

University of Memphis

University of Memphis Digital Commons

Electronic Theses and Dissertations

2018

The Influence of Gender Role Conflict on Perpetration and Victimization of Intimate Partner Violence in Same Sex Male Relationships

Hannah Elise Emery

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.memphis.edu/etd>

Recommended Citation

Emery, Hannah Elise, "The Influence of Gender Role Conflict on Perpetration and Victimization of Intimate Partner Violence in Same Sex Male Relationships" (2018). *Electronic Theses and Dissertations*. 2524. <https://digitalcommons.memphis.edu/etd/2524>

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by University of Memphis Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Electronic Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of University of Memphis Digital Commons. For more information, please contact khhgerty@memphis.edu.

THE INFLUENCE OF GENDER ROLE CONFLICT ON PERPETRATION
AND VICTIMIZATION OF INTIMATE PARTNER VIOLENCE IN SAME SEX
MALE RELATIONSHIPS

by

Hannah Elise Emery

A Dissertation

Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the

Requirements for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

Major: Counseling Psychology

The University of Memphis

August 2018

Abstract

Emery, Hannah Elise. Ph.D. The University of Memphis. August, 2018. The Influence of Gender Role Conflict on Perpetration and Victimization of Intimate Partner Violence in Same Sex Male Relationships. Major Professor: Elin Ovrebo, Ph.D.

Gender role conflict has long been thought to predict perpetration of Intimate Partner Violence (IPV) in heterosexual relationships, but the relationship between gender role conflict and IPV among same sex male relationships has yet to be adequately explored. The current study investigated how gender role conflict predicted both perpetration and victimization of Intimate Partner Violence (IPV) among 320 gay men, 159 who had experienced some form of partner abuse and 161 who endorsed no experiences of abuse. Gender role conflict, specifically a man's drive for success and use of competition to obtain power, significantly predicted IPV perpetration above and beyond being a recipient of abuse. A man's difficulty balancing work and family demands significantly predicted IPV victimization when controlling for perpetration. Implications of the relationship between these two variables, limitations of the study, and ideas for future research are also discussed.

Table of Contents

| | Page |
|---|------|
| List of Tables | iv |
| Chapter | |
| 1. Introduction | 1 |
| Same Sex Male Intimate Partner Violence | 2 |
| Gender Role Conflict | 3 |
| Gender Role Conflict in Sexual Minorities | 5 |
| Gender Role Conflict and Heterosexual Intimate Partner Violence | 6 |
| Gender Role Conformity and Same Sex Intimate Partner Violence | 7 |
| Rationale for Current Study | 9 |
| 2. Methods | 10 |
| Participants | 10 |
| Procedures | 12 |
| Instruments | 12 |
| 3. Results | 15 |
| Preliminary Analyses | 15 |
| Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis | 17 |
| 4. Discussion | 20 |
| Implications | 23 |
| Limitations and Future Research | 24 |
| References | 26 |
| Appendix | |
| A. IRB Approval | 35 |

List of Tables

| Table | Page |
|---|------|
| 1. Gay Male Sample Characteristics | 11 |
| 2. Means, Standard Deviations, and Subscale Correlations | 16 |
| 3. Frequencies of IPV Victimization | 17 |
| 4. Frequencies of IPV Perpetration | 17 |
| 5. Hierarchical Multiple Regression Results for IPV Perpetration | 19 |
| 6. Hierarchical Multiple Regression Results for IPV Victimization | 20 |

The Influence of Gender Role Conflict on Perpetration and Victimization of Intimate Partner Violence in Same Sex Male Relationships

Intimate Partner Violence (IPV) is a serious physical and psychological health issue in the United States (Breiding, Basile, Smith, Black, & Mahendra, 2015). One in three women and one in four men will experience at least one form of IPV over their lifetime (National Coalition Against Domestic Violence, 2015). IPV is defined as “physical violence, sexual violence, stalking and psychological aggression (including coercive tactics) by a current or former intimate partner (i.e., spouse, boyfriend/girlfriend, dating partner, or ongoing sexual partner” (Breiding, Basile, Smith, Black, & Mahendra, 2015; p. 11). Some experts go beyond that definition to argue that IPV includes a real or threatened act of physical violence, sexual assault, and/or stalking by current or ex-partner (Black et al., 2011). IPV may include physical, verbal, psychological, or financial abuse (Burke, 1998). IPV exists between all types of intimate partners regardless of each individuals’ race, gender, social class, or sexual orientation (Breiding et al., 2015).

Research has thoroughly established a relationship between male gender role conflict and IPV in heterosexual couples (Jakupcak, Lisak, & Roemer, 2002; McDermott & Lopez, 2013; Moore et al., 2010; Schwartz, Waldo, & Daniel, 2005) and begun to explore it in same sex couples (Oringher & Samuelson, 2011). Gender role conflict has been defined as “a psychological state in which socialized [male] gender roles have negative consequences for the person or others” (O’Neil, 2008, p. 362). O’Neil (1981) hypothesized that an internal conflict arises when men adhere to traditional gender roles too strictly.

Intimate partner violence in same sex relationships occurs as often, if not more, than heterosexual partner abuse (Edwards, Sylaska, & Neal, 2015). However, researchers have yet to explore the relation between gender role conflict and IPV in same sex couples. Furthermore,

traditional gender role conflict research has focused primarily on men as perpetrators and women as victims, leading to the misconception that partner violence is less problematic in same sex couples (Girshick, 2002). Same sex couples also give us a unique opportunity to investigate how male gender role conflict may also interact with the negative experiences that come from being a victim of IPV to further explore how victims of IPV later may perpetrate it. Previous research has established the relationship between experiences of victimization and later perpetration in heterosexual couples but the concept, and potential factors that influence it, have not been as thoroughly explored in same sex couples (Oringher & Samuelson, 2011; Palmetto, Davidson, Breitbart, & Rickert, 2013). The current study addressed the gap in the literature on gender role conflict and IPV among gay men by identifying how gender role conflict related to both victimization and perpetration of IPV in same sex male couples.

Same Sex Male Intimate Partner Violence

The National Coalition of Antiviolence Programs's (NCAVP) 2001 publication on Domestic Violence in the LGBT community describes the necessity of understanding IPV as power-based rather than gender-based (NCAVP, 2001). Abuse does not have to solely occur by a man to a woman because IPV is "a means to control others through power" that can be perpetrated by an individual regardless of gender or, more importantly, physical strength (NCAVP, 2001, p. 4). One partner uses abusive techniques to gain and maintain control over the other partner, which has little to do with the biological gender of either partner (NCAVP, 2001).

Violence in same sex relationships appears similar to abuse in heterosexual relationships. McClennen, Summers, and Vaughan (2002) explored the experience of IPV in same sex male relationships and found that same sex male relationship abuse occurs in many of the same forms as heterosexual relationship violence (i.e., physical, verbal, psychological, and financial abuse)

but it tends to be more severe and occur over a longer period of time. Not only do male survivors experience more severe and longer occurring abuse, they have a tendency to limit their help-seeking behaviors (McClennen et al., 2002).

