

An Examination of Monogamy Values among Gay Men and the Influence of Masculine
Gender Conformity

by

Christopher Ron Shillington

A thesis submitted in conformity with the requirements
for the degree of Master of Arts
Department of Applied Psychology and Human Development
Ontario Institute for Studies in Education
University of Toronto

© copyright by Christopher Ron Shillington, 2013

Master of Arts in Counselling Psychology for Psychology Specialists,

November 2013

Christopher Ron Shillington

Department of Applied Psychology and Human Development

University of Toronto

Abstract

Monogamy values and the influence of masculine conformity were examined using a sample of 154 gay men within the Greater Toronto Area. Monogamy values were measured on four dimensions: emotional monogamy, sexual monogamy, perceptions of monogamy as relationship-enhancing and perceptions of monogamy as a sacrifice. Gay men generally found monogamy to be enhancing, however, they tended to value emotional monogamy more than sexual monogamy. Gay men with traditionally masculine attitudes valued sexual monogamy less than those who held non-traditional attitudes. Emotional monogamy was not associated with masculine attitudes. This relationship of masculine attitudes and monogamy values was moderated by length of longest relationship experienced, religiosity, as well as current relational status. Results are interpreted through evolutionary, social learning and queer theory perspectives to suggest that monogamy values are a multi-faceted construct. Counsellors would benefit by asking questions regarding monogamy values expecting multiple interpretations as well applications.

Acknowledgements

I would like to express gratitude to my thesis committee Dr. Joseph R. Gillis and Dr. Suzanne Stewart for their continual support throughout my Master's thesis process. Thank you Dr. Stewart for your encouragement to transfer to the M.A. program. It has been one of my greatest challenges in life to date; such challenges build strength of character and for that I am grateful. I would also like to thank Dr. Evelyn McMullen for her dedication, time and support with the statistical analysis and interpretation of this research; you were a pleasure to work with and your kind supportive words were appreciated.

Dedications

To my loving (monogamous) parents who taught me to be brave and bold in life and love, to be unashamedly 'me' and to cherish relationships for the gifts they are. To my beautifully inspiring husband, who pushes me, while holding me through life's challenges. Your support throughout this process has been patient, constant and loving, you emulate the values that I hope to one day embody as a psychotherapist; all my love and respect to you in return, there is no other man I would rather journey through life with. And lastly to all the queer pioneers before me who courageously pushed for visibility, sharing their experiences thereby creating space for research such as this to exist within the field of psychology, I am grateful to live in this time and place where I can exercise such privileges. Thank You.

Table of Contents

Abstract	ii
Acknowledgements	iii
Dedications	iv
Introduction	1
Monogamism/Mononormativity	2
Monogamy and Gender: Theoretical Perspectives	3
The Relationship Between Gender and Extra-Relational Behaviour	5
Sexual Orientation and Gender Non/Conformity	7
Gay Men and Monogamy	8
Relationship Counselling & Gay Men	9
The Study	11
Method	13
Participants	13
Procedures	14
Measures	15
Results	19
Inter-Correlations of the Measures	19
Mean Group Differences within the Monogamy Measures	19
Non/Traditional Masculine Conformity and Monogamy Values	20
Religiosity and Monogamy Values	21
Length of Relationship and Monogamy Values	22
Age and Monogamy Values	22

Relationship Status and Monogamy Values	23
Discussion	23
Limitations To The Current Study and Future Research	31
Tables	
Table 1. Descriptive Statistics	34
Table 2. Monogamy Values by Degree of Masculine Conformity	34
Table 3. Monogamy Attitudes by Degree of Masculine Conformity	34
Table 4. Multivariate Analyses of Variance for Monogamy Values and Masculine Conformity	35
Table 5. Inter-correlations among Monogamy Values and Attitudes for Traditional/Non-Traditional Masculine Conformity	35
References	36
Appendices	
A. Monogamy Attitudes Scale	42
B. Emotional and Sexual Monogamy Views Scale	44
C. The Conformity to Masculine Norms Inventory – 46	47

Introduction

An essential part of healthy human development is forming intimate relationships (Baumeister & Leary, 1995; MacDonald, 1992). In North America, with the exception of select sub-cultural groups, monogamy, defined as “the practice or state of being married to or having a sexual relationship with only one partner,” (The Oxford Dictionary) is the prescribed norm of exclusivity within romantic relationships. It is largely accepted as the healthiest and most ‘natural’ form of a union between two individuals (Erikson, 1964), despite our modern day sex characteristics indicating a genetic predisposition toward sexual non-monogamy (Ryan & Jetha, 2010). This contradiction commonly results in serial-monogamy, the practice of engaging in romantic or sexual relationships (short or long term) in succession. Monogamy in this sense, however, is not the norm worldwide; in fact, only 16 percent of the 853 cultures on record prescribe monogamy (Tsapelas, Fisher & Aron, 2011). Non-monogamy, (commonly referred to as open relationships) is a relationship structure that allows for numerous variations with regard to exclusivity and is often viewed as deviant, unhealthy, or “less ideal” by modern North American values. One sub-culture that has embraced alternative ways of forming romantic relationships despite prescriptive relational norms is the queer community (Rose, 1996). Queer, being an umbrella identity including but not limited to gay, lesbian, bisexual and trans individuals (GayCentre.org). It is important that the psychological community better understand the unique nature of these individual’s romantic relationships not only to inform the counselling profession when working with this community, but to also learn from a community which actively re-defines relational norms within the structure of their intimate relationships as a reflection of their values. Non-monogamy has been

documented among gay men. (Adam, 2006; Barker & Langdridge, 2010; Blasband & Paplau, 1985; Bryant & Demian, 1994; Gotta, et. al, 2011; LaSala, 2004, 2005; Parsons et al., 2012; 2013) The present study examines the value of monogamy among gay men residing within the Greater Toronto Area and how their monogamy values relate to individual traditional or non-traditional masculine conformity.

Monogamism/ Mononormativity

High incidences of reported infidelity in monogamous relationships have resulted in numerous researchers studying patterns and attitudes regarding a closely related construct to monogamy, extra-relational sex or/ infidelity (Choi, Catania & Dolcini, 1994; Kinsey et al, 1953; Laumann et al, 2004; Leigh, Temple & Trocki, 1993; Smith, 1991). Little research however has focused specifically on the value system that structures and gives meaning to infidelity, monogamy or what sociologist Dr. Eric Anderson refers to as *monogamism*, “the privileged sexual paradigm that promotes monogamy as the only acceptable sexual script and discriminates against other relational dynamics “(Anderson, 2012, p. 193). This paradigm is also referred to within the literature as *mononormativity*, a term coined by Pieper & Bauer in 2005 referring to the dominant assumptions of the normalcy and naturalness of monogamy (Pieper & Bauer, 2005). It is important that researchers and clinicians attune to their own biases with respect to monogamy, as these values are deeply engrained value within North American society. To research infidelity or ‘cheating’ is to approach monogamy from a sex-negative or mononormative perspective. It is essential to study the valuing of monogamy as a separate construct, distinct from attitudes and behaviours concerning infidelity. Values and behaviour have not been found to be congruent within individuals. It has been

shown that one can state that they value and self-identify as monogamous, while still having extra-relational sex or conversely, not believe in monogamy and yet remain monogamous (Schmookler & Bursik, 2007). These contradictions highlight the complexity of monogamy and extra-relational sex research as well as the importance of researching monogamy values separate from infidelity behaviour.

Monogamy and Gender: Theoretical Perspectives

Two distinct theories offer the most comprehensive explanations within the literature on the construct of monogamy, and similarly apply to gender development. Firstly, biological determinism is, the belief that our genetic make up alone predisposes individuals to behave the way they do and excludes the notion of free-will/choice (Pinker, 2008). Similar to biological determinism is the evolutionary perspective, the belief that behaviors are the result of evolutionary succession (Darwin, 1859) and ancestral imprinting (Malamuth, 1996). Secondly, socialization, or social learning theory takes a psychosocial approach in the examination of norms, mores and values within a given society and how they relate to human psychology or behaviour (Lott & Maluso, 1993).

With respect to monogamy, the evolutionary perspective looks at human biology, sex characteristics, as well as our closest genetic match in the animal kingdom, chimpanzees/bonobos. Research from an evolutionary perspective offers numerous theories and explanations for our present mating practices, with varying opinions. Some evolutionary theorists argue that in examination of our modern day sex characteristics as well as our closest genetic relatives it is evident that we are not genetically predisposed toward sexual monogamy (Ryan & Jetha, 2010). Meta-analysis of evolutionary research with respect to monogamy shows that sexual monogamy is not within our biological

nature. We are a sexually promiscuous, monogamy-valuing society (Anderson, 2012, Ryan & Jetha, 2010).

Social learning theory similarly identifies the contradiction of sexually promiscuous behaviour and monogamous values. This theory states that similar to gender identity formation, agents of socialization reinforce the value of sexual monogamy and promote it as the only healthy form of romantic relationship. Two such examples include the government, which identifies sexual infidelity as just cause for legal divorce, or Christianity, the dominant influential religion in North America, which generally restricts most sexual activity aside from married, monogamous, heterosexual potentially reproductive sex. Social learning theory explains infidelity patterns and behaviour as resulting from covert attitudes that permit individuals (primarily men) to engage in extra-relational sex, providing it is secretive and not openly valued. Most modern theorists today however subscribe to a bio-psychosocial perspective, a combination of biology and socialization accounting for the sexual paradox of promiscuous behaviour and monogamous values (Ryan & Jetha, 2010).

