Published in final edited form as:

Violence Vict. 2014 ; 29(3): 422–435.

Antecedents of Intimate Partner Violence Among Gay and Bisexual Men

Catherine Finneran, MPH and Rob Stephenson, PhD

Emory University Rollins School of Public Health, Atlanta, GA

Abstract

Examinations of gay and bisexual men's (GBM) perceptions of intimate partner violence (IPV), including their perceptions of events likely to precipitate IPV, are lacking. Focus group discussions with GBM ($n = 83$) yielded 24 unique antecedents, or triggers, of IPV in male–male relationships. Venue-recruited survey participants ($n = 700$) identified antecedents that were likely to cause partner violence in male–male relationships, including antecedents GBM-specific currently absent from the literature. Chi-square tests found significant variations in antecedent endorsement when tested against recent receipt of IPV. Linear regression confirmed that men reporting recent IPV endorsed significantly more IPV antecedents than men without recent IPV ($\beta = 1.8155, p < .012$). A better understanding of the IPV event itself in male–male couples versus heterosexual couples, including its antecedents, can inform and strengthen IPV prevention efforts.

Keywords

intimate partner violence; gay men; violence antecedents; triggers of violence; violence; LGBT

Recent studies suggest that gay and bisexual men (GBM) experience intimate partner violence (IPV) at rates comparable to or higher than those documented among women (Blosnich & Bossarte, 2009; Messinger, 2011; Tjaden, Thoennes, & Allison, 1999), with estimates that approximately 25%–50% of U.S. GBM report experiencing physical IPV, and 12%–30% report experiencing sexual IPV (Balsam, Lehavot, & Beadnell, 2011; Blosnich & Bossarte, 2009; Nieves-Rosa, Carballo-Diéguez, & Dolezal, 2000; Pantalone, Hessler, & Simoni, 2010; Tjaden et al., 1999). A recent systematic review of IPV among men who have sex with men (MSM) demonstrated that these high rates of partner violence are emerging in diverse geographic settings and across demographic groups, and that partner violence among MSM continues to be documented, even in more recent studies in which shorter recall periods have been used (Finneran & Stephenson, 2013). In the past 5 years, particularly, the volume of research regarding IPV among MSM has increased substantially: nearly half of the studies captured in the systematic review were published since 2007. Despite this new focus on partner violence among lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender persons in general and among MSM in particular, explanatory models and theories of IPV—all of which were

derived from heterosexual populations—are not necessarily congruent with the reality of IPV among gay, bisexual, and other MSM that is beginning to be documented (Bell & Naugle, 2008; Relf, 2001).

Indeed, it remains unexplored how feminist explanatory models of partner violence, which often greatly emphasize male control *over a female partner*, may or may not apply similarly to cases in which a man perpetrates violence against his male partner. For example, men and women have been shown to have different views of anger provocation (Harris, 1993) and to respond to nonviolent versus violent events differently (Jacobson et al., 1994). Power theory, which may be more applicable to same-sex IPV, suggests that conflict and stress are the main sources of IPV but still underlines the uneven, gender-based power relations in male–female couples (Sagrestano, 1992a, 1992b; Sagrestano, Heavey, & Christensen, 1999; Straus, 1976, 1977). Felson and Messner (2000) borrowed from both feminist and power IPV theories in suggesting that the use of violence in intimate partnerships was most importantly an attempt by the perpetrator of violence to obtain control over the victim of the violence, and that this control motive was particularly prevalent in partner assault in a way not found in other forms of assault. However, because the analysis group contained few homosexual persons, this “control motive” could not attain significance for male–male partner assault; nonetheless, the authors noted this limitation and emphasized that the data approached a similar conclusion (Felson & Messner, 2000).