Additionally, the specific techniques same sex perpetrators utilize to verbally assault and psychologically control their victims may come in different forms than those used in heterosexual relationships. Examples of this include threatening to “out” the partner (disclosing partner’s same-sex attraction to a workplace, family or friends), convincing the victim that they are also an abuser, and threatening to infect that partner with HIV or another sexually transmitted disease (Bartholomew, Regan, Oram, & White, 2008). The level of outness of the survivor also influences abuse, as an abuser who knows his/her partner is not out can use that as a way to isolate the survivor, cutting off social support and influencing the survivor to stay in the abusive relationship or to refrain from addressing the issue of the abuse (Bartholomew et al., 2008; Girshick, 2002).

Gender Role Conflict

In modern society, gender is often defined as the characteristics a person exhibits based on his or her biological sex. However, beyond biological sex characteristics, gender is a social construct. Pleck (1981) theorized that gender is socially constructed and that traditional masculine ideology influences boys and men to conform to male gender norms by adopting certain masculine behaviors and rejecting other forbidden behaviors. Often, adapting to socially prescribed gender roles denies some psychological needs and actualization of the person’s true self, which may lead to gender role conflict (O’Neil, 2008).

In adhering to a masculine gender role, boys and men often develop a fear of feminine behaviors and thoughts; therefore, they may reject situations that may be seen as feminine,

causing conflict and stress (Pleck, Sonenstein, & Ku, 1993; Wade, 2009). O'Neil (1981) described four constructs that contribute to gender role conflict; a drive for success, power, and competition, restricting affectionate behavior towards other men, restricting emotional expression, and experiencing a conflict between work and family life that further elucidate the stress that adherence to masculine norms creates. Since its introduction, gender role conflict has been studied extensively with regard to its relationship to men's psychological well-being. Researchers have found significant positive relationships between gender role conflict and greater feelings of depressive symptoms (Good & Mintz, 1990), greater feelings of shame (Thompkins & Rando, 2003), more frequent thoughts of suicidality (Houle, Mishara, & Chagnon, 2009), greater body dissatisfaction (Murray & Lewis, 2014), and greater overall psychological distress (Hayes & Mahalik, 2000).

Researchers have also suggested that gender role conflict influences men's social interactions and relationships. Several studies have found aspects of gender role conflict were related to homophobia (Kassing, Beesley, & Frey, 2005; McDermott, Schwartz, Lindley & Proietti; 2006; Schwartz & Tylka, 2008; Wilkinson, 2004). Overall, men who expressed higher levels of drive for power and control, more restriction of emotional expression, and more restriction of affectionate behavior towards other men were also found to be more likely to express higher levels of homophobia and anti-gay sentiments (Kassing et al., 2005; McDermott et al., 2006; Schwartz & Tylka, 2008; Wilkinson, 2004). Outward homophobia has been found to reduce male companionship and intimacy in both intimate relationships and friendships (Sharpe & Heppner, 1991; Wester, Poinke, & Vogel; 2005).

Two of the constructs of male socialization that O'Neil (1981) identifies as creating conflict, restrictive affectionate behavior between men and restrictive emotionality, heavily

influence men's intimate relationships. Fear of femininity and greater endorsement of masculine ideology limits men's ability to express sexual or affectionate feelings towards significant others, regardless of the partner's gender (Pleck et al., 1993). Men are socialized to believe that emotions and self-disclosure are feminine, that touching is inappropriate, and expressing passive sexual behavior is feminine (O'Neil, 1981; O'Neil, 2008; Sharpe, Heppner, & Dixon, 1995). Several studies have supported the idea that restricting emotional expression and affectionate behavior is inversely related to indices of relationship quality and may adversely affect relationships, illustrating the negative relationship between gender role conflict and intimacy in relationships among both college-aged men and adult men (Cournoyer & Mahalik, 1995; Good et al., 1995; Lease et al., 2013; McDermott et al., 2014; Sharpe & Heppner, 1991; Sharpe et al., 1995).

Gender Role Conflict in Sexual Minorities

Researchers have begun to explore how gender role conflict may influence the lives of those who identify as non-heterosexual. Gay men with higher gender role conflict around emotional expression were found to be less likely to seek psychological help and more likely to exhibit anger, anxiety, and depression than those who expressed affection more easily (Simonsen, Blazina, & Watkins, 2000). Gender role conflict has also been shown to predict other psychological aspects in the lives of sexual minorities such as psychological distress, self-esteem and coping (Szymanski & Carr, 2008) and internalized heterosexism and depression (Szymanski & Ikizler, 2013).

The degree to which gay men value masculinity and are concerned with violating traditionally masculine ideals is positively related to negative feelings about being gay (Sanchez, Westefeld, Liu, & Vilain, 2010). More specifically, men who had difficulty expressing affection

towards other men, placed more importance on appearing masculine in public, and struggled with emotional expression reported more negative feelings about being gay (Sanchez et al., 2010). In addition, gay men who endorsed more conflict related to affectionate behavior towards other men were more likely to acknowledge relationship dissatisfaction than men who more easily expressed same sex affection (Wester et al. 2005).

Gender Role Conflict and Heterosexual Intimate Partner Violence

Overall, research has suggested that greater gender role conflict is positively related to increased perpetration of IPV in heterosexual men (McDermott & Lopez, 2013; Moore et al., 2010; Schwartz et al., 2005). Masculine ideology, or a man's cognitive conception of masculinity, has been found to interact with gender role conflict in predicting relationship violence, such that when adherence to a masculine ideology is higher, gender role conflict predicts aggression and relationship violence (Jakupcak et al., 2002). Furthermore, the context of where the gender role stress is experienced influences the type of abuse perpetrated (Moore et al., 2010). Failure to perform in work or sexual domains is associated with psychological aggression, intellectual inferiority is associated with physical injury, and physical fitness and masculine appearance are associated with sexual coercion (Moore et al., 2010).

Later research illustrated the complexity of the relationship between gender role conflict and IPV in heterosexual men when other variables are considered. In the presence of high gender role conflict, low self-esteem predicted significantly more instances of IPV perpetration (Schwartz et al., 2005). More specifically, a man's drive for success and power in combination with low self-esteem was found to be positively related to physical abuse (Schwartz et al., 2005). Men who reported low self-esteem and more open expression of emotions were more likely to engage in verbal threats and intimidation. Schwartz et al. (2005) hypothesized that emotional

expression from men with low self-esteem who have previously perpetrated IPV may take an abusive form. Overall, the literature illustrates a relationship, albeit a somewhat complex one, between gender role conflict and heterosexual IPV such that greater internal conflict related to masculine gender roles increases partner violence.

Gender Role Conformity and Same Sex Intimate Partner Violence

Although gender role conflict and IPV has been studied extensively in heterosexual men, research in this area for gay men is limited. Oringher and Samuelson (2011) conducted a study examining experiences of IPV and gender role conformity in a sample of gay men. Over half of the sample indicated bidirectional violence such that men who were a victims of violence also tended to perpetrate violence. Greater conformity to traditional masculine norms, specifically aggressiveness and suppression of emotional vulnerability, was a significant predictor of perpetration over and above being a recipient of violence (Oringher & Samuelson, 2011).

