

Predicting Relationship Commitment in Gay Men: Contributions of Vicarious Shame and Internalized Homophobia to the Investment Model

Darrell C. Greene
New York City, New York

Paula J. Britton
John Carroll University

Applying the Investment Model and theory of minority stress to cohabiting gay men, this study used an online survey ($N = 232$) to investigate contributions of relationship satisfaction, quality of alternatives, investment size, vicarious shame, and internalized homophobia to predict relationship commitment level. Findings indicated satisfaction, investment size, vicarious shame, and internalized homophobia significantly contributed to the prediction of relationship commitment. Internalized homophobia functioned as a suppressor variable in the relationship between vicarious shame and commitment level. Implications for therapy are discussed.

Keywords: gay men, internalized homophobia, commitment, shame

Although minority stress theory (Meyer, 2007; Meyer & Dean, 1998) has contextualized the impact of social strain on gay men's relationships, including relationship quality (Frost & Meyer, 2009), intimacy (Frederick, 1995), attachment (Zakalik & Wei, 2006), and social support (Rostosky, Riggle, Gray, & Hatton, 2007), there is a paucity of research integrating minority stress theory with investigations that predict gay men's relationship commitment. A broader analysis of features of minority stress affecting gay men's coupling longevity is vital to counseling practice that can address the unique needs of gay men in intimate relationships. By determining factors contributing to increased or decreased relationship commitment levels in gay men, more strategic interventions may become available to counselors promoting relationship strengthening or addressing negative conditions deleterious to gay men's relationship health. Further information on contributing factors to gay men's relationship commitment level may be particularly useful to gay couples pursuing and/or participating in long-term relationships who request counselor guidance to improve or sustain their ongoing bonds.

In contrast to the limited research on minority stress and relationship commitment in gay men, one much researched model of relationship longevity is the Investment Model of relationship interdependence (Rusbult, Martz, & Agnew, 1998). According to the model, relational interdependency emerges as an additive function of wanting to persist in one's relationship or feeling satisfied, needing to persist because one's investments are high, and having no choice but to persist because alternatives to one's relationship are poor (Rusbult et al., 1998). Rusbult, Coolsen, Kirchner, and Clarke (2006) explain that commitment level is defined as the

"intent to persist in a relationship, including long-term orientation toward the involvement as well as feelings of psychological attachment to it" (p. 618). Salient to relationship commitment, satisfaction level is defined by the model as the degree to which an individual experiences positive affect as a result of relational involvement, and includes fulfilling needs for companionship, intimacy, sexuality, security, and belonging. Quality of alternatives, a second feature of the model, refers to the perceived desirability of available alternatives, including but not restricted to sexual and romantic alternatives to one's primary relationship. Finally, investment size is a third component of the model and describes the significance and magnitude of resources attached to a relationship, including time and effort spent to sustain a relationship, emotional investiture through intimacy, mutual friends, personal identity as coupled, children, and mutual economic investments. The practical utility of the Investment Model of interdependence is defined by its ability to predict those who will end their relationships. As such, the model allows for a determination of features contributing to relational dissolution and definition of areas reflecting relationship problems (Baucom, Epstein, & Stanion, 2006; Rusbult, Coolsen, Kirchner, & Clarke, 2006). Its theoretical significance lies in its capacity to explain how some will remain relationally committed in spite of suffering significant and ongoing relational dissatisfaction (Kurdek, 1992; Rusbult et al., 2006).

The model has proved successful in predicting gay men's relationship commitment level as investigated by Duffy and Rusbult (1986). Their classic study found significant multiple correlations between commitment and satisfaction, quality of alternatives, and investment ($R = .82$) for gay men in relationships. However, Duffy and Rusbult's study was limited by investigating gay men's relationship commitment across various levels of relationship seriousness, and consisted of a sample of 25 gay men in relationships who resided in Kentucky. As such, results may have been confounded by undifferentiated relational categories given potential differences in commitment as a function of relationship status (e.g., Rhoades, Stanley, & Markman, 2010). On the other hand, multiple studies have demonstrated that higher commitment level

This article was published Online First December 23, 2013.

Darrell C. Greene, Private practice, New York City, New York; Paula J. Britton, Department of Education and Allied Studies, John Carroll University.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Paula J. Britton, One John Carroll Boulevard, University Heights, OH 44118. E-mail: pbritton@jcu.edu

correlates with increased satisfaction, increased investment, and lower quality of alternatives across sexual minority and heterosexual populations, relationship duration, and types of relationships, including those dating, married, and cohabiting (Bui, Peplau, & Hill, 1996; Davis, 2000; Impett, Beals, & Peplau, 2001–2002; Le & Agnew, 2003; McCabe, 2006; Rusbult, Johnson, & Morrow, 1986; Rusbult et al., 1998; Sprecher, 2002). Using average z scores weighted by sample size and then reconverted to R^2 , Le and Agnew's (2003) meta-analysis of the Investment Model across numerous studies, including heterosexuals and nonheterosexuals, concluded that satisfaction, alternatives, and investment each uniquely contributed to the prediction of commitment, explaining 61% ($R = .78$) of the variance, as well as successfully explaining 22% ($R = .47$) of the variance of relationship breakup as a function of commitment level.

Although the Investment Model has demonstrated general validity, its application to gay men requires further investigation specific to relationship status. The current study focused on gay men in cohabiting relationships and their commitment level. Additionally, it is unclear if constructs related to minority stress might offer further contributions to the Investment Model's prediction of commitment. Two such features of potential importance are internalized homophobia and vicarious shame.

Gay Men's Relationships, Internalized Homophobia, and Vicarious Shame

Internalized homophobia (IH), defined as the internalization of negative social attitudes about homosexuality by sexual minorities (Weinberg, 1972) is considered a major component of sexual minority stress negatively influencing gay men in intimate relationships. Described as insidiously self-perpetuating (Malyon, 1982; Meyer & Dean, 1998), the impact of IH on relationships includes a "lack of entitlement to give and receive love, resulting in irrational efforts to undermine the relationship; and projection of the devalued self-image to the partner who is then made the scapegoat" (Friedman, 1991, p. 488). Both theory (Cabaj, 1988; McWhirtier & Mattison, 1984; Ossana, 2000) and research (Coleman, Rossner, & Strapko, 1992; Frost & Meyer, 2009; Meyer & Dean, 1998; Ross & Rosser, 1996; Szymanski, Kashubeck-West, & Miller, 2008) specific to gay men in relationships have identified IH as adversely affecting coupling dynamics. For example, research has found that gay men with higher IH report greater problems with their partners, appear less likely to be involved in intimate attachments (Meyer & Dean, 1998), experience more sexual guilt (Rowen & Malcolm, 2002), suffer reduced relationship quality (Mohr & Fassinger, 2006; Shidlo, 1994), and express decreased relationship satisfaction (Bradley, 2008; for review, see Szymanski, Kashubeck-West, & Miller, 2008). Although research on IH and reduced relationship quality in gay men (Frost & Meyer, 2009), or similar negative internalizations like internalized racism and negative relationship functioning in minority heterosexuals (Kelly & Floyd, 2006) may inform predictions of the negative impact of internalized homophobia on gay men's relationships, specific study of how internalized homophobia may influence relationship commitment in cohabiting gay men is currently unavailable as contextualized by the Investment Model. IH may negatively affect gay men's commitment levels through cultural internalization of reduced expectations of relational longevity for

gay men in relationships, feeling unworthy of love, or being uncomfortable in intimate relationships (Greenan & Tunnell, 2003). Alternatively, IH may increase commitment in cohabiting gay men as a function of generalized perceptions of reduced quality of relationship alternatives; if all gay men have been negatively judged, expectations for alternative relationships may be equally negative or even less appealing relative to one's current relationship.