Similar to overall explanatory models of IPV, a great deal of the literature regarding the IPV event itself is couched in assumption of a male IPV perpetrator and a female IPV victim. These gender-based theories were put forth by R. P. Dobash, Dobash, Wilson, and Daly (1992) partly in response to research that stated that men and women were equally as violent in relationships, arguing that simply counting the number of forms of violence used and their frequencies of use ignores context, particularly the context of patriarchy. In pioneering event-based analysis, R. E. Dobash and Dobash (1984) focused on the immediate antecedents of violence, among them, jealousy/possessiveness, expectations of domestic work, money, status problems, and sexual refusal. Their conclusions, while shifting theoretical focus away from previous models in which the onus of violence was on the victim, focused on the “importance of gender in shaping the nature of violent events” while commenting on the “wider sociocultural context of patriarchal domination” (R. E. Dobash & Dobash, 1984). Although masculinity and other gendered forces may indeed be influential distal antecedents to IPV among GBM, the theory is insufficient to explain any differences in proximal antecedents. Therefore, the objective of this study is to describe for the first time in the literature what GBM themselves view as proximal antecedents, or triggers, of male–male IPV.

METHODS

This study was approved by Emory University’s institutional review board. Between September and December 2011, participants were recruited into the study using venue-based sampling. Venue-based sampling is a derivative of time-space sampling in which sampling occurs within prescribed blocks of time at particular venues. As a method to access hard-to-reach populations, venue-based recruitment is a process in which a sampling frame of

venue-time units is created through formative research with key informants and community members. After creating a list of potential venues where the target population is reported to be more prevalent than in the general community, researchers visit each venue at the times it is reported to be active (e.g., Thursdays from 9 p.m. to 1 a.m.) to confirm that the venue is active at those times and the population in question accesses the venue; this venue-time unit is then added to the sampling frame. To reach a diverse population of GBM in the Atlanta area, the venue sampling frame used for this study consisted of a wide variety of gay-themed or gay-friendly venues, including gay pride events, gay sports teams events, gay fund-raising events, downtown areas, gay bars, bathhouses, an AIDS service organization, an MSM-targeted drop-in center, gay bookstores, restaurants, and urban parks. All venues were within the Atlanta metro area. The sampling frame used in this study contained more than 160 venue-time units and was updated monthly as venues closed or as new venues became available. A randomized computer program assigned venue-time units monthly, with at least one recruitment event per day.

During recruitment, two or more study recruiters wearing study t-shirts stood adjacent to the venue during the time prescribed by the computer program. Recruiters then drew an imaginary line on the ground and then approached every n th man who crossed it; n varied between one and three depending on the volume of traffic at the venue. After introducing themselves, the recruiter would ask if the man was interested in seeing if he was eligible for a research study at Emory University. If he agreed to be screened, he was then asked a series of eight questions to assess his eligibility, including his sexual orientation, recent sex with a man, race, age, and residence in the Atlanta metro area. Responses for all persons were recorded on palm-held computers, including whether or not a person agreed to be screened for eligibility. Eligible men were then read a short script that described the study process: a Web-based survey approximately 20 min in length that could be completed at home or, in the case of five venues (the AIDS service organization, the drop-in center, Atlanta Pride, In the Life Pride, and a National Coming Out Day event), at the venue itself on a tablet computer. Men interested in study participation were then given a card with a Web address and a unique identifier that would link their recruitment data to their survey data. Participants who completed the survey at the venue were compensated with a gift card; participants who completed the survey at home were compensated with the same value of gift card that was sent to them electronically.

The self-administered, Web-based survey contained several domains of questions regarding demographics, recent sexual behavior with male partners, IPV, couples coping and communication, social network characteristics, and minority stress (e.g., internalized homophobia). Survey development was informed by seven racially stratified focus group discussions with GBM in Atlanta area ($n = 83$); during these focus groups, several areas of IPV among GBM—including definitional conceptions of IPV, triggers of IPV, and first- or second-hand accounts of IPV—were discussed.

Of 4,903 men approached, 2,936 (59.9%) agreed to be screened for the study. Of these, 2,093 (71.3%) were eligible for study participation. Men were eligible for study participation if they reported being 18 years of age or older, being male, identifying as gay/ homosexual or bisexual, living in the Atlanta metro area, and having had sex with a man in

the previous 6 months. Of eligible participants, 1,965 (93.9%) were interested in study participation. There were 1,075 men who completed the survey; thus, 21.9% of men approached and 51.4% of eligible men completed the survey. Approximately one-third (33.7%) completed the survey at a venue, whereas the remaining two-thirds (66.3%) of respondents completed the survey at home. There were 700 men who had complete data for all covariates of interest and were included in this analysis.

