



ACADEMICA
An International
Multidisciplinary
Research Journal
 (Double Blind Refereed & Peer Reviewed Journal)



DOI: 10.5958/2249-7137.2021.02166.2

SPOUSE OR PARTNER CONFLICT IN SAME-SEX GUY MARRIAGE

Ms. Shiwangi*

*SMAC Sanskriti University, Mathura,
 Uttar Pradesh, INDIA

Email id: shiwangi.sobas@sanskriti.edu.in

ABSTRACT

Violence is a poorly understood phenomena in homosexual interactions. While there is an increasing number of literatures on violence in women of the same sex, few published research explores violence in men of the same sex .Despite evidence of a high frequency of violence in Males same-sex relationships, very little known about the nature of this violence. The nature of male same-sex interpersonal violence was examined in this research. In an interview on their intimate relationships, 69 homosexual and bisexual males were picked at random from a community sample and told about at least one violent incident. The recorded interviews were used to classify the men's accounts of the most serious event in their most recent violent relationship. Intimate violence patterns ranged from moderate to severe, including unidirectional and bidirectional violent scenarios. In the overwhelming majority of instances, violence was an outburst of an ongoing dispute that included bidirectional emotional abuse and became more expressive than instrumental. Conflict resolution difficulties and attachment concerns seemed to explain violence more than the desire to dominate one's spouse.

KEYWORDS: *Homosexual, Intimate, Reciprocity, Same-Sex Relationships, Violence.*

1. INTRODUCTION

The limited research available indicate that violence is reported in 21-5% of homosexual males, which is similar to rates found in lesbian and heterosexual pairs. In one research, for example, which estimated the prevalence rates of violence in male homosexual interactions using a randomly chosen sample, 41% of males reported receiving violence from romantic partners; 35% reported committing romanticized violence against romantic partners. Sadly, despite the seeming

frequency of interpersonal violence in homosexual male relationships, there is little information about homosexual violence patterns. Theoretical discussion on the origins of intimate violence in male homosexual partnerships and therapeutic attempts to support the afflicted may be erroneous without a more comprehensive understanding. This research examined the overall nature of homosexual intimate violence against men. Several scholars have suggested that the view that acts of violence and who initiated a physical confrontation are inadequate and potentially deceptive, without addressing contextual variables. We studied the pattern of violence, the surroundings, the ensuing repercussions, the underlying reasons and recurring subjects in violent interactions in order to better understand the nature of physical and emotional aggressiveness in men's same sex encounters[1].

1.1 Intimate Molestation:

Researchers describe physical violence as "actions performed with the purpose or purpose perceived to cause bodily suffering or injuries to someone else." Whereas physics is relatively simple to describe and recognize, it is harder to quantify and measure emotional and psychological aggressiveness. Despite this difficulty, it is essential to include psychological aggressiveness. Studies of physical violence in same-sex couples found emotional abuse at rates greater than physical abuse by the majority of the participants. For example, researchers found that 83 percent of homosexuals in their samples suffered emotional abuse and 95 percent of their samples of lesbians and gays recognized verbally abusive techniques. Moreover, a qualitative research of homosexual men's experiences of intra-mate violence showed that both physical and psychological hostility were part of participants' definitions of domestic abuse. Physical and emotional violence in male homosexual relationships were investigated in this research[2].

1.2 Violence Reciprocity:

Victims and perpetrators of violence are referred to throughout the literature on domestic violence. The prior results, however, do not show this obvious difference between victim and perpetrator. Rather, interpersonal violence frequently seems to be bidirectional. Researchers have shown that prior violence is the greatest predictor of violence in heterosexual relationships between men and women. In addition, 2/3 of the women reported both being victims of violence and being aggressors in an earlier lesbian relationship. Strong correlations between partner accounts of same-sex aggression also provide indications of reciprocity. Finally, homosexual males were frequently referred to as both victim and offender in a qualitative research, making it difficult to classify them as victims or perpetrators.