With respect to gender identity, the evolutionary perspective states that our biological sex, or rather the assignment of a biological sex largely dictates which gender we are likely to conform to and that the performance of gendered behaviours are a result of our genetic make-up and hormones (Ryan & Jetha, 2010). Evolutionary psychologists believe that males perform their gender in stereotypically “masculine” ways as a result of testosterone resulting in higher sex drives. Conversely, social learning theory argues that various agents of socialization such as family, school, church, government etc. dictate gender appropriate behaviours (Jacklin & Reynolds, 1993). “Masculinity is

conceptualized as culturally defined, embedded in social relations of power, (such as those just mentioned) and acted on by individuals through performative aspects of behavior” (Wheldon & Pathak, 2010, p.461). Regardless of the theoretical framework used to examine gender conformity and monogamy values, gender differences are apparent in the literature. It is important then to study same-sex relationships, as it could be hypothesized that some of these found differences within opposite-sex relationships may in fact be relational similarities for same-sex couples.

The Relationship Between Gender and Extra-Relational Behaviour

In 2007, Schmookler & Bursik initiated the process in bridging the gap between infidelity research and monogamy values by creating two measures, the Monogamy Attitudes Scale and the Emotional and Sexual Monogamy Views Scale. Schmookler and Bursik found that heterosexual men and women differ in their valuing of monogamy such that women were found to value both emotional and sexual monogamy more strongly than men. Both men and women perceived monogamy to be relationship enhancing, however, men were more likely to view monogamy as a personal sacrifice (Schmookler & Bursik, 2007). Furthermore, individuals that internalized traditional gender roles were found to value monogamy in the following ways: (1) traditionally masculine individuals reported to value sexual monogamy significantly less than traditionally feminine individuals; and (2) traditionally masculine individuals reported valuing emotional monogamy less than traditionally feminine. These gender differences in the valuing of monogamy form the theoretical underpinnings for the present study, which will examine the valuing of monogamy among a population of gay men, and measure the extent to which non/traditional masculine beliefs influence these values.

In support of Schmookler's & Bursik's 2007 research, several gender differences have been found with respect to extra-relational sex. Relative to women, men have been found to be more likely to engage in ongoing sexual relationships without wanting emotional involvement (Townsend, 1995), and give reasons for engaging in sexual behaviour that emphasize sexual pleasure and recreation, rather than intimacy (Leigh, 1989). Numerous studies support this, showing that men in contrast to women are more likely to cognitively separate love from sex (Banfield & McCabe, 2001; Duncombe & Marsden, 1999; LaSala, 2004; Nabavi, 2004; Lawson, 1988). This is a form of compartmentalization and supports Schmookler's and Bursik's distinction between sexual and emotional monogamy. Within psychology, compartmentalization is defined "as an unconscious defense mechanism used to avoid cognitive dissonance, or the mental discomfort and anxiety caused by a person having conflicting values, cognitions, emotions, beliefs, etc. within themselves" (Leary & Tangney, 2012, p. 58). This definition is inherently biased as compartmentalization is potentially healthy and adaptive particularly when cognitive dissonance results from the discomfort between one's biology and imposed mononormativity. This contention is supported through Anderson's theory of dyadic dissonance theory, which states that "the social processes that take young men from a disposition of expecting monogamy of themselves, to valuing monogamy but nonetheless cheating" (Anderson, 2005, p.192), is a form of cognitive dissonance that can be viewed as adaptive.

Men and women differ in their jealousy responses to perceived infidelity. Several studies have shown that women appear to be more threatened by their male partner's emotional infidelity whereas men may be more threatened by women's sexual infidelity

(Bhowon, Ah-Kion, Tseung-Wong, 2004; Schützwohl, Koch, 2004; Buunk, & Dijkstra, 2004). It is unclear if these differences are biological or a socially conditioned difference between men and women. What is clear, however, is that these repeatedly found differences with respect to extra-relational sex contribute to some of the found gender variances in monogamy values.

Many researchers have attempted to correlate relationship satisfaction with extra-relational sex, with mixed results. Glass and Wright (1985, 1992) found that more than half of the men in their sample who had extra-relational sex stated that their marriages were happy or very happy, and that they pursued extramarital relationships for sexual excitement, rather than emotional fulfillment (LaSala, 2004, 2005). In a similar study, looking at gender differences in extra-relational sex, the quality of the relationship was not found to be a factor. The only observed difference between men and women was that women tended to incorporate ‘emotional infidelity’ in addition to ‘sexual infidelity’ within their extra-relational relationships (Cohen, 2006). Among gay men it has been repeatedly found that no significant differences in relationship quality or satisfaction between samples of sexually exclusive and non-exclusive male couples exist (Blasband & Peplau, 1985; Bonello, 2009; LaSala, 2004, 2005; Wagner, et.al., 2000). It is evident that men and women’s understanding and experience of monogamy is quantifiably different from one another and, therefore, relationships between two men may potentially value and practice monogamy differently than opposite-sex partnerships.

Sexual Orientation and Gender Non/Conformity

The gendered pattern of findings found by Schmookler & Bursik (2007) pose interesting questions when applied to gay men. It has been found that homosexual men

and women on average tend to be more gender nonconforming than their heterosexual peers (Lippa, 2000, 2002; Pillard, 1991) particularly in traits such as voice, movement, and appearance (Ambady, Hallahan, & Conner, 1999; Bailey, 2003). While gender non-conformity and sexual orientation appear to be related, not all lesbians and gay men are gender non-conforming. Many lesbians and gay men report sex-typical behaviour and interests (Bailey, Kim, Hills, & Linsenmeier, 1997; Bailey & Zucker, 1995; Friedman & Downey, 1999). The relationship between gender non-conformity and sexual orientation, although documented in many studies, is complex and not yet fully understood and needs to be further explored before drawing conclusions based on heterosexual populations. Due to the complex nature of the relationship between sexual orientation and gender conformity it is difficult to predict how gender may influence monogamy values for gay men.

Gay Men and Monogamy

Many researchers within the field of gay and lesbian studies have contributed to the growing body of knowledge regarding gay men and monogamy. It has been found that one of the defining differences within the intimate relationships of gay men is the departure from the normative values surrounding monogamy (Anderson, 2012; Blumstein & Schwartz, 1983; Demaian, 1994). Previous studies comparing samples of gay male and lesbian couples (Bryant & Demian, 1994; Wagner, Remien, & Carballo-Diequez, 2000) or comparing gay, lesbian, and heterosexual couples (Blumstein & Schwartz, 1983), repeatedly found that gay male respondents are more likely to be in unions that allow extra-relational sex (LaSala, 2005). Quantitative surveys report finding as many as 90% of gay men having slept with someone other than their primary partner since the

relationship began (Blasband & Peplau, 1985). One study found that only 26% of the male couples in the sample remained monogamous. In each case, the couple had been together less than three years (Adam, 2006). Similarly, research has found that non-monogamous agreements are more common among older gay men as well as men in relationships of a longer duration (Prestage et al., 2008). Gay men are also more likely to discuss the topic of non-monogamy compared to their heterosexual counterparts (Gotta et al, 2011), indicating that gay men feel an amount of freedom in defining their intimate relationships in a way that heterosexuals do not. It is interesting to note that when infidelity occurs within gay male relationships, it rarely leads to the males contesting the value of monogamy within their relationship (Anderson, 2012). Again, gay men seem to experience a form of cognitive dissonance with respect to the value of monogamy and their sexuality.

Relationship Counselling & Gay Men

The dominant discourse within psychological research tends to present monogamous coupling as the only natural and/or morally correct form of human relating (Rubin, 1984). No research to date has focused on the potential benefits of counselling couples toward a consensual non-monogamous relationship. Several interview style, qualitative studies have looked at non-monogamy within gay male relationships, ultimately offering little more than case studies of individuals who have managed to navigate non-monogamy within a monocentric, heteronormative (a body of norms with assume and privilege heterosexuality) (Kitzinger, 2005) society. “The mental health profession has historically demonstrated heterocentric and homophobic beliefs, prejudices, and practices against (gay) individuals” (Pachankis & Goldfried, 2013). As a

result clinicians outdated in ethical practice with the lesbian, gay, bisexual, trans (LGBT) community may be prone to problematize non-traditional values within the relationships of their gay male clients, such as non-monogamous arrangements (Anderson, 2012). Blasband and Peplau (1985) found that when comparing gay men in monogamous and non-monogamous relationships, the men did not differ on measures of love, liking, relationship satisfaction, or commitment. Another study found that men, who practiced some form of non-monogamy within their relationships, reported lower rates of depression when compared with single men and higher rates of life satisfaction compared to both single men and monogamous men (Parsons et al., 2011). This suggests that mutually consensual non-monogamous relationships have the potential to be just as or even more satisfying than monogamous relationships. It was also found that non-monogamous relationships are not inherently associated with sexual dissatisfaction or communication difficulties within gay male relationships (Parsons et al., 2011). It was further noted that couples in non-monogamous relationships had been together as long as or longer than couples in monogamous relationships (Parsons et al., 2011). Research that does not privilege monogamy as an ideal, such as the study by Parsons et al., is limited. As previously cited, research shows these assumptions are potentially problematic when working with gay male clients. It is imperative that practitioners educate themselves with the most current research on the various forms and dynamics found within non-monogamous relationships. For example, gay men often implement rules that govern the extra-relational sex in order to protect the primary relationship, such as no sleep overs, never with the same person more than twice, anal sex only within the primary relationship, never in the couple's own home, only threesomes etc. (LaSala, 2001). A

clinician versed in the most current and relevant research on the importance of countering heterocentrism as well as monocentricism is better suited to offering meaningful helpful counseling to gay couples or individuals.

It is evident in examination of the existing literature that research on monogamy values is only just beginning to scratch the surface in terms of the complexities and varying dynamics found, not only within gay male relationships, but relationships of all orientations. Dominant and prescriptive ideals of how intimate relationships should be structured are still quite pervasive, not only secularly but also within the academic/counselling community. Most current practicing marriage and couples therapists promote fidelity and will not entertain non-monogamy as a possibility for couples struggling within their sex lives (Pittman & Wagers, 2005). These aforementioned findings support the necessity for further research into the value system of non/monogamy as experienced and understood by gay men.

