



Intimate Partner Violence (IPV) in Homosexual Man

Fauziah Mirlavia Aisyah

Faculty of Psychology, Gunadarma University, Depok, Indonesia

Corresponding Author: mirlaviaisyah@gmail.com

Abstract. Violence of homosexual (gay) couples or also known as Intimate Partner Violence (IPV) is a phenomenon that commonly occurs in society. This study aims to observe an image of IPV which occurs in homosexual (gay) community. A measuring instrument used in this research belongs to Black C. Michael, et. al. (2010) for measuring IPV. The research has already done by quantitative study with descriptive type. Respondents in this research are homosexuals (gay) who have a friend date, lover (boyfriend), or ex lover (ex boyfriend). Respondents in this research are about 100 people which consist of 30 people in pilot study and 70 people in field study. The result of this research showed that most of the respondents have already sustained of IPV behavior by his couple. Respondents in this research sustained in the IPV behavior which is actually risky for them. The biggest IPV behaviors happen in psychological aggression, where someone falls on to violence verbally and emotionally. While the smallest IPV behaviors happen in sexual health.

Keywords: Gay, Homosexual, IPV.

1. INTRODUCTION

"*Intimate Partner Violence*" (IPV) refers to behaviors that cause physical and psychological harm to romantic partners. A person intentionally hurts the person with whom he or she chooses to unite life, have a bond of promise, have closeness, love and respect for each other until death separates the couple (Baron & Richardson, 1994). In the United States, one in six unmarried heterosexual couples and married couples experience at least one act of IPV each year (Straus & Gelles: Schafer, Caetano, & Clark, 1998).

Patricia & Nancy (2000) reported the results of a telephone interview study with 8,000 women and 8,000 men in the US. Respondents told about their experiences as victims of IPV, with various forms of violence, such as rape, physical violence, and verbal violence. IPV has certain aspects empirically. Victims of IPV are mostly women in states with a partisan culture. Gender inequality favors men over victimized female partners (Archer, 2006).

According to Elaine (2004) IPV is defined as the intentional use of physical and verbal violence by someone in a close relationship with their partner. Perpetrators of IPV are married, divorced, dating, and unmarried individuals. IPV perpetrators can be female, male, and transgender.

APA (*American Psychology Association*) categorizes IPV as violence in the form of physical, sexual, and psychological violence committed by a person against their partner (Anderson, et. al., 2008). According to Saltzman, L.E., Fanslow, J. L., McMahon, P. M., & Shelley, G. A. (2002) IPV has several types in it, namely: *physical violence* (physical violence),

sexual violence (sexual violence), *threats of physical or sexual violence* (verbal or physical violence), and *psychological or emotional violence* (verbal violence that can cause trauma). In addition, Michael, *et. al.* (2010) conducted research on 200,000 heterosexuals in the United States with the types of violence that are not much different from Saltzman, namely: *sexual violence* (sexual violence), *stalking* (monitoring, threatening, following IPV victims), *physical violence* (physical violence), *psychological aggression* (verbal violence which is divided into expressions of aggression and coercive control), and *sexual health* (sexual health). The biggest result of the research, which was conducted for 1 year, showed that 56.8% of women experienced *physical violence* (Michael, *et. al.* 2010).

The above studies examined IPV that occurred in heterosexual couples with women or wives as the victims. The issue of men attacking women in IPV is of much greater concern than women attacking men (Schuler, 2010). 30% of women in the United States die unnaturally due to IPV, while 3% of men (Anderson, *et.al.* 2008).

These IPV studies often occur in heterosexuals, but IPV can also occur in homosexuals as perpetrators or victims of IPV. homosexuals show a higher likelihood of experiencing IPV compared to straight men (Bowwman & Morgan, in Williams, Sawyer, & Wahlstrom, 2006). This is because homosexual men are ashamed to report their relationship conditions to the law, police, and regulations that discriminate against homosexual male individuals, so victims of IPV in homosexual male couples are not well protected (Murray, Mobley, Buford, & Seaman-DeJohn, 2006). One of the factors that trigger the emergence of IPV in homosexuals is the masculine gender role, which is superior in the cultural context and holds a controlling role (Anderson, *et. al.*, 2008). This gender role encourages the growth of IPV that occurs in homosexual men, even though in homosexual men both parties in the couple are men, considering that homosexuals also have gender roles like heterosexual couples.