In addition to questions concerning the influence of IH on cohabiting gay men's commitment, internalized homophobia may be only one manifestation of a broader category of shame reactions troubling male dyads (Friedman, 1991; Greenan & Tunnell, 2003; Kaufman & Raphael, 1996). Shame is understood as a social emotion comprised of a family of negative feelings, ranging from mild embarrassment to severe humiliation (Tomkins, 1987) related to appraisals of wrong-doing and self-blame (Tangney, Burggraf, & Wagner, 1995). In shame, the self is perceived as exposed, flawed, or defective, leading to a desire to escape or hide (e.g., Tangney, Miller, Flicker, & Barlow, 1992). Shame often manifests in sexual minorities as a consequence of the minority stressors of societal derision, prejudicial events, physical threat, and/or psychological meanings attached to a stigmatized identity (Meyer, 1995, 2003). Shame has been found to correlate to IH across sexual minorities (Greene & Britton, 2012) and in gay men (Allen & Oleson, 1999; Brown & Trevethan, 2010), as well as having been found associated with avoidant and anxious relational attachment styles in gay men (Brown & Trevethan, 2010) and heterosexuals (Lopez et al., 1997).

Although shame has been primarily investigated as an intrapsychic phenomenon, shame may also be experienced interpersonally and externally, as vicarious shame. Vicarious shame is defined by shame reactions felt by an individual or individuals in response to the actions of others. Although the concept of vicarious shame is implied in psychological literature as early as James' (1890) definition of the social self, and continued through the notion of the self-concept as also including others (Aron, Aron, Tudor, & Nelson, 1991; Hermans, Kempen, & Van Loon, 1992), recent research has explored relationships of negative actions by nations, groups, or individuals leading to a personal sense of shame (Lickel, Schmader, Curtis, Scarnier, & Ames, 2005). Experience of vicarious shame appears particularly poignant within close or intimate relationships, such as between parents and children (Scarnier, 2007) and for those in close proximity (e.g., Hatfield, Cacioppo, & Rapson, 1994; Mackie, Devos, & Smith, 2000; Miller, 1987), wherein a shared identity and sense of responsibility for the other exists (Bennett, Yuill, Banerjee, & Thomson, 1998; Cialdini & de Nicholas, 1989; Tajfel & Turner, 1986; Tesser, 1988). Vicarious shame is theorized to occur when another's wrong-doing is appraised as threatening to one's self-image (Lickel, Schmader, & Barquissau, 2004). Just as intrapsychic shame hypothetically accompanies cognitions of a flawed self-exposed before an internalized observing "other," vicarious shame may result from feeling that one's connection to a significant other's person, behavior, character, or qualities reveals a flawed aspect of one's shared identity or signifies personal inadequacy as to object-choice. As such, vicarious shame occurs through imagined or perceived negative social or interpersonal reactions to one's significant other, evoking personal shame.

Gay men in relationships may respond with vicarious shame not only when negatively judging a partner's behavior because of concerns about social approval, social status, and image representation, but also when perceiving their relationship through the lens of a homophobic "other." For example, a member of a male couple who is perfectly receptive to the other's gestures of affection in gay-friendly environments may experience vicarious shame when that same partner attempts to hold hands in an unknown or less embracing public space because of an anticipation of another's judgment. Although this example may also refer to intrapsychic shame emerging through an unexpected felt exposure of one's sexual minority identity status, vicarious shame is differentiated from intrapsychic shame because it is identified with the action of one's partner, and thereby judged as provoking a personal or mutual vulnerability to social threat. Further, as relationships offer a sense of shared identity (Lickel, Schmader, & Spanovic, 2007; Tajfel, 1981) and encourage self-other integration (Aron, Aron, Tudor, & Nelson, 1991), the experience of criticism or devaluation directed at one's partner or significant other following perceived insufficiency, inadequacy, faux pas, negatively perceived stereotypic behavior, or social and professional failure may create susceptibility to a personal and/or mutual sense of being flawed, inappropriate, or of having participated in wrong-doing. Similar to shame reactions in general (Gilbert, 1998), gay men's felt vicarious shame in the company of one's partner may lead to increased insensitivity, self-consciousness, fear of negative evaluation, social withdrawal, increased self- and other-monitoring, social hypervigilance, anger, defensive strategies of relational disengagement, or shame-rage communication cycles escalating into relational discord (Lewis, 1971; Retzinger, 1991; Scheff & Retzinger, 1991). In addition, vicarious shame may cause undue restrictions on social expression of relationship-enhancing behavior, like public displays of affection, and overconcern or criticalness about how one's partner or significant other is behaving or being "seen"—all of which may negatively impact upon relationship functioning (Fitzness & Fletcher, 1993; Green & Mitchell, 2002; Jones & Gallois, 1989; Major & O'Brien, 2005; Mohr & Fassinger, 2006). Although there is a dearth of research on vicarious shame and its consequences for heterosexual or gay male coupling dynamics and outcomes in general or information on relationship commitment level specifically, findings of the impact of stress on heterosexual marriages (Bodenmann, Ledermann, & Bradbury, 2007), negative influences of nonvalidating communication styles on heterosexual and gay male couples' relationship satisfaction (Croyle & Waltz, 2002; Gottman et al., 2003), and studies of negative interaction patterns predicting unhappiness (Gottman & Krokoff, 1989; for review, see Weiss & Heyman, 1990) or provoking reciprocal negative affect between partners (Fincham, 1985; Fincham & Bradbury, 1993; Gottman, 1994; Gottman & Krokoff, 1989; Krokoff, Gottman, & Roy, 1988; Margolin & Wampold, 1981; Weiss & Heyman, 1990) would all support hypotheses of negative relationship outcomes as related to vicarious shame, including gay men's relationship commitment. Further, suggestive support comes from Schmader and Lickel's (2006) study which found minority member's reports of vicarious shame in reaction to in-group member's negative stereotypic behavior was associated to distancing responses from group members and group identity. As such, it is suggested that vicarious shame is an important though presently unexplored form of social strain requiring further inves-

tigation, and potentially impacting upon cohabiting gay men's commitment level.

In summary, we hypothesized that (a) the Investment Model variables of satisfaction, investment, and quality of relationship alternatives, and the minority stress variables of vicarious shame and internalized homophobia, would make independent contributions to cohabiting gay men's commitment level; and (b) internalized homophobia and vicarious shame would be positively correlated. No prior research to our knowledge is available that has combined variables of the Investment Model with minority stressors of internalized homophobia and vicarious shame to look at their independent contributions to gay men's relationship commitment levels. Because research on relationships has been criticized for a lack of distinctions among relationship statuses (Surra, Gray, Boettcher, Cottle, & West, 2006), the current study focused only on gay men in cohabiting relationships.

