .001$). As hypothesized, self-labeled *bisexual* men had higher *synthesis* ($M = 4.65, SD = 1.00$) than self-labeled *mostly homosexual* men ($M = 4.20, SD = 0.86, p = .002$). Lastly, as hypothesized, *mostly homosexual* self-labeled men had lower *synthesis* ($M = 4.20, SD = 0.86$) than *exclusively homosexual* self-labeled men ($M = 4.54, SD = 0.98, p = .001$).

MANOVA of Sexual Identity and Traditional Latino Gender Norms

As for hypothesis 2a, the MANOVA resulted in a significant omnibus test for sexual identity, *Wilks's A* = 0.723, $F(8, 920) = 20.24, p < .001, \eta^2 = .15$. Univariate ANOVAs revealed main effects of sexual identity were for machismo: $F(4, 36.64) = 30.90, p < .001, \eta^2 = .21$ and caballerismo $F(4, 17.39) = 24.28, p < .001, \eta^2 = .17$.

Machismo

Post hoc analyses for machismo found that, as expected, *exclusively heterosexual* self-labeled men reported higher machismo ($M = 5.26, SD = 0.74$) than *bisexual* ($M = 4.61, SD = 1.40, p < .05$), *mostly homosexual* ($M = 4.20, SD = 0.95, p < .001$), and *exclusively homosexual* self-labeled men ($M = 4.36, SD = 1.08, p < .001$). Also, as expected, *mostly heterosexual* self-labeled men reported higher machismo ($M = 5.66, SD = 1.12$) than *bisexual* ($M = 4.61, SD = 1.40, p < .001$), *mostly homosexual* ($M = 4.20, SD = 0.95, p < .001$), and *exclusively homosexual* self-labeled men ($M = 4.36, SD = 1.08, p < .001$).

Caballerismo

As for, post hoc analyses for caballerismo found that *exclusively heterosexual* self-labeled men reported higher caballerismo ($M = 5.46, SD = 0.57$) than *mostly homosexual* self-labeled men ($M = 4.72, SD = 1.07, p < .001$), as hypothesized. Also, as hypothesized *mostly heterosexual* self-labeled men reported higher caballerismo ($M = 5.88, SD = 0.56$) than *bisexual* ($M = 5.44, SD = 1.01, p < .01$), *mostly homosexual* ($M = 4.72, SD = 1.07, p < .001$), and *exclusively homosexual* self-labeled men ($M = 5.27, SD = 0.80, p < .001$).

Correlations between Sexual Identity Developmental Status and Traditional Latino Gender Norms

In accordance with hypothesis 2b, bivariate correlation analyses found *uncertainty* positively correlated with machismo (see Table 2). However, contrary to expectations, *exploration* was positively correlated with machismo, and caballerismo. Also, contrary to hypotheses, *commitment* was positively correlated with caballerismo. But, as hypothesized, *commitment* was negatively correlated with machismo. Furthermore, contrary to expectations, *synthesis* was positively correlated with machismo and caballerismo.

CHAPTER 5

DISCUSSION

This study examined how self-identified sexual identity group membership related to hypothesized sexual identity development statuses measured by the MoSIEC among LMSM. The results also describe whether and how (a) self-identified sexual identity group membership and (b) sexual identity development statuses relate with traditional Latino gender norms (machismo and caballerismo). A majority of a priori hypotheses were supported by analyses. Results from this study generally provide evidence of concurrent validity for the MoSIEC, as well as inform the field of how the Latinx traditional masculine gender norms of machismo and caballerismo relate with sexual identity development and expression among LMSM.

Uncertainty

For the *sexual identity uncertainty status*, mostly heterosexual identifying men reported higher *uncertainty* than men belonging to each of the Kinsey-type sexual identity labels: *bisexual*, *mostly homosexual*, and *exclusively homosexual*. While the *exclusively heterosexual* participants only reported significant higher *uncertainty* than *exclusively homosexuals*. Of note, these findings differ from those found by Worthington et al. (2008), who found heterosexual identifying individuals reported lower uncertainty. However, this increased uncertainty, not found by Worthington et al. (2008), could be due to the present sample's reported same-sex sexual behavior. This questioning of identity and reported uncertainty supports criterion-related validity of this measure.

Contrary to hypotheses, men identifying as *mostly homosexuals* indicated less *uncertainty* than men identifying as *exclusively homosexual*. One possible explanation for

this could be due to the recent increase of individuals identifying as alternative or “in-between” identities, such as queer or pansexual, that differ from bisexuality (Miller et al., 2016; Morandini et al., 2017), even in the Latinx community (Carrillo & Hoffman, 2018). This result also supports findings by Vrangalova and Savin-Williams (2012), who encouraged the addition of a mostly gay/lesbian identity to be included in the listing of the sexual orientation identity spectrum.

