

HEGEMONIC MASCULINITY AND VIOLENCE IN GAY COUPLES: A PSYCHOANALYTIC READING

JUAN PABLO SÁNCHEZ DOMÍNGUEZ ; CLAUDIA INÉS CAMPO; LUBIA DEL CARMEN CASTILLO ARCOS

Juan Pablo Sánchez Domínguez¹

¹Departamento de psicología clínica, Universidad Autónoma del Carmen. Ciudad del Carmen, Campeche, México.

Claudia Inés Campo²

²Facultad de psicología, Universidad Nacional de San Luis. San Luis, Argentina.

Lubia del Carmen Castillo Arcos³

³Departamento de enfermería, Universidad Autónoma del Carmen. Ciudad del Carmen, Campeche, México.

ABSTRACT: The initial purpose of this paper is to analyze the literature on hegemonic masculinity and its intersection with violence in intimate gay couples. As a result, it is identified that hegemonic masculinity is a historical, social and cultural construction that, in order to perpetuate its power over other masculinities “contaminated by the feminine”, employs diverse mechanisms of violence, sometimes imperceptible to those who experience it. Psychoanalytically oriented, a case is analyzed to obtain empirical information and to situate the reality of the phenomenon beyond heteronormative parameters, while offering a methodology to investigate the problem.

Keywords: Hegemonic masculinity; violence; gay couples; psychoanalysis.

Resumo: Masculinidade hegemônica e violência em casais gays: uma leitura psicanalítica. O presente trabalho tem como objetivo inicial uma análise da literatura sobre masculinidade hegemônica e sua interseção com a violência em casais gays íntimos. Como resultado, identifica-se que a masculinidade hegemônica é uma construção histórica, social e cultural que, para perpetuar seu poder sobre outras masculinidades “contaminadas pelo feminino”, utiliza vários mecanismos de violência às vezes imperceptíveis por quem a vive. De orientação psicanalítica, analisamos um caso que nos permite obter informações empíricas e colocar a realidade do fenômeno além dos parâmetros heteronormativos, oferecendo um método metodológico para investigar o problema.

Palavras-chave: masculinidade hegemônica; violência; casais gays; psicanálise.

DOI - <http://dx.doi.org/10.1590/1809-44142022001007>

Todo o conteúdo deste periódico, exceto onde estiver identificado, está licenciado sob uma licença Creative Commons (cc by 4.0)

INTRODUCTION

The objective of this work is to integrate current knowledge about violence in gay intimate partners and its intersection with the category of hegemonic masculinity. In order to do this, it was initially based on a review of the existing literature and later on the analysis of a case of violence through a psychoanalytic interpretation with a gender perspective.

It is assumed that the articulation between psychoanalysis and gender studies, although they are in permanent tension, constitutes a theoretical perspective that enriches the understanding of the subjectivity of both men and women. The intersection between psychoanalysis and gender studies allows us to analyze the relationship between desire and power, that is, it makes it possible to reflect about the political dimension of subjectivity in the constitution of the psyche.

For its part, the notion of gender provides a contribution to the approach to the symbolic dimension of femininity – masculinity outside of any naturalistic dye. The term “gender” in the social sciences and in discourses is presented with a specific intention. This meaning dates from the 1950s, when Money (1955) proposed the term “gender role” to describe the set of behaviors attributed to men and women. From the perspective of the analysis of subjectivity, it was Stoller (1968) who established the conceptual difference between sex and gender, based on boys and girls who, due to congenital anatomical problems, had been educated according to a sex that did not correspond anatomically to theirs. Hence, for Stoller (1968), the acquisition of another meaning about the anatomical constitution in our species acquires a fundamental importance. In such a way that, when the biological body does not agree with the perception or the identification project that the parents elaborate with respect to the infant, it is the parental desire that prevails. The feeling of being female or male is established in the middle of the second year of life, long before genital representation is configured. Stoller incorporated the concept of gender into the field of psychoanalysis, by studying developmental psychology and seeing how gender identity is constructed in boys. He did not only question the Freudian hypothesis about primary masculinity in girls, but also inverted it. Based on the importance assigned by Stoller to early identification processes, an initial femininity is postulated in men, who should no longer change their primary object of love, as was described for girls, but their model, the image about the which builds its being.

The patriarchal culture hierarchized the characteristics of the male subject who occupies the place of ideal and conceived it as the paradigmatic axis of the human. It is of interest to analyze and identify how the social and theoretical conceptions that emphasize the privilege of men make the obstacles invisible and make changes difficult.

On the other hand, gender understood as a general organizer of the psyche, precedes the birth of the subject and in this sense conditions the development of the ego as a structure, as well as the modality in which the ideal ego-superego system evolves (DIO BLEICHMAR, 1985; 1997). That said, the hegemonic masculinity model is a social construction and as such it pre-exists the subject and becomes a privileged organizer through which roles are assigned and certain behaviors are imposed. It is in this sense that the modes of subjectivation allow us to assess what each man builds in his uniqueness, with the divergences that the resignifications and articulations between the different psychic strata and the culture can produce (CÓRDOBA, 2020).

According to Azpiazu (2017), traditional masculinity is a model that is delegitimized, at least in some areas and social spaces. He points out that there are a large number of men who embody the classic masculinity model, however, he argues that it is another ideal that at the moment marks the path of what is desirable and admissible and is what is currently known as “new masculinity”. Empathy and tears that were once unthinkable due to gender biases are no longer considered taboo and are beginning to be part of the possible images of new masculinities. Feelings and their expression currently occupy an important place in the lives of many men. This does not mean that traditional men had a life devoid of emotionality, rather it shows that they only encouraged the development of some feelings and were repressed those linked to femininity. The author states that even without strictly exhibiting the traditional attributes of masculinity, somehow all men continue to enjoy certain privileges.

HEGEMONIC MASCULINITY AND PSYCHOANALYSIS

Although the creator of psychoanalysis did not use the term “hegemonic masculinity”, from very early in his writings, masculinity appears linked to virility, power, knowledge and the norm. Men are proposed as an ideal of maturity and health that women lack, and he places them on the side of the symptom very quickly. In other words, they are all characteristics of what is later formulated as hegemonic masculinity.

After a long analysis of the vast work of Sigmund Freud, it is inferred that for the most part it endorses and accentuates the asymmetric relations between the genders, characteristics of an androcentric, binary and heterosexist system. Thus, he considers men as virile, heroes, leaders of the masses, protagonists of the origin of culture, almighty and omnipotent parents, among other attributes. In short, as an overvalued genre. In this sense, the psychic development of men includes everything related to what is normal and orderly. The homologation of the human generic with the masculine is detected, which results in thinking of all people from this parameter.