Although numerous results show reciprocal violence in heterosexual and homosexual interactions, many studies have not addressed reciprocity, possibly because researchers have assumed that the role of victims and perpetrators is different. Iceland claims, for example, that mutual homosexual male intimate violence is not shared aggression; instead, a partner is a main aggressor continuously. Whilst they argue that homosexuals may respond violently to hostile actions against them, they are against the mutual fighting label. Island findings are based on their experience dealing with abused gay men and therefore inadequate generalizations in relations of violence from clinical samples to the entire community of homosexual men. This research will look at the direction of violence among homosexual male relationships in order to answer this issue.

1.3 Motives:

Research suggests that the form of interpersonal violence is not determined by the actual conduct, but rather by the reasons behind such behaviour. Violence used for self-defense or retribution is, in particular, fundamentally distinct from violence intended to dominate or retain authority over another. In line with this point of view, scholars argue that the desire to dominate a partner decides who the offender is rather than just who starts the violence. Researchers believe that the purpose for controlling the partner affects the form of the violence and offers a typology based on reciprocity and motivation differences. Common Couple Violence (CCV) defines the partnerships in which one or both spouses were aggressive, violent and controlling. This violence is usually modest and rare and occurs during a few of fights. Patriarchal Terrorism defines the interactions between a partner and his or her spouse in order to control and dominate.

This violence is unidirectional, persistent and often harsh and severe with the offender and the victim. Researchers suggest that CCV is frequently reported in surveys of domestic violence, whereas patriarchal terrorism is usually recorded in clinical samples. He also argues that the desire of males to control women stems from patriarchal terrorism. On the other hand, when both parties are aggressive and troll, mutual violence happens and violent resistance depicts links, when both partners are violent, but only one controls. In the latter group, women are suggested to resist violence and try to regulate violence by themselves. Although Johnson explains the origins of violence in the patriarchal dominance of males over women, this typology may apply to same-sex relationships only when definitions are taken into consideration and not the theoretical reasons.

Speculation about motivations falls along gender lines in most of family violence literature. As Johnson's typology reflects, men's violence is usually considered to be instrumental in nature and aims to gain dominance over women. A study of the relationships between high-school students showed that although both men and women reported the most wrath as the cause of violence, males were more likely than women to describe using violence to gain control over their partners. Researchers indicate that aggression by women against males may have comparable coercive or instrumental motivations to violence by men against women. Based on a sample of pairs in treatment, researchers discovered that although men's violence was more likely than women to be considered to be partly instrumental in nature, the violence of both men and women has frequently been driven by a mix of instrumental and expressive purposes. Given that motivating factors may explain the dynamics of intimate violence, and that violence against men and women may serve many purposes, the reasons behind the intimate violence of homosexual males need study.

1.4 Context:

Violent events may provide important information about the nature of violence. Researchers found that interpersonal violence is an out-of-conflict growth for around half of their pairs in treatment. These results contrast sharply with the notion that domestic violence is an unforeseen occurrence. In addition, the degree of tension in relationships is closely linked to both data violence and dating violence. We thus evaluated whether the alleged violence stemmed from an escalation of dispute.

1.5 Consequences:

The inability to link acts of physical violence to the repercussions of these actions is a recurrent critique of family violence studies. Since a slap varies from a lighthearted touch to an open blow with the entire weight of the offender, the resultant damage provides more information than just describing the act. Scholars argue that batterers differ from victims in choosing to hurt. The psychological effect of interpersonal violence may also vary significantly depending on the nature of the act of aggression. For example, when accompanied with a death threat, a slap is more frightening. We thus investigated the physical and mental repercussions of a certain incidence of violence to enable a comprehensive knowledge of interpersonal violence.

1.6 This Study:

The purpose of this research was to give an overview of interpersonal violence in homosexual ships. In a certain incident and throughout the partnership, we analyzed the direction of both emotional and physical violence. We also examined the reasons behind the violent conduct, if the continuing dispute was escalating and whether the violent event had the psychological and physical effects. As little is known about violence in homosexual ships among men, we also looked at themes and patterns in the accounts of their violent relationships by participants.

This research has been intended to enhance our capacity in homosexual relationships to reflect violence. We investigated homosexual intimate violence in a semi-structured interview style that provided flexibility and responsiveness needed to explore and comprehend the reactions of the participants. Our research focuses on the most serious violent incident in recent violent relations. These authors indicate that discussion of the worst incident of interpersonal violence is the most accurate reminder, since unpleasant experiences generate deeper cognitive treatment. Although concentrating on one particular incident provides more comprehensive information on the context and effects of violence, it is possible that a particular event does not represent the overall pattern of violence in connection. Violence was thus also studied inside the relationship as a whole.