Method

Participants

A total sample of 232 self-identified gay and bisexual men in cohabiting same-sex relationships participated in the study, with 66% in committed and cohabiting relationships, 15% in state-defined domestic partnerships, and 19% legally married. Approximately 91% self-identified as gay men, and 8% self-identified as bisexual, mostly gay, and 1% self-identified as bisexual, mostly heterosexual. Ages ranged from 18 to 66 or older, with approximately 4% 18–24 year, 14% 25–31 years, 21% 32–38 years, 12% 39–44 years, 17% 45–51 years, 17% 52–58 years, 11% 59–65 years, and 5% 66 or older. Approximately 74% of the total sample self-identified as non-Hispanic White, 9% as Latino or Hispanic, 9% as Asian American, 5% as African American or Black, 2% as American Indian or Native American, and 1% as Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander. Relationship longevity included 24% who had been in their relationship between 4 and 7 years, about 20% who had been together for 1–3 years, 19% who had been together over 20 years, 15% had been together 8–11 years, 8% for 12–15 years, and 4% for less than 1 year. Approximately 52% had an advanced degree, 29% were college graduates, 14% had some college, and 4% had terminal high school diplomas or its equivalent, and less than 1% had less than a high school education. The majority of the sample did not have children living in their households; however, of the 10% who did, 7% reported having one child, 2% reported having three children in their households, and 1% reported two children living with them. Economically, the sample was at the higher end of the continuum, with 31% earning \$100,000 or more, 31% earning \$50,000–\$100,000 annually, 12% earned \$30,000–\$39,000, 12% earned \$40,000–\$49,000 annually, 7% earned \$20,000–\$29,000, 4% earned less than \$10,000 annually, and 3% earned \$10,000–\$19,000.

Instruments

Internalized homophobia. Internalized homophobia was measured using the Short Internalized Homonegativity Scale (SIHS; Currie, Cunningham, & Findlay, 2004). The SIHS is a 12-item measure of internalized homophobia based upon the Reactions to Homosexuality Scale (RHS; Ross & Rosser, 1996).

Through confirmatory factor analysis, three underlying and moderately correlated dimensions of public identification as gay, social comfort with gay men, and sexual comfort with gay men were delineated. The SIHS provides a total score indicative of internalized homonegativity. Participants respond to the 12 items by endorsing the degree to which they agreed to each statement on a 7-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 7 (*strongly agree*), with high scores indicative of higher internalized homonegativity. Cronbach's alpha for total score was .78 in the original factor analysis study. For the current study, total sample $\alpha = .80$.

Vicarious shame. Vicarious shame was measured through an adaptation of the Experience of Shame Scale (ESS; Andrews, Qian, & Valentine, 2002), as developed by the authors of the current study. The 25-item Experience of Shame Scale is a self-report questionnaire assessing characterological shame, behavioral shame, and body shame, with a total score indicative of shame-proneness. Adaptation of the ESS in the current study involved altering questions to reflect the construct of vicarious shame by changing the direction of the question from the self to the other. For example, phrasing of items was changed from the original question's intrapsychic orientation (Have you felt ashamed of any of your personal habits?) to one focusing on one's partner or significant other (Have you ever felt ashamed of any of O's personal habits?), with the following introductory directions: "In each statement 'O' refers to your partner or significant other." An additional item was "Have you felt ashamed of O's manner with others?" Respondents answered on a 4-point scale, ranging from 1 (*not at all*) to 4 (*very much*). Total scores ranged from 25–100. In the original validation study, total scores showed high internal consistency (Cronbach's alpha = .92), and test-retest reliability was .83. Validity was demonstrated by testing for depression using the SCL-90 (Derogatis, 1983) at Time 1 and Time 2 at an interval of 11 weeks. Both time periods evidenced significantly moderate correlations, as well as significantly moderately high correlation between the Experience of Shame Scale and the Test of Self-Conscious Affect-Shame (Tangney, Wagner, & Gramzow, 1989). Cronbach's alpha in the present sample total scale score was .97.

Commitment, satisfaction, investment, and quality of alternatives. Variables of the investment model were assessed using the Global Investment Model (GIMS; Rusbult et al., 1998), a 37-item instrument used to assess relationship satisfaction, commitment level, investment size, and quality of alternatives. The Satisfaction Level subscale of the GIMS is a 10-item self-report questionnaire of relationship satisfaction. Items including the following statements: "I feel satisfied with our relationship" and "My relationship is much better than other relationships." The first five items on the scale are measured on a 4-point Likert-like scale, from 0 (*Don't agree at all*) to 4 (*Agree completely*), and the later five are measured across a 9-point Likert-like scale, from 0 (*Do not agree at all*) to 8 (*Agree completely*). Higher scores are indicative of relationship satisfaction. Cronbach's alpha for satisfaction level in the original validation study ranged from .92 to .95. Commitment level is a 7-item, 9-point Likert-like rating subscale of the GIMS, including items like "I want our relationship to last for a very long time" and "I am committed to maintaining my relationship with my partner." Cronbach's alpha for commitment level ranged from .91 to .95. Investment size is also 10-item subscale, with items like "I have invested a great deal of time in our relationship" and "My

sense of personal identity (who I am) is linked to my partner and our relationship." Cronbach's alpha for investment size ranged from .82 to .84. Quality of alternatives is 10-item subscale, with the same scale structure. It includes items like "My needs for intimacy (sharing personal thoughts, secrets, etc.) could be fulfilled in alternative relationships" and "My alternatives are attractive to me (dating another, spending time with friends or on my own, etc.)." Cronbach's alpha for the quality of alternatives ranged from .82 to .88. Validity was indicated with correlations to the Dyadic Adjustment Scale (Spanier, 1976), the Relationship Closeness Inventory (Berscheid, Synder, & Omoto, 1989), the Inclusion of the Other in the Self Scale (Aron, Aron, & Smollan, 1992), the Trust Scale (Rempel, Holmes, & Zanna, 1985), the Equity in the Relationship Scale (Walster, Walster, & Traupmann, 1978), and the Liking and Loving Scale (Rubin, 1970) across subscales in predicted directions. In the current study, Satisfaction Level $\alpha = .92$, Quality of Alternatives $\alpha = .85$, Investment Size $\alpha = .80$, and Commitment Level $\alpha = .74$.

Procedures

Following university IRB approval, a survey was conducted between May, 2011 and February 2012. Survey participants were recruited from Internet Web sites across the United States, as well as through friendship networks. The recruitment statement asked for gay and bisexual men in relationships to participate in an anonymous online survey study with specific reference to study of gay and bisexual men's relationships.

The informed consent statement notified potential participants that they were free to skip any question that made them feel uncomfortable, that the researchers were available to answer any questions regarding the survey, and information on mental health resources would be made available upon request. Participants were assured of anonymity. They were also offered enrollment in a random raffle drawing at the conclusion of the study to win one of 10 \$10 gift cards, or one \$50 gift card, as a token of the researchers' appreciation for their participation.

