

**A Dyadic Longitudinal Examination of the Effects of Minority Stressors on Relationships Outcomes
for Interracial and Same-Race Male Couples**

by

Anastasia Gusakova

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy
(Psychology and Women's and Gender Studies)
in the University of Michigan
2022

Doctoral Committee:

Professor Terri D. Conley, Co-Chair
Professor Robin S. Edelstein, Co-Chair
Associate Professor Lynae A. Darbes
Assistant Professor Amie M. Gordon

Anastasia Gusakova

gusakova@umich.edu

ORCID iD: [0000-0002-9769-2394](https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9769-2394)

© Anastasia Gusakova 2022

Acknowledgements

I am incredibly thankful to Dr. Robin Edelstein, Dr. Terri Conley, Dr. Amie Gordon, and Dr. Lynae Darbes for making this dissertation possible. It has been an incredible experience to learn from you all and push myself to constantly grow as a scholar. Thank you to the Gay Couples study team – Dr. Lynae Darbes, Dr. Colleen Hoff, Dr. Tor Neilands, and Dee Chakravarty – for collecting these data and providing me the opportunity to work with them. This research was made possible due to grant funding from the National Institute for Mental Health (Grant No. MH 075598).

I am grateful for the Psychology and Women's and Gender Studies communities and for the various forms of support I have received from the faculty, staff, and my undergraduate research teams. Thank you to Kathy Robotham and Aki Gormezano for your friendship and for providing me weekly opportunities to try and get my shit together.

Aaron Blanchard, Aurelia Allen, Chelsea McGhee, Jonathon Ryan, and Will Weaver – I love you all. Your friendships have been the magical and have brought me so much strength, encouragement, playfulness, and adventure. Damaya, my sweet potato, you have supported me in so many ways and consistently bring me so much joy. And Jonathon – thank you for always being so understanding, responsive, and nurturing and constantly making me feel comfortable being myself.

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements.....	ii
List of Tables	v
List of Appendices	vi
Abstract.....	vii
Chapter 1 Introduction	1
Differences in Relationship Outcomes.....	3
Links Between Minority Stress and Relationship Outcomes.....	6
Current Study	8
Chapter 2 Methods.....	10
Participants	10
Procedure.....	10
Measures.....	11
Demographics.....	11
Relationship Satisfaction.....	11
Equality.....	11
Sexual Agreement Investment.....	11
Individual-Level Stigma.....	12
Everyday Discrimination.....	12
Relationship Marginalization	12
Analytic Approach	12

Research Question 1: Differences Between Individuals in Same-Race and Interracial Relationships	14
Research Question 2: Associations Between Stress and Relationship Outcomes	15
Chapter 3 Results	19
Research Question 1	19
Relationship Satisfaction	19
Equality.....	20
Investment in Sexual Agreement.....	20
Stigma.....	21
Discrimination	21
Relationship Marginalization	22
Research Question 2.....	30
Relationship Satisfaction	30
Investment in Sexual Agreements	32
Equality.....	34
Controlling for Couple HIV Serostatus	37
Chapter 4 Discussion	47
Differences in Relationship Outcomes and Minority Stress	47
Effects of Minority Stressors on Relationship Outcomes	49
Clinical Implications	53
Limitations	54
Conclusion.....	56
Appendices.....	58
References.....	65

List of Tables

Table 1. Characteristics of the sample (882 individuals; 441 couples).	17
Table 2. Means, Standard Deviations, and Correlations Among Variables	18
Table 3. Results of Dyadic Growth Curve Model of Relationship Satisfaction.....	24
Table 4. Results of Dyadic Growth Curve Model of Equality	25
Table 5. Results of Dyadic Growth Curve Model of Investment in Sexual Agreement	26
Table 6. Results of Dyadic Growth Curve Model of Stigma.....	27
Table 7. Results of Dyadic Growth Curve Model of Discrimination.....	28
Table 8. Results of Dyadic Growth Curve Model of Relationship Marginalization	29
Table 9. Results of Over-Time APIM Model of Stigma on Relationship Satisfaction	38
Table 10. Results of Over-Time APIM Model of Discrimination on Relationship Satisfaction..	39
Table 11. Results of Over-Time APIM Model of Relationship Marginalization on Relationship Satisfaction.....	40
Table 12. Results of Over-Time APIM Model of Stigma on Investment in Sexual Agreements	41
Table 13. Results of Over-Time APIM Model of Discrimination on Investment in Sexual Agreement.....	42
Table 14. Results of Over-Time APIM Model of Relationship Marginalization on Investment in Sexual Agreement.....	43
Table 15. Results of Over-Time APIM Model of Stigma on Equality.....	44
Table 16. Results of Over-Time APIM Model of Discrimination on Equality	45
Table 17. Results of Over-Time APIM Model of Relationship Marginalization on Equality	46

List of Appendices

Appendix A Measures.....	59
Appendix B DGCM Sample Syntax.....	62
Appendix C L-APIM Sample Syntax	64

Abstract

Relatively little work has explored relationship outcomes and experiences of minority stressors in same-gender same-race and interracial relationships. Using a dyadic, longitudinal methods with a sample of male couples, this research evaluated if the racial composition of the couple moderated 1) initial levels and changes in minority stress (i.e. stigma, discrimination, and relationship marginalization) and relationship outcomes (i.e. relationship satisfaction, equality, and investment in sexual agreements) and 2) and the association between experiences of minority stress and the impact of these experiences on relationship outcomes. For research question one, I found that initial levels or trajectories of change for relationship satisfaction, investment in sexual agreements, or equality were not moderated by couple race, but differences did emerge in experiences of stigma, discrimination, and relationship marginalization. For research question two, I found relatively few instances in which couple race moderated the effects of minority stress on relationship outcomes. Taken together, the current study reveals that there are more similarities than differences between different types of interracial and same-race couples.

Chapter 1 Introduction

Interracial relationships – relationships in which partners do not share the same-race or ethnicity – are becoming more accepted and common in the United States and are more common amongst same-gender couples compared to heterosexual couples (Newport, 2013). Researchers studying interracial relationships have focused on comparing the relationship outcomes of interracial and same-race couples, with work primarily addressing the relationship satisfaction of these couples (Brooks, 2021; Henderson & Braithwaite, 2021). It is becoming clearer that relationship satisfaction is similar across couples regardless of their racial composition. Despite increasing research in this area, most of this research only includes one partner from heterosexual, Black-White marriages, limiting our knowledge of the relationship functioning of those in same-gender interracial relationships. Similarly, research on same-gender relationships is done with majority White samples, thus overlooking the experiences of people of color (POC) in same-gender relationships. In addition, longitudinal research is scarce, thereby ignoring the changing nature of relationships over time.

Additionally, much less is known about relationship outcomes aside from relationship satisfaction. For instance, do individuals see themselves as equals in their relationship, and are they similarly invested in their relationships, regardless of the racial background of each partner? Moreover, it remains unclear what factors influence differences in relationship outcomes for people in same-gender relationships. People in interracial same-gender relationships contend with issues common to all couples but additionally encounter various minority stressors resulting from prejudicial attitudes that stigmatize sexual minorities, racial minorities, and their

relationships. In the current research, I address three forms of minority stress – stigma, discrimination, and relationship marginalization. Importantly, given that stress proliferates over time, addressing longitudinal changes in minority stress can facilitate a more holistic understanding of the similarities and differences in how individuals in same-race and interracial change across time.

Relationship outcomes and minority stressors are also likely to differ across different types of same-race and interracial couples. Few studies differentiate between a same-race relationship composed of two White people versus two POC of the same-race or between an interracial couple composed of a White person and a POC versus two POC from different racial backgrounds. It may be that relationship outcomes and minority stress experiences look different due to shared or divergent histories of oppression. Thus, expanding to look at relationship outcomes and minority stressors across four different racial compositions (i.e. same-race relationship with two White people, interracial relationship between a White person and a POC, two POC in a same-race relationship, and a POC in an interracial relationship with another POC from a different racial background) could result in understanding the experiences of individuals in same-gender same-race and interracial relationships more fully.

The present research extends this previous literature by using a longitudinal design to address two overarching goals; The first goal is to determine if experiences of minority stress and relationship outcomes differ based on the racial composition of the couples, and whether these outcomes change over the course of their relationship. The second goal is to examine if minority stress impacts relationship outcomes differently based on the racial composition of the couple. The current study looks at a large sample of male couples who were surveyed over the course of

two years, thereby extending our knowledge of relationship outcomes among individuals in interracial relationships, and same-gender relationships more specifically.

Differences in Relationship Outcomes

Although prior work has established that there is no evidence of differences in relationship satisfaction between same-race and interracial couples (Brooks, 2021; Henderson & Braithwaite, 2021), relatively little work has extended this research to those in same-gender relationships and has not established whether satisfaction might change differently over time across the two groups. Two cross-sectional studies of women in same-gender relationships found no differences in relationship satisfaction between individuals in same-race and interracial relationships (Jeong & Horne, 2009; Veldhuis, 2020). The only study to look at relationship satisfaction in a sample of gay, bisexual, and queer (GBQ) men compared same-race White-White and POC-POC couples to White-POC couples (Perry, Huebner, Baucom, & Hoff, 2016) to understand how different demographic variables (i.e. age, race, HIV status) affect decision-making power in the relationship and relationship satisfaction. They found that race was not a significant predictor of relationship satisfaction after accounting for other demographic information (Perry et al., 2016). Further investigation into relationship satisfaction remains warranted given the paucity of research on same-gender relationships, and GBQ men specifically. Using a longitudinal design will further elucidate whether satisfaction may change differently over the course of the relationship depending on racial composition of the couple.

Two additional important and unexamined relationship outcomes are equality and investment in sexual agreements; exploring these could provide additional information on relationship functioning. People in same-gender relationships report striving towards equality by eliminating power imbalances, cultivating a sense of fairness in their relationship decision-making, and

allowing both partners to have a say in relationship matters (Brown, 2008; Kurdek & Schmitt, 1985; Landolt & Dutton, 1997; Peplau & Cochran, 1981). However, men of color have reported that they feel like they are “never an equal” with their partners (Nemoto et al., 2003). This perception could stem from racial stereotyping, which associates certain sexual experiences with the race of one’s partner (Crockett, 2020; Wilson et al., 2009) and may result in male partners of color feeling fetishized by their partners (Buggs, 2017; Nemoto et al., 2003; Spell, 2017; Stacey & Forbes, 2021). People who are attracted to others because of their race also tend to believe in race-based social hierarchies (Casalheira & Smith, 2020; Tan, Pratto, Operario, & Dworkin, 2013), thus potentially preventing interracial partners from viewing one another as equal. In the one study (to my knowledge) that has examined differences in between feelings of equality between women in same-race and interracial relationships found no evidence of difference in a cross-sectional sample of lesbian women (Jeong & Horne, 2009). Because relatively little is known about whether partners perceive each other as equals when there are power differentials – namely in the form of racial inequality – within the relationship, differences in equality are worth further investigation.

Investment in sexual agreements is another important relationship outcome that is unique within the context of GBQ men’s relationships. Sexual agreements serve as a common way for male couples to form decisions about allowed sexual behaviors within and outside a relationship (Hoff & Beougher, 2010; Hoff, Beougher, Chakravarty, Darbes, & Neilands, 2010). Whereas some couples form agreements that are open and permit sex with outside partners, others form agreements that are closed (monogamous) and do not allow sex with outside partners (Hosking, 2013; LaSala, 2004b, 2004a; Remien, Carballo-Diéguez, & Wagner, 1995). Agreements can hold great meaning for couples and are made to encourage honesty, build trust, and protect the

relationship (Hoff & Beougher, 2010; Hoff et al., 2010; Mitchell, 2014). Thus, it is important to understand how invested individuals are in their sexual agreement and if investment differs based on a couple's relationship composition. Individuals in marginalized relationships (e.g. interracial relationships) are less invested in their relationships compared to those in non-marginalized relationships (Lehmiller & Agnew, 2006), making it plausible that these results would translate to lesser investment in sexual agreements more specifically.

Beyond understanding differences in relationship outcomes, researchers are increasingly paying attention to *why* differences in relationship outcomes may emerge. People in interracial same-gender relationships contend with issues common to all couples; however sexual and racial minorities face multiple forms of oppression – including racism and homonegativity – and thus also contend with several forms of minority stress. Minority stressors are unique, chronic stressors emanating from prejudicial attitudes that are directed at stigmatized individuals and members of stigmatized relationships (Frost et al., 2017; LeBlanc & Frost, 2020; LeBlanc, Frost, & Wight, 2015; Meyer, 2003). Minority stressors can proliferate and have a cumulative impact on people's health and relationships over time (Wallace, Nazroo, & Bécares, 2016).

On an individual level, minority stress includes *stigma*, a process in which people are othered, stereotyped, and rejected for their social identities, and *discrimination*, referring to prejudicial treatment of individuals based on their identity (Link & Phelan, 2001; Meyer, 1995, 2003). Individuals who are both people of color and queer encounter both stigma and discrimination that can affect their lives in simultaneous and unique ways. Indeed, research has shown that queer men of color experience more minority stress compared to White queer men (Cyrus, 2017).

In addition, people in interracial relationships may experience become the targets of social disapproval, creating a couple-level minority stressor in the form of *relationship marginalization* (LeBlanc & Frost, 2020; LeBlanc et al., 2015; Neilands et al., 2020; Rosenthal & Starks, 2015). Although explicit attitudes towards interracial relationships have become more favorable, people in same-gender and interracial relationships experience more relationship marginalization compared with those in non-marginalized relationships (Lehmiller & Agnew, 2006). Across sexual orientations, people in interracial relationships in the United States experience more marginalization than same-race couples (Gaines, 2002; Herek, 2000; Rosenblatt, Karis, & Powell, 1995; Yancey, 2003). Individuals in interracial relationships report hearing racist language from close others and isolation and rejection from both queer and people of color communities (Rostosky, Riggle, Savage, Roberts, & Singletary, 2008). Taking together the findings on stigma, discrimination, and relationship marginalization, this study examined if people in same-race and interracial relationships differ in the amount of initial stigma, discrimination, and relationship marginalization they experience and if these experiences change differently over time.

Links Between Minority Stress and Relationship Outcomes

Within close relationships, stressful life events, including experiences of minority stress, can cause stress to proliferate over time, cross-over between partners, and lead to worse relationship and health outcomes (Gamarel, Reisner, Laurenceau, Nemoto, & Operario, 2014; LeBlanc et al., 2015). According to Interdependence theory, relationship partners are interdependent and exert mutual influences on one another's behaviors through their interactions (Kelly & Thibaut, 1978). Thus, experiences of minority stress may not only affect one's own relationship outcomes, but they may also influence one's partner's relationship outcomes.

Determining how couples are functioning in the face of minority stress could provide critical information on when, if, and for whom relationship education interventions are most beneficial at reducing the impacts of minority stress (Lewis et al., 2006; Whitton, Weitbrecht, Kuryluk, & Hutsell, 2016).

While it is well established that experiences of stigma, discrimination, and relationship marginalization can negatively impact relationship outcomes, it is not well understood whether these effects are felt more acutely by those in interracial relationships and how these effects may change over time. Individuals' experiences with minority stressors are often associated with experiencing worse relationship quality and satisfaction (Lincoln & Chae, 2010; Murry, Brown, Brody, Cutrona, & Simons, 2001). Additionally, having a partner who has experienced discrimination is associated with lower relationship quality (Otis, Rostosky, Riggle, & Hamrin, 2006).

