

Intimate Partner Violence and the Role of Masculinity in Male Same-Sex Relationships

Jonathan Oringer¹ and Kristin W. Samuelson¹

Abstract

Intimate partner violence (IPV) in heterosexual couples has been heavily researched for decades, but researchers have only recently begun to examine the correlates of violent behavior in same-sex relationships. Masculinity and male-role socialization have long been recognized as related to many forms of violent behavior, but masculine behavior in gay men and its role in IPV have not been similarly studied. In a community sample of 117 ethnically diverse, primarily college educated gay and bisexual men, it was found that men who had perpetrated physical or sexual violence in their same-sex relationships reported higher levels of masculine behaviors than men who had not used violence. A high correlation between perpetrating acts of IPV and being the victim of such acts was also found. Greater conformity to traditional masculine norms, specifically, aggressiveness and suppression of emotional vulnerability, was a significant predictor of perpetrator physical violence over and above being the recipient of physical IPV acts. Overall, these results suggest that clinicians serving the LGBT community may not wish to ascribe to a patriarchal model of IPV in which there are distinct perpetrator and victim roles.

Keywords

partner abuse, bidirectional IPV, gay men

Intimate partner violence (IPV) is abuse that occurs between two individuals in a close and intimate relationship and usually refers to romantic couples, be they married, dating, living together, or former partners/spouses. IPV can include a spectrum of behaviors including physical abuse, sexual abuse, threats, and emotional abuse (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, 2008a). Although the research examining IPV in heterosexual couples is vast, only recently have researchers examined prevalence rates of IPV and correlates of violence in same-sex romantic relationships. Findings of prevalence rates have been somewhat disparate, with rates of physical abuse in male same-sex relationships ranging from 14% (Tjaden, Thoennes, & Allison, 1999) to 50% (Stanley, Bartholomew, Taylor, Oram, & Landolt, 2006). This disparity may be the result of various factors, including differences in definitions of IPV, differences in relationships being studied (e.g., committed partnerships versus casual relationships), and potential underreporting behaviors of gay men. In addition, some men may not report the violence (to researchers, clinicians, or friends and family) because they are not out or are concerned that authorities may be prejudiced and will be unhelpful or even blaming of victims. Alternatively, because of internalized gender stereotypes regarding victims of violence, some gay male victims of partner violence

may not see themselves as “victims” or may be ashamed to report victimization because to do so may seem unmasculine (Cruz, 2000).

A limitation of many same-sex IPV studies is the focus on victimization (McClennen, Summers, & Vaughn, 2002; Merrill & Wolfe, 2000; Renzetti, 1992). By recruiting only self-identified victims, researchers may exclude men who may not view themselves as victims. Merrill and Wolfe found that men who have defended themselves physically do not necessarily see themselves as victims because they used force for self-defense. In addition, it is difficult to generalize to the general population of same-sex victims of IPV from research that only examines men who seek help. Less frequently, researchers have examined reports of both victimization and perpetration, which allows for an examination of the bidirectionality of abuse. Bartholomew, Regan, White, and Oram (2008), who collected data from a random sample

¹California School of Professional Psychology at Alliant International University, San Francisco, CA

Corresponding Author:

Kristin W. Samuelson, California School of Professional Psychology at Alliant International University, One Beach Street, San Francisco, CA 94133
Email: ksamuelson@alliant.edu

of 284 gay and bisexual Canadian men in 1998, found strong correlations between reports of perpetration and receipt of violence. Looking at lifetime experience, 31% of their sample reported bidirectional physical abuse (both receiving and perpetrating physical violence). Landolt and Dutton (1997) reported intraclass correlations of .57 for violence receipt and perpetration in their study of 52 gay male couples (mean length of relationship = 5.5 years, range = 6 months-31 years). Bartholomew, Regan, White, et al. speculated that the bidirectional abuse may be more likely to occur in same-sex relationships as opposed to heterosexual relationships because retaliation and escalation is more likely. It also suggests that clinicians and researchers in the LGBT community cannot ascribe to the patriarchal model of IPV, in which there are distinct perpetrator and victim roles. Likewise, other researchers have refuted the notion that most same-sex male romantic relationships have one individual in the “male” and one individual in the “female” role (Bell & Weinberg, 1978; Harry, 1984; Kelly & Warshafsky, 1987; Landolt & Dutton, 1997; Peplau, 1993). Same-sex relationships tend to be more equalitarian and symmetrical and less prone to dominant/submissive, dichotomous gender roles (Carrington, 1999).