Homosexuality relates to a person's sexual orientation, namely the tendency in sexual and emotional relationships with someone of the same sex (homosexual), opposite sex (heterosexual), or both (bisexual) (Nevid, Rathus & Rathus, 1995). Homosexuality is divided into 2 types, namely homosexual (male) and lesbian (female). Neale, Davison, & Haaga (1996), said that homosexuality is a sexual desire or activity directed towards people of the same sex. homosexuals tend to be few or minority because of the few opportunities to explore their relationships and also the many rejections that exist in society for same-sex lovers (Diamond, in Santrock, 2006).

This research focuses on violence against homosexual men, particularly in Indonesia. In 2008, Indonesia had a case of mutilation murder committed by a homosexual man with his

partner's mistress. The murder case committed by Veri Idham Henyansyah alias Ryan was proven to have killed and even mutilated Heri Santoso because he felt jealous and unhappy with the victim who had a crush on his same-sex boyfriend Novel. Ryan hit Heri with an iron rod and stabbed him with a knife and then dismembered Heri's body into seven pieces. What was even more shocking was that Ryan had also previously committed murder and the bodies of his victims were buried behind his house. Of his eleven victims, nine were homosexuals (Fikria, 2008).

A case of homosexual violence also happened to a man in Tangerang, W was assaulted by his homosexual partner with a busted lip on the grounds that he did not want to be asked out. W admitted that his life had been financed by his homosexual partner (Nourkinan, 2013). Murder has happened to a homosexual designer who was killed by his homosexual partner. The suspect admitted that he stabbed the victim's body with a cutlass because he was burning with jealousy. The suspect felt hurt when his homosexual partner refused to watch, and switched with another man in the room of his rented house (Suadmadji, 2012).

The phenomena above describe acts of IPV committed by homosexual men against their partners

Some of the phenomena of homosexual men in Indonesia, violence can lead to death, but in the context of this research, the limitations of IPV committed have not yet reached homicide or the non-occurrence of IPV that causes death.

The researcher also interviewed a 23-year-old homosexual man (R) who works as a *public relation* in the Darmawangsa area. R shared his experience of dating a homosexual man. In R's case, it can be said that there was an act of IPV. Patrick, Mc.Kenry Serovich, Mason, & Mosack. (2006) found that homosexual couples who dominate will control their partners, while the controlled partner has no empowerment, low *self-esteem* and is not valued, so when they have conflict, IPV occurs.

Researchers conducted descriptive research because the discussion of the phenomena of homosexual men and IPV that has been described is an interesting and sensitive topic to do, so there have not been many previous studies that raised phenomena and topics like this research. In addition, the researcher hopes that the research can be the basis for further research.

Based on the background that has been described, the researcher wants to know the IPV that occurs in homosexual men.

2. RESEARCH METHODS

Research respondents

Respondents in this study are individuals who have sexual attraction, sexual involvement with other individuals who have the same gender as themselves and identify themselves as homosexual men.

Sampling Technique

The sampling method in this study uses *non-probability sampling* techniques because not everyone in the population has the same opportunity to become a research sample (Creswell, 2005). Then using *purposive* sampling, namely sampling based on research objectives in accordance with predetermined characteristics or criteria (Creswell, 2005). then *snowball sampling* is also done by determining the sample which is initially small in number, then enlarges like a snowball rolling so that it gradually becomes large. In determining the sample, which is initially small in number but increasingly stops until the information obtained is considered sufficient (Sugiyono, 2007). Homosexuals are not as common as heterosexuals, because homosexuals are a minority, the researcher decided to use *snowball sampling* of some of the researcher's colleagues (homosexuals) to help find other homosexual men, so that this study has more than 30 respondents.

Research Measurement Tools

The IPV measurement tool that will be used in this study uses a questionnaire developed by Michael, *et. al.* (2010) with consideration of the results of a *summary report* conducted on 200,000 people in the US who were victims of IPV. The summary report contains the types of IPV that are used as measuring instruments in this study.