Relationship marginalization is negatively linked with various facets of relationships quality (Lehmiller & Agnew, 2006; Rosenthal, Deosaran, Young, & Starks, 2019; Rosenthal & Starks, 2015; Yampolsky, West, Zhou, Muise, & LaLonde, 2020). This may be because relationship marginalization conveys a lack of social support, which is important for relationship outcomes (Brooks, Ogolsky, & Monk, 2018; Shibazaki & Brennan, 1998). Lehmiller and Agnew (2007) found that people in same-gender or interracial relationships are less invested in their relationships as a function of higher relationship marginalization. In interviews, interracial same-sex couples said that relationship stigma negatively affected their satisfaction (Frost, 2011). Thus, to the extent that relationship outcomes and minority stressors differ for people in same-race and interracial relationships, it is also important to investigate how various forms of minority stress differently impact their relationship quality. By using a longitudinal design, the

present research explores how variations in the experience of minority stress influences relationship outcomes over time.

It is equally important to consider the possibility that minority stress may be associated with better relationship outcomes. From an Interdependence theory perspective, partners undergo a transformation of motivation in which they realize that individual threats, such as minority stress, are meaningful for both their partner and the relationship. Being in an interracial relationship often increases awareness of race and racism for White partners (AhnAllen & Suyemoto, 2011; Foeman & Nance, 1999). Minority stress may strengthen the bond and commitment between interracial couples (Dalmage, 2000; Frost, 2011; Hibbler & Shinew, 2002). Experiencing racism has been found to increase commitment and unity between the partners (Hibbler & Shinew, 2002) due to an increase in awareness of racism and resulting empathy (Dalmage, 2000). Many same-gender couples report overcoming relationship stigma and find that it affects them less over time (Frost, 2011).

Current Study

The goal of the current study is to build upon and expand previous research on same-race and interracial male couples' relationship outcomes and minority stressors. The aims of the study are twofold; First, I will examine whether initial levels and growth trajectories of minority stress (i.e. stigma, discrimination, and relationship marginalization) and relationship outcomes (i.e. relationship satisfaction, equality, and investment in sexual agreements) differ based on the racial composition of the couple to which an individual belongs to. Second, I will investigate the association between minority stressors and the impact of these stressors on relationship outcomes by determining a) how individual fluctuations in minority stressors relate to their relationship outcomes (i.e. within-person effects) and b) how levels of minority stressors relate to overall

levels of relationship outcomes (i.e. between-person effects). Additionally, I explore if these outcomes differ between White individuals and people of color (POC) for those in interracial White-POC relationships.

Chapter 2 Methods

Participants

This research draws on a longitudinal study of male couples ($N = 441$) who were recruited as part the Gay Couples Study funded by the National Institute for Mental Health (Grant No. MH 075598). This study examined how relationship dynamics affect sexual behaviors within and outside their relationships. By focusing on male couples this research targets a group in which interracial relationships are common but has been underrepresented in research on minority stressors and relationship outcomes. Couples were recruited from the San Francisco Bay Area between 2012 and 2014 using active and passive methods (e.g., flyers, advertisements, active recruiters, community events, etc.). To be eligible for the study, both participants had to be over 18 years old, fluent in English, report that they were in a relationship for at least 3 months, know their own and their partner's HIV serostatus, identify as gay or bisexual, and identify as cisgender. Participant demographics can be found in Table 1. Couples who broke up during the study were excluded from subsequent waves. There was minimal attrition over time, with retention rates of 85% between wave 1 and wave 2, 79% between wave 1 and wave 3, and 74% between wave 1 and wave 4. The observed means, standard deviations, and correlations are presented in Table 2.

Procedure

Couples were surveyed simultaneously but separately at the study office, located in downtown San Francisco. Each person provided informed consent and then individually

completed the self-administered survey, which queried about relationship dynamics (e.g., communication, intimacy), sexual behaviors, sexual agreements, broken agreements, and HIV testing. Surveys were completed by each partner every six months. Ethics approval for this study was received from San Francisco State University.

Measures

Demographics Each individual provided information about their age, sexual orientation, race/ethnicity, relationship length, employment status, and education level.

Relationship Satisfaction Using a 9-point scale ranging from 0 (*do not agree at all*) to 8 (*agree completely*), participants completed the 5-item relationship satisfaction subscale from the Investment Model Scale (Rusbult, Martz, & Agnew, 1998). Sample items include “I feel satisfied with our relationship” and “Our relationship does a good job of fulfilling my needs for intimacy, companionship, etc” ($\alpha = .91$).

Equality Current levels of equality were measured using an eight-item scale developed by (Kurdek, 1995) (adapted from (Cochran & Peplau, 1985)(Peplau & Cochran, 1981). Sample items include “My partner and I have equal power in the relationship,” “My partner shows as much affection to me as I think I show to him.” Participants rated items on a 9-point scale ranging from 1 (*not true at all*) to 9 (*extremely true*) ($\alpha = .91$).

Sexual Agreement Investment To measure levels of investment in sexual agreements, participants completed the 13-item Sexual Agreement Investment Scale (Neilands, Chakravarty, Darbes, Beougher, & Hoff, 2010). Investment was measured across three domains: commitment, satisfaction, and value. Example items include “How much do you appreciate having your current agreement?,” “How important is it to you that both you and your primary partner are equally committed to your current agreement?” and “How important is it that you feel satisfied

with your current agreement?” These items were measured from 0 (*not at all*) to 4 (*extremely*) ($\alpha = .95$).

Individual-Level Stigma To assess individual-level stigma, participants completed a six item stigma scale adapted from (Link, 1987) by Meyer and colleagues (Meyer, Schwartz, & Frost, 2008). Participants rated their agreement to items such as “Most employers will not hire a person like you” and “Most people believe that a person like you cannot be trusted.” Participants rated these items on a scale of 1 (*disagree strongly*) to 4 (*agree strongly*) ($\alpha = .90$).

Everyday Discrimination Participants completed the 10-item version of the Everyday Discrimination Scale to assess the extent of individual-level discrimination individuals experienced over the past 6 months using a scale of 1 (*never*) to 4 (*often*) (Lewis et al., 2006; Williams, Yan Yu, Jackson, & Anderson, 1997). An example includes “In your day-to-day life how often are you treated with less courtesy than other people?” ($\alpha = .87$).

Relationship Marginalization To understand the extent of relationship marginalization individuals experienced, participants were asked four questions about social attitudes towards their relationship (Lehmiller & Agnew, 2006). Two items reflect relationship approval (e.g. “My relationship has general societal acceptance”) and two items reflect relationship disapproval (e.g. “I believe that most other persons (whom I do not know) would generally disapprove of my relationship.” Items were rated on a 9-point scale ranging from 0 (*not true at all*) to 8 (*very true*) ($\alpha = .73$).

Analytic Approach

For both research questions, analyses were conducted using multilevel modeling (MLM) in SPSS v.27 (see Appendices B and C for example syntax). MLM accounts for multiple measurements and the nesting of individuals within dyads (Kenny, Kashy, & Cook, 2006). I used

a two-level cross-classified model that accounts for non-independence within both dyads and time points. Random intercepts were modeled separately for each partner but were constrained to be equal using compound symmetry matrices for random effects because couple members were treated as indistinguishable. To set up these models, two dummy variables were generated for each person: $P1 = 1$ if the outcome variable is from Partner 1 and $P1 = 0$ otherwise and $P2 = 1$ if the outcome variable is from Partner 2 and $P2 = 0$ otherwise. Creating these dummy variables enables the specification of equality constraints because dyad members are indistinguishable (Kashy, Donnellan, Burt, & McGue, 2008).

Across all models, the racial composition of the couple was treated as a moderating variable. The four comparison groups were: same-race relationship with two White people, interracial relationship between a White person and a POC, two POC in a same-race relationship, and a POC in an interracial relationship with another POC. Individuals in White-POC relationships were treated as the reference group which allowed me to determine if the association between two variables was different for an individual belonging to one of the other three groups compared to those in a White-POC relationships.

Each model included 3 covariates: length of the relationship (grand-mean centered), the type of sexual agreement couples had (i.e., monogamous, open, or discrepant), and age discrepancy (dummy coded 1 = age gap over 10 years and 0 = age gap less than 10 years). I included relationship length as a covariate because of evidence that longer relationships are more resilient to the impacts of stress. Sex agreement type is included given that importance of sexual agreements to male couples. Finally, age gap was included as a covariate because it has been theorized to influence decision-making power among male couples (Dworkin et al. 2017).

For each research question, I conducted follow-up analyses that only included participants in White-POC relationships to understand differences between White and POC partners. Models were set up like those above but instead used a dummy-coded predictor representing the participants' race as the moderating variable. Using race as a moderator allowed me to test for the significance of racial differences as opposed to reporting effects separately for White people and POC (e.g. if using a two-intercept model).

Research Question 1: Differences Between Individuals in Same-Race and Interracial Relationships

To test the first research question about the similarities and differences between individuals in different types of same-race and interracial relationships, I ran a series of dyadic growth curves models (DGCM) to assess if the couple racial composition moderates the initial level and degree of change over time in their outcome variable. Growth curve models estimate two main parameters. First, they estimate the intercept, which shows the overall level of variable at a fixed time point averaged across the sample. The second parameter is the slope, which shows the direction and amount of linear change. The initial measurement for each partner was centered at 0 (the intercept). The slope thus models the predicted change in the dependent variable as time increases by 6 months (the time between measurements). Because couples are treated as indistinguishable both the intercepts and slopes are constrained to the same value across partners.

Modeling was done using a two-step approach. First, I ran unconditional linear models for each of the different outcomes without any additional predictors to establish the initial levels of each outcome (i.e., the intercepts) and the changes in each outcome (i.e., the slopes). Next, I ran a series of conditional models which included all variables of interest to understand whether

the type of relationship was linked with different aspects of relationship outcomes and minority stressors.

Research Question 2: Associations Between Stress and Relationship Outcomes

For the second set of analyses, I investigated how minority stressors are associated with relationship outcomes, and whether the racial composition of the couple moderates this association. In total, I estimated 9 separate models in which associations were assessed between each type of minority stress (stigma, discrimination, and relationship marginalization) and relationship satisfaction, investment in sexual agreements, and equality. I used the Actor-Partner Interdependence Model (APIM) to simultaneously estimate the effect that one's own minority stress has on one's own outcome (actor effect) and the effect that one's own minority stress has on their partner's outcome (partner effect) (Kenny et al., 2006).

Due to the longitudinal nature of the design, I used an over-time APIM that models both within-person effects and between-person effects. Within-person effects are time-varying and capture whether wave-to-wave changes in minority stressors are associated with corresponding changes in a participant's relationship outcomes (e.g., how levels of minority stress during one wave relate to relationship outcomes during that same wave). Specifically, I was interested in whether people would report poorer relationship outcomes in their relationship when they experienced more minority stress than they typically did. I estimated both actor and partner within-person effects, meaning that I examined if individuals' minority stress is associated with their own relationship outcomes (actor effect) as well as their partner's relationship outcomes (partner effect). Between-person effects modeled whether the average value of the predictor was associated with the outcome variables, allowing me to determine if individuals who tend to experience more minority stress also tend to experience worse relationship outcomes.

Additionally, racial composition of the couple was tested as a moderating variable between minority stress and relationship outcomes for both the within- and between-person effects.

Table 1. Characteristics of the sample (882 individuals; 441 couples).

	%	N
Individual-level characteristics		
Age (years, SD)	41.30	12.38
Race		
American Indian or Alaskan Native	.7	6
Asian/Pacific Islander	9.5	84
Black, not of Hispanic Origin	7.5	66
Hispanic (Latino)	13	115
White, not of Hispanic Origin	61.3	541
Mixed Race	7.7	68
Another race	.2	2
Sexual Orientation		
Queer	6.6	58
Gay or Homosexual	84.7	747
Bisexual	6.8	60
None of the above	1.3	12
Unsure	.6	5
Employment		
Employed	74.4	656
Unemployed	25.6	226
Education		
Did not complete high school	1.9	17
High school diploma or GED	8	71
Some College of Associate Degree	30.7	271
Bachelor's degree	32.3	285
Masters, Doctor's or other professional degree	27	238
Couple-level characteristics		
Relationship length (years, SD)	7.83	7.85
Sexual Agreement Type		
Monogamous	41.3	182
Open	48.3	213
Discrepant	10.4	46
Age Discrepancy		
Yes	77.6	342
No	22.4	99
Couple Race		
Same-Race White	11.3	183
Same-Race POC		50
Interracial White-POC	39.7	175
Interracial POC-POC	7.5	33

Note. All values are from first wave of data collection.

Table 2. Means, Standard Deviations, and Correlations Among Variables

Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6
1. Stigma	1.53 (.63)					
2. Discrimination	.57**	2.17 (.59)				
3. Marginalization	.52**	.38**	1.95 (1.52)			
4. Relationship Satisfaction	-.14**	-.16**	-.33**	6.51 (1.45)		
5. Investment in Sexual Agreement	-.13**	-.04*	-.13**	.49**	3.15 (.72)	
6. Equality	-.15**	-.19**	-.33**	.77**	.44**	7.30 (1.53)

Note. Means and standard deviations (calculated over-time) are represented on the diagonal. Correlations represent within-person correlations (overall mean across waves). They do not take the dyadic structure of the data into account and thus are for descriptive purpose only. * $p < .05$
 ** $p < .001$

Chapter 3 Results

Research Question 1

I first ran a series of unconditional DGCM with no predictors to establish initial levels of relationship outcomes and minority stressors (i.e. intercepts) and changes in relationship outcomes and minority stressors across 6, 12, and 18 months after initial data collection (i.e. slopes). Results for each of the unconditional models can be found in Tables 3-8. Next, to test initial differences between the different types of same-race and interracial couples on each outcome, and changes in those outcomes, I entered time, a 3-level couple-level variable representing the racial-composition of the couple, and an interaction between the couple-level racial-composition variable and time. Additionally, relationship length, age discrepancy, and sexual agreement were added as control variables. Finally, I ran follow-up DGCM's including only men in White-POC relationships to determine if White and POC partners differed in their initial levels and changes in each variable of interest.

Relationship Satisfaction

Conditional Model. The initial relationship satisfaction score was generally high, with an average score of 5.98 among men in White-POC relationships (out of 8) and showed a relatively small, but statistically significant, decline of 0.08 units in between waves. Initial levels of relationship satisfaction did not significantly differ between men in White-POC relationships and the other three racial groups. Additionally, racial composition did not significantly moderate the change in slope, suggesting that individuals in same-race White-White, same-race POC, and

interracial POC-only relationships did not differ in the extent to which they reported decreases in relationship satisfaction compared to individuals in White-POC relationships. Results are presented in Table 3.

White-POC Couples. I ran a follow-up DGCM including only men in White-POC relationships to determine differences between White and POC partners. I found that White and POC partners did not differ from one another in their initial levels or changes in relationship satisfaction over time.

Equality

Conditional Model. Initial perceptions of equality were relatively high for individuals in White-POC relationships with a mean score of 6.51 (out of 9). Equality scores did not significantly change over time. Neither initial levels nor changes in equality significantly differed between White-POC couples and the other three racial groups. See Table 4 for results.

White-POC Couples. To determine if White and POC partners differed in initial levels or changes in perceptions of equality, I tested participant race as a moderator in a model with only White-POC couples. Among White-POC couples, White and POC partners did not differ in initial equality levels nor in their change over time.

Investment in Sexual Agreement

Conditional Model. Initial levels of investment in sexual agreements among men in White-POC relationships was relatively high, with a mean score of 2.94 (out of 4) and there was a small, statistically significant decrease of 0.03 units between waves. Neither initial investment scores nor changes in investment scores statistically differed between men in White-POC relationships and the other three racial groups. Results can be found in Table 5.