The few prior research on violence among homosexual males focused on convenience samples such as news media reporters and community contacts. Consequently, the results of these research cannot be generalized to the broader homosexual and bisexual population. In contrast, participants in this research were selected via a random selection of participants in the West End Relationships Project (WERP).

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

The description of their relationship dynamics by participants was compared to the typology of violent partnerships by Johnson. 47 of the 69 relations explain the grouping of common couple violence (CCV), in which one or both members of a marriage are violent but neither controls (68 percent). CCV appeared to be an invasion group, since neither offenders nor beneficiaries tended to characterize violence or their interactions in terms of control. As previously stated, studies on motivational variables show that violence is driven not by utilitarian or control goals but by expressive purposes. Violence in the CCV group varied considerably and connections did not seem to be as consistent as possible. In the CCV group, for example, there were between 1 and over 40 violent events and the degree of violence varied from no injuries to serious injuries. Of the 47 CCV-classified partnerships, 20 had unidirectional violence and 27 had bidirectional

violence. Furthermore, just 25 featured one violent event, often characterized as "one-time explosion." These participants considered violence to be an isolated occurrence that is typically the consequence of frustrated communication and inadequate dispute resolution. One participant said, "I've experienced a violent moment when my rage was out of control, but this isn't a matter when this pattern is frequent"[3].

Domestic violence is often indicated by a desire to dominate one's spouse. But for just 6 of the 69 interactions, the idea of control and dominance seemed essential. In terms of Johnson's typology, only two ties were characterized with the category of patriarchal terrorism, including relations with one violent and dominant partner (3 percent). Both included fairly serious violence, as evidenced by injuries, although violence did not occur often in either relationship. Three relations characterized violent resistance, partnerships where both parties are aggressive but only one control (4 percent). The frequency of violent events varied from 1 to more than 20 among this group, with reports of moderate to severe bodily injuries. The description of reciprocal violence is one relationship: there was regular aggression by both spouses and both parties appeared to control or dominate conduct[4].

Several difficulties were identified with the application of Johnson's typology to this sample. First, there was significant diversity within the typology groups. Additionally, 16 participants' descriptions (23%) of their relationships cannot be categorized using the typology of Johnson. Six of these instances characterized the main beneficiary of violence as controlling. One participant for example characterized the emotional instigation of violent episodes as part of an overall pattern of manipulation and control of his spouse. Control-based groups provided minimal discrimination. There were only six links among the three groups including a controlling violent spouse, equal to the number of connections involving a controlling victim of violence[5].

A subject that became apparent in 36% (n 25) of participants' tales was that a demand/withdrawal interaction occurred in the dispute that was physical or typical of the communication style of the connection. This dynamic shows a pattern of engagement in which one party retires, while the other is requesting or demanding and engaged in interaction more openly. Those with a demanding job want closer relationships and may be more engaged, whereas retired people seek less intimacy and more detachment and thus seem to be less emotionally committed. The first offender was in the demanding position and the receiver was in the retirement role in 18 encounters. For instance, a participant was "weary to be emotionally ignored and pushed away" during a conversation by his withdrawing partner, so he attempted to have his partner listen, keeping him at one place. Another participant, who moved to another room to avoid confrontation, was pursued by and strangled by his companion. The men in the demanding position usually felt that their efforts to communicate and satisfy their emotional needs were hindered by the lack of availability of their partners[6].

The other seven males, who described the interaction between request and withdrawal, said that the receiver was the victim of the first violent act and that the offender was in the retreat. For instance, after his spouse retired to another room, a participant claimed to knock down a door and repeatedly asked, "What are you doing? Why are you not going to speak to me?" His companion shouted loudly, "Get away!" and responded aggressively at last. Another guy attempted to go when his companion remarked, "Oh yes, just like your dad did, desert me." This

guy stated, "I believe it occurred because I felt completely trapped," regarding his aggressive acts. In these instances, retreating offenders were commonplace because they had "pushed button," were stuck and became violent when their efforts to get out of the conflict scenario failed. Thus these guys characterized their aggression as caused by emotional maltreatment, or as a response when they felt that there was no alternative course of action. In these circumstances, the demanding victims often reported continuous efforts to communicate and unceasingly pursue their spouses during conflict. For instance, a participant said, "I [emotionally] pushed him. I wanted him to react. I wanted him to answer. I kept coming to him." I continued coming to him[7].