This measuring instrument uses a Likert model scale based on an interval scale and is presented in the form of *favorable* (f) and *unfavorable* (uf) statements. The items in this measurement scale have two answer options, namely: YES and NO. The score given moves from 0 to 1. The assessment weight for favorable statements is: YES = 1, NO = 0. The higher the participant's score, the higher the IPV that occurs in homosexual men, but the lower the score, the lower the IPV that occurs in homosexual men.

IPV (*Intimate Partner Violence*) Scale

The IPV measuring instrument that will be used in this study uses a questionnaire developed by Black C. Michael, *et al.* (2010), with consideration of the components contained in IPV, namely *sexual violence, stalking, physical violence, psychological aggression, sexual health*. This measuring instrument contains (39) questions in the *pilot study* and 37 statements in the *field study*.

3. RESEARCH RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Descriptive Statistical Analysis Results

The respondents of this study were homosexual men. This research is divided into two stages, the first stage is a *pilot study* of 30 people and the second stage is a *field study* of 70 people. The distribution of respondents in this study is in the form of data in the form of frequency distributions taken based on gender roles, age, ethnicity of the last education, and the time span of being a homosexual man. The following is a table of respondents:

Table 1. Respondent Overview

No.	Aspects	Description	N	Percentage (%)	Mean
1	Age	<20 Years	25	36%	0.36
		>20 Years	45	64%	0.66
		Total	70	100%	
2	Tribe	Java	30	43%	0.43
		Kalimantan	3	4%	0.04
		Sunda	13	19%	0.19
		Betawi	8	11%	0.11
		Chinese	1	1%	0.01
		Unclear	15	22%	0.21
		Total	70	100%	
3	Education Last	SMP	1	1%	0.01
		HIGH	30	43%	
		SCHOOL			0.43
		D3	17	24%	0.24
		S1	20	29%	0.29
		S2	2	3%	0.03
4	Range Homosexual Time	Total	70	100%	
		< 1 Year	3	4%	0.04
		2-3 Years	20	29%	0.29
		> 3 Years	47	67%	0.67
5	Role Gender	Total	70	100%	
		Top	23	33%	0.33
		Bottom	27	39%	0.39
		Vers	20	29%	0.29

Table 1 shows that respondents who have an average value on the aspect of age > 20 years are 0.66 higher than those aged < 20 years, 0.36. Based on the aspect of the last education, it is known that the highest mean value is 0.43 in Java and the lowest is 0.43 in Java.

0.01 in Chinese. Based on the aspect of ethnicity, it is known that the highest mean value is 0.43 in high school and the lowest is 0.01 in junior high school. Based on the aspect of the time span of being homosexual, it is known that the highest mean value is 0.67 in the time span of being homosexual >3 years and the lowest in the time span of being homosexual <1 year 0.04. Based on the aspect of gender roles, it is known that the highest mean value is 0.39 in *bottom* and the lowest is 0.29 in *vers*.

Furthermore, the average values for all types of IPV are shown in Table 2.

Table 2. mean Intimate Partner Violence (IPV)

No.	Type	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
1	Physical violence	70	2.64	1.31
2	Sexual violence	70	4.41	1.85
3	Psychological aggression	70	9.13	2.56
4	Stalking	70	3.30	1.54
5	Sexual health	70	1.14	0.86
	N	70		

Based on Table 2, it can be seen that the highest *mean* is in the type of IPV *psychological aggression* with a value of 9.13, while the lowest *mean* is in the type of IPV *sexual health* at 1.14. The data shows that *psychological aggression* IPV is the biggest type of IPV that affects IPV in homosexuals.

Furthermore, to provide an interpretation of the measuring instrument scores in this study, researchers used categorization based on the normal distribution model . Researchers used the hypothetical *mean*. According to Azwar (2010) the price or value of the hypothetical *mean* can be considered as the population *mean* which is categorized into, medium, low, and high.

Based on table 3. In the hypopthetic *mean*, the mean value of the population categorized into, moderate, low, and high with the types of IPV, namely physical violence, sexual violence, psychological aggression, stalking, and sexual health, is classified as moderate.