Exploration

For the sexual identity *exploration* status, as hypothesized, *exclusively heterosexual* identifying men reported higher *exploration* than *mostly homosexual* identifying men. *Also*, as hypothesized, *mostly heterosexual* identifying men reported higher *exploration* than *bisexuals* and *exclusively homosexual* identifying men. These findings, although different from Worthington et al. (2008), were not surprising in the present sample. Worthington et al. (2008), found that heterosexuals reported the low exploration. The discrepancy in findings between our studies could have been related to more compulsory heterosexuality (i.e., the belief that heterosexuality is the normal/typical default sexual identity; Dillon et al., 2011) in the Worthington et al. (2008) sample because the present sample’s reported same-sex sexual behavior. On the contrary, the findings of this study could represent the progress made over the past decade regarding societal acceptance of exploring one’s sexual identity (Carrillo & Hoffman, 2018; Vrangalova & Savin-Williams, 2012). This also supports findings by Carrillo and Hoffman (2018), Vrangalova and Savin-Williams (2012), and Ward (2008; 2015), who indicated support for a flexible male heterosexual identity (i.e., identifying as

heterosexual, has attraction and sex with other men in addition to women) among Latinx men.

With that being said, contrary to hypotheses, *bisexual* identifying men reported significantly higher exploration than *mostly homosexual* identifying men. Although contrary to hypotheses, this finding fell in line with that of Worthington et al. (2008) and Worthington and Reynolds (2009), who found that bisexual participants reported high exploration. Additionally, even though contrary to hypotheses, Weinberg et al. (1994) put it best that “becoming bisexual involves rejection of not one but two recognized categories of sexual identity” (p. 26); let alone substantial external pressures to conform to the gay-straight dichotomy that plague bisexual individuals (Dillon et al., 2011). This lens suggests that exploration may be a key part of bisexual identity, regardless of one’s certainty of their bisexuality. Another explanation for this finding is that the exploration subscale is showing bisexuality as a more fluid identity with more layers to it that just being bisexual (Diamond, 2016; Worthington & Reynolds, 2009).

Another surprising and contradictory result was that *mostly homosexual* identifying men reported significantly less *exploration* than *exclusively homosexual* identifying men. Once again, a possible explanation for this could be due to the increased variability of responses due to increased discussion and awareness of alternative “in-between” identities for those who do not identify as bisexual, such as queer or pansexual. Furthermore, prior research in this area has tended to focus on women due to the lesser societal stigma and at times fetishization of women exploring their sexual identities (Diamond, 2000; 2003; 2008). Furthermore, this finding also provides support for the

inclusion of a mostly gay identity to be listed as its own unique and legitimate identity (Vrangalova & Savin-Williams, 2012).

Commitment

All hypotheses were significant and accurate for the sexual identity *commitment* status. *Mostly heterosexual* identifying men reported less commitment than *bisexual* and *exclusively homosexual* identifying men. This finding was contradictory to Worthington et al. (2008), who found heterosexuals to have higher commitment and less exploration. However, support for concurrent validity of this measure is shown by linking participants' self-reported same-sex sexual behavior with their reported of actively questioning and exploring their sexual identity, as indicated by their reported high levels of uncertainty and exploration. as suggested by several theorists (Carrillo and Hoffman, (2018), Vrangalova and Savin-Williams (2012), and Ward (2008; 2015).

Additionally, *bisexual* identifying men reported higher *commitment* than *mostly homosexual* identifying men. This result further supports bisexuality as its own unique and legitimate identity, even though individuals in this study simultaneously reported greater exploration in comparison *mostly homosexual* reporting men. As previously discussed, this increased exploration could be the result of a more fluid sexual identity or a greater spectrum of bisexuality (Diamond, 2016; Worthington & Reynolds, 2009). Although, this level of commitment was not discussed in Worthington et al. (2008), Worthington and Reynolds (2009) found bisexual men to have lower commitment. I believe these differing results still provide support concurrent validity of this measure, because as previously hypothesized one could explore their bisexual identity, but still be committed to it more than men who identify as mostly homosexual.

Also, *mostly homosexual* identifying men reported lower *commitment* than *exclusively homosexual* identifying men. This finding was hypothesized; however, it does not appear to line up with the previously reported low uncertainty and low exploration of mostly homosexual identifying men relative to other men. One reason for this could be a lack of comfortability with identifying “in-between” identities. Regardless, this appears to be a weakness in the measure that should be expanded upon in future research.

Synthesis

For the sexual identity *synthesis* status, *bisexual* identifying men reported higher *synthesis* than *mostly homosexual* identifying men. This was an interesting finding that supports the concurrent validity of the measure due to the higher *commitment* reported by *bisexual* identifying individuals as hypothesized. Additionally, this finding provides further support for bisexuality as a valid and legitimate identity.

Also, *mostly homosexual* identifying men reported lower *synthesis* than *exclusively homosexual* identifying men. This finding supports concurrent validity as hypothesized. One reasoning for this could be that even though *mostly homosexual* identifying men reported lower uncertainty, exploration, and commitment than *exclusively homosexuals*, it might be a factor of not fully understanding one’s self. Additionally, as previously discussed, this could be that participants identified as alternative or “in-between” identities, such as queer or pansexual, that differ from bisexuality (Miller et al., 2016; Morandini et al., 2017). Regardless, the inconsistencies support the need for further investigation with this measure and *mostly homosexual* identifying men.