Oringher and Samuelson (2011) suggested that bidirectional violence occurs more in same sex relationships compared to heterosexual relationships, raising questions about how gender role conformity might relate to IPV in same sex male couples. Gender role conformity may directly affect perpetration of IPV, but it also may increase the likelihood of future perpetration after becoming a victim. Male gender socialization influences men to believe that if they are perpetrated against, they should stand up for themselves and fight back, potentially increasing the chances of a man perpetrating after becoming a victim (Brown, 2008). It is important to note that while same sex male relationships have an increased risk of bidirectional violence, the violence is not necessarily bidirectional within the same relationship. A man may be a victim of violence in one relationship and perpetrate violence in a different one. Traditional IPV research with heterosexual couples focuses on men as perpetrators and women as victims or

on one partner as perpetrator and one as the victim, not allowing for the exploration of the connection between being both a victim and a perpetrator of IPV.

Oringher and Samuelson (2011) explored the relationship between masculine gender norms and IPV in same sex relationships using a scale that assessed gender role conformity. Moore and Stuart (2005) argue that gender role conflict adds more to the research on IPV due to its unique ability to assess the stress men experience when gender norms are challenged and not just endorsement of traditional masculine gender norms. In support of this theory, Franchina, Eisler, and Moore (2001) found that men with higher gender role stress endorsed more use of verbal aggression compared to men with low gender role stress when responding to masculine gender-relevant vignettes involving disputes with an intimate partner but the two groups did not differ when responding to gender-irrelevant vignettes.

Additionally, Copenhaver, Lash, and Eisler (2000) found that gender role stress significantly predicted dating violence above and beyond the effects of masculine ideology or family income. Baugher and Gazmararian (2015) reviewed 20 articles that examined the relationship between gender role stress and IPV and concluded that greater endorsement of gender role stress was related to increased use of violence when masculinity is threatened, increased anti-femininity norms, increased maladaptive attachment styles, and greater adherence to rigid gender norms. Studying gender role conflict instead of gender role conformity may be more pertinent as violence is thought of as a way of dealing with the internal conflict, not necessarily a result of adherence to traditional gender roles (Moore & Stuart, 2005). More research is needed to fully examine the role of the gender role conflict subtypes in same sex IPV.

Rationale for Current Study

Existing research has illustrated that sexual minority men experience negative consequences of gender role conflict similar to heterosexual men. Sexual minority men experience the consequences of gender role conflict in the form of higher psychological distress (Simonsen et al., 2000; Szymanski & Carr, 2008; Szymanski & Ikizler, 2013) and reduced intimacy in relationships (Vasquez et al., 2014; Wester et al., 2005). Current research suggests that gender role conformity influences perpetration of IPV among gay men, as it does among heterosexual men (Oringher & Samuelson, 2011), but the impact of gender role conflict on same sex male IPV has yet to be studied.

Unlike heterosexual situations, however, same sex male couples may have an increased risk of bidirectional violence in which one partner both perpetrates violence against the other and receives it from the partner (Brown, 2008; Oringher & Samuelson, 2011). Previous research also suggests that same sex male IPV is more severe and longer lasting compared to heterosexual IPV (McClennen et al., 2002). Since both partners may experience levels of gender role conflict, exploration into gay men's use of violence as a response to challenges against his masculinity is important. The specifics of how the different subtypes of gender role conflict, including success, power, and competition, restrictive emotionality, restrictive affectionate behavior between men, and conflict between work and family, are related to both the perpetration and receipt of violence have not yet been explored.

The present study (a) examined if the gender role conflict subscales predict perpetration of IPV regardless of an individual's history of victimization. The current study also addressed the following research question: (c) do any subscales of gender role conflict have a unique and significant relationship with IPV victimization? Consistent with Oringher and Samuelson (2011)

results that explored gender role conformity and IPV, the author hypothesized that the success, power, and competition subtype as well as the restrictive emotionality subtype of gender role conflict will predict greater perpetration of IPV when controlling for victimization. Because the second research question is exploratory, there is no hypothesis for the relationship between the variables.

Method

Participants

Participants for this study were 322 men between the age of 18 and 65 who identified as gay and living in the United States who were part of a larger data set collected for a separate study. In order to be included in the current study, participants needed to complete both the Gender Role Conflict Scale (GRCS; O'Neil, Helms, Gable, David, & Wrightsman, 1986) and the Lifetime Experiences of Intimate Partner Violence scale. In order to explore the relationship between the variables in those with and without experiences of abuse, all participants that completed the assessments were considered for analysis. Sample characteristics are presented in Table 1.

Table 1*Gay Male Sample Characteristics (N = 320)*

| Variable | n | % |
|--------------------------------|-----|------|
| Abuse Experiences | | |
| Victimization Only | 54 | 16.9 |
| Perpetration Only | 13 | 4.1 |
| Victimization and Perpetration | 92 | 28.8 |
| No Experiences of Abuse | 161 | 50.3 |
| Age | | |
| 18-25 | 165 | 51.6 |
| 26-35 | 102 | 31.9 |
| 36-45 | 25 | 7.8 |
| 46-55 | 20 | 6.3 |
| 56-65 | 7 | 2.2 |
| 65+ | 1 | 0.3 |
| Race | | |
| White | 267 | 83.4 |
| Hispanic/Latino | 21 | 6.6 |
| Asian American | 11 | 3.4 |
| African American | 4 | 1.3 |
| Multiracial | 6 | 1.9 |
| Biracial | 5 | 1.6 |
| Other | 5 | 1.5 |

Because the aim of the study was to explore the relationship between current gender role conflict and IPV, the author attempted to collect a sample of participants that had more recent experiences of abuse. Research indicates that most abusive relationships occur between the ages of 18 and 24 (National Coalition Against Domestic Violence, 2015). Previous research also suggests that gender role conflict decreases with age (O'Neil & Egan, 1992). In an attempt to explore the relationship between current gender role conflict and more recent abusive relationships, the recruited sample ended up being largely young with 51.6% of the participants falling in the 18-25 age range.

Procedure

Data were collected as part of a larger study on factors that influence same sex male IPV in which participants were recruited through convenience and snowball sampling strategies via electronic means such as Facebook, email, and listserves. Due to the potential for the study to ask participants to “out” themselves in two ways through both their sexual minority status and as a victim of abuse, recruitment using online resources provides extra anonymity and aids in the recruitment of LGBT participants that would likely not be included in the study otherwise due to organizational barriers or rural location (King, O’Rourke, & DeLongis, 2014).