White-POC Couples. In a follow-up DGCM, I tested participant race as a moderator in a model with only White-POC couples. White partners experienced a lower initial investment compared to partners of color, $t(256) = -2.64, p = 0.009, 95\% \text{ CI } [-.29, -.04]$. White and POC participants did not differ in the extent to which they reported changes in investment over time.

Stigma

Conditional Model. For initial stigma, individuals in White-POC relationships scored 1.59 (out of 4) on average and experienced a relatively small, but statistically significant, increase of 0.02 units between waves. Compared to men in White-POC relationships, men in same-race POC relationships reported experiencing more initial stigma; however, individuals in same-race White or interracial POC relationships did not significantly differ from individuals in White-POC relationships in their initial stigma scores. None of the interactions between racial composition and wave were significant, indicating that perceptions of stigma did not change differently over time for men in same-race White-White, same-race POC, and interracial POC-only relationships compared to those in White-POC relationships (see Table 6).

White-POC Couples. I tested participant race as a moderator in a model with only White-POC couples. I found that White partners experienced lower initial stigma compared to partners of color, $t(260) = -2.01, p = 0.046, 95\% \text{ CI } [-.24, -.00]$. White and POC participants did not differ in the extent to which they reported changes in stigma.

Discrimination

Conditional Model. Men in White-POC relationships had an average initial discrimination score of 2.39 (out of 4) and did not experience a significant change between waves. Compared to individuals in White-POC relationships, POC in same-race POC

relationships reported significantly higher initial discrimination and White men in same-race relationships reported significant lower initial discrimination. There was no difference between men in White-POC relationships and interracial POC-only relationships. Men in same-race White-White, same-race POC, and interracial POC-only relationships did not differ in the extent to which they reported changes in their discrimination over time.

White-POC Couples. Among White-POC couples, White partners experienced lower initial discrimination compared to partners of color, $t(247) = -3.05, p = 0.003, 95\% \text{ CI } [-.25, -.05]$. White and POC participants did not differ in the extent to which they reported changes in discrimination over time.

Relationship Marginalization

Conditional Model. Finally, the average initial relationship marginalization score for men in White-POC couples was relatively low, with a mean of 2.29 (out of 8); however, the slope was nonsignificant indicating that relationship marginalization did not change over time for men in White-POC relationships. Compared to men in White-POC relationships, men in White same-race relationships reported experiencing lower initial marginalization whereas POC in same-race POC relationships reported significantly higher marginalization. No significant difference was observed in initial relationship marginalization scores between men in White-POC relationships and same-race POC relationships. In terms of change over time, there were two significant interactions. Compared to individuals in White-POC relationships, White men in same-race relationships and men of color in interracial relationships reported a significant increase in relationship marginalization. No difference was observed between those in White-POC relationships and same-race POC relationships in changes in relationship marginalization.

White-POC Couples. In the final DGCM testing differences between White and POC partners in White-POC relationships, neither initial levels nor changes in relationship marginalization differed between White and POC partners.

Table 3. Results of Dyadic Growth Curve Model of Relationship Satisfaction

Fixed Effects	<i>b</i>	<i>t</i>	95% CI
Unconditional Model			
Intercept	6.55 (0.06)	115.17**	[6.43, 6.66]
Wave	-0.07 (0.02)	-4.17**	[-0.01, -0.04]
Conditional Model			
Intercept	5.98 (0.18)	32.76**	[5.62, 6.34]
Same-Race White	-0.09 (0.12)	-0.76	[-0.34, 0.15]
Same-Race POC	-0.3 (0.19)	-1.62	[-0.67, 0.07]
Interracial POC	0.13 (0.22)	0.57	[-0.31, 0.56]
Wave	-0.08 (0.03)	-2.96*	[-0.13, -0.03]
Same-Race White Slope	0.01 (0.04)	0.40	[-0.06, 0.09]
Same-Race POC Slope	0.02 (0.06)	0.39	[-0.09, 0.14]
Interracial POC Slope	-0.1 (0.07)	-1.47	[-0.24, 0.03]
Relationship Length	0.01 (0.01)	2.28*	[0.00, 0.03]
Age Discrepancy	0.03 (0.12)	0.24	[-0.21, 0.27]
Monogamous	0.98 (0.18)	5.46**	[0.63, 1.33]
CNM	0.49 (0.18)	2.73*	[0.14, 0.85]

Note: * $p < .05$ ** $p < .001$

Table 4. Results of Dyadic Growth Curve Model of Equality

Fixed Effects	<i>b</i>	<i>t</i>	95% <i>CI</i>
Unconditional Model			
Intercept	7.28 (0.06)	122.55**	[7.16, 7.40]
Wave	-0.02 (0.02)	-1.29	[-0.05, 0.01]
Conditional Model			
Intercept	6.51 (0.19)	34.33**	[6.14, 6.88]
Same-Race White	-0.04 (0.13)	-0.32	[-0.29, 0.21]
Same-Race POC	-0.17 (0.19)	-0.86	[-0.55, 0.21]
Interracial POC	0.06 (0.23)	0.28	[-0.39, 0.51]
Wave	-0.03 (0.03)	-1.24	[-0.09, 0.02]
Same-Race White Slope	0.03 (0.04)	0.72	[-0.05, 0.10]
Same-Race POC Slope	-0.05 (0.06)	-0.78	[-0.16, 0.07]
Interracial POC Slope	-0.08 (0.07)	-1.09	[-0.21, 0.06]
Relationship Length	0.02 (0.01)	2.43*	[0, 0.03]
Age Discrepancy	0.02 (0.13)	0.12	[-0.23, 0.27]
Monogamous	1.17 (0.19)	6.28**	[0.80, 1.54]
CNM	0.69 (0.19)	3.66**	[0.32, 1.06]

Note: * $p < .05$ ** $p < .001$

Table 5. Results of Dyadic Growth Curve Model of Investment in Sexual Agreement

Fixed Effects	<i>b</i>	<i>t</i>	95% <i>CI</i>
Unconditional Model			
Intercept	3.17 (0.03)	119.40**	[3.12, 3.22]
Wave	-0.02 (0.01)	-3.29**	[-0.04, -0.01]
Conditional Model			
Intercept	2.94 (0.08)	36.20**	[2.78, 3.10]
Same-Race White	-0.03 (0.05)	-0.49	[-0.13, 0.08]
Same-Race POC	-0.08 (0.08)	-0.98	[-0.24, 0.08]
Interracial POC	0.07 (0.10)	0.70	[-0.12, 0.26]
Wave	-0.03 (0.01)	-2.33*	[-0.05, 0]
Same-Race White Slope	0.01 (0.02)	0.81	[-0.02, 0.04]
Same-Race POC Slope	-0.01 (0.02)	-0.51	[-0.06, 0.04]
Interracial POC Slope	-0.01 (0.03)	-0.41	[-0.07, 0.05]
Relationship Length	0 (0)	-0.12	[-0.01, 0.01]
Age Discrepancy	-0.07 (0.05)	-1.34	[-0.18, 0.03]
Monogamous	0.53 (0.08)	6.65**	[0.37, 0.69]
CNM	0.09 (0.08)	1.11	[-0.07, 0.25]

Note: * $p < .05$ ** $p < .001$

Table 6. Results of Dyadic Growth Curve Model of Stigma

Fixed Effects	<i>b</i>	<i>t</i>	95% <i>CI</i>
Unconditional Model			
Intercept	1.52 (0.02)	66.36**	[1.48, 1.57]
Wave	0.02 (0.01)	2.35*	[0, 0.03]
Conditional Models			
Intercept	1.59 (0.07)	22.02**	[1.44, 1.73]
Same-Race White	-0.03 (0.05)	-0.67	[-0.13, 0.06]
Same-Race POC	0.42 (0.07)	5.74**	[0.28, 0.57]
Interracial POC	0.09 (0.09)	0.98	[-0.09, 0.26]
Wave	0.02 (0.01)	2.25*	[0, 0.05]
Same-Race White Slope	-0.01 (0.01)	-0.44	[-0.03, 0.02]
Same-Race POC Slope	-0.02 (0.02)	-0.86	[-0.06, 0.03]
Interracial POC Slope	-0.01 (0.03)	-0.40	[-0.07, 0.04]
Relationship Length	-0.01 (0)	-2.18*	[-0.01, 0]
Age Discrepancy	0.06 (0.05)	1.28	[-0.03, 0.16]
Monogamous	-0.19 (0.07)	-2.62*	[-0.32, -0.05]
CNM	-0.10 (0.07)	-1.47	[-0.24, 0.04]

Note: * $p < .05$ ** $p < .001$

Table 7. Results of Dyadic Growth Curve Model of Discrimination

Fixed Effects	<i>b</i>	<i>t</i>	95% <i>CI</i>
Unconditional Model			
Intercept	2.20 (0.02)	100.30**	[2.16, 2.24]
Wave	-0.01 (0.01)	-1.79	[-0.02, 0]
Conditional Models			
Intercept	2.39 (0.07)	35.09**	[2.26, 2.53]
Same-Race White	-0.15 (0.05)	-3.39**	[-0.24, -0.06]
Same-Race POC	0.31 (0.07)	4.49**	[0.17, 0.44]
Interracial POC	0.02 (0.08)	0.25	[-0.14, 0.18]
Wave	0 (0.01)	-0.39	[-0.02, 0.01]
Same-Race White Slope	0 (0.01)	0.18	[-0.02, 0.02]
Same-Race POC Slope	-0.01 (0.02)	-0.56	[-0.04, 0.02]
Interracial POC Slope	-0.02 (0.02)	-0.72	[-0.06, 0.03]
Relationship Length	-0.01 (0)	-3.50**	[-0.01, 0]
Age Discrepancy	0.05 (0.05)	0.98	[-0.05, 0.14]
Monogamous	-0.21 (0.07)	-3.15*	[-0.35, -0.08]
CNM	-0.20 (0.07)	-3.02*	[-0.34, -0.07]

Note: * $p < .05$ ** $p < .001$

Table 8. Results of Dyadic Growth Curve Model of Relationship Marginalization

Fixed Effects	<i>b</i>	<i>t</i>	95% <i>CI</i>
Unconditional Model			
Intercept	1.98 (0.06)	34.77**	[1.87, 2.09]
Wave	0.02 (0.02)	1.44	[-0.01, 0.05]
Conditional Models			
Intercept	2.29 (0.18)	12.78**	[1.94, 2.64]
Same-Race White	-0.3 (0.12)	-2.50*	[-0.54, -0.06]
Same-Race POC	0.74 (0.18)	4.05**	[0.38, 1.1]
Interracial POC	-0.37 (0.22)	-1.72	[-0.79, 0.05]
Wave	-0.01 (0.03)	-0.25	[-0.06, 0.04]
Same-Race White Slope	0.08 (0.03)	2.17*	[0.01, 0.14]
Same-Race POC Slope	-0.02 (0.06)	-0.36	[-0.13, 0.09]
Interracial POC Slope	0.16 (0.07)	2.42*	[0.03, 0.29]
Relationship Length	-0.02 (0.01)	-3.53**	[-0.03, -0.01]
Age Discrepancy	0.30 (0.12)	2.47*	[0.06, 0.53]
Monogamous	-0.47 (0.18)	-2.64*	[-0.81, -0.12]
CNM	-0.28 (0.18)	-1.57	[-0.63, 0.07]

Note: * $p < .05$ ** $p < .001$

Research Question 2

The second research question examined in this study addresses the association between minority stressors and relationship outcomes, and whether the racial composition of the couple moderates this association. Using an over-time APIM, I examined how levels of actor or partner minority stress during one wave relate to relationship outcomes during that same wave (within-person effect). I also examined if individuals who tend to experience more minority stress, or have partners who tend to experience more minority stress, also tend to experience worse relationship outcomes (between-person effect).

Additionally, I conducted follow-up analyses examining whether minority stress affects relationship quality differently for White individuals and POC in White-POC relationships. Across all models, I found no difference between White men and men of color and results are thus not reported below.

Relationship Satisfaction

Stigma. Results of the over-time APIM for the effects of stigma on relationship satisfaction are presented in Table 9. There were no significant within-person associations, suggesting that experiences of actor or partner stigma were not associated with relationship satisfaction during that same wave. Additionally, racial composition did not moderate the link between actor or partner stigma and relationship satisfaction.

I next looked at between-person differences and found main effects for both actor and partner stigma. These effects suggest that men in White-POC relationships who tended to experience more stigma, and those whose partners tended to experience more stigma, were less satisfied than those individuals, or those with partners, who tended to experience less stigma. However, racial composition did not moderate this association for actors. For partner effects, I

found two significant interactions that suggested that the between-person effect of partner stigma differed between those in White-POC relationships and those in same-race or interracial POC-only relationships: Whereas men in White-POC relationships had lower relationship satisfaction if their partners tended to experience more stigma, there was an opposite effect for men in either same-race or interracial POC relationships such that men whose partners tended to experience greater stigma had higher relationship satisfaction. The between-person effect of partner stigma did not differ between those in White-POC relationships and those in White-White relationships.

Discrimination. Table 10 presents the results of the over-time APIM for the effects of discrimination on relationship satisfaction. There were no significant within-person effects of actor or partner's discrimination, suggesting that experiences of actor or partner discrimination were not associated with relationship satisfaction during that same wave. Racial composition did not moderate within-person effects of actor or partner's discrimination. Additionally, there were no significant between-person effects of actor discrimination suggesting that the tendency to experience discrimination was not associated with a tendency to experience worse relationship satisfaction. There was a significant main effect for partners, such that individuals in White-POC relationships were less satisfied if their partners tended to experience more discrimination. There were no significant interactions between couple racial composition and between-person effects of actor or partner's discrimination.

Marginalization. Results of the over-time APIM for the effects of relationship marginalization on relationship satisfaction are presented in Table 11. I found a significant within-person actor effect, such that individuals in White-POC relationships reported lower relationship satisfaction when they experienced more relationship marginalization than usual. There was no significant within-person effect of partner relationship marginalization nor did

couple racial composition moderate within-person actor effects for relationship marginalization. I found one significant interaction that suggested that the within-person effect of partner relationship marginalization differed between men in White-POC relationships and those in POC-only interracial relationships. There was a stronger negative effect of partners' relationship marginalization on one's own relationship satisfaction for individuals in POC-only interracial relationships compared to individuals in White-POC interracial relationships when their partners experienced more relationship marginalization than usual.

I next looked at between-person differences and found a main effect for actor, but not partner, relationship marginalization. This actor effect suggests that those who tended to experience more relationship marginalization on average were less satisfied than those individuals who tended to experience less relationship marginalization. Couple racial composition did not moderate the between-person effects for actor or partner relationship marginalization.

Removing Couples with Discrepant Agreements. I ran follow-up L-APIMs excluding men who disagreed with their partners on their sexual agreement (i.e. if they were in a monogamous or open relationship) to determine if this affected between- and within-person actor and partner effects of stigma on relationship satisfaction. I found that between- and within-person actor and partner effects remained unchanged from the results described above.

Investment in Sexual Agreements

Stigma. Results of the over-time APIM for the effects of stigma on investment in sexual agreements are presented in Table 12. I found a significant within-person main effect for actors, such that men in White-POC relationships reported lower investment in their sexual agreement when they experienced more stigma than usual. There was no significant main effect of partner

stigma. For actor effects, I found one significant interaction that suggested that the within-person effect of stigma differed between men in White-POC relationships and White same-race relationships such that White men in same-race relationships experienced more investment in their sexual agreement during times in which they experienced more stigma than usual. Otherwise, I found no significant interactions between racial composition and within-person effects of actor or partner stigma.