Researchers also have focused on examining potential correlates of violent relationships and perpetration specifically. Many correlates of heterosexual partner abuse also apply to same-sex partner abuse such as a history of family of origin violence, attachment anxiety, and level of substance use (Bartholomew, Regan, Oram, & White, 2008). Likewise, the cycle of interpersonal conflict in same-sex relationships with IPV has been found to match that in heterosexual relationships (Elliott, 1996). Examining only gay male and lesbian relationships, Bryant and Demian (1994) found factors such as high relationship commitment, infrequent big arguments, high joint income, and high quality of sexual interaction to be correlated with low frequency of abusive behavior.

Island and Letellier (1991) first introduced the connection between masculinity and same-sex IPV by hypothesizing that batterers are “obviously confused about the concept of masculinity” (p. 49). They speculated that all men are exposed to the same societal messages regarding masculinity, including negative correlates of masculinity, such as aggression. In interpreting the results of his qualitative study, Cruz (2000) surmised that masculinity is a key variable in understanding IPV, as IPV can be viewed as the result of one man trying to assert power and control over his partner, be that partner male or female. Cultural expectations about masculinity are conveyed to individuals through a process known as masculine socialization (O’Neil, 1981). One example is that boys are often taught that repressing emotions is a sign of strength and an appropriate masculine behavior. Likewise, researchers have found that male gender role conflict among gay men is correlated with anger, anxiety, and a reluctance to seek psychological services, which is similar to heterosexual men when faced with a gender-role conflict (Simonsen, Blazina, & Watkins, 2000). In gay couples, homophobia (anti-gay/LGBT

prejudice), when it manifests as internalized homophobia, has been found to be related to IPV perpetrator behavior but not IPV victim experiences (Bartholomew, Regan, Oram, et al., 2008).

In multiple studies examining heterosexual males, traditional masculine attitudes have been found to be predictive of sexual violence beliefs, attitudes supportive of date rape, as well as aggressive sexual behavior (Good, Heppner, Hillenbrand-Gunn, & Wang, 1995; Mosher & Anderson, 1986; Truman, Tokar, & Fischer, 1996). In studies examining both male and female and gender roles, although being male predicted aggressive behavior, masculinity was the better predictor (Gini & Pozzoli, 2006; Hammock & Richardson, 1992). In research conducted in a laboratory setting, higher levels of masculinity in adult men have been found to be a predictor of greater aggression toward both women and men (Parrott & Zeichner, 2003, 2008; Reidy, Shirk, Sloan, & Zeichner, 2009). Qualitative research with heterosexual male perpetrators of IPV by Anderson and Umberson (2001) and Levitt, Swanger, and Butler (2008) has identified a connection between physical violence and perceived threats to one’s internal sense of masculinity. They found that among men with stronger endorsement of masculine attitudes, perpetrating IPV acted as a means of restoring one’s sense of masculinity, after feeling weak (or emasculated).

To our knowledge, only one study has examined the role of masculinity in same-sex relationships with IPV. Examining both gay men and lesbians, Kelly and Warshafsky (1987) used the Personal Attributes Questionnaire (PAQ), a measure which classifies test-takers into one of four gender roles—male, female, androgynous, and undifferentiated. They found that undifferentiated sex role identity was related to use of aggression in a relationship conflict but did not find the same correlation for a male, female, or androgynous identity. They did not report findings delineating results for gay men and lesbian women, making it difficult to ascertain the role of gender in their findings. The PAQ measures gender role socialization categorically and thus does not address the range in which gender role behavior may manifest. The present study employs Green’s (1998) conceptualization of masculinity as a continuous variable encompassing a broad range of behaviors and attitudes such as suppression of emotion, avoidance of behavior associated with the female role, independence, aggression, dominance and hierarchical control, and homophobia.

Aims of the current study are to (a) describe prevalence rates of IPV perpetration and victimization in a community sample of gay and bisexual men, (b) explore the bidirectionality of abuse by examining the extent to which violence perpetration and victimization co-occur, and (c) examine differences in rates of masculinity between men who do and do not perpetrate IPV. It was hypothesized that there would be a correlation between victimization and perpetration of IPV and a difference in conformity to traditional norms of the male role between men who had and had not perpetrated IPV.