Table 3. Hypothetical mean of IPV

No.	Type IPV	Category Response	Norma	N	%
1	<i>Physical violence</i>	High	$X \geq 3.3$	20	28.57%
		Medium	$1.7 \leq X < 3.3$	35	50%
		Low	< 1.7	15	21.43%
2	<i>Sexual violence</i>	High	$X \geq 5.3$	20	29%
		Medium	$2.7 \leq X < 5.3$	39	55.71%
		Low	< 2.7	11	15.71%
3	<i>Psychological aggression</i>	High	$X \geq 9.3$	31	44%
		Medium	$4.7 \leq X < 9.3$	36	51.43%
		Low	< 4.7	3	4.29%
4	<i>Stalking</i>	High	$X \geq 4.7$	13	18.57%
		Medium	$2.3 \leq X < 4.7$	35	50%
		Low	< 2.3	22	31.43%
5	<i>Sexual Health</i>	High	$X \geq 3.3$	1	4.29%
		Medium	$1.7 \leq X < 3.3$	49	70%
		Low	< 1.7	18	25.71%
		Total		70	100%

Furthermore, each aspect will be seen in the overall score category

Table 4. IPV score categories

No.	Type	High	Medium	Low	Total
1	<i>Physical violence</i>	29%	29%	43%	100%
2	<i>Sexual violence</i>	29%	41%	30%	100%
3	<i>Psychological aggression</i>	36%	59%	6%	100%
4	<i>Stalking</i>	19%	50%	31%	100%
5	<i>Sexual health</i>	4%	31%	64%	100%

Table 4. shows the percentage of respondents regarding *Intimate Partner Violence* (IPV) in homosexual men. The percentage is done to see the percentage of types of IPV to make it clearer, especially in the high, medium, low sections. In the type of IPV *physical violence* that falls into the high category is 29%, 29% in the medium category, and 43% in the low category. In the type of IPV *sexual violence*, 29% were in the high category, 41% in the medium category, and 30% in the low category. In the type of IPV *psychological aggression* which falls into the high category of 36%, medium category 59%, and 6% in the low category. In the type of IPV *stalking* that falls into the high category of 19%, the medium category is 50%, and 31% in the low category. In the type of IPV *sexual health* that falls into the high category of 4%, 31% in the medium category, and 64% in the low category. So it can be said

that of the 5 types of IPV measured by homosexual male respondents, 3 types of IPV are in the moderate category, namely (*sexual violence, psychological aggression, stalking*), and 2 types of IPV are in the low category (*physical violence and sexual health*).

Based on the respondent description data, the *mean* results of *Intimate Partner Violence* (IPV) in homosexual men based on age are as follows:

Table 5. Mean value of IPV with aspects of respondents' description

No.	Aspects	<i>Physical violence</i>	<i>Sexual violence</i>	<i>Psychological aggression</i>	<i>Stalking</i>	<i>Sexual health</i>	Total mean score
1	Age						
	> 20 Years	2.78	4.73	9.22	3.36	1.11	21.38
	≤ 20 Years	2.4	3.84	8.96	3.2	1.2	19.6
2	Tribe						
	Java	2.6	4.47	9.37	3.67	1.13	21.5
	Sunda	2.54	3.54	8.85	3.08	1.31	19.31
	betawi	2.75	5.63	9.63	3.25	1.5	22.75
	Kalimantan	2.67	4.67	8.33	3.67	0.33	19.67
	Not clear	2.93	4.33	8.6	2.67	1	19.5
3	Last Education						
	HIGH SCHOOL	2.7	4.6	9.2	3.47	0.93	20.9
	D3	2.28	3.94	8.61	3.39	1.5	1.11
	S1	2.8	4.35	9.2	3.15	1.5	21
	S2	2.5	4.5	9	2	0.5	18.5
	Time Range						
4							
	<1 Year	3.67	5.33	9.67	3.67	1.33	23.67
	2-3 Years	2.6	4.15	9.05	3.25	1.35	20.7
	>3 Years	2.6	4.47	9.13	3.3	1.04	20
5	Gender roles						
	Top	2.22	3.96	8.48	3.48	1.39	19.52
	Bottom	3	4.81	9.52	3.63	0.96	22.22
	Vers	2.65	4.4	9.35	2.65	1.1	20.15

Based on table 5 at all ages, it shows that the highest *mean* of respondents with age > 20 years is in the type of IPV *psychological aggression* with a value of 9.22, while the lowest *mean* is in the type of IPV *sexual health* 1.11. The data shows that the *psychological aggression* dimension is the largest type of IPV that affects IPV in homosexuals with age > 20 years.