Measurements

Triggers of Violence—Potential triggers of violence were drawn from the seven qualitative focus group discussions on IPV, all held in Atlanta and recruited in a similar fashion. The focus group discussions were stratified by race, with one comprising White participants, two comprising Black/African American participants, and four comprising multiple races. The focus group discussions were transcribed, de-identified, and analyzed using MaxQDA. The discussion of triggers of violence began in each group with the stem, “*What might trigger violence in a male–male relationship?*” From these discussions, 24 unique IPV triggers were identified by the participants. If a trigger was mentioned even once, it was abstracted and included in the list of all potential triggers. Potential triggers covered a range of experiences, for example, “acting disrespectful toward a partner,” “alcohol/being drunk,” or “one partner being in the closet.” These 24 triggers were then included in the survey of GBM. In the survey, participants were asked how likely each trigger was to cause violence in a male–male relationship: “probably won’t cause violence,” “possibly can cause violence,” or “definitely can cause violence.” Triggers were dichotomized into “probably won’t cause violence” versus “possibly could” and “definitely can” cause violence. All triggers of violence were summed to create an index scale of number of items endorsed as triggers of violence in a male–male relationship.

Intimate Partner Violence—Survey participants were assessed for recent IPV from a male partner, either physical (“*In the last 12 months, have any of your partners ever tried to hurt you? This includes pushing you, holding you down, hitting you with a fist, kicking you, attempting to strangle you, and/or attacking you with a knife, gun or other weapon*”) or sexual (“*In the last 12 months, have any of your partners ever used physical force or verbal threats to force you to have sex when you did not want to?*”). Participants who responded yes to either of these questions were classified as having had a recent experience of IPV.

Analysis

The data were analyzed using STATA 12. Based on distribution, age was categorized into discreet groups of 18–24, 25–34, 35–44, and >44 years. Race was defined as White non-Hispanic, Black/African American non-Hispanic, and other, including Latino/Hispanic persons and persons of mixed race. Level of education was categorized as having completed high school or less, some college or 2-year degree, or college or greater. Employment was classified as unemployed or employed either part- or full-time. HIV status was classified as negative or positive for men who reported negative or positive HIV status respectively, and unknown for men who reported never having been tested for HIV, having received an indeterminate/inconclusive result, had never received the results of their last test, or preferred not to answer.

The underlying factor structure of the IPV antecedents was tested using factor rotational analysis with oblique rotation using a Promax solution. The internal reliability of the IPV antecedents was assessed by calculating Cronbach's alpha, with adequate reliability considered $>.70$. Differences in trigger endorsement by recent experience of IPV were examined using chi-square testing ($\alpha = .05$). Demographic variation in the mean number of factors identified as triggers was assessed using analysis of variance (ANOVA) testing. Number of factors identified as triggers of IPV was modeled using linear regression, with the model including age, race, sexual orientation, HIV status, education, employment, and recent experience of IPV.

RESULTS

Endorsement of Antecedents

Demographic characteristics of the sample are summarized in Table 1. The sample was predominately young (52.0% younger than 35 years old), racially diverse (47.3% non-White), identified as homosexual/gay (91.1%), and employed (79.9%), with some degree of post-high school education (84.3%). Nearly one-third of the sample (30.9%) reported positive or unknown HIV status. Approximately 15.0% of participants reported experiencing physical IPV, sexual IPV, or both physical and sexual IPV from a male partner in the past year ($n = 104$).

The endorsement of triggers and results of chi-square testing by recent history of IPV are summarized in Table 2. Overall, trigger endorsement ranged from 91.1% (alcohol/being drunk) to 20.1% (talking about safe sex). Of the 24 triggers, 15 triggers (63.0%) demonstrated significant variation by recent IPV experience ($p < .05$). For all items found to have significant variation, men with recent history of IPV were more likely to endorse the item as a trigger of violence compared men without a recent history of IPV, for example, a lack of trust (recent IPV: 85.6%, no recent IPV: 72.1%, $p < .0017$) or disagreements about sex (recent IPV: 62.5%, no recent IPV: 49.8%, $p < .0103$). Overall, men with recent IPV history endorsed significantly more IPV triggers compared to their counterparts ($p < .0014$), as did non-White men ($p < .0005$), younger men ($p < .0083$), HIV-positive men ($p < .0479$), and employed men ($p < .0016$; see Table 3).