In relation to the latest theorizations about the Oedipus complex and the new model of the psychic apparatus, the author’s conjectures about how he considers that he becomes a heterosexual male can be extracted. The starting point is the masculine gender that is the model for explaining the conformation of both masculinity and femininity. Taking males as a reference accounts for the androcentrism of the theory since he assumes that only starting from them could he

understand the other gender. It should be noted that he uses so many arguments that come from anatomy and biology, from which he constructs justifications that place men as representatives of mental health.

The sexual difference is thought based on the absence or presence of the penis. These statements lead to the existence of what Dio Bleichmar (1985) calls “phallocentrism”, to account for the symbolism of these considerations related to power and superiority. Since the new organization proposed by Freud (1923), men perceive women as incomplete, lacking and consequently despised. That is, an infantile sexual theory is established as an adult fantasy, losing the notion of such. If its imaginary character is not taken into account, it functions as an empirically proven truth. This situation brings with it numerous consequences since the phallocentric conception takes on a structuring role. The male gender, through the possession of the penis, has numerous valuable attributes that reaffirm it as superior and dominant. In this way, the conditions are created for the expropriation of the rights of those who are not taken as equal or similar, in this case women. Symbolic violence is generated that implies perceiving that different other as a foreigner, a supplement, which causes endless inequalities (FERNÁNDEZ, 2021).

In the theorizations, corresponding to the moment of the end of the Freudian work, it is detected that he continues to emphasize masculinity as the dominant gender that possesses qualities associated with activity, violence, protagonist in culture, the highest moral values, among others.

Hegemonic masculinity is not a fixed type of character, it is not always and everywhere, but rather the hegemonic position is a given model of gender relations. The concept of hegemony, derived from Gramsci's (1975) analysis of class relations, refers to the cultural dynamics by which a group demands and sustains a leadership position in social life. Hegemonic masculinity can be defined as: “the generic practice configuration that embodies the currently accepted answer to the problem of the legitimacy of patriarchy, the one that guarantees (or is taken to guarantee) the dominant position of men and the subordination of women” (CONNELL, 1995, p. 37).

Patriarchy places homosexual masculinities at the bottom of a gender hierarchy among men. Homosexuality, in this ideology, would be like the recipient of everything expelled from hegemonic masculinity. Therefore, from her point of view, homosexuality is easily assimilated to femininity. Therefore, according to some theorists, the ferocity of homophobic attacks, with gay masculinity being the most obvious subordinate, but not the only one. Some heterosexual men are also expelled from the circle of legitimacy. Here the symbolic confusion with femininity is explicit.

Having said the above, and coinciding with Cantillo (2016), we can see that the works directed to the study of the masculine were widely promoted by academic circles during the 70s. These investigations, which during that time were developed mainly by female activists, were established with a less two purposes, on the one hand, to make masculinities visible and, on the other, to problematize the position of men in society (KIMMEL; HEARN; CONNELL, 2004). In this sense, Morales (2015) states that gay men also made important contributions at the same time, essentially around the problem that hegemonic masculinity brought with it in various sociocultural structures. At the end of this decade, various “authors from the social and anthropological sciences attributed that the emergence of this new line of research was born from a crisis over male identity, questioning the traditional masculinity model” (MORALES, 2015, p. 35). For its part, Cantillo (2016) points out that these ideas were also positioned as a criticism of the normative nature of sexuality legitimized by a patriarchal ideology and that functioned as a hierarchical, authoritarian, and exclusive model of life. We have then:

Traditional masculinity is not only a predominant manifestation, but as such it is defined as a hegemonic social model that imposes a particular mode of configuration of subjectivity, corporeality, the common existential position of men and common men. Although some of its components are currently in a crisis of social legitimation, their shaping power remains almost intact. (BONINO, 2002, p. 8).

In this same direction, Carrigan, Connell and Lee, in 1985, coined the concept of hegemonic masculinity in a more contemporary dimension, noting that masculinity had to do with the power relations between men and women and also among men themselves. For Bermúdez (2013), this conception allowed questioning an idealized type of masculinity that does not necessarily correspond to the majority of men and proposed the existence of different forms of hegemonic masculinity present in ideological, political, economic, family and individual structures (LOZANO; ROCHA, 2011). That said, Bonino (2002) will emphasize that hegemonic masculinity has been established throughout Western history as an indisputable structuring of sexual and social identities, contributing externally and preexisting to the subjective construction of values – and antivalues – to which someone has to come and go to be a “proper man”.

From the previous perspective, Bonino (1998), Benjamin (1995), Burin and Meler (2000) will be pioneers in conducting studies from psychoanalysis with a gender perspective, seeking, among other things, to unveil and deconstruct the way in which hegemonic masculinity has become a complex and compact conglomerate of socially desired hierarchical values for men, made up of prescriptive mandates that promote qualities, attributes, social demands of and towards masculinities. That is to say, hegemonic masculinity is constituted in this way as a privileged computer of the construction of the psyche and the body in their intersection with other power relations – namely age, ethnicity, class, gender and sexuality – thus managing to produce their effects. According to the above, Connell (1987); Bonino (1998); and Lozano and Rocha (2011) argue that, in any case, these power relations where hegemonic masculinity is instituted and presented socially and subjectively, impose other forms of domination, regarding aspects related to achievement, to the work, physical strength, purchasing power, leadership and competence, while what defines the feminine is expression, affection, submission and self-denial.

LITERATURE REVIEW

As we pointed out previously, hegemonic masculinity is an exercise of power over what is related to the feminine and any other expression of sexuality contrary to the qualities and values proscribed for men. Bonino (2002); Lozano and ROCHA (2011) agree that homosexuality would historically remain within the framework of this domain.

In correspondence to the review of the existing literature, we can point out that in general the studies aimed at explaining hegemonic masculinity in the context of gay communities are still insignificant, if we compare it with those carried out in heterosexual groups (BURKE; FOLLINGSTAD, 1999; TORO; RODRÍGUEZ, 2003; FORTUNATA; KOHN, 2003; MCKENRY, P.; SEROVICH, J.; MASON, T.; MOSACK, K., 2006; BOSCH; FERRER, 2012). In this way, Murray and Mobley (2009) argue that the attempts to explain the phenomena that occurred in the population of homosexual men have consisted solely of describing the causes associated with their dynamics, without being able to enter the complexity of the situations. In this context, most of the researchers dedicated to studying the LGBTTTIQ population (lesbian, gay, bisexual, transsexual, transgender, transvestite, intersex and queer) at least during the first years of this century were somewhat disinterested in phenomena such as that of violence, preferring to direct their work to issues related to sexually transmitted diseases (POORMAN, 2001). In the words of Elliott, (1996); González and Martínez (2014), the few studies dedicated to explaining the phenomenon of violence in these groups have been segregated by a sexist ideology and colored by the dominance of hegemonic masculinity, even maintaining the belief that this type of aggression only occurs in heterosexual couples.