In all tribes, the highest *mean* of respondents with Betawi tribe was in the type of IPV *psychological aggression* with a value of 9.63, while the lowest *mean* was in the type of IPV *sexual health* at 1.31. The data shows that the type of IPV *psychological aggression* is the biggest type that affects IPV in homosexuals with Betawi ethnicity.

In all the last education, it shows that the highest *mean of* respondents with the last education of high school is in the type of IPV *psychological aggression* with a value of 9.63, while the lowest *mean* is in the type of IPV *sexual health* at 1.31. The data shows that *psychological aggression* IPV is the biggest type of IPV that affects IPV in homosexuals with a high school education.

In all time spans of being homosexual, it shows that the highest *mean of* respondents with a span of <1 year is in the type of IPV *psychological aggression* with a value of 9.67, while the lowest *mean* is in the type of IPV *Sexual health* at 1.33. The data shows that the type of IPV *psychological aggression* is the biggest type of IPV that affects IPV in homosexuals with a time span of <1 year.

In all gender roles, it shows that the highest *mean of* respondents with *bottom* gender roles is in the type of IPV *psychological aggression* with a value of 8.48, while the lowest *mean* is in the type of IPV *sexual health* at 0.96. The data shows that *psychological aggression* IPV is the biggest type of IPV that affects IPV in homosexuals with *bottom* gender roles.

Discussion

This study aims to describe *Intimate Partner Violence* (IPV) that occurs in homosexual men. Dutton, *et. al.* (2005), said IPV is a physically or sexually violent assault or treatment or psychological or emotional abuse perpetrated against a married partner, a partner who has been married, a girlfriend, a former girlfriend, or a dating partner. In this study, respondents experienced verbal violence such as psychological or emotional abuse. In table 2. it is known that the *mean psychological aggression* is 9.13, this type of IPV has the greatest effect among other types of IPV on IPV that occurs in homosexual men.

According to Satzman *et. al.* (2002), *psychological or emotional violence* can include insulting the victim, controlling what the victim should and should not do, ignoring everything the victim says, doing something that can make the victim feel discriminated against and humiliated, isolating the victim from friends or family, and not providing money or the victim's basic needs. This is similar to the type of IPV *psychological aggression*. Michael, *et. al* (2010), *psychological aggression* has two types, namely expression of aggression (calling out harshly, insulting, or humiliating their intimate partner) and coercive control, by having behaviors such as (threatening, monitoring, controlling their intimate partner). In this study, the *mean* type of IPV *sexual health* was the lowest type of IPV of all types of IPV. According to the *World Health Organization* (2006), *sexual health* requires a positive approach and respect for sexuality in sexual relationships. The thing that must be considered in *sexual health* is that

everyone's sexual rights must be respected and protected, such as sexual experiences that are pleasant, safe, and free from coercion and violence.

Researchers used the hypothetical *mean* in this study. According to Azwar (2010) the price or value of the hypothetical *mean* can be considered as the population *mean* which is categorized into, moderate, low, and high. Based on the hypothetical *mean* in table 3, researchers categorized respondents on each type of IPV. The results of the categorization are that all types of IPV, namely *sexual violence*, *stalking*, *physical violence*, *psychological aggression*, and *sexual health* are at a moderate level.

