



Cross-Cultural Reflections on Queer Intimate Partner Violence (IPV)

Esra Ummak¹

Received: 12 December 2025 / Accepted: 3 May 2026
© The Author(s) 2026

Abstract

Objective This commentary critically examines queer intimate partner violence (IPV) across Western, Educated, Industrialized, Rich, Democratic (WEIRD)—a category of societies disproportionately represented in psychological and social science research—and non-WEIRD sociocultural contexts. It argues that prevailing cis-heteronormative and Western-centric frameworks insufficiently capture the complexity of queer survivors' experiences.

Method I drew on empirical research and cross-cultural comparisons to examine IPV and barriers to help-seeking among queer individuals.

Results Evidence from both WEIRD and non-WEIRD context demonstrates how sociopolitical climates, cultural norms, and institutional arrangements profoundly shape patterns of IPV and access to support. Across contexts, a shared theme of “institutional abandonment” emerges, wherein queer survivors remain underserved even within systems that appear formally inclusive.

Conclusions This commentary highlights the urgent need for a decolonized, queer-affirming approach to IPV research. Advancing IPV research requires the development of culturally grounded, identity-sensitive measurement tools, the transformation of institutional and community support systems and the cultivation of equitable global academic partnerships. Effectively addressing queer IPV necessitates moving beyond universalized Western frameworks toward intersectional, contextually nuanced approaches that authentically reflect the diversity of queer experiences worldwide.

Keywords Intimate partner violence · Queer intimate partner violence · WEIRD sample · Non- WEIRD sample · Cross-cultural violence

Intimate partner violence (IPV) can be understood as a pattern of behaviours that instil fear, control, and coerce a partner, inducing guilt and forcing them to act against their will or restrict their own wishes, thereby undermining autonomy and establishing dominance within the relationship (Ummak et al, 2024a; Isdal, 2000). Despite growing evidence that IPV manifests differently across sexual and gender identities (Ummak et al, 2024b, c; Donovan & Hester, 2008; Donovan & Hester, 2014; Donovan & Barnes, 2020), dominant research and policy frameworks remain grounded in cis-heteronormative assumptions. For instance, research

has shown that standardized IPV instruments such as the Revised Conflict Tactics Scale (CTS-2) inadequately capture queer-specific dynamics (Donovan & Barnes, 2026; this issue), with studies highlighting underreporting of severity in same sex physical violence (Regan et al., 2002), the need for additional items addressing identity-based psychological violence (Balsam & Szymanski, 2005), the importance of how questions are framed to effectively detect different forms of identity-based violence (McCarry et al., 2008) and modifications to better measure man-to-man IPV (Greenwood et al., 2002).

Moreover empirical evidence from my research across diverse cultural contexts and the broader literature on queer violence demonstrate that queer individuals experience not only conventional forms of IPV but also forms of violence that specifically target and exploit gender and sexual identities. These dynamics are shaped by broader sociocultural

✉ Esra Ummak
esra.ummak@vid.no

¹ Faculty of Social Sciences, Department of Social Work, VID Specialized University, Diakonveien 14, Oslo 0370, Norway

conditions and intersecting marginalized positionalities, which perpetrators may mobilize to exert control and inflict harm. Furthermore, structural and sociopolitical contexts—such as legal recognition, heteronormativity and heterosexism—significantly shape the prevalence and severity of IPV.

Nonetheless, research on queer IPV is still predominantly focused on samples from WEIRD (Western, Educated, Industrialized, Rich, Democratic) countries. The acronym WEIRD was introduced by Henrich et al. (2010a, b) to critique the predominance of psychological research based on data drawn from participants in the United States and Western Europe and its implications for the study of human psychology and behaviour. Extending this critique, Clancy and Davis (2019) argue that the WEIRD/non-WEIRD distinction should be reframed through a decolonizing lens that actively challenges the dominance of Eurocentric epistemologies in knowledge production. From this perspective, researchers are encouraged to decenter white, Western modes of inquiry and to reintroduce greater cultural and contextual variability into understandings of all populations (Clancy & Davis, 2019). This limitation is not unique to the study of queer IPV. The broader IPV field is also largely shaped by research originating in WEIRD contexts, particularly the United States, where legal frameworks and policy approaches to IPV have often been uncritically exported and applied in other parts of the world (Goodmark, 2015). As a result, conclusions from this work are often of limited relevance to non-WEIRD countries, where the majority of the global queer population resides. Although research has documented that the prevalence rates of different types of IPV violence perpetration and victimization is high among queer people in NON-WEIRD countries (Ummak et al., 2021, 2023; Yu et al., 2013; Lin et al., 2022; Yan et al., 2022); culturally sensitive research tools and approaches are still missing in the context of IPV and seeking help (Donovan & Barnes, 2026; this issue).

In contexts where queer populations face major discrimination and criminalization, it is particularly important to produce locally grounded knowledge on queer IPV, with the aim of informing tailored interventions to support these populations. Overlooking the intersectional forms of violence experienced by queer people globally may therefore result in a failure to recognise or adequately address these complex and intersecting experiences.