Method

Participants

Participants were recruited via online postings, recruitment emails sent to LGBT mailing lists, and postings in retail establishments and community centers throughout the San Francisco Bay Area. Men were recruited to participate in a study that focused on gay male relationships; some fliers specifically mentioned violence relationships whereas others did not. A total of 117 men participated in the study. The average age of participants was 34.5 years old ($SD = 9.8$), and the range of ages was 20 to 63. Sixty-eight percent of participants identified as White, 11% identified as Latino/Hispanic, 8% identified as Asian American, 8% identified as multiracial, 4% identified as African American, and 1% identified as Other. Twenty-two percent of participants were born outside of the United States. One hundred one participants self-identified as gay, 10 as bisexual, and 6 as "other" (these individuals described themselves as "queer").

The participants reported primarily high levels of education: 47% of participants held a bachelor's degree; 32% had a master's or doctorate degree; 12% attended some college (but no degree); 4% had an associates degree; and 5% received a high school diploma or GED. Nineteen percent of participants reported an income greater than US\$100,000 per year; 9% of participants reported an income between US\$80,000 and US\$99,999; 15% reported an income between US\$60,000 and US\$79,999; 17% of participants reported an income between US\$40,000 and US\$59,999; 18% of participants reported an income between US\$20,000 and US\$39,999; 6% reported an income between US\$10,001 and US\$19,999; and 15% reported an income between US\$0 and US\$10,000.

Measures

Masculinity was measured by the Conformity Scale of Nabavi and Green's Masculinity Attitudes Stress Conformity Scale (MASC; Nabavi, 2004; Nabavi & Green, 2002). The MASC is a 108-item self-report questionnaire using a 6-point Likert-type scale; the Conformity Scale uses 36 of those items, and final scores on the Conformity Scale can range from 0 to 216. The MASC examines conformity to masculine norms with six subscales: Suppression of Emotional Vulnerability; Avoiding Dependency on Others; Self-Destructive Achievement (defined as the willingness to sacrifice relationships to succeed at work); Striving for Dominance, Aggressiveness, and Traditional Views on Sex and Sexuality. The Conformity Scale consists of 36 items and measures the extent to which an individual's own behavior confirms to traditional norms of the male role. The MASC demonstrates excellent internal consistency, with a Cronbach's alpha of .95. In this study, internal consistency was .88 for the overall measure. Alphas for each subscale of the MASC were the following: Suppression of Emotional Vulnerability = .69; Avoiding

Dependency on Others = .84; Self-Destructive Achievement = .70; Dominance = .78; Aggressiveness = .78; and Traditional Views of Sex and Sexuality = .44. This last subscale was removed from any further analyses due to the low internal consistency. In the present study, the MASC Conformity Scale showed a normal distribution ($M = 116.9$, $SD = 21.6$, range 36-170).

IPV behaviors were measured using the Conflicts Tactics Scale—Second Edition (CTS2; Straus, Hamby, Boney-McCoy, & Sugarman, 1995). The CTS2 is a 78-item, Likert-type scale, self-report questionnaire that examines the role of both perpetrating and receiving harmful acts during conflict. The CTS2 contains five subscales: Negotiation Scale, Psychological Aggression Scale, Physical Assault Scale, Sexual Coercion Scale, and Injury Scale. For this study, participants completed the entire CTS2, but only the Physical Assault, Sexual Coercion, and Injury Scales were analyzed. Physical Assault scale items include questions such as "I grabbed my partner," "I choked my partner," and the complimentary recipient questions, "My partner did this to me." Sexual Coercion scale items include questions such as "I made my partner have sex without a condom," "I used force (like hitting, holding down, or using a weapon) to make my partner have oral or anal sex," and the complimentary recipient questions, "My partner did this to me." Injury scale items include questions such as "I went to the doctor because of a fight with my partner," "I had a broken bone from a fight with my partner," and the complementary recipient wording of those questions. Participants identified how many times in the past year each act occurred and also if the act had ever occurred in their lifetime with a same-sex intimate partner. Prevalence rates were based on whether the act had ever occurred. Total IPV scores, in the past year, were derived by adding responses to items from all three scales. For our sample, a Cronbach's alpha of .79 was determined for Perpetrating IPV total and .78 for Receiving IPV total. For this study, acts of psychological aggression were not analyzed.