On the other hand, Cantera and Blanch (2010) and Ortega (2014) have argued that, despite the minimal interest in conducting research about violence in gay communities, these have brought to light relevant information to differentiate it from that which occurred in heterosexual groups. For their part, Saldivia, Faúndez, Sotomayor and Cea (2017) state that an important reference is one that places the presence of the phenomenon at its intersection with the categories of homophobia and heterosexism. In this regard, Stéfano (2017), derived from a study on sexual diversity and coexistence carried out in young Spanish people, concludes that homophobia can be understood as the social and individual rejection of those masculinities whose expressions of sexuality question the hegemonic masculinity system in which the heteronormative ideology is based (WEINBERG, 1972). In this same context, Kimmel, Hearn and Connell (2004) emphasize that homophobia is the mechanism of power that censors any sign of femininity in other men and in oneself, as a result of the fear of discovering in oneself the inability to uphold the social standards of supposed as heteronormative masculinity. From a subjective perspective, Camejo (2018) will specify that homophobia constitutes a statute of psychic defense whose purpose would be to deny any aspect of feminized connotation. In this context, the behavior observed in same-sex male couples tending to reject “feminized bodies” both individually and collectively constitutes a rooted mechanism within a heteronormative society that invites the perpetuation of a space of habitual hegemonic masculinity in a hetero patriarchal society (KIRBY; HAY, 1997).

In another context, various authors conclude that despite the few investigations dedicated to investigating the problem of violence in gay couples, the methodological contributions carried out by psychoanalysis are significant since they have allowed to enter the phenomenon despite the fact that the victims are regularly reluctant to report experiences of this type, considering that communicating intimate aspects of abuse brings negative effects on their relationship (MURRAY; MOBLEY, 2009). On the other hand, Kay and Jeffries (2010) point out that the failure to express the aggressions is also associated with the fear of publishing their homosexual preference and that this may lead to homophobic attacks by conservative sectors.

In our society, symbolic violence has managed to become culturally the normal state of affairs, transforming itself into a phenomenon imperceptible to the victims (BOURDIEU, 2000). In this context, a type of *symbolic violence* exercised in the sphere of the homosexual community and associated with hegemonic masculinity is that which manifests itself through a restraining mechanism, confining any form of sexual expression to the private space. Under this rationality, all those “male subjects” who intend to express their sexuality in public spaces will be the focus of attention. However, since they are men classified as homosexuals, they will also be questioned and controlled by a supposed heteronormal legitimacy (VALENTINE, 1993). It should be noted that this patriarchal ideology scheme has been perfectly systematized in each of the social structures, in such a way that any phenomenon that puts male supremacy at risk will be trivialized through procedures that constitute heteronormal actions and criteria and that culture outlines for this purpose (SCHONGUT, 2012). In this sense, various studies have shown that in societies like ours with a patriarchal system, hegemonic masculinity is embodied in a series of violent practices, as a device of control over the bodies, where homosexuality assimilated to femininity leads to homophobic attacks (MORALES, 2015). In no way does this place the gay community as the only subordinate masculinity, however, Benjamin (1996) and Meler (2012), from a psychoanalytic perspective, have shown that this is the sexual identity that is traditionally most associated with the female order.

In an investigation carried out by Lopes (2019) on the violence suffered by a gay couple in a Rio de Janeiro neighborhood, the author highlights that in hetero patriarchal cultures, homosexual experiences place the subjects who practice it in a position feminized. He also reported that there are mechanisms that tend to place gay subjects within the framework of a kind of “bodies contaminated by the feminine” (LOPES, 2019, p. 19).

On the other hand, in a study carried out on a community of young Australian gay men, Kay and Jeffries (2010) found that hegemonic masculinity, homophony and hetero normativism emerge as main characteristics in the experience of violence between intimate partners of men.

In another research carried out by González and Martínez (2014), the authors reported that a form of violence within the relationships of homosexual men associated with hegemonic masculinity is presented as coercion, that is, many times when a love relationship ends, the abandoned threatens to make public the homosexuality of the other in contexts where it is not known, in order to maintain control of the relationship. In this type of cases, the coerced feels obliged to preserve privacy in order to keep their sexuality private, thus avoiding discriminatory heteronormative judgments.

For its part, Lopes (2019) reported that violence against homosexual couples can be interpreted as an attempt to submit to a "*feminized nomination*" strongly rooted in hegemonic masculinity, that is, in these cases violence could be understood as an act disciplinary against those who stand at the opposite extreme of hegemonic masculinity. In this context, Bourdieu (2000) affirms that when the thought patterns and perceptions of the dominated are structured in correspondence to their own structures of "domination", their acts of knowledge are, inevitably, acts of recognition and submission. This submission, according to the same author, is rooted in the hetero normalized system of sexuality, a product of the transformation of history into nature and cultural arbitrariness into natural. For Ramírez (2005), this implicit and unrecognizable mutation process contains traces of violence imprinted on itself. That said, Villaseñor (2003) points out that, if this historical-cultural control and subjugation of women by men has been constructed, accepted and legitimized as a violent practice, in the same way, we would have to think about the exercise of domination by some men over them and about others.

GAY PARTNERS' VIOLENCE

The body of literature suggests that the prevalence rates of abuse in same-sex couples are high and their correlates show many similarities with those identified in incidents of abuse in heterosexual couples (BURKE; FOLLINGSTAD, 1999). However, the studies carried out from Psychoanalysis with a gender perspective have allowed us to shed a singular difference in relation to the way in which subjects make and reproduce in intimacy unequal positions established by the hetero patriarchal context (GONZÁLEZ; MARTÍNEZ, 2014). In this sense, in a study carried out by Kirby and Hay (1997) where the experiences of homosexual men were examined within everyday places, the authors reported that common spaces (home, work, school) are experienced as heterosexual, oppressive and homophobic. In this regard, other studies have revealed that hetero normalized behaviors similar to those found in heterosexual couples are reproduced in homosexual domestic violence (ORTEGA, 2016). In this context, Saldivia, Faúndez, Sotomayor and Cea (2017) affirm that the internalization of heterocentric ideologies among homosexuals is expressed at home through violent behaviors. According to Stephenson, Hast, Finneran and Sineath (2014) a high level of identification with hegemonic aspects of masculinity could be considered prominent predictors of intimate partner violence in these collectives, that is, the more a homosexual man identifies with elements of our heteropatriarchal culture, the more likely he is to manifest abusive behaviors (JOHNSTON; VALENTINE, 1995; SALDIVIA; FAÚNDEZ; SOTOMAYOR; CEA, 2017). In their own homes, some homosexual men find that hegemonic masculinity is not only reproduced in violent acts but also that the norms of heterosexuality are constituted through such abuses.