In addition, researchers also categorized the types of IPV as a whole, this proves that homosexual men in this study received IPV treatment from their partners which is classified as moderate, especially in the types of IPV *sexual violence*, *psychological aggression*, *stalking*. In table 4, the type of IPV *sexual violence* is in the moderate category with 41%, this shows that respondents experience this type of IPV in sexual violence which is quite vulnerable. This type of IPV *sexual violence* uses physical force in sexual acts against their partners. While the item that was answered "YES" by 92% of respondents was "my partner has used his authority (such as money, means of communication, a place to live given) to control me to have sex". The item explains that IPV perpetrators who want sexual intercourse, use physical strength by often giving gifts in the form of material or objects that their partners want.

The type of IPV *stalking* is in the moderate category with 50%, this proves that respondents experience a form of IPV in the aspect of *stalking* that is quite vulnerable. The type of IPV *stalking* is threatening or harassing a partner with excessive suspicion or spying by the perpetrator, often the victim feels afraid as if they want to be killed by their own partner. While the item that was answered "YES" by 64% of respondents was "my partner often calls and sends text messages with excessive intensity to me". The type of IPV *psychological aggression* is in the moderate category with 59%, this shows that IPV victims get verbal treatment in the form of expressions of aggression and coercive control. Verbal forms of *psychological aggression* for IPV victims are treated uncomfortably such as being called abusive names, insulted, or humiliated. IPV victims are also monitored, threatened and controlled by their partners. Based on this study, expression of aggression has the most results answered "YES" by 88% of respondents, with the item "I have been scolded by my partner, which makes me uncomfortable", while the most results answered "YES" by 92% of respondents on coercive control is "My partner once threatened not to give me money and would take back the money that had been given to me". This explains that most respondents received unpleasant treatment by being scolded by their partners. In addition, most respondents

were also threatened by their partners by not giving money or withdrawing money given by their partners, this reveals that someone who commits IPV is mostly in control by giving material such as money to their partner, and will withdraw it if the victim makes the perpetrator uncomfortable. The type of IPV *sexual health* is in the low category with 64%, this proves that based on the items answered by respondents, 61% of respondents mostly answered "YES", with the item "my partner has replaced special lubricants with *handbody lotion* for sexual intercourse". This explains that in sexual intercourse, IPV perpetrators replace special lubricants with *handbody lotion* to their victims. This explains that although IPV respondents from the IPV *sexual health* type are in the lowest category and *mean*, there are still perpetrators who harm respondents in aspect 5, such as using *handbody lotion* in sexual intercourse.

The description of respondents in this study has 5 aspects in table 5, namely: age, latest education, ethnicity, time span of being homosexual, and gender roles. Based on table 5 on age, the overall *mean* total age of homosexual men, under 20 years old and over 20 years old is in the aspect of *psychological aggression*, which is higher in getting IPV treatment is over 20 years old. This explains that homosexual men above 20 years of age receive higher IPV treatment than those aged 20 years and below. In the aspect of homosexual men's ethnicity, the highest mean value in homosexual men in Javanese, Sundanese, Betawi, Kalimantan, Chinese, and tribes that are not given a description of their type is *psychological aggression*. In this study, the overall *mean of* all tribes that received more IPV was the Javanese tribe. This explains that homosexual men of Javanese ethnicity are more vulnerable to IPV than other ethnic groups. The aspect of the last education of homosexual men, the highest mean value in types of IPV IPV of homosexual men in the last education of junior high school, high school, D3, S1, S2 is *psychological aggression*. In this study, the overall *mean* total of all the last education that received more IPV actions was the last education of high school. This explains that homosexual men who have a high school education are more vulnerable to IPV than other last education. The aspect of the time span of homosexual men, the highest mean value in the types of IPV IPV homosexual men under 1 year, 2-3 years, and more than 3 years is *psychological aggression*. In this study, the overall *mean of* the total time span of being a homosexual man between 1 year, 2-3 years, and more than 3 years, which is higher in getting IPV treatment is the time span under 1 year. This explains that homosexual men who are relatively new to being homosexual are victims of higher IPV acts than 2-3 years, and more than 3 years from their partners. In the aspect of gender roles, the highest mean value in IPV victims, both homosexual men with *bottom*, *top*, and *vers* gender roles, is *psychological aggression*. This explains that both *bottom*, *top*, and *vers* gender roles are equally the object of

IPV perpetrated by their partners. In homosexual men, the partner who is more feminine than the other partner takes the gender role of a woman or wife in the household and the partner who is more masculine takes the role of a man or husband in the household (Peplau, 1982). This leads to the *top* or masculine role being superior and holding a controlling role on their partner to be the perpetrator of IPV compared to the *bottom and vers*.