I next looked at between-person differences and found no between-person effects of actor or partner stigma. Furthermore, couple racial composition did not moderate the association between-person effects of actor or partner's stigma.

Discrimination. Looking at the effects of discrimination on investment in sexual agreements, I found no significant within- or between-person main effects of actor or partner discrimination nor any significant interactions between racial composition of the couple and within- or between-person effects of actor or partner's discrimination (see Table 13).

Relationship Marginalization. Table 14 presents the results of the over-time APIM for the effects of relationship marginalization on investment in sexual agreements. I found a significant main effect for actors, such that men in White-POC relationships reported lower investment in their sexual agreement when they experienced more relationship marginalization than usual. There was no significant within-person effect of partner relationship marginalization. Additionally, there were no significant interactions between couple racial composition and within-person effects of actor relationship marginalization. I found one significant interaction that suggested that the within-person effect of partner relationship marginalization differed between men in White-POC relationships and POC same-race relationships. Men in same-race POC relationships experienced more investment when their partners experienced more

relationship marginalization than usual whereas no such effect was found for men in White-POC relationships. The within-person effect of partner stigma did not differ between those in White-POC relationships and those in White-White or interracial POC-only relationships.

I next looked at between-person differences and found a significant actor, but not partner, main effect of relationship marginalization that shows that men in White-POC relationships who tended to experience more relationship marginalization were less invested in their sexual agreement than those individuals who tended to experience less relationship marginalization. There were no significant interactions between couple racial composition and between-person effects of actor or partner's relationship marginalization.

Removing Couples with Discrepant Agreements. I ran follow-up L-APIMs excluding men who disagreed with their partners on their sexual agreement (i.e. if they were in a monogamous or open relationship) to determine if this affected between- and within-person actor and partner effects of stigma on relationship satisfaction. With two exceptions, I found that between- and within-person actor and partner effects remained unchanged from the results described above. I found that the within-person actor effect of relationship marginalization on investment in sexual agreements was no longer significant when men with discrepant agreements were removed from the analyses. Additionally, the within-person effect of partner relationship marginalization no longer differed between men in White-POC relationships and POC same-race relationships as it did in the original model.

Equality

Stigma. Results of the over-time APIM for the effects of stigma on equality are presented in Table 15. There were no significant within-person associations between actor or partner stigma

and equality, nor any significant interactions between racial composition of the couple and within-person effects of actor or partner's stigma.

Next, looking at between-person effects, I found a main effect for actor, but not partner, stigma. This effect suggests that those who tended to experience more stigma felt their relationships were less equal than those individuals who tended to experience less stigma. None of the interactions between racial composition and between-person actor or partner stigma were significant.

Discrimination. Looking at the within-person effects of discrimination on perceptions of equality, I found a significant main effect for actors, such that men in White-POC relationships reported lower equality when they experienced more discrimination than usual. There was no main effect for partner discrimination nor were there any significant interactions between racial composition and within-person effects of actor or partner's discrimination.

For between-person effects, there was a significant main effect of actor, but not partner, discrimination showing that individuals in White-POC relationships felt less equal if their partners tended to experience more discrimination. There were no significant interactions between racial composition of the couple and between-person effects of actor or partner discrimination.

Relationship Marginalization. In my final model, I examined how relationship marginalization is associated with feelings of equality (Table 17). I found a significant within-person actor effect, such that individuals in White-POC relationships reported lower equality when they experienced more relationship marginalization than usual. There was no significant within-person effect of partner relationship marginalization. The within-person effect of actor and partner relationship marginalization differed between men in White-POC relationships and

interracial POC-only relationships. There was a stronger effect of actor and partner relationship marginalization on one's own equality score for individuals in POC-only interracial relationships compared to individuals in White-POC interracial relationships when either they or their partners experienced more relationship marginalization than usual. A similar effect was found for partner relationship marginalization for men in same-race White relationships, suggesting that, compared to men in White-POC relationships, White men in same-race relationships experienced lower feelings of equality during times in which their partner experienced more relationship marginalization than usual.

Finally, looking at between-person differences, I found a significant main effect for actor relationship marginalization. This effect suggests that those who tended to experience more relationship marginalization tended to also experience lower equality than those individuals who tended to experience less relationship marginalization. None of the interactions between racial composition and between-person actor or partner relationship marginalization were significant.

Removing Couples with Discrepant Agreements. I ran follow-up L-APIMs excluding men who disagreed with their partners on their sexual agreement (i.e. if they were in a monogamous or open relationship) to determine if this affected between- and within-person actor and partner effects of minority stress on equality. With regards to the effects of stigma on equality, I found that the within-person actor effect and between-person partner effects were no longer significant. Additionally, the between-person effect of partner discrimination no longer differed between men in White-POC relationships and POC same-race relationships as it did in the original model. Next, with regards to the between- and within-person actor and partner effects of discrimination on equality, I found that they remained unchanged from the original model that included couples of all agreements. Finally, looking at the within- and between-

person effects of relationship marginalization on equality, I found the within-person effect of partner discrimination no longer differed between men in White-POC relationships and same-race White relationships or interracial POC-only relationships.

Controlling for Couple HIV Serostatus.

In a series of follow-up analyses, I examined the effects of each minority stressor on each relationship outcome while controlling for the HIV serostatus of the couple (0 = concordant negative, 1 = serodiscordant). Serostatus was a significant predictor in several models, showing that men in serodiscordant White-POC relationships had better initial relationship outcomes compared to men in concordant negative relationships. These included the effects of stigma, discrimination, and relationship marginalization on relationship satisfaction and investment in sexual agreement (but not on equality). However, including serostatus as a covariate did not change any of the observed effects found in my previous models.

Table 9. Results of Over-Time APIM of Stigma on Relationship Satisfaction

Fixed Effects	<i>b</i>	<i>t</i>	95% <i>CI</i>
Intercept	7.09 (0.35)	20.01**	[6.39, 7.79]
White Same-Race	-0.5 (0.45)	-1.11	[-1.37, 0.38]
POC Same-Race	-1.47 (0.56)	-2.60*	[-2.57, -0.36]
POC Interracial	-1.06 (0.83)	-1.28	[-2.68, 0.57]
Actor Within Person Effect	-0.15 (0.08)	-1.95	[-0.30, 0]
Actor Between Person Effect	-0.34 (0.12)	-2.79*	[-0.59, -0.10]
Partner Within Person Effect	-0.09 (0.08)	-1.13	[-0.24, 0.07]
Partner Between Person Effect	-0.38 (0.12)	-3.07*	[-0.62, -0.14]
Wave	-0.07 (0.03)	-2.73*	[-0.13, -0.02]
White Same-Race × Wave	0.01 (0.04)	0.36	[-0.06, 0.09]
POC Same-Race × Wave	0.02 (0.06)	0.28	[-0.10, 0.13]
POC Interracial × Wave	-0.11 (0.07)	-1.52	[-0.24, 0.03]
Within Person Interactions			
White Same-Race × Actor Stigma	-0.02 (0.11)	-0.18	[-0.24, 0.20]
POC Same-Race × Actor Stigma	0 (0.13)	-0.03	[-0.27, 0.26]
POC Interracial × Actor Stigma	0.34 (0.26)	1.31	[-0.17, 0.84]
White Same-Race × Partner Stigma	0.04 (0.11)	0.35	[-0.18, 0.26]
POC Same-Race × Partner Stigma	0.03 (0.13)	0.23	[-0.23, 0.30]
POC Interracial × Partner Stigma	-0.19 (0.26)	-0.75	[-0.70, 0.31]
Between Person Interactions			
White Same-Race × Actor Stigma	0.08 (0.18)	0.42	[-0.28, 0.43]
POC Same-Race × Actor Stigma	0.12 (0.21)	0.60	[-0.29, 0.53]
POC Interracial × Actor Stigma	0.09 (0.31)	0.28	[-0.51, 0.68]
White Same-Race × Partner Stigma	0.18 (0.18)	0.97	[-0.18, 0.54]
POC Same-Race × Partner Stigma	0.64 (0.21)	3.05*	[0.23, 1.05]
POC Interracial × Partner Stigma	0.7 (0.31)	2.28*	[0.10, 1.30]
Covariates			
Age Discrepancy	0.04 (0.12)	0.37	[-0.19, 0.28]
Monogamous	0.91 (0.18)	5.12**	[0.56, 1.27]
CNM	0.48 (0.18)	2.69*	[0.13, 0.83]
Relationship Length	0.01 (0.01)	1.89	[0.00, 0.02]

Note: * $p < .05$ ** $p < .001$

Table 10. Results of Over-Time APIM of Discrimination on Relationship Satisfaction

Fixed Effects	<i>b</i>	<i>t</i>	95% <i>CI</i>
Intercept	7.20 (0.46)	15.73**	[6.30, 8.10]
White Same-Race	0.06 (0.62)	0.09	[-1.16, 1.27]
POC Same-Race	0.13 (0.86)	0.15	[-1.56, 1.82]
POC Interracial	0.35 (1.23)	0.29	[-2.06, 2.77]
Actor Within Person Effect	-0.09 (0.10)	-0.92	[-0.29, 0.10]
Actor Between Person Effect	-0.18 (0.13)	-1.40	[-0.42, 0.07]
Partner Within Person Effect	0.03 (0.10)	0.30	[-0.17, 0.23]
Partner Between Person Effect	-0.33 (0.13)	-2.63*	[-0.58, -0.08]
Wave	-0.08 (0.03)	-2.91*	[-0.13, -0.03]
White Same-Race × Wave	0.01 (0.04)	0.38	[-0.06, 0.09]
POC Same-Race × Wave	0.02 (0.06)	0.30	[-0.10, 0.13]
POC Interracial × Wave	-0.10 (0.07)	-1.46	[-0.24, 0.04]
Within P Interactions			
White Same-Race × Actor Discrimination	-0.07 (0.15)	-0.49	[-0.36, 0.22]
POC Same-Race × Actor Discrimination	0.10 (0.18)	0.59	[-0.24, 0.45]
POC Interracial × Actor Discrimination	-0.16 (0.28)	-0.58	[-0.70, 0.38]
White Same-Race × Partner Discrimination	-0.13 (0.15)	-0.88	[-0.42, 0.16]
POC Same-Race × Partner Discrimination	-0.06 (0.18)	-0.32	[-0.41, 0.29]
POC Interracial × Partner Discrimination	0.17 (0.28)	0.63	[-0.37, 0.72]
Between Person Interactions			
White Same-Race × Actor Discrimination	-0.21 (0.18)	-1.13	[-0.57, 0.15]
POC Same-Race × Actor Discrimination	-0.34 (0.24)	-1.45	[-0.81, 0.12]
POC Interracial × Actor Discrimination	0 (0.33)	0.00	[-0.64, 0.64]
White Same-Race × Partner Discrimination	0.10 (0.18)	0.54	[-0.26, 0.46]
POC Same-Race × Partner Discrimination	0.24 (0.24)	0.99	[-0.23, 0.70]
POC Interracial × Partner Discrimination	-0.10 (0.33)	-0.31	[-0.74, 0.54]
Covariates			
Age Discrepancy	0.06 (0.12)	0.47	[-0.18, 0.29]
Monogamous	0.86 (0.18)	4.78**	[0.50, 1.21]
CNM	0.37 (0.18)	2.06*	[0.02, 0.73]
Relationship Length	0.01 (0.01)	1.55	[0, 0.02]

Note: * $p < .05$ ** $p < .001$

Table 11. Results of Over-Time APIM of Relationship Marginalization on Relationship Satisfaction

Fixed Effects	<i>b</i>	<i>t</i>	95% <i>CI</i>
Intercept	6.61 (0.23)	28.99*	[6.17, 7.06]
White Same-Race	-0.03 (0.23)	-0.13	[-0.48, 0.42]
POC Same-Race	0.2 (0.39)	0.52	[-0.57, 0.97]
POC Interracial	0.09 (0.42)	0.22	[-0.74, 0.92]
Actor Within Person Effect	-0.23 (0.03)	-6.99**	[-0.29, -0.17]
Actor Between Person Effect	-0.30 (0.05)	-6.49**	[-0.39, -0.21]
Partner Within Person Effect	-0.03 (0.03)	-0.80	[-0.09, 0.04]
Partner Between Person Effect	0.03 (0.05)	0.62	[-0.06, 0.12]
Wave	-0.08 (0.03)	-3.11*	[-0.13, -0.03]
White Same-Race × Wave	0.04 (0.04)	1.03	[-0.03, 0.11]
POC Same-Race × Wave	0.01 (0.06)	0.26	[-0.10, 0.12]
POC Interracial × Wave	0 (0.07)	-0.05	[-0.14, 0.14]
Within Person Interactions			
White Same-Race × Actor R.M.	0.04 (0.05)	0.89	[-0.05, 0.13]
POC Same-Race × Actor R.M.	-0.01 (0.06)	-0.16	[-0.12, 0.10]
POC Interracial × Actor R.M.	-0.16 (0.1)	-1.66	[-0.35, 0.03]
White Same-Race × Partner R.M.	-0.08 (0.05)	-1.80	[-0.17, 0.01]
POC Same-Race × Partner R.M.	0.02 (0.06)	0.41	[-0.09, 0.13]
POC Interracial × Partner R.M.	-0.20 (0.1)	-2.05*	[-0.39, -0.01]
Between Person Interactions			
White Same-Race × Actor R.M.	-0.03 (0.07)	-0.37	[-0.16, 0.11]
POC Same-Race × Actor R.M.	0.07 (0.09)	0.76	[-0.11, 0.24]
POC Interracial × Actor R.M.	-0.03 (0.12)	-0.26	[-0.27, 0.20]
White Same-Race × Partner R.M.	-0.06 (0.07)	-0.81	[-0.19, 0.08]
POC Same-Race × Partner R.M.	-0.18 (0.09)	-1.97	[-0.35, 0]
POC Interracial × Partner R.M.	-0.04 (0.12)	-0.32	[-0.27, 0.20]
Covariates			
Age Discrepancy	0.13 (0.12)	1.09	[-0.1, 0.36]
Monogamous	0.82 (0.17)	4.75**	[0.48, 1.16]
CNM	0.40 (0.17)	2.30*	[0.06, 0.74]
Relationship Length	0.01 (0.01)	1.15	[0, 0.02]