METHODOLOGY

This research is with a qualitative, descriptive and interpretive approach and was carried out in two moments.

The first stage consisted of a bibliographic review of the existing literature on the phenomenon investigated. Later, a content analysis of the texts was carried out that, articulated with interpretive processes, allowed the construction of categories of analysis (GONZÁLEZ; LAMARQUE; RENZETTI; SIMONE, 2014; MARRADI; ARCHENTI; PIOVANI, 2007). This strategy was defined as a set of systematic and objective procedures that enable the analysis and interpretation of both the manifest and latent meanings expressed in a text, allowing contextualized inferences to be made on aspects and phenomena of social and individual life (ABELA, 2001). For Navarro and Díaz (1995), an analytical metatext is generated from this analysis in which the textual corpus is represented in a transformed way. In order to carry out the aforementioned work, a search was carried out for articles in periodic journals and hosted in free access databases in Spanish (Redalyc, Scielo). Later, the Tandfonline platform was consulted, which hosts full texts in English without access opened. The investigation in each database was carried out by keywords: Masculinidad Hegemónica + psicoanálisis+ Violencia + Homosexualidad; Heteronormatividad + psicoanálisis + Violencia + parejas intimas +; Heteropatriarcado + Violencia domestica + Parejas gays; Violencia domestica + Homosexual. In Tandfonline the same procedure was carried out with the difference of replacing the words with their respective translations into the English language.

After the selection of the texts and the content analysis of each one of them, a selection of the units of analysis was made intentionally from the theoretical point of view, with a dual purpose: first, the configuration of an interview guide in depth for the collection of information about our object of study, considering the variables and theoretical constructs that, according to the existing literature, are part of the Hegemonic Masculinity category and its intersection with the phenomenon of violence in gay intimate partners, it should be noted that the in-depth interview ultimately allows us to obtain valuable material to identify the essential points of subjective experience that in our subject situates affective complexes and mental images about violence in the context of their human relationships (ROBLES, 2011; SÁNCHEZ, 2017); second, the implementation of strategies for the analysis and interpretation of the experiences of the participating

subjects expressed in each information collection instrument used throughout the entire investigation.

For the second moment of the research, the selection of our population was carried out for convenience. From a total enrollment of 625 students belonging to a public Higher Education Institution (HEI) in the southeast of Mexico, for the purposes of our research was select a group of 50 male students of Mexican origin, whose ages were between 21-40 years old and who at the time of data collection reported having had at least one intimate relationship throughout their lives. It was an essential requirement that participants with informed consent agree to participate, at least in the application of the first instrument called "Life history".

Before applying the aforementioned instrument, a series of concepts were presented to the participants in an expository manner, in order to sensitize them about the subject on which they will preferably focus the writing of their lived experience, these were:

- Love relationships between same-sex couples;
- Love relationships between same-sex couples;
- Conflicting relationships between same-sex couples;
- Masculinities;
- Heteropatriarchy;
- Symbolic violence;
- Intimate violence;
- Intimate partner violence;
- Dating violence;
- Violence between couples of the same sex.

Later and before starting the writing of their "Life Stories" it was reiterated that the information provided would be totally anonymous, emphasizing that those who decided to leave their contact information (email, mobile etc.) could do so. This final statement was intended to obtain necessary information that could help us to remain linked after analyzing the information derived from their experiences.

Once the analysis of the "stories..." was carried out, three cases of "intimate homosexual violence" were identified. Of these, only two participants offered a mobile phone number, of which at the time of establishing contact with them again and indicating the scope and focus of our study, as well as their participation in it, only one of them agreed to collaborate. The in-depth interview was carried out in the psychological office of the IES where the study takes place. To conduct it, the theoretical analysis carried out in the first stage of the investigation was taken into account. There were five interviews with an approximate duration of 90 minutes each, a standard voice recorder was used to record the audio, it was necessary for the content analysis to perform the computerized transcription to the Microsoft Word processor.

Presentation of the case

The elaboration of a case allows investigating human subjectivity and the discursive contexts in which it occurs, regardless of the time between what happened and its approach, in this sense "it is the synthetic result of those ways in which an era, a society and a subject determined, they rationalize their experience" (SÁNCHEZ, 2016, p. 16). Thanks to these approaches, it is possible to explain "the operation of certain devices that oblige us to silence the infamous" (FOUCAULT, 1985/2009, p. 14).

The real identity of the subject of our investigation remains anonymous, we have used the name of 'Omar' for reference only.

Omar claims to be a 27-year-old gay male, an undergraduate student at a public Higher Education Institution (HEI). From childhood he considered himself different from others. The feeling that has marked his existence is sadness. He has been exposed to numerous situations of extreme violence both in his closest family and in various love relationships, as well as in work activities. He also points out that he has kept all his life little affective bond with his siblings and with his schoolmates.

RESULT AND ANALYSIS

During the first years of his life, he remembers that his mother constantly beat and insulted him while exclaiming "you're only hindering me ... I would have preferred to abort you". This expression reveals a traumatic situation to which Omar was exposed from a very young age, leaving very important consequences. In the same way, he exposes the characteristics of a mother who would have a very dissociated mental state, since she cannot regulate or take dimension of the consequences of her verbalizations. It could be conjectured that, although she did not abort him physically, he did so in the realm of the symbolic, since he was unable to libidinize it.

During the period of his basic education (between 6 and 12 years) he showed difficulties to socialize with his classmates in the classroom, associated with the fear of being ridiculed in the eyes of others, when responding to the questions of a teacher or teacher. In the first year of school, he was attacked on several occasions by his teacher, describing the

situation as follows:

The teacher would throw my notebook at me [...] if I did a task correctly, even so, she would tear off the pages [...] without knowing why she would send me to the corner with donkey ears [...] I never commented about what was happening in the classroom, since my parents they hit and scold [...] no one realized everything that was happening with me [...] until now that I'm telling it.

The phrase reveals how extreme violence continues in the extra-family environment. In this sense, we have the question regarding how his psyche and his own subjectivity were built. When he expresses that no one could detect what was happening to him, the suffering that he could not express at that moment is noted.

At the same time, a victim of constant attacks at school, an infidelity on the part of his father led to various twists and turns within his family, emphasizing an emotional distancing and the increase in aggressions among members of the family nucleus.