4. CONCLUSIONS AND ADVICE

Conclusions

Based on the research that has been conducted, the conclusion is that the types of IPV based on the frequency category, 3 of the 5 types are at a moderate level, namely *psychological aggression, stalking, and sexual health*, while 2 of the 3 types of IPV are at a low level, namely *physical violence, sexual violence*. Types of IPV based on hypothetical *mean* categories, *sexual violence, stalking, physical violence, psychological aggression, and sexual health* in IPV. *Psychological aggression* is the largest *mean* experienced by respondents. *Sexual health* is the smallest mean experienced by respondents.

Advice

The researcher also gave suggestions to future research, namely that further research is expected to conduct longitudinal research, in order to be able to explain more deeply and see other factors that influence the occurrence of IPV acts on homosexuals. Future research can conduct *mix & mathc* research by conducting quantitative and qualitative research simultaneously in the context of IPV in homosexual men.

Suggestions for homosexual men are that homosexual men can prevent IPV from happening to them, especially in the aspects that have been described, namely *sexual violence, stalking, physical violence, psychological aggression, and sexual health*, homosexual men know that the choice to become a homosexual man is risky and vulnerable to IPV, especially in the type of *psychological aggression*.

LITERATURE

- Alpert, E. J. (2004). *Massachusetts Medical Society Committee on Violence Intervention and Prevention* (5th ed.). Massachusetts: Medical Society.
- Anastasi, A., & Susana, U. (2007). *Psychological tests* (7th ed.). Hariono. Jakarta: PT Macanan Jaya Cemerlang.
- Anderson, J. E., Abraham, M., Bruessow, D. M., Coleman, R. D., McCharty, K. C., Harris-Odingbe, T., & Tong, C. K. (2008). Cross-cultural perspectives on intimate partner violence. *JAAPA*, October 10, 2012.
- Archer, J. (2006). Cross-cultural differences in physical aggression between partners: A social role analysis. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 10, 133-153.
- Azwar, S. (2008). *Human attitudes* (12th ed.). Yogyakarta: Student Library Offset.
- Azwar, S. (2010a). *Psychological scale formulation*. Yogyakarta: Student Library.
- Baron, R. A., & Richardson, D. R. (1994). *Human aggression* (2nd ed.). New York: Plenum.
- Black, C. M., Basile, S. G., Walters, M. G., Chen, J., & Stevens, M. (2010). *The National Intimate Partner and Sexual Violence Survey*. Atlanta, GA: National Center for Injury Prevention and Control, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.
- Caroll, J. L. (2005). *Sexuality now: Embracing diversity*. Belmont: Thomson Wadsworth.
- Coker, A. L., Davis, K. E., Arias, I., Desai, S., Sanderson, M., Brandt, H. M., & Smith, P. H. (2001). Physical and mental health effects of intimate partner violence for men and women. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine*, 24(4), 260-268.
- Creswell, J. W. (2005). *Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research*. New Jersey: Pearson Education, Inc.
- Dewi, D. B. (2005). Conflict and conflict resolution in gay individuals who marry the opposite sex. Depok: Faculty of Psychology, University of Indonesia.
- Dutton, M. A., El-Khoury, M., Murphy, M., Sumberg, R., & Bell, M. E. (2005). Women in intimate partner violence: Major advances and new directions.
- Fikria, W. (2008). Mutilation, Ryan is the sole perpetrator. *Kompas*. Retrieved February 3, 2013, from <http://www.kompas.com>
- Herdiansyah, H. (2010). *Qualitative research methodology for social sciences*. Jakarta: Salemba Humanika.
- Hogan, R. M. (1980). *Human sexuality: A nursing perspective*. London: Appleton Century Crofts.
- Kendal, D. (1998). *Social problems in a diverse society*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Kerlinger, F. N., & Lee, H. B. (2000). *Foundations of behavioral research* (4th ed.). Florida: Harcourt Inc.