Furthermore, contrary to hypotheses, *mostly heterosexual* identifying men reported higher *synthesis* than *bisexuals*. This was surprising, the realm of sexual identity is not always black and white. Just because an individual engages in same-sex sexual behavior, does not mean said individual identifies as LGB+. Carrillo and Hoffman (2018), Vrangalova and Savin-Williams (2012), and Ward (2008; 2015) have found evidence for a subset of straight men, who engage in sexual behavior with other straight or bisexual men. They found these individuals to be fully content with their heterosexual identity. Therefore, suggest a less rigid interpretation of heterosexuality, as well as an integration of a heteroflexible identity or *mostly heterosexual* identity as unique and legitimate be integrated into future research. With that being said, the conflicting results of *mostly heterosexual* identifying men reporting high uncertainty, high exploration, low commitment, but high synthesis suggests an inconsistency with this measure. Future research should continue to further assess for evidence of concurrent validity of the *synthesis* subscale.

Traditional Masculine Gender Norms and Self-Identified Sexual Labels

Findings concerning the traditional masculine gender norms fully supported hypotheses that *exclusively heterosexual* and *mostly heterosexual* identifying men reported higher machismo than *exclusively homosexual*, *mostly homosexual*, and *bisexual* men. Additionally, relations were found for *mostly heterosexual* identifying men reporting higher machismo than *exclusively homosexual*, *mostly homosexual*, and *bisexual* men. Finally, a link between *exclusively heterosexual* men and higher *caballerismo* was only found when compared with *mostly homosexual* men. There has not been any research comparing these cultural norms with the sexual identities reported.

With that being said, these results follow the findings of Ojeda and Piña-Watson (2014), Sánchez et al. (2016), and Zellner et al. (2009), who have found strong machismo and caballerismo impact mental health of LGB+ and questioning individuals.

Traditional Masculine Gender Norms and Sexual Identity Development Status

Mix results were found regarding the hypothesis of correlations between machismo and caballerismo with MoSIEC subscales. In accordance with the hypothesis, men who indicated more machismo also reported more sexual identity *uncertainty* and less *commitment*. However, contrary to expectations, men indicating more machismo and caballerismo also reported more sexual identity *exploration* and *synthesis*. This seems to go against what research would assume, since machismo and caballerismo factors have been shown to increase homophobia and toxic masculinity (Ojeda & Piña-Watson, 2014; Sánchez et al., 2016; Zellner et al., 2009). However, research by Abreu and Gonzalez (2020) and Abreu, Gonzales, Capielo Rosario, et al. (2020) found that Latino cultural gender norms, machismo and caballerismo, may be supportive factors that aided in understanding and acceptance of gender minority individuals by their families. This provides an alternative explanation and rationale for a more positive outlook of the impact of such cultural gender norms on one's sexual identity. Also, times are changing, and it is becoming less stigmatized to explore one's sexual identity (Carrillo & Hoffman, 2018; Vrangalova & Savin-Williams, 2012; Ward, 2008; Ward, 2015).

Furthermore, contrary to hypotheses, men endorsing more caballerismo also reported more sexual identity *commitment*. The values that make machismo and caballerismo different could be a factor as to why caballerismo was positively correlated with commitment, while machismo was found to be negatively correlated *commitment*.

Caballerismo puts an emphasis on the family and social support (Ojeda & Piña-Watson, 2014), while machismo puts emphasis on being strong and not showing weakness (Sánchez et al., 2016; Zellner et al., 2009). Additionally, as previously stated, Abreu and Gonzalez (2020) and Abreu, Gonzales, Capielo Rosario, et al. (2020) found that caballerismo was shown to aid in a parent's acceptance of their adult child's LGB sexual orientation identity. Therefore, because of the supportive nature of caballerismo, it could translate into supporting LMSM with the acceptance and commitment with one's own identity.

Strengths, Limitations, and Future Research

One limitation for this study is the age of the data. This data was collected from February 2016 to July 2016. Many things have changed since then, including the political climate towards LGB individuals and the spectrum that is sexual identity (Lange et al., 2019). This should be noted when attempting to generalize this to the population of Latino men. Another limitation was that participants were not asked the gender of their partner whether in a relationship, married, separated, or widowed. This could have given us a better understanding of participants' self-reported sexual identity. Additionally, there was a very small sample of individuals who self-labeled themselves as exclusively heterosexual. This could have impacted why there were fewer significant results for this portion of the sample. Lastly, as stated prior, this study was secondary data analysis, therefore I was only able to study the variables in the parent study.

As for strengths, a main strength of this study is that this study was conducted with LMSM, who are a heterogeneous and understudied sample who identify across the spectrum of sexual identity. Most research regarding "in-between" or non-normative

sexual identities has primarily been conducted with female participants (Diamond, 2000; 2003; 2008). This could be largely due to the taboo nature of heterosexual identifying men questioning and exploring their sexual identity (Ward, 2008). Regardless, this study allows for greater interpretation of how sexual identity develops and further convergent validation for the MoSIEC with LMSM.

As for future research, this study suggests continued research on the MoSIEC with mostly gay identifying individuals, as well as the synthesis subscale. Additionally, further research should be conducted with ethnic minority individuals who identify with alternative “in-between” identities, such as mostly heterosexual and mostly gay. Future research should also continue to discern how other culture norms and values impact sexual identity and sexual identity development.