On several occasions they fought in front of us, my mother held on so that we would not see her cry [...] my older brothers tried to separate them, however, it was of no use [...] we always went out to warn our neighbors and they took refuge in their homes so that we did not see what was happening between my parents, however, we could not avoid seeing them since they threw things until they both bled, the fight ended when the municipal police arrested my father.

The description that he makes of his parents shows the characteristics of the bond between them, also tinged with a high degree of violence. It should be noted that the identifying models that it has have to do with contempt, not registering what happens to the other, extreme suffering and fundamentally a model of masculinity related to the fact that everything in life is resolved by blows, shouting and enduring any abuse. It is inferred that this has affected the modalities that later ties have in Omar's life.

On the other hand, Omar describes how he greatly regrets what happened in the fifth grade of elementary school, when he was about 10 years old:

One day I went to the bathroom to pee [...] when a couple of students came in they stared at me [...] I felt that the two of them were standing behind me [...] at that moment they pushed me and put me in a cubicle, they lowered my pants and covered my mouth, threatening that if I said something they would hit me. The two of them rubbed their genitals on my "buttocks" [...] it hurt a lot and I cried [...] in the end the boys left and later I went back to the classroom without mentioning anything.

The fact that Omar kept this situation hidden until the moment of the interview is highly significant. He expresses that he tried to act regularly, so that his parents did not suspect anything of the violent situation he had suffered. There is a question in relation to the reasons that led him not to be able to express what was happening to him. One conjecture is linked to the difficulty in having continent objects that could receive those anxieties so difficult to metabolize. In the same way, it could be inferred that he himself unconsciously punishes and mistreats himself, feeling worthy of it. The concept of subordination erogeneity (MELER, 2013), which is used to explain the traumatic situations in which the subjects find themselves, could be valued. The author maintains that, to link the amount of stimuli that overflows them, they resort to erotic excitation. Subordinates are exposed to traumatic stimuli.

Examples of these situations are numerous. He relates an event that occurred during the same grade, which was the following: "One day I was sitting down for breakfast and alone, a classmate started throwing stones at me hitting my head and right eye while the others laughed at me, everything happened so fast that I woke up at the address [...] without remembering how I got there". The extreme situations of bullying, harassment, contempt, break out in a way that leaves traces of a trauma comparable with situations as overwhelming as war and its subsequent effects. In this way, it could be conjectured that Omar has his mental functions very attacked without being able to be used fundamentally, those such as consciousness, thought, memory that cannot be used to understand the situation and ask for help.

He relates that when he started high school he was interested in the exact sciences, thus obtaining his first academic scholarship. Later, and for showing good school performance, he was the focus of frequent aggressions by his peers.

For the second grade, he relates:

I had a classmate who was gay named Carlos, on one occasion he spread the rumor that I had had oral sex with him at his house in such a way that everyone believed him, on the fourth time he mentioned it I could not resist anymore and I hit, I grabbed him by the neck demanding that he tells the truth in front of my teammates [...] in the end they expelled us both.

One might think that these verbalizations show that he has an introjected model with characteristics of extreme violence from which he has no other way of responding than through aggression.

Due to financial difficulties he truncated his high school studies, a circumstance that led him to take a formal job for

the first time in a department store, his co-workers held meetings at lunchtime, without inviting him. After 6 months, they conspired to accuse him of theft, ultimately resulting in his dismissal, despite knowing who and how they had carried out the theft, he preferred to remain silent and want to retaliate for the situation, he points out: "Courage and desire to take revenge, but never take it out on one woman and even less because there are several". A mandate of hegemonic masculinity is revealed that Omar without thinking repeats, he feels that women must be protected, cared for, protected despite the fact that they may exercise some type of violence.

Later, he began work in a pharmacy, by that time he was 19 years old, throughout that time and after several attempts he decided to reveal his homosexuality to his mother; he confesses to try to preserve the image of "man" before others out of fear to be rejected by homophobic people.

When I decided to tell the truth to my mother, only to her, her response was a slap [...] I left her alone while I listened to her cry in her bedroom for a long time, I came back later, hugged her and asked her forgiveness for being homosexual [...] she left me talking for a while, for me it was years [...] at that time I was afraid of those who do not tolerate or respect the lives of gays, a frequent fear assailed me that they would offend me on the street or that they would yell at me anything and that the neighbors will find out about my preference.

In this expression, the force of heterosexual thought can be seen (WITTIG, 1992). The aforementioned author states that subjects with this type of thinking are incapable of conceiving a culture or a society, in which heterosexuality does not order not only all human relationships but also their production of concepts at the same time as all the processes that escape from awareness.

He claims to have had different love relationships, all of them with men, but the most significant thing is having been exposed to the submission, ridicule and violence that they exerted towards him. In this way, he was placed in a place of little value without being taken into account in a true way and in some cases without registering him almost as a human being. In relationships there was a lot of dependency on objects that gave the self-disqualifying characteristics of it. Here the consequences of not having had objects with the capacity of "reverie" to shelter and calm him are detected, then systematically repeating this situation in subsequent bonds.

It should be noted that his identification models, which come from his parents, have transmitted him a high degree of violence, contempt and systematic attacks. He could not question these models and that is how they incarnated in his being, leading him to expose himself to new situations like the ones he experienced during his childhood.

In order to justify the conjectures stated above, we will briefly describe his sex-affective ties. His first relationship was with a man we will call Miguel, who constantly humiliated Omar and he submitted to his wishes without asking about his own. He describes the manifestation of jealousy on the part of Miguel that could be characterized as delusional:

[...] if he didn't watch me at home it was at work, when I left work I would watch him go by and even slow down his car, but as I was always walking I would look at him this way out of the corner of his eye so suddenly, but now I kind of he was causing me more problems, he can't do my thing right or go anywhere just because he was always watching me and I never liked that because I even felt like he was leaving me at work and leaving.

The violence that this couple exerted on Omar was of all kinds. As for the physical abuse, he hit him numerous times. Sexual violence is also detected since it forced him to have intimate relationships without his own consent.

It should be noted that the aggression was mutual and happened over a prolonged period of time. You might think that he identified with that model of parents whose relationship was one of extreme abuse. Therefore, it is possible to formulate the existence of a predominance of the death drive expressed on both sides. This situation is repeating itself in other relationships.

Another important aspect to highlight in the aforementioned relationship is the fact that despite the requests made by Omar for Miguel to recognize him in front of his parents as a "couple", this never took place, despite warning him that this situation would deteriorate the relationship. This significant aspect for Omar could be considered, on the one hand, as an indicator of psychological violence on Miguel's part and, on the other, as the implementation of traditional constructions about masculinity strongly rooted in the hegemonic masculinity that Miguel charges such force to the degree of preferring the deterioration of his relationship with his partner rather than declaring his homosexuality in front of his parents. In this regard Omar declares the following:

On one occasion I confronted him to ask him bluntly why he had not introduced me as his partner, he pointed out that he had not confessed to his parents about his homosexuality for fear that for that reason they would attack him by expelling him from his home, at that moment I warned him that our relationship had no future.