Instruments

Gender Role Conflict Scale (GRCS). The GRCS (O’Neil et al., 1986) consists of 37 statements intended to assess masculine gender role conflict. Men rate their level of agreement with the statements on a 6-point Likert scale (1 = strongly disagree, 6 = strongly agree). Exploratory and confirmatory factor analyses have indicated the presence of four subscales in college male populations; sample items are provided in parentheses: Success, Power, and Competition (“I evaluate other people’s value by their level of achievement and success”); Restrictive Affectionate Behavior Between Men (“Verbally expressing my love to another man is difficult for me”); Restrictive Emotionality (“Strong emotions are difficult for me to understand”); and Conflict Between Work and Family Relations (“My career, job, or school affects the quality of my leisure or family life;” Good et al., 1995; Moradi, Tokar, Schaub, Jome, & Serna, 2000; O’Neil et al., 1986). The GRCS provides scores for each of the four subscales as well as an overall gender role conflict score. Items are summed to create the four subscales which can then be added together to obtain an overall scale score. Higher scores indicate greater gender role conflict.

O'Neil, Good, and Holmes (1995) reported average internal consistency estimates of GRCS scores to be between .80 (Conflict Between Work and Family Relations subscale) and .87 (Success, Power, and Competition subscale) for the college male population. O'Neil et al. (1986) found scale scores to have test-retest reliabilities over a 4 week period ranging from .72 to .86. Validity was supported by moderate correlations between the Gender Role Conflict Scale and the Masculine Gender Role Stress Scale ($r = .51$; Fischer & Good, 1997), the Brannon Masculinity Scale ($r = .60$; Good et al., 1995), and the Conformity to Masculine Norms Inventory ($r = .56$; Mahalik, et al., 2003). Herdman, Fuqua, Namok, and Newman (2012) reported high internal consistency values with a sample of gay men and lesbian women, but the authors did not report the specific coefficient alpha for the scale. Wester et al. (2005) reported high internal consistency values for the Gender Role Conflict Scale's subscales, with coefficient alphas ranging between .80 and .91 for a representative sample of gay and bisexual men. Alpha coefficients for the current study were acceptable for the total Gender Role Conflict scale ($r = .93$) as well as the subscales; Success, Power, and Competition ($r = .87$); Restricted Emotionality ($r = .92$); Restricted Affectionate Behavior Between Men ($r = .85$); and Conflict Between Work and Family ($r = .87$).

Lifetime Experiences of Intimate Partner Violence scale. Experiences of Intimate Partner Violence over the lifetime were explored using an adaptation of the Lifetime Experiences of Intimate Partner Violence scale developed by Feldman, Diaz, Ream, and El-Bassel (2008). Ten Likert-scale frequency questions, five assessing for victimization ("I have been insulted or verbally abused by a lover or partner.") and five that ask about perpetration ("I have physically assaulted (e.g., hit, kicked, slapped) a partner or lover."). The original scale included six yes/no questions, three for victimization and three for perpetration, focusing on physical, verbal, and

sexual forms of partner violence (Feldman et al., 2008). Previous research suggests that same sex partners may use controlling behaviors, limiting social support, and threatening to “out” a partner as additional abusive tactics (McClennen et al., 2002). In order to include those specific techniques, questions about controlling behavior (“I have insisted on knowing where my partner is at all times or get extremely jealous when he talks to other men.”) and cutting off social support (“My partner threatens to out me as gay/bisexual or cut me off from other friends”) were added to both the victimization and perpetration scales for a total of five different forms of violence. Possible answers assessed the frequency of abusive experiences and ranged from “Never” to “6+ Times a Week.” Higher scores reflect more frequent abuse as well as experiences of different types of abuse. Following Stults et al. (2015), the five victimization variables and five perpetration variables were collapsed to produce two composite variables for inclusion into the regression analysis: Intimate Partner Violence victimization and Intimate Partner Violence perpetration, respectively. Those that endorsed at least one type of abuse were included in the abuse group. Results for this sample indicated moderate to high internal consistency for the IPV Victimization measure ($r = .80$) as well as the IPV Perpetration measure ($r = .64$).

Demographics Questionnaire. Participants completed a demographics questionnaire that asked about general characteristics: such as age, gender, sexual orientation, level of education, race/ethnicity, geographic location and average income. Participants who indicated a gender other than male, a sexual orientation other than bisexual or gay, or reported that they have not been in a same sex relationship were directed to the end of the survey.

Results

Preliminary Analyses

The data were checked for accuracy, missing values, and outliers. Less than .01 percent of the data was missing which was deemed acceptable. Outlier analysis was conducted by examining Cook's distance and standardized residuals. Two univariate outliers were identified with a Cook's distance greater than one and standardized residuals greater than three standard deviations from the mean. The outliers were deleted, resulting in an overall sample of 320 men. The variance inflation factors for all variables were greater than 10, indicating no issues with multicollinearity between the variables. A preliminary data analysis was performed to obtain full descriptive statistics, including means, standard deviations, and correlations found in Table 2.

Table 2*Means, Standard Deviations, and Subscale Score Correlations*

| | M | SD | 1. | 2. | 3. | 4. | 5. | 6. | 7. |
|----------------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|--------|------|-------|-------|-------|
| 1. IPV Victimization | 1.77 | 3.44 | - | | | | | | |
| 2. IPV Perpetration | 0.73 | 1.64 | .27** | - | | | | | |
| 3. Age | 1.77 | 1.02 | .06 | .14* | - | | | | |
| 4. Race | 1.57 | 1.51 | -.09 | -.08 | .12 | - | | | |
| 5. SPC | 49.04 | 10.89 | .08 | .15** | -.18** | -.05 | - | | |
| 6. RE | 32.34 | 11.44 | .08 | .05 | -.20** | -.03 | .25** | - | |
| 7. RABBM | 21.10 | 7.67 | .06 | .03 | -.22** | .01 | .29** | .76** | - |
| 8. CBWF | 22.51 | 6.56 | .15** | .08 | -.12* | -.05 | .42** | .31** | .25** |

Note. $N = 320$. Cronbach's coefficient alphas appear in italics on the diagonal. SPC = Success, Power, and Competition; RE = Restrictive Emotionality; RABBM = Restrictive Affectionate Behavior Between Men; CBWF = Conflict Between Work and Family. * $p < 0.05$. ** $p < 0.01$.

The current study assessed five types of techniques commonly used in abusive same sex relationships. The author was interested in how frequent and intense certain types of abuse were experienced. Frequencies of the types of abuse as indicated by the sample that endorsed experiences of abuse are presented in Tables 3 and 4.