REFERENCES

- Abreu, R. L., Gonzalez, K. A., Capielo Rosario, C., Pulice-Farrow, L., Domenech Rodriguez, M. (2020). Latinos have a stronger attachment to the family”: Latinx fathers’ acceptance of their sexual minority children. *Journal of GLBT Family Studies, 16*(2), 192-210. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1550428X.2019.1672232>
- Abreu, R. L., Gonzalez, K. A. (2020). Redefining collectivism: Family and community among sexual and gender diverse people of color and indigenous people: Introduction to the special issue. *Journal of GLBT Family Studies, 16*(2), 107-110. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1550428X.2020.1736038>
- Arnett, J. J. (2000). Emerging adulthood: A theory of development from the late teens through the twenties. *American Psychologist, 55*, 469– 480. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066x.55.5.469>
- Arciniega, G. M., Anderson, T. C., Tovar-Blank, Z. G., & Tracey, T. J. G. (2008). Toward a fuller conception of machismo: Development of a traditional Machismo and Caballerismo Scale. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 55*, 19–33. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0167.55.1.19>
- Bond, L., Wheeler, D. P., Millett, G. A., LaPollo, A. B., Carson, L. F., & Liao, A. (2009). Black men who have sex with men and the association of down-low identity with HIV risk behavior. *American Journal of Public Health, 99*(S1), S92-S95.
- Carrillo, H. & Hoffman, A. (2018). ‘Straight with a pinch of bi’: The construction of heterosexuality as an elastic category among adult US men. *Sexualities, 21*(1–2), 90–108. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1363460716678561>
- Diamond, L. M. (2000). Sexual identity, attractions, and behavior among young sexual-minority women over a two-year period. *Developmental Psychology, 36*, 241–250. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0012-1649.36.2.241>
- Diamond, L. M. (2003). Was it a phase? Young women’s relinquishment of lesbian/bisexual identities over a 5-year period. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 84*, 352–364. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.84.2.352>
- Diamond, L. M. (2008). Female bisexuality from adolescence to adulthood: Results from a 10-year longitudinal study. *Developmental Psychology, 44*, 5–14. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0012-1649.44.1.5>
- Diamond, L. M. (2016). Sexual fluidity in male and females. *Current Sexual Health Reports, 8*(4), 249-256. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11930-016-0092-z>

- Dillon, F. R., Worthington, R. L., & Moradi, B. (2011). Sexual identity as a universal process. *Handbook of Identity Theory and Research*, 649–670.
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4419-7988-9_27
- Dillon, F. R., Eklund, A., Ebersole, R., Ertl, M. M., Martin, J. L., Verile, M. G., Gonzalez, S. R., Johnson, S., Florentin, D., Wilson, L., Roberts, S., & Fisher, N. (2018). Heterosexual self-presentation and other individual- and community-based correlates of HIV testing among latino men who have sex with men. *Psychology of Men and Masculinity*, 20, 238-251.
<https://doi.org/10.1037/men0000166>
- Erikson, E. H. (1950). *Childhood and society*. New York: Norton.
- Ghavami, N., Fingerhut, A., Peplau, L. A., Grant, S. K., & Wittig, M. A. (2011). Testing a model of minority identity achievement, identity affirmation, and psychological well-being among ethnic minority and sexual minority individuals. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology*, 17(1), 79–88.
<https://doi.org/10.1037/a0022532>
- Kline, R. B. (2010). *Principles and Practice of Structural Equation Modeling* (4th Ed). New York, NY: Guilford Press.
- Lange, A.C., Duran, A., & Jackson, R. (2019). The state of LGBT and queer research in higher education revisited: Current academic houses and future possibilities. *Journal of College Student Development* 60(5), 511-526.
<https://doi.org/10.1353/csd.2019.0047>
- Luyckx, K., Schwartz, S. J., Berzonsky, M. D., Soenens, B., Vansteenkiste, M., Smits, I., & Goossens, L. (2008). Capturing ruminative exploration: Extending the four-dimensional model of identity formation in late adolescence. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 42, 58–82. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrp.2007.04.004>
- Magana, J. R., & Carrier, J. M. (1991). Mexican and Mexican American male sexual behavior & spread of AIDS in California. *Journal of Sex Research*, 28, 425-441.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/00224499109551617>
- Marcia, J. E. (1966). Development and validation of ego identity status. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 5, 551–558. <https://doi.org/10.1037/h0023281>
- Miller, S. D., Taylor, V., & Rupp, L. J. (2016). Social movements and the construction of queer identity. *New Directions in Identity Theory and Research*, 443-470.
<https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780190457532.003.0016>
- Millett, G., Malebranche, D., Mason, B., & Spikes, P. (2005). Focusing" down low": Bisexual black men, HIV risk and heterosexual transmission. *Journal of the National Medical Association*, 97(7 Suppl), 52S-59S.