90 males (28 percent) characterized the relationship being one in which a partner is more emotionally involved than his partner and the more engaged spouse tends to be the starter of violence. For example, a guy who behaved aggressively was irritated and furious by his partner's reluctance to engage and would not spend as much time with him as he wanted. Several guys have stated that their spouses desire an open and thus less committed relationship while they seek a one-off connection[8]. Another frequent topic identified in 14 (20%) of the interviews was infidelity. Several violent instances happened when one partner met the other in a sexual encounter. Others described fighting over unfaithfulness when the argument escalated into physical violence. For these male same-sex partnerships, negotiation of a mutually pleasant relationship structure that specifies the degree of monogamy or openness was particularly essential[9]. The last topic was that violence happened frequently for the first time when the relationship ended. Sixteen men (23 percent) have reported violence after it became apparent that the relationship had taken its course during the disintegration or soon after the disintegration, when the men still had a certain level of connection. For instance, many males justified the start of physical violence by their partners because of their displeasure at the participants' efforts to leave the relationship[10].

3. DISCUSSION

The findings paint a picture of violence among male same-sex relationships in general. The majority of males said that violence in their relationships happened rarely, with 44 percent saying it happened just once. The physical and mental repercussions of the violence were, for the most part, minor. A significant minority of individuals, on the other hand, reported serious and regular violence. In all of the violent events, physical violence co-occurred with emotional abuse, and as reports of emotional abuse rose, so did the degree of physical and emotional damage. We wonder whether physical and emotional abuse should be regarded different entities, despite the fact that they entail distinct actions. Emotionally abusive methods may have an effect on the impact of physical aggression; for example, threats of bodily damage to oneself or others can cause receivers to worry for their physical safety regardless of whether actual violence is used.

In majority of the relationships reported, there was significant evidence of some degree of reciprocity of violence. Both members of the marriage behaved violently in a high percentage of violent episodes and throughout the relationship as a whole. In several of the cases, the males seemed to be committing about equal amounts of violence, while others were committing similar amounts of violence in distinct instances of unidirectional aggression. Emotional abuse reciprocity was particularly high, with reciprocal emotional abuse being reported in nearly every violent event. These results support experts' observations that aggressive couples often seem to

mentally and physically attack one another, ultimately confining their disputes to violence-prone paths. As the participants' interpersonal disputes became more emotional and physical, their capacity to resolve them constructively appeared to deteriorate. It should be emphasized, however, that a significant minority of individuals reported instances and relationships in which the abuse was mainly unidirectional.

Anger and dissatisfaction were often cited as motivators for participants' aggression. The idea that violence is used to create and retain power and control over a relationship is contradicted by these results. Participants who committed violence, on the other hand, often reported a loss of control in their relationships, as well as rage and dissatisfaction about the present state of their relationships. When we looked into these relationships further, we discovered that the overwhelming majority of them did not have a dominating spouse. Furthermore, there were just as many peaceful controlling partners as there were violent controlling partners. Our inability to apply the concept of control exemplifies the difficulty of characterizing violent relationships using broad generalizations. Because the nature of same-sex intimate violence may vary greatly, many elements of the violence and the relationship must be assessed in order to properly represent the various types of intimate violence. When we tried to put the tales of participants into a tightly defined typology, we discovered that the stories within each category varied significantly, and that 23% of the stories did not fit into any of the groups. Given these challenges, we came to the conclusion that no one relationship type could properly explain intimate violence in our sample. We discovered that documenting the various kinds of interpersonal violence by taking into account numerous continuous factors and analyzing patterns of relationship dynamics was more helpful.