Table 3*Frequencies of IPV Victimization*

| Frequency | Type of Abuse (%) | | | | |
|-------------------|-------------------|---------|---------|----------|--------|
| | Verbal | Control | Support | Physical | Sexual |
| 1-2 Times a Month | 34.6 | 30.8 | 5.7 | 20.1 | 16.4 |
| 1-2 Times a Week | 11.3 | 13.2 | 0.6 | 1.3 | 2.5 |
| 3-5 Times a Week | 10.7 | 3.8 | 1.9 | 0.6 | 0.6 |
| 6+ Times a Week | 9.4 | 12.8 | 2.5 | 2.5 | 1.2 |
| Total | 66.0 | 61.0 | 10.4 | 24.5 | 20.9 |

Note. N = 159. Control = Controlling behaviors; Support = Cutting off social support

Table 4*Frequencies of IPV Perpetration*

| Frequency | Type of Abuse (%) | | | | |
|-------------------|-------------------|---------|---------|----------|--------|
| | Verbal | Control | Support | Physical | Sexual |
| 1-2 Times a Month | 39.0 | 24.5 | 1.3 | 12.6 | 8.2 |
| 1-2 Times a Week | 4.4 | 4.4 | 0 | 1.3 | 0 |
| 3-5 Times a Week | 1.3 | 3.8 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 6+ Times a Week | 1.3 | 2.5 | 0.6 | 0 | 0.6 |
| Total | 45.9 | 35.2 | 1.9 | 13.9 | 8.8 |

Note. N = 159. Control = Controlling behaviors; Support = Cutting off social support

Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analyses

In order to explore the relationship between gender role conflict and victimization and perpetration of IPV, the author conducted two hierarchical multiple regressions; (1) to address the impact of the gender role conflict subscales (i.e., success, power, and competition; restrictive emotionality; restricted affectionate behavior between men; and conflict between work and family) on IPV perpetration and (2) to examine the impact of the gender role conflict subscales on IPV victimization. Consistent with the results reported by Oringher and Samuelson (2011), there was a significant positive relationship between IPV perpetration and IPV victimization. The author controlled for victimization (to account for the participants who reported both perpetration and victimization experiences) for the regression examining perpetration. To better

examine the relationship between the variables of interest, those with experiences of victimization only ($n = 54$) were removed from the perpetration sample. To counter-balance the sample, 56 participants with no abuse experiences were randomly removed as well to result in a final sample of 210 participants (105 with abuse and 105 without).

Age was entered in Step 1 and did not contribute significantly to the regression model, $F(1, 209) = 1.81, p = .180$. The addition of victimization to the model in Step 2 significantly accounted for more variance in IPV perpetration $F(2, 208) = 14.92, p < .001$. The gender role conflict subscales were entered into the model in Step 3. The final model indicated that Success, Power, and Competition was the only significant predictor of IPV perpetration when victimization is already in the model ($\beta = .35, p < .001$). Collectively, 23.5% of the variance in IPV perpetration was accounted for by all of the variables in the model, $F(6, 204) = 10.39, p < .001$. The addition of the gender role conflict subscales to the model accounted for a significant increase in variance ($\Delta R^2 = .109, p < .001$) in IPV perpetration. A summary of the hierarchical regression results for this model are presented in Table 5.

Table 5*Hierarchical Multiple Regression Results for IPV Perpetration*

| | <i>B</i> | β | <i>t</i> | <i>p</i> | <i>R</i> ² | ΔR^2 |
|--------|----------|---------|----------|----------|-----------------------|--------------|
| Step 1 | | | | | .009 | .009 |
| Age | .11 | .05 | .81 | .418 | | |
| Step 2 | | | | | .126 | .117** |
| Victim | .15 | .26 | 3.96 | .001** | | |
| Step 3 | | | | | .235 | .109** |
| SPC | .07 | .35 | 5.01 | .001** | | |
| RE | .02 | .09 | .92 | .361 | | |
| RABBM | -.01 | -.02 | -.21 | .831 | | |
| CBWF | -.02 | -.05 | -.75 | .455 | | |

Note. *N* = 210. *SPC* = *Success, Power, and Competition*; *RE* = *Restrictive Emotionality*; *RABBM* = *Restrictive Affectionate Behavior Between Men*; *CBWF* = *Conflict Between Work and Family*. * *p* < 0.05. ** *p* < 0.01.

A second hierarchical multiple regression analysis was conducted to explore the relationship between the subscales of gender role conflict and victimization of IPV when controlling for experiences of perpetration (to account for the participants who reported both perpetration and victimization experiences). As with the previous analysis, participants with perpetration experiences only (*n* = 13) were removed from the total sample. Again, in order to counter-balance the sample, 15 participants with no experiences of abuse were removed randomly, resulting in a sample of 292 participants.

Age entered into Step 1 did not contribute significantly to the regression model, $F(1, 291) = .00, p = .399$. The addition of IPV perpetration to the model in Step 2 significantly accounted for more variance in IPV victimization $F(2, 290) = 11.84, p < .001$. The gender role conflict subscales were entered into the model in Step 3. The final model indicated that Conflict Between Work and Family was the only significant predictor of IPV victimization when perpetration is already in the model ($\beta = .14, p = .029$). Collectively, 10.6% of the variance in IPV victimization was accounted for by all of the variables in the model, $F(6, 286) = 5.66, p < .001$. The addition of the gender role conflict subscales to the model accounted for a significant increase in variance

($\Delta R^2 = .031, p = .046$) in IPV victimization. A summary of the hierarchical regression results for this model are presented in Table 6.

Table 6

Hierarchical Multiple Regression Results for IPV Victimization

| | <i>B</i> | β | <i>t</i> | <i>p</i> | <i>R</i> ² | ΔR^2 |
|--------|----------|---------|----------|----------|-----------------------|--------------|
| Step 1 | | | | | .002 | .002 |
| Age | .21 | .06 | .95 | .345 | | |
| Step 2 | | | | | .076 | .073** |
| Perp | .51 | .24 | 4.21 | .000** | | |
| Step 3 | | | | | .106 | .031* |
| SPC | .01 | .04 | .58 | .562 | | |
| RE | .02 | .06 | .68 | .495 | | |
| RABBM | -.01 | -.02 | -.17 | .866 | | |
| CBWF | .08 | .14 | 2.20 | .029* | | |

Note. *N* = 291. *SPC* = Success, Power, and Competition. *RE* = Restrictive Emotionality; *RABBM* = Restricted Affectionate Behavior Between Men; *CBWF* = Conflict Between Work and Family. * *p* < 0.05. ** *p* < 0.01.

Discussion

The present study explored the relationship between gender role conflict and victimization/perpetration of IPV in same sex male relationships. To date, there is little research that has explored these relationships in same sex couples and that research primarily focuses on how gender role conformity, rather than gender role conflict, influences perpetration/victimization of IPV (Oringher & Samuelson, 2011). The findings suggest that different aspects of gender role conflict are related to both perpetration and victimization of IPV in same sex male couples.

Consistent with previous research, Success, Power, and Competition was the only significant predictor of IPV perpetration (Oringher & Samuelson, 2011). This suggests that gay men who experience an increased drive to succeed and obtain power over others may be more likely to exert power in the form of abuse with their same sex intimate partners. In our society,

masculine socialization indicates that men should be focused on achievement, power, and success to the point that a man may be perceived as less masculine if he does not have power and control in any given situation (O'Neil, 1981).

A common way to gain power over intimate partners is through the use of coercive controlling violence, which is defined as a technique that combines emotionally abusive intimidation with coercion and controlling behaviors (Kelly & Johnson, 2008). Not surprisingly, many participants who endorsed using abusive techniques indicated that they often use verbal insults (45.9%) or controlling techniques (35.2%). Further exploration into this relationship illustrated that scores on the Success, Power, and Competition subscale were significantly correlated with the scores for controlling behavior ($r = .22$) indicating that a significant positive relationship exists between these two variables.