Participants completed an online questionnaire that included scales to assess relationship satisfaction, quality of alternatives, investment size, commitment level, and internalized homophobia, and vicarious shame. The questionnaire also asked for information pertaining to demographic variables, including sexual orientation identity, racial/ethnic identity, age, education, income, current relationship status, and length of current relationship. Descriptive, correlational analyses and percentage of missing data per variable are presented. The expectation/maximum (EM) procedure in IBM SPSS 20 was used to test the null hypothesis that missing data were randomly occurring. In addition to descriptive and correlational analyses with the data-set corrected for missing values, multiple hierarchical linear regressions were conducted to determine the amount of variance contributed by variables, using the forward method. Prediction of commitment was conducted with predictor variables of relationship satisfaction, quality of alternatives, investment size, internalized homophobia, and vicarious shame.

Results

Means, standard deviations, intercorrelations, and percentage of missing data for all variables assessed in this study are shown in

Table 1
Descriptive Statistics for Continuous Measures Used in the Study ($N = 232$)

Measures	1	2	3	4	5	6
1 Vicarious shame	—					
2. IH	.36**	—				
3. Satisfaction	-.30**	.09	—			
4. Commitment	-.32**	.02	.47**	—		
5. Investment	-.17**	-.12*	.37**	.42**	—	
6. Alternatives	.26**	-.06	-.24**	-.18**	-.28**	—
X	34.45	-4.26	53.54	40.38	53.29	35.15
SD	12.37	11.39	10.01	6.39	8.83	12.22
% Missing	24.6%	13.8%	8.2%	12.1%	13.8%	13.8%

* $p < .05$, one-tailed. ** $p < .01$.

Table 1. Missing data ranged from a low of 8.2% (relationship satisfaction) to a high of 24.6% (vicarious shame) across variables (see Table 1). Missing data was treated through expectations/maximization, or EM algorithm. EM is a maximum likelihood procedure addressing the relationships between missing data and unknown parameters of the data model. EM was preceded by first testing the null hypotheses that missing data were randomly distributed by employing Little's MCAR test. Little's MCAR test was nonsignificant ($\chi^2 = 47.18$, $df = 70$, $p = .98$) suggesting missing data were randomly occurring and were unrelated to any variables under study. As such, EM was used to replace missing data. Bivariate analyses indicated that vicarious shame and internalized homophobia were positively correlated ($r = .36$, $p < .01$), and vicarious shame was negatively related to satisfaction ($r = -.30$, $p < .01$), commitment ($r = -.32$, $p < .01$), and investment ($r = -.17$, $p < .01$), and positively related to quality of alternatives ($r = .26$, $p < .01$). In contrast, IH was only negatively correlated to the Investment Model variable of investment size ($r = -.12$, $p < .05$). Correlations between commitment and satisfaction ($r = .47$, $p < .01$), investment ($r = .42$, $p < .01$), and quality of alternatives ($r = -.18$, $p < .01$) were also noted (see Table 1).

Hierarchical multiple regression was conducted to predict commitment level, using the forward method, with the F -to-enter criterion value set at $F = 3.00$. The forward method of regression maximizes the greatest increase in R^2 per predictor variable. When the F ratio for the R^2 increased due to the addition of variables was below $F = 3.00$, no further variables were added to the equation model. This process resulted in the following order of entry: at Step 1, relationship satisfaction, at Step 2, investment size, at Step 3, vicarious shame, and at Step 4, internalized homophobia. Quality of alternatives did not enter into the equation. With four of the five candidate predictors included in the model, the overall regression was statistically significant, $R = .58$, $R^2 = .34$, adjusted $R^2 = .33$, $F(4, 227) = 29.39$, $p < .001$. Approximately one third of the variance in commitment level scores was accounted for by the regression equation.

To determine the statistical significance of contributions for each predictor, the F ratio for R^2 increment was assessed for individual variables in the step when first loaded into the analysis. At Step 1, relationship satisfaction produced an R^2 increment of .219, $F(1, 230) = 64.61$, $p < .001$. At Step 2, investment size produced an increment in R^2 of .070, $F(1, 229) = 46.58$, $p < .001$. At Step 3, vicarious shame produced an increment of R^2 of .028,

$F(1, 228) = 35.32$, $p < .001$. Finally, at Step 4, internalized homophobia produced an R^2 increment of .024, $F(1, 227) = 29.39$, $p < .001$. Except for vicarious shame, all of the slope predictors had positive signs (see Table 2).

Internalized homophobia functioned as a suppressor variable. A suppressor variable is one which increases the predictive validity of a variable (or set of variables) through its additive inclusion in a regression equation, in spite of an absence of bivariate correlation between it and the dependent variable. Also known as a classical suppressor (Horst, 1941), or a negative confounding variable (Breslow & Day, 1980), the suppression effect is present when the effect of one variable is to suppress or alter the apparent relationship between another independent variable and the dependent variable. Only when the suppressor is controlled for is the actual relationship evidenced (Warner, 2013). As recommended by the formula defined by Sobel (1986), in the current study the mediated effect of the suppressor IH, $\hat{\alpha}\beta = .030$, with a standard error = .027, represented upper and lower 95% confidence intervals for the mediated effect of .06 and .01, respectively. As the

Table 2
Predictors of Commitment ($N = 232$)

	B	β		
Step 1				
Constant	24.43			
Satisfaction	0.29	0.47***		
Step 2				
Constant	17.16			
Satisfaction	0.23	0.36***		
Investment	0.21	0.29***		
Step 3				
Constant	22.65			
Satisfaction	0.20	0.31***		
Investment	0.20	0.27***		
Vicarious Shame	-0.10	-0.18**		
Step 4				
Constant	23.93		Zero-order	Semi-partial
			Correlation	Correlation
Satisfaction	0.19	0.31***	.47	.32
Investment	0.21	0.29***	.42	.31
Vicarious Shame	-0.13	-0.24**	-.32	-.25
IH	0.10	0.17**	.02	.19
R^2	.22***	.29***	.32***	.34***
ΔR^2	—	.07***	.03**	.02**

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

confidence interval did not include 0, this range verified that the suppressor effect was greater than that which would have been expected by chance alone (MacKinnon, Krull, & Lockwood, 2000). The addition of internalized homophobia to the analysis unsuppressed the underlining pattern wherein vicarious shame was fully related to commitment level by extinguishing components of vicarious shame associated with negative socialization about being gay. Examination of semipartial and zero-order correlations offered further evidence of a suppression effect. The semipartial correlation removes shared variance for each variable. The IH semipartial correlation was positive because the part of IH that was positively related to commitment was what was left over when that part of IH that is not related to commitment was removed. The removed part (taken through residualizing IH) was masking the relationship between IH and commitment. As such, the model suggested the importance of assessing internalized homophobia when investigating commitment level, and determining relationships among vicarious shame, internalized homophobia, and commitment levels for gay men in intimate cohabiting relationships. Vicarious shame with IH increased the negative prediction of commitment, perhaps by increasing blame of the other without the constraint of self-examination for one's own negative responsivity associated with internalized homophobia.