The results of the linear regression modeling are summarized in Table 4. Little variation was seen in increasing endorsement of IPV triggers, although Black/African American non-Hispanic men ($p < .033$) and unemployed men ($p < .033$) endorsed significantly more items as triggers of violence. Men who reported experiencing physical IPV, sexual IPV, or both physical and sexual IPV in the past year also endorsed significantly more items as triggers of violence ($p < .012$).

Factor Analysis

All IPV antecedents loaded into one of four factors identified by rotational factor analysis with eigenvalues >1.0 (see Table 5).

Factor 1: Power and Negotiation Characteristics—This factor included talking about safe sex, talking about HIV statuses, one partner being more educated than the other,

one partner making more money than the other, deciding who tops and bottoms during sex, different HIV statuses (one partner HIV-negative, one partner HIV-positive), religious differences, discussions about being in an open versus monogamous relationship, and age differences between partners. This factor explained 20.3% of the variance in the sample.

Factor 2: Relationship Characteristics—Antecedents that loaded into this factor were dissatisfaction with the relationship, disagreements about sex, one partner being in the closet, both partners being in the closet, lack of communication, relationship expectations that don't line up, lack of trust, and disagreements about how much time to spend together, accounting for 19.7% of the variance.

Factor 3: Life Stressors—The following items loaded together and accounted for 13.1% of the variance: alcohol/being drunk, drugs/being high, jealousy, dishonesty, and money.

Factor 4: Threats to Masculinity—Two items loaded into this factor: acting disrespectful toward a partner and both partners being “alpha males,” accounting for 8.9% of the variance.

DISCUSSION

To the authors' knowledge, this is the first study to either qualitatively describe or quantitatively analyze antecedents, or triggers, of IPV among GBM. The results highlight the complex relationship between anticipation of partner violence and the actual experience of partner violence, and suggest that this relationship may vary in cases of male–male partner violence compared to male–female partner violence. In addition, the results of the rotational factor analysis call into question distinguishing between distal/static IPV antecedents and proximal IPV antecedents among GBM as is generally done for heterosexual persons (Wilkinson & Hamerschlag, 2005).

A primary finding is various triggers of IPV identified by the participants in this study, including triggers that would by necessity not be found in male–female relationships. Although validated scales of proximal IPV antecedents do exist, covering such triggers as arguments about sex, controlling behaviors, ignoring a partner, or being disrespectful toward a partner (Babcock, Costa, Green, & Eckhardt, 2004), and a recent review found remarkable similarity in these triggers across studies (Wilkinson & Hamerschlag, 2005), all validated scales currently used in IPV research were created from samples of women or of male–female couples (Wilkinson & Hamerschlag, 2005). Most antecedents present in those scales but not found in this study are antecedents that may not apply to GBM, including, for example, a partner expressing regret for marrying the other, a partner threatening divorce, or a partner spending time with close friends of the opposite sex (Babcock et al., 2004), although some of these antecedents may become more applicable to GBM because gay marriages are increasingly being afforded legal recognition.

Nonetheless, many of the antecedents identified by studies of opposite-sex couples also emerged as significant antecedents for GBM. Factor 3, for example, included the general life stressors of alcohol, drugs, jealousy, dishonesty, and money, all of which are viewed as

classic IPV antecedents in the literature with well-documented connections to IPV events (Bell & Naugle, 2008; Wilkinson & Hamerschlag, 2005). Despite these similarities, antecedents that are generally specific to GBM emerged from the data as equally important antecedents: one or both partners being in the closet and deciding who tops (is the insertive partner) and bottoms (is the receptive partner) during anal sex. The importance of such gay/bisexual men-specific antecedents can be further seen in that one of the four factors comprising threats to masculinity, a threat that GBM may feel acutely in a heteronormative society. The results here point to the need to include these additional domains of situational factors, unique to GBM's relationships and perhaps unique to other same-sex relationships, that are absent from the current literature.