The findings of the current study further suggest that gender role conflict predicts IPV perpetration even when controlling for experiences of interpersonal violence. Oringher and Samuelson (2011) suggested that masculine gender socialization includes aspects such as men standing up for and defending themselves influencing survivors in abusive same sex relationships to perpetrate against their abusive partner, increasing bidirectionality of abuse and possibly influencing those that would otherwise not perpetrate to do so after experiences of IPV victimization. Consistent with those findings, the results for the current sample produced a statistically significant correlation between being a recipient and being a perpetrator of partner violence. A majority of the sample that had abuse experiences (57.9%) reported experiencing some form of both victimization and perpetration of violence. The present results support the heterosexual research on gender role conflict and IPV, suggesting that partner abuse may be one

way men attempt to reduce the internal stress associated with gender role conformity (McDermott & Lopez, 2013; Moore et al., 2010; Schwartz et al., 2005).

The results from the current study also suggested that gender role conflict predicts IPV victimization among same-sex male couples. The Conflict Between Work and Family subscale was the only significant predictor of IPV victimization, indicating that those who struggle to balance the demands of work and family life may be more likely to be victims of abuse. Those that indicated experiencing IPV victimization scored significantly higher on the Conflict Between Work and Family subscale ($M = 23.6, SD = 6.55$) compared to those without abuse experiences ($M = 20.9, SD = 6.02$). The relationship between gender role conflict and IPV victimization has yet to be explored in same sex male relationships but has been thoroughly established in the heterosexual literature, indicating that women in abusive heterosexual relationships have more difficulty maintaining employment due to issues at home (Rothman, Hathaway, Stidsen, & de Vries, 2007), difficulty concentrating at work (Samuel, Tudor, Weinstein, Moss, & Glass, 2011), and absenteeism from work (Swanberg, Macke, & Logan, 2006). Recent research also suggests that incompatibility between work and family demands contributed to domestic violence such that those who experienced more conflict also experienced more domestic violence, especially when job satisfaction was low (Trachtenberg, Anderson, & Sabatelli, 2009). The significant relationship between conflict between work and family and IPV victimization found in this study may reflect an individual's difficulty attending and succeeding at work due to the abuse or an increased chance of experiencing partner abuse due to difficulty balancing demands of work and family.

Although the results indicate that conflicts between work and family is a significant predictor of IPV victimization, it is important to note that the relationship was not very strong

and may be interpreted with caution. The addition of the gender role conflict subscales only explained an additional three percent of the variance in IPV victimization. The relationship between experiences of perpetration is a more significant predictor of IPV victimization but other aspects, such as conflict between work and family, warrant more exploration to fully understand factors that contribute to or influence the receipt of relationship violence.

The results of this study illustrate the complicated nature of the relationship between gender role conflict and IPV in same sex male couples. Certain internal gender conflicts, such as the drive for power and control, may predict the use of abusive tactics towards their partner while other forms may influence men to engage in or tolerate abusive relationships. Masculine gender socialization and the stress associated with attempting to conform to societal gender roles have a lasting impact on all areas of men's lives, including the perpetration or receipt of abuse in same sex intimate relationships.

Implications

The results from this study have many potential implications for understanding the impact of masculine gender role conflict on gay men as well as additional considerations for the specifics of IPV in same sex male relationships. One important implication is the furthered support for bidirectionality of abuse in same sex male relationships. Many individuals, including those in the mental health field, are under the impression that relationship violence is unidirectional with one partner perpetrating and the other partner receiving the abuse (Brown, 2008).

An additional implication of the study is the consideration of how the internal conflict due to gender role socialization may influence becoming a victim of IPV. The current study found a relationship between IPV victimization and the conflict men experience when balancing

work and family. Exploring how gender role conflict is related to IPV victimization is a relatively unexplored topic and may uncover areas for intervention and prevention to decrease the incidence of relationship violence.

Limitations and Future Research

The current study has several limitations. First, the sample was largely made up of individuals that are White and between the ages of 18 and 25. National research indicates that IPV occurs across demographics (Breiding et al., 2015) but the current study's sample is limited to young, White gay men. Future research should aim to collect a more diverse sample so that the relationships between the variables can be examined in racial/ethnic minorities and across ages. Although the results were significant, very little of the variance was explained by the subscales of gender role conflict. More research is needed on IPV in general to further understand the concept.

Another limitation of the study was the simplicity in the design. Previous research suggests that the relationship between the variables of interest is complex, being influenced by confounding variables such as self-esteem (Schwartz et al., 2005) and type of gender role stress (Moore et al. 2010). Because the relationship between gender role conflict and IPV had not been established in same sex male couples, the aim of the current study was to explore the existence of a relationship. Future research will hopefully examine how the relationship between the two variables changes as other variables, such as internalized homophobia, are considered. It would be particularly interesting to see studies investigate how factors such as self-esteem and minority stress may influence the relationship between gender role conflict and victimization.

Finally, the use of a self-report measure for experiences of abuse is a possible limitation. The ten questions used to inquire about IPV victimization and perpetration are relatively basic

and therefore participants could potentially respond to them in a socially desirable manner. Participants likely knew that admitting to perpetrating the more severe forms of abuse (e.g., physical and sexual abuse) would be socially unacceptable. It is also possible that participants may be unaware of the abusive nature of some of these actions due to violence being normalized in their relationships (Olliffe et al., 2014). The simple measure used to assess IPV victimization and perpetration did not investigate all possible abusive actions. Future research might utilize a more sophisticated measure of IPV experiences that inquire about the frequency of specific abusive actions to further explore types of IPV in same sex male relationships as well as potentially reduce social desirability effects.

References

- Bartholomew, K., Regan, K. V., Oram, D., & White, M. A. (2008). Correlates of partner abuse in male same sex relationships. *Violence and Victims, 23*, 344-360. doi:10.1891/0886-6708.23.3.344
- Baugher, A., & Gazmararian, J. (2015). Masculine gender role stress and violence: A literature review and future directions. *Aggression and Violent Behavior, 24*, 107-112. doi:10.1016/j.avb.2015.04.002
- Black, M.C., Basile, K.C., Breiding, M.J., Smith, S.G., Walters, M.L., Merrick, M.T., Chen, J., & Stevens, M.R. (2011). The National Intimate Partner and Sexual Violence Survey (NISVS): 2010 Summary Report. Atlanta, GA: National Center for Injury Prevention and Control, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.
- Breiding M.J., Basile K.C., Smith S.G., Black M.C., & Mahendra R.R. (2015). Intimate partner violence surveillance: Uniform definitions and recommended data elements, version 2.0. *National Center for Injury Prevention and Control, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.*
- Brown, C. (2008). Gender-role implications on same sex intimate partner abuse. *Journal of Family Violence, 23*. 457-462. doi:10.1007/s10896-008-9172-9
- Burke, T. (May, 1998). Male-to-male gay domestic violence. In N. A. Jackson & G. C. Oates (Eds.), *Violence in intimate relationships: Examining Sociological & Psychological Issues*. MA: Butterworth-Heinemann (pp. 161-180).
- Copenhaver, M. M., Lash, S. J., & Eisler, R. M. (2000). Masculine gender role stress, anger, and male intimate abusiveness: Implications for men's relationships. *Sex Roles, 42*, 405– 414.