- Montgomery, J. P., Mokotoff, E. D., Gentry, A. C., & Blair, J. M. (2003). The extent of bisexual behaviour in HIV-infected men and implications for transmission to their female sex partners. *AIDS Care*, *15*, 829–837. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09540120310001618676>
- Morandini, J. S., Blaszczyński, A., & Dar-Nimrod, I. (2017). Who adopts queer and pansexual identities?. *The Journal of Sex Research*, *54*(7), 911-922. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00224499.2016.1249332>
- Moreira, A. D., Halkitis, P. N., & Kapadia, F. (2015). Sexual identity development of a new generation of emerging adult men: The P18 cohort study. *Journal of Sexual Orientation and Gender Diversity*, *2*, 159-167. <https://doi.org/10.1037/sgd0000099>
- Ojeda, L., & Piña-Watson, B. (2014). Caballerismo may protect against the role of machismo on Mexican day laborers' self-esteem. *Psychology of Men and Masculinity*, *15*, 288–295. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0033450>
- Rosario, M., Schrimshaw, E. W., & Hunter, J. (2004). Ethnic/racial differences in the coming-out process of lesbian, gay, and bisexual youths: A comparison of sexual identity development over time. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology*, *10*, 215–228. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/1099-9809.10.3.215>
- Sánchez, F., Blas-Lopez, F., Martínez-Patiño, M., Vilain, E., & Liu, W. M. (2016). Masculine consciousness and anti-effeminacy among latino and white gay men. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity*, *17*, 54–63. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0039465>
- Schlomer, G., Bauman, S., & Card, NA. (2010). Best practices for missing data management in counseling psychology. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, *57*, 1-10. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0018082>
- Schwartz, S. J. (2001). The evolution of Eriksonian and neo-Eriksonian identity theory and research: A review and integration. *Identity*, *1*, 7–58. <https://doi.org/10.1207/s1532706xschwartz>
- Vrangalova, Z. & Savin-Williams, R. C. (2012). Mostly heterosexual and mostly gay/lesbian: Evidence for new sexual orientation identities. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, *41*(1), 85-101. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10508-012-9921-y>
- Ward, J. (2008). Dude sex: White masculine and 'authentic' heterosexuality among dudes who have sex with dudes. *Sexualities*, *11*(4), 414-434. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1363460708091742>
- Ward, J. (2015). *Not gay: Sex between straight white men*. (Vol. 19). New York University Press.

- Weinberg, M. S., Williams, C. J., & Pryor, D. W. (1994). *Dual attraction: Understanding bisexuality*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Wejnert, C., Hess, K. L., Hall, H. I., Van Handel, M., Hayes, D., Fulton, P. Jr., An, Q., Koenig L. J., Prejean, J., & Valleroy, L. A. (2016). Vital signs: Trends in HIV diagnoses, risk behaviors, and prevention among persons who inject drugs — United States. *Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report*, *65*, 1336–1342. <https://doi.org/10.15585/mmwr.mm6547e1>
- Wolitski, R. J., Jones, K. T., Wasserman, J. L., & Smith, J. C. (2006). Self- identification as “down low” among men who have sex with men (MSM) from 12 US cities. *AIDS and Behavior*, *10*, 519-529. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10461-006-9095-5>
- Worthington, R. L., Navarro, R. L., Savoy, H. B., & Hampton, D. (2008). Development, reliability, and validity of the measure of sexual identity exploration and commitment (MoSIEC). *Developmental Psychology*, *44*, 22-33. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0012-1649.44.1.22>
- Worthington, R. L., & Reynolds, A. L. (2009). Within-group differences in sexual orientation and identity. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, *56*, 44–55. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0013498>
- Worthington, R. L., Savoy, H., Dillon, F. R., & Vernaglia, E. R. (2002). Heterosexual identity development: A multidimensional model of individual and group identity. *Counseling Psychologist*, *30*, 496–531. <https://doi.org/10.1177/00100002030004002>
- Zea, M. C., Reisen, C. A., & Diaz, R. M. (2003). Methodological issues in research on sexual behavior with Latino gay and bisexual men. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, *3*, 281–291. <https://doi.org/10.1023/a:1023962805064>
- Zellner, J. A., Martínez-Donate, A. P., Sañudo, F., Fernández-Cerdeño, A., Sipan, C. L., Hovell, M. F., & Carrillo, H. (2009). The interaction of sexual identity with sexual behavior and its influence on HIV risk among latino men: Results of a community survey in northern San Diego County, CA. *American Journal of Public Health*, *99*, 125–132. <https://doi.org/10.2105/AJPH.2007.129809>

APPENDIX A

PSYCHOMETRIC PROPERTIES OF THE MAJOR STUDY VARIABLES

Table 1

Psychometric Properties of the Major Study Variables

Variable	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>Mdn</i>	<i>SD</i>	α
Sexual identity development					
Uncertainty	494	3.15	3.33	1.16	.63
Exploration	483	4.61	4.75	0.87	.90
Commitment	483	4.13	3.67	0.93	.76
Synthesis	484	4.59	4.80	0.98	.90
Latino cultural gender norms					
Machismo	483	4.70	4.80	1.23	.89
Caballerismo	486	5.33	5.40	0.94	.88

Note. Skew was +/- 3 and kurtosis was +/- 8 (Kline, 2010).