Data Analysis

To evaluate the relationship between perpetrating IPV and being the recipient of IPV perpetrator (in the past year), IPV perpetrating behavior was correlated with recipient IPV behavior on the physical assault and sexual assault subscales and total score (sum of physical, sexual, and injury) of the CTS. To control for multiple comparisons, we used a more conservative cutoff of $p < .01$ to determine significance of correlations. Hierarchical regressions were performed to determine if the five subscales of masculinity predicted both violent physical perpetrator behavior (defined as physical assault or causing injury) and violent sexual behavior, over and above experience of being a victim of violent behavior.

Table 1. Lifetime Prevalence Rates of Physical and Sexual Abuse and Injury

Forms of abuse	Direction of abuse			
	None % (n)	Receipt & perpetration % (n)	Receipt only % (n)	Perpetration only % (n)
Physical abuse	70.9 (83)	24.8 (29)	3.4 (4)	0.9 (1)
Sexual abuse	54.7 (64)	29.9 (35)	10.3 (12)	5.1 (6)
Injury scale	89.7 (105)	4.3 (5)	2.6 (3)	3.4 (4)
Total IPV (Physical and/or sexual abuse)	44.4 (52)	42.7 (50)	9.4 (11)	3.4 (4)

Table 2. Hierarchical Regression Analysis for Masculinity as a Predictor of Perpetrator Intimate Partner Violence Behavior

Variable	B	SE B	β	R ² change
Step 1				
Recipient IPV	.32	.04	.624*	.39
Step 2				.16
MASC subscales				
Suppression of emotional vulnerability	.41	.12	.32*	
Avoidance of dependency on others	-.29	.10	-.27*	
Self-destructive achievement	-.02	.10	-.02	
Dominance	-.12	.12	-.10	
Aggressiveness	.44	.10	.36*	

* $p < .001$.

Results

Lifetime prevalence rates for perpetrator and victim IPV behavior, according to the CTS2, are presented in Table 1. While few participants reported solely being the victim or perpetrator of violence in their relationships, 42.7% of the sample reported physical and sexual conflict to be bidirectional (both perpetrating and receiving acts of violence). On average, men reported having perpetrated acts of violence in the past year ($M = 6.06$, $SD = 21.21$) at similar rates to having been the victim of acts of violence ($M = 8.31$, $SD = 23.3$), $t(116) = -1.52$, $p = .13$. Only 4 participants reported a single occurrence of perpetrating IPV behavior. Of those 4, one participant reported perpetrating a single incident of physical abuse, and the other 3 men reported perpetrating a single item of sexual assault. Seven men reported a single occurrence of being a recipient of violence. Four of those men reported being a recipient of a single incident of sexual assault, and 3 of those men reported being a recipient of a single incident of physical assault. As the CTS2 was not normally distributed, Spearman's rho correlations were conducted for further analyses. There were strong correlations between being a recipient of IPV and perpetrating acts of IPV in the past year. The correlation between overall perpetrating IPV and overall recipient IPV was $.772$ ($p < .001$). The correlation between perpetrating and receiving physical abuse was $.832$ ($p < .001$) and between perpetrating and

receiving sexual abuse was $.718$ ($p < .001$). Perpetrating physical assault was correlated with perpetrating sexual assault ($r = .300$, $p = .001$), and recipient physical assault was correlated with recipient sexual assault ($r = .200$, $p = .031$).

A hierarchical regression analysis indicated that being a recipient of physical IPV accounted for 39% of the variance in scores related to perpetrating physical IPV. After accounting for violence received, the subscales of the MASC accounted for an additional 16% of the variance in perpetrator behavior (see Table 2). In particular, suppression of vulnerability and aggressiveness were strong predictors of perpetrating physical violence. In addition, avoidance of dependency predicted perpetrator violence but in the opposite direction of what was predicted: less avoidance of dependency in relationships was related to higher levels of perpetrator behavior.

A hierarchical regression analysis indicated that being a recipient of sexual IPV accounted for 65% of the variance in scores related to perpetrating sexual IPV ($B = .89$, $SE = .06$, $p < .001$). After accounting for violence received, the subscales of the MASC were not significant predictors of perpetrating sexual IPV (r^2 change = $.024$, $p = .15$).