Discussion

This study contributed to current knowledge of gay men in cohabiting relationships through prediction of relationship commitment levels. Prediction of commitment level was assessed by the combined influences of minority stress (internalized homophobia, vicarious shame) and Investment Model variables (relationship satisfaction, investment, and quality of alternatives). The first goal of the study was to determine whether these minority stressors uniquely contributed to the prediction of gay men's relationship commitment along with contributions of the Investment model variables of interdependency (Rusbult, 1980, 1983). The second goal of the study was to test whether there was an association between internalized homophobia and vicarious shame as features of minority stress in gay men in cohabiting relationships.

In terms of the first goal, as predicted, minority stress variables of vicarious shame and internalized homophobia uniquely contributed to cohabiting gay men's commitment levels along with features of the Investment Model. Further it was found that the minority stressor of internalized homophobia impacted cohabiting gay men's commitment level through contributing features of vicarious shame. Relationships among variables suggested a broader perspective for understanding and counseling gay men in cohabiting relationships with regard to commitment level. Satisfaction and investment, as asserted by the Investment Model, were primary contributors to cohabiting gay men's relationship commitment. However, in contrast to other research on the Investment Model across relationship subgroups, perceived quality of alternatives did not contribute to cohabiting gay men's relationship commitment level. In contrast, vicarious shame was a significant feature negatively contributing to cohabiting gay men's relationship commitment. Interpretation of this result suggested that cohabiting gay men's relationship commitment level is more saliently influenced by vicarious shame and other characteristics that are internal to the relationship, rather than concerns about the

quality of alternatives existing outside of one's primary relationship.

Further study is required to clarify the nonsignificant finding of quality of alternatives and commitment for cohabiting gay men. It may be that this is a finding specific to cohabiting gay men, whereas gay men in marital relationships or who are dating experience quality of alternatives to be an important contributor to their relationship commitment level. Alternatively, it is possible that monogamous, nonmonogamous, and self-reported monogamous gay male couples in which one or both partners engage in extrarelatational sex, moderates the effect of quality of alternatives on relationship commitment in cohabiting gay men (LaSala, 2004). Continued investigation of differences and characteristics within gay men in relationships, as well as differences across sexual minorities and heterosexual relational status is recommended to further assess both Investment Model and minority stressor variables as predictors of relationship commitment.

In reference to the second goal of this study, vicarious shame was moderately and positively correlated with internalized homophobia. Although both were negatively associated with investment size, vicarious shame alone was negatively correlated with relationship satisfaction and commitment, and positively associated with increased perceived quality of alternatives to one's primary relationship. In contrast to other studies demonstrating the negative impact of internalized homophobia on gay men's relationship longevity, satisfaction, or quality (Meyer & Dean, 1998; Ross & Rosser, 1996), current results suggested a less overarching influence of internalized homophobia specific to relationship variables for cohabiting gay men as compared with studies drawn from the general gay male community. As such, results provide an expanded conceptualization of minority stress features negatively affecting cohabiting gay men's relationship outcomes beyond those of internalized homophobia by evidencing vicarious shame's deleterious influence on cohabiting gay men's relationship dynamics. In conjunction with prior research findings in the literature, results may suggest possible differences in internalized homophobia as a function of relationship status, perhaps as a function of reduced expression of internalized homophobia in those more capable of establishing cohabiting relationships. An assessment of difference in IH across gay men's relational statuses requires further investigation.

The current study has important implications for mental health providers offering individual and couples' counseling for gay men in cohabiting relationships. Both evaluation of internalized homophobia and vicarious shame should be explored concomitantly, in addition to issues of satisfaction and investment when making an assessment of cohabiting gay couples or treating individual cohabiting gay men with relational concerns. Because articulation of vicarious shame may in itself be shame-inducing, its exploration must proceed with therapeutic sensitivity. Exploration of vicarious shame by therapists might begin with an initial questioning about negative reactions to a partner's behavior, rather than immediate discussion of a partner's character. Gay men's unacknowledged vicarious shame felt in response to perceived transgressions or devalued differences of their significant other may result in being at greater risk for destructive coupling dynamics. Thus, therapist attention to vicarious shame may help to bring emotional awareness of vicarious shame into consciousness. Bypassed vicarious shame may disrupt acceptance or forgiveness of the other's limi-

tations, errors, transgressions, manner, or characteristics. Disengagement or blaming sparked by vicarious shame may require assisting gay male clients to perceive how they are employing defensive responses to attenuate shame affect. Once defenses are understood, a greater appreciation of vicarious shame's social origins and of the influences of minority stress on identity, self-esteem, and relationships may become available (Kaufman & Raphael, 1996).

To illustrate the importance of uncovering dynamics of vicarious shame when counseling gay men, we present the following example. A gay male partner who is fully accepting of his sexual orientation identity may experience vicarious shame when observing his partner's non-normative gender behavior, to which he initially responds with "joking," but later, silence and hostility. Because he feels ashamed of his reaction, which he understands to be related to internalized homophobia, he feels unable to articulate how he is reacting to his partner's behavior, and fears offending him. His partner, reacting to cues of disapproval and shame from his significant other, becomes increasingly self-consciousness. This may stimulate interpersonal withdrawal, causing feelings of mutual rejection. Without resolution, defensiveness and criticism may intensify, along with increasingly rigid self-other differentiation. Partners may no longer feel safe, close, or desired. Without consideration of vicarious shame's negative effects on gay male dyads, efforts to promote a return to intimacy may be stymied. Through counselor labeling of affect, normalization of feelings and behavior, recognition, understanding, and reparation, counselors may facilitate an open discussion of the role of vicarious shame impacting their gay male client's relationships.

Limitations of the current study include problems of studying relationships through individual participants, unknown participation by both members of a partnership, and self-report questionnaire, rather than by behavioral indices. Because no instrumentation was available measuring vicarious shame, further validity testing of application of the Experience of Shame Scale to vicarious shame is necessary across populations. As a correlation study, current results require further longitudinal exploration. Additional limitations of this study include convenience sampling. As findings are drawn from a racially restricted, well-educated, and economically advantaged gay male sample, results may have been indeterminately biased. Evidence of internalized homophobia as a suppressor variable on the relationship between vicarious shame and commitment level requires further testing and verification. Other variables may predict commitment in gay men in relationships. Variables like children living at home, age, years together, ethnicity, sexual orientation subgroups, socioeconomic status, sexual satisfaction, monogamy, internalized homophobia specific to coupling in same-sex romantic relationships, social support, discrimination, and other forms of minority stress are further recommended as important variables for future study, particularly within a longitudinal framework. Finally, further study of vicarious shame is required to determine if it is specific to gay men in cohabiting relationships or exists across the spectrum of gender identities, relationship status, and sexual orientations.

In conclusion, the present study offers further confirmation of the minority stress model by demonstrating relationships among commitment in cohabiting gay men, internalized homophobia and vicarious shame, as well as partially verifying the Investment Model of relationship interdependence for gay men's relationship

commitment as described by variables of satisfaction and investment. Identification and treatment of vicarious shame was discussed as vital to the well-being of gay men in cohabiting relationships. It is recommended that counselors may increase their ability to discern the unique needs of gay men in relationships by considering the role of minority stress through both vicarious shame and internalized homophobia on gay male coupling dynamics.