The Study

The present study measured gay men within Toronto and the Greater Toronto Area on four dimensions: the value of emotional monogamy, the value sexual monogamy, perceptions of monogamy as a relationship-enhancing, and perceptions of monogamy as a sacrifice necessary to be in a committed relationship. This study expands upon previous theory and research which to date has compared only heterosexual men and women's valuing of monogamy. There are two publications using Schmoekler and Bursik's monogamy scales (The Monogamy Attitudes Scale and The Emotional and Sexual Monogamy Views Scale) both measuring heterosexual populations. In addition to the two monogamy value measures, a measure of traditional masculinity conformity was

included to better understand the gendered component previously found within heterosexual samples. Based on the findings from Schmookler's and Bursik's study and existing research on gay men and extra-relational sex, several predictions were made.

First, it was predicted that gay men would differ in their attitudes toward sexual and emotional monogamy, in that they would value emotional monogamy over sexual monogamy. Sexual monogamy has been found to be less important among gay males relative to the importance placed on emotional monogamy within their relationships (Bunello & Cross, 2010; LaSala, 2005).

Second, gay men will report similar levels of valuing monogamy, perceiving it as both enhancing and sacrificing. Research supports this conflicted position citing gay men's cognitive dissonance stemming from their desire for both monogamous committed relationships and casual sex at the same time (Trussler, Perchal & Barker, 2000).

Third, it was predicted that gay men who score higher, (traditional masculine conformity) on the Conformity to Masculine Norms Inventory-46 (CMNI-46) (Parent & Moradi, 2009) will value both sexual as well as emotional monogamy less than those who score lower on the CMNI-46 (non-traditional masculine conformity). This was predicted based on Schmookler's and Bursik's finding that traditionally masculine individuals value sexual and emotional monogamy less than traditionally feminine individuals (Schmookler & Bursik, 2007).

Fourth, with respect to traditional masculinity conformity it is predicted that those who score higher on the CMNI-46 (traditional masculine conformity) will report monogamy as more of a relational sacrifice than relationship enhancing. Gay men who score as less traditionally gender conforming in contrast, will report monogamy as more

enhancing than sacrificing. Those who score high, endorsing traditional masculine norms will perceive monogamy as less enhancing and more of a relational sacrifice relative to those who score lower on the CMNI-46 (non-traditional masculine conformity).

Fifth, it is predicted that gay men who attend church will perceive monogamy as more enhancing than sacrificing subscale relative to those who do not attend church. Similarly, those who attend church will value both sexual and emotional monogamy more than those who do not attend church; this is supported within the literature (Zaleski & Schiaffino, 2000).

Lastly it is predicted that the length of the longest romantic relationship a participant has experienced will influence their monogamy values (Prestage et al., 2008; Adam, 2006). Gay men who have been in relationships lasting longer than five years will be more likely to report monogamy as a relational sacrifice and less likely to report monogamy as enhancing. Similarly, individuals who have experienced relationships that lasted longer than five years will report valuing emotional monogamy significantly more than sexual monogamy. For those who had not been in a relationship longer than five years it is predicted that they will report monogamy as more enhancing than sacrificing and will similarly value emotional monogamy over sexual monogamy.

Method

Participants

The sample included 154 cisgendered gay men from within Toronto and the Greater Toronto Area (GTA). Of the participants who met the criteria only 12 surveys were incomplete, missing more than one or two questions. Nearly 300 individuals attempted to complete the survey however did not meet the criteria, the majority of these

instances being heterosexual men and women. It was not possible to determine a response rate, as it was not possible to track the number of people who viewed the posting call for participants. Participants ranged in age from 19 to 69 years ($M = 31.43$, $SD = 8.04$). Thirty-nine participants chose to not disclose their age. However, there were no statistically significant differences on any of the dependent variables when comparing those who reported their age and those who did not. Approximately 81% of the participants were Caucasian, 1% Black African/ Caribbean, 3% South Asian, 1% East Asian, 2% Middle Eastern, 1% South East Asian, 1% Hispanic, and 10% were of mixed descent. Participants identified themselves as either gay (90%), bisexual (2%) or queer (8%). Ninety percent of the sample resided within urban Toronto and 10% sub-urban (GTA). Ninety-six percent of the participants had some degree of post-secondary education with 42% having completed an undergraduate degree and 26% having completed a post-graduate degree. Ninety-six percent of the participants described themselves as totally or mostly out, with only one participant describing himself as totally closeted.

Religiosity was measured by frequency of church attendance. Seventy-one percent of participants reported never attending church, 25% reported attending from 1 to 5 times a year, three percent once a week and one percent more than once a week. Relationship status at the time of survey completion broke down as follows: 29% single, 14% casually dating, 28% in a relationship with a man, 16% in a common-law relationship with a man and 12% were married to a man. Length of longest relationship was recorded in months and ranged from 0 to 300 months ($M = 54.46$ months or 4.5 years, $SD = 49.93$, MDN: 36 months or 3 years).

Procedure

Participants were primarily recruited through the use of gay males in the Facebook community who had access to many gay male Facebook friends. A snowball recruiting effect then happened whereby gay men reading the initial post would then post the link to the survey on their Facebook wall asking their “Facebook friends” to post it as well. This generated the majority 92% of responses to the survey. Posters were also put up within the local queer community centre, within the University of Toronto’s Sexual Diversity Department, and on bulletin boards around Church St, Toronto’s queer village. In order to qualify for the study, participants were required to self-identify as gay, male, be over the age of 18 and currently reside within Toronto or the GTA. Interested participants followed a link to the online survey prompting them to answer several qualifying questions before directing them to the consent form, which gave a detailed explanation of the research, the survey process and the right to withdraw. The Ethical Review Board of the University of Toronto approved the research project.

Consistent with research ethics principles, all participants were assured of the confidentiality and anonymity of their data. They were asked to answer the questions as honestly as possible. On average participants took approximately 20 minutes to complete all measures. Upon completion of the survey, participants were given the opportunity to enter an optional draw for a \$50 VISA gift card, as well as the option to request a summary of the results. Participants were also provided with a list of community resources they could access in the event that they should feel any anxiety, or have any concerns resulting from the research survey.

Measures

Participants who consented to complete the survey completed a series of questionnaires, including demographic variables, items pertaining to values surrounding monogamy, (see Appendix A and B) as well as a measure of conformity to traditional masculinity scale. (See Appendix C). These included The Monogamy Attitudes Scale (MAS), the Emotional and Sexual Monogamy Views Scale (ESMVS) and the Conformity to Masculine Norms Inventory-46 (CMNI-46) and were administered in this order.

The Monogamy Attitudes Scale (*MAS*) (Schmookler & Bursik, 2007) was designed to assess the degree to which an individual views being monogamous as enhancing of a relationship in and of itself, as well as the degree to which an individual views being monogamous as a sacrifice to be made for the sake of the relationship. The measure consists of 16 items that are rated on a 7-point Likert scale (1 = “strongly disagree;” 7 = “strongly agree”). Eight of the items were designed to reflect attitudes that hold monogamy as enhancing, such as “Monogamy feels natural and healthy to me” and “Monogamy builds intimacy between two people.” Eight of the items evaluate the extent to which an individual views monogamy as a sacrifice, such as “Monogamy blocks natural drives” and “By being in a monogamous relationship, I am sacrificing my desires to have experiences with other people.” Each set of eight items is summed to yield a score for Enhancing (*MAS-ENH*) attitudes and a score for sacrificing (*MAS-SAC*) attitudes; total scores range from 8 to 56. Internal consistency for the enhancing subscale ($\alpha = .916$) and sacrificing subscale ($\alpha = .831$) were found to be acceptable and comparable to previous uses of the scale with other populations.

The Emotional and Sexual Monogamy Views Scale (*ESMVS*) (Schmookler & Bursik, 2007) measures the extent to which an individual values being emotionally monogamous with a partner as well as the extent to which sexual monogamy is valued. All questions pertain to the individual's attitudes towards his own commitment in a monogamous relationship. Eleven items measure each dimension of monogamy, with items rated on a 7-point Likert scale (1 = "strongly disagree," 7 = "strongly agree"). Items that measure sexual monogamy attitudes were designed to mirror items assessing emotional monogamy attitudes, with approximately half of the items reverse-keyed. Items on the valuing of emotional monogamy subscale include "Falling in love with someone other than my partner is okay, I wish I could have an emotional romantic relationship with someone other than my partner," and "I have no interest in falling in love with another person while I am in this relationship." Items on the valuing of sexual monogamy subscale include, "I wish that I could have a sexual experience with someone other than my partner," and "I have no interest in having a sexual experience with anyone other than my partner while in this relationship." Scores range from 11 to 77 for each subscale. Internal consistency for the Emotional subscale (*ESMVS-EMO*) ($\alpha = .837$) and Sexual subscale (*ESMVS-SEX*) ($\alpha = .938$) were found to be acceptable and comparable to previous samples.

The Conformity to Masculine Norms Inventory-46 (*CMNI-46*) (Parent & Moradi, 2009) is the brief version based on the original *CMNI* (Mahalik et al., 2003). The *CMNI* assesses an individual's conformity to traditional and non-traditional masculine norms. It measures masculine norms that are common in masculinity literature and in American cultural beliefs and attitudes (Mahalik et al., 2003). The original *CMNI* consisted of 94

items and measured 11 masculine norms, including winning, emotional control, risk-taking, violence, power over women, playboy, self-reliance, primacy of work, dominance, pursuit of status, and heterosexual self-presentation. Sample items on the CMNI include, “In general, I will do anything to win” (winning scale), and “If I could, I would frequently change sexual partners” (playboy scale). Items on this measure were scored on a four-point Likert-type scale, from 0 (strongly disagree) to 3 (strongly agree). Because of the length of the original CMNI, the CMNI-46 was developed through a confirmatory factor-analytic study that reduced the length of the CMNI measure to about half, while still maintaining the original factor structure (Parent & Moradi, 2009). The internal consistency of the overall scale was acceptable ($\alpha = .834$) with an average of ($\alpha = .811$) across the subscales. The subscale measuring heterosexual self-presentation was removed, as it was inappropriate in surveying gay men. Results indicated that the CMNI-46 was theoretically consistent with the original CMNI measure and previous uses on other populations.