Note: RM: relationship marginalization; * $p < .05$ ** $p < .001$

Table 12. Results of Over-Time APIM of Stigma on Investment in Sexual Agreements

Fixed Effects	<i>b</i>	<i>t</i>	95% <i>CI</i>
Intercept	3.12 (0.16)	19.56**	[2.81, 3.44]
White Same-Race	-0.08 (0.20)	-0.39	[-0.47, 0.32]
POC Same-Race	-0.07 (0.25)	-0.28	[-0.57, 0.43]
POC Interracial	0.29 (0.37)	0.77	[-0.45, 1.02]
Actor Within Person Effect	-0.10 (0.04)	-2.73*	[-0.17, -0.03]
Actor Between Person Effect	-0.11 (0.06)	-1.86	[-0.23, 0.01]
Partner Within Person Effect	-0.05 (0.04)	-1.26	[-0.12, 0.03]
Partner Between Person Effect	0 (0.06)	-0.08	[-0.12, 0.11]
Wave	-0.02 (0.01)	-2.00*	[-0.05, 0]
White Same-Race × Wave	0.01 (0.02)	0.56	[-0.02, 0.04]
POC Same-Race × Wave	-0.02 (0.02)	-0.63	[-0.06, 0.03]
POC Interracial × Wave	-0.01 (0.03)	-0.50	[-0.07, 0.04]
Within Person Interactions			
White Same-Race × Actor Stigma	0.16 (0.05)	3.05*	[0.06, 0.27]
POC Same-Race × Actor Stigma	0.09 (0.06)	1.45	[-0.03, 0.22]
POC Interracial × Actor Stigma	0.06 (0.12)	0.45	[-0.19, 0.30]
White Same-Race × Partner Stigma	0.01 (0.05)	0.27	[-0.09, 0.12]
POC Same-Race × Partner Stigma	0.02 (0.06)	0.36	[-0.10, 0.15]
POC Interracial × Partner Stigma	0 (0.12)	0.03	[-0.24, 0.25]
Between Person Interactions			
White Same-Race × Actor Stigma	0.02 (0.09)	0.17	[-0.16, 0.19]
POC Same-Race × Actor Stigma	-0.16 (0.10)	-1.59	[-0.37, 0.04]
POC Interracial × Actor Stigma	-0.09 (0.15)	-0.63	[-0.38, 0.20]
White Same-Race × Partner Stigma	0.02 (0.09)	0.23	[-0.15, 0.19]
POC Same-Race × Partner Stigma	0.19 (0.10)	1.83	[-0.01, 0.39]
POC Interracial × Partner Stigma	-0.04 (0.15)	-0.26	[-0.33, 0.25]
Covariates			
Age Discrepancy	-0.07 (0.05)	-1.26	[-0.18, 0.04]
Monogamous	0.51 (0.08)	6.33**	[0.35, 0.67]
CNM	0.08 (0.08)	0.94	[-0.08, 0.23]
Relationship Length	0 (0)	-0.27	[-0.01, 0]

Note: * $p < .05$ ** $p < .001$

Table 13. Results of Over-Time APIM of Discrimination on Investment in Sexual Agreement

Fixed Effects	<i>b</i>	<i>t</i>	95% <i>CI</i>
Intercept	2.85 (0.21)	13.74**	[2.45, 3.26]
White Same-Race	0.23 (0.28)	0.82	[-0.32, 0.78]
POC Same-Race	0 (0.39)	0.01	[-0.76, 0.77]
POC Interracial	0.72 (0.56)	1.28	[-0.38, 1.81]
Actor Within Person Effect	-0.05 (0.05)	-1.09	[-0.14, 0.04]
Actor Between Person Effect	-0.02 (0.06)	-0.31	[-0.14, 0.10]
Partner Within Person Effect	-0.06 (0.05)	-1.31	[-0.16, 0.03]
Partner Between Person Effect	0.06 (0.06)	0.94	[-0.06, 0.18]
Wave	-0.03 (0.01)	-2.36*	[-0.05, 0]
White Same-Race × Wave	0.01 (0.02)	0.79	[-0.02, 0.04]
POC Same-Race × Wave	-0.01 (0.02)	-0.50	[-0.06, 0.04]
POC Interracial × Wave	-0.01 (0.03)	-0.34	[-0.07, 0.05]
Within P Interactions			
White Same-Race × Actor Discrimination	-0.01 (0.07)	-0.07	[-0.14, 0.13]
POC Same-Race × Actor Discrimination	0.05 (0.08)	0.61	[-0.11, 0.22]
POC Interracial × Actor Discrimination	0.14 (0.13)	1.02	[-0.13, 0.40]
White Same-Race × Partner Discrimination	0 (0.07)	-0.01	[-0.14, 0.14]
POC Same-Race × Partner Discrimination	0.02 (0.08)	0.20	[-0.15, 0.18]
POC Interracial × Partner Discrimination	0.07 (0.13)	0.51	[-0.19, 0.33]
Between Person Interactions			
White Same-Race × Actor Discrimination	-0.03 (0.09)	-0.28	[-0.21, 0.15]
POC Same-Race × Actor Discrimination	0.01 (0.12)	0.07	[-0.23, 0.24]
POC Interracial × Actor Discrimination	-0.10 (0.16)	-0.63	[-0.41, 0.21]
White Same-Race × Partner Discrimination	-0.10 (0.09)	-1.05	[-0.28, 0.08]
POC Same-Race × Partner Discrimination	-0.04 (0.12)	-0.37	[-0.28, 0.19]
POC Interracial × Partner Discrimination	-0.19 (0.16)	-1.18	[-0.50, 0.12]
Covariates			
Age Discrepancy	-0.07 (0.05)	-1.29	[-0.18, 0.04]
Monogamous	0.53 (0.08)	6.50**	[0.37, 0.69]
CNM	0.08 (0.08)	1.02	[-0.08, 0.24]
Relationship Length	0 (0)	-0.19	[-0.01, 0.01]

Note: * $p < .05$ ** $p < .001$

Table 14. Results of Over-Time APIM of Relationship Marginalization on Investment in Sexual Agreement

Fixed Effects	<i>b</i>	<i>t</i>	95% <i>CI</i>
Intercept	3.06 (0.11)	28.81**	[2.86, 3.27]
White Same-Race	-0.09 (0.11)	-0.80	[-0.30, 0.12]
POC Same-Race	-0.12 (0.18)	-0.66	[-0.48, 0.24]
POC Interracial	0.08 (0.2)	0.42	[-0.30, 0.47]
Actor Within Person Effect	-0.04 (0.02)	-2.22*	[-0.07, 0]
Actor Between Person Effect	-0.07 (0.02)	-3.06*	[-0.12, -0.03]
Partner Within Person Effect	-0.01 (0.02)	-0.39	[-0.04, 0.03]
Partner Between Person Effect	0.02 (0.02)	0.70	[-0.03, 0.06]
Wave	-0.03 (0.01)	-2.36	[-0.05, 0]
White Same-Race × Wave	0.01 (0.02)	0.89	[-0.02, 0.04]
POC Same-Race × Wave	-0.01 (0.02)	-0.44	[-0.06, 0.04]
POC Interracial × Wave	0 (0.03)	-0.14	[-0.07, 0.06]
Within Person Interactions			
White Same-Race × Actor R.M.	0.02 (0.02)	0.93	[-0.02, 0.07]
POC Same-Race × Actor R.M.	0.03 (0.03)	0.92	[-0.03, 0.08]
POC Interracial × Actor R.M.	-0.04 (0.05)	-0.85	[-0.13, 0.05]
White Same-Race × Partner R.M.	0.01 (0.02)	0.54	[-0.03, 0.06]
POC Same-Race × Partner R.M.	0.06 (0.03)	2.17*	[0.01, 0.11]
POC Interracial × Partner R.M.	0.03 (0.05)	0.60	[-0.06, 0.12]
Between Person Interactions			
White Same-Race × Actor R.M.	0.03 (0.04)	0.88	[-0.04, 0.10]
POC Same-Race × Actor R.M.	0.04 (0.05)	0.76	[-0.06, 0.13]
POC Interracial × Actor R.M.	-0.01 (0.06)	-0.15	[-0.13, 0.11]
White Same-Race × Partner R.M.	-0.01 (0.04)	-0.19	[-0.08, 0.06]
POC Same-Race × Partner R.M.	0 (0.05)	-0.11	[-0.10, 0.09]
POC Interracial × Partner R.M.	-0.01 (0.06)	-0.15	[-0.13, 0.11]
Covariates			
Age Discrepancy	-0.06 (0.05)	-1.12	[-0.17, 0.05]
Monogamous	0.51 (0.08)	6.33**	[0.35, 0.67]
CNM	0.08 (0.08)	0.95	[-0.08, 0.24]
Relationship Length	0 (0)	-0.43	[-0.01, 0]

Note: RM: relationship marginalization; * $p < .05$ ** $p < .001$

Table 15. Results of Over-Time APIM of Stigma on Equality

Fixed Effects	<i>b</i>	<i>t</i>	95% <i>CI</i>
Intercept	7.59 (0.37)	20.54**	[6.86, 8.31]
White Same-Race	-0.42 (0.47)	-0.90	[-1.33, 0.50]
POC Same-Race	-1.36 (0.59)	-2.32*	[-2.52, -0.21]
POC Interracial	-1.20 (0.86)	-1.40	[-2.90, 0.49]
Actor Within Person Effect	-0.22 (0.08)	-2.66*	[-0.38, -0.06]
Actor Between Person Effect	-0.35 (0.13)	-2.72*	[-0.61, -0.10]
Partner Within Person Effect	0 (0.08)	-0.05	[-0.16, 0.16]
Partner Between Person Effect	-0.35 (0.13)	-2.67*	[-0.60, -0.09]
Wave	-0.03 (0.03)	-1.07	[-0.08, 0.02]
White Same-Race × Wave	0.03 (0.04)	0.71	[-0.05, 0.10]
POC Same-Race × Wave	-0.06 (0.06)	-0.95	[-0.17, 0.06]
POC Interracial × Wave	-0.08 (0.07)	-1.14	[-0.22, 0.06]
Within Person Interactions			
White Same-Race × Actor Stigma	0.12 (0.12)	1.07	[-0.10, 0.35]
POC Same-Race × Actor Stigma	0.33 (0.14)	2.30*	[0.05, 0.60]
POC Interracial × Actor Stigma	0.26 (0.27)	0.97	[-0.27, 0.79]
White Same-Race × Partner Stigma	-0.13 (0.12)	-1.14	[-0.36, 0.10]
POC Same-Race × Partner Stigma	0.02 (0.14)	0.15	[-0.26, 0.30]
POC Interracial × Partner Stigma	-0.07 (0.27)	-0.25	[-0.60, 0.46]
Between Person Interactions			
White Same-Race × Actor Stigma	0.01 (0.19)	0.04	[-0.37, 0.38]
POC Same-Race × Actor Stigma	0.21 (0.22)	0.95	[-0.22, 0.64]
POC Interracial × Actor Stigma	0.25 (0.32)	0.77	[-0.38, 0.88]
White Same-Race × Partner Stigma	0.23 (0.19)	1.18	[-0.15, 0.60]
POC Same-Race × Partner Stigma	0.57 (0.22)	2.59*	[0.14, 1.00]
POC Interracial × Partner Stigma	0.59 (0.32)	1.84	[-0.04, 1.22]
Covariates			
Age Discrepancy	0.03 (0.13)	0.25	[-0.22, 0.28]
Monogamous	1.11 (0.19)	5.98**	[0.75, 1.48]
CNM	0.68 (0.19)	3.64**	[0.31, 1.05]
Relationship Length	0.01 (0.01)	2.12*	[0, 0.03]

Note: * $p < .05$ ** $p < .001$

Table 16. Results of Over-Time APIM of Discrimination on Equality

Fixed Effects	<i>b</i>	<i>t</i>	95% <i>CI</i>
Intercept	7.70 (0.48)	16.13**	[6.77, 8.64]
White Same-Race	0.04 (0.64)	0.06	[-1.23, 1.30]
POC Same-Race	-0.39 (0.90)	-0.43	[-2.15, 1.38]
POC Interracial	1.01 (1.28)	0.79	[-1.51, 3.53]
Actor Within Person Effect	-0.26 (0.10)	-2.54*	[-0.47, -0.06]
Actor Between Person Effect	-0.32 (0.13)	-2.46*	[-0.58, -0.07]
Partner Within Person Effect	-0.03 (0.10)	-0.33	[-0.24, 0.17]
Partner Between Person Effect	-0.18 (0.13)	-1.35	[-0.44, 0.08]
Wave	-0.03 (0.03)	-1.28	[-0.09, 0.02]
White Same-Race × Wave	0.03 (0.04)	0.78	[-0.04, 0.10]
POC Same-Race × Wave	-0.05 (0.06)	-0.92	[-0.17, 0.06]
POC Interracial × Wave	-0.08 (0.07)	-1.14	[-0.22, 0.06]
Within P Interactions			
White Same-Race × Actor Discrimination	0.17 (0.16)	1.08	[-0.14, 0.47]
POC Same-Race × Actor Discrimination	-0.04 (0.19)	-0.23	[-0.41, 0.32]
POC Interracial × Actor Discrimination	0.04 (0.29)	0.13	[-0.53, 0.61]
White Same-Race × Partner Discrimination	0.05 (0.16)	0.32	[-0.26, 0.35]
POC Same-Race × Partner Discrimination	0.02 (0.19)	0.09	[-0.35, 0.38]
POC Interracial × Partner Discrimination	-0.03 (0.29)	-0.11	[-0.60, 0.54]
Between Person Interactions			
White Same-Race × Actor Discrimination	-0.10 (0.19)	-0.53	[-0.48, 0.28]
POC Same-Race × Actor Discrimination	-0.02 (0.25)	-0.07	[-0.51, 0.48]
POC Interracial × Actor Discrimination	-0.07 (0.34)	-0.19	[-0.74, 0.61]
White Same-Race × Partner Discrimination	0.03 (0.19)	0.14	[-0.35, 0.41]
POC Same-Race × Partner Discrimination	0.17 (0.25)	0.66	[-0.33, 0.66]
POC Interracial × Partner Discrimination	-0.35 (0.34)	-1.02	[-1.02, 0.32]
Covariates			
Age Discrepancy	0.04 (0.13)	0.32	[-0.21, 0.29]
Monogamous	1.07 (0.19)	5.73**	[0.71, 1.44]
CNM	0.59 (0.19)	3.15*	[0.22, 0.97]
Relationship Length	0.01 (0.01)	1.81	[0, 0.02]

Note: * $p < .05$ ** $p < .001$

Table 17. Results of Over-Time APIM of Relationship Marginalization on Equality

Fixed Effects	<i>b</i>	<i>t</i>	95% <i>CI</i>
Intercept	7.27 (0.24)	30.67**	[6.80, 7.74]
White Same-Race	-0.06 (0.24)	-0.24	[-0.52, 0.41]
POC Same-Race	-0.09 (0.41)	-0.23	[-0.89, 0.70]
POC Interracial	-0.43 (0.44)	-0.98	[-1.29, 0.43]
Actor Within Person Effect	-0.23 (0.03)	-6.73**	[-0.30, -0.16]
Actor Between Person Effect	-0.31 (0.05)	-6.37**	[-0.41, -0.22]
Partner Within Person Effect	0 (0.03)	-0.13	[-0.07, 0.06]
Partner Between Person Effect	-0.03 (0.05)	-0.57	[-0.12, 0.07]
Wave	-0.04 (0.03)	-1.37	[-0.09, 0.02]
White Same-Race × Wave	0.05 (0.04)	1.44	[-0.02, 0.12]
POC Same-Race × Wave	-0.05 (0.06)	-0.97	[-0.16, 0.06]
POC Interracial × Wave	0.05 (0.07)	0.69	[-0.09, 0.19]
Within Person Interactions			
White Same-Race × Actor R.M.	0.01 (0.05)	0.16	[-0.09, 0.10]
POC Same-Race × Actor R.M.	-0.01 (0.06)	-0.12	[-0.12, 0.11]
POC Interracial × Actor R.M.	-0.21 (0.10)	-2.04*	[-0.40, -0.01]
White Same-Race × Partner R.M.	-0.10 (0.05)	-1.98*	[-0.19, 0]
POC Same-Race × Partner R.M.	-0.02 (0.06)	-0.38	[-0.14, 0.09]
POC Interracial × Partner R.M.	-0.30 (0.10)	-2.94*	[-0.50, -0.10]
Between Person Interactions			
White Same-Race × Actor R.M.	-0.01 (0.07)	-0.13	[-0.15, 0.13]
POC Same-Race × Actor R.M.	0.10 (0.09)	1.02	[-0.09, 0.28]
POC Interracial × Actor R.M.	0.05 (0.13)	0.43	[-0.19, 0.30]
White Same-Race × Partner R.M.	-0.04 (0.07)	-0.51	[-0.18, 0.11]
POC Same-Race × Partner R.M.	-0.03 (0.09)	-0.33	[-0.22, 0.15]
POC Interracial × Partner R.M.	0.10 (0.13)	0.77	[-0.15, 0.34]
Covariates			
Age Discrepancy	0.12 (0.12)	0.97	[-0.12, 0.36]
Monogamous	1.03 (0.18)	5.72**	[0.68, 1.38]
CNM	0.61 (0.18)	3.40*	[0.26, 0.96]
Relationship Length	0.01 (0.01)	1.26	[0, 0.02]

Note: RM: relationship marginalization; * $p < .05$ ** $p < .0$

Chapter 4 Discussion

The current research sought to understand relationship outcomes and minority stressors across four groups of men in same-race and interracial relationships. I addressed two research questions: a) how do relationship outcomes and experiences of minority stress differ by racial composition of the couple and b) does minority stress differentially impact relationship outcomes across these groups? This study provides novel information on same-race and interracial couples by addressing a dearth of research that captures dyadic and longitudinal dynamics in same-gender couples, with a focus on male couples. By using a large sample of interracial and same-race couples and breaking down comparisons across four types of racial compositions among couples, this study found effects that could not have been captured in a one-shot study and thus provides more nuance to the developing literature on interracial relationships. My findings suggest that many relationship outcomes and experiences of minority stress, and the effects of minority stress on relationship outcomes, are similar regardless of the racial composition of the couple.