In this commentary I compare research on IPV and help-seeking behaviour among queer populations in WEIRD and non-WEIRD countries. Using an intersectional lens, I examine what cross-cultural comparisons reveal about how social norms, stigma, and policy contexts shape IPV experiences and responses, and I suggest ways forward for research and practice.

Queer IPV and Barriers to Help-Seeking in WEIRD Countries

Studies conducted in WEIRD countries such as the United States, United Kingdom, Australia, Germany, and Canada have documented varying prevalence rates and correlates of IPV among queer populations (Finneran & Stephenson, 2012; Hester et al., 2010; Frankland & Brown, 2014; Krahe & Berger, 2013; Barrett & St.Pierre, 2013). Moreover, research from Nordic countries—such as Denmark, Norway, and Sweden—within the broader WEIRD context has reported elevated rates of IPV and persistent barriers to help-seeking (Author, 2021, 2023, 2024d, 2025; Øverlien, 2020). Despite progressive legal protections for queer people in those countries, IPV remains a significant public-health problem, and barriers to help-seeking are inadequately addressed (Ummak et al., 2025; Domestic Abuse Commissioner for England and Wales, 2022; Galop, 2023; Santoniccolo et al., 2021; Øverlien, 2020). For example, shelter policies in Norway continue to be shaped by cis-heteronormative and gender-normative assumptions, as the Crisis Centre Act and related parliamentary provisions explicitly refer to “men, women, and children” and mandate gender-segregated accommodation, leaving little recognition or protection for queer and non-binary survivors in Norway (Crisis Center Act, 2009; Stortinget, 2025).

As noted in *Guidance for Researching Domestic Abuse in LGBT+ Communities* (Donovan & Rowlands, 2025), in recent years, public debates in WEIRD countries about gender and sex have become increasingly politicized. In particular, the recognition of transgender rights has been contested: transgender women are often portrayed as threats, while transgender men and non-binary people are frequently rendered invisible (Donovan & Rowlands, 2025). These dynamics have undermined trust in help-seeking services, leaving many queer people — both transgender and cisgender — uncertain about whether they can safely access support in cases of IPV (Ummak et al., 2025). For example, drawing on 21 studies across European, UK, and US settings, Santoniccolo et al. (2021) found that queer individuals seldom engaged with formal support services, which were frequently perceived as both inaccessible and ineffective. Moreover, a recent study by Author (2025) found that the lack of services specialized for queer victims of IPV and the presence of bias (as both intended discrimination—negative bias against LGBTQ+ service users—and unintended bias arising from a lack of training or confidence on the part of the practitioner in responding appropriately) among service providers pose significant barriers to help-seeking—despite the common assumption in Norway that IPV services are accessible to everyone, regardless of gender identity or sexual orientation.

Queer IPV Beyond the West: Non-WEIRD Realities and Challenges

Very little is known about queer IPV and barriers to help-seeking outside of WEIRD countries. A major obstacle to conducting research in non-WEIRD contexts is the presence of anti-LGBTQI+ legislation, state persecution, and restrictive socio-cultural and policy environments in countries such as Egypt, Tunisia, Jordan, Sudan, Uganda, and Turkey. Public discourse in many of these countries dehumanizes LGBTQI+ people, subjecting them to structural stigma—the societal-level conditions, cultural norms, and institutional policies that limit the opportunities, resources, and well-being of stigmatized groups (Hatzenbuehler & Link, 2014, p. 2). Addressing existing gaps and barriers in these under-studied areas requires a nuanced understanding of the social norms, cultural values, and broader climate of the specific society in question. While I have conducted some mapping in Turkey, a significant gap persists between research in WEIRD and non-WEIRD countries.

In our study (Ummak et al, 2021) found that lesbian and bisexual (LB) women in Turkey experience higher levels of psychological IPV than their counterparts in Denmark, likely reflecting broader societal and institutional hostility toward sexual minorities in Turkey (ILGA-Europe, 2019, 2020). We proposed that such hostile environments may potentially increase internalized heterosexism (I prefer to use “internalized heterosexism” over “internalized homophobia” because it better highlights the role of cultural, institutional, and social factors in prejudice against LGBTQ+ people, whereas “internalized homophobia” places greater emphasis on individual fear and irrational belief, which is not the intended focus, see also Ummak et al, 2023), which in turn arguably contributes to IPV perpetration. From an intersectional perspective, we discussed how cultural factors—such as collectivism, which prioritizes family over individual desires—may further reinforce heterosexist norms (Toplu-Demirtaş et al., 2020) and exacerbate marginalized positionality, thereby amplifying IPV among LB women in Turkey. In contrast, Denmark’s individualistic culture (Hofstede, 2011), which emphasizes personal autonomy and self-expression, may buffer against these stressors, resulting in lower IPV rates.

Additionally, we proposed that in Turkey, limited social recognition and support for LB women can lead to social isolation and stronger attachment to partners, creating potential risks for partner violence due to dependency and conflicting desires for autonomy (Ummak et al, 2021). Collectivist cultural tendencies, emphasizing relationship harmony and intimacy, may also foster a greater sense of relational “fusion” among LB women in Turkey compared to Denmark, further contributing to higher IPV rates (Ummak et

al, 2021). Our findings underscore the critical need to examine how cultural context mediates the relationship between internalized heterosexism and IPV across different societies.