Discussion

In a nonclinical sample of adult gay men, we sought to report the prevalence of lifetime experience of IPV in male same-sex relationships to replicate the findings of Bartholomew, Regan,

White, et al. (2008) demonstrating a pattern of bidirectional abuse and to examine differences in levels of masculinity behavior between men who do and men who do not perpetrate violence. In our multiculturally diverse sample, 44.4% of men reported no acts of IPV violence (either as a victim or as a perpetrator) in their same-sex romantic relationships. The majority of the remainder of the sample reported both perpetrating and being a recipient of IPV, similar to the findings of Bartholomew, Regan, White, et al. (2008). Of the men who reported experiencing IPV, very few reported experiencing only a single incident of IPV, indicating that most men with IPV histories experienced multiple violent acts. Distinguishing the two studies, the present study employed a web-based data-collection model and a nonrandom sampling technique with a primarily American sample.

We also found a strong correlation between being a recipient and being a perpetrator of IPV, similar to findings of other researchers exploring IPV in same-sex couples (Bartholomew, Regan, White, et al., 2008; Kelly & Warshafsky, 1987; Landolt & Dutton, 1997). This experience of bidirectionality has also been found in heterosexual couples (Prospero, 2008). Because of the high correlation between victim behavior and perpetrator behavior, it is possible that the focus on identifying a perpetrator and a victim commonly seen in law enforcement or in the mental health field is not always appropriate in this population. Likewise, treatment with couples or individuals may not be effective if the therapist is operating under incorrect assumptions. Although the purpose of this study was not to identify prevalence rates of IPV among men in the LGBT community, the high rate of IPV seen in our participants would suggest a need for clinicians working with LGBT clients to assess for IPV and be familiar with appropriate interventions. Despite these rates of bidirectional violence, little is known about the psychological effects of violence when violence is bidirectional, and more research is needed in this area.

Greater conformity to traditional masculine norms, specifically, aggressiveness and suppression of emotional vulnerability, was a significant predictor of perpetrator physical violence over and above being the recipient of physical IPV acts. Another subscale of the MASC, avoidance of dependency on others, was negatively related to perpetrator behavior. The relationship between aggressiveness and perpetrating IPV suggests that generally aggressive men are likely to be physically aggressive in their romantic relationships as well. This finding suggests that the link between masculinity and the perpetration of violence found in heterosexual men (Anderson & Umberson, 2001; Levitt et al., 2008) may also exist in gay and bisexual men. The positive correlation between suppression of emotional vulnerability and perpetrating IPV coupled with the negative correlation between avoidance of dependency on others and perpetrating IPV suggests that these men may be using physical violence as a means of responding to internal emotional conflicts.

In a qualitative study of heterosexual male perpetrators of IPV, Levitt et al. (2008) found that male batterers perpetrate violence following a perceived threat of appearing weak or unmanly in their partners' eyes. In addition, violence is perpetrated in lieu of a discussion of angry feelings with their partners. In fact, these men reported that they believed their female partners preferred an expression of rage to a confession of vulnerability. Interventions that address these internal emotional conflicts may relate to changes in physical expressions of aggression. In fact, the National Center for Injury Prevention and Control states, "the capacity to communicate in ways that allow each partner to identify and share feelings of concerns in an open and safe way may prevent IPV" (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, 2008b). Thus, interventions aimed at reducing violence in relationships may want to include a focus on teaching men how to recognize, label, and ultimately verbally express their own emotions.

Methodological differences may account for the inconsistency in findings between this study and those of Kelly and Warshafsky (1987). Those researchers combined gay men and lesbians into one sample and used a measure that emphasized more desirable characteristics of the masculinity construct (such as self-confidence, independence, and drive). Thus, it may not be surprising that these functional aspects of the construct are correlated with lower rates of abuse and less desirable aspects of the construct (such as aggression, dominance, and control) would be correlated with higher rates of abuse.

As one of the first studies to examine masculinity behaviors in gay and bisexual men, it is noteworthy that the breadth of self-reported conformity to the traditional male role in this sample was not skewed, indicating that these men exhibit a broad range of degrees of conformity to traditional male norms. This finding suggests that although gay men may have experiences that distinguish them from heterosexual males, their levels of conformity to traditional male norms are variable and distributed normally.