Differences in Relationship Outcomes and Minority Stress

Findings from this study revealed no differences in the initial levels or trajectories of change for relationship satisfaction, investment in sexual agreements, or equality for men in White-White, same-race POC, or interracial POC-only relationships compared to men in White-POC relationships. The null findings for relationship satisfaction align with previous research that also has not found differences (Brooks, 2021; Henderson & Braithwaite, 2021; Jeong & Horne, 2009; Veldhuis, 2020) and extends prior work to a sample of GBQ men.

Our study was the first to examine investment in sexual agreements and equality differences based on couples' racial composition. One previous study found that people in interracial relationships are less invested in their relationships (Lehmiller & Agnew, 2006), but the current findings suggest that this does not extend to lower investment in sexual agreements. However, we did find that White partners were less invested than POC when we looked at differences in investment for individuals in White-POC interracial relationships. Sexual agreements are critical to sexual decision-making and safer sex behaviors and this finding suggests that intervention researchers may need to tailor interventions to be attentive to race, at least for men White-POC relationships. Regarding equality, men of color have expressed concerns about equality within their relationships (Nemoto et al., 2003). Interestingly, I found that White men and men of color in White-POC relationships felt similarly equal in their relationship. My findings are consistent with research that also found no differences in feelings of equality among women in same-gender relationships (Jeong & Horne, 2009) and provide preliminary evidence that at least some men in interracial relationships do not perceive differences in equality within their relationship.

In terms of experiences of minority stressors, I observed that, compared to men in White-POC relationships, men in same-race POC relationships experienced higher initial levels of stigma, discrimination, and relationship marginalization. Interestingly, my observation that men in same-race POC-only relationships experience more minority stress is novel. Although scholars have speculated on reasons for differences between interracial and same-race couples, there has been limited attention to couples where both partners are from racial groups who that been historically marginalized in similar versus different ways, which further highlights the importance of looking at the different types of interracial and same-race couples in future work.

Men in same-race White relationships experienced lower levels of discrimination and relationships marginalization, but not stigma, compared to men in White-POC relationships. Among men in White-POC relationships, White partners experienced lower initial stigma and discrimination, but not relationship marginalization, compared to POC. These findings suggest that both individual and couple-level minority stressors are worse for people in interracial relationships. Additionally, these findings are consistent with previous literature suggesting that individuals in interracial relationships experience more relationship marginalization compared to people in same-race relationships (Lehmiller & Agnew, 2006; Rosenthal et al., 2019).

Effects of Minority Stressors on Relationship Outcomes

The second aim of this study was to examine the effects of minority stressors on relationship outcomes. Overall, our findings showed that both experiencing more minority stress than usual (within-person effects) and experiencing more minority stress on average (between-person effects) impacted some relationship outcomes, aligning with previous research in this area and extending the literature to a sample of GBQ couples (Lehmiller & Agnew, 2006; Lincoln & Chae, 2010; Murry et al., 2001; Rosenthal et al., 2019; Rosenthal & Starks, 2015; Yampolsky et al., 2020). Perhaps surprisingly, few within and between-person actor and partner effects were moderated by couple racial composition. Instead, my results suggest that minority stressors are associated with lower relationship outcomes across relationships of varying racial compositions.

Several findings indicated that certain minority stressors may have positively impacted relationship outcomes and that this association varied by couple racial composition. Notably, compared to men in White-POC relationships, White men in same-race relationships reported more investment in their sexual agreement during times in which they experienced more stigma than usual and men in same-race POC relationships experienced more investment when their

partners experienced more relationship marginalization than usual. Additionally, whereas men in White-POC relationships had lower relationship satisfaction if their partners tended to experience more stigma, there was an opposite effect for men in either same-race or interracial POC relationships, such that men whose partners tended to experience greater stigma had higher relationship satisfaction. These findings suggest that for some men, particularly men in same-race relationships, minority stressors may bring partners closer together (Troy, 2006), and could explain why previous studies have reported contradictory findings on relationship satisfaction. These findings can be explained by transformation of motivation, a construct derived from interdependence theory, in which people realize that their partner's experiences of minority stress have consequences for their relationship. This may lead them to engage in communal coping by communicating with one another and engaging in joint actions to tackle the consequences of minority stress. This is supported by prior work showing that minority stress can have positive consequences for relationship dynamics, especially when couples can have conversations about these issues and "stand together" against instances of discrimination and injustice (Frost, 2011). Future studies should continue examining the circumstances that empower some couples to manage minority stressors as a joint problem and emerge with better relationship outcomes.

I also found that individuals in POC-only interracial relationships felt even less equal and satisfied than individuals in White-POC relationships when they or their partners experienced more relationship marginalization than usual. Given the finding that people in POC-only interracial relationships also felt greater relationship marginalization, this finding suggests that marginalization faced by both partners could compound its effects on equality and satisfaction. It

is possible that having one partner from a historically privileged group confers some advantages to those in White-POC relationships that is then protective for their relationship outcomes.

Notably, men in serodiscordant White-POC relationships had better initial relationship satisfaction and higher investment in their sexual agreements compared to men in concordant negative relationships. However, couple serostatus did not change the observed effects of minority stress on relationship outcomes. Positive relationship factors, including relationship satisfaction, equality and investment in sexual agreements, have been associated with less sexual risk behavior with outsider partner's (Darbes, Chakravarty, Neilands, Beougher, & Hoff, 2014; Hoff, Campbell, Chakravarty, & Darbes, 2016; Hoff, Chakravarty, Beougher, Neilands, & Darbes, 2012), so it would be worthwhile for future studies to investigate how a couple's racial composition and couple serostatus interact and influence relationship dynamics and sexual risk behaviors.

Taken together, the current study reveals that there are more similarities than differences between outcomes for different types of interracial and same-race couples. Although it cannot be ruled out that these groups are different on outcomes that were not measured here, this is a highly powered study that should theoretically be able to capture differences if they exist. The lack of difference in relationship satisfaction and positive effects of stigma on relationship outcomes may reflect several things in the current study. First, participants may attribute more minority stress to being in a same-gender relationship than to being in an interracial relationship (Rostosky et al., 2008) and being in an interracial relationship may not compound couple members' minority stress because it is already high for same-gender couples (Veldhuis, 2020).

Second, due to the high levels of stress that people in same-gender and/or interracial relationships face, many may develop resilience and coping mechanisms and turn to their

partners to help them navigate these stressors (G. U. Y. Bodenmann, Ledermann, & Bradbury, 2007; Clavél, Cutrona, & Russell, 2017; Cutrona, Bodenmann, Randall, Clavél, & Johnson, 2018; Gamarel et al., 2019). According to the Vulnerability-Stress Adaptation Model, *adaptive processes*, the techniques used to cope with stress, can mediate the relationship between stress and relationship quality. For example, couples who are able to engage in dyadic coping by jointly tackling minority stressors as a team (i.e. “we-stress”), as opposed to considering them individual problems (i.e. “I-stress”) may be better able to work through minority stress as a couple and consequently strengthen their relationship (Clavél et al., 2017; Cutrona et al., 2018; Rosenthal & Starks, 2015). However, partners often take different approaches to discussing instances of injustice. While some couples discuss instances of racism, others avoid discussing racism and minimize racial differences and the experiences of racism and inequality by people of color (Bonilla-Silva, 2010; Rostosky et al., 2008). Some partners believe that racial differences are inconsequential and may instead focus more on their similarities (Brummett, 2017; Childs, 2005; Killian, 2001, 2002, 2003). Moreover, when stressed, couples struggle to communicate positively and constructively (Neff & Karney, 2017). When racist instances occur, White partners may refuse to acknowledge these events, discount their partner’s experiences, deprioritize racial/ethnic differences, or dissociate from one another (Killian, 2001, 2002, 2003; Leslie & Letiecq, 2004; Rostosky et al., 2008). Even though some couples may not regard racial differences as important, how couples respond when minority stressors occur is nevertheless worthy of investigation. Thus, future studies would benefit from examining what factors help alleviate the deleterious effects of minority stressors on relationship outcomes (e.g. partner support, dyadic coping, and communication) versus worsen (e.g. color-blind ideology) them (G. Bodenmann, 2005; Holzapfel, Randall, Tao, & Iida, 2018)

Third, it is important to consider that the average length of couple's relationships in this study was approximately 8 years and that couples who broke up during the study were excluded from subsequent waves. The stability of these relationships may imply that many of these couples have successfully navigated their own and their partners experiences of minority stressors. Over-time, partners develop an understand of the impact that minority stressors have on their relationships. For example, some White people go through an awakening about how pervasive racism is when they enter interracial relationships with some White individuals, reporting a heightened sense of awareness of racism due to being part of an interracial couple (Dalmage, 2000; Yancey, 2007). This awareness may contribute to interracial partners actively working to confront racism (Rostosky et al., 2008). Future studies should examine these concepts in newly dating couples, which could better capture longitudinal changes and assess how minority stressors effect relationship stability.

Clinical Implications

The findings identified have implications for relationship education interventions focused on improving relationship outcomes among male couples. Existing interventions like the Strengthening Same- Sex Relationship Program (SSSR) and 2GETHER have found that teaching male couples how to dyadically cope with minority stress is associated with positive long-term effects on relationship outcomes and communication (Newcomb et al., 2017; Whitton et al., 2016). As these programs are disseminated to more diverse audiences, it will be important to consider the differing effects of minority stress on relationship outcomes for couples of different racial compositions.

Limitations

This study advances a growing body of work on same-gender interracial couples; however, there are several limitations that should be acknowledged that limit the generalizability of these findings. Foremost, the unique characteristics of our sample must be considered. Participants in this study lived in a somewhat racially diverse region which could have decreased the likelihood of experiencing minority stressors (at least directed at their relationship) and increased the likelihood of being in an interracial relationship since areas with lower racial segregation typically have more interracial relationships (Jones, Malone, & Campbell, 2021). Moreover, acceptance of interracial relationships differs across regions in the U.S., likely due in part to the continued impact of anti-miscegenation laws that remained in many states into the 20th century (Yancey, 2007; Yancey & Yancey, 1998). Because California overruled anti-miscegenation laws in 1948, the acceptance of interracial relationships may be higher than in other parts of the U.S. Thus, it is possible that geographic differences may result in fewer overt instances of minority stress.

Another important consideration is that people who are in interracial relationships are a somewhat self-selected group. Individuals who date interracially are more likely to have grown up in a diverse community (Fujino, 1997; Yancey, 2002). Additionally, dating preferences are influenced by racist attitudes and racial hierarchies. Although many people say they are accepting of interracial relationships, many would not themselves date interracially (Herman & Campbell, 2012). Even among those who date interracially there are preferences for some racial groups over others (Fiebert, Karamol, & Kasdan, 2000; Fujino, 1997). Among same-gender couples, White-Black pairings are the most common interracial pairing (Jones et al., 2021). However, POC are often seen as the least desirable partners (Green, 2008; Lundquist & Lin,

2015; Robinson, 2015). Some gay men use “personal preference” rhetoric to justify their exclusion of POC (Robinson, 2015). Thus, being in an interracial relationship is not always an option for POC due to exclusion and racism within the gay community (Hart, Sharvendiran, Chikermane, Kidwai, & Grace, 2021). In contrast, few POC say they are unwilling to date White people (Green, 2008; Han & Choi, 2018). However, racial preferences may be protective for POC, as there is distrust of White intentions in dating that is rooted in historical mistreatment of POC and experiences of fetishization (Childs, 2005; Collins, 2004; Stacey & Forbes, 2021).

Notably, our generalizability is also constrained by the sample size of some groups in this study. This study only looked at four groups of couples and lower representation of same-race POC and interracial POC-only couples (~20% of sample) may not accurately portray differences between groups and the role that minority stressors play in relationship outcomes. Moreover, by grouping all POC together into one group, this study erased important group differences amongst POC who have unique histories of oppression in the United States. Overall, research should continue to consider how multiple forms of oppression influence the relationship functioning of people in interracial relationships and how this differs across differentially marginalized groups (Bowleg, 2008).

Our results are also qualified by our methods and measures. Most notably, the scales measuring stigma, discrimination, and relationship marginalization did not ask about specific identities. Because none of the scales asked about experiences of minority stress based on racial identity, participants could have been thinking about minority stress experienced mostly based on their sexual identity or heterosexism given that the larger study examined couple-based approaches to HIV prevention. Indeed, when encountering discrimination, people may try to reduce the effects of that discrimination by focusing on a less stigmatized identity (Bowleg,

Huang, Brooks, Black, & Burkholder, 2003; Shih, Young, & Bucher, 2013). Future work should consider having couples reflect specifically about their racial identity, as racial identity is highly linked with relationship satisfaction, at least in Black individuals and, to a lesser extent, in White individuals (Leslie & Letiecq, 2004)

Another important consideration is that participants completed questionnaires every six months, which may hide some of the variability that may occur if participants were surveyed more frequently. More intensive longitudinal methods, such as daily diaries, could capture everyday variation in experiences or anticipation of minority stressors. Anticipation of minority stress is a common, unique source of stress for stigmatized individuals and can have equally strong effects on people's health and relationships as experiences of stigmatization (Thomeer, LeBlanc, Frost, & Bowen, 2018; Williams & Mohammed, 2009), and may be easier to capture using longitudinal methods compared to actual experiences of minority stress.

Finally, the measures we used combined different sources of minority stress into one. Experiencing minority stress from more proximal sources (e.g. friends, family) may have different consequences compared to experiencing more distal sources of minority stress. For example, couples who experience more relationship marginalization from friends and family are more likely to breakup, but the same associations are not observed for societal relationship marginalization (Lehmiller & Agnew, 2006). Future studies assessing sources of minority stress may help more clearly identify differences in relationship outcomes for same-race and interracial relationships.

Conclusion

Individuals who date interracially have seen a growing acceptance of their relationships and appear to be as satisfied as those who date within their race. The current findings show mixed

support for differences between different types of same-race and interracial couples, providing growing support that people in interracial relationships do not have worse relationship outcomes. Moreover, these findings challenge the narrative that interracial relationships are less fulfilling and have worse outcomes while also extending this work to a previously understudied group of people. Moving forward, applying strength-based and resiliency perspectives to understand how men in same-gender relationships protect their relationships from minority stressors is a critical area of research.