In addition to identifying the proximal antecedents to partner violence, such as alcohol use, jealousy, or disagreements about sex, participants in this study also identified distal/static violence antecedents, such as a lack of trust or both partners being "alpha males." This finding is consistent with previous studies that have identified similar distal and proximal antecedents among different-sex couples (DeMaris, Benson, Fox, Hill, & Van Wyk, 2004; Eisikovits & Buchbinder, 2000), although such studies were generally drawn from samples of married couples, and antecedents that may apply less to same-sex IPV, such as number of children and challenges to gender roles, are prominent. Thus it appears that gay/bisexual men's understanding of the IPV event itself not only includes the immediate precipitants of the event but also the uneven power dynamics or sources of intrarelationship stress that lead to this event. Particularly novel in these findings is the prominence with which sexual stressors, including several stressors regarding HIV, emerged.

A secondary finding is the striking differences in trigger identification when measured by recent experience of IPV. Men with a history of recent IPV identified significantly more triggers than men without such a history and were more likely to suggest that nearly every trigger could result in partner violence. Two explanations may apply: first, men with recent IPV are responding from their discreet experience—that is, they elect that a given item can trigger violence because they have seen it trigger violence against themselves—or second, they project an increased likelihood of violence onto all or nearly all other possibilities based on their experiences. Previously, women with recent histories of partner abuse have been shown to accurately predict whether or not they would be reabused. In a sample of approximately 250 women, Cattaneo, Bell, Goodman, and Dutton (2007) found that 66% of recently abused women accurately predicted whether or not they would be reabused in 6 months, although this proportion was higher among women who were not reabused (74%) versus women who were reabused (43%). Thus, persons with recent experience of partner abuse may have developed a more keen understanding of what may cause partner abuse in the future, as seen here. This explanation would be further consistent with the escalation theory of IPV, which posits that less acute forms of violence, such as verbal aggression, precede more severe forms of violence such as slapping/hitting (Feld & Straus, 1989; Hilton & Harris, 2005; O'Leary, Malone, & Tyree, 1994). Such theory would account for the agreement of men with and men without recent IPV histories regarding the potential of proximal antecedents to cause violence but the disagreement seen regarding the potential of distal/static antecedents to cause violence: for example, drug use (men without recent IPV:

90.8%, men with recent IPV: 91.3%, $p < .851$) versus relationship expectations that don't line up (men without recent IPV: 57.9%, men with recent IPV: 74.0%, $p < .002$). These findings also highlight the impact of relationship context on the antecedents of IPV and that couples-based approaches to IPV prevention may also be appropriate for GBM. Additional event-based research is needed to confirm these hypotheses, and to understand the frequency with which each of these identified triggers actually cause violence versus the frequency in which men anticipate they will cause violence.

Limitations

This study has several limitations, mainly stemming from its methodology. Although venue-based sampling has been shown to produce samples similar to other methods of recruitment, GBM are nonetheless a difficult-to-reach population, and GBM who did not access gay-themed or gay-friendly locations during the sampling time frame would necessarily have been excluded from the sample. In addition, the cross-sectional design of this study means that causality cannot be inferred. Although the results presented here highlight the importance of the context in which IPV occurs, sufficient data were not collected regarding the kinds of partners who perpetrated IPV against the respondents (e.g., main partner, casual partner). Furthermore, because this study is among the first of its kind, the authors did not statistically classify the triggers into proximal versus distal antecedents as some theories would have dictated; the shortcomings of IPV theories in same-sex IPV have been discussed previously.

CONCLUSION

This study describes for the first time GBM's understandings of antecedents of partner violence and demonstrates for the first time in this population that recent experience of IPV is associated with increasing identification of IPV antecedents. Although the data were insufficient to suggest a direct pathway between triggers of IPV, which can also be conceptualized as anticipation of or fear of IPV, and the experience of partner violence itself, these preliminary findings point toward the need for new explanatory models for same-sex IPV. These models will likely borrow from multiple areas of IPV theory, including feminist theory, power theory, and event-based theory, while incorporating new findings regarding same-sex IPV. Future research should focus on studies that will produce results to clarify these theories. In addition, these findings can inform prevention efforts because this study identified four unique domains of IPV antecedents, several of which would by necessity be unique to GBM. It is only through a holistic understanding of all facets of IPV—including its antecedents, risk factors for perpetration, risk factors for victimization, and its acute and lasting effects—that prevention efforts for IPV among GBM become efficacious. Because efforts to address IPV among gay and bisexual increase alongside a growing understanding of same-sex IPV, responders should understand both the similarities of same-sex and opposite-sex IPV, and perhaps more importantly, their differences as described here.