- Cournoyer, R. J., & Mahalik, J. R. (1995). A cross-sectional study of gender role conflict examining college-aged and middle-aged men. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 42*, 11-19. doi: 10.1037/0022-0167.42.1.11
- Edwards, K. M., Sylaska, K. M., & Neal, A. M. (2015). Intimate partner violence among sexual minority populations: A critical review of the literature and agenda for future research. *Psychology of Violence, 5*, 112-121. doi:10.1037/a0038656
- Feldman, M. B., Díaz, R. M., Ream, G. L., & El-Bassel, N. (2008). Intimate partner violence and HIV sexual risk behavior among Latino gay and bisexual men. *Journal of LGBT Health Research, 3*, 9-19. doi:10.1300/J463v03n02_02
- Fischer, A. R., & Good, G. E. (1997). Men and psychotherapy: An investigation of alexithymia, intimacy, and masculine gender roles. *Psychotherapy, 34*, 160-170. doi:10.1037/h0087646
- Franchina, J. J., Eisler, R. M., & Moore, T. M. (2001). Masculine gender role stress and intimate abuse: Effects of masculine gender relevance of dating situations and female threat on men's attributions and affective responses. *Psychology of Men and Masculinity, 2*, 34 – 41. doi:10.1037//1524-9220.2.1.34
- Girshick, L. B. (2002). No sugar, no spice: Reflections on woman-to-woman sexual violence. *Violence Against Women, 8*, 1500-1520. doi:10.1177/107780102237967
- Good, G. E., & Mintz, L. B. (1990). Gender role conflict and depression in college men: Evidence for compounded risk. *Journal of Counseling & Development, 69*, 17-21. doi:10.1002/j.1556-6676.1990.tb01447.
- Good, G. E., Robertson, J. M., O'Neil, J. M., Fitzgerald, L. F., DeBord, K. A., Stevens, M., ... Braverman, D. G. (1995). Male gender role conflict: Psychometric properties and

- relations to distress. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 42, 3-10. doi:10.1037/0022-0167.42.1.3
- Hayes, J.A., & Mahalik, J.R. (2000). Gender role conflict and psychological distress in male counseling center clients. *Psychology of Men and Masculinity*, 2, 116-125. doi:10.1037//1524-9220.1.2.H6
- Herdman, K. J., Fuqua, D. R., Namok, C., & Newman, J. L. (2012). Gender Role Conflict Scale: Validation for a sample of gay men and lesbian women. *Psychological Reports*, 110, 227-232. doi:10.2466/02.07.PR0.110.1.227-232
- Houle, J., Mishara, B.L., & Chagnon, F. (2009). An empirical test of a mediational model of impact of the traditional male gender role on suicidal behavior in men. *Journal of Affective Disorders*, 107, 37-43. doi:10.1016/j.jad.2007.07.016
- Kassing, L.R., Beesley, D., & Frey, L.L. (2005). Gender role conflict, homophobia, age, education, as predictors of male rape myth acceptance. *Journal of Mental Health Counseling*, 27, 311-328. doi:10.17744/mehc.27.4.9wfm24f52kqgav37
- Kelly, J. B., & Johnson, M. P. (2008). Differentiation among types of intimate partner violence: Research update and implications for interventions. *Family Court Review*, 46(3), 476-499. doi:10.1111/j.1744-1617.2008.00215.x
- King, D. B., O'Rourke, N., & DeLongis, A. (2014). Social media recruitment and online data collection: A beginner's guide and best practices for accessing low-prevalence and hard-to-reach populations. *Canadian Psychology/Psychologie Canadienne*, 55, 240-249. doi:10.1037/a0038087

- Jakupcak, M., Lisak, D., & Roemer, L. (2002). The role of masculine ideology and masculine gender role stress in men's perpetration of relationship violence. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity*, 3, 97-106. doi:10.1037//1524-9220.3.2.97
- Lease, S. H., Montes, S. H., Baggett, L. R., Sawyer, R. J., Fleming-Norwood, K. M., Hampton, A. B., Ovrebo, E., ... Boyraz, G. (2013). A cross-cultural exploration of masculinity and relationships in men from Turkey, Norway, and the United States. *Journal of Cross - Cultural Psychology*, 44, 1, 84.
- Mahalik, J. R., Locke, B. D., Ludlow, L. H., Diemer, M. A., Scott, R. J., Gottfried, M., & Freitas, G. (2003). Development of the conformity to masculine norms inventory. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity*, 4, 3-25. doi:10.1037/1524-9220.4.1.3
- McClennen, J. C., Summers, A. B., & Vaughan, C. (2002). Gay men's domestic violence: Dynamics, help-seeking behaviors, and correlates. *Journal of Gay & Lesbian Social Services: Issues In Practice, Policy & Research*, 14, 23-49. doi:10.1300/J041v14n01_02
- McDermott, R. C., & Lopez, F. G. (2013). College men's Intimate partner violence attitudes: Contributions of adult attachment and gender role stress. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 60, 127-136, doi:10.1037/a0030353
- McDermott, R. C., Schwartz, J. P., Lindley, L. D., & Proietti, J. S. (2014). Exploring men's homophobia: Associations with religious fundamentalism and gender role conflict domains. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity*, 15, 191-200. doi:10.1037/a0032788
- Moore, T. M., & Stuart, G. L. (2005). A review of the literature on masculinity and partner violence. *Psychology of Men and Masculinity*, 6(1), 46-61.

- Moore, T. M., Stuart, G. L., McNulty, J. K., Addis, M. E., Cordova, J. V., & Temple, J. R. (2010). Domains of masculine gender role stress and Intimate Partner Violence in a clinical sample of violent men. *Psychology of Violence, 1*, 68-75.
doi:10.1037/2152-0828.1.S.68
- Moradi, B., Tokar, D. M., Schaub, M., Jome, L. M., & Serna, G. S. (2000). Revisiting the structural validity of the Gender Role Conflict Scale. *Psychology of Men and Masculinity, 1*, 62-69. doi:10.1037/-1524-9220.1.1.62
- Murray, T., & Lewis, V. (2014). Gender role conflict and men's body satisfaction: The moderating role of age. *Psychology of Men and Masculinity, 15*, 40-48.
doi:10.1037/a0030959
- National Coalition Against Domestic Violence. (2015). Domestic violence national statistics. Retrieved from www.ncadv.org
- National Coalition of Anti-Violence Programs. (2001). Lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender domestic violence.
http://www.ncavp.org/common/document_files/Reports/2001ncavpvrpt.pdf
- Oliffe, J. L., Han, C., Maria, E. S., Lohan, M., Howard, T., Stewart, D. E., & MacMillan, H. (2014). Gay men and intimate partner violence: A gender analysis. *Sociology Of Health & Illness, 36*(4), 564-579. doi:10.1111/1467-9566.12099
- O'Neil, J. M. (1981). Patterns of gender role conflict and strain: Sexism and fear of femininity in men's lives. *Personnel & Guidance Journal, 60*, 203-210.
doi:10.1002/j.2164-4918.1981.tb00282.x