Appendices

Appendix A Measures

Stigma

1. Most employers will not hire a person like you.
2. Most people believe that a person like you cannot be trusted.
3. Most people think that a person like you is dangerous and unpredictable.
4. Most people think less of a person like you.
5. Most people look down on people like you.
6. Most people think people like you are not as intelligent as the average person.

Everyday Discrimination

1. Over your lifetime, was being treated with less courtesy related to any of the following reasons?
2. Over your lifetime, how often have you been treated with less respect than others?
3. Over your lifetime, how often have you received poorer service than others in restaurants or stores?
4. Over your lifetime, how often have you experienced people treating you as if you're not smart?
5. Over your lifetime, how often have you experienced people acting as if as if they are better than you are?
6. Over your lifetime, how often have you experienced people acting as if they are afraid of you?
7. Over your lifetime, was people's acting as if they are afraid of you related to any of the following reasons?
8. Over your lifetime, how often have you experienced people acting as if they think you are dishonest?
9. Over your lifetime, how often have you been called names or insulted?

Relationship Marginalization

1. Most others generally disapprove of my relationship.
2. My relationship has general societal acceptance.
3. My family and friends approve of my relationship.
4. My family and/or friends are not accepting of this relationship.

Relationship Satisfaction

1. I feel satisfied with our relationship.
2. My relationship is much better than others' relationships.
3. My relationship is close to ideal.
4. Our relationship makes me very happy.
5. Our relationship does a good job of fulfilling my needs for intimacy, companionship, etc.

Equality

1. My partner and I have equal power in the relationship.
2. My partner shows as much affection to me as I think I show to him.
3. My partner and I invest equal amounts of time and energy in the relationship.
4. My partner and I are equally committed to working out problems that occur in our relationship.
5. All things considered, my partner and I contribute an equal amount to the relationship.
6. My partner and I deal with each other as equals.
7. My partner treats me and respects me as an equal.
8. My partner depends on me as much as I depend on him.

Attitudes towards Sexual Agreements

Value

1. How much do you appreciate having your current agreement?
2. How much do you value your current agreement?
3. How much do you respect your current agreement?
4. How important is your current agreement to you?
5. How much does your current agreement matter to you?
6. How much do you benefit from having your current agreement?

Commitment

1. How important is it for you to be committed to your current agreement?
2. How important is it to you that your primary partner is committed to your current agreement?
3. How important is it to you that both you and your primary partner are equally committed to your current agreement?
4. How committed are you to having your current agreement?

Satisfaction

1. How satisfied are you with your current agreement?

2. How much does satisfaction with your current agreement influence satisfaction with your relationship?
3. How important is it that you feel satisfied with your current agreement?

Appendix B DGCM Sample Syntax

Sample Syntax for Unconditional Dyadic Growth Curve Model

```
MIXED mSTIGMA WITH Person1 Person2 cwave  
/CRITERIA=DFMETHOD(SATTERTHWAITE) CIN(95) MXITER(1000) MXSTEP(25)  
SCORING(1)  
SINGULAR(0.000000000001) HCONVERGE(0, ABSOLUTE) LCONVERGE(0,  
ABSOLUTE) PCONVERGE(0.000001, ABSOLUTE)  
/FIXED= cwave  
/PRINT=SOLUTION TESTCOV  
/RANDOM = Person1 Person2 | SUBJECT(COUPLEID) COVTYPE(CSR)  
COVTYPE(CSR)  
/REPEATED= Person1 | SUBJECT(cwave*COUPLEID) COVTYPE(CSR).
```

Sample Syntax for Dyadic Growth Curve Model with All Predictors

```
MIXED mSTIGMA BY SA_consensus1 WITH Person1 Person2 white_IR POC_IR POC_SR  
cRel_Len age_disc cwave  
/CRITERIA=DFMETHOD(SATTERTHWAITE) CIN(95) MXITER(1000) MXSTEP(25)  
SCORING(1)  
SINGULAR(0.000000000001) HCONVERGE(0, ABSOLUTE) LCONVERGE(0,  
ABSOLUTE) PCONVERGE(0.000001, ABSOLUTE)  
/FIXED= white_IR POC_IR POC_SR cwave white_IR*cwave POC_IR*cwave POC_SR*cwave  
cRel_Len age_disc SA_consensus1  
/PRINT=SOLUTION TESTCOV  
/RANDOM = Person1 Person2 | SUBJECT(COUPLEID) COVTYPE(CSR)  
COVTYPE(CSR)  
/REPEATED= Person1 | SUBJECT(cwave*COUPLEID) COVTYPE(CSR).
```

Sample Syntax for Dyadic Growth Curve Model with Only White-POC couples

```
MIXED mSAIS BY SA_consensus1 A_White_1 WITH Person1 Person2 cRel_Len age_disc  
cwave  
/CRITERIA=DFMETHOD(SATTERTHWAITE) CIN(95) MXITER(1000) MXSTEP(25)  
SCORING(1)  
SINGULAR(0.000000000001) HCONVERGE(0, ABSOLUTE) LCONVERGE(0,  
ABSOLUTE) PCONVERGE(0.000001, ABSOLUTE)  
/FIXED= A_White_1 cwave A_White_1*cwave cRel_Len age_disc SA_consensus1  
/PRINT=SOLUTION TESTCOV
```

```
/RANDOM = Person1 Person2 | SUBJECT(COUPLEID) COVTYPE(CSR)  
COVTYPE(CSR)  
/REPEATED= Person1 | SUBJECT(cwave*COUPLEID) COVTYPE(CSR).
```

Appendix C L-APIM Sample Syntax

Sample Syntax for L-APIM

```
MIXED mRUS_SAT_A BY SA_consensus1 MixedCoupleType_WIR WITH Person1_A
Person2_A STIGMAw_A STIGMA_mean_A STIGMAw_P STIGMA_mean_P age_disc
cRel_Len cwave_A
/CRITERIA=DFMETHOD(SATTERTHWAITE) CIN(95) MXITER(1000) MXSTEP(25)
SCORING(1)
  SINGULAR(0.000000000001) HCONVERGE(0, ABSOLUTE) LCONVERGE(0,
ABSOLUTE) PCONVERGE(0.000001, ABSOLUTE)
/FIXED=MixedCoupleType_WIR STIGMAw_A STIGMA_mean_A STIGMAw_P
STIGMA_mean_P cwave_A
MixedCoupleType_WIR*STIGMAw_A MixedCoupleType_WIR*STIGMA_mean_A
MixedCoupleType_WIR*STIGMAw_P MixedCoupleType_WIR*STIGMA_mean_P
MixedCoupleType_WIR*cwave_A age_disc SA_consensus1 cRel_Len
/PRINT=SOLUTION TESTCOV
/RANDOM = Person1_A Person2_A | SUBJECT(Dyad_ID) COVTYPE(CSR)
COVTYPE(CSR)
/REPEATED= Person1_A | SUBJECT(cwave_A*Dyad_ID) COVTYPE(CSR).
```

Sample Syntax for L-APIM with Only White-POC Couples

```
MIXED mRUS_SAT_A BY SA_consensus1 White_A_1 WITH Person1_A Person2_A
STIGMAw_A STIGMA_mean_A STIGMAw_P STIGMA_mean_P age_disc cRel_Len
cwave_A
/CRITERIA=DFMETHOD(SATTERTHWAITE) CIN(95) MXITER(1000) MXSTEP(25)
SCORING(1)
  SINGULAR(0.000000000001) HCONVERGE(0, ABSOLUTE) LCONVERGE(0,
ABSOLUTE) PCONVERGE(0.000001, ABSOLUTE)
/FIXED=White_A_1 STIGMAw_A STIGMA_mean_A STIGMAw_P STIGMA_mean_P
cwave_A
White_A_1*STIGMAw_A White_A_1*STIGMA_mean_A White_A_1*STIGMAw_P
White_A_1*STIGMA_mean_P
White_A_1*cwave_A age_disc SA_consensus1 cRel_Len
/PRINT=SOLUTION TESTCOV
/RANDOM = Person1_A Person2_A | SUBJECT(Dyad_ID) COVTYPE(CSR)
COVTYPE(CSR)
/REPEATED= Person1_A | SUBJECT(cwave_A*Dyad_ID) COVTYPE(CSR).
```


References

- AhnAllen, J. M., & Suyemoto, K. L. (2011). Influence of interracial dating on racial and/or ethnic identities of Asian American women and white European American men. *Asian American Journal of Psychology, 2*(1), 61–75. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0023325>
- Bodenmann, G. (2005). *Couples coping with stress: Emerging perspectives on dyadic coping*. (T. A. Revenson, K. Kayser, & G. Bodenmann, Eds.) (pp. 33–50). Washington D.C.: American Psychological Association. <https://doi.org/10.1037/11031-000>
- Bodenmann, G. U. Y., Ledermann, T., & Bradbury, T. N. (2007). Stress, sex, and satisfaction in marriage. *Personal Relationships, 14*(4), 551–569. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1475-6811.2007.00171.x>
- Bonilla-Silva, E. (2010). *Racism without racists: Color-blind racism and the persistence of racial inequality in America* (5th ed.). Lanham: The Rowman and Littlefield Publishing Group.
- Bowleg, L. (2008). When black + lesbian + woman ≠ black lesbian woman: The methodological challenges of qualitative and quantitative intersectionality research. *Sex Roles, 59*(5–6), 312–325. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-008-9400-z>
- Bowleg, L., Huang, J., Brooks, K., Black, A., & Burkholder, G. (2003). Triple jeopardy and beyond: multiple minority stress and resilience among black lesbians. *Journal of Lesbian Studies, 7*(4), 87–108. https://doi.org/10.1300/J155v07n04_06
- Brooks, J. E. (2021). Differences in satisfaction? A meta-analytic review of interracial and intraracial relationships. *Marriage & Family Review, 1–29*.

<https://doi.org/10.1080/01494929.2021.1937443>

- Brooks, J. E., Ogolsky, B. G., & Monk, J. K. (2018). Commitment in interracial relationships: Dyadic and longitudinal tests of the investment model. *Journal of Family Issues, 39*(9), 2685–2708. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0192513X18758343>
- Brown, C. (2008). Gender-role implications on same-sex intimate partner abuse. *Journal of Family Violence, 23*(6), 457–462. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10896-008-9172-9>
- Brummett, E. A. (2017). “Race doesn’t matter”: A dialogic analysis of interracial romantic partners’ stories about racial differences. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 34*(5), 771–789. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0265407516658790>
- Buggs, S. G. (2017). Does (mixed-)race matter? The role of race in interracial sex, dating, and marriage. *Sociology Compass, 11*(11), e12531. <https://doi.org/10.1111/soc4.12531>
- Cascalheira, C. J., & Smith, B. A. (2020). Hierarchy of desire: Partner preferences and social identities of men who have sex with men on geosocial networks. *Sexuality & Culture, 24*(3), 630–648. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12119-019-09653-z>
- Childs, E. C. (2005). *Navigating interracial borders: Black-white couples and their social worlds*. New Brunswick, N.J: Rutgers University Press.
- Clavél, F. D., Cutrona, C. E., & Russell, D. W. (2017). United and divided by stress: how stressors differentially influence social support in african american couples over time. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 43*(7), 1050–1064. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167217704195>
- Cochran, S. D., & Peplau, L. A. (1985). Value orientations in heterosexual relationships. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 9*(4), 477–488. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1471-6402.1985.tb00897.x>

- Collins, P. H. (2004). *Black sexual politics: African Americans, gender, and the new racism*. New York: Routledge.
- Crockett, J. (2020). “Damn i’m dating a lot of white guys”: Gay men’s individual narratives of racial sexual orientation development. In J. Gregorio Smith & C. W. Han (Eds.), *Home and community for queer men of color: The intersection of race and sexuality* (pp. 1–30). London: The Rowman and Littlefield Publishing Group.
- Cutrona, C., Bodenmann, G., Randall, A. K., Clavél, F. D., & Johnson, M. (2018). Stress, dyadic coping, and social support: Moving toward integration. In A. L. Vangelisti & D. Perlman (Eds.), *The Cambridge Handbook of Personal Relationships* (pp. 341–352). Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781316417867.027>
- Cyrus, K. (2017). Multiple minorities as multiply marginalized: Applying the minority stress theory to LGBTQ people of color. *Journal of Gay & Lesbian Mental Health*, 21(3), 194–202. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19359705.2017.1320739>
- Dalmage, H. M. (2000). *Tripping on the color line: Black-white multiracial families in a racially divided world*. Rutgers University Press.
- Darbes, L. A., Chakravarty, D., Neilands, T. B., Beougher, S. C., & Hoff, C. C. (2014). Sexual risk for HIV among gay male couples: a longitudinal study of the impact of relationship dynamics. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 43(1), 47–60. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10508-013-0206-x>
- Fiebert, M. S., Karamol, H., & Kasdan, M. (2000). Interracial dating: Attitudes and experience among American college students in California. *Psychological Reports*, 87, 1059–1064. <https://doi.org/10.2466/pr0.2000.87.3f.1059>
- Foeman, A. K., & Nance, T. (1999). From miscegenation to multiculturalism: Perceptions and

- stages of interracial relationship development. *Journal of Black Studies*, 29(4), 540–557.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/002193479902900405>
- Frost, D. M. (2011). Similarities and differences in the pursuit of intimacy among sexual minority and heterosexual individuals: A personal projects analysis. *Journal of Social Issues*, 67(2), 282–301. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4560.2011.01698.x>
- Frost, D. M., LeBlanc, A. J., de Vries, B., Alston-Stepnitz, E., Stephenson, R., & Woodyatt, C. (2017). Couple-level minority stress: An examination of same-sex couples' unique experiences. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior*, 58(4), 455–472.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0022146517736754>
- Fujino, D. C. (1997). The rates, patterns and reasons for forming heterosexual interracial dating relationships among Asian Americans. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 14(6), 809–828. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0265407597146006>
- Gaines, S. O. (2002). Interracial relationships. In R. Goodwin & D. Cramer (Eds.), J. Leaver (Trans.), *Inappropriate relationships: The unconventional, the disapproved, and the forbidden* (pp. 65–78). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.
- Gamarel, K. E., Reisner, S. L., Laurenceau, J.-P., Nemoto, T., & Operario, D. (2014). Gender minority stress, mental health, and relationship quality: A dyadic investigation of transgender women and their cisgender male partners. *Journal of Family Psychology*, 28(4), 437–447. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0037171>
- Gamarel, K. E., Sevelius, J. M., Reisner, S. L., Coats, C. S., Nemoto, T., & Operario, D. (2019). Commitment, interpersonal stigma, and mental health in romantic relationships between transgender women and cisgender male partners. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 36(7), 2180–2201. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0265407518785768>

- Green, A. I. (2008). The social organization of desire: the sexual fields approach. *Sociological Theory*, 26(1), 25–50. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9558.2008.00317.x>
- Han, C.-S., & Choi, K.-H. (2018). Very few people say “no whites”: gay men of color and the racial politics of desire. *Sociological Spectrum : The Official Journal of the Mid-South Sociological Association*, 38(3), 145–161.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/02732173.2018.1469444>
- Hart, T. A., Sharvendiran, R., Chikermane, V., Kidwai, A., & Grace, D. (2021). At the intersection of homophobia and racism: Sociocultural context and the sexual health of South Asian Canadian gay and bisexual men. *Stigma and Health*.
<https://doi.org/10.1037/sah0000295>
- Henderson, E. K., & Braithwaite, S. R. (2021). Cross-group relationship satisfaction: A meta-analysis. *Marriage & Family Review*, 1–26.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/01494929.2021.1887046>
- Herek, G. M. (2000). The psychology of sexual prejudice . *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 9(1), 19–22.
- Hibbler, D. K., & Shiness, K. J. (2002). Interracial couples’ experience of leisure: A social network approach. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 34(2), 135–156.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/00222216.2002.11949966>
- Hoff, C. C., & Beougher, S. C. (2010). Sexual agreements among gay male couples. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 39(3), 774–787. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10508-008-9393-2>
- Hoff, C. C., Beougher, S. C., Chakravarty, D., Darbes, L. A., & Neilands, T. B. (2010). Relationship characteristics and motivations behind agreements among gay male couples: Differences by agreement type and couple serostatus. *AIDS Care*, 22(7), 827–835.