Future research is needed to better understand the link between masculinity and violence in same-sex relationships. It may be that gay and bisexual men who conform to traditional norms of the male role may be more likely to feel threatened when their masculinity is challenged and use violence to reestablish their perceived notion of themselves as appropriately masculine. Alternatively, hypermasculine men may use violence to control their partners. The role of masculinity in same-sex relationships in which there is IPV is a needed focus for treatment providers working with this population.

There are some limitations to this study which should be noted. In inquiring about IPV behaviors, we did not investigate the timeliness of the acts and cannot determine if perpetrator behavior was in response to being victimized, vice-versa, or if these behaviors occurred in the same relationship. Thus, although we clearly identified bidirectional

abuse in participants' relationships in the past year, we are unable to ascertain the nature of that abuse (e.g., co-combatant, self-defense, etc.). Our reliance on online data collection limited the population pool to the computer literate. In addition, by recruiting for this study in the San Francisco Bay Area, an urban environment recognized to be supportive of the LGBT community, our findings might not be generalizable to other areas of the country. This study also did not address the role of alcohol and substance use, an important area for future researchers to address given the links between substance abuse and IPV found by other researchers (Bartholomew, Regan, Oram, et al., 2008; Reif, Huang, Campbell, & Catania, 2004; Renzetti, 1992).

Research investigating relationship behavior in same-sex relationships is likely to be affected by the legal recognition in some states of same-sex committed relationships through domestic partnerships, civil unions, and same-sex marriages. Future studies may wish to continue to explore the role that the new social and legal statuses have on the behavior of men and women in same-sex relationships. Likewise, social norms regarding gender are not static, and research in the field of masculinity needs to recognize changes in societal views of masculinity as they occur.

Declaration of Conflicting Interests

The author(s) declared no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the authorship and/or publication of this article.

Funding

The author(s) received no financial support for the research and/or authorship of this article.

References

- Anderson, K., & Umberson, D. (2001). Gendering violence: Masculinity and power in men's accounts of domestic violence. *Gender and Society, 15*, 358-380.
- Bartholomew, K., Regan, K., Oram, D., & White, M. (2008). Correlates of partner abuse in male same-sex relationships. *Violence and Victims, 23*, 344-360.
- Bartholomew, K., Regan, K., White, M., & Oram, D. (2008). Patterns of abuse in male same-sex relationships. *Violence and Victims, 23*, 617-636.
- Bell, A. P., & Weinberg, M. S. (1978). *Homosexualities: A study of diversity among men and women*. New York, NY: Simon & Schuster.
- Bryant, A. S., & Demian, R. (1994). Relationship characteristics of American gay and lesbian couples: Findings from a national survey. *Journal of Gay and Lesbian Social Services, 1*, 101-117.
- Carrington, C. (1999). *No place like home: Relationships and family life among lesbians and gay men*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. (2008a). Adverse health conditions and health risk behaviors associated with intimate partner violence—United States, 2005. *Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report, 57*, 113-117.
- Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, National Center for Injury Prevention and Control. (2008b). *Strategic direction for intimate partner violence prevention: Promoting respectful, nonviolent intimate partner relationships through individual, community and societal change*. Retrieved from http://www.cdc.gov/violenceprevention/pdf/IPV_Strategic_Direction_One-Page-a.pdf
- Cruz, J. M. (2000). Gay male domestic violence and the pursuit of masculinity. In P. Nardi (Ed.), *Gay masculinities* (pp. 66-82). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Elliott, P. (1996). A survey of factors contributing to gay and lesbian violence in relationships. *Journal of Gay & Lesbian Social Services, 4*, 35-42.
- Gini, G., & Pozzoli, T. (2006). The role of masculinity in children's bullying. *Sex Roles, 54*, 585-588.
- Good, G., Heppner, M., Hillenbrand-Gunn, T., & Wang, L. (1995). Sexual and psychological violence: An exploratory study of predictors in college men. *Journal of Men's Studies, 25*, 2099-2117.
- Green, R.-J. (1998). Traditional norms of masculinity. *Journal of Feminist Family Therapy, 10*, 81-83.
- Hammock, G. S., & Richardson, D. S. (1992). Predictors of aggressive behavior. *Aggressive Behavior, 18*, 219-229.
- Harry, J. (1984). *Gay couples*. New York, NY: Praeger.
- Island, D., & Letellier, P. (1991). *Men who beat the men who love them: Battered gay men and domestic violence*. Birmingham, NY: Hayworth.
- Kelly, C. E., & Warshafsky, L. (1987, July). *Partner abuse in gay male and lesbian couples*. Paper presented at the Third National Conference for the Family Violence Researchers, Durham, NH.
- Landolt, M., & Dutton, D. (1997). Power and personality: An analysis of gay male intimate abuse. *Sex Roles, 37*, 117-128.
- Levitt, H., Swanger, R., & Butler, J. (2008). Male perpetrators' perspectives on intimate partner violence, religion and masculinity. *Sex Roles, 58*, 435-448.
- McClenen, J. C., Summers, B., & Vaughn, C. (2002). Gay men's domestic violence: Dynamics, help-seeking behaviors, and correlates. *Journal of Gay and Lesbian Social Services, 14*(1), 23-49.
- Merrill, G. S., & Wolfe, V. A. (2000). Battered gay men: An exploration of abuse, help seeking, and why they stay. *Journal of Homosexuality, 39*(2), 1-30.
- Mosher, D., & Anderson, R. (1986). Macho personality, sexual aggression, and reactions to guided imagery of realistic rape. *Journal of Research in Personality, 20*, 77-94.
- Nabavi, R. (2004). The Masculinity Attitudes, Stress, and Conformity Questionnaire (MASC): A new measure for studying the psychology of men. *Dissertation Abstracts International: Section B: The Sciences and Engineering, 65*(5-B), 2641.
- Nabavi, R., & Green, R.-J. (2002). *Masculinity Attitudes, Stress, and Conformity Scale (MASC)*. Unpublished manuscript, California School of Professional Psychology, Alliant International University, Alameda.
- O'Neil, J. M. (1981). Patterns of gender role conflict and strain: Sexism and fear of femininity in men's lives. *Personnel and Guidance Journal, 60*, 203-210.