In other studies, using the same study design in both Turkey and Norway, focusing on lesbian, gay, and bisexual (LGB)-specific IPV (Ummak et al, 2024b, c), notable differences emerged. While both countries showed patterns of sexual identity invalidation and control over sexual behaviours and expression, in Turkey we identified two unique LGB-specific IPV factors: disclosure of sexual orientation—the act of revealing someone’s sexual orientation as a form of IPV through the weaponization of heterosexism in LGB relationships—and binegativity, which in this study manifested as bisexual stereotypes and experiences of bisexual jealousy (i.e., referred to in the literature as bisexual identity abuse; Donovan & Hester, 2014; Donovan & Barnes, 2020; Head & Milton, 2014). The absence of these LGB-specific forms of IPV in the Norwegian context may reflect broader socio-legal and cultural differences, as greater societal acceptance and stronger legal protections for queer people in Norway (ILGA-Europe, 2026) may reduce the harmful impact of outing and, in turn, limit the expression of bisexual identity-based abuse. In the Turkish context, we further discussed the potential for the disclosure of sexual orientation as a form of LGB-specific IPV, which stems from the heterosexist societal notion that LGB individuals are not equal to heterosexual people. Furthermore, we highlighted how bisexual individuals remain the least visible group in Türkiye compared to gay, lesbian, and transgender communities (KaosGL, 2020) and how this invisibility might explain why certain societal assumptions about bisexuality are adopted and internalized by LGB individuals, contributing to an increase in negative behaviours. However, little is known about why this is true. Therefore, our findings suggest need to examine new insights into IPV and bisexual individuals in non-WEIRD countries.

Institutional Abandonment as a Joint Experience Across WEIRD and Non-WEIRD Contexts

Although experiences of IPV are shaped by distinct social, cultural, and legal contexts, evidence from both WEIRD and non-WEIRD countries highlights the critical role of “institutional abandonment” in influencing queer individuals’ experiences of violence and their access to support. Here, by institutional abandonment, I refer to the widespread neglect and insufficiency of institutional support that queer people face globally, in both WEIRD and non-WEIRD contexts.

In WEIRD contexts, legal protections, social recognition, and specialized services may offer resources that buffer against IPV; however, the mere existence of these resources does not guarantee equitable protection. As documented

in Norway and other Nordic countries, even when such resources are available, cis-heteronormative assumptions embedded within policies and services frequently limit their accessibility for queer survivors (Ummak et al, 2022, 2025; Øverlien, 2020; Crisis Center Act, 2009). In contrast, in non-WEIRD contexts—where institutional support is often absent or severely limited—queer individuals are particularly vulnerable to IPV, a vulnerability intensified by structural stigma, criminalization, and societal hostility. Even in relatively resource-rich settings, queer survivors frequently encounter gaps in recognition, inclusion, and responsiveness, reflecting a form of institutional abandonment. This highlights the need to examine how such abandonment, in conjunction with social norms and cultural contexts, shapes both IPV dynamics and help-seeking behaviours in non-WEIRD countries.

Where to Go from Here?

The evidence from both WEIRD and non-WEIRD contexts points toward a common conclusion: addressing queer IPV globally requires a fundamental rethinking of the assumptions, tools, and institutional structures that currently shape research, policy, and practice. Below, I outline several pathways forward.

Decolonizing and Queering IPV Research

A major limitation in the existing literature is the dominance of WEIRD-centric frameworks that implicitly treat Western understandings of queer sexuality, queer identity, and queer violence as universal. Future research must adopt approaches that are culturally grounded and attuned to local social, cultural, and political realities. It is important to recognize that non-WEIRD countries are not a monolith; the enforcement of anti-LGBTQ+ laws and policies varies widely both within and across regions, shaping queer sexuality, identity, experiences of violence, and patterns of help-seeking. For instance, the Khwajasara/Hijra community—a recognized third-gender group with a long historical presence in South Asia—illustrates the complex interplay between religious beliefs and cultural practices (Ahuwalia et al., 2024). In Pakistan, traditional acceptance of nonbinary identities often coexists with rigid theological gender norms (Ahuwalia et al., 2024). Understanding the experiences of violence and help-seeking behaviors among these individuals therefore requires careful attention to the country's distinct social and cultural context. Moreover, developing gender and sexuality-specific IPV instruments that capture identity-related and socio-culturally specific forms

of violence—rather than relying on retrofitted Western centred cis-heteronormative tools—are essential steps for examining how social norms, collectivism, state violence, and structural marginalization interact to shape queer IPV and help seeking. This approach not only deepens empirical understanding but also challenges the epistemic hierarchies that have historically marginalized diverse experiences of gender and sexuality beyond Western contexts.

Reimagining Institutions and Service Provision

Across contexts, survivors of diverse genders and sexualities confront institutional abandonment—whether through invisibility within ostensibly inclusive systems or through outright criminalization and state violence. In this sense, while advocating for the establishment and