APPENDIX B

DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS AND CORRELATIONS

Table 2

Descriptive Statistics and Correlations for Study Variables

Variable	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	1	2	3	4	5	6
1. Uncertain	494	3.15	1.16	—					
2. Exploration	483	4.61	0.87	.03	—				
3. Commitment	483	4.13	0.93	-.77**	.18**	—			
4. Synthesis	484	4.59	0.98	-.20**	.71**	.37**	—		
5. Machismo	483	4.70	1.23	.45**	.30**	-.27**	.26**	—	
6. Caballerismo	486	5.33	0.94	-.03	.54**	.21**	.47**	.52**	—

** $p < .001$

APPENDIX C
IRB APPROVAL



UNIVERSITY AT ALBANY
State University of New York

IRB Authorization Agreement
Ver 8.02.17

Institution A- Name of Institution or Organization Providing IRB Review: University at Albany, State University of New York --- Federalwide Assurance # FWA00001970 IRB Registration #: <input type="checkbox"/> IRB #1 (00000589), <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IRB#2 (00000590)

Institution B- Name of Institution or Organization Relying on the Designated IRB Review: Arizona State University Federalwide Assurance (FWA) #00009102
--

The Officials signing below agree that **Arizona State University (Institution B)** may rely on the designated IRB for review and continuing oversight of the human subject research described below:

This agreement is limited to the following specific protocol:

Protocol #: 15-E-134	
Title of Research Project: HIV Testing & Latino MSM: Individual, Sociocultural, and Structural Determinants	
Sponsor or Funding Agency Name: NA	
University at Albany Principal Investigator Name: Jessica L. Martin, Ph.D.	Institution B's Principal Investigator Name: Frank Dillon, Ph.D.

The review and continuing oversight performed by the designated IRB will meet the human subject's protection requirements of Institution B's OHRP-approved FWA. Both institutions agree to the following conditions:

The IRB at Institution/Organization A will follow written procedures for reporting its findings and actions to appropriate officials at Institution B. Relevant minutes of IRB meetings will be made available to Institution B upon request. Institution B remains responsible for ensuring compliance with the IRB's determinations and with the Terms of its OHRP-approved FWA. Institution A's IRB will notify Institution B if the study is suspended or terminated and will provide a summary of the reasons for the suspension or termination. Institution A's IRB will notify Institution B of any unanticipated problems involving risks to human participants or others. Institution A's IRB will notify Institution B of audits/investigations by oversight agencies, the sponsor or funding agencies and will provide a summary of the findings. If Institution A fails to notify Institution B as stated above, Institution B shall have the right to terminate this agreement immediately, and request any study related documents associated with Institution B's investigator's role in the study.

This document must be kept on file at both institutions and provided to OHRP upon request.

NOTE: Once executed, Institution B must list Institution A's IRB on its OHRP approved FWA.

<i>Institution A Signatory Official</i>		<i>Institution B Signatory Official</i>	
	8-2-17		
Signature	Date	Signature	Date
Name: Adrienne D. Bonilla, Esq., Title: Assistant Vice President for Research		Name:	
Address: Pre-Award and Compliance Services University at Albany, 1400 Washington Ave, MSC 100B Albany, NY 12222		Title:	
Phone: 518-437-3850 Fax: 518-437-3855		Address:	
Email: abonilla@albany.edu		Phone:	Fax:
		Email:	

**IRB NOTICE OF APPROVAL
REQUEST FOR MODIFICATION(S)**

Principal/Co-Principal Investigator(s):	Jessica Martin
Faculty Advisor:	
Protocol Title:	HIV Testing & Latino MSM: Individual, Sociocultural, and Structural Determinants
Protocol Number:	15-E-134-03

Effective **July 25, 2017**, the University at Albany Institutional Review Board (IRB) approved the modification request submitted for the above-referenced research protocol.

Summary of Modification(s):

- Change the PI to Jessica Martin

All investigators (listed above) are required to comply with the researcher requirements outlined at: <http://www.albany.edu/orrc/irb.php>

Please be sure to obtain any and all other applicable approvals from UAlbany and any other locations where this research will be conducted.

IRB NOTICE OF APPROVAL

Principal/Co-Principal Investigator(s):	Jessica Martin
Faculty Advisor:	
Protocol Title:	HIV Testing & Latino MSM: Individual, Sociocultural, and Structural Determinants
Protocol Number:	15-E-134-03

Effective **April 19, 2017**, the University at Albany Institutional Review Board (IRB) approved the Annual Continuation request for the above-referenced research protocol.

This approval provides permission to continue the human subjects activities outlined in the IRB-approved protocol and supporting documents. All changes must be submitted to the IRB in a modification request and approved by the IRB prior to the implementation of any changes, regardless of how minor, except where necessary to eliminate apparent immediate hazards to the subjects. Report within 5 business days to the IRB any injuries of other unanticipated or adverse events involving risks to human research subjects or others.

All investigators (listed above) are required to comply with the researcher requirements outlined at: <http://www.albany.edu/orrc/irb.php>

Please be sure to obtain any and all other applicable approvals from UAlbany and any other locations where this research will be conducted.

Please review responsibilities before the commencement of your research.

PROTOCOL INFORMATION:

Approved As: Expedited, under 45 CFR.110 Category 7
 Protocol Approval Date: April 19, 2017
 Protocol Expiration Date: April 18, 2018
 Continuing Review Due Date* March 18, 2018

* Date a Continuing Review Request is due to the IRB if activities covered under this protocol, including data analysis are to continue beyond the Protocol Expiration Date. Continuing Review/Progress report is due 30 days before expiration to avoid a lapse in approval.

INCENTIVE INFORMATION (IF APPLICABLE)

Form/method of payment	# of participants	Incentive amount	# of payments per participant	Notes:
Amazon e-Gift Card	620	\$15 US; \$19 US; \$20 US	Up to 3	\$15 – baseline \$19 – follow up #1 \$20 – follow up #2

FEDERALLY FUNDED RESEARCH REQUIREMENTS:

Per federal regulations, 45 CFR 46.103(f), the IRB is required to compare all federally funded grant proposals/work statements to the IRB protocols(s) which cover the human research activities included in the proposal/work statement before funds are released. The following table indicates whether grant proposals are related to this IRB protocol and which of the listed proposals have been compared to the IRB protocol, if required.