Prior to completing the three questionnaires participants responded to several socio-demographic questions including: age, ethnicity, education, outness, religiosity, current relationship status and length of longest relationship to date. Several other questions were asked regarding monogamy status, sexual patterns within their longest relationship, frequency of monogamy being discussed within the relationship and whether or not the sexual patterns reflected what was negotiated.

Results

Inter-correlation of the Measures

Pearson product-moment correlations were calculated for all four monogamy variables (MAS-ENH, MAS-SAC, ESMVS-SEX, ESMVS-EMO) and indicated moderate associations ranging from .383 to -.692. Views of monogamy as a sacrifice were negatively associated with views of MAS-ENH, $r = -.621, p < .01$, as well as with valuing of emotional, $r = -.492, p < .01$, and MAS-SEX, $r = -.692, p < .01$. Views of monogamy as enhancing were positively correlated with the valuing of both sexual, $r = .681, p < .01$ and emotional monogamy, $r = .383, p < .01$. Sexual and emotional monogamy were also positively associated, $r = .536, p < .01$. These patterns of correlations show strong evidence for construct validity of these scales, and compare favourably with previous research.

Mean Group Differences within the Monogamy Measures (MAS & ESMVS)

It was predicted that gay men would generally value emotional monogamy over sexual monogamy. A paired-samples t -test indicated that scores were significantly higher for the emotional monogamy subscale ($M = 52.32, SD = 13.01$) than for the sexual monogamy subscale ($M = 43.86, SD = 20.21$), $t(151) = 6.219, p < .001, d = 0.50$ (see Table 2). Secondly, it was predicted that participants would report monogamy as equally enhancing and sacrificing. A paired-samples t -test indicated that in fact, scores were significantly lower for the sacrificing subscale ($M = 30.08, SD = 9.86$) than for the enhancing subscale ($M = 36.27, SD = 11.30$), $t(151) = 4.01, p < .001, d = .33$ (see Table 3) indicating that participants generally perceive monogamy to more relationship enhancing than sacrificing.

Non/Traditional Masculine Conformity and Monogamy Values

Participants were quartiled based on CMNI scores and those in the high and low groups were compared (CMNI_{low}, CMNI_{high}). It was predicted that CMNI_{high} participants would value both emotional and sexual monogamy less than CMNI_{low} participants. This was found in the case of sexual monogamy (CMNI_{high}, M = 41.35, SD = 17.16 and CMNI_{low}, M = 46.57, SD = 23.59). In contrast, however, participants were found to value emotional monogamy equally (CMNI_{high}, M = 51.82, SD = 13.06 and CMNI_{low}, M = 50.52, SD = 13.85).

It was also predicted that CMNI_{high} participants would perceive monogamy to be more of a sacrifice than relationship enhancing, the reverse was found to be true, (MAS-SAC, M = 30.93, SD = 9.61 and MAS-ENH M = 34.97, SD = 9.92). It was then predicted that CMNI_{low} participant's would perceive monogamy to be more relationship enhancing than sacrificing, (MAS-SAC, M = 28.31, SD = 10.96 and MAS-ENH, M = 39.46, SD = 11.17). Regardless of traditional or non-traditional masculine conformity (CMNI_{high} or CMNI_{low}), participants perceived monogamy to be more relationship enhancing than sacrificing. This effect was even more pronounced for CMNI_{low} participants. It was then predicted that CMNI_{high} participants will score lower on perceptions of monogamy as enhancing, however, this hypothesis was not supported.

A multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was performed due to the moderate inter-correlation between the four monogamy measures (MAS-SAC, MAS-ENH, ESMVS-SEX, ESMVS-EMO) (see Table 4). The MANOVA showed no statistically significant differences in monogamy values as a function of masculine gender conformity, $F(12, 381.20) = 1.133, p < .0005; \text{Wilk's } \Lambda = 0.911, \text{partial } \eta^2 = .03,$

power = .370. Following the MONOVA analyses, it was decided to test the linearity of the relationship of the variables considered. Spearman rank-order correlational analyses were computed, and indicated that the relationship between MAS-SAC, MAS-ENH, ESMVS-SEX, ESMVS-EMO and CMNI_{low}, CMNI_{high} was non-linear. For participants that scored in the CMNI_{low} group, MAS-SAC was negatively correlated with the belief that monogamy is enhancing ($r = -.670, p < .01$) compared to the CMNI_{high} participants ($r = -.377, p .01$). For those participants in the CMNI_{low} group a positive relationship was found between MAS-ENH and ESMVS-SEX, ($r = .663, p < .01$). This was similarly found for CMNI_{high} participants ($r = .627, p < .01$).

A negative relationship was found between MAS-SAC and ESMVS-SEX for both CMNI_{low} and CMNI_{high} participants, $r = -.743, p < .01$ and $r = -.491, p < .01$ respectively. The following relationships were found for the CMNI_{low} individuals: ESMVS-SEX and ESMVS-EMO were positively correlated, ($r = .650, p < .01$), MAS-ENH was positively correlated with ESMVS-EMO, ($r = .567, p < .01$) and MAS-SAC was negatively correlated with ESMVS-EMO, ($r = -.638, p < .01$) (see Table 5).

There were no statistically significant relationships related to ESMVS-EMO for CMNI_{high} participants. All of the measures were significantly correlated at CMNI_{low} and the strength of the correlations was greater for CMNI_{high} participants.

Religiosity and Monogamy Values

Religiosity was measured and grouped as follows: those who never attended church were non-religious and all others were recorded as religious. There was a statistically significant difference in MAS-SAC, MAS-ENH, ESMVS-SEX and ESMVS-EMO based on religiosity as measured by church attendance, $F(4, 146) = 2.381, p <$

.0005; Wilk's $\Lambda = 0.939$, partial $\eta^2 = .06$. Church attendance had a statistically significant effect on all monogamy value subscales: MAS-EMO ($F(1, 149) = 4.520$; $p < .0005$; partial $\eta^2 = .03$) ESMVS-SEX ($F(1, 149) = 9.262$; $p < .0005$; partial $\eta^2 = .06$) MAS-ENH ($F(1, 149) = 9.912$; $p < .0005$; partial $\eta^2 = .03$) and MAS-SAC ($F(1, 149) = 5.412$; $p < .0005$; partial $\eta^2 = .04$). The mean differences are as follows: ESMVS-EMO-REL ($M = 55.87$, $SD = 12.07$), ESMVS-EMO-NONREL ($M = 50.91$, $SD = 13.27$); ESMVS-SEX-REL ($M = 51.43$, $SD = 20.92$), ESMVS-SEX-NONREL ($M = 40.62$, $SD = 19.21$); MAS-ENH-REL ($M = 39.40$, $SD = 10.60$), MAS-ENH-NONREL ($M = 34.94$, $SD = 11.38$); and MAS-SAC-REL ($M = 27.89$, $SD = 11.01$), MAS-SAC-NONREL ($M = 31.27$, $SD = 9.20$).

Length of Relationship and Monogamy Values

Length of relationship was grouped as follows: those whose longest relationship had been less than five years (LESS) and those whose longest relationship had been more than five years (MORE). A statistically significant difference was found in the valuing of monogamy depending on the length of time a participant had been in a romantic relationship, $F(4, 138) = 4.367$, $p < .0005$; Wilk's $\Lambda = .888$, partial $\eta^2 = .11$. Only ESMVS-SEX was found to be statistically different as a result of the length of longest relationship, $F(1, 141) = 5.221$, $p < .0005$; partial $\eta^2 = .04$; ESMVS-SEX-LESS ($M = 45.49$, $SD = 19.16$) and ESMVS-SEX-MORE ($M = 37.51$, $SD = 20.51$).

Age and Monogamy Values

The MANOVA showed no statistically significant differences in monogamy values when accounting for age of the participant, $F(12, 317) = 1.452$, $p < .0005$; Wilk's $\Lambda = .852$, partial $\eta^2 = .05$.

Relationship Status and Monogamy Values

Relationship status was grouped as follows, those who were either married or common-law were grouped (MAR/COM), those dating or single were grouped (NOT). The MANOVA showed a statistically significant difference in monogamy values depending on an individual's current relationship status, $F(4, 146) = 7.567, p < .0005$; Wilk's $\Lambda = .828$, $\text{partial}\eta^2 = .17$, for ESMVS-SEX, $F(1, 149) = 17.619, p < .0005$; $\text{partial}\eta^2 = .11$ as well as MAS-ENH $F(1, 149) = 7.673, p < .0005$; $\text{partial}\eta^2 = .05$. The mean differences were as follows: ESMVS-SEX-MAR/COM ($M = 33.30, SD = 16.54$), EMVS-SEX-NOT ($M = 47.80, SD = 20.06$); and MAS-ENH-MAR/COM ($M = 32.26, SD = 8.78$) MAS-ENH-NOT ($M = 37.85, SD = 11.81$).