Acknowledgments

This original research was supported by funding from the Eunice Kennedy Shriver National Institute of Child Health & Human Development, grant #5R21HD066306-02, and the Emory Center for AIDS Research (CFAR), P30 AI050409.

REFERENCES

- Babcock JC, Costa DM, Green CE, Eckhardt CI. What situations induce intimate partner violence? A reliability and validity study of the Proximal Antecedents to Violent Episodes (PAVE) scale. *Journal of Family Psychology*. 2004; 18(3):433–442. [PubMed: 15382968]
- Balsam KF, Lehavot K, Beadnell B. Sexual revictimization and mental health: A comparison of lesbians, gay men, heterosexual women. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*. 2011; 26(9):1798–1814. [PubMed: 20724297]
- Bell KM, Naugle AE. Intimate partner violence theoretical considerations: Moving towards a contextual framework. *Clinical Psychology Review*. 2008; 28(7):1096–1107. [PubMed: 18430501]
- Blosnich JR, Bossarte RM. Comparisons of intimate partner violence among partners in same-sex and opposite-sex relationships in the United States. *American Journal of Public Health*. 2009; 99(12):2182–2184. [PubMed: 19834003]
- Cattaneo LB, Bell ME, Goodman LA, Dutton MA. Intimate partner violence victims' accuracy in assessing their risk of re-abuse. *Journal of Family Violence*. 2007; 22(6):429–440.
- DeMaris A, Benson ML, Fox GL, Hill T, Van Wyk J. Distal and proximal factors in domestic violence: A test of an integrated model. *Journal of Marriage and Family*. 2004; 65(3):652–667.
- Dobash RE, Dobash RP. The nature and antecedents of violent events. *British Journal of Criminology*. 1984; 24:269–288.
- Dobash RP, Dobash RE, Wilson M, Daly M. The myth of sexual symmetry in marital violence. *Social Problems*. 1992; 59:71–91.
- Eisikovits, Z.; Buchbinder, E. Locked in a violent embrace: Understanding and intervening in domestic violence. Vol. 16. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage; 2000.
- Feld SL, Straus MA. Escalation and desistance of wife assault in marriage. *Criminology*. 1989; 27(1):141–162.
- Felson RB, Messner SF. The control motive in intimate partner violence. *Social Psychology Quarterly*. 2000; 63:86–94.
- Finneran C, Stephenson R. Intimate partner violence among men who have sex with men: A systematic review. *Trauma, Violence & Abuse*. 2013; 14(2):168–185.
- Harris MB. How provoking! What makes men and women angry? *Aggressive Behavior*. 1993; 19(3):199–211.
- Hilton NZ, Harris GT. Predicting wife assault a critical review and implications for policy and practice. *Trauma, Violence, & Abuse*. 2005; 6(1):3–23.
- Jacobson NS, Gottman JM, Waltz J, Rushe R, Babcock J, Holtzworth-Munroe A. Affect, verbal content, and psychophysiology in the arguments of couples with a violent husband. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*. 1994; 62(5):982–988. [PubMed: 7806730]
- Messinger AM. Invisible victims: Same-sex IPV in the National Violence Against Women Survey. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*. 2011; 26(11):2228–2243. [PubMed: 20829231]
- Nieves-Rosa LE, Carballo-Diéguez A, Dolezal C. Domestic abuse and HIV-risk behavior in Latin American men who have sex with men in New York city. *Journal of Gay & Lesbian Social Services*. 2000; 11(1):77–90.
- O'Leary KD, Malone J, Tyree A. Physical aggression in early marriage: Prerelationship and relationship effects. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*. 1994; 62(3):594–602. [PubMed: 8063986]
- Pantalone DW, Hessler DM, Simoni JM. Mental health pathways from interpersonal violence to health-related outcomes in HIV-positive sexual minority men. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*. 2010; 78(3):387–397. [PubMed: 20515213]