Date congruency review completed	Coeus IP Number	Sponsor
5/20/15	15072633	NIMHD

cc: Stefan Brooks

Ver. 6.17.16

Protocol (Study) Number	15-E-134-01
Study Title	HIV TESTING & LATINO MSM: INDIVIDUAL, SOCIOCULTURAL, & STRUCTURAL DETERMINANTS
Study Principal Investigator Name	Jessica L. Martin, PhD
Study Principal Investigator Phone #	518-442-4935
Study Principal Investigator Email address	jlmartin@albany.edu

PURPOSE OF THE STUDY / PROPÓSITO DE ESTE ESTUDIO

This study aims to describe how many parts of Latino men's personal life (social life, neighborhood, culture, mental health, attitudes about sex, and health risk behaviors) influence HIV testing over time. Examples of health risk behaviors include using alcohol and drugs, engaging in sexual risk behaviors, and not having proper health care. Findings from this study will help researchers identify personal and community characteristics that support the health of Latino men. If you decide to be in this study, you will be one of approximately 619 men in this research study. *El propósito de este estudio es ver como la vida personal de los hombres (vida social, vecindario, cultura, salud mental, actitudes sobre sexo y comportamientos de riesgo de salud) influyen las pruebas de VIH a través del tiempo. Ejemplos de comportamientos de salud incluyen uso de alcohol y drogas, conductas de riesgos sexuales, y no tener atención médica adecuada. Los resultados de este estudio ayudaran a los investigadores identificar características personales y comunitarias que apoyan la salud de los hombres Latinos. Si usted decide participar en este estudio, será uno de aproximadamente hombres en este estudio.*

WHAT WILL I BE ASKED TO DO? HOW LONG WILL IT TAKE? ¿QUÉ ME PEDIRÁN HACER? ¿CUÁNTO TIEMPO DEMORARA?

If you agree to be in the study, we will ask you to do the following things: / *Si usted está de acuerdo en participar en este estudio, le pediremos que haga lo siguiente:*

1. You will complete an online survey. It will take approximately 30 minutes to complete and submit. The online survey will be followed up by 1 more, 30 minute online surveys in approximately 12 months. / *Usted completará una encuesta en línea. Le tomara aproximadamente una hora para completar y enviar. La encuesta será seguida por una encuesta más de una hora en línea (para ser realizado en doce meses).*

2. We will ask you many personal questions about your life. Some of the questions are about alcohol or drug use, sexual behaviors, attitudes about sex, mental health and things you may have done that are against the law. / *Vamos a hacerle muchas preguntas personales sobre su vida. Varias preguntas son sobre alcohol o uso de drogas, comportamientos sexuales, actitudes sobre el sexo, salud mental y cosas que usted pudo haber hecho que están en contra de la ley.*



WHAT ARE THE RISKS OR INCONVENIENCES OF THE STUDY? / ¿CUÁLES SON LOS RIESGOS O INCONVENIENTES DEL ESTUDIO?

It is anticipated that this study will involve minimal physical risks. We are not aware of any negative side effects associated with completing the interview assessments used in this study. Nevertheless, as with many studies assessing health risk behaviors, some people may experience some degree of discomfort and stress. Moreover, no substantial medical risks exist to the participants. / *Se espera que este estudio implique riesgos físicos mínimos. No somos conscientes de ningún efecto secundario negativo asociado con realizar la evaluación utilizada en este estudio. Sin embargo, como muchos estudios que evalúan conductas de riesgos para la salud, algunas personas pueden experimentar algún grado de incomodidad y estrés. No riesgos médicos existen para los participantes.*

Although all measures to protect confidentiality will be put in place, the possibility exists that security of encrypted electronic information could be jeopardized. In the remote case that such event occurs, it will be immediately reported to the University at Albany – State University of New York Institutional Review Board. / *Aunque todas las medidas para proteger la confidencialidad serán puestas, existe la posibilidad de que la seguridad de la información electrónica cifrada podría estar en peligro. En el caso remoto que se produzca tal caso, la Universidad de Albany – Universidad Estatal de la Junta de Revisión Institucional de Nueva York será notificado inmediatamente.*

This project has been approved by the University at Albany Institutional Review Board. Approval of this project only signifies that the procedures adequately protect the rights and welfare of the participants. Please note that absolute confidentiality cannot be guaranteed due to the limited protections of Internet access. Please be sure to close your browser when finished so no one will be able to see what you have been doing. / *Este proyecto ha sido aprobado por la Universidad de Albany Junta de Revisión Institucional. La aprobación de este proyecto sólo significa que los procedimientos protegen adecuadamente los derechos y el bienestar de los participantes. Tenga en cuenta que la confidencialidad absoluta no puede ser garantizada debido a las protecciones limitadas de acceso al internet. Por favor, asegúrese de cerrar su navegador cuando haya terminado para que nadie pueda ver lo que ha estado haciendo.*

WHAT ARE THE BENEFITS OF THE STUDY? / ¿CUÁLES SON LOS BENEFICIOS DEL ESTUDIO?