- Machado, C., Caridade, S., & Martins, C. (2010). Violence in juvenile dating relationships: Self-reported prevalence and attitudes in a Portuguese sample. *Journal of Family Violence*, 25, 43-52.
- Murray, C. E., Mobley, A. K., Buford, A. P., & Seaman-DeJohn, M. M. (2006). Same-sex intimate partner violence: Dynamics, social context, and counseling implications. *The Journal of LGBT Issues in Counseling*, 1(4), 7-30.
- Neale, J. M., Davison, G. C., & Haaga, D. A. F. (1996). *Exploring abnormal psychology*. Michigan: J. Wiley.
- Neuman, W. L. (2000). *Social research methods: Qualitative and quantitative approaches* (4th ed.). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Nevid, J. S., Fichner-Rathus, L., & Rathus, S. A. (1995). *Human sexuality* (2nd ed.). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Nisfiannoor, M. (2009). *Modern statistical approaches: For the social sciences*. Jakarta: Salemba Humanika.
- Okenwa, L., & Lawoko, S. (2010). Social indicators and physical abuse of women by intimate partners: A study of women in Zambia. *Journal of Violence and Victims*, 25(2). Retrieved from <http://www.proquest.umi.com>.
- Patricia, T., & Nancy, T. (2000). Extent, nature, and consequences of intimate partner violence. Findings from the National Violence Against Women Survey.
- Patrick, C. M., Serovich, J. M., Mason, T. L., & Mosack, K. E. (2006). Perpetration of gay and lesbian partner violence: A disempowerment perspective. *Journal of Family Violence*, 21(4), 233-243.
- Peplau, L. A. (1982). Research on homosexual couples: An overview. *Journal of Homosexuality*, 8(2), 1-6.
- Poskota.com. (2012, December 11). Same-sex romance of young designer murdered. Retrieved February 3, 2013, from <http://www.poskotanews.com/2012/12/11/association-equal-types-designers-young-murdered/>
- Saltzman, L. E., Fanslow, J. L., McMahon, P. M., & Shelley, G. A. (2002). *Intimate partner violence surveillance: Uniform definitions and recommended data elements*. Atlanta, GA: Centers for Disease Control, National Center for Injury Prevention and Control, Division of Violence Prevention.
- Santrock, J. W. (2006). *Life-span development* (10th ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Schafer, J., Caetano, R., & Clark, C. L. (1998). Rates of intimate partner violence among U.S. couples. *American Journal of Public Health*, 88, 1702-1704.
- Schuler, C. A. (2010). Male victims of intimate partner violence in the United States: An examination of the review of literature through the critical theoretical perspective. *International Journal of Criminal Justice Sciences (IJCJS)*, 5(1), 163-173.

- Sekaran, U., & Bougie, R. (2010). *Research methods for business: A skill-building approach*. United Kingdom: John Wiley & Sons.
- Sugiyono. (2007). *Quantitative, qualitative, and R&D research methods*. Bandung: Alfabeta.
- Sunaryo. (2002). *Psychology for nursing*. Jakarta: EGC.
- Suryabrata, S. (2009). *Development of psychological measurement tools*. Yogyakarta: Andi Offset.
- Vandello, J. A., & Cohen, D. (2008). Culture, gender, and men's intimate partner violence. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*, 652-667.
- William, L., Tianfu, W., Edward, O. L., Suiming, P., & Ye, L. (2004). Intimate partner violence in China: National prevalence, risk factors, and associated health problems. *Journal of Violence*, 30(4).
- Williams, B. K., Sawyer, S. C., & Wahlstrom, C. M. (2006). *Marriage, families, and intimate relationships*. USA: Pearson Education, Inc.
- Winarsunu, T. (2007). *Statistics in psychology and education research* (4th ed.). Malang: UMM Press.
- World Health Organization. (2002). *World report on violence and health*. Retrieved from <http://www.who.int/>.
- World Health Organization. (2006). *World report on sexual and reproductive health*. Retrieved from <http://www.who.int/>.