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This article articulates a contextualized understanding of gender and ethnicity as interacting social determinants of HIV risk and acquisition, with special focus on African Americans and Hispanics/Latinos—2 ethnic groups currently at most risk for HIV/AIDS acquisition in the United States. First, sex and gender are defined. Second, a conceptual model of gender, ethnicity, and HIV risk and resilience is presented. Third, a historical backdrop of gender and ethnic disparities is provided, with attention to key moments in history when notions of the intersections between gender, ethnicity, and HIV have taken important shifts. Finally, new frontiers in psychology are presented, with recommendations as to how psychology as a discipline can better incorporate considerations of gender and ethnicity as not only HIV risk factors but also as potential avenues of resilience in ethnic families and communities. Throughout the article, we promulgate the notion of a syndemic intersectional approach, which provides a critical framework for understanding and building the conditions that create and sustain overall community health by locating gendered lived experiences and expectations within the layered conceptual model ranging from the biological self to broader societal structures that define and constrain personal decisions, behaviors, actions, resources, and consequences. For ethnic individuals and populations, health disparities, stress and depression, substance abuse, and violence and trauma are of considerable concern, especially with regard to HIV risk, infection, and treatment. The conceptual model poses new frontiers for psychology in HIV policy, research, interventions, and training.
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HIV/AIDS was first identified over 30 years ago as a life-threatening disease, and since then, extensive and costly efforts have been devoted to isolating factors (e.g., behaviors) that contribute to HIV transmission in order to develop effective interventions. Over time, however, it has become abundantly clear that behaviors contributing to HIV cannot be examined in isolation, and they are not particularly amenable to “quick fix” interventions that do not address the contexts in which those behaviors occur (Adimora, Schoenbach, & Floris-Moore, 2009; Aral, Adimora, & Fenton, 2008). Instead, behaviors need to be understood—and addressed—in the contexts of personal identity, communities, cultures, and broader sociopolitical environments. Two key interrelated social constructs to consider in a contextualized understanding of HIV-related behaviors are gender and ethnicity.

In U.S.-based HIV/AIDS research and policy, gender and ethnicity are considered “risk factors” due to the fact that males and females from specific ethnic groups have historically been variably at risk for HIV and more or less burdened by a preponderance of HIV infection (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention [CDC], 2012). What was once a disease concentrated in White, gay, affluent men has now become a disease concentrated in non-affluent popu-
tional definitions and roles of gender identity in ethnic and sexual minority communities, and the contradictions that emerge when addressing HIV risk in underserved communities. In addition, psychologists must often consider gender and ethnicity-related sociocultural factors in the context of other HIV-related issues such as substance abuse, sexual violence, and mental illness.

This is one of few articles that provides a sociocultural perspective on gender and ethnic disparities for HIV interventions and prevention within the context of other epidemic challenges in underserved communities. Much extant research acknowledges gender, religion, and culture as important contributors to health determinants that are “features of and pathways by which societal conditions affect health” (Krieger, 2001, cited in Poundstone, Strathdee, & Celantano, 2004, p. 22; see also Ford & Airhihenbuwa, 2010; Yamada & Brekke, 2008). However, very little research directly addresses specific gender norms and expectations and the relevance of social support, family, and ethnic and religious communities to gender and ethnic disparities in HIV/AIDS treatment and prevention. Factors that pertain to HIV prevention and reduction of mental illness and trauma-related symptoms—such as substance abuse, depression, and interpersonal or community-level violence—are also not adequately addressed in the current demonstration of evidence-based interventions (DEBIs) that are endorsed by the CDC (Wyatt, Williams, Gupta, & Malebranche, 2012).

The goal of this article is to contextualize gender and ethnicity as social determinants of HIV risk and transmission, with a special focus on African Americans and Hispanics/Latinos—two ethnic groups currently at most risk for HIV/AIDS acquisition. We begin by defining sex and gender, and then we present our conceptual model, which we believe to be unique in its inclusive conceptualization of gender (as not only female but also male and other gender identities) and its consideration of gender and ethnicity as not only risk factors but also potential resilience factors. Then we point out key moments in history when notions of the intersections of gender, ethnicity, and HIV have taken pivotal and important shifts. We provide some examples of how gender roles and identities are expressed in ethnic minority communities, and the implications of gendered norms for HIV risk, transmission, treatment, and prevention. Finally, we pose new frontiers for psychology in HIV prevention and interventions and important next steps to integrate gender, ethnicity, and other factors that influence and enhance risk reduction and resilience among populations most at risk for HIV transmission.