- Relf M. Battering and HIV in men who have sex with men: A critique and synthesis of the literature. *Journal of the Association of Nurses in AIDS Care*. 2001; 12(3):41–48. [PubMed: 11387804]
- Sagrestano LM. Power strategies in interpersonal relationships: The effects of expertise and gender. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*. 1992a; 16(4):481–495.
- Sagrestano LM. The use of power and influence in a gendered world. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*. 1992b; 16(4):439–447.
- Sagrestano LM, Heavey CL, Christensen A. Perceived power and physical violence in marital conflict. *Journal of Social Issues*. 1999; 55(1):65–79.
- Straus MA. Sexual inequality, cultural norms, and wife-beating. *Victimology*. 1976; 1:54–76.
- Straus MA. Wife beating: How common and why? *Victimology*. 1977; 2:443–458.
- Tjaden P, Thoennes N, Allison CJ. Comparing violence over the life span in samples of same-sex and opposite-sex cohabitants. *Violence and Victims*. 1999; 14(4):413–425. [PubMed: 10751048]
- Wilkinson DL, Hamerschlag SJ. Situational determinants in intimate partner violence. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*. 2005; 10(3):333–361.

TABLE 1

Descriptive Characteristics of the Sample

	<i>n</i>	%
Age		
18–24 years	142	20.9
25–34 years	218	31.1
35–44 years	189	27.0
45+ years	151	21.6
Race		
White non-Hispanic	369	52.7
Black non-Hispanic	242	34.6
Latino and other	89	12.7
Sexual orientation		
Homosexual/gay	639	91.1
Bisexual	61	8.7
HIV status		
Negative	484	69.1
Positive	172	24.6
Don't know/never tested	44	6.3
Education		
High school or less	110	15.7
Some college/2-year degree	229	32.7
College or more	361	51.6
Employment		
Employed	559	79.9
Unemployed	141	20.1
Recent receipt of IPV		
Recent IPV	104	14.9
No recent IPV	596	85.1
Total	700	100.0%

Note. IPV = intimate partner violence.

TABLE 2

Percentages of Men Endorsing That an Item “Possibly Can” or “Definitely Will” Cause Partner Violence, in Total and by Recent Experience of IPV, and Results of Chi-Square Testing

	Total (%)	No Recent IPV	Recent IPV	Chi-Square <i>p</i> -Value
Alcohol/being drunk	91.1	91.1	91.3	.937
Drugs/being high	90.9	90.8	91.3	.851
Jealousy	90.9	90.4	93.3	.355
<i>Dishonesty</i>	87.7	86.6	94.2	.028
<i>Acting disrespectful toward a partner</i>	81.1	79.9	88.5	.039
Money	77.4	76.2	84.6	.057
Lack of trust	74.1	72.1	85.6	.004
<i>Both partners being “alpha males”</i>	69.7	68.3	77.9	.049
<i>Dissatisfaction with relationship</i>	68.6	66.9	77.9	.027
<i>Lack of communication</i>	65.9	63.6	78.8	.002
<i>Relationship expectations that don’t line up</i>	60.3	57.9	74.0	.002
<i>Disagreements about sex</i>	51.7	49.8	62.5	.017
<i>Discussions about being in an open versus monogamous relationship</i>	51.0	48.2	67.3	.000
<i>One partner being in the closet</i>	50.1	47.8	63.5	.003
<i>Disagreements about how much time to spend together</i>	46.9	45.3	55.8	.048
<i>Different HIV statuses: one partner HIV–, one partner HIV+</i>	46.1	44.3	56.7	.019
Both partners being in the closet	45.1	44.0	51.9	.132
One partner making more money than the other	39.7	38.9	44.2	.308
Talking about HIV statuses	37.0	36.6	39.4	.579
<i>Age differences between partners</i>	34.3	32.4	45.2	.011
One partner being more educated than the other	32.3	31.2	38.5	.144
<i>Religious differences</i>	30.9	29.0	41.3	.012
<i>Deciding who tops and bottoms during sex</i>	30.1	28.7	38.5	.045
Talking about safe sex	20.1	19.1	26.0	.109

Note. Significant difference at $\alpha = .05$ are denoted in **bold italics**. IPV = intimate partner violence.