- O'Neil, J. M. (2008). Summarizing 25 years of research on men's gender role conflict scale: New research paradigms and clinical implications. *The Counseling Psychologist, 36*, 358-445. doi: 10.1177/0011000008317057
- O'Neil, J. M., Good, G. E., & Holmes, S. (1995). Fifteen years of theory and research on men's gender role conflict: New paradigms for empirical research. In R. Levant & W. Pollack (Eds.), *A new psychology of men* (pp. 164-206). New York, NY: Basic.
- O'Neil, J. M., Helms, B. J., Gable, R. K., David, L., & Wrightsman, L. S. (1986). Gender Role Conflict Scale: College men's fear of femininity. *Sex Roles, 14*, 335-350. doi:10.1007/BF00287583
- Oringher, J., & Samuelson, K. W. (2011). Intimate Partner Violence and the role of masculinity in male same sex relationships. *Traumatology, 17*, 68-74. doi:10.1177/1534765610395620
- Palmetto, N., Davidson, L., Brietbart, V., & Rickert, V. (2013). Predictors of physical intimate partner violence in the lives of young women: Victimization, perpetration, and bidirectional violence. *Violence and Victims, 28*, 103-121. doi:10.1891/0886-6708.28.1.103
- Pleck, J. (1981). *The myth of masculinity*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Pleck, J. H., Sonenstein, F. L., & Ku, L. C. (1993). Masculinity ideology: Its impact on adolescent males' heterosexual relationships. *Journal of Social Issues, 49*, 11-29. doi:10.1111/j.1540-4560.1993.tb01166.x
- Rothman, E. F., Hathaway, J., Stidsen, A., & de Vries, H. F. (2007). How employment helps female victims of intimate partner violence: a qualitative study. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 12*(2), 136-143. doi:10.1037/1076-8998.12.2.136

- Samuel, L. J., Tudor, C., Weinstein, M., Moss, H., & Glass, N. (2011). Employers' perceptions of intimate partner violence among a diverse workforce. *Safe Health Work, 2*(3), 250–259. doi: 10.5491/shaw.2011.2.3.250
- Sanchez, F. J., Westefeld, J. S., Liu, W. M., & Vilain, E. (2010). Masculine gender role conflict and negative feelings about being gay. *Professional Psychology Research and Practice, 41*, 104-111. doi:10.1037/a0015805
- Schwartz, J. P., Waldo, M., & Daniel, D. (2005). Gender-role conflict and self-esteem: Factors associated with partner abuse in court-referred men. *Psychology of Men and Masculinity, 6*, 109-113. doi:10.1037/1524-9920.6.2.109
- Sharpe, M. J., & Heppner, P. P. (1991). Gender role, gender role conflict, and psychological well-being in men. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 38*, 323-330. doi: 10.1037/0022-0167.38.3.323
- Sharpe, M. J., Heppner, P. P., & Dixon, W. A. (1995) Gender role conflict, instrumentality, expressiveness, and well-being in adult men. *Sex Roles, 33*, 1-18.
doi:10.1007/bf01547932
- Simonsen, G., Blazina, C., & Watkins, C. J. (2000). Gender role conflict and psychological well-being among gay men. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 47*, 85-89.
doi:10.1037/0022-0167.47.1.85
- Stults, C. B., Javdani, S., Greenbaum, C. A., Barton, S. C., Kapadia, F., & Halkitis, P. N. (2015). IPV perpetration and victimization among YMSM: The P18 cohort study. *Psychology of Sexual Orientation and Gender Diversity, 2*, 152-158. doi:10.1037/sgd0000104

- Swanberg, J., Macke, C., & Logan, T. K. (2006). Intimate partner violence, women, and work: coping on the job. *Violence and Victims, 21*(5), 561–578. doi: 10.1891/0886-6708.21.5.561
- Szymanski, D. M., & Carr, E. R. (2008). The roles of gender role conflict and internalized heterosexism in gay and bisexual men's psychological distress: Testing two mediation models. *Psychology of Men and Masculinity, 9*, 40-54. doi:10.1037/1524-9220.9.1.40
- Szymanski, D. M., & Ikizler, A. S. (2013). Internalized heterosexism as a mediator in the relationship between gender role conflict, heterosexist discrimination, and depression among sexual minority men. *Psychology of Men and Masculinity, 14*, 211-219, doi:10.1037/a0027787
- Thompkins, C.D., & Rando, R.A. (2003). Gender role conflict and shame in college men. *Psychology of Men and Masculinity, 4*, 79-81. doi:10.1037/1524-9220.4.1.79
- Trachtenberg, J., Anderson, S., & Sabatelli, R. (2009). Work-home conflict and domestic violence: a test of a conceptual model. *Journal of Family Violence, 24*(7), 471-483. doi:10.1007/s10896-009-9246-3
- Vasquez, D.A., Newman, J.L., Frey, L.L. Caze, T.J., Friedman, A.N., & Meek, W.D. (2014). Relational health and masculine gender role conflicts in the friendships and community relationships of bisexual, gay, and straight men. *Journal of LGBT Issues in Counseling, 8*, 124-145. doi:10.1080/15538605.2014.895662
- Wade, J. C. (2009). Traditional masculinity and African American men's health-related attitudes and behaviors. *American Journal of Men's Health, 3*, 165-172. doi:10.1177/1557988308320180

Wester, S.R., Pionke, D.R., & Vogel, D.L. (2005) Male gender role conflict, gay men, and same sex romantic relationships. *Psychology of Men and Masculinity*, 6, 195-208.

doi:10.1037/1524-9220.6.3.195.

Wilkinson, W. W. (2004). Authoritarian hegemony, dimensions of masculinity, and male antigay attitudes. *Psychology of Men and Masculinity*, 5, 121-131. doi: 10.1037/1524-

9220.5.2.121

APPENDIX A

IRB Approval

Institutional Review Board
Office of Sponsored Programs
University of Memphis
315 Admin Bldg
Memphis, TN 38152-3370

Feb 24, 2017

PI Name: Hannah Emery

Co-Investigators:

Advisor and/or Co-PI: Elin Ovrebo, Madeline Stenersen

Submission Type: Initial

Title: The Influence of Gender Role Conflict, Level of Outness, and LGB Positive Identity on
Intimate Partner Violence

IRB ID : #PRO-FY2017-78

Exempt Approval: Feb 24, 2017

Approval of this project is given with the following obligations:

1. When the project is finished or terminated, a completion form must be submitted.
2. No change may be made in the approved protocol without prior board approval.
3. Exempt approval are considered to have no expiration date and no further review is necessary unless the protocol needs modification.

Thank you,
James P. Whelan, Ph.D.
Institutional Review Board Chair
The University of Memphis.