Defining Sex and Gender

Although the constructs of sex and gender are distinct, they are often used interchangeably, raising serious concerns in health research and confusion about how findings are to be implemented (Krieger, 2003; Lorber, 1994; Nowatzki & Grant, 2011). The term sex refers to the biological, chromosomal, hormonal, and physiological characteristics of being male or female either at birth or before (Pryzgoda &
from their biological sex at birth (Gay and Lesbian Alliance Against Defamation, 2010; Institute of Medicine, 2011). It is important to recognize that this term does not describe sexuality, sexual behavior, or sexual orientation. Transgender persons may be male-to-female or female-to-male and may self-identify as heterosexual, homosexual, bisexual, or any number of other gender identities (Stryker, 1998). The recent Institute of Medicine (2011) report, The Health of Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Transgender People: Building a Foundation for Better Understanding, acknowledges that data specifically on the proportion of transgender people in the U.S. population are sorely lacking. However, the CDC reports that transgender communities in the United States are among the groups at highest risk for HIV infection, as noted above (CDC, 2011).

Gender, as a social determinant of health, contributes to inequitable social, economic, and psychological experiences that can lead to differential health risks and outcomes (Keleher, 2004). In sum, gender—a dynamic of social expectations, social position, and a social history that impacts us throughout our life course—can serve as both an asset and a liability in HIV acquisition, particularly among ethnic communities in the United States. When ethnicity and HIV risks are added to the complexities of gender, our inability to address these three issues in combination has created disparities in how we currently address them.

A Conceptual Model of Gender, Ethnicity, and HIV Risk and Resilience

Our conceptual model (see Figure 1) depicts the intersectionality of gender and ethnicity, as shaped and influenced by ethnic and religious communities, proximal social networks, and broader social contexts. One of the solutions to minimizing gender disparities is to recognize the limitations associated with isolating gender as a sole contributor to health outcomes. Intersectionality assumes race, class, and gender are interacting systems of social and power relations within which all members of society are located (Bilge, 1999), and presupposes that the simultaneous workings of these power relations shape social locations, experiences, and identities and cannot be simply added or subtracted to any concept (Cole, 2009). Within each layer of our model, there are norms and expectations for behavior, as well as opportunities to ascribe to or veer away from these norms. We move beyond the biological assignment of sex at birth (Circle A) to the social construction of the gendered, ethnic self (Circle B) as embedded in communities, some of which are ascribed according to sociocultural norms (Circle C) and some of which are chosen according to personal and social preferences (Circle D).

As depicted by the dotted lines surrounding and intersecting the circles, our model incorporates the notion of syndemics. For ethnic individuals and populations struggling under multiple interactive constraints and opportunities, health disparities, stress and depression, substance abuse, and violence and trauma (depicted in the boxes in the corners of the model) are of considerable concern, especially with regard to HIV risk, infection, and treatment.
A syndemic is defined as “two or more epidemics . . . , interacting synergistically and contributing, as a result of their interaction, to exceed burden of disease in a population” (Singer & Clair, 2003, p. 425). Initially introduced by anthropologist Merrill Singer, the substance abuse, violence, and AIDS—or SAVA—syndemic was conceptualized as inextricable and mutually reinforcing connections between three conditions that disproportionately afflict those living in poverty in U.S. cities (Singer, 1994, 1996). Our model posits a syndemic intersectional approach, locating gendered lived experience and expectations within broader societal structures (Circle E) that define and constrain personal decisions, behaviors, actions, resources, and consequences. A syndemic intersectional approach provides a critical framework for understanding and building the conditions that create and sustain overall community health (Egan et al., 2011).

Ethnic and Religious Communities (Circle C) and Social Networks (Circle D)

Families and communities typically expect adherence to traditional or gender neutral roles in the interest of the community over the individual. This is illustrated by the African philosophical statement, “I am because we are and because we are, I am” (Mbiti, 1970, p. 141). The endorsement of particular gender norms by important role models and leaders is often expressed in ways that are rarely perceived as protective and affirming to the larger community, and sometimes leadership and larger communities express very different perspectives. For example, 2012 Gallup Polls of gay rights views in the United States indicate that about half of Blacks approve of same sex marriage (50%) and believe that gay/lesbian relations are acceptable (50%) and should be legalized (59%; Gallup Poll, 2012). Though comparable polls for Black congregations do not yet exist, the Black church has been characterized as one of the main perpetrators of homophobia in the Black community (Ward, 2005). Although there are interventions aimed at providing ministers with HIV-related facts and skills to address prevention within a religious context (Vasquez, 2012), there are too few interventions that balance attention to cultural norms and religious beliefs with attention to sexual practices that either heighten HIV-related risk or promote sexual health.

The need for family members to assume gendered responsibilities to ensure family cohesion and well-being does not necessarily change with sexual orientation. For sexual minorities, family and community support are important, but can come with a price. The contradictions between what is expected and what is happening are still major sources of HIV-related conflict and consequent risk-taking practices, especially for MSM and women who value their relationships with partners and families over self-protection, for example, in cases of abuse (Wyatt, 2009). Furthermore, African American men and women at
highest risk for HIV often do not identify as same-gender-loving or gay, due to stigma as well as economic and emotional dependence. This has serious consequences in terms of acknowledging risks, getting tested for HIV/AIDS, and adhering to HIV medications to prevent or treat symptoms of HIV. The reality of living with a chronic disease threatens the acceptance and social support of family, friends, and communities (Williams, Wyatt, Resell, Peterson, & O’Brien, 2004).

