

SEX AND VIOLENCE:

The meanings and gendering of sex acts in the treatment groups for intimately violent heterosexual men

Maria Sundqvist
Master's thesis in psychology
Department of Psychology
University of Jyväskylä
September 2012

UNIVERSITY OF JYVÄSKYLÄ

Department of Psychology

SUNDQVIST, MARIA: Sex and violence: The meanings and gendering of sex acts in the treatment groups for intimately violent heterosexual men

Master's thesis, 34 pages, 1 appendix

Supervisor: Juha Holma

Psychology

September 2012

This study aims to find out how men who are violent towards their intimate partner perceive sex acts in the context of heterosexual, monogamous relationships. The meanings of sex, the separation or connecting of sex and violence and the ways of gendering in the therapy group were studied. This study is placed in the theoretical framework of postmodern feminism regarding the understanding of gender and sexuality. The data were analyzed by using critical discourse analysis and feminist reading.

The data consisted of eight treatment groups for men violent towards their intimate partners from 1996 to 2000. The sessions of the therapy groups were previously transcribed and 18 sessions from the eight groups constituted the data for analyzing. There were a total of 53 men in these groups. These therapy groups in Jyväskylä are a part of Finnish prevention and treatment program of violence. The Jyväskylä program is carried out as a collaboration between crisis center Mobile and the Jyväskylä University Psychotherapy Training and Research Centre.

The talk of sex acts in the context of intimate relationships were gendered throughout the data. The sexual and intimate partner was always defined as female either directly or indirectly. Sex acts were perceived as expressions of love and intimacy in the context of a relationship. In these cases the men also often described an ideal relationship where the woman was seen as a partner or a companion. The men also connected sex acts to the meanings of power and self-determination in the relationship context. In those discussions the men stated how a woman has the right to say no and has self-determination. Then again, refusing sexual relations was also seen as a way for a woman to use power over a man. Even though all the participants in the treatment groups have acted physically violent towards their spouses, sexual violence, mainly understood as rape, was clearly condemned. The meaning of rape charges was different in the data when they were directed to the man himself. In that case women were seen as wrongfully exploiting the legal system.

In therapeutic work, it is important to notice how the notions of sexuality and gender affect the understanding of what violence is. Considering intimate partner violence, it is necessary to identify what kind of meanings sex acts have in a relationship and in what ways they are gendered. This is important for recognizing sexual violence and also for recognizing what aspects of the relationship support the positive change during treatment.

Key words: intimate partner violence, sexuality, heterosexuality, postmodern feminism, critical discourse analysis, relationships, sexual violence

JYVÄSKYLÄN YLIOPISTO

Psykologian laitos

SUNDQVIST, MARIA: Seksi ja väkivalta: Seksin merkitykset ja sukupuolittuminen

lähisuhdeväkivaltaan syyllistyneiden miesten hoitoryhmissä

Pro gradu -tutkielma, 34 sivua, 1 liite

Ohjaaja: Juha Holma

Psykologia

Syyskuu 2012

Tämä tutkimus tarkastelee lähisuhteissaan väkivaltaisten miesten käsityksiä seksistä heteroseksuaalisen, monogamisen parisuhteen kontekstissa. Huomio kiinnittyi seksille annettuihin merkityksiin, väkivallan ja seksin erottamiseen tai yhdistämiseen sekä seksin sukupuolittamisen tapoihin hoitoryhmissä käydyissä keskusteluissa. Tutkimus paikantuu teoreettisesti postmodernin feminismin käsityksiin sukupuolesta ja seksuaalisuudesta. Aineistoa analysoitiin kriittisen diskurssianalyysin ja feministisen lukutavan keinoin.

Tutkimusaineisto koostui vuosina 1996-2000 kokoontuneista lähisuhteissaan väkivaltaisten miesten ryhmistä, joita oli yhteensä 8. Näistä ryhmistä valikoitui istuntoja aineistoon 18 ja yhteensä miehiä oli 53. Ryhmät on toteutettu Jyväskylässä osana suomalaista väkivallan hoito-ohjelmaa. Ohjelma on toteutettu Jyväskylän yliopiston psykoterapian opetus- ja tutkimusklinikan sekä kriisikeskus Mobilen yhteistyönä. Aineistona oli valmiit litteraatiot videoiduista ryhmäistunnoista.

Sukupuolittuneisuus näkyi läpi aineiston puheessa seksistä parisuhteessa. Seksikumppani ja parisuhteen osapuoli määritettiin aina naiseksi suoraan tai epäsuorasti. Seksillä oli parisuhteen kontekstissa keskeinen merkitys rakkauden ja läheisyyden ilmentäjänä. Tällöin kyse oli ideaalista parisuhteesta, jossa nainen nähdään kumppanina. Seksille annettiin myös vallankäyttöön ja itsemääräämisoikeuteen liittyviä merkityksiä, jossa yhtäältä verrattiin naisen oikeutta kieltäytyä seksistä myös vallankäyttöön, mutta toisaalta vahvasti esitettiin, että naisella on itsemääräämisoikeus seksin suhteen. Vaikka terapiaryhmän osallistujat olivat väkivaltaisia puolisoaan kohtaan, seksuaalinen väkivalta pääasiassa tuomittiin selkeästi. Raiskaus ymmärrettiin keskeisenä seksuaalisen väkivallan muotona, ja se sukupuolittui selkeästi miehen naiseen kohdistamaksi teoksi. Kuitenkin raiskaussyyte voitiin myös nähdä kiusantekona naisen taholta, kun kyse oli miehen omaan käytökseen liittyvästä tilanteesta.

Terapiatyössä on tärkeää huomioida, miten käsitykset seksuaalisuudesta ja sukupuolesta vaikuttavat väkivallan ymmärtämiseen. Etenkin lähisuhdeväkivallan ollessa kyseessä, on olennaista huomioida sitä, miten seksi määrittyy ja käsitetään parisuhteessa sekä millaisia sukupuolittuneita käsityksiä siihen liittyy. Tämä vaikuttaa esimerkiksi seksuaalisen väkivallan tunnistamiseen sekä positiivista muutosta edistävien tekijöiden huomioimiseen terapiatyössä.

Avainsanat: lähisuhdeväkivalta, seksuaalisuus, parisuhde, seksi, kriittinen diskurssianalyysi, postmoderni feminismi, ryhmäterapia, seksuaalinen väkivalta

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. INTRODUCTION	5
1.1. The postmodern approach to therapy, sexuality and gender	5
1.2. Intimate partner violence and pro-feminist treatment programs	6
1.3. Studies of sexuality and masculinity in the context of intimate violence	7
1.4. The Jyväskylä model	9
1.5. The aim of the study and the research questions	10
2. METHODOLOGY	11
2.1. Collecting and translating the data	11
2.2. Critical discourse analysis as a method	12
3. RESULTS	15
3.1. Sex, intimacy and love	15
3.2. Self-determination and gendered power in sex	18
3.3. The separation of sex act, sex crime and violence	20
4. DISCUSSION	25
References	29
Appendix 1	

1. INTRODUCTION

Even though there has been a lot of research on intimate partner violence and sexual violence, there have not been many studies that focus on how violent heterosexual men understand sexuality and intimacy. Of course, a few studies have noted how intimately violent men in heterosexual relationships use the notions of love and gender as justifications for violent behavior (e.g. Boonzaier & de la Rey, 2004; Hearn, 1998). While it has been debated whether intimate partner violence (IPV) is a gendered issue (as in typically male perpetrator - female victim) or more gender symmetric, the understanding of gender and how it is constructed in the context of IPV has not been in focus very often (Anderson, 2005). The feminist theories have examined the gendered aspects of violence and the effect of patriarchy and violence towards women, yet only fairly recently have critical studies of men and masculinities emerged to scrutinize the experiences of men and the construction of masculinity also in relation to violence (Hearn & Kimmel, 2006; Kavanagh & Lewis, 1996). The aim of this study is to examine the ways in which intimately violent men understand sex acts and intimate relationships and how those are gendered in the discussions that take place in treatment groups for intimately violent men.