The force of the mandate of heterosexuality corresponding to traditional masculinity continues to be noted

The second bond he established is with another male whom we will call Francisco. It was seen at the beginning as more constructive since there was greater emotional exchange and a recognition of the existence of him as a subject. However, he culminates in a cheating with his best friend, summarizing the relationship situation as follows, "He made

me think what did I do or what have I done? or what was it that caused him to get angry or what did I do? I'll see you later, it was the only thing he told me, I waited for his message, a month passed, two months, however, he did not send me a message”.

These expressions could be considered as a reflective moment of Omar by which he tries to look at himself and think what he has to do with all the situations that happen to him, this contact being very ephemeral, projective identification predominant as defense since it presents a climate of much dissociation and emotional disconnection. If he could carry out a very deep review, he could ask for professional help to get out of such violent situations, however, this is not possible.

In a third sex-affective relationship with whom we will identify as Alejandro, perhaps one of the most destructive, Omar will be placed in a place of great disqualification. In this way he becomes his servant, understanding him, cleaning his house, that is, as a domestic servant of his partner.

One day he asked me to help him clean and put away all the furniture in his business after closing [...] he started paying me one hundred and fifty pesos [...] I became like his employee [...], I took it in a good way, I thought he wanted to help me, at least he had some money [...] meanwhile he continued living with him. On one occasion he told me: this plate is all dirty [...] I have already told you to wake up earlier so that you can clean well so that you can go look for work and at that moment he began to throw the kitchen utensils at me.

In principle he makes him quit his job with the promise that he would be his financial support. However, that would be in exchange for putting him down, mistreating him and denigrating him. In Omar's words, we have: “as long as I get along, I did what Alejandro asked me to do”, “he began to treat me very badly”, “I still thought – maybe he's right – I behave like immature”. These aspects that could very well be called *melancholic* make him try to take responsibility for a situation of great violence, even in this way tacitly accepting his own domination through the form of guilt.

In his last relationship, the one who exercises extreme control over Omar will be the mother of his partner, that is, she is in charge of denigrating him as his subject. It should be noted that, although Omar's description is of a controlling woman, the most important thing will be the way in which he stays in those places until a very extreme situation occurs and difficult to be circumvented.

After all of the above, we can place how the parameters of hegemonic masculinity are still present in subjects of the same gender-sex, in this case among men. Among them it is detected that one of the two places himself in the place of power, of knowledge and based on this he feels that he can overshadow, detract, despise and even subdue the other. In this particular case, Omar is denigrated, in one way or another, by all the males with whom he associates. He exercises the power of hegemonic masculinity with all the dominance that goes with it. In this sense, the exercise of violence is identified in all its manifestations: physical, verbal, sexual, economic, symbolic and psychological.

Finally, one cannot fail to specify the mental state of *dissociation* that Omar lives and that places him, without knowing it, in a situation of constant vulnerability, exposing him to difficulties that generate intense suffering and situations of denigration from those who exercise on and for him a violence in the maximum degree.

FINAL CONSIDERATIONS

The current socio-cultural framework aims to make the relations between the genders more equitable, trying to question the exercise of masculine power over the feminine. However, on numerous occasions it is lost sight of the fact that this phenomenon is also present within women same-sex couples. This situation leads us to think and reflect about the strength that the exercise of power of hegemonic masculinity still shows, even beyond the heteronormative parameters.

Violence in gay couples is a subject little studied, as we expressed it at the beginning of our work. However, according to our literature review, the prevalence rate in some societies is usually higher than that which occurs in so-called heterosexual couples.

On the other hand, in the context of our case we identify hegemonic masculinity as an element in the subjective construction of sex-gender, which for its perpetuity is amalgamated with certain mechanisms of violence, which within the relationships established by Omar allow him to tolerate the exercise of aggression on oneself, even going so far as to go unnoticed in various situations. Given this, the history of our investigated subject admits to arguing that hegemonic masculinity is inscribed in the entire complex identity process, configuring in him the position to occupy in his various intimate relationships.

In correspondence with the foregoing, the case at hand also reveals that despite the advances in the dynamics tending to gender equality typical of societies based on the ideal of traditional masculinity, there are still resistance effects even in those in who register the effects of their domination.

It is important to note that our case also allowed us to analyze that the prolongation of the cycle of violence against Omar was favored in the context of one of the sex-affective relationships with which he maintained a greater emotional attachment and economic dependence.

Finally, we consider that our contribution is significant in the context of offering possible methodological approaches and access to the experience for those survivors of intimate partner violence; experiences that, according to various

researchers, tend to remain silent, considering that when communicating intimate aspects of abuse will have negative effects on their intimate relationship. Although the analysis carried out from our perspective could not be generalized to other populations because it is a case study, it is pointed out that relationships, be they heterosexual or homosexual, can allow the existence of other masculinities and thus enjoy emotional ties of intimacy, with recognition of the others as autonomous subjects with their own desires.

Recebido em: 05 de novembro de 2019. **Aprovado em:** 17 de dezembro de 2021.