Similarly, the threat of HIV/AIDS to the U.S. Latino community highlights important aspects of respect (respeto), importance of maintaining relationships (personalismo), and connectedness with family and community (familismo); these aspects of culture may indeed serve as both protective and risk factors for HIV. Gender nonconformity can lead to social and familial ostracism and discrimination (Carrillo, 2002; Valencia-Garcia, Starks, Strick, & Simoni, 2008). However, the support of family and community in the face of gender nonconformity can have powerful, positive effects on self-esteem and mental health (Simont, Montoya, Huang, & Goodry, 2005). For many Latinos, what your family and society thinks of you—que dira la gente (what will people say)—is often a powerful influence on behavior. However, though specific cultural factors may be contextually important when examining the risk of HIV among Latinos living in the United States, not all subgroups adhere to or endorse culturally specific factors in a uniform fashion, as is also the case in African American communities in the United States. Important ethnic subgroup differences exist among these heterogeneous populations, which vary on levels of acculturation, immigration and sociopolitical status, economic context (e.g., income and education), and health (Carter-Pokras & Zambrana, 2001; Vega & Alegria, 2001).

The sociocultural approach to gender presented in this article is distinct from much contemporary HIV prevention theory and research due to our focus on gender-relevant roles, locations, functions, and situations. Ethnicity and gender have a special association among ethnic people, in particular because of discrimination and stigma. When discrimination of any nature occurs, individuals are overlooked and not valued; the right to be oneself is negated and often repeatedly so. To counter negative assumptions about personal credibility, individuals might use visible ethnic characteristics of facial features, skin color, hair texture, language and accent, dress, and behavior in ways that affirm their presence and identity (Wyatt, 1990). Other attributes like education, language spoken, and racial socialization (e.g., strategies that are taught to address perceived discrimination and promote self-validation) can serve as buffers to experiences of discrimination (Harris-Britt, Valrie, Kurtz-Costes, & Rowley, 2007).

For both men and women, gender roles exist on a continuum and HIV affects individuals across this spectrum. We have often failed to examine and highlight the flexible and fluid nature of gender roles for men and women, especially within a cultural context. For example, though masculine roles exist in most cultures, the term machismo historically denoted certain racial characteristics, often one-sided and negative, which are then used to stereotype and minimize the role of Latino men (Gutmann, 1996; Mirande, 1997). Yet, prior research suggested that as few as 10% of Latinos identify with traditional, unidimensional machismo, with the majority of respondents instead endorsing identification with other dimensions such as contemporary masculinity, conflicted/compassionate machismo, and contemporary machismo (Torres, Solberg, & Carlstrom, 2002). More recently, Arciniega, Anderson, Tovar-Blank, and Tracey (2008) empirically demonstrated the dimensions of (a) traditional machismo, with a focus on hypermasculinity and aggression, and (b) caballerosimo, which reflected characteristics of affiliation, chivalry, social responsibility, and emotional engagement.

Despite this recent research on more complex constructions and expressions of masculinity, more complex notions of gender roles have not permeated the discipline of psychology, and they have not been incorporated into HIV research, treatment, and prevention. Instead, “conventional wisdom” has prevailed (Poundstone et al., 2004), under-mining the nuanced reality of negotiated masculinity among Latinos and African American men, and thereby placing men of color at risk for excess disease, illness, and mortality. In other words, the socially proscribed version of masculinity may contribute to low help-seeking and high risk-taking. For example, heterosexual Black males who embrace cultural norms of masculinity—characterized in the United States by power and dominance—might equate manhood with having multiple and concurrent sexual female partners (Bowleg et al., 2011; Marable, 1984; Parham, White, & Ajamu, 1999). Through these types of pursuits, some African American men may attempt to confirm a comparative and competitive prowess, particularly if they lack opportunities for an adequate education.
and skills to earn an income (White & Cones, 1999). Masculine socialization has also been found to impact HIV sexual behavior and partner selection among Black MSM (Bowleg et al., 2011; Malebranche, Fields, Bryant, & Harper, 2009). For example, young Black MSM have been found to engage in more HIV risk-taking sexual behavior (e.g., unprotected anal intercourse) with males perceived as masculine, in the belief that they are less risky than those overtly related to gay lifestyle (Fields et al., 2012). Association with overtly feminine males is typically stigmatized and linked to White, flamboyant gay culture (Fields et al., 2012).

In sum, for men and women of color, reducing HIV risk might fly in the face of expected gendered behavior and gender norms. This challenge is consonant with the conundrum posed by Parham (1999, p. 795) regarding African Americans: “How does one maintain a sense of cultural integrity in a world that does not support nor affirm our humanity as people of African descent?” This same question could be asked for other ethnic communities who experience persistent contradictions between cultural and societal expectations and demands.