Discussion

The goal of the present study was to extend Shmookler and Bursik's work on monogamy values and the influence of traditional gender conformity; interesting patterns emerge in the study of gay men. First with respect to those who scored higher on the CMNI-46, meaning that they endorse traditional masculine norms it was found that these individuals value sexual monogamy less than those who score lower on the CMNI-46. However, these two groups were found to value emotional monogamy equally. It was further found that regardless of traditional or non-traditional masculine conformity, gay men find monogamy to be more relationally enhancing than sacrificing. This was found to be more so the case, particularly within the enhancing subscale. This aligns with previous findings that correlate traditional masculinity with lesser valuing of monogamy (Schmookler & Bursik, 2007). Theoretically, this supports both biological determinism as well as social learning theory from a socialization perspective. Males appear to be, in

fact, either less genetically predisposed to sexual monogamy as biological determinism would suggest, or they are the product of male socialization. As this study shows, however, this effect is moderated by the extent to which an individual male subscribes to traditional masculine norms.

It was first predicted and found that gay men would value emotional monogamy over sexual monogamy. This is strongly supported within the literature, with repeated qualitative studies finding gay men having emotionally monogamous relationships with varying degrees of sexual non-monogamy (Bonello & Kross, 2010; LaSala, 2005). Despite the departure from the norm of monogamy with respect to sexual monogamy, gay men reported overall finding monogamy to be more relationship enhancing than sacrificing. This is further supported with statements such as “Monogamy builds intimacy between two people” being highly endorsed by the current sample. This is qualified however by statements such as “I have considered having a sexual experience with someone other than my partner” being similarly highly endorsed. This supports findings that while gay men overall find monogamy to be enhancing within their relationships they are more specifically referring to emotional monogamy and less so sexual monogamy. This supports the conceptualization that men seem to be more able to compartmentalize sex and emotions as compared to women (Banfield & McCabe, 2001; Duncombe & Marsden, 1999; LaSala, 2004; Lawson, 1988). Several other contradictory statements were equally endorsed, again indicating a form of cognitive dissonance for gay men with respect to monogamy (Anderson, 2012). Gay men appear to be conflicted with regards to the value of monogamy within their intimate relationships. At once seemingly wanting monogamy for its socialized and perceived benefits while at the same

time negotiating the extent to which they wish to partake in a heteronormative relational structure. Many competing factors influence monogamy values, such as morality, sexual health, and societal pressures. These factors likely result in the seemingly contradictory findings reported here (Jackson & Scott, 2004; Parsons, et al, 2013; Anderson, 2012).

Some of the correlations were significantly different between those low and high in traditional masculinity. First, the belief that monogamy is a sacrifice was negatively correlated with the belief that monogamy is enhancing. However, this relationship was significantly stronger for those low in traditionally masculine beliefs. It is intuitive that these two subscales would be in a negative relationship. However, it is not a perfect correlation indicating that those who endorse traditional masculinity are more conflicted (greater cognitive dissonance) in their values about monogamy relative to those who are non-traditional. Traditional masculinity historically discourages monogamy among men allowing for mistresses and concubines outside of the primary marital relationship. It is interesting to note that despite similar mean scores in the valuing of emotional monogamy between traditionally high and non-traditional individuals the relationship between emotional monogamy and the other three subscales (MAS-ENH, MAS-SAC, ESMVS-SEX) differ greatly between the two groups. The valuing of sexual and emotional monogamy differ such that those low in traditional masculinity report the valuing of these two variables as highly related compared to those high in traditional masculinity where there appears to be a weak, but not statistically significant relationship. Again, this supports previous research that indicates the ability for men to compartmentalize sex and emotions. It would seem that non-traditional males (males which reject traditionally masculine attitudes) respond more similarly to women with

respect to valuing sexual and emotional monogamy more equally. Similarly the relationship between the sacrificing subscale and the emotional monogamy subscale as well as the relationship between the enhancing subscale and the emotional monogamy subscale, are significantly more related among those low in traditionally masculine beliefs. These dramatic differences in the magnitude of the correlations could possibly be explained by findings that indicate less emotional awareness and expression among traditionally masculine men (Conway, 2000; Jakupcak, Tull, & Roemer, 2005). These findings support the need for better socialization of emotional expression and gender fluidity among young men.

Several other factors were found to have varying degrees of influence on the valuing of monogamy among gay men. Religiosity, measured by level of church attendance was found to influence as follows: (1) those who attend church find monogamy to more relationship enhancing than those who do not, (2) those who attend church find monogamy to be less of a relational sacrifice relative to those who do not, (3) those who attend church value sexual monogamy more than those who do not and lastly, (4) those who attend church value emotional monogamy more than those who do not attend church. These findings are intuitive in that, historically, the major Western religions have prescribed sexual monogamy within intimate relationships, and sexual abstinence before marriage. It is interesting that the influence of Christianity on modern North American monogamy values continue to influence same-sex couples today despite it's historic, and in some denominations current, disapproval of homosexual relationships. Further research is needed which would include a greater sample of highly religious gay men and a greater spectrum of religious beliefs.

Another factor that influences monogamy values relate to the length of time that an individual has been in an intimate relationship. In comparing gay men who had either previously been in a relationship that lasted longer than five years or were presently in a relationship lasting longer than five years with those who had not, one statistical difference was found pertaining to the value of sexual monogamy. Those who had not experienced a relationship lasting longer than five years were found to value sexual monogamy significantly more than those who had. This would indicate that sexual monogamy might be more of a relational ideal for individuals with less relationship experience. Once the individual experiences a relationship lasting longer than five years, this value is potentially lessened for some. It is also likely that in the beginning of an intimate relationship sexual monogamy is valued as a symbolic form of commitment to one another, and that after some time together emotional monogamy becomes more central to the relationship than sexual monogamy. Among this sample, the median length of relationship was 36 months (3 years). Nearly the entire sample reported having discussed the topic of non/monogamy within their longest relationship, and well over half of the sample reported the topic resurfacing frequently. This indicates that despite norms of monogamy, gay men feel greater freedoms than their heterosexual counterparts to negotiate the monogamy status within their intimate relationships with one another. It is commonly theorized that this is the result of having already negotiated and adopted a minority status (homosexual) within a heterocentric society allowing gay men to be more critical of relational norms and ideals (Anderson, 2012). This data coincides with research that supports both sociological and biological reasons for why men may be more prone to extra-relational sex, citing masculine socialization and biological mating

succession as possible reasons for this difference (Banfield & McCabe, 2001; Duncombe & Marsden, 1999; LaSala, 2004, 2005; Lawson, 1988). This may partially account for why men who have intimate relationships with men may be more likely to have sexually “open” relationships.

Relational status was examined comparing those who were in common-law relationships or married with those who were dating or single. Two variables were found to be statistically significant, the valuing of sexual monogamy and the perception of monogamy as being enhancing. Those who were either common-law or married valued sexual monogamy significantly less than those who were either dating or single. This finding likely relates to the finding that length of relationship is negatively correlated with sexual monogamy values. Those in common-law relationships or marriages have on average been together longer than those who are in dating relationships. For the enhancing dimension of the subscale, it was found that those in common-law relationships or marriages reported monogamy as significantly less relationship enhancing than those dating or single. Again, this likely relates to length of time within a relationship and an increasing interest in non-monogamy, particularly with respect to sexual non-monogamy. This is possibly related to findings that among monogamous gay men sexual desires are less correlated with their sexual behaviours when compared with non-monogamous men (Muskowitz & Roloff, 2010).

Numerous differences were found within the gay male population sampled, particularly when comparing those high and low in traditional masculine gender conformity. It is interesting to compare this sample of gay men with Shmookler’s and Bursik’s sample of heterosexual men and women. When making that comparison, the

following differences were found. First, with respect to the perception that monogamy is enhancing, heterosexual women followed by heterosexual men find monogamy to be significantly more enhancing than homosexual men do. It is likely that socialization contributes to why heterosexuals might report monogamy to be more relationship enhancing than homosexual men. As previously discussed, the experience of oppression can lead gay men to establishing their own norms within their loving relationships. Heterosexuals are less likely to be critical of monocentricism/ monogamism due to the privilege monogamy inherently affords as a majority status in North American society. This is a society that values ‘the couple’ as the most ideal and ‘healthy’ form of intimate relationship, structuring privilege into institutions which traditionally has encouraged heterosexual monogamous coupling and discourages other relational dynamics. These previously mentioned findings corroborate with popular beliefs that women are the ‘police of monogamy’ within heterosexual relationships, (Anderson, 2012), and that men find monogamy to be much more of a relational sacrifice than women do. Research looking at homosexual women and the valuing of monogamy would offer further insight into this finding.

Second, with regards to the value of sexual monogamy, heterosexual women appear to value it the most while gay men value it the least. This finding is not surprising as it relates to both socialization as well as evolutionary theory. Women are socialized to be sexually conservative and cautious, whereas men are encouraged to be highly sexual. This creates a dynamic of “cat and mouse sexuality” between the sexes. These findings suggest that gay men feel significantly more sexual freedoms with respect to self and relational definition than heterosexual men or women do. Interestingly no research to

date has looked at gender conformity within lesbian couples and the influence of monogamy values. Research examining female monogamy patterns would likely lead to a hypothesis that lesbian women would be highly emotionally as well as sexually monogamous/ However, future research in this area is needed to confirm this hypothesis. Finally, in terms of emotional monogamy, heterosexual women value monogamy the most, followed by heterosexual and gay men who did not differ in this regard. Men, therefore, regardless of sexual orientation, appear to value emotional monogamy similarly. This also aligns with previous research that finds gender differences in men and women's processing of emotions (Pennebaker & Roberts, 1992), as well as supporting the theory of male compartmentalization of sex and emotion.

These differences in attitudes toward monogamy make it imperative that counselors, clinicians and service providers, particularly for the gay male community, are familiar with the various possible relationship dynamics found within this population. To assume monogamy, be it emotional or sexual may be to potentially alienate these clients. This likely would result in omission of truths surrounding sexual behaviours and attitudes and, ultimately, rupture the therapeutic relationship. It could prevent these individuals from receiving appropriate care. Practitioners must educate themselves with current and relevant research, which shows a great amount of diversity in what "healthy relationships" potentially look like, particularly within the gay, lesbian, bisexual and trans community.