We were able to represent the variety of violence we saw by using continuous variables such as emotional and physical repercussions, the number of episodes, and the degree to which the violence fulfilled instrumental and expressive purposes. We discovered underlying patterns by detecting motifs in participants' tales, which may assist to understand why disagreement develops into violence in certain relationships. Unmet or threatened emotional demands were the most common themes in participants' stories: conflicting requirements for intimacy vs autonomy, disappointed wishes for commitment and monogamy, and relationship loss. As a result, attachment theory may be a helpful lens through which to examine these results. Relationship violence, according to experts, may be an adult version of protest behavior—a maladaptive attempt to retain connection to a loved one when a relationship is endangered. Relationship violence has been repeatedly linked to attachment, especially the underpinning component of fear about desertion. Intimate violence was shown to be more probable when a person who was anxious about abandonment was paired with someone who avoided intimacy, a pattern that was comparable to the demand-withdrawal dynamic observed in our group. The authors' notion that violence may be employed as a pursuing or distancing strategy is consistent with our results that violence was committed by both demanding and withdrawing partners. Attachment anxiety and attachment protest actions may be triggered by being aware of a spouse's infidelity, seeing one's partner as less emotionally engaged, or being threatened with the loss of a relationship.

4. CONCLUSION

Finally, the homosexual and bisexual males in our sample reported a wide range of interpersonal violent encounters as well as responses to violence. The bulk of the reported violence was minor

and rare, but there were some instances of serious violence. Violence was most common during interpersonal conflict, and participants often spoke about it in terms of endangered emotional needs. Furthermore, the majority of violence was expressive, and negative conflict strategies including shouting, criticism, and retreat were used in almost every violent event. As a result, therapeutic and research efforts should be focused on understanding the conflict that leads to violence. The development of constructive communication skills that enable both the expressing and fulfilment of emotional demands should be given special emphasis. Our results also show how abusive interaction habits emerge in the setting of a relationship.

REFERENCES

1. E. Wu *et al.*, “The Association Between Substance Use and Intimate Partner Violence Within Black Male Same-Sex Relationships,” *J. Interpers. Violence*, 2015, doi: 10.1177/0886260514536277.
2. M. Kay and S. Jeffries, “Homophobia, heteronormativity and hegemonic masculinity: Male same-sex intimate violence from the perspective of Brisbane service providers,” *Psychiatry, Psychol. Law*, 2010, doi: 10.1080/13218710903566953.
3. J. Oringher and K. W. Samuelson, “Intimate partner violence and the role of masculinity in male same-sex relationships,” *Traumatology (Tallahass. Fla.)*, 2011, doi: 10.1177/1534765610395620.
4. R. Freeland, T. Goldenberg, and R. Stephenson, “Perceptions of Informal and Formal Coping Strategies for Intimate Partner Violence Among Gay and Bisexual Men,” *Am. J. Mens. Health*, 2018, doi: 10.1177/1557988316631965.
5. K. V. Regan, K. Bartholomew, D. Oram, and M. A. Landolt, “Measuring physical violence in male same-sex relationships: An item response theory analysis of the conflict tactics scales,” *J. Interpers. Violence*, 2002, doi: 10.1177/0886260502017003001.
6. K. V. Regan, K. Bartholomew, D. Oram, and M. A. Landolt, “Measuring Physical Violence in Male Same-Sex Relationships,” *J. Interpers. Violence*, 2002, doi: 10.1177/0886260502017003001.
7. T. Goldenberg, R. Stephenson, R. Freeland, C. Finneran, and C. Hadley, “‘Struggling to be the alpha’: sources of tension and intimate partner violence in same-sex relationships between men,” *Cult. Heal. Sex.*, 2016, doi: 10.1080/13691058.2016.1144791.
8. C. R. Woodyatt and R. Stephenson, “Emotional intimate partner violence experienced by men in same-sex relationships,” *Cult. Heal. Sex.*, 2016, doi: 10.1080/13691058.2016.1175027.
9. R. Stephenson, C. Rentsch, L. F. Salazar, and P. S. Sullivan, “Dyadic characteristics and intimate partner violence among men who have sex with men,” *West. J. Emerg. Med.*, 2011.
10. J. Oringher and K. W. Samuelson, “Intimate partner violence and the role of masculinity in male same-sex relationships,” *Eur. Phys. Educ. Rev.*, 2011.