REFERENCES

- ABELA, J. *Las técnicas de análisis de contenido, una revisión actualizada*. Granada: Universidad de Granada, 2001.
- AZPIAZU, J. *Masculinidades y feminismo*. Barcelona, Virus editorial, 2017.
- BENJAMIN, J. *Sameness and difference*. New Haven: Yale University press, 1995.
- BENJAMIN, J. *Los lazos de amor. Psicoanálisis, feminismo y el problema de la dominación*. Buenos Aires: Paidós, 1996.
- BERMÚDEZ, M. Connel y el concepto de masculinidades hegemónicas: notas críticas desde la obra de Pierre Bourdieu. *Revista Estudos Feministas*, n. 21, vol. 1, p. 283-300, 2013. Disponible en: <https://dx.doi.org/10.1590/S0104-026X2013000100015>. Acceso en: 12 jul. 2019.
- DIO BLEICHMAR, E. *El feminismo espontáneo de la histeria. Estudios de los trastornos narcisistas de la feminidad*. Buenos Aires, Adotraf S.A, 1985.
- DIO BLEICHMAR, E. *La sexualidad femenina. De la niña a la mujer*. Buenos Aires Paidós, 1997.
- BONINO, L. Los varones frente al cambio de las mujeres. *Lectora. Revista de dones i textualitat*, n. 4, p. 7-22, 1998. Disponible en: <http://revistes.ub.edu/index.php/lectora/article/view/6459>. Acceso en: 17 ago. 2019.
- BONINO, L. Masculinidad hegemónica e identidad masculina. *Revista Dossiers feministes*, n. 6, vol. 1, p. 7-35, 2002. Disponible en: <http://www.e-revistes.uji.es/index.php/dossiers/article/view/735>. Acceso en: 18 sept. 2019.
- BOSCH, E.; FERRER, V. (2012). Nuevo mapa de los mitos sobre la violencia de género en el siglo XXI. *Psicothema*, n. 4, vol. 24, p. 548-554. Disponible en: <http://www.redalyc.org/articulo.oa?id=72723959007>. Acceso en: 22 sept. 2019.
- BOURDIEU, P. *La dominación masculina*. Barcelona: Anagrama, 2000.
- BURIN, M.; MELER, I. *Varones, género y subjetividad femenina*. Buenos Aires: Paidós, 2000.
- BURKE, L.; FOLLINGSTAD, D. Violence in Lesbian and Gay Relationships: Theory, Prevalence, and Correlational Factors. *Clinical Psychology Review*, n. 19, vol. 5, p. 487-512, 1999. Disponible en: [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0272-7358\(98\)00054-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0272-7358(98)00054-3). Acceso en: 24 jun. 2019.
- CANTERA, L.; BLANCH, J. Percepción Social de la Violencia en la Pareja desde los Estereotipos de Género. *Intervención psicosocial*, n. 19, vol. 2, p. 121-127, 2010. Disponible en: <https://doi.org/10.5093/in2010v19n2a3>. Acceso en: 22 jun. 2019.
- CANTILLO, L. Alteridades de las masculinidades gay en el Departamento del Atlántico, *Revista Justicia Juris*, n. 12, vol. 2, p. 95-106, 2016. Disponible en: <http://dx.doi.org/10.15665/rj.v12i2.1014>. Acceso en: 02 jun. 2019.
- CARRIGAN, T.; CONNELL, R.; LEE, J. Toward a new sociology of Masculinity. *Theory and Society*, n. 14, vol. 5, p. 551-604, 1985. Disponible en: <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00160017>. Acceso en: 25 ago. 2019.
- CONNELL, R. *Gender and power: society, the person and sexual politics*. Cambridge: Polity Press, 1987.
- CÓRDOBA, M. *Ser varón en tiempos feministas. Entre el conflicto y el cambio*. Buenos Aires, Noveduc, 2020.
- ELLIOTT, P. Shattering Illusions, Same-Sex Domestic Violence. *Journal of Gay & Lesbian Social Services*, n. 4, vol. 1, p. 1-8, 1996. Disponible en: http://dx.doi.org/10.1300/J041v04n01_01. Acceso en: 03 ago. 2019.
- FERNANDEZ, A. M. *De los lapsus fundacionales a los feminismos del siglo XXI*. Paidós, 2021.
- FORTUNATA, B.; KOHN, C. Demographic, psychosocial and personality characteristics of lesbian batterers. *Violence & Victims*, n. 18, vol. 5, p. 557-568, 2003. Disponible en: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1891/vivi.2003.18.5.557>. Acceso en: 07 jun. 2019.
- FOUCAULT, M. *Herculine Barbin, llamada Alexina B.* (1985). Madrid: Revolución, 2009.
- FREUD, S. *El yo y el ello y otras obras* (1923). Buenos Aires: Amorrortu, 2003 (Ed. standard en castellano de las obras completas de Sigmund Freud)
- GONZÁLEZ, M.; LAMARQUE, C. ; RENZETTI, L. ; SIMONE, M. Conceptualizaciones sobre violencia en parejas del mismo sexo. Parte II. *VI Congreso Internacional de Investigación y Práctica Profesional en Psicología*. Facultad de Psicología - Universidad de Buenos Aires, Buenos Aires, 2014. Disponible en: <https://www.aacademica.org/000-035/30>. Acceso en: 09 ago. 2019.
- GONZÁLEZ, M.; MARTÍNEZ, A. Conceptualizaciones sobre violencia en parejas del mismo sexo. Parte I. *VI Congreso Internacional de Investigación y Práctica Profesional en Psicología*. Facultad de Psicología - Universidad de Buenos Aires, Buenos Aires, 2014. Disponible en: <https://www.aacademica.org/000-035/29>. Acceso en: 25 ago. 2019.
- JOHNSTON, L.; VALENTINE, G. Wherever I lay my girlfriend that's my home: the performance and surveillance of lesbian identities in domestic environments. In: BELL, D.; VALENTINE, G. (eds.). *Mapping desire, geographies of sexualities*. London: Routledge, 1995, p. 99-113.
- KAY, M.; JEFFRIES, S. Homophobia, Heteronormativity and Hegemonic Masculinity: Male Same-Sex Intimate Violence from the Perspective of Brisbane Service Providers. *Psychiatry, Psychology and Law*, n. 17, vol. 3, p. 412-423, 2010. Disponible en: <https://doi.org/10.1080/13218710903566953>. Acceso en: 04 ago. 2019.