Missing from most interventions is an acknowledgment that gender and cultural values are important to integrate into curricula that address how to establish and maintain an identification with characteristics that promote positive identities and the resultant self-efficacy to reduce risks as an HIV-positive individual (El-Bassel, Gilbert, et al., 2010; Valencia-Garcia et al., 2008). These examples of the intersections of gender, ethnicity, and HIV-related risks can provide insight into why heterosexual and same gender-loving individuals may embrace traditional gender roles as a testament to their resilience. They may, however, also resist the possible stigmatized identities as a person at risk for or living with HIV, routine HIV/STI testing, and daily adherence to HIV medications, even in the face of heightened risks for HIV/AIDS acquisition or transmission (Wyatt, 2009).

**Broad Societal Conditions (Circle E) and Syndemics**

The gender expectations and gender role dynamics described above are realized within broader social, economic, and environmental conditions. These dynamics, including perceived discrimination, can contribute to poor health and risk of disease transmission due to high levels of community, relationship and personal violence and related trauma, alcohol and substance abuse, unaddressed mental health needs, and lack of health care access and equal opportunities for HIV treatment (Institute of Medicine, 2002; see also Wu et al., 2010). Research on gender differences in violence and trauma, substance abuse, and mental health is extensive (see, e.g., Brady & Randall, 1999), as is research on racial/ethnic differences. However, few studies address gender and ethnic differences in syndemics (i.e., interacting conditions) that are highly implicated in HIV risk. In an effort to explain the higher incidence of HIV among Black women (compared to White and Latina women), Tillerson (2008) conducted a systematic review and found that Black women are no more likely to have unprotected sex, have multiple sexual partners, or use drugs than women of other racial/ethnic groups. Tillerson also found some studies that suggest that Black women are more likely to have risky sex partners and STDs, and that Black men are less likely to disclose their same-sex behavior to female partners. However, overall, these findings failed to explain the greater burden of HIV among Black women. Tillerson (2008) and others (e.g., Bogart, Wagner, Galvan, & Klein, 2010; Latkin & Knowlton, 2005) have recommended greater examination of these and other macro-level social, ecological, and behavioral factors such as poverty, health care access, and perceived and actual discrimination to explain racial/ethnic and gender disparities in HIV incidence.

**Key Moments in the History of HIV, Gender, and Ethnicity**

The following pivotal points in the history of HIV/AIDS illustrate how gender and ethnicity have been consistently implicated in HIV risks and transmission.

1. **AIDS was initially considered as a “gendered” (i.e., male) and social disease, but with racial/ethnic overtones.** Medical and government experts described the condition as the gay-related immunodeficiency disease (GRID) because it occurred predominantly among gay men. The fact that women were also presenting with HIV-related symptoms was largely ignored (Masur, Murry, & Jones, 1982). HIV had not yet been discovered, but the negative portrayal and prejudice about the types of men and women becoming infected were also becoming widespread. People talked about a “4-H club” of persons at risk for AIDS: homosexuals, hemophiliacs, heroin addicts, and Haitians—although hemophiliacs were quickly dropped...
and substituted with “hookers”—underscoring the view that it was really the undesirables of American society that were impacted (Black, 1986; Callen, 1983; Goldstein, 1983). The Haitian vulnerability was never well-defined, but the inclusion of a specific ethnic group in this initial list fueled the intersection of race/ethnicity, gender, and sexual orientation as a target of stigma and discrimination.

2. Prevention interventions in the United States started with grassroots, non-governmental efforts by community-based organizations (CBOs) and health providers (Altman, 1984; Arno, 1986; Shilts, 1987). The assumption behind these efforts was that these groups knew the pertinent communities and how to reach those at risk. These efforts originated in 1982 before there was a definitive understanding of the mechanisms of transmission of the newly named Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndrome (AIDS), and they were culturally specific to the populations of gay men, injection drug users, and commercial sex workers—populations not likely to be the focus of government-sponsored interventions (Altman, 1984; Ickovics, Morrill, Beren, Walsh, & Rodin, 1994; Kalichman, 1996). Structural interventions and policies being considered by local governments were specific to a “disease control” model, such as the closure of gay bathhouses and the exclusion of blood donation by groups considered being at risk. In the 1987 report, Koop noted, “Couples who maintain mutually faithful monogamous relationships (only one continuing sexual partner) are protected from AIDS through sexual transmission” (p. 16). In the 1988 report, Koop went even further in this message, stating “Married people who are uninfected, faithful and don’t shoot drugs are not at risk” (p. 4). The invisibility of HIV risk for women was promulgated in the popular media, such as a January 1988 article in a popular women’s magazine, Cosmopolitan, which featured an editorial by Dr. Robert E. Gould, a psychiatrist, who reassured women that there was little to no risk of infection via heterosexual intercourse. Although an editorial in Cosmopolitan did not constitute a scientific publication, it underscored the zeitgeist of the perception that women were not at risk.