References

- Allen, D. J., & Oleson, T. (1999). Shame and internalized homophobia in gay men. *Journal of Homosexuality*, 37, 33–43. doi:10.1300/J082v37n03_03
- Andrews, B., Qian, M., & Valentine, J. D. (2002). Predicting depressive symptoms with a new measure of shame: The experience of shame scale. *British Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 41, 29–42. doi:10.1348/014466502163778
- Aron, A., Aron, E. N., & Smollan, D. (1992). Inclusion of other in the Self Scale and the structure of interpersonal closeness. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 63, 596–612. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.63.4.596
- Aron, A., Aron, E. N., Tudor, M., & Nelson, G. (1991). Close relationships as including other in the self. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 60, 241–253. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.60.2.241
- Baucom, D. H., Epstein, N. B., & Stanton, S. (2006). The treatment of relationship distress: Theoretical perspectives and empirical findings. In A. L. Vangelisti & D. Perlman (Eds.), *The Cambridge handbook of personal relationships* (pp. 745–765). New York, NY: Cambridge University Press. doi:10.1017/CBO9780511606632.041
- Bennett, M., Yuill, N., Banerjee, R., & Thomson, S. (1998). Children's understanding of extended identity. *Developmental Psychology*, 34, 322–331. doi:10.1037/0012-1649.34.2.322
- Berscheid, E., Snyder, M., & Omoto, A. M. (1989). The Relationship Closeness Inventory: Assessing the closeness of interpersonal relationships. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 57, 792–802. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.57.5.792
- Bodenmann, G., Ledermann, T., & Bradbury, T. N. (2007). Stress, sex, and satisfaction in marriage. *Personal Relationships*, 14, 551–569. doi:10.1111/j.1475-6811.2007.00171.x
- Bradley, T. (2008). *Correlates of relationship satisfaction in gay men: An attachment perspective* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses (Accession Order No. 3305627).
- Breslow, N. E., & Day, N. E. (1980). *Statistical methods in cancer research* (Vol. 1). Lyon, France: International Agency for Research on Cancer.
- Brown, J., & Trevethan, R. (2010). Shame, internalized homophobia, identity formation, attachment style, and the connection to relationship status in gay men. *American Journal of Men's Health*, 4, 267–276. doi:10.1177/1557988309342002
- Bui, K. T., Peplau, L. A., & Hill, C. T. (1996). Testing the Rusbult model of relationship commitment and stability in a 15-year study of heterosexual couples. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 22, 1244–1257. doi:10.1177/01461672962212005
- Cabaj, R. P. (1988). Gay and lesbian couples: Lessons on human intimacy. *Psychiatric Annals*, 18, 21–25.
- Cialdini, R. B., & de Nicholas, M. E. (1989). Self-presentation by association. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 57, 626–631. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.57.4.626
- Coleman, E., Rossner, B. R., & Strapko, N. (1992). Sexual and intimacy dysfunction among homosexual men and women. *Psychiatric Medicine*, 10, 257–271.

- Croyle, K. L., & Waltz, J. (2002). Emotional awareness and couples' relationship satisfaction. *Journal of Marital and Family Therapy*, 28, 435–444. doi:10.1111/j.1752-0606.2002.tb00368.x
- Currie, M. R., Cunningham, E. G., & Findlay, B. M. (2004, December). The Short Internalized Homonegativity Scale: Examination of the factorial structure of a new measure of internalized homophobia. *Educational and Psychology Measurement*, 64, 1053–1067. doi:10.1177/0013164404264845
- Davis, L. E. (2000). Factors contribution to partner commitment among unmarried African Americans. *Social Work Research*, 24, 4–15. doi:10.1093/swr/24.1.4
- Derogatis, L. R. (1983). *SCL-90: Administration, scoring, and procedures manual for the revised version*. Baltimore, MD: Clinical Psychometric Research.
- Duffy, S. M., & Rusbult, C. E. (1986). Satisfaction and commitment in homosexual and heterosexual relationships. *Journal of Homosexuality*, 12(2), 1–23. doi:10.1300/J082v12n02_01
- Fincham, F. D. (1985). Attribution processes in distressed and nondistressed couples. II. Responsibility for marital problems. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, 94, 183–190. doi:10.1037/0021-843X.94.2.183
- Fincham, F. D., & Bradbury, T. N. (1993). Marital satisfaction, depression, and attributions: A longitudinal analysis. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 64, 442–452. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.64.3.442
- Fitness, J., & Fletcher, G. J. O. (1993). Love, hate, anger and jealousy in close relationships: A prototype and cognitive appraisal analysis. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 65, 942–958. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.65.5.942
- Frederick, R. J. (1995). Internalized homophobia, gender roles, self-esteem, and fear of intimacy in gay men. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 56(09), 5169.
- Friedman, R. C. (1991). Couple therapy with gay couples. *Psychiatric Annals*, 21, 485–490.
- Frost, D. M., & Meyer, I. H. (2009). Internalized homophobia and relationship quality among lesbians, gay men, and bisexuals. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 56, 97–109. doi:10.1037/a0012844
- Gilbert, P. (1998). What is shame? Some core issues and controversies. In P. Gilbert & B. Andrews (Eds.), *Shame: Interpersonal behavior, psychopathology, and culture* (pp. 3–57). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Gottman, J. M. (1994). *What predicts divorce? The relationship between marital processes and marital outcomes*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Gottman, J. M., & Krokoff, N. J. (1989). The relationship between marital interaction and marital satisfaction: A longitudinal view. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 57, 47–52. doi:10.1037/0022-006X.57.1.47
- Green, R. J., & Mitchell, V. (2002). Gay and lesbian couples in therapy: Homophobia, relational ambiguity, and social support. In A. Gurman & N. Jacobson (Eds.), *Clinical handbook of couple therapy* (3rd ed., pp. 546–568). New York, NY: Guilford Press.
- Greenan, D. E., & Tunnell, G. (2003). *Couple therapy with gay men*. New York, NY: Guilford Press.
- Greene, D. C., & Britton, P. (2012). Stage of Sexual Minority Identity: The impact of shame, internalized homophobia, ambivalence over emotional expression, and personal mastery. *Journal of Gay and Lesbian Mental Health*, 16, 188–214. doi:10.1080/19359705.2012.671126
- Gottman, J. M., Levenson, R. W., Gross, J., Frederickson, B. L., McCoy, K., Rosenthal, L., . . . Yoshimoto, D. (2003). Correlates of gay and lesbian couples' relationship satisfaction and relationship dissolution. *Journal of Homosexuality*, 45, 23–43. doi:10.1300/J082v45n01_02
- Hatfield, E., Cacioppo, J., & Rapson, R. L. (1994). *Emotional contagion*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Hermans, H. J. M., Kempen, H. J. G., & Van Loon, R. (1992). The dialogical self: Beyond individualism and rationalism. *American Psychologist*, 47, 23–33. doi:10.1037/0003-066X.47.1.23
- Horst, P. (1941). The role of the predictor variables which are independent of the criterion. *Social Science Research Council*, 48, 431–436.
- Impett, E. A., Beals, K. P., & Peplau, L. A. (2001–2002). Testing the investment model of relationship commitment and stability in a longitudinal study of married couples. *Current Psychology*, 20, 312–326. doi:10.1007/s12144-001-1014-3
- James, W. (1890). *The principles of psychology* (Vol. 1). New York, NY: Holt. doi:10.1037/11059-000
- Jones, E., & Gallois, C. (1989). Spouses' impressions of rules for communication in public and private marital conflicts. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 51, 957–967. doi:10.2307/353208
- Kaufman, G., & Raphael, L. (1996). *Coming out of shame: Transforming gay and lesbian lives*. New York, NY: Doubleday.
- Kelly, S., & Floyd, F. J. (2006). Impact of racial perspectives and contextual variables on marital trust and adjustment for African American couples. *Journal of Family Psychology*, 20, 79–87. doi:10.1037/0893-3200.20.1.79
- Krokoff, L. J., Gottman, J. M., & Roy, A. K. (1988). Blue-collar marital interaction and a companionate philosophy of marriage. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 5, 201–221. doi:10.1177/026540758800500205
- Kurdek, L. A. (1992). Relationship stability and relationship satisfaction in cohabitating gay and lesbian couples: A prospective longitudinal test of the contextual and interdependence models. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 9, 125–142. doi:10.1177/0265407592091007
- LaSala, M. C. (2004). Extradyadic sex and gay male couples: Comparing monogamous and nonmonogamous relationships. *Families in Society: The Journal of Contemporary Social Services*, 85, 405–412. doi:10.1606/1044-3894.1502
- Le, B., & Agnew, C. R. (2003). Commitment and its theorized determinants: A meta-analysis of the investment model. *Personal Relationships*, 10, 37–57. doi:10.1111/1475-6811.00035
- Lewis, H. B. (1971). *Shame and guilt in neurosis*. New York, NY: International Universities Press.
- Lickel, B., Schmader, T., & Barquissau, M. (2004). The evocation of moral emotions in intergroup contexts: The distinction between collective guilt and collective shame. In N. R. Branscombe & B. Doosje (Eds.), *Collective guilt: International perspectives* (pp. 35–55). New York, NY: Cambridge University Press. doi:10.1017/CBO9781139106931.005
- Lickel, B., Schmader, T., Curtis, M., Scarnier, M., & Ames, D. (2005). Vicarious shame and guilt. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations*, 8, 145–157. doi:10.1177/1368430205051064
- Lickel, B., Schmader, T., & Spanovic, M. (2007). Group-conscious emotions: Implications of other's wrongdoings for identity and relationships. In J. L. Tracy, R. W. Robins, & J. P. Tangney (Eds.), *The self-conscious emotions: Theory and research* (pp. 351–370). New York, NY: Guilford Press.
- Lopez, F. G., Gover, M. R., Leskela, J., Sauer, E. M., Schirmer, L., & Wyssmann, J. (1997). Attachment styles, shame, guilt, and collaborative problem-solving orientations. *Personal Relationships*, 4, 187–199. doi:10.1111/j.1475-6811.1997.tb00138.x
- Mackie, D. M., Devos, T., & Smith, E. R. (2000). Intergroup emotions: Explaining offensive action tendencies in an intergroup context. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 79, 602–616. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.79.4.602
- MacKinnon, D. P., Krull, J. L., & Lockwood, C. M. (2000). Equivalence of the mediation, confounding, and suppression effect. *Prevention Science*, 1, 173–181. doi:10.1023/A:1026595011371
- Major, B., & O'Brien, L. T. (2005). The social psychology of stigma. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 56, 393–421. doi:10.1146/annurev.psych.56.091103.070137
- Margolin, G., & Wampold, B. E. (1981). Sequential analysis of conflict and accord in distressed and nondistressed marital partners. *Journal of*

- Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 49, 554–567. doi:10.1037/0022-006X.49.4.554
- Malton, A. K. (1982). Psychotherapeutic implications of internalized homophobia in gay men. *Journal of Homosexuality*, 7, 59–69. doi:10.1300/J082v07n02_08
- McCabe, M. P. (2006). Satisfaction in marriage and committed heterosexual relationships: Past, present, and future. *Annual Review of Sex Research*, 17, 39–58.
- McWhirtier, D. P., & Mattison, A. M. (1984). *The male couple: How relationships develop*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall, Inc.
- Meyer, I. H. (1995). Minority stress and mental health in gay men. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior*, 36, 38–56. doi:10.2307/2137286
- Meyer, I. H. (2003). Prejudice, social stress, and mental health in lesbian, gay, and bisexual populations: Conceptual issues and research evidence. *Psychological Bulletin*, 129, 674–697. doi:10.1037/0033-2909.129.5.674
- Meyer, I. H. (2007). Prejudice and discrimination as social stressors. In I. H. Meyer & M. E. Northridge (Eds.), *The health of sexual minorities: Public health perspectives on lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender populations* (pp. 242–267). New York, NY: Springer. doi:10.1007/978-0-387-31334-4_10
- Meyer, I. H., & Dean, L. (1998). Internalized homophobia, intimacy, and sexual behavior among gay and bisexual men. In G. M. Herek (Ed.), *Stigma and sexual orientation: Understanding prejudice against lesbians, gay men, and bisexuals* (pp. 160–186). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage. doi:10.4135/9781452243818.n8
- Miller, R. S. (1987). Empathic embarrassment: Situational and personal determinants of reactions to the embarrassment of another. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 53, 1061–1069. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.53.6.1061
- Mohr, J. J., & Fassinger, R. E. (2006). Sexual orientation identity and romantic relationship quality in same-sex couples. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 32, 1085–1099. doi:10.1177/0146167206288281
- Ossana, S. M. (2000). Relationship and couples counseling. In R. M. Perez, K. A. DeBord, & K. J. Bieschke (Eds.), *Handbook of counseling and psychotherapy with lesbian, gay, and bisexual clients* (pp. 275–302). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association. doi:10.1037/10339-012
- Rempel, J. K., Holmes, J. G., & Zanna, M. P. (1985). Trust in close relationships. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 49, 95–112. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.49.1.95
- Retzinger, S. M. (1991). *Violent emotions: Shame and rage in marital quarrels*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Rhoades, G. K., Stanley, S. M., & Markman, H. J. (2010). Should I stay or should I go? Predicting dating relationship stability from four aspects of commitment. *Journal of Family Psychology*, 24, 543–550. doi:10.1037/a0021008
- Ross, M. W., & Rosser, B. R. (1996). Measurement and correlates of internalized homophobia: A factor analytic study. *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 52, 15–21. doi:10.1002/(SICI)1097-4679(199601)52:1<15::AID-JCLP2>3.0.CO;2-V
- Rostosky, S. S., Riggle, E. D. B., Gray, B. E., & Hatton, R. L. (2007). Minority stress experiences in committed same-sex couple relationships. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice*, 38, 392–400. doi:10.1037/0735-7028.38.4.392
- Rowen, C. J., & Malcolm, J. P. (2002). Correlates of internalized homophobia and homosexual identity formation in a sample of gay men. *Journal of Homosexuality*, 43, 77–92. Retrieved from http://dx.doi.org/10.1300/J082v43n02_05
- Rubin, Z. (1970). Measurement of romantic love. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 16, 265–273. doi:10.1037/h0029841
- Rusbult, C. E. (1980). Commitment and satisfaction in romantic association: A test of the investment model. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 16, 172–186. doi:10.1016/0022-1031(80)90007-4
- Rusbult, C. E. (1983). A longitudinal test of the investment model: The development (and deterioration) of satisfaction and commitment in heterosexual involvements. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 45, 101–117. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.45.1.101
- Rusbult, C. E., Coolsen, M. K., Kirchner, J. L., & Clarke, J. A. (2006). Commitment. In A. L. Vangelisti & D. Perlman (Eds.), *The Cambridge handbook of personal relationships* (pp. 615–636). New York, NY: Cambridge University Press. doi:10.1017/CBO9780511606632.034
- Rusbult, C. E., Johnson, D. J., & Morrow, G. D. (1986). Predicting satisfaction and commitment in adult romantic involvements. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 49, 81–89. doi:10.2307/2786859
- Rusbult, C. E., Martz, J. M., & Agnew, C. R. (1998). The investment model scale: Measuring commitment level, satisfaction level, and investment size. *Personal Relationships*, 5, 357–387. doi:10.1111/j.1475-6811.1998.tb00177.x
- Scarnier, M. A. (2007). *Parents' vicarious shame and guilt responses to children's wrong-doings* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses (AccessionOrder328357-391).
- Scheff, T. J., & Retzinger, S. M. (1991). *Emotions and violence: Shame and rage in destructive conflict*. New York, NY: Lexington.
- Schmader, T., & Lickel, B. (2006). Stigma and shame: Emotional responses to the stereotypic actions of one's ethnic ingroup. In S. Levin & C. van Laar (Eds.), *Stigma and group inequality: Social psychological approaches* (pp. 261–285). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Shidlo, A. (1994). Internalized homophobia: Conceptual and empirical issues in measurement. In B. Greene & G. M. Herek (Eds.), *Lesbian and gay psychology: Theory, research and clinical applications* (pp. 176–205). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Sobel, M. M. (1986). Some new results on indirect effects and their covariance in structure models. In N. Tuma (Ed.), *Sociological methodology* (pp. 159–186). Washington, DC: American Sociological Association. doi:10.2307/270922
- Spanier, G. (1976). Measuring dyadic adjustment: New scales for assessing the quality of marriage and similar dyads. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 38, 15–28. doi:10.2307/350547
- Sprecher, S. (2002). Sexual satisfaction in premarital relationships: Associations with satisfaction, love, commitment, and stability. *The Journal of Sex Research*, 39, 190–196. doi:10.1080/00224490209552141
- Surra, C. A., Gray, C. R., Boettcher, T. M., Cottle, N. R., & West, A. R. (2006). From courtship to universal properties: Research on dating and mate selection 1950 to 2003. In A. L. Vangelisti & D. Perlman (Eds.), *The Cambridge handbook of personal relationships* (pp. 113–130). New York, NY: Cambridge University Press. doi:10.1017/CBO9780511606632.008
- Szymanski, D. M., Kashubeck-West, S., & Miller, J. (2008). Internalized heterosexism: Measurement, psychosocial correlates, and research directions. *The Counseling Psychologist*, 36, 525–574. doi:10.1177/0011000007309489
- Tajfel, H. (1981). *Human groups and social categories*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. C. (1986). Social identity theory of intergroup behavior. In W. Austin & S. Worchel (Eds.), *Psychology of intergroup relations* (2nd ed., pp. 7–24). Chicago, IL: Nelson-Hall.
- Tangney, J. P., Burgraff, S. A., & Wagner, P. E. (1995). Shame-proneness, guilt-proneness, and psychological symptoms. In J. P. Tangney & K. W. Fischer (Eds.), *Self-conscious emotions: The psychology of shame, guilt, embarrassment, and pride* (pp. 343–367). New York, NY: Guilford Press.
- Tangney, J. P., Miller, R. S., Flicker, L., & Barlow, D. B. (1992). Are shame, guilt, and embarrassment distinct emotions? *Journal of Person-*