- KIMMEL, S.; HEARN, J.; CONNELL, R. *Handbook of studies on Men and Masculinities*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications, 2014.
- KIRBY, S.; HAY, I. (Hetero) sexing space: gay men and "straight" space in Adelaide, South Australia. *Professional Geographer*, n. 49, vol. 3, p. 295-305, 1997. Disponible en: <https://doi.org/10.1111/0033-0124.00078>. Acceso en: 24 jun. 2019.
- LAQUEUR, T. *La construcción del sexo*. Cuerpo y género desde los griegos hasta Freud. Madrid: Ediciones Cátedra, 1994.
- LOPES, P. Corpos, gêneros e subjetividades em disputa: reflexões a partir de um caso de violência em uma favela do Rio de Janeiro. *Cadernos Pagu*, n. 55, p. 2-32, 2019. Disponible en: <https://dx.doi.org/10.1590/18094449201900550020>. Acceso en: 04 oct. 2019.
- LOZANO, I.; ROCHA, T. La homofobia y su relación con la masculinidad hegemónica en México. *Revista Puertorriqueña de Psicología*, n. 22, p. 101-121, 2011. Disponible en: http://pepsic.bvsalud.org/scielo.php?script=sci_arttext&pid=S1946-20262011000100005&lng=pt&tng=es. Acceso en: 11 ago. 2019.
- MARRADI, A.; ARCHENTI, N.; PIOVANI, J. *Metodología de las ciencias sociales*. Buenos Aires: Emecé, 2007.
- MARTÍNEZ, A.; ÍÑIGUEZ, L. Prácticas Discursivas y Violencia Simbólica Hacia la Comunidad LGBT en Espacios Universitarios. *Paidéia*, n. 27, vol. 1, p. 367-375, 2017. Disponible en: <https://dx.doi.org/10.1590/1982-432727s1201701>. Acceso en: 02 oct. 2019.
- MCKENRY, P.; SEROVICH, J.; MASON, T.; MOSACK, K. Perpetration of gay and lesbian partner violence: A disempowerment perspective. *Journal of Family Violence*, n. 21, vol. 4, p. 233-243, 2006. Disponible en: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10896-006-9020-8>. Acceso en: 05 sept. 2019.
- MELER, I. Violencia contra las mujeres. El contexto cultural y los trastornos psicopatológicos. *Revista Actualidad Psicológica*, n. 407, vol. 37, p.7-10, 2012. Disponible en: <http://www.actualidadpsi.com/muestra2.php?numero=407>. Acceso en: 16 feb. 2019.
- MOORE, H. Fantasías de poder e fantasías de identidad: género, raza e violência. *Cadernos pagu*, n. 14, p. 13-44, 2000. Disponible en: <https://periodicos.sbu.unicamp.br/ojs/index.php/cadpagu/article/view/8635341>. Acceso en: 10 jul. 2019.
- MORALES, A. Los hombres entre la esfera productiva y reproductiva: padres comprometidos durante la crisis económica en España (2011-2013). Tesis de Doctorado en Sociedad de la Información y el Conocimiento, Instituto de Internet Interdisciplinaria, Universitat Oberta de Catalunya. 2015.
- MURRAY, C.; MOBLEY, K. Empirical research about same-sex intimate partner violence: a methodological review. *Journal of Homosexuality*, n. 56, vol. 3, p. 361-386, 2009. Disponible en: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00918360902728848>. Acceso en: 16 feb. 2019.
- NAVARRO, P.; DÍAZ, C. "Análisis de contenido", en Delgado y Gutiérrez (Coords.). *Métodos y técnicas de investigación en Ciencias Sociales*. Madrid: Síntesis, 1995, p. 177-224.
- ORTEGA, A. Agresión en parejas homosexuales en España y Argentina: Prevalencias y heterosexismo. Tesis de Doctorado en psicología, Facultad de psicología departamento de personalidad, Universidad Complutense de Madrid. 2014.
- ORTEGA, M. La violencia entre parejas del mismo sexo. Propuesta de campaña para información y prevención. Trabajo de Maestría en Mercadotecnia Global, Departamento de Economía, Administración y Mercadología, Instituto Tecnológico y de Estudios Superiores de Occidente, Tlaquepaque. 2016.
- POORMAN, P. Forging community links to address abuse in lesbian relationships. *Women & Therapy*, n. 23, vol. 3, p. 7-24, 2001. Disponible en: http://dx.doi.org/10.1300/J015v23n03_02. Acceso en: 11 ago. 2019.
- RAMÍREZ, J. *Madeiras entreveradas: Violencia, masculinidad y poder: Varones que ejercen violencia contra sus parejas*. Zapopan: Plaza y Valdez, 2005.
- ROBLES, B. La entrevista en profundidad: una técnica útil dentro del campo antropológico. *Revista Cuicuilco*, n. 18, vol. 52, p. 39-49, 2011. Disponible en: http://www.scielo.org.mx/scielo.php?script=sci_arttext&pid=S0185-16592011000300004&lng=es&tng=es. Acceso en: 13 jul. 2019.
- SALDIVIA, C.; FAÚNDEZ, B.; SOTOMAYOR, S.; CEA, F. Violencia íntima en parejas jóvenes del mismo sexo en Chile. *Revista Última década*, n. 25, vol. 46, p. 184-212, 2017. Disponible en: <https://dx.doi.org/10.4067/S0718-22362017000100184>. Acceso en: 3 ago. 2019.
- SÁNCHEZ, J. Estudio de caso: Una manera de investigar en psicoanálisis. *Revista de psicología Ajayu*, n. 14, vol. 1, 2016. Disponible en http://www.scielo.org.bo/scielo.php?script=sci_arttext&pid=S2077-21612016000100002. Acceso en: 02 oct. 2019.
- SÁNCHEZ, J. Hercúline Barbin y la problemática del verdadero sexo. *Revista de psicología Ajayu*, n. 15, vol. 1, p. 104-126, 2017. Disponible en: http://www.scielo.org.bo/scielo.php?script=sci_arttext&pid=S2077-21612017000100007&lng=es&tng=es. Acceso en: 03 ago. 2019.
- SCHONGUT, N. La construcción social de la masculinidad: poder, hegemonía y violencia. *Revista Psicología, Conocimiento y Sociedad*, n. 2, vol. 2, p. 27-65, 2012. Disponible en: <https://revista.psyco.edu.uy/index.php/revpsicologia/article/view/119>. Acceso en: 04 sept. 2019.
- STÉFANO, M. Hacerse hombre en el aula: masculinidad, homofobia y acoso escolar. *Cadernos Pagu*, vol. 50, p. 1-28, 2017. Disponible en: <https://dx.doi.org/10.1590/18094449201700500014>. Acceso en: 05 sept. 2019.
- STEPHENSON, R.; HAST, M.; FINNERAN, C.; SINEATH, C. Intimate partner, familial and community violence among men who have sex with men in Namibia. *Culture, Health & Sexuality*, n. 16, vol. 5, p. 473-487, 2014. Disponible en: <https://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13691058.2014.889753>. Acceso en: 08 sept. 2019.
- STOLLER, R. *Sex and gender*. Aronson, 1968.
- TORO, J.; RODRÍGUEZ, S. Violencia doméstica en parejas de hombres gay puertorriqueños. *Perspectivas psicológicas*, n. 3, vol. 4, p. 164-172, 2003. Disponible en: <http://pepsic.bvsalud.org/pdf/pp/v3-4/v3-4a18.pdf>. Acceso en: 15 sept. 2019.

VILLASEÑOR, M. Masculinidad, sexualidad, poder y violencia: análisis de significados en adolescentes. *Salud Pública de México*, n. 45, vol. 1, p. 44-57, 2003. Disponible en: http://www.scielo.org.mx/scielo.php?script=sci_arttext&pid=S0036-36342003000700008&lng=es&tlng=es. Acceso en: 10 sept. 2019.

WEINBERG, G. *Society and the Healthy Homosexual*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1972.

Juan Pablo Sánchez Domínguez

jsanchez@pampano.unacar.mx

Claudia Inés Campo

claudiainesc3@gmail.com

Lubia del Carmen Castillo Arcos

lcastillo@delfin.unacar.mx