- Parrott, D. J., & Zeichner, A. (2003). Effects of hypermasculinity on physical aggression against women. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity, 4*, 70-78.
- Parrott, D. J., & Zeichner, A. (2008). Determinants of anger and physical aggression based on sexual orientation: An experimental examination of hypermasculinity and exposure to male same gender role violations. *Archives of Sexual Behavior, 37*, 891-901.
- Peplau, L. (1993). Lesbian and gay relationships. In L. D. Garnets & D. C. Kimmel (Eds.), *Psychological perspectives on lesbian and gay male experiences* (pp. 395-419). New York, NY: Columbia University Press.
- Prospero, M. (2008). Effects of masculinity, sex, and control on different types of intimate partner violence perpetration. *Journal of Family Violence, 2*, 639-645.
- Reidy, D. E., Shirk, S. D., Sloan, C. A., & Zeichner, A. (2009). Men who aggress against women: Effects of feminine gender role violation on physical aggression in hypermasculine men. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity, 10*, 1-12.
- Reif, M., Huang, B., Campbell, J., & Catania, J. (2004). Gay identity, interpersonal violence, and HIV risk behaviors: An empirical test of theoretical relationships among a probability-based sample of urban men who have sex with men. *JANAC: Journal of the Association of Nurses in AIDS Care, 15*, 14-26.
- Renzetti, C. M. (1992). *Violent betrayal: Partner abuse in lesbian relationships*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Simonsen, G., Blazina, C., & Watkins, C. E. (2000). Gender role conflict and psychological well-being among gay men. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 47*, 85-89.
- Stanley, J. L., Bartholomew, K., Taylor, T., Oram, D., & Landolt, M. (2006). Intimate violence in male same-sex relationships. *Journal of Family Violence, 21*, 31-41.
- Straus, M. A., Hamby, S. L., Boney-McCoy, S., & Sugarman, D. B. (1995). *The Conflict Tactic Scale (CTS2)*. Durham: University of New Hampshire Research Laboratory.
- Tjaden, P., Thoennes, N., & Allison, C. J. (1999). Comparing violence over the life span in samples of same-sex and opposite-sex cohabitants. *Violence and Victims, 14*, 413-425.
- Truman, D., Tokar, D., & Fischer, A. (1996). Dimensions of masculinity: Relations to date rape supportive attitudes and sexual aggression in dating situations. *Journal of Counseling & Development, 74*, 555-562.