TABLE 3

Mean Endorsement of IPV Triggers by Exposures With Results of ANOVA and Chi-Square Testing

	Number of Items Endorsed Mean (SD)	<i>p</i> Value
Age		
18–24 years	<i>15.2 (6.5)</i>	
25–34 years	<i>14.0 (6.6)</i>	
35–44 years	<i>13.2 (7.0)</i>	
45+ years	<i>12.6 (6.7)</i>	
		<i>.0083</i>
Race		
White non-Hispanic	<i>12.9 (6.9)</i>	
Black non-Hispanic	<i>15.0 (6.4)</i>	
Latino and other	<i>13.7 (6.8)</i>	
		<i>.0005</i>
Sexual Orientation		
Homosexual/gay	13.6 (6.8)	
Bisexual	15.0 (6.8)	
		.1208
HIV Status		
Negative	<i>13.3 (6.8)</i>	
Positive	<i>14.6 (6.7)</i>	
Don't know/never tested	<i>14.9 (6.4)</i>	
		<i>.0479</i>
Education		
High school or less	14.0 (6.5)	
Some college/2-year degree	14.3 (7.0)	
College or more	13.3 (6.7)	
		.2366
Employment		
Employed	<i>15.3 (6.6)</i>	
Unemployed	<i>13.3 (6.8)</i>	
		<i>.0016</i>
Recent Receipt of IPV		
Recent IPV	<i>15.9 (5.7)</i>	
No recent IPV	<i>13.4 (6.9)</i>	
		<i>.0014</i>
Total	13.7 (6.8)	

Note. Significant difference at $\alpha = .05$ are denoted in ***bold italics***. IPV = intimate partner violence.

TABLE 4

Linear and Logistic Regression Modeling Results for Increasing Endorsement of Triggers of IPV

	Increasing Index Score β (<i>p</i> Value)
Age	
18–24 years	Referent
25–34 years	–0.6989 (.353)
35–44 years	–1.4372 (.071)
45+ years	– 1.9222 (.024)
Race	
White non-Hispanic	Referent
Black non-Hispanic	1.3014 (.033)
Latino and other	0.2570 (.748)
Sexual Orientation	
Homosexual/gay	Referent
Bisexual	0.5985 (.514)
HIV Status	
Negative	Referent
Positive	1.1319 (.074)
Never tested/unknown	1.3077 (.218)
Education	
High school or less	Referent
Some college or 2-year degree	0.9042 (.253)
College or more	1.0728 (.174)
Employment Status	
Employed	Referent
Unemployed	1.4471 (.033)
Recent IPV	
No	Referent
Yes	1.8155 (.012)

Note. β and *p* values are shown for increasing score of trigger index scale; β scores and *p* values are shown. Significant results at $\alpha = .05$ are denoted in **bold italics**. IPV = intimate partner violence.

TABLE 5

Results of Rotational Factor Analysis of Triggers of IPV Among Gay and Bisexual Men

Items	Factor Loading
Factor 1: Power and Negotiation Characteristics	
Eigenvalue (Proportion of Variance Explained)	9.65294 (20.3)
Combined Cronbach's Alpha	.9037
Talking about safe sex	.7662
Deciding who tops and bottoms during sex	.7299
One partner being more educated than the other	.7263
Age differences between partners	.6995
Talking about HIV statuses	.6915
Religious differences	.6900
Different HIV statuses: one partner HIV-, one partner HIV+	.6597
One partner making more money than the other	.6461
Discussions about being in an open versus monogamous relationship	.5258
Factor 2: Relationship Characteristics	
Eigenvalue (Proportion of Variance Explained)	2.72489 (19.7)
Combined Cronbach's Alpha	.8863
Relationship expectations that don't line up	.7545
One partner being in the closet	.7348
Disagreements about how much time to spend together	.7291
Disagreements about sex	.7210
Lack of communication	.7116
Both partners being in the closet	.6997
Dissatisfaction with relationship	.6081
Lack of trust	.4692
Factor 3: Life Stressors	
Eigenvalue (Proportion of Variance Explained)	1.49264 (13.1)
Combined Cronbach's Alpha	.8300
Drugs/being high	.8598
Alcohol/being drunk	.8506
Jealousy	.7359
Money	.5754
Dishonesty	.5753
Factor 4: Threats to Masculinity	
Eigenvalue (Proportion of Variance Explained)	1.04264 (8.9)
Combined Cronbach's Alpha	.6757
Acting disrespectful toward a partner	.7471
Both partners being "alpha males"	.6539
Total Cronbach's Alpha for All Factors Combined	.9349

Note. IPV = intimate partner violence.