This study found that over half of the gay male participants had had sex outside of their primary relationship and that they had negotiated this with their partner. Having not measured couples, but rather individuals, it is difficult to know the accuracy of this

statistic. However, it would seem that gay men are more likely to jointly negotiate their own rules and boundaries with respect to monogamy within their relationships. The freedom to define the unique parameters of a given relationship as exercised by gay men is a concept that counselors and practitioners could potentially apply within their practice with heterosexual clients. These heterosexual clients may be struggling with prescribed monogamy values that do not reflect their personal relational values.

It is important to interpret this research in context, as contributing to the broadening of understanding in the various relational dynamics that may exist within the queer community. In the same way that some gay men are more traditional in their gender conformity, some gay men will have more traditional values with respect to monogamy and extra-relational sex. Clinicians should not make monogamy value assumptions based on gender performativity or sexual orientation, but rather be knowledgeable of the diversity of potential values that exist so as to create the most positive space for their LGBT clients.

Limitations To The Current Study and Future Research

There are several limitations to this study worth considering. First, pertaining to the inclusion criteria, it is uncertain as to how this may have influenced the results, since only self-identified, cisgendered¹ gay men were permitted to participate. Individuals who identified as transgendered², curious³, questioning³, or pansexual⁴ were excluded from

¹ Cisgendered defined as someone who identifies as they gender/sex they were assigned at birth

² Transgender defined as an umbrella term for people whose gender identity and/or gender expression differs from the sex they were assigned at birth

³ Curious/questioning defined as a person who is those that are not yet certain of their sexual orientation and/or gender identity.

the study. This created an issue with respect to trans gay men, as it was not specified within the recruitment process that they would be excluded based on their trans identity. While it is not within the scope of this particular study to examine individuals who had differing gender expressions and socialization experiences, future research with transgendered individuals could enrich this model.

Second, this study is further limited by its sample with regards to generalizability. The sample is largely urban, Caucasian, highly educated, almost entirely “out” and non-religious. It is important to keep this in mind when interpreting the results of this study as it has been shown in research that culture, education as well as religious upbringing are related to attitudes and behaviours surrounding monogamy values (Wheldon & Pathak, 2010; Stelboum, 1999). Samples’ including a greater diversity of gay men within future research is needed to appreciate the full complexity of the valuing of monogamy within this community specifically, individuals from rural communities, various religious communities as well as varying socio-economic statuses. Also as previously noted, a study of monogamy values and gender conformity among women who have intimate relationships with women would help to complete the model in terms of understanding the full influence of gender on monogamy values.

Lastly, it is important to highlight that some of the standard deviation’s in mean scores for attitudes toward monogamy are quite high. This indicates considerable variability in responses for this sample to questions about monogamy.

Much of the research to date on monogamy within same-sex relationships has used qualitative interviewing, offering individuals a chance to give further meaning to

⁴ Pansexual defined as a person who feels they are sexually/emotionally/spiritually capable of falling in love with all genders

their personal values (Bonello & Cross, 2010; LaSala, 2005; Worth, Reid & McMillan, 2002; Adam, 2006). Quantitative research can be limited in the sense that it does not allow for in-depth exploration of particular themes. However, it was the intention of this particular study to build upon and quantify some of the qualitative studies, which saturate the field of study on extra-relational sex and monogamy within in the gay community.

Values, particularly those surrounding sexuality are highly controversial. Basic human rights pertaining to sexual minorities are still a very contested topic within North America and the rest of the world. While the queer community in Canada just celebrated ten years of gay marriage, many within Canada still experience oppression. This is; particularly true for those who choose to structure their personal lives outside of heteronormativity. Non-monogamy will likely become the next form of identity to “come out of the closet” as society gradually shifts from conservative prescribed values of monogamy to values that reflect current attitudes regarding relationships and sexuality. Consideration of these values in psychotherapy, in turn, can serve to more accurately reflect the dynamics of individuals within diverse relationships.

Table 1
Descriptive Statistics

	N	M	SD	Range
ESMVS – Sexual Monogamy	153	43.86	20.21	11-77
ESMVS – Emotional Monogamy	153	52.32	13.01	11-77
MAS - Enhancing	152	36.27	11.30	8-56
MAS - Sacrificing	153	30.11	9.83	8-56
CMNI-46 Total	154	46.01	12.02	0-120

Note. ESMVS = Emotional and Sexual Monogamy Views Scale. MAS = Monogamy Attitudes Scale. CMNI-46 = Conformity to Masculine Norms Inventory-46

Table 2
Mean differences for Monogamy Values by Degree of Masculine Conformity (n =152)

	<i>Emotional Monogamy</i>		<i>Sexual Monogamy</i>		<i>df</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>Cohen's d</i>
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>				
Masculine conformity								
Whole sample	52.32	13.01	43.86	20.21	151	6.219	.000	.504
Low conformity	50.53	13.85	46.57	23.59	35	1.279	.209	.104
Low to mod conformity	53.49	11.41	45.67	20.06	38	3.295	.002	.267
Mod to high conformity	53.23	14.07	41.37	19.80	38	4.505	.000	.365
High conformity	51.83	13.07	41.35	17.16	37	3.597	.001	.292

Table 3
Mean differences for Monogamy Attitudes by Degree of Masculine Conformity (n =152)

	View Monogamy as Enhancing		View Monogamy as Sacrificing		<i>df</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>Cohen's d</i>
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>				
Masculine conformity								
Whole sample	36.27	11.30	30.08	9.86	151	4.01	.000	.33
Low conformity	39.46	11.17	28.31	10.96	35	3.296	.002	.267
Low to mod conformity	34.93	11.61	29.20	10.14	39	1.801	.000	.146
Mod to high conformity	35.93	12.14	31.82	8.66	39	1.343	.187	.109
High conformity	34.97	9.92	30.93	9.61	37	1.521	.137	.123

Table 4

Multivariate Analyses of Variance for Monogamy Values and Attitudes (n =151)

Note. Multivariate *F* were generated from Wilks’ Lambda statistic. Masculine

		Univariate														
Multivariate		Value Emotional Monogamy			Value Sexual Monogamy			View Monogamy as Enhancing			View Monogamy as Sacrificing					
		<i>F</i> ^a	<i>p</i>	η^2	<i>F</i> ^b	<i>p</i>	η^2	<i>F</i> ^b	<i>p</i>	η^2	<i>F</i> ^b	<i>p</i>	η^2	<i>F</i> ^b	<i>p</i>	η^2
Masc. confor		1.133	.331	.030	.400	.753	.008	.709	.548	.014	1.397	.246	.028	.962	.412	.019

Conformity has 4 levels, scores grouped by quartile.

^aMultivariate *df* = 12, 381.20. ^bUnivariate *df* = 3, 147.

Table 5

Inter-correlations among Monogamy Values and Attitudes for Traditional/ Non-Traditional Masculine Conformity (n=152)

	Emotional				Sexual				Enhancing				Sacrificing			
	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4
<i>Monogamy Views</i>																
Emotional	-	-	-	-	.650**	.693**	.551**	.291	.567**	.576**	.462**	-.027	-.638**	-.619**	-.496**	-.219
Sexual	.650**	.693**	.551**	.291	-	-	-	-	.663**	.776**	.757**	.627**	-.743**	-.802**	-.675**	-.491**
<i>Monogamy Values</i>																
Enhancing	.567**	.576**	.462**	-.027	.663**	.776**	.757**	.627**	-	-	-	-	-.670**	-.691**	-.708**	-.377**
Sacrificing	-.638**	-.619**	-.496**	-.219	-.743**	.802**	-.675**	-.491**	-.670**	-.691**	-.708**	-.377**	-	-	-	-

Note. Multivariate *F* were generated from Wilks’ Lambda statistic. Masculine Conformity has 4 levels, scores grouped by quartile.

Q1 = low conformity, Q2 – low to moderate conformity, Q3 = moderate to high conformity, Q4 = high conformity.

* *p* < .05. ***p* < .01. ****p* < .001.

References

- Adam, B. (2006). Relationship innovation in male couples. *Sexualities*, 9(1), 5-26.
- Ambady, N., Hallahan, M., & Conner, B. (1999). Accuracy of judgments of sexual orientation from thin slices of behaviour. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 77, 538–547.
- Anderson, E. (2012). *The monogamy gap: men, love, and the reality of cheating*. New York: Oxford University Press, Inc.
- Barker, M., & Langdrige, D. (2010). Whatever happened to non-monogamies? critical reflections on recent research and theory. *Sexualities*, 13, 748.
- Bailey, J. M., & Zucker, K. J. (1995). Childhood sex-typed behaviour and sexual orientation: A conceptual analysis and quantitative review. *Developmental Psychology*, 31, 43–55.
- Bailey, J. M., Kim, P. Y., Hills, A., & Linsenmeier, J. A. W. (1997). Butch, femme, or straight acting? Partner preferences of gay men and lesbians. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 73, 960–973.
- Bailey, J. M. (2003). *The man who would be queen*. Washington, DC: The Joseph Henry Press.
- Banfield, S., & McCabe, M. P. (2001). Extra relationship involvement among women: Are they different from men? *Archives of Sexual Behaviour*, 30, 119-142.
- Barbara, A. M., Chaim, G., & Doctor, F. Centre for Addiction and Mental Health, (2007). *Asking the right questions, 2: Talking about sexual orientation and gender identity in mental health, counselling, and addiction settings*. Toronto, Canada: Centre for Addiction and Mental Health.
- Barker, M. & Langdrige, D. (2012). What ever happened to non-monogamies? Critical reflections on recent research and theory. *Sexualities*, 13(6), 748-772.
- Baumeister, R. F., & Leary, M. R. (1995). The need to belong: Desire for interpersonal attachments as a fundamental human motive. *Psychological Bulletin*, 117(3), 497-529.
- Blasband, D., & Paplau, L. (1985). Sexual exclusivity versus openness in gay couples. *Archives of Sexual Behaviour*, 14(5), 395-412.
- Blumstein, P., & Schwartz, P. (1983). *American couples: Money-work-sex*. New York: William Morrow & Co.