This study is expected to generate important information about factors that may impact HIV testing. Study findings may inform scientists of potential modifiable risks, and could enhance researchers' information for the future development of both HIV and health risk interventions. On an individual level, our prior experience indicates that most participants find the research process interesting and rewarding. / *Se espera que este estudio genere información importante acerca de los factores que pueden influir la prueba del VIH. Resultados del estudio pueden informar a los científicos de riesgos modificables y podrían mejorar la información de los investigadores para el desarrollo futuro de las intervenciones de riesgos de VIH y la salud. Al nivel individual, nuestra experiencia indica que la mayoría de los participantes encuentran el proceso de investigación interesante y gratificante.*



WILL I RECEIVE PAYMENT FOR PARTICIPATION? ARE THERE COSTS TO PARTICIPATE? / ¿VOY A RECIBIR PAGO DE LA PARTICIPACIÓN? ¿HAY COSTOS PARA PARTICIPAR?

Yes, you will be compensated for your time and effort *if you are eligible and complete the entire online survey*. The compensation will be distributed accordingly, \$15 Amazon.com gift certificate emailed to you for 1st completed survey (first year); \$19 Amazon.com gift certificate emailed to you for 2nd completed survey (2nd year); and \$20 Amazon.com gift certificate emailed to you for 3rd completed survey (3rd year). / *Si, usted será compensado por su tiempo y esfuerzo si es elegible y completa toda la encuesta en línea. La compensación será distribuida con un un certificado de regalo de Amazon.com de \$15 que será enviado por correo electrónico por completar la primera encuesta (primer año); un certificado de regalo de Amazon.com de \$19 será enviado por correo electrónico por la segunda encuesta completada (segundo año); y un certificado de regalo de Amazon.com de \$20 será enviado por correo electrónico al completar la tercera encuesta-tercer año.*

HOW WILL MY PERSONAL INFORMATION BE PROTECTED? / ¿CÓMO SE PROTEGERÁ MI INFORMACIÓN PERSONAL?

All information obtained in this study is strictly confidential unless disclosure is required by law. / *Toda la información obtenida en este estudio es estrictamente confidencial al menos que la revelación sea requerida por la ley.*

CAN I STOP BEING IN THE STUDY AND WHAT ARE MY RIGHTS? / ¿PUEDO DEJAR DE PARTICIPAR EN EL ESTUDIO Y CUÁLES SON MIS DERECHOS?

You should also know that participation in research is entirely voluntary. Even after you agree to participate in the research, you may decide to leave the study at any time without penalty or loss of benefits to which you may otherwise have been entitled. You should also be aware that the investigator may withdraw you from participation at his/her professional discretion. / *Usted también debe saber que la participación en la investigación es completamente voluntaria. Incluso después de que usted se comprometa a participar en la investigación, usted puede decidir abandonar el estudio en cualquier momento sin penalidad o pérdida de beneficios a que haya tenido derecho. También debe ser consciente de que el investigador puede terminar su participación a su discreción profesional.*

WHOM DO I CONTACT IF I HAVE QUESTIONS ABOUT THE STUDY? / ¿A QUIÉN DEBO CONTACTAR SI TENGO ALGUNAS PREGUNTAS SOBRE EL ESTUDIO?

Take as long as you like before you make a decision. We will be happy to answer any question you have about this study. If you have further questions about this project or if you have a research-related problem, you may contact the principal investigator: Jessica L. Martin, PhD, Phone: 518-442-4935; Email: jlmartin@albany.edu / *Tómese el tiempo que desee antes de tomar una decisión. Estaremos encantados de responder a cualquier pregunta que tenga acerca de este estudio. Si usted tiene alguna*



UNIVERSITY AT ALBANY
State University of New York



Institutional Review Board (IRB)
Informed Consent Information
for Participation in a Research Study

15-E-134-01

pregunta acerca de este proyecto o si usted tiene un problema relacionado con esta investigación, puede comunicarse con el investigador principal: Jessica L. Martin, PhD, Phone: 518-442-4935; correo electrónico: jlmartin@albany.edu.

WHOM DO I CONTACT IF I HAVE QUESTIONS ABOUT MY RIGHTS AS A STUDY PARTICIPANT? / ¿A QUIÉN DEBO CONTACTAR SI TENGO PREGUNTAS SOBRE MIS DERECHOS COMO PARTICIPANTE EN EL ESTUDIO?

Research at the University Albany involving human participants is carried out under the oversight of the Institutional Review Board (IRB). This research has been reviewed and approved by the IRB. If you have any questions concerning your rights as a research subject or if you wish to report any concerns about the study, you may contact the University at Albany's Office of Regulatory & Research Compliance at 1-800-857-5459 or hsconcerns@albany.edu. / *Investigaciones en la Universidad de Albany con participantes humanos se lleva a cabo bajo la supervisión de la Junta de Revisión Institucional (IRB). Esta investigación ha sido revisada y aprobada por el IRB. Si usted tiene alguna pregunta acerca de sus derechos como sujeto de investigación o si desea reportar cualquier preocupación sobre el estudio, puede comunicarse con la Universidad de Albany en la oficina de Cumplimiento Normativo de Investigación a 1-866-857-5459 o hsconcerns@albany.edu.*