<https://doi.org/10.1080/09540120903443384>

- Hoff, C. C., Campbell, C. K., Chakravarty, D., & Darbes, L. A. (2016). Relationship-Based Predictors of Sexual Risk for HIV Among MSM Couples: A Systematic Review of the Literature. *AIDS and Behavior*, *20*(12), 2873–2892. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10461-016-1350-9>
- Hoff, C. C., Chakravarty, D., Beougher, S. C., Neilands, T. B., & Darbes, L. A. (2012). Relationship characteristics associated with sexual risk behavior among MSM in committed relationships. *AIDS Patient Care and STDs*, *26*(12), 738–745. <https://doi.org/10.1089/apc.2012.0198>
- Holzappel, J., Randall, A. K., Tao, C., & Iida, M. (2018). Intercultural couples' internal stress, relationship satisfaction, and dyadic coping. *Interpersona: An International Journal on Personal Relationships*, *12*(2), 145–163. <https://doi.org/10.5964/ijpr.v12i2.302>
- Hosking, W. (2013). Agreements about extra-dyadic sex in gay men's relationships: Exploring differences in relationship quality by agreement type and rule-breaking behavior. *Journal of Homosexuality*, *60*(5), 711–733. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00918369.2013.773819>
- Jeong, J. Y., & Horne, S. G. (2009). Relationship characteristics of women in interracial same-sex relationships. *Journal of Homosexuality*, *56*(4), 443–456. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00918360902821445>
- Jones, N. E., Malone, D. E., & Campbell, M. E. (2021). Same-Sex and Different-Sex Interracial Couples: The Importance of Demographic and Religious Context. *Race and Social Problems*, *13*(4), 267–278. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12552-021-09340-5>
- Kashy, D. A., Donnellan, M. B., Burt, S. A., & McGue, M. (2008). Growth curve models for indistinguishable dyads using multilevel modeling and structural equation modeling: The

- case of adolescent twins' conflict with their mothers. *Developmental Psychology*, 44(2), 316–329. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0012-1649.44.2.316>
- Kelly, H. H., & Thibaut, J. W. (1978). *Interpersonal relationships: A theory of interdependence*. New York: Wiley.
- Kenny, D. A., Kashy, D. A., & Cook, W. L. (2006). *Dyadic data analysis*. New York, NY: The Guilford Press.
- Killian, K. D. (2001). Reconstituting racial histories and identities: The narratives of interracial couples. *Journal of Marital and Family Therapy*, 27(1), 27–42. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1752-0606.2001.tb01137.x>
- Killian, K. D. (2002). Dominant and marginalized discourses in interracial couples' narratives: Implications for family therapists. *Family Process*, 41(4), 603–618. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1545-5300.2002.00603.x>
- Killian, K. D. (2003). Homogamy outlaws. *Journal of Couple & Relationship Therapy*, 2(2–3), 3–21. https://doi.org/10.1300/J398v02n02_02
- Kurdek, L. A. (1995). Developmental changes in relationship quality in gay and lesbian cohabiting couples. *Developmental Psychology*, 31(1), 86–94. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0012-1649.31.1.86>
- Kurdek, L. A., & Schmitt, J. P. (1985). Relationship quality of gay men in closed or open relationships. *Journal of Homosexuality*, 12(2), 85–99. https://doi.org/10.1300/j082v12n02_06
- Landolt, M. A., & Dutton, D. G. (1997). Power and personality: An analysis of gay male intimate abuse. *Sex Roles*, 37(5–6), 335–359. <https://doi.org/10.1023/a:1025649306193>
- LaSala, M. C. (2004a). Extradyadic sex and gay male couples: Comparing monogamous and

- nonmonogamous relationships. *Families in Society: The Journal of Contemporary Social Services*, 85(3), 405–412. <https://doi.org/10.1177/104438940408500319>
- LaSala, M. C. (2004b). Monogamy of the heart. *Journal of Gay & Lesbian Social Services*, 17(3), 1–24. https://doi.org/10.1300/J041v17n03_01
- LeBlanc, A. J., & Frost, D. M. (2020). Couple-level minority stress and mental health among people in same-sex relationships: Extending minority stress theory. *Society and Mental Health*, 10(3), 215686931988472. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2156869319884724>
- LeBlanc, A. J., Frost, D. M., & Wight, R. G. (2015). Minority stress and stress proliferation among same-sex and other marginalized couples. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 77(1), 40–59. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jomf.12160>
- Lehmiller, J. J., & Agnew, C. R. (2006). Marginalized relationships: The impact of social disapproval on romantic relationship commitment. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 32(1), 40–51. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167205278710>
- Leslie, L. A., & Letiecq, B. L. (2004). Marital quality of African American and white partners in interracial couples. *Personal Relationships*, 11, 559–574.
- Lewis, M. A., McBride, C. M., Pollak, K. I., Puleo, E., Butterfield, R. M., & Emmons, K. M. (2006). Understanding health behavior change among couples: An interdependence and communal coping approach. *Social Science & Medicine*, 62(6), 1369–1380. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2005.08.006>
- Lincoln, K. D., & Chae, D. H. (2010). Stress, marital satisfaction, and psychological distress among african americans. *Journal of Family Issues*, 31(8), 1081–1105. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0192513X10365826>
- Link, B. G. (1987). Understanding labeling effects in the area of mental disorders: An

- assessment of the effects of expectations of rejection. *Understanding Labeling Effects in the Area of Mental Disorders: An Assessment of the Effects of Expectations of Rejection. American Sociological Review*, 52, 96–112.
- Link, B. G., & Phelan, J. C. (2001). Conceptualizing stigma. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 27(1), 363–385. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.soc.27.1.363>
- Lundquist, J. H., & Lin, K. H. (2015). Is love (color) blind? The economy of race among gay and straight daters. *Social Forces*, 93(4), 1423–1449. <https://doi.org/10.1093/sf/sov008>
- Meyer, I. H. (1995). Minority stress and mental health in gay men. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior*, 36(1), 38–56.
- Meyer, I. H. (2003). Prejudice, social stress, and mental health in lesbian, gay, and bisexual populations: conceptual issues and research evidence. *Psychological Bulletin*, 129(5), 674–697. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.129.5.674>
- Meyer, I. H., Schwartz, S., & Frost, D. M. (2008). Social patterning of stress and coping: Does disadvantaged social statuses confer more stress and fewer coping resources? *Social Science & Medicine*, 67(3), 368–379. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2008.03.012>
- Mitchell, J. W. (2014). Characteristics and allowed behaviors of gay male couples' sexual agreements. *Journal of Sex Research*, 51(3), 316–328. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00224499.2012.727915>
- Murry, V. M., Brown, P. A., Brody, G. H., Cutrona, C. E., & Simons, R. L. (2001). Racial discrimination as a moderator of the links among stress, maternal psychological functioning, and family relationships. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 63(4), 915–926. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1741-3737.2001.00915.x>
- Neff, L. A., & Karney, B. R. (2017). Acknowledging the elephant in the room: How stressful

- environmental contexts shape relationship dynamics. *Current Opinion in Psychology*, *13*, 107–110. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.copsyc.2016.05.013>
- Neilands, T. B., Chakravarty, D., Darbes, L. A., Beougher, S. C., & Hoff, C. C. (2010). Development and validation of the sexual agreement investment scale. *Journal of Sex Research*, *47*(1), 24–37. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00224490902916017>
- Neilands, T. B., LeBlanc, A. J., Frost, D. M., Bowen, K., Sullivan, P. S., Hoff, C. C., & Chang, J. (2020). Measuring a new stress domain: Validation of the couple-level minority stress scale. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, *49*(1), 249–265. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10508-019-01487-y>
- Nemoto, T., Operario, D., Soma, T., Bao, D., Vajrabukka, A., & Crisostomo, V. (2003). HIV risk and prevention among asian/pacific islander men who have sex with men: Listen to our stories. *AIDS Education and Prevention*, *15*(Supplement A), 7–20. <https://doi.org/10.1521/aeap.15.1.5.7.23616>
- Newcomb, M. E., Macapagal, K. R., Feinstein, B. A., Bettin, E., Swann, G., & Whitton, S. W. (2017). Integrating HIV Prevention and Relationship Education for Young Same-Sex Male Couples: A Pilot Trial of the 2GETHER Intervention. *AIDS and Behavior*, *21*(8), 2464–2478. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10461-017-1674-0>
- Newport, F. (2013, July 25). In U.S., 87% approve of Black-White marriage vs. 4% in 1958. *Gallup News*.
- Otis, M. D., Rostosky, S. S., Riggle, E. D. B., & Hamrin, R. (2006). Stress and relationship quality in same-sex couples. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, *23*(1), 81–99. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0265407506060179>
- Peplau, L. A., & Cochran, S. D. (1981). Value orientations in the intimate relationships of gay

- men. *Journal of Homosexuality*, 6(3), 1–19. https://doi.org/10.1300/j082v06n03_01
- Perry, N. S., Huebner, D. M., Baucom, B. R. W., & Hoff, C. C. (2016). The complex contribution of sociodemographics to decision-making power in gay male couples. *Journal of Family Psychology*, 30(8), 977–986. <https://doi.org/10.1037/fam0000234>
- Remien, R. H., Carballo-Diéguez, A., & Wagner, G. (1995). Intimacy and sexual risk behaviour in serodiscordant male couples. *AIDS Care*, 7(4), 429–438. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09540129550126380>
- Robinson, B. A. (2015). “Personal preference” as the new racism: Gay desire and racial cleansing in cyberspace. *Sociology of Race and Ethnicity*, 1(2), 317–330. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2332649214546870>
- Rosenblatt, P. C., Karis, T. A., & Powell, R. D. (1995). *Multiracial couples: Black & white voices*. London: SAGE Publications.
- Rosenthal, L., Deosaran, A., Young, D. L., & Starks, T. J. (2019). Relationship stigma and well-being among adults in interracial and same-sex relationships. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 36(11–12), 3408–3428. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0265407518822785>
- Rosenthal, L., & Starks, T. J. (2015). Relationship stigma and relationship outcomes in interracial and same-sex relationships: Examination of sources and buffers. *Journal of Family Psychology*, 29(6), 818–830. <https://doi.org/10.1037/fam0000116>
- Rostosky, S. S., Riggle, E. D. B., Savage, T. A., Roberts, S. D., & Singletary, G. (2008). Interracial same-sex couples’ perceptions of stress and coping: An exploratory study. *Journal of GLBT Family Studies*, 4(3), 277–299. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15504280802177458>

- Rusbult, C. E., Martz, J. M., & Agnew, C. R. (1998). The Investment Model Scale: Measuring commitment level, satisfaction level, quality of alternatives, and investment size. *Personal Relationships*, 5(4), 357–387. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1475-6811.1998.tb00177.x>
- Shibazaki, K., & Brennan, K. A. (1998). When birds of different feathers flock together: A preliminary comparison of intra-ethnic and inter-ethnic dating relationships. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 15(2), 248–256. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0265407598152007>
- Shih, M., Young, M. J., & Bucher, A. (2013). Working to reduce the effects of discrimination: Identity management strategies in organizations. *The American Psychologist*, 68(3), 145–157.
- Spell, S. A. (2017). Not just black and white: How race/ethnicity and gender intersect in hookup culture. *Sociology of Race and Ethnicity*, 3(2), 172–187. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2332649216658296>
- Stacey, L., & Forbes, T. D. (2021). Feeling like a fetish: racialized feelings, fetishization, and the contours of sexual racism on gay dating apps. *Journal of Sex Research*, 1–13. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00224499.2021.1979455>
- Tan, J. Y., Pratto, F., Operario, D., & Dworkin, S. L. (2013). Sexual positioning and race-based attraction by preferences for social dominance among gay Asian/Pacific Islander men in the United States. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 42(7), 1233–1239. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10508-013-0088-y>
- Thomeer, M. B., LeBlanc, A. J., Frost, D. M., & Bowen, K. (2018). Anticipatory minority stressors among same-sex couples: A relationship timeline approach. *Social Psychology*

- Quarterly*, 81(2), 126–148. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0190272518769603>
- Troy, A. B. (2006). Interracial and intraracial romantic relationships: The search for differences in satisfaction, conflict, and attachment style. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 23(1), 65–80. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0265407506060178>
- Veldhuis, C. (2020). Associations between individual and couple-level minority stressors and relationship stress in queer women’s interracial/interethnic couple relationships. <https://doi.org/10.31234/osf.io/nujvf>
- Wallace, S., Nazroo, J., & Bécares, L. (2016). Cumulative effect of racial discrimination on the mental health of ethnic minorities in the united kingdom. *American Journal of Public Health*, 106(7), 1294–1300. <https://doi.org/10.2105/AJPH.2016.303121>
- Whitton, S. W., Weitbrecht, E. M., Kuryluk, A. D., & Hutsell, D. W. (2016). A randomized waitlist-controlled trial of culturally sensitive relationship education for male same-sex couples. *Journal of Family Psychology*, 30(6), 763–768. <https://doi.org/10.1037/fam0000199>
- Williams, D. R., & Mohammed, S. A. (2009). Discrimination and racial disparities in health: evidence and needed research. *Journal of Behavioral Medicine*, 32(1), 20–47. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10865-008-9185-0>
- Williams, D. R., Yan Yu, Jackson, J. S., & Anderson, N. B. (1997). Racial differences in physical and mental health: Socio-economic status, stress and discrimination. *Journal of Health Psychology*, 2(3), 335–351. <https://doi.org/10.1177/135910539700200305>
- Wilson, P. A., Valera, P., Ventuneac, A., Balan, I., Rowe, M., & Carballo-Diequez, A. (2009). Race-based sexual stereotyping and sexual partnering among men who use the internet to identify other men for bareback sex. *Journal of Sex Research*, 46(5), 399–413.

<https://doi.org/10.1080/00224490902846479>

- Yampolsky, M., West, A. L., Zhou, B., Muise, A., & LaLonde, R. N. (2020). Divided together: How marginalization of intercultural relationships is associated with identity integration and relationship quality. *Social Psychological and Personality Science*.
- Yancey, G. (2002). Who interracially dates: An examination of the characteristics of those who have interracially. *Journal of Comparative Family Studies*, 33(2), 179–190.
- Yancey, G. (2003). A preliminary examination of differential sexual attitudes among individuals involved in interracial relationships: Testing “Jungle Fever.” *The Social Science Journal*, 40(1), 153–157. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0362-3319\(02\)00266-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0362-3319(02)00266-5)
- Yancey, G. (2007). *Interracial contact and social change*. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner Publishers.
- Yancey, G., & Yancey, S. (1998). Interracial Dating: Evidence from personal advertisements. *Journal of Family Issues*, 19(3), 334–348. <https://doi.org/10.1177/019251398019003006>