- Bhowon, U., Ah-Kion, J., & Tseung-Wong, C. (2004). Jealousy in sexual and emotional infidelity: A study of sex differences. *Gender & Behaviour*, 2, 225-239.
- Bonello, K. (2009). Gay monogamy and extra-dyadic sex: A critical review of the theoretical and empirical literature. *Counselling Psychology Review*, 24(3-4), 51-65.
- Bonello, K. & Cross, M.C., (2010). Gay monogamy: I love you but I can't have sex with only you. *Journal of Homosexuality* 57(1) 117-139.
- Bryant, A. S., & Demian (1994). Relationship characteristics of American gays and lesbians: Findings from a national survey. *Journal of Gay & Lesbian Social Services*, 1, 101-117.
- Buunk, B. P., & Dijkstra, P. (2004). Gender differences in rival characteristics that evoke jealousy in response to emotional versus sexual infidelity. *Personal Relationships*, 11(4), 395-408.
- Cisgendered. 2013. In [queerdictionary.tumblr.com](http://queerdictionary.tumblr.com/post/9264228131/cisgender-adj). Retrieved Sept 8, 2013 from <http://queerdictionary.tumblr.com/post/9264228131/cisgender-adj>
- Cohen, A. B. (2006). *The relation of attachment to infidelity in romantic relationships: An exploration of attachment style, perception of partner's attachment style, relationship satisfaction, relationship quality and gender differences in sexual behaviours*. *Dissertation Abstracts International: Section B: The Sciences and Engineering*, , 2218-2218.
- Conway, M. (2000). On sex roles and representations of emotional experience: Masculinity, femininity and emotional awareness. *Sex Roles*, 43(9-10), 687-698.
- Curious/Questioning. 2013. In [Casafeschools.org](http://www.casafeschools.org/resourceguide/glossary.html). Retrieved Sept 8, 2013 from <http://www.casafeschools.org/resourceguide/glossary.html>
- Darwin, C. (1859). *On the origin of species: By means of natural selection*. London, J. Murray: Dover Publications.
- Duncombe, J., & Marsden, D. (1999). Love and intimacy: The gender division of emotion and 'emotion work': A neglected aspect of sociological discussion of hetero- sexual relationships. In Allan, G. (Ed.), *The sociology of the family: A reader* (pp. 91-110). Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishers Inc.
- Erikson, E. (1964). *Insight and responsibility: Lectures on the ethical implications of psychoanalytic insight*. New York: W.W. Norton
- Friedman, R. C., & Downey, J. I. (1999). Internalized homophobia and gender-valued self-esteem in the psychoanalysis of gay patients. *Psychoanalytic Review*, 86, 325-347.

- Glass, S. P., & Wright, T. M. (1985). Sex differences in type of extramarital involvement and marital satisfaction. *Sex Roles, 12*, 1101-1120.
- Gotta, et. al. (2011). Heterosexual, lesbian, and gay male relationships: A comparison of couples in 1975 and 2000. *Family Process, 50*(3), 353-376.
- Jacklin, C. N., & Reynolds, C. (1993). *Gender and childhood socialization*. (pp. 197-214) Guilford Press, New York, NY.
- Jackson, S., & Scott, S. (2004). The personal is still political: Heterosexuality, feminism and monogamy. *Feminism & Psychology, 14*(1), 151-157.
- Jakupcak, M., Tull, M. T., & Roemer, L. (2005). Masculinity, shame, and fear of emotions as predictors of men's expressions of anger and hostility. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity, 6*(4), 275-284.
- Kitzinger, C. (2005). Heteronormativity in action: Reproducing the heterosexual nuclear family in after-hours medical calls. *Social Problems, 52*, 477-498.
- LaSala, M. (2001). Monogamous or not: Understanding and counseling gay male couples. *Families in Society, 82*(6), 605-611.
- LaSala, M. (2005). Monogamy of the heart: A qualitative study of extradyadic sex among gay male couples. *Journal of Gay and Lesbian Social Services, 17*(3), 1-24.
- LaSala, M. (2004). Extradyadic sex and gay male couples: Comparing monogamous and non-monogamous relationships. *Families in Society: The Journal of Contemporary Human Services, 85*, 405-412.
- Lawson, A. (1988). *Adultery: An analysis of love and betrayal*. New York: Basic Books.
- Leary, M. R., & Tangney, J. P. (2012). *Handbook of self and identity*. New York, NY: The Guilford Press.
- Leigh, R. C. (1989). Reasons for having and avoiding sex: Gender, sexual orientation and relationship to sexual behaviour. *The Journal of Sex Research, 35*, 199-200.
- Lippa, R. A. (2000). Gender-related traits in gay men, lesbian women, and heterosexual men and women: The virtual identity of homosexual-heterosexual diagnosticity and gender diagnosticity. *Journal of Personality, 68*, 899-926.
- Lippa, R. A. (2002). Gender-related traits of heterosexual and homosexual men and women. *Archives of Sexual Behaviour, 31*, 83-98.
- Lott, B., & Maluso, D. (1993). The social learning of gender. (pp. 99-123) Guilford Press, New York, NY.

- MacDonald, K. (1992). Warmth as a developmental construct. *Child Development*, 63, 753-773.
- Malamuth, N. M. (1996). Sexually explicit media, gender differences, and evolutionary theory. *Journal of Communication*, 46(3), 8-31.
- McNulty, J. K., & Fisher, T. D. (2008). Gender differences in response to sexual expectancies and changes in sexual frequency: A short-term longitudinal study of sexual satisfaction in newly married couples. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 37(2), 229-240.
- Monogamy. 2013. In Oxforddictionaries.com. Retrieved July 17, 2013, from <http://oxforddictionaries.com/definition/english/monogamy>
- Moskowitz, D. A., & Roloff, M. E. (2010). Moderators of sexual behavior in gay men. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 39(4), 950-958.
- Nabavi, R. (2004). The "Masculinity Attitudes, Stress, and Conformity questionnaire (MASC)": A new measure for studying psychology of men (Doctoral dissertation, Alliant International University, 2004). Dissertation Abstracts International, 65, 2641.
- Pachankis, J. E., & Goldfried, M. R. (2013). Clinical issues in working with lesbian, gay, and bisexual clients. *Psychology of Sexual Orientation and Gender Diversity*, 1, 45-58.
- Pansexual. 2013. In Stop-homophobia.com. Retrieved Sept 8, 2013 from <http://www.stop-homophobia.com/pansexuality.htm>
- Parent, Mike C., & Bonnie Moradi. (2009). Confirmatory factor analysis of the conformity to masculine norms inventory and development of the conformity to masculine norms inventory-46. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity*, 10(3), 175-189
- Parsons, J. T., Starks, T. J., DuBois, S., Grov, C., & Golub, S. A. (2011). Alternatives to monogamy among gay male couples in a community survey: Implications for mental health and sexual risk. *Archives of Sexual Behaviour*, 42(2), 303-312.
- Parsons, J. T., Starks, T. J., Gamarel, K. E., & Grov, C. (2012). Non-monogamy and sexual relationship quality among same-sex male couples. *Journal of Family Psychology*, 26(5), 669-677.
- Parsons, J. T., Starks, T. J., DuBois, S., Grov, C., & Golub, S. A. (2013). Alternatives to monogamy among gay male couples in a community survey: Implications for mental health and sexual risk. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 42(2), 303-312.

- Pieper, M., & Bauer, R. (2005). Call for papers: International conference on polyamory and mono-normativity. University of Hamburg, 5–6 November 2005.
- Pillard, R. C. (1991). Masculinity and femininity in homosexuality: “Inversion” revisited. In J. C. Gonsiorek & J. D. Weinrich (Eds.), *Homosexuality: Research implications for public policy* (pp. 32–43). Newbury Park: Sage.
- Pinker, S. (2008). The fear of determinism. (pp. 311-324) Oxford University Press, New York, NY.
- Pittman, F. S., & Wagers, T. P. (2005). Teaching fidelity. *Journal of Clinical Psychology, 61*(11), 1407-1419.
- Prestage, G., Jin, F., Zablotska, I., Grulich, A., Imrie, J., Kaldor, J., . . . Kippax, S. (2008). Trends in agreements between regular partners among gay men in sydney, melbourne and brisbane, australia. *AIDS and Behavior, 12*(3), 513-520.
- Queer. 2013. In Gaycentre.org. Retrieved July 17, 2013, from <http://www.gaycenter.org/gip/transbasics/glossary>
- Rose, S. (1996). *Lesbian and gay love scripts*. (pp. 151-173) Sage Publications, Inc, Thousand Oaks, CA.
- Rubin, S. Gayle. 1984, 1992. First published in Carol S. Vance, ed., *Pleasure and Danger Exploring Female Sexuality*.
- Ryan, C., & Jetha, C. (2010). *Sex at dawn: The prehistoric origins of modern sexuality*. New York, NY: HarperCollins Publishers.
- Schmookler, T., & Bursik, K.. (2007). The value of monogamy in emerging adulthood: A gendered perspective. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 24*(6), 819-835.
- Schützwohl, A., & Koch, S. (2004). Sex differences in jealousy: The recall of cues to sexual and emotional infidelity in personally more and less threatening context conditions. *Evolution and Human Behaviour, 25*(4), 249-257.
- Stelboun, J. P. (1999). Patriarchal monogamy. *Journal of Lesbian Studies, 3*(1-2), 39-46.
- Townsend, J. M. (1995). Sex without emotional involvement: An evolutionary interpretation of sex differences. *Archives of Sexual Behaviour, 24*, 173-206.
- Transgender. 2013 in Gaycentre.org. Retrieved Sept 8, 2013 from <http://www.gaycenter.org/gip/transbasics/glossary>