1.1. The postmodern approach to therapy, sexuality and gender

This study uses the theoretical approach of postmodern thinking to gender and sexuality as well as to therapeutic work. Postmodern thought includes various theories and feminist postmodern theory is mainly concerned with the works of Foucault, Derrida and other French poststructuralists (Ramazanoglu & Holland, 2002). In postmodern thought, language constitutes reality and there is not any one definitive reality, instead it is fragmented (Kvale, 1992). In therapeutic work, postmodern thinking makes psychotherapeutic process as "shifting the client's current 'problematic' discourse to another discourse that is more fluid and allows for a broader range of possible interactions" (Lax, 1992, 69). Like Lax (1992) states, self and reality are constructed through language and in relation to others. He points out that various socioeconomical, political and cultural contexts create boundaries for this production of self and reality.

Postmodern feminist thought deconstructs gender as well as sexuality and aims to reveal and analyze the relationship of knowledge and power (Ramazanoglu & Holland, 2002). Rather than

perceiving gender and sexuality as essential and ahistorical facts, they are seen as socially constructed categories of what kind of being and living can be seen as understandable (Foucault, 1981; Butler, 1990). Dividing gender dichotomously into men and women is one of the most profound ways in which beings are constructed as human citizens in the Western world. Genders are produced through the use of language and the ways they are described and talked about have consequences.

In a therapeutic context, also discourses of gender and sexuality can go under re-evaluation, especially when the therapeutic process involves distinctly gendered problematics like intimate partner violence. Especially in pro-feminist treatment programs the focus is on gendered aspects of violence and the treatment process includes critically examining how masculinity and femininity are constructed in relation to violence (Hearn, 1998).

1.2. Intimate partner violence and pro-feminist treatment programs

Intimate partner violence or domestic violence has been treated in various ways depending on the treatment program. The traditional views of violent men and their female partners have seen them or the couple's interaction as abnormal, distinguished from 'normal' population and relationships (Dobash & Dobash, 1992). In pro-feminist programs men are seen as normal, yet using violence to maintain their power and dominance over their spouse. Intimate partner violence is seen as a problem in the structure of society, that is to say that the use of power and dominance is gendered (Hearn, 1998).

The understanding of intimate partner violence is evolving through the research in the field. Stith et al. (2012) state that while feminist treatment programs see violence mainly as a male phenomenon and intimate partner violence as something perpetrated by men towards women, evidence of more gender symmetric violence has been found. However, it is noteworthy that this does not mean that pro-feminist programs are useless, although there have been debates over their effectiveness (Babcock, Canady, Graham, & Schart, 2007). Johnson (2007) also claims that the ways of measuring violent behavior and recognizing the different types of intimate partner violence affects the view of gender symmetry or asymmetry. The important question is how treatment programs and studies reach and recognize various violences. In this study the treatment group is one of the available treatments and the participants are selected based on their motivation and commitment to the treatment (Holma, Partanen, Wahlström, Laitila & Seikkula, 2006).

1.3. Studies of sexuality and masculinity in the context of intimate violence

Even though there are many studies done on intimate partner violence and violent men to date, sexuality has been addressed only partly. There has been a lot of research on intimate partner violence in various relationship situations and on sexual violence and its effect on women and children (Johnson & Ferraro, 2000; Martsof et al., 2010). The topic of sexual violence is often included in the studies of intimate partner violence and it has been researched in the field of feminist studies. But in the context of sexuality, focusing on its multiple meanings has remained as largely uncharted in Finland as well as internationally. Furthermore, the study of sexuality and heterosexual masculinity and their construction processes in everyday sexual practices is a neglected field in general (Bertone & Ferrero Camoletto, 2009; Elder, Brooks & Morrow, 2012). It also needs to be noted that all kinds of violence in the intimate relationships can be seen as sexual, even though it might not include any kind of sexual act (Månsson, 1994; Nyqvist, 2001). Like Jackson (2008) argues, sexuality is embedded in everyday life and it is not some separate part from the non-sexual aspects of life. Therefore violence can have sexualized meanings even though it has no straightforward sexual component or it is not straightforwardly defined in sexual terms.

The construction of masculine identity has been seen as a crucial part of intimate partner violence (Dobash, Dobash, Kavanagh & Lewis, 2000; Hearn, 1998). IPV is also often seen to be connected to the gender role expectations that are limited and inflexible (Holma, Partanen, Wahlström, Laitila & Seikkula, 2006). Interestingly, Partanen (2008) has noted how the men in the treatment groups themselves do not connect the use of violence to masculinity or emphasize 'being male' in relation to violence. It is noteworthy that her research is based on the same program of treatment group for violent men as this study. However, Hearn (1998) claims that gender as well as sexuality, family, race and age are often subtexts when men talk about violence. Rather than addressed clearly, they can remain hidden, yet be taken for granted.

Jones and Hearn (2008) have examined the marking of body in the context of sex and violence. They point out that while there are acts that are more clearly defined as violence even though they might have a sexual meaning, there are acts that are commonly connected to sexuality and love that can be used in a violent context. In this case, hickeys or love bites are used as an example of a visible mark that usually carries meanings of passion and sex, but can also be used for controlling and marking in a violent relationship. Hearn (1998) and Nyqvist (2001) have included

themes of sexuality and sex as a small part in their studies of intimate partner violence. The context of those studies differ from this study since the men were interviewed during the treatment process that consisted mostly of couples therapy and individual therapy as well as other forms of services provided.

Hearn (1998) describes sexuality as a subtext when men talk about violence, specifically when they disclose their own violent behaviour. This means that sexuality is hidden yet present in the context of violence in intimate relationships. The connections between sexuality and violence are smaller parts of the data that consist of 60 interviews of men that are violent towards their intimate female partners and other women they know. Hearn depicts the absence and presence of sex and sexuality in the speech of violent men as taken-for-granted heterosexuality combined with the separation of violence and sexuality, that is, not naming any violence that can be named sexual. Hearn also points out how sexual violence is seen as separate from physical violence, even though acts of physical violence, like battering, can have sexualized meanings. Defining sexual violence precisely is difficult since it can include very different forms of behaviour and acts. Hearn has used Kelly's (1987) understanding of sexual violence as a continuum to describe the various ways it can occur in a context of a heterosexual relationship.

Nyqvist (2001) has done research on violent men and their relationships for developing after-crisis work in shelters. His data consist of interviews of 18 men and 16 women, so they differ from the data of this study even though there is a therapeutic setting involved. He uses the interviews of women to illustrate the various ways sex and violence are linked in an intimately violent relationship. Nyqvist states how sexual violence occurs in various ways in the relationships. It can involve controlling the woman's sexuality and sexual behavior as well as coercion and degrading but also be unresponsiveness towards partner's needs and degrading her by being openly unfaithful. The women do not use the word rape even though some of the experiences could very well be named as such. Also Nyqvist notes that not all sexual relationships are dysfunctional even though the man is violent. The sexual relationship might be the only part that works.

In conclusion, sexuality in the context of intimate partner violence can be seen as a partially neglected research field. While the research on the sexual violence experienced by the female partners is an important part of developing the services for intimate violence survivors and the prevention of intimate violence, more studies on sexuality and violent men are needed in order to develop violence treatment and prevention programs further.

1.4. The Jyväskylä model

This study is based on the data collected in the Jyväskylä model treatment groups for men who are violent towards their female partners. The treatment groups are one part of the multi-professional co-operation of services offered for partner abusers, their victims and their children who have witnessed abuse at home. This model is established in 1996 and is strongly influenced by a Norwegian treatment model *Alternativ til Vold* (ATV, Alternative for violence) (Holma et al., 2006). The treatment is based on voluntary participation and usually it does not alleviate the legal outcome. Also, not all of the participants in the treatment groups are being prosecuted for their violent acts. The program is pro-feminism oriented, but also other features of various therapeutic orientations are applied (Holma et al., 2006; Partanen, 2008).

Men who enter the treatment groups have first contacted the crisis center in Jyväskylä by themselves or with a guidance from local health care or the police or via contact by a female spouse. First there is an immediate intervention with interviewing and assessing the situation. A minority of the men who are violent towards their intimate partners start the group treatment, since it requires motivation and commitment. The group meetings are unstructured and there are two counsellors in each session. The unstructured sessions give room for adapting the treatment to serve the needs of the men in the group. However the counsellors direct the discussion to specific topics including past and present violent behavior, the security of the victim, violence as a conscious choice and the different characteristics of masculinity and masculine identity. The sessions are videotaped.

The female partners of the men are met at the beginning and at the end of the group treatment as well as in a two-year follow-up. The purpose is to screen the types and scales of violence the partners have experienced. The female partners are also provided with information of the services they can contact and the risks involved in the therapy program. However the data in this study do not include the partner interviews since they were added to the treatment model in 2001, whereas this study contains data from 1996 to 2000.