3. Social determinants of HIV risk (including gender and ethnicity) were absent from initial research and prevention intervention efforts in part because a public health/epidemiological model became the impetus for the eradication of this new epidemic. In this model, the distribution of disease considers demographic characteristics (e.g., sex, age, geography) and the determinants of the observed distribution, which, for HIV, became predominantly a focus on the identification of sex- and drug-related behavior patterns leading to HIV transmission. Initial studies of gay men (McKusick, Hortsman, & Coates, 1985) and injection drug users (IDUs; Des Jarlais, Friedman, & Hopkins, 1985) focused on identifying the scope and determinants of HIV transmission risk behaviors, and potential strategies to reduce those behaviors.

Interventions in the early 1980s began in the major urban epicenters (New York, San Francisco, Los Angeles, and Miami) and included outreach, telephone information hotlines, and group education activities delivered by newly formed community groups such as the Gay Men’s Health Crisis in New York and the San Francisco AIDS Foundation in California.

4. The identification of HIV in 1984 and subsequent development of the HIV antibody test in 1985 increased the government’s national media campaign and other educational efforts. Surgeon General Koop’s historic 1987 report (Koop, 1987), delivered in a more abbreviated version to every American household in 1988 (Koop, 1988), was one of the most candid and well-explained messages regarding mechanisms of transmission. Unfortunately, both versions included language that allowed heterosexuals, particularly women, to erroneously assume they were not at risk. In the 1987 report, Koop noted, “Couples who maintain mutually faithful monogamous relationships (only one continuing sexual partner) are protected from AIDS through sexual transmission” (p. 16). In the 1988 report, Koop went even further in this message, stating “Married people who are uninfected, faithful and don’t shoot drugs are not at risk” (p. 4). The invisibility of HIV risk for women was promulgated in the popular media, such as a January 1988 article in a popular women’s magazine, Cosmopolitan, which featured an editorial by Dr. Robert E. Gould, a psychiatrist, who reassured women that there was little to no risk of infection via heterosexual intercourse. Although an editorial in Cosmopolitan did not constitute a scientific publication, it underscored the zeitgeist of the perception that women were not at risk.

5. AIDS-defining conditions specific to women such as cervical cancer were not included by the CDC in the AIDS-spectrum diagnosis until 1993 (Hader, Smith, Moore, & Holmberg, 2001). In 1987, the CDC created a list of AIDS-defining illnesses that were a proxy for severe immunosuppression, especially defective cell-mediated immunity. Kaposi’s sarcoma (KS) and high-grade non-Hodgkin’s lymphoma (NHL) were included in this list and most common among HIV-infected men. By 1993, CDC had recognized an increased prevalence of cervical dysplasia (a precursor lesion for cervical cancer) among HIV-infected women, and studies also documented that a higher prevalence of cervical dysplasia among HIV-infected women was associated with greater immunosuppression (CDC, 1992). This delay in recognizing women-specific AIDS-related illnesses deprived women of critical health and financial resources (i.e., an AIDS diagnosis would provide disability and health care benefits) that were available to men for over a decade before they were available to women living with HIV. Consequently, gender inequities and low
social status of women have been evident throughout the course of the epidemic. Even though women were at risk and becoming infected with HIV, they were primarily viewed as vectors for the spread of HIV, either to their unborn fetuses or to heterosexual men via sex work (Gómez, 2011). Furthermore, early attention to transgender women and men was primarily about their HIV risk in relation to gender identity disorder (Pang, Pugh, & Catalan, 1994) or as vectors through transsexual or transvestite prostitution (Boles & Elifson, 1994; Elifson et al., 1993; Modan et al., 1992).

6. The CDC AIDS surveillance system showed an inconsistent use of gender, sexual behavior, sexual orientation, and injection drug use in classifying modes of HIV acquisition for men and for women. The ability to classify mode of transmission for every new incidence of HIV requires the newly infected person to be able to identify and disclose the most likely route of HIV acquisition. In the context of a frightening and deadly epidemic, this may have been an appropriate expectation in theory, but the immediate level of stigma associated with AIDS and the subsequent chronicity of HIV/AIDS would soon bring into question the wisdom of this classification system, and today provides great challenges in its level of accuracy and its contribution to the persistent perception that women are minimally at risk. For example, if a woman is found to have HIV, she will be asked about her own behaviors and about her male partner’s behaviors. If she reports that she has ever injected drugs and also reports that she has a male partner infected with HIV, she will be classified as a woman who became infected via injection drug use, even if she believes she got infected through heterosexual sex and was not currently injecting drugs. This is because the CDC has a hierarchy of risk classification, meaning that if you have multiple potential avenues of HIV risk, you will be classified under the highest risk level, in this case, injection drug use. However, under the classification for men, there is a combined classification for men who have sex with men and inject drugs. Therefore a gender bias was embedded early in the classification system by not allowing women to have an “injection drug use and sex with a man” classification that might have acknowledged the broader role of gender hidden within the drug use classification.