- Trussler, T., Perchal, P., & Barker, A. (2000). "Between what is said and what is done": Cultural constructs and young gay men's HIV vulnerability. *Psychology, Health and Medicine*, 5(3), 295-306.
- Tsapelas, I., Fisher, H. E., & Aron, A. (2011). Infidelity: When, where, why. (pp. 175-195). New York, NY, US: Routledge/Taylor & Francis Group, New York, NY. Retrieved from <http://search.proquest.com/docview/816389587?accountid=14771>
- Wagner, G.J., Remien, R.H., & Carballo-Diequez, A. (2000). Prevalence of extra-dyadic sex in male couples of mixed HIV status and its relationship to psychological distress and relationship quality. *Journal of Homosexuality*, 39, 31-46.
- Wheldon, C. W., & Pathak, E. B. (2010). Masculinity and relationship agreements among male same-sex couples. *Journal of Sex Research*, 47(5), 460-470.
- Worth, H., Reid, A., & McMillan, K. (2002). Somewhere over the rainbow: Love, trust and monogamy in gay relationships. *Journal of Sociology*, 38(3), 237-253.
- Zaleski, E. H., & Schiaffino, K. M. (2000). Religiosity and sexual risk-taking behaviour during the transition to college. *Journal of Adolescence*, 23(2), 223-227.

Appendix A

Monogamy Attitudes Scale

Directions: Please read each item carefully and indicate how much you agree or disagree with each statement by circling a number 1-7. There is no right or wrong answer; we are only interested in your personal views.

<i>Strongly Disagree</i>	<i>Mostly Disagree</i>	<i>Slightly Disagree</i>	<i>Neither Agree or Disagree</i>	<i>Slightly Agree</i>	<i>Mostly Agree</i>	<i>Strongly Agree</i>
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

1. Forming monogamous relationships is part of human nature.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
---	---	---	---	---	---	---

2. By being in a monogamous relationship, I am sacrificing my desires to have experiences with other people.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
---	---	---	---	---	---	---

3. Relationships would be healthier if people valued monogamy more.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
---	---	---	---	---	---	---

4. In a monogamous relationship, one is missing out on all the other possible opportunities that could be had.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
---	---	---	---	---	---	---

5. Monogamy feels unnatural to me because desiring multiple partners is part of human nature.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
---	---	---	---	---	---	---

6. Being with only one person enriches the quality of the relationship.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
---	---	---	---	---	---	---

7. Being monogamous is a benefit derived from being in a relationship.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
---	---	---	---	---	---	---

8. Relationships would be healthier if we moved away from imposed norms such as monogamy.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
---	---	---	---	---	---	---

<i>Strongly Disagree</i>	<i>Mostly Disagree</i>	<i>Slightly Disagree</i>	<i>Neither Agree or Disagree</i>	<i>Slightly Agree</i>	<i>Mostly Agree</i>	<i>Strongly Agree</i>
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

9. Monogamy builds intimacy between two people.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

10. I often think about what I am giving up by being in a monogamous relationship.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

11. Being monogamous is a cost one must pay to be in a relationship.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

12. Monogamy is a relationship strengthens the bond between the two people.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

13. Monogamy blocks natural drives.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

14. Being with only one person limits my personal growth.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

15. Monogamy feels natural and healthy to me.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

16. Being monogamous helps the relationship grow over time.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Appendix B *Emotional and Sexual Monogamy Views Scale*

Directions: Please read each item carefully and indicate how much you agree or disagree with each statement by circling a number 1-7. There is no right or wrong answer; we are only interested in your personal views, so please respond candidly. If not currently in a relationship with a man, refer to your longest intimate relationship to respond.

<i>Strongly Disagree</i>	<i>Mostly Disagree</i>	<i>Slightly Disagree</i>	<i>Neither Agree or Disagree</i>	<i>Slightly Agree</i>	<i>Mostly Agree</i>	<i>Strongly Agree</i>
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1. It is OK to have a crush on someone other than my partner.						
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
2. It is OK to fantasize about someone other than my partner.						
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
3. Having a crush on someone other than my partner would have a negative impact on my relationship, even if my partner didn't know about it.						
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
4. Falling in love with someone other than my partner is OK.						
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
5. Having an emotional romantic relationship with another person would not affect my feelings towards my partner.						
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
6. Having a romantic attachment to someone other than my partner would detract from my relationship's emotional intimacy.						
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
7. I wish I could have an emotional romantic relationship with someone other than my partner.						
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

<i>Strongly Disagree</i>	<i>Mostly Disagree</i>	<i>Slightly Disagree</i>	<i>Neither Agree or Disagree</i>	<i>Slightly Agree</i>	<i>Mostly Agree</i>	<i>Strongly Agree</i>
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

8. I have considered having an emotional romantic relationship with someone other than my partner.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

9. It is possible for me to be in love with my partner and be in love with someone else at the same time.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

10. I would consider having an emotional affair (no sex, reciprocal falling in love) if I knew my partner would never find out.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

11. I have no interest in falling in love with another person while I am in this relationship.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

12. Although I might like to fall in love with another person other than my partner, I would not do so while in this relationship.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

13. It is OK to have a purely sexual experience with someone other than my partner.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

14. Having a purely sexual experience with someone other than my partner would negatively affect my relationship, even if my partner did not know about it.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

15. Having a meaningless sexual experience would not affect my feelings toward my partner.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

16. If my partner gave me permission, I would have a purely sexual experience with another person.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
<i>Strongly Disagree</i>	<i>Mostly Disagree</i>	<i>Slightly Disagree</i>	<i>Neither Agree or Disagree</i>	<i>Slightly Agree</i>	<i>Mostly Agree</i>	<i>Strongly Agree</i>
<i>1</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>4</i>	<i>5</i>	<i>6</i>	<i>7</i>

17. I would consider having a purely sexual experience with another person if I knew my partner would never find out.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

18. Having a sexual experience with someone other than my partner would detract from this relationship's emotional intimacy.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

19. I wish that I could have a sexual experience with someone other than my partner.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

20. I have considered having a sexual experience with someone other than my partner.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

21. If my partner's feelings were not a consideration, I would be comfortable having a sexual experience with someone other than my partner while still in this relationship.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

22. I would have a sexual experience with someone other than my partner even if I knew my partner would find out.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

23. I have no interest in having a sexual experience with anyone other than my partner while in this relationship.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

24. Although I would like to have a sexual experience with someone other than my partner, I would not do so while I am in this relationship.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Appendix C *The Conformity to Masculine Norms Inventory – 46*

The following pages contain a series of statements about how men might think, feel or behave. The statements are designed to measure attitudes, beliefs, and behaviours associated with both traditional and non-traditional masculine gender roles.

Thinking about your own actions, feelings and beliefs, please indicate how much you personally agree or disagree with each statement by circling SD for "Strongly Disagree", D for "Disagree", A for "Agree," or SA for "Strongly agree" to the left of the statement. There are no right or wrong responses to the statements. You should give the responses that most accurately describe your personal actions, feelings and beliefs. It is best if you respond with your first impression when answering.

1 In general, I will do anything to win	SD	D	A	SA
2 If I could, I would frequently change sexual partners	SD	D	A	SA
3 I hate asking for help	SD	D	A	SA
4 I believe that violence is never justified	SD	D	A	SA
6 In general, I do not like risky situations	SD	D	A	SA
7 Winning is not my first priority	SD	D	A	SA
8 I enjoy taking risks	SD	D	A	SA
9 I am disgusted by any kind of violence	SD	D	A	SA
10 I ask for help when I need it	SD	D	A	SA
11 My work is the most important part of my life	SD	D	A	SA
12 I would only have sex if I were in a committed relationship	SD	D	A	SA
13 I bring up my feelings when talking to others	SD	D	A	SA
15 I don't mind losing	SD	D	A	SA
16 I take risks	SD	D	A	SA
18 I never share my feelings	SD	D	A	SA
19 Sometimes violent action is necessary	SD	D	A	SA
20 In general, I control the women in my life	SD	D	A	SA

21 I would feel good if I had many sexual partners	SD	D	A	SA
22 It is important for me to win	SD	D	A	SA
23 I don't like giving all my attention to work	SD	D	A	SA
25 I like to talk about my feelings	SD	D	A	SA
26 I never ask for help	SD	D	A	SA
27 More often than not, losing does not bother me	SD	D	A	SA
28 I frequently put myself in risky situations	SD	D	A	SA
29 Women should be subservient to men	SD	D	A	SA
30 I am willing to get into a physical fight if necessary	SD	D	A	SA
31 I feel good when work is my first priority	SD	D	A	SA
32 I tend to keep my feelings to myself	SD	D	A	SA
33 Winning is not important to me	SD	D	A	SA
34 Violence is almost never justified	SD	D	A	SA
35 I am happiest when I'm risking danger	SD	D	A	SA
36 It would be enjoyable to date more than one person at a time	SD	D	A	SA
38 I am not ashamed to ask for help	SD	D	A	SA
39 Work comes first	SD	D	A	SA
40 I tend to share my feelings	SD	D	A	SA
41 No matter what the situation I would never act violently	SD	D	A	SA
42 Things tend to be better when men are in charge	SD	D	A	SA
43 It bothers me when I have to ask for help	SD	D	A	SA
44 I love it when men are in charge of women	SD	D	A	SA
45 I hate it when people ask me to talk about my feelings	SD	D	A	SA