1.5. The aim of this study and the research questions

The purpose of this study is to examine the ways the male participants talk about sex and sexuality in the Jyväskylä model treatment groups for intimately violent men. The topic of this study comes from the researcher's own research interests and previous studies in this research field. Furthermore, the topic of sexuality has not been studied in this research project, there is only one bachelor's thesis by Heino and Kääriäinen (2008) that focuses on sexual violence and its prevalence during the treatment. The research questions were defined during the reading and the process of the data selection. Not only does this study try to reach the notions of sex and sexuality in the context of violent men in therapy groups but also to connect them to a wider cultural concepts of sex, violence, masculinity, love and heterosexual relationships.

The research questions are:

1. How is sex as an act perceived by the violent men in the context of heterosexual relationship?
2. How are sex act and violence separated and connected in the therapy group discussions?
3. In what ways are sex acts gendered in the discussions of sex in the context of relationship?

2. METHODOLOGY

2.1. Collecting and translating the data

The data of this study consist of selected parts of transcribed group treatment sessions of eight different groups for men who are violent towards their intimate partners from 1996 to 2000 in Jyväskylä. There were total of 53 men in the groups and five of them attended only to 1-3 sessions. The transcriptions were made from videotaped treatment sessions by different transcribers. The men who participated in these groups were or had been in heterosexual relationships, most of them being married at the time or in a common-law marriage. Less than five of them had divorced from the partner they had battered or the divorce proceedings were going on. They were from 20 to 60 years of age and their socioeconomic backgrounds and education varied. Most of them had children of ages ranging from newborns to adults over 18 years of age. Some also had children from earlier relationships or their spouse had children from a previous relationships. All of the men were citizens of Finland, although one of them had the nationality of another European country as well. The majority of the men in the groups reported having acted violently towards their partner for longer than a year and commonly more than 7-10 times altogether.

The data were selected from the total of eight groups. For most of the groups the data consisted of 15 sessions but two groups lacked the transcriptions of one to five sessions. There is also one follow-up session of one group included. For further analysis, the data was selected by searching through digital text documents with a search function. Keywords like *sex*, *sexuality* and in some cases more informal words were used to find specifically those parts of the discussions where the topic was sex and sexuality. Other small references to sex were also found and included in the data as well. This resulted in approximately 25 pages of transcribed material from twenty group sessions of eight different treatment groups which constitutes the data for analysis. This means that in every group the topic of sex and sexuality was raised in one or more sessions.

The transcription styles vary in the data. The transcriptions of two sessions are partly summarized and do not include information on pause lengths. There are 18 sessions that are transcribed thoroughly with timed pauses of speech and the volume and style are also specified. The transcriptions of two sessions lack the timed pauses and the specified quality of speech, otherwise they are thorough. This inconsistency in the transcribed data complicated the reading and analyzing process since some of the information is lost; for example pauses, tones and quality can affect the

meaning of spoken words very dramatically. This loss was compensated by reading closely the conversations that lead to sexual themes and following the individual styles of speech of the men in the treatment groups. The appendix includes transcription notes as well as the excerpts in Finnish.

The translation of the data from Finnish into English is based on finding the most appropriate expressions that capture both the style and the meaning of the original speech. Of course, translating discussions that contain a wide variety of slang and dialect words is challenging and it is impossible to find a completely corresponding word for every expression. Pauses and other important qualities of speech that have been marked in the transcription have been included as exactly as possible.

2.2. Methods of analysis

Critical discourse analysis was chosen as a method for this study. Also a feminist way of reading was applied to this method as a way to concentrate critically on gender and sexuality. Both critical discourse analysis and feminist reading concentrate on the political power that the use of language has (Weiss & Wodak, 2003; Mills, 1995). Like discourse analysis, critical discourse analysis cannot be separated from its epistemology since there is a core assumption of language as a constructive tool (Coyle, 2000). In this study, the treatment group is the site where negotiations and struggles of defining sex, sexuality and gender occur.

Critical discourse analysis is a form of discourse analysis that is influenced by the works of Michel Foucault (Wooffitt, 2005). This method has a clear political agenda and it aims to reveal the forms of power and oppression, like Wooffitt (2005) concludes. Wodak (2002b) notes that critical discourse analysis focuses on text, written or spoken, but it also focuses on the social processes and structures that produce those text in question. These structures are historical, situated in certain times and spaces and dominant structures are linked to power and the legitimated ideologies of certain groups (Wodak, 2002b). Wooffit (2005) presents critical discourse analysis and Foucauldian discourse analysis as two separate strands of the critical movement of discourse analysis. He notes that critical discourse analysis takes a strong political stance, being open about the motives and emancipatory interests connected to the studies. While this study mainly uses critical discourse analysis, also Foucauldian discourse analysis has influenced it. Meyer (2002) states that critical discourse analysis is agreed to be an approach rather than a single method. Therefore it can be

applied in various ways depending on the topic. While there is not any clearly distinctive feminist method, the feminist framework can be applied to various studies. This means that the research is connected to the theoretical, epistemological and political discussions of feminist research and focuses critically on the notions of gender and sexuality (Ramazanoglu & Holland, 2002).

The data in this study is analyzed on four levels influenced by Wodak (2002a): words and utterances, relationship of utterances and conversation, therapeutic contexts of texts and wider, sociopolitical and cultural aspects. Within these data, this means analyzing the speech and choices of words about sexuality and sex as utterances, their relationship in the conversations in a therapy group setting and connecting the concepts of sexuality and violence produced in this setting to the wider sociopolitical aspects. The emancipatory goal of critical discourse analysis in this study differs from the way Wooffit (2005) describes it. This is not an analysis of a certain oppressed group and the struggle of power with a dominant group but a critical examination on the notions of sex, sexuality and gender in a therapy group of heterosexual men who have used violence towards their intimate partners. Here, the power under examination lies in the negotiations of gender and sexuality in the therapy context, in the context of intimate partner violence and the wider sociopolitical and cultural contexts of gender and violence. Not only is power used by violent men towards their partners but there are power struggles in the discourses of sexuality and gender as well.

The data selection process described in the previous chapter gives a general sense of the overall contents of the data. Following Willig's (2008) description of the research stages of the Foucauldian analysis, the first read-throughs of the data included highlighting the words that were central to the theme of sexuality. Then these parts were closely read in order to recognize recurring themes. Through these themes certain categories of sex discussion were created. Like Meyer (2002) points out, in critical discourse analysis data collecting and analysis are not necessarily separate steps in a way that data collecting should be finished before analyzing. In this case, the data provided many different themes and perspectives and during the analysis the aim of the study became more precise and defined. Rather than selecting a very strict and defined question at the beginning, the analysis progressed from a more general level to a more precise. Therefore some parts of the results from the analysis were dropped out since they did not fit to the more clearly defined research questions. The concept of relationship became central in the discussions of sex acts and through that, the themes of self-determination, gendering, power and sexual violence occurred. Like Meyer (2002) describes, critical discourse analysis has a similar starting point in analysis as grounded theory. The research has been documented by writing notes and keeping a research journal. This way the decisions guiding the process as well as the emotions raised by the data are

visible and easier to reflect upon.

In this study, the data were read in a critical and feminist way. This means that the researcher concentrates especially on the choices of words in the data and how they construct gender and sexuality in the theoretic framework of postmodern feminism. Certain words and utterances were central to the analysis and recognizing their meanings involved comparing them to the various other ways of expressing the same thing and how they affect the meaning and its consequences. In addition, the utterances and bits of conversations are connected to the wider discourses of sex. This way the consequences of certain ways of speaking can be more visible. The excerpts illustrate the categories the data are divided into and show how negotiations of different discourses of sex take place in the therapy group. Like Parker (1994) notes, the discourses are not hidden to be discovered but produced in the analysis. However, "-- they do then give a coherence to the organization of language and tap institutional structures of power and ideology in a way that a simple appeal to common reasoning could never do" (Parker, 1994, 104).

3. RESULTS

The discussions about sex and relationships in the therapy groups for male batterers contain gendered meanings about sex acts, love, self-determination, power, and violence. The three categories of sex in the context of heterosexual relationship are sex connected to intimacy and love, sex connected to self-determination, and gendered power and sex separated from sex crimes and violence. The chosen excerpts illustrate the categories and negotiations represented in this study. The text excerpts are selected from different groups and different sessions so they cover the whole data. The parts that are crucial and central to interpretation are in bold text. The participants and therapists have been marked with abbreviations, that indicate when the group started and which session of the group is in question, M and a number meaning a participant and T and a number meaning a therapist. For example F99/12/M3: the first letter and number indicate the year and whether it is a spring or a fall group, the number after the first slash is the session of that group and the last letter and number specify the person talking. These abbreviations are used in the original transcriptions and all the names and other information that may cause the participants to be recognized is changed. The transcription uses (brackets) to point out pauses; number inside the brackets signifies seconds and a period is used to mark only a short pause. ((Double brackets)) are used to signify other communicative elements like laughter.

3.1. Sex, intimacy and love

This chapter focuses on how the men in the therapy groups define sex and what kind of contexts are associated with that. Sex can have multiple meanings depending on the context. A sex act in the context of a relationship is often connected to the notions of love and romance. (Jackson, 1999) The most euphemistic expressions of sexuality and sex acts occur in the data when they are associated with love and the ideal of an intimate relationship. The men in the therapy groups are heterosexual and do not present any possibilities for homosexual sex or relationship scenarios, so love of a romantic nature is always focused on women. Also the talk about sex, infidelity and relationships point at an ideal of a monogamous relationship. Having sex with someone else is seen as infidelity, breaking a promise. Sex can also be 'just sex' without a romantic context and this is indicated in

various ways in the data. Whether the style is coarse or more neutral, the men refer to sex as a mutually agreed act. These are the preconditions for understanding the meanings of sex acts in a (heterosexual) relationship within these data.

The notion of an ideal intimate relationship in the data contains a sexual component that is understood as an expression of love. The sexual act should be passionate and in that way it resembles a passionate relationship.

S96/11/M2: *I think it's not doing well, if it goes to that kind of (.) **greyness I was in before** (.) in my previous marriage (.) just going to work and coming home and lying down on and farting and then turning your back (.) -- I can tell that it I haven't seen **real love** before (1) It isn't that kind (.) of passionate that I like (1) Yeah (1) It I don't like just that plain life (.) like it's just going to work and waking up and back and sleep and back to work and back and (.) eating and watching a video and going to sleep ja wo- (.) **and once a week screwing or once a month, it's no fucking use anything like that.** (.) **It's like the all the energy and (.) flourishing is lacking there***

This man describes the mundane, dull relationship lacking the *real love*: sex is *screwing* every now and then. When depicting the ideal romantic and sexual relationship he uses almost poetic language, using *passion* and later even *energy* and *flourishing*. Here, sex has an important role in defining a loving relationship. The description of sex as an important part of a romantic relationship occurs multiple times throughout the data.

Ideally sex is seen as a mutually agreed and enjoyable act for both:

F98/5/M2: -- *what sex is at it's best (.) when it's like (.) **a mutual, shared thing** (1) adults' **game***

Sex is referred to as a shared act as well as a game. The mutuality and sharing emphasize the intimate aspect of sex, while game refers to playfulness. The same participant uses the words *closeness* and *love* and also states that sex should be *fun* when he describes it further. Mutually pleasurable sex is seen as a crucial part of a romantic relationship:

F98/5/M1: -- *Sometimes I have talked (.) with women (.) who have been (.) like ten (.) fifteen (1) years in their relationships and (2) when they're a bit drunk and they (.) start to talk about sex then it turns out that **they have never had (.) an orgasm (1) and that (.) felt a bit***

strange that the relationship has lasted so long and (1) still (2) like from the outside (.) for example the relationship looks (.) good

Here a pleasing and successful sexual act is defined by having an orgasm. The participant M1 connects a pleasing sex life to a good relationship by wondering how a relationship may have lasted years even when the female partner has not been satisfied. Another participant M2 comments on this and adds how *that kind of a relationship has to have another kind of love*. This emphasizes how sex is perceived as an act of ideal and romantic love in a relationship. If the sex life is not pleasing, the relationship has to have *another kind of love* to last so long. This can refer to a type of love that friends share, commonly understood as platonic love.

Sexual acts can occur as separate from love as the data shows. There are several occasions when the men refer to *sexual relations* meaning casual sex without a romantic relationship. Casual sex is referred as *fucking* in a couple of instances. Sex can define a relationship as a relationship but it can occur separately from it too.

F98/12/T2: (1) *do you have sexual relations?*

F98/12/M1: (2) *Occasionally yeah*

F98/12/T2: (1) *mm (.) well **what separates it from a relationship?***

F98/12/M1: (3) ***maybe feelings** -- (5) *the feelings side (.) in a way that it isn't (.) it isn't a relationship**

Here, a relationship is defined by *feelings*, even though sexual acts are understood as a significant factor in romantic relationships. The therapist asks the participant to tell what makes sexual relations different from a relationship so the participant M1 has to define the most important factor that characterizes the difference.

Even though sex is often defined as *intimate* in the group discussions, sexual partners can be seen as irrelevant outside the relationship context. The individuality of a sexual partner can fade and then she is defined through her gender as a representative of women in general. This illustrates how a female partner (a spouse or a girlfriend) differs from other women:

F98/5/M2: -- *like what it is at its best that the partner is **your friend** (.) more like it would be (.) **just a woman to you***

Here the distinction is made by describing how the sexual partner in the relationship is *a friend* and

not *just a woman*. This can also illustrate how gender might be a secondary characteristic in an ideal romantic relationship: the woman is first and foremost a partner and a friend.

In the data, sex and love are connected in the context of relationship. Sex is defined as a crucial part of a heterosexual relationship since it is seen as an act of mutual love. Sex is also expected to be enjoyable and satisfying for both parties involved. This is described in two ways, as a physical satisfaction (orgasm) as well as more abstractly as mutual enjoyment and fun. When sex and love are separated and a sex act occurs just as a sex act with out feelings and relationships, the meaning of the sexual partner changes. In the data the partners are strongly defined through their gender. This is connected to heterosexuality and the understanding of two essentially opposite genders. The gender of the sexual partner (in a relationship or outside it) is always mentioned directly or indirectly so the desire is always directed to the opposite sex in the data. Yet there is a possibility for companionship to override gender as a crucial definition of a romantic and a sexual partner.

3.2. Self-determination and gendered power in sex

It is almost like a general understanding in all of the therapy groups in the data that sex should be based on a mutual consent. The negotiations of consenting occur when it needs to be determined who can say no and in what context. The discussions of self-determination are often linked to the gendered power aspect of sex.

Here consenting is perceived through gender, stating that women have the right to say no.

F98/5/M2: (9) *then you just have to humble yourself and apologize (.) bring (.) come in with a bouquet of flowers (4) and even then it isn't sure (4) **woman really has the right to say no***

In this excerpt, the context is relationship and violence. The therapist and participants have discussed how violent behavior affects sexual life. It is agreed that a woman has the right to say no and deny sex in the relationship, especially if the man has been violent. It is seen logical and understandable that a woman does not want to have sex with a man who has been violent towards her. Even if the man is repentant, expressed here with words like *humble yourself, apologize* and *a bouquet of flowers*, it is not seen as an obligation for the woman to agree to have sex.

The sex act can be seen as containing meanings of power in a relationship simply by agreeing to have sex with the partner or denying it from him or her. Here denying sex is presented as power and even violence used by women:

F99/10/M4: -- *it can be that kind of balance (.) of violence where **both use it (.) reciprocally (.) and pretty harsh (.) like possibly **pretty harsh violence hhh. towards one another like other shouts (.) other*****

F99/10/M1: *won't put out ((someone laughs))*

F99/10/M4: *other (.) **won't put out** or ((utterance of laughter)) .hh or like.. uses like (.) other's some kind of **mental weak spots** like (I) conciously or subconsciously exploiting it can be very (.) like so hard to see what (.) **what is violence***

F99/10/T1: *mmm (.) now if you had said that (.) wh- when we had ((laughing)) those visitors they hhh. would have said that why women don't have a right for their own body*

F99/10/M1: *right (I) does a man*

F99/10/M4: ***why doesn't a man have a right for his own body ()**
it's the same thing*

Shouting and not putting out are suggested as similar forms of violence in this excerpt. *Exploiting one's mental weak spots* is also presented as a similar oppressing and violent act as denying sex. This excerpt can be seen as a way of finding and negotiating the definition of violence. Interestingly, here *the right to one's own body* is used as an argument for men by a man. Although both women and men are this way put in a similar position regarding the rights, still men and women are represented as different. The theme of women being verbally more competent and using verbal violence arises as a justification of violence in the groups for male batterers and this occurs in this example too. Refusing to have sex is seen also as a form of violence the woman uses towards the man:

F99/10/M1: *(.) tormenting the other (.) **tormenting with lack of sex** to say it straight (.) **it is some kind of violence too (.) it's oppres- it's oppressing the other.***

This sparks up a discussion of how violence and using power is separated. The therapist points out how a threat of violence and forcing concerning sex are violence.

Using sex acts and denying them as a form of power can be seen as problem in certain relationships, not necessarily primarily gendered:

F99/10/M1: *--earlier we didn't have (.) didn't have a working sex life and if I say it straight **it was used as and extortion .hhh extortion so it became like begging and praying***

*((someone laughs)) begging (.) but well (.) I think that (.) if (.) I did it now (1) we both for both of us the sex life means so much and it is (.) it works very well for us (.) and well it hasn't been used as(.) used as (.) but well if you think and I think that if and you hear that (.) hear that then (.) every now and then someone (.) speaks about it for the heck of it speaks openly too then I think that (.) **if I for example (1) denied it it would cause an uproar if I said that I don't care for it -- strange situation for me to think that but also vice versa***

The participant M1 describes his earlier relationship and how sex was used as an *extortion*. He compares that to the current relationship, where *the sex life is working*. He makes an allusion to a situation where he could be the one to deny sex and how in the current relationship it would cause *an uproar*. So there is a possibility that denying sex can be used as a means of power by both sides in the heterosexual relationship, even though it is seen as *a strange situation*. Even presenting this possibility is important, because it questions the static gender roles in relationships where the man is seen as active and wanting and the woman is seen as passive and uninterested in sexual relations.

Sex can be seen as usage of power in a relationship. In the data, it is mainly women who are seen to use sex as power by the means of withholding sex from the male partner on purpose. Still, there is a possibility that the power aspect can be seen as a problem in a specific relationship and not necessarily primarily gendered. In that case the explanations are more based on individual differences and interaction than on rigid gender differences. The men in the therapy groups negotiate on the limits and definitions of violence so it is suggested that withholding sex could be seen as violence. The therapists play an important role in the discussions where violence is defined since the men often justify their violent behavior by how the woman has acted or what she has said.

3.3. The separation of sex act, sex crime and violence

The topic of sexual violence is indeed a distressing one and when combined with assessing one's own (potentially sexually) violent behavior, it is even more difficult. The men in the therapy groups are forced to confront their own sexual behavior and attitudes towards heterosexual relationships with women. The discomfort is shown in the therapy sessions through frequent pauses and searching for the right words as well as hedging and avoiding certain words, using words like *it* and *you know*.

The men in my data generally clearly dissociate themselves from sex offenders, especially

rapists. Sex crimes are generally understood as raping and condemned as loathsome. Here, one participant states this very clearly:

F99/10/M1: *--and personally (for example) I reckon rapist really ((coughs)) that I think it's really **despicable** (.) I have said it and (.) and(.) I've always thought that (.) **a man doesn't need a woman necessarily** and (.) it's really **the most despicable thing one can do to a woman***

Raping is understood as the most *despicable* thing a man can do to a woman, so there is a clear assumption of heterosexuality and power dynamic between genders reflected in this statement. This person also states that *a man doesn't need a woman necessarily*, rejecting the view of male sexuality as an uncontrollable urge. Recognizing one's own possible sexually harassing behavior causes unpleasantness:

S00/8/M1: *-- **it would feel repulsive to think that (.) i could (.) be guilty of sexual harassment** (2) that would be like (.) that would be like (.) like (1) admitting to someone it that (2) like (1) or like see it in yourself*

Sexuality and violence are understood as separate in a way, making the possibility of sexually violent behavior nonexistent in oneself.

S99/13/M3: *--**if the violence for example had been sexual it would be likely (1) or pretty surely there (2) the other one would be scared.***

S99/13/T1: *mmm.*

S99/13/M3: *(1) so maybe **they both are in a way like so close thing in their own way that it doesn't raise fear.***

S99/13/T1: *mmm (8) hhh. do you mean that how harsh threatening and hitting is it is actually very personal and intimate?*

S99/13/M3: *(3) no not really .hhh in some way yes (but) (.) hhh. (.) well (3) **violence and sexuality are pretty much (.) like primitive things***

S99/13/T1: *mmm*

S99/13/M3: *(1) very (.) primitive so that **they are both like in their primitiveness like in their own (1) sections that they don't really (2) like mix with one another***

Here the participant M3 separates sexuality and violence although he states that they are *close*. He places sexuality and violence as separate notions under the category of primitivity. This way they are simultaneously connected and separated, both belonging to this essential notion of nature by being adjacent. Primitivity can be understood as some kind of fundamental part of human nature. The possibility of sexually violent behavior is present, but only as a reference to that kind of theoretical situation.

The typical gendered aspect of sexual violence (theoretical male perpetrator and female victim) is put in question in this excerpt:

F99/10/M6: *then it started (1) that is (.) th-th-that (.) it had to be taken care of this way (.) she came first and then everyone was happy .hhh ((laughs))*

F99/10/T2: *then you got to stay home*

F99/10/M6: *yeah then you got stay home -- (2) then it started to become like (1) (there) I started to get stressed by it*

The participant M6 describes the situations he has experienced with a female sexual partner where the woman demanded to have an orgasm first and if this demand was not fulfilled, the man was forced to leave the house. He says that he *started to be stressed by it*, so these situations were distressing. This is a rare occasion where a male participant brings out a situation where he can be seen as a subject of sexual violence in the sense that he is being forced. Later he describes how he was *the more passive party in it and how he started to fear the situation*. The therapist points out how this experience must make it easier to understand how a woman feels in a similar situation. Even though the participant M6 also laughs while telling this, it is obvious that this experience differs from the gendered power aspect of sex that was analyzed in the previous chapter where denying sex was suggested as violence towards men. Considering traditional masculinity, the possibility of a man being violated sexually by a woman is seen as virtually impossible (see Abdullah-Khan, 2008). Therefore the situation is presented in a humorous fashion, leaving some room concerning how the group and the therapists respond to this. If the hurtfulness experienced is rejected by others, it is possible to claim he was not serious.

One participant in the whole data brings out that he has been charged with a sex crime:

F00/2/M4: *-- I'm (.) it (.) being charged with (.) r-rape (no) what (is it) it hhh. is the term rape? Or something like this that not a rape but the next interph- like it hasn't been hhh. has been (.) has been (.) in a relationship that it hasn't been done it has been done (.) under*

*the same roof I don't know what it's called*¹

He states that he has been charged with *rape*, but then hesitates and makes an allusion that it is a milder form of violation. M4 refers to *relationship* and *being under the same roof*, implying he connects the milder form to the context of relationship. It has to be noted that the Finnish legislation recognized marital rape as late as 1994. It is possible that marital or a common law relationship is seen here as a mitigating circumstance even though that is not the case from legislative point of view. M4 seeks to reduce the impact of the term rape by offering these factors that might make the other see it as a milder offence.

There is also an instance where claims of sex crimes and sexual violence are seen as a way to intentionally and wrongfully convict the man:

F00/5/M5: -- *and then there's that (.) that one law that the women can easily cause trouble if they want (that) .hhh even if you're married (.) .hhh you're in bed together like normally both wanting it (.) if she just gets this idea in her head she can go to the police he has raped me (.) but yeah (.)*

The possibility of committing a sex crime and sexually abusive behavior is here denied by describing how a woman might just decide that a *normal* sexual act is a rape. The law is not seen as protecting the rights of women but as a possibility for *causing trouble* for a man. The participant M4 who had been charged with a sex crime agreed to this statement by saying it fits his situation. Here the men are seen as the victims of the situation where women exploit the justice system wrongfully.

Sexual violence is commonly identified as raping in the data, but the therapists stir up conversations about coercion as a form of sexual violence and the meaning of self-determination. Interestingly, in the data, sexual violence - mainly understood as raping - is quite clearly condemned with one rather ambiguous exception is the man who speaks about legal actions concerning the act of sexual violence he did to his wife. The more personal the possibility of sexually violent behavior becomes, the more explicitly the men deny it or put the blame on someone or something else. Women can be seen as abusing the legal system but also the law is considered to enable the possibility of causing trouble for men. There is also a situation where the man speaking can be positioned as the one violated in a sexual relation. Naming and recognizing the wide spectrum of

¹ It should be pointed out that in Finnish there are two words for rape and both are used in this excerpt. One of them, *väkisinmakaaminen*, is an older term used in the Finnish legislation until the year 1998.

sexually violent behavior is challenging in both positions, as a perpetrator and as a victim. The understanding of sexual violence is clearly gendered in the society, setting the limits for the full understanding of experiences. The perpetrator is normally gendered as a man and the victim as a woman. If the woman uses power, it is different from the way man uses it: a woman is not seen as a possible rapist in the data but she can use the role of a 'typical victim' in an abusive way.

4. DISCUSSION

In this study, the aim was to examine how the men who have been violent towards their intimate partners perceive sex as an act in the context of heterosexual relationships, how sex act and violence are separated and connected and how the sex acts are gendered in the discussion in the therapy groups. The transcribed data from the therapy sessions were analyzed using the method of critical discourse analysis in the theoretical framework of postmodern feminism.

The ways sex acts were defined in the context of heterosexual relationships were divided into three categories. The sex act was strongly linked to a romantic relationship and in that context the female partner was clearly gendered as a woman but also characterized as 'more than just some woman'. Having mutually satisfying sex was perceived as a way of expressing love. The taken-for-granted heterosexuality is present in these results just like in Hearn's (1998) study. Sex act was also defined through the notions of self-determination and power. In this category, a sex act is gendered by defining who can say no to sex and in what context. The separation of power and self-determination is made by negotiating the meanings of saying no to sex. While it is mutually agreed that a person, here defined as a woman, has the right to say no, in certain contexts saying no is defined as using power over a partner. The men in the therapy groups even suggest that withholding sex could be considered violence and in this way comparable to battering for example. In this way these results are similar to both Nyqvist's (2001) and Hearn's (1998) findings: the violent men speak about women using sex as power. The topic of sexual violence was always initiated by the therapists and it caused great discomfort in the group. Sexual violence was mainly understood as raping and the men condemned it as despicable. One exception was a man who spoke about legal proceedings concerning the sexual assault charges brought against him by his ex-spouse. Even though women and men were seen as very different and opposite in the data, the static roles and possibilities were slightly questioned.

Nyqvist (2001) states that it is a common phenomenon in the studies of intimately violent men that they do not disclose their sexual behaviour and they leave out sexual violence from their definition of violence. Yet Hearn (1998) states that the interviews may include a lot of sexual, sexually violent and gendered meanings, usually indirectly. The results from this study are partially similar to those of Hearn's study. The men in this study did not initiate discussion of sexual violence, yet prompted they did contemplate their own behavior. Gendered meanings of sex acts were often expressed indirectly when discussing sexual themes. Sex and intimate relationship was a commonly recurring theme in the sessions. Even though there was not reported any similar usage of certain sex

acts as violence in this data, the study by Jones and Hearn (2008) of the markings of the body provides an important view to this research. The sex acts and behaviour connected to the markings have different meanings depending on the context. Of course, the spouses' views would provide much more information in this case. Defining sexual violence is not clear-cut since what usually are considered acts of love can be used harmfully as well and some behavior that could be labeled as violent can also be understood as 'normal' behavior in certain contexts.

Even though there was a strong discourse of love and sexual violence was mainly condemned, it needs to be pointed out that the way these men speak can differ greatly from how they act. The ideals of relationship and sexual relations can contain meanings of mutual consent, respect and companionship while the real current relationship with the spouse can be violent and derogatory. However, it is noteworthy that these views of ideal relationships with female spouses are more equalitarian and positive in comparison to the views of love in Hearn's (1998) study. He points out that love and affection have been used as a justification for violence and dominating. The key to knowing whether the ideals work in the daily life lies in the views of sex acts and what is perceived and labeled as normal behavior.

Recognizing sexual violence is a very important part of the therapeutic process of treating males who have committed intimate partner violence. Admitting and confronting one's violent behavior is challenging but sexually violent behavior is even more difficult to deal with since sexuality is a deeply intimate part of life. Sexual violence is typically understood as raping and it is seen as a crime that only sex offenders do. That way it's separated from the daily life and the so called normal people. Thus it's possible for a man to condemn rapists yet be charged with a sex crime himself, because one's own behavior can be conceptualized in various ways and the responsibilities and reasons can be placed upon other people. Recognizing the continuum of sexual violence is challenging since it includes various forms of coercion and harassment that can occur in one's own relationship and life and can be accepted as normal sexual behavior in the context of traditional masculinity (see Kelly, 1987). Another issue to be addressed is that men can be subjected to sexual violence as well. From the traditional masculinity's point of view, being a victim of abuse and sexual violence is practically impossible for a man, yet it does happen. The experiences of abuse are difficult to disclose if they are not seen as possible happening to a heterosexual man.

Partanen (2008) ponders whether masculinity should be a central topic in the treatment groups even when the men in the groups don not bring up masculinity as an important element in their violent behavior. There is not much straightforward talk about violence 'as a man' in the data of this study either. Of course, the focus is more on sex acts and intimacy but the men do not particularly emphasize masculinity or maleness. But just like Partanen (2008) concludes, this might

be due to the taken-for-granted masculinity so it does not need to be even mentioned or it is not really seen as problematic or the gender neutral speech is a way to avoid guilt and shame. Masculinity can be seen as a subtext like Hearn (1998) posits about heterosexuality and gender. When the men define genders as different from one another and describe how and what women are, they can be seen as also vicariously constructing masculinity. Although gendering occurs continuously in the data, there are moments when it is questioned or transcended. For example the understanding of the intimate partnership can transcend the gender in importance, making the companion first and foremost a partner and a friend rather than a woman.

It has to be kept in mind that the data in this study come from 1996 to 2000, so it is possible that the ways the men address sex acts in intimate relationships and define gender might have changed in the treatment group meetings held after that. The talk about gender and equality in the media in Finland and internationally has increased. Considering the changes in understanding violence as a phenomenon in the last 20 years and the rise of postmodern thinking, it is no surprise the public debate about gender as well as sexuality has been heated. The gender roles are also performed and constructed again yet criticized and questioned. Masculinity is not static and that shows in the data of this study as well. The men recognize sexual violence and condemn it, they define gender dichotomously yet they question whether the both genders could experience the same things and they disclose the need for intimacy even though they have battered the spouse they claim to love.

This study was carried out following the criteria of qualitative research in order to produce reliable results (Tindall, 1994; Yeardley, 2008). One of the main problems concerning this study is the fact that the data consisted of transcriptions of the taped sessions only and there were variations in the transcription styles. Due to time limitations only transcriptions were used, since including the taped sessions would have been very time consuming. Some of the nonverbal messages in sessions were lost due to the inconsistency of the transcription styles throughout the data and watching the taped sessions would have compensated that loss. Furthermore, if there had been a possibility of interviewing the participants, it would have provided additional data. Even though not used as data, the interview forms of participants were read during the research process. They offered background information of the men in treatment groups.

The analysis is mainly carried out by one researcher so triangulation (using more than one researcher, data source or method) could have improved the quality of the research. This lack was compensated by keeping notes throughout the research process as well as discussing the analysis with the supervisor and colleagues. Using the excerpts from the actual data makes the results easier for the reader to evaluate and also this way the participants' voices come through. The number of

participants in the groups and in the selected data is quite small but it can still be assumed that this research can provide knowledge of the views on sexual acts, relationships and gender in the treatment programmes for batterers

For further research, it would be useful to examine what kind of changes occur in the ways violent men talk about sex, sexuality and gender throughout the therapy process. Since this study has a limited amount of data, it cannot include that kind of process dimension of the therapy groups. The differences between the groups or individual men were not under examination in this study either. It would be interesting to find out whether the meanings of intimacy and sex acts differ between groups and if they do, why. The treatment processes on an individual level could provide more insight to therapeutic changes and the effect of other factors like ethnicity, age and socioeconomic background. Applying the knowledge of various forms of intimate partner violence and studying the understanding of sexual relations in that context would provide information beneficiary for developing treatment. Knowing how sexual violence is defined and understood is valuable for the development of interventions and preventive care too.

On an societal level, the examination of the ways in which gendering occurs in various contexts provides valuable information of their consequences. Gender has social, political and cultural repercussions for individuals and groups. Considering intimate partner violence, gendering and the various definitions and expectations of gender have an effect on what kind of help is provided and for whom but also how the gender is constructed in the treatment by the participants and therapists. The negotiation of the limits of gender and behavior have a political effect: what is defined as forbidden and as accepted for individuals based on their various identities. Critical research of gender is valuable for studies of intimate partner violence since it enhances the understanding of violence as a multidimensional phenomenon and supports the development of more suitable and versatile forms of help and prevention.

References

- Abdullah-Khan, N. (2008). *Male Rape - The Emergence of a Social and Legal Issue*. Basingstoke, Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Anderson, K.L. (2005). Theorizing Gender in Intimate Partner Violence Research. *Sex Roles*, 52(11/12), 853-865.
- Babcock, J. C., Canady, B. E., Graham, K., & Schart, L. (2007). The evolution of battering interventions: From the dark ages into the scientific age. In J. Hamel & T. L. Nicholls (Eds.), *Family interventions in domestic violence*. (pp. 215-244) New York: Springer publishing company.
- Boonzaier, F. & de la Rey, C. (2004). Woman Abuse: The Construction of Gender in Women and men's Narratives of Violence. *South African Journal of Psychology*, 34(3). 443-463.
- Bertone, C. & Ferrero Camoletto, R. (2009). Beyond the Sex Machine? Sexual practices and masculinity in adult men's heterosexual accounts. *Journal of Gender Studies*, 18(4), 369–386.
- Butler, J. (1990). *Gender Trouble: Feminism and The Subversion of Identity*. London: Routledge.
- Coyle, A. (2000). Discourse Analysis. In G.M. Breakwell, S. Hammond & C. Fife-Schaw (Eds.), *Research Methods in Psychology* (2nd ed.) (pp. 251-268). London, Thousand Oaks, New Delhi: Sage Publications.
- Dobash, R. E., & Dobash, R. P. (1992). *Women, violence and social change*. London: Routledge.
- Elder, W. B., Brooks, G. R. & Morrow, S. L. (2012). Sexual Self-Schemas of Heterosexual Men. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity*, 13(2), 166–179.
- Foucault, M. (1981). *The history of sexuality. Vol. 1, An Introduction*. (R. Hurley, Trans.) Harmondsworth: Penguin. (Original work published 1976).
- Hearn, J. (1998). *The Violences of Men: How men talk about and how agencies respond to men's violence to women*. London: Sage.
- Hearn, J. & Kimmel, M. (2006). Changing Studies on Men and Masculinities. In K. Davis, M. Evans, and J. Lorber (Eds.), *Handbook of Gender and Women's Studies*. (pp. 54-71) Thousand Oaks: SAGE.
- Heino, H. & Kääriäinen, H. (2008). *Seksuaalinen väkivalta "Vaihtoehto väkivallalle" -terapiaryhmään osallistuneiden miesten parisuhteissa*. (Bachelor's thesis) The University of Jyväskylä, Jyväskylä.
- Holma, J., Partanen, T., Wahlström, J., Laitila, A., & Seikkula, J. (2006). Narratives and discourses in groups for male batterers. In M. Libshitz (Ed.), *Domestic Violence and its Reverberations* (pp. 59-83). New York: Nova Science Publishers.
- Jackson, S. (1999). *Heterosexuality in Question*. London, Thousand Oaks, New Delhi: SAGE Publications.
- Jackson, S. (2008). Ordinary Sex. *Sexualities*, 11(33), 33-37.
- Johnson, M. P. (2007). Domestic Violence - The Intersection of Gender and Control. In L. O'Toole, J.R. Schiffman & M.L. Kiter Edwards (Eds.), *Gender Violence - Interdisciplinary Perspectives* (2nd ed.) (pp. 257-268). New York & London: New York University press.
- Johnson, M. P. & Ferraro, K. J. (2000). Research on Domestic Violence in the 1990s: Making Distinctions. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 62, 948–963.
- Jones, M. & Hearn, J. (2008). Physical Bruises, Emotional Scars and 'Love Bites': Women's Experiences of Men's Violence. In V. Burr & J. Hearn (Eds.), *Sex, Violence and the Body: The Erotics of Wounding* (pp. 53-70). Palgrave Macmillan.

- Kavanagh, K. & Lewis, R. (1996). Interviewing Violent Men - Challenge or Compromise? In K. Cavanagh & V.E. Cree (Eds.), *Working With Men - Feminism and Social Work* (pp. 87-112). London, New York: Routledge.
- Kelly, L. (1987). The Continuum of Sexual Violence. In J. Hanmer & M. Maynard (Eds.), *Women, Violence and Social Control* (pp. 46-60). London: Macmillan Press.
- Kvale, S. (1992). Postmodern Psychology - A Contradiction in Terms? In S. Kvale (Eds.), *Psychology and Postmodernism* (pp. 31-57). London, Newbury Park, New Delhi: Sage Publications.
- Lax, W. D. (1992). Postmodern Thinking in a Clinical Practice. In S. McNamee & K.J. Bergen (Eds.), *Therapy as Social Construction* (pp. 69-85). London: Sage Publications.
- Martolf, D. S., Draucker, C. B., Cook, C. B., Ross, R., Stidham, A. W., & Mweemba, P. (2010). A meta-summary of qualitative findings about professional services for survivors of sexual violence. *The Qualitative Report*, 15(3), 489-506.
- Meyer, M. (2002). Between theory, method and politics: Positioning of the approaches to CDA. In R. Wodak & M. Meyer (Eds.), *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis* (pp. 14-31). London: SAGE Publications.
- Mills, S. (1995). *Feminist Stylistics*. London: Routledge.
- Månsson, S. (1994). Kvinnomisshandel - ur mannens perspektiv. *Nordisk socialt arbeid* 14(1), 13-27.
- Nyqvist, L. (2001). *Väkivaltainen parisuhde, asiakkuus ja muutos*. Ensi- ja turvakotien liiton julkaisu 28. Turku: Painosalama Oy.
- Parker, I. (1994). Discourse analysis. In P. Bannister, E. Burman, I. Parker, M. Taylor & C. Tindall (Eds.), *Qualitative Methods in Psychology - A Research Guide* (pp. 92-107). Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Partanen, T. (2008). *Interaction and Therapeutic Interventions in Treatment Groups for Intimately Violent Men*. Jyväskylä: Jyväskylä University Printing House.
- Ramazanoglu, C. & Holland, J. (2002). *Feminist methodology - Challenges and choices*. London: Sage Publications.
- Stith, S. M., McCollum, E. E., Amanor-Boadu, Y. & Smith, D. (2012). Systemic perspectives on intimate partner violence. *Journal of Marital and family Therapy* 38(1), 220-240.
- Tindall, C. (1994). Issues of evaluation. In P. Banister, E. Burman, I. Parker, M. Taylor & C. Tindall (Eds.), *Qualitative methods in psychology: a research guide* (pp. 142-158). Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Willig, C. (2008). Discourse Analysis. In J. A. Smith (Eds.), *Qualitative Psychology: A Practical Guide to Research Methods* (pp. 142-158). London, Thousand Oaks, New Delhi, Singapore: Sage Publications.
- Wodak, R. (2002a). The discourse-historical approach. In R. Wodak & M. Meyer (Eds.), *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis* (pp. 63-94). London: SAGE Publications.
- Wodak, R. (2002b). What CDA is about - a summary of its history, important concepts and its developments. In R. Wodak & M. Meyer (Eds.), *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis* (pp.1-13). London: SAGE Publications.
- Woolfit, R. (2005). *Conversation Analysis and Discourse Analysis. A Comparative and Critical Introduction*. London, Thousand Oaks, New Delhi: SAGE Publications.
- Yardley, L. (2008). Demonstrating Validity in Qualitative Psychology. In J. A. Smith (Eds.), *Qualitative Psychology: A Practical Guide to Research Methods* (pp. 235-251). London, Thousand Oaks, New Delhi, Singapore: Sage Publications.

APPENDIX 1: THE ORIGINAL TEXT EXCERPTS IN FINNISH

S96/11/M2: *Minun mielestä se menee huonosti, jos se menee semmoseen (.) **harmauteen missä minäki aikasemmin** (.) edellisessä avioliitossa olin että (.) töihin ja kotiin ja kylelle ja pierasee ja kääntää selekää ja (.) se menee minä sanon suoraan siitä ei semmosesta semmosesta semmo- se ei oo ees. (.) Mää voin sanoa että ni se ei oo mää en **oikeeta rakkautta** ennen nähnykkään. (1) Sillei se ei ole niin semmonen (.) intohimoinen mistä minä pidän. (1) Joo. (1) Se mää en tykkää semmosesta tasasesta ja (.) semmosesta mikä on vaan tämmönen, että töihin ja herätään ja takasi ja nukkumaan ja töihi ja takasi ja (.) syyvään ja katotaan video ja lähetään nukkuun ja tö- (.) **ja kerran viikossa kiksautetaan tai kerran kuussa ni ei helevetin hevon hyötyä oo siitä. (1) Se on niinku kokonaan siitä se semmonen tarmokkuus ja semmonen (.) kukoistus ja semmonen on semmosesta rus- suhteesta pois ihan täysin tyystin.***

F98/5/M2: *--sillo ku se parhaimmillaan se seksi on (.) ku se on semmonen (.) **yhteinen jaettu asia** (1) aikuisten **leikki***

F98/5/M1: *--oon jutellu joskus (1) naisihmisten kanssa (.) mitkä tuota ni (.) on eläny jo (1) kymmenen (.) viistoista vuotta parisuhteessa ja (2) kun ne (.) on pikkusen juovuksissa ja niitten (1) menee puhe seksiin ni ilimeneeki että **nei oo ikänä esimerkiks saanu (.) orgasmia ollenkaan (1) ni se (.) tuntu vähä ihmeelliseltä että parisuhe on kestäny niin pitkään ja (1) kuitenkin (2) on niinku ulospäin (.) esimerkiks parisuhe näyttää (.) hyvältä ni***

F98/12/T2: (1) onko teillä seksisuhdetta

F98/12/M1: (2) toisinaan joo

F98/12/T2: (1) mm (.) no **mikä sen erottaa seurustelusuhdesta**

F98/12/M1: (3) **ehkä tunne**

S98/12/T2: (1) mmm

S98/12/M1: (5) **tunnepuolelta (.) ainakin silleen että ei se oo (1) ei se oo seurustelu**

F98/5/M2: *niinku se parhaimmillaan on että kumppanis on sun ystäväs (.) enempi kuin se on (.) sulle vaan niinku nainen*

F98/5/M2: *(9) siinon nöyryttävä vaan ja pyyvettävä anteeks (.) tuotava (.) tultava kukkapuskan kanssa (4) siltikään sei oo varmaa (4) **kyllä naisellon oikeus kieltäytyä***

F99/10/M4: *-- se saattaa olla hyvin molemminpuolista (.) siis se voi olla tommonen väkivallan (.) tasapaino missä molemmat käyttää niinku .hhh niinku vastavuorosesti (.) (ja) aika (.) kovaa (.) siis mahdollisesti aika kovaaki .hhh väkivaltaa toisiaan kohtaa (ett) toinen huutaa toinen (.) toinen tota*

F99/10/M1: *pihtaa ((joku naurahtaa))*

F99/10/M4: *toinen (.) **pihtaa** tai ((naurahtaa)) .hhh tai tota yy- käyttää tota (.) toisen (.) jonkullaisia **psykkisiä heikkoja paikkoja** niinku (1) tietoisesti tai tietämättään hyväksi se voi olla siis (.) niinku hyvin vaikee nähdä ett mikä (1) **mikä on väkivaltaa***

F99/10/T2: *(1) mmm (.) nyt jos sä oisit sanonu tuon (1) silloin ku täällä oli ne ((nauraen)) .hhh vieraat ni .hhh tuota ne ois sanonu että miksei naisella o oikeus (.) omaan ruumiiseensa*

F99/10/M1: *aivan (1) onko miehellä*

F99/10/M4: **miksei miehellä o oikeus omaan ruumiiseensa**

F99/10/M1: *(.) toisen piinaaminen (.) **piinaaminen puutteessa** näin suoraan sanottuna ni (.) jonkullaista väkivaltaahan sekin on (.) se on alistam- se on toisen alistamista*

F99/10/M1: *-- aikasemmassa meillä ei (.) ei (.) sukupuolielämä ei toiminu .hhh ja sitä käytettiin suoraan sanottuna semmosena kiristyksenä .hhh kiristyksenä että se alko olla semmosta **rukoilemalla rukoilemista** ((joku naurahtaa)) (.) rukoilemista mutta tuota (.) mä luulen että (.) jos (.) minä tekisin nyt vasta (1) molemmilla molemmille sukupuolielämä meille merkitsee paljon ja se on (.) se toimii todella hyvin meillä .hhh ja tuota sitä ei oo käytetty (.) käytetty (niin) mutt jos (.) jos niinkun ajattelee ja kyllä tossa kuulee (.) kuulee sitä silloin (.) silloin tällön varmasti joku (.) puhuu sitä piruutetaan joku puhuu avoimestikkin nin .hhh kyllä mä luulen ett **jos (1) minä esimerkiksi (1) kieltäisin niin siitä nousis kyllä hirveen haloo jos mä sanosin että emmä välitä -- outo tilanne on tietysti ajatella minun mutta että myöski päinvastoin***

F99/10/M1: *pidän henkilökohtasesti (ni esimes) raiskaajaa tosiaan niin tuota (.) ((selvittää kurkkuaan)) nin (.) pidän todella **alhaisena** (.) olen sanonu sen ja (.) ja tuota (.) ollu aina sitä mieltä että **mies ei välttämättä naista kaipaa ja (.) se on kyllä alhaisin mitä voi naista kohtaan tehdä***

S00/8/M1: -- *tuntus niin vastenmieliseltä ajatella että (.) et ite niinku (.) syyllistys semmoseen **niinku seksuaaliseen häirintään** (2) et ei niinku (3) et se ois varmaan niinku (.) et sille in niinku (1) myöntää toiselle se niinku tavallaan että (2) et silleen (1) tai nähä itessään niinku se*

S99/13/M3: -- *jos väkivalta esimerkiks ois ollu seksuaalista niin todennäkösesti niinku (1) tai **melko varmaanhan siinä** (2) toinen pelekäiski*

S99/13/T1: *mmm*

S99/13/M3: (1) *ett ehkä ne on sitten **molemmat tota niin omalla tavallaan tota läheisiä asioita** ett sei välttämättä herätä pelekoo*

S99/13/T1: *mmm (8) .hhh tarkotatko sä että n-niin karua ku uhkailu ja lyöminen onki ni se on itse asiassa hirvittävän henkilökohtasta ja lähelle tulevaa*

S99/13/M3: (3) *ää en oikeestaan tota .hhh tietyllä tavalla kyllä (mutt) (.) .hhh ett (.) tuota tuota (3) **väkivallassa ja seksuaalisuudessahan sinänsä ne on aika (.) sinänsä primitiivisiä asioita***

S99/13/T1: *mmm*

S99/13/M3: (1) *hyvin (.) alkukantasia ett ehkä **ne on molemmat niinku jollain .hhh sill alkukantasuudellaan niinku omassa (1) lokerossaan ettei ne välttämättä tota (2) niinku sekaannu toisiinsa***

F99/10/M6: *sillon se alako (1) eli sillä (.) s-si- sii- (.) se piti tota (.) sillai hoitaa **hän sai ensin ni kaikki oli tyytyväisiä .hhh ((nauraa))***

F99/10/T2: *sitten sai jäädä kotiin*

F99/10/M6: ***ni sitt sai jäädä kotiin** siinä tuli jo semmosta (1) **rupes jo ressaantumaan siitä itte***

F00/2/M4: -- *mua (.) se (.) syytetään mua niinku (.) v- väkisinmakaamisesta (eikun) mikä (se on) se hhh väki- onko se () tai joku tämmöne ett ei raiskaus mutta se siitä seuraava väliva- sitt että sei oo niinku .hhh on ollu (.) ollu kuitenkin (.) parisuhteessa että sei oo niinku tehty se on tehty sillä tavalla (.) saman katon alla emmä tiä mikä se on se*

F00/5/M5: -- *niin ja sitt on tää (.) tää yks laki on kanssa semmonen missä naiset pystyy tekee hyvin kiusaa jos ne haluaa (tota että) .hhh vaikk ois naimisissa (.) .hhh teette ihan normaalisti näitä sänkyhommia molemmat haluaa sitä (.) jos sillä oikeen välähtää päähän se voi mennä poliisille se on raiskannu (.) mut nii*