- ality and Social Psychology, 62, 669–675. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.62.4.669
- Tangney, J. P., Wagner, P., & Gramzow, R. (1989). *The test of self-conscious affect*. Fairfax, VA: George Mason University Press.
- Tesser, A. (1988). Toward a self-evaluation maintenance model of social behavior. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (Vol. 21, pp. 181–227). San Diego, CA: Academic Press Inc. doi:10.1016/S0065-2601(08)60227-0
- Tomkins, S. S. (1987). Script theory. In J. Aronoff, A. I. Rubin, & R. A. Zucker (Eds.), *The emergence of personality* (pp. 147–216). New York, NY: Springer.
- Walster, E., Walster, G. W., & Traupmann, J. (1978). Equity and premarital sex. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 36, 82–92. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.36.1.82
- Warner, R. M. (2013). *Applied statistics: From bivariate through multivariate techniques*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Weinberg, G. (1972). *Society and the healthy homosexual*. New York, NY: St. Martin's Press.
- Weiss, R. L., & Heyman, R. E. (1990). Marital discord. In A. Belleck & M. Hersen (Eds.), *International handbook of behavior modification* (2nd ed., pp. 475–501). New York, NY: Plenum Press. doi:10.1007/978-1-4613-0523-1_23
- Zakalik, R. A., & Wei, M. (2006). Adult attachment, perceived discrimination based on sexual orientation and depression in gay males: Examining the meditation and moderation effects. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 53, 302–313.

Received May 14, 2013

Revision received October 3, 2013

Accepted October 7, 2013 ■

Correction to Edley and Wetherell (2014)

In the article “Roles, Roots, and Rifts: A Rejoinder to Mahalik, Silverstein, and Hammond” by Nigel Edley and Margaret Wetherell (*Psychology of Men & Masculinity*, 2014, Vol. 15, No. 4, pp. 375–376. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0038008>), there were two pronoun errors. The second to last paragraph should have read, “Elsewhere in her commentary, Hammond suggests that a mixed-methods approach might allow researchers to keep simultaneous track of how men operate at both a macro and micro level. In doing so, she seems to imply that quantitative studies might prove useful in revealing how “men think about masculinities *on average*” (p. 373; emphasis added). But what does that actually mean? In one of our featured studies (Wetherell & Edley, 1999) we noted that some subject positions appeared to be more popular than others. We found that, within our data set, it was more usual for men to distance themselves from the discourses of hegemonic masculinity. Such patterns may be common-place—even typical perhaps—but is that the same as *average*? Would a quantitative approach involve spending hours with a stopwatch, trying to clock the amount of time men spend occupying the positions of heroic, complicit, and rebellious masculinities? How would it deal with those occasions when men invoke one form of discourse as a contrast or counterpoint? As we showed in our original article, we are not disinterested in the notion of *Mr. Average*. The difference is that, for discursive psychologists, it always exists as a *construct*—either in the hands of the social scientist or those of the ordinary, everyday speaker.”

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0038532>