The initial and widespread perception that women with HIV in the United States were “bad” women—mostly IDUs and/or sex workers—was ultimately challenged in 1995 when heterosexual contact was documented by the CDC as the main source of HIV acquisition for women (Branson et al., 2006; Hader et al., 2001). This clarified the fact that the majority of women were becoming infected through heterosexual contact with a high-risk male partner whose HIV status was likely unknown to them, and represented the failure of Surgeon General Koop’s assumed monogamy.

7. As AIDS incidence rates continued to rise exponentially among all genders, the need for more systematic and comprehensive HIV prevention strategies that could reach diverse audiences was apparent. Most HIV prevention interventions focused solely on male condom use during sex and non-sharing of injection equipment (Burkett, 1996; Patton, 1996; Sobo, 1995). Even screening questions about risk behaviors were typically generic, focusing on number of sex partners and condom use. Sexual practices and drug-sharing were not contextualized, the focus was on individuals and not relationships, and sex was assumed to be consensual. Interventions did not address violent or coercive relationships that might increase risks for HIV/AIDS (Wyatt et al., 2011, 2004).

8. Attention to gender dynamics and contexts of sexual encounters emerged with the realization that women were not the “condom wearers.” Interventions focusing on women negotiating condom use with a male partner (Kalichman, Kelly, Hunter, Murphy, & Tyler, 1993), or negotiating clean injection practices with drug-sharing partners (Des Jarlais et al., 1985), were eventually criticized for focusing on individuals rather than the relational, structural, and environmental context of risk-taking involved in sexual and drug-using behaviors (Amaro, 1993; Gómez & Marin, 1996; Wyatt, 1994, 2009). As the epidemic continued to ravage through ethnic communities, too did the need to understand these more complex and interrelated dynamics of ethnicity and gender.

9. Critical gaps within interventions and research included the role of power dynamics, social structures, and the influences of racism, sexism, classism, and transphobia. Social, economic, and political influences were identified as playing a role in the disparities underlying the increasing infection rates in ethnic communities (De La Cancela, 1989). However, despite these issues, attention to gender and power imbalances as well as to the cultural
issues pertinent to risk and protective factors among ethnic communities continued to be absent in interventions (Amaro, 1995; Gómez, 2011; Wyatt et al., 2004, 2012).

10. Over 20 years into this pandemic, the role of culture, gender, and power imbalances in relationships as well as the numerous societal and economic factors impacting disadvantaged groups most affected by HIV continue to be ignored. A recent review of HIV/AIDS interventions published between 1988 and 2010 that met guidelines of the CDC’s HIV/AIDS Prevention Research Synthesis-Compendium of HIV Prevention Interventions with Evidence of Effectiveness (CDC, 2001) reported that only 34 of 166 interventions included some definition of the culture of the targeted groups, or attempted to address some aspect of cultural beliefs and practices that might conflict with prevention messages about HIV/AIDS transmission (Wyatt et al., 2012). These findings highlight our need to understand what about culture matters and what about gender can serve to protect and empower both men and women, especially among ethnic minority populations who carry the burden of HIV.

11. As we move toward implementing biological methods of treatment and the first National HIV/AIDS Strategy for the United States (White House Office of National AIDS Policy, 2010), there has been growing concern that consideration of gender and ethnicity is still absent, even though HIV clinical trials are now incorporating treatments that affect the physiology and biology of individuals. As noted by the Positive Women’s Network (2012, p. 2), inadequate research has been conducted to date to make a determination on efficacy of Truvada [an HIV medication now being used preventively among high-risk individuals] as PrEP [Pre-Exposure Prophylaxis] among women, factors that impact adherence among women, as well as safety for women at various stages of their life spans.

Approved by the Federal Drug Administration in July 2012 as the first HIV prevention pill (Knox, 2012), Truvada continues to be a controversial and complicated approach to preventing HIV, with little known about its safety, utility, feasibility, sustainability, and affordability in diverse populations.

As of 2011, there are no reported biological sex differences in adverse events with integrase, fusion, or CCR5 inhibitors. However, among women, virologic failure rates are more related to antiretroviral therapy (ART)-related complications (Aziz & Smith, 2012); women experience biologically linked side effects (Mave, Gahunia, Frontini, Clark, & Mushatt, 2011) and severe side effects with highly active antiretroviral therapy (HAART; see review by Florida, Giuliano, Palmisano, & Vella, 2008), and women appear to discontinue HAART at greater rates than men. It is also important to note that virologic failure rates in the United States vary widely by population group, with African American women and men at far greater risk for virologic failure than their White American counterparts (Weintrob et al., 2009).

Addressing Gender and Ethnicity as Social Determinants of HIV: New Frontiers in Psychology

Although psychology as a discipline has been at the forefront of HIV/AIDS prevention, efforts to forge new ground should consider multiple levels of change agents within policy, research, clinical practice, and training. We offer specific recommendations and examples within each of these areas.

Policy Changes

Gender theories have moved us beyond an earlier dichotomous view of gender identity to recognize multi-dimensional and multi-layered concepts, as described above. Biological, social, and personal history aspects of sex and gender identity may matter for understanding health differences. Accordingly, data collection protocols should allow for collection of the key aspects of these factors. Still, many researchers, health departments, funders, and government agencies do not allow for or consider the identification or reporting of a gender continuum, and currently there is no standardized method for capturing sex and gender identity data that accurately reflects these complexities.

Policy changes in systematic data collection by local and federal health agencies could lead the way in establishing effective methodologies for the measurement of gender. For example, the San Francisco Department of Public Health (SFDPH), in collaboration with social/medical research scientists, recently developed a set of principles and guidelines on how to collect, categorize, report, and use sex and gender data in their programs. The guiding principles are as follows:

1. To the extent that sex and gender identity are markers of health or risk differences, they should be identified as well as possible in data collection and reporting.
2. Biological, social, and personal history aspects of sex and gender identity may matter for understanding health differences. Data collection protocols should allow for concise collection of the most key aspects of these factors.
3. Naming of sex and gender identity should allow for both consistency and relevancy.
4. Categorization should allow for both compliance and comparability.
5. A single set of core sex and gender categories that are aligned with state and federal minimum reporting requirements are needed and should be developed.
6. Sexual orientation, behavior, and practice data should be gathered through other specific questions and not inferred from sex and gender identity.

These guidelines are a first attempt by SFDPH to systematically address the need for data collection in order to improve information, data consistency, and understanding of their populations’ sex and gender identities. These changes in data collection practices will be increasingly important for biomedical interventions that also require behavior change, especially for those populations whose behaviors are inconsistent with the manner in which they
identify themselves as well as with the way that they are biologically defined. Psychologists can contribute and participate in the development of these more precise measurements, and they should always include them in their own research and clinical practice protocols.

A second policy change related to data collection would be to advocate for the revision of risk hierarchies used by the CDC for HIV and AIDS surveillance, as previously discussed, to better reflect the mode of infection (i.e., sex with a man; sharing a needle) rather than risk groups (i.e., men who have sex with men) as is current practice. Additionally, increasing access to other intersectional data in HIV surveillance such as social class or income would improve contextual analyses beyond a sole focus on race/ethnicity and gender as risk factors.

Public health policies that require use of evidence-based interventions for HIV risk reduction should move beyond condom use promotion strategies and include interventions that focus on quality of life over time. Psychologists can join with other professionals to help develop interventions that include components addressing job training, microfinance skills, and attainment of basic educational skills such as reading and writing for literacy among highly vulnerable and at risk populations; these enhancements can have a profound impact on the populations most at risk.

The American Psychological Association (APA) has a well-established and effective Public Interest Directorate that “applies psychology to the fundamental problems of human welfare and social justice and the promotion of equitable and just treatment of all segments of society through education, training, and public policy” (see http://www.apa.org/pi/) and that should continue to address relevant issues that promote gender, racial, and ethnic equalities within society. Accordingly, psychologists can take advantage of the wealth of resources provided by APA to stay current on relevant policy changes regarding social determinants of health.

Changes in Research Directions

The research needed today to end the epidemic must go beyond individual-level change and must stop using gender, race, and ethnicity as proxies for explanatory risk factors. Instead, HIV prevention and intervention research must understand the intersection of gender and ethnicity, and at times, the contradictions that emerge when addressing HIV risk in underserved communities. Below are some specific examples of needed changes in research direction.

Investigators should broaden their understanding of gender-specific HIV prevention interventions, so that the needs of men at risk for or living with HIV can gain more attention. Ethnic minority men face social and economic disadvantages as well as complex gender roles that place them at heightened risk for infection, as discussed above (Amaro, Vega, & Valencia, 2001). The social pressures regarding masculinity and heterosexism in our society create risks for men that further impact risks for women (Paternostro, 1998; Valencia-Garcia et al., 2008), yet these aspects of gender continue to be overlooked in most interventions to date. Recently, research with couples at risk for or living with HIV/AIDS has been successful in addressing gender-specific needs within the context of interventions aimed at the couple supporting each other (El-Bassel, Jemmott, et al., 2010). Further, psychologists can review the methods by which global programs, such as International Planned Parenthood Federation, effectively include men in gender programs, interventions, and policy work. Incorporating men as essential constituents in gender research yields products of more nuanced and complex effective education and action programs regarding health, HIV, and men’s involvement with family and community empowerment (International Planned Parenthood Federation, 2008, 2010).

Research that addresses gender differences in risk for HIV/AIDS transmission needs to contextualize sexual and drug-related risk-taking practices to better understand some of the personal, relationship, circumstantial, cultural, religious, and community-level expectations that contradict risk reduction efforts. For example, interventions should include a focus on learning to cope with personal trauma as a result of sexual or physical violence, regardless of gender or sexual orientation. These programs need to address how health-damaging coping strategies such as substance abuse and medical mistrust due to inequities and mistreatment in the health care system can compromise medical adherence and health care access. Teaching effective coping skills should be essential components of “basic readiness” prior to enrollment into biomedical or biobehavioral interventions that address risky practices in relationships, social networks, and communities. This is especially required for survivors of violence and trauma. Future research should also embrace feminist gains, gendered analyses, and findings regarding more complex understandings of gender roles and experiences. Attention should be directed to studying the limitations of models focusing solely on women’s empowerment and limits of dichotomizing men’s and women’s roles in personal, sexual, and family issues. Furthermore, priority should be given to studies of transgender men and women, the context of their risks and resilience, and interventions that acknowledge different definitions and roles of gender identity and health promotion.

We need research expertise to develop interventions to bridge the gap between the adherence to rich, traditional messages about gender and its value in ethnic communities, along with other survival strategies, and what is needed in the 21st century in order to avoid disease transmission. Much of the change in thinking about some of these concepts will have to come from within the communities, religious institutions, and groups at most risk for HIV/AIDS, and changes to structural and institutional barriers are also being made via policy. We need to create more opportunities for investigators with diverse educational and ethnic backgrounds to conduct comprehensive research that addresses ethnic, cultural, and gender disparities (Ginther et al., 2011).
Clinical Practice

Issues related to gender inequalities as well as associated psychological distress and trauma are often seen in clinical practice. Psychologists with expertise in understanding gender disparities and the importance of maintaining ethnic, cultural, religious socialization in families and communities as sources of resilience for ethnic minorities need to be acknowledged (Smedley, 2012). Clinicians should seek consultation with colleagues experienced in this area for appropriate and competent treatment.

Although psychologists may not directly address pharmacologic HIV treatment and care, an understanding of gender and biological factors may lead to different intervention approaches for persons living with HIV disease. Knowing the probabilities of virologic failure for specific populations may lead to different ways to present information to persons at possible risk for HIV infection and different ways to formulate interventions that take differential effects of medications into consideration.

Last, psychology licensing boards need to assess for competence in gender as well as culturally and clinically relevant assessment practices and skills in order to heighten awareness of gender and ethnicity-based inequalities are developed, supported, and sustained within our cultural and social structures and policies, and how perceived discrimination contributes to health disparities (Smedley, 2012). Once we achieve a better understanding of these mechanisms of influence, we will be better prepared to intervene beyond individual-level behavior change, and find alternative forms of family, community, and social acceptance beyond ethnically based gender norm conformity. If we refine the basic training of psychologists, along with the clinical practice tools and research skills that will improve the work that they do, new frontiers will be initiated so that gender and ethnic disparities in HIV can finally be eliminated.

Undergraduate- and Graduate-Level Training in Psychology

As part of the curriculum, undergraduate- and graduate-level psychology training programs need to include courses and training that address and examine gender disparities as social determinants of health, including mental health. Students need to better understand how pivotal historical points have contributed to gender and health disparities for different ethnic and cultural groups. We need to minimize barriers created by gender inequities by adapting models like the one proposed in this article to balance, broaden, and implement a new understanding of the intersectional components of gender and its influence on HIV/AIDS-related health issues. These changes in training will increase competence in diversity training and practice.

Conclusion

This is one of few articles to examine gender disparities along a continuum that includes both biological and social constructions that intersect with ethnicity and cultural beliefs and practices for some of the groups at most risk for and living with HIV/AIDS. We recognize that this review does not discuss all ethnic groups at growing HIV acquisition risk that deserve a similar discourse about gender and ethnic disparities of their own; this article only begins this conversation. This article does affirm that traditional gender roles and values in ethnic minority communities need to be acknowledged and understood. Although some cultural values may be disempowering for women and should not be promulgated, others may be drawn from as strengths in HIV prevention efforts that promote self-protection and sexual health; fundamental principles of human rights and dignity serve as an important backdrop to consideration of cultural values related to gender (United Nations Population Fund, 2008).

Psychologists can have an active role in better understanding gender norms and expectations in our relationships, families, institutions, and in the larger society. Furthermore, we must increase our understanding of how gender and ethnicity-based inequalities are developed, supported, and sustained within our cultural and social structures and policies, and how perceived discrimination contributes to health disparities (Smedley, 2012). Once we achieve a better understanding of these mechanisms of influence, we will be better prepared to intervene beyond individual-level behavior change, and find alternative forms of family, community, and social acceptance beyond ethnically based gender norm conformity. If we refine the basic training of psychologists, along with the clinical practice tools and research skills that will improve the work that they do, new frontiers will be initiated so that gender and ethnic disparities in HIV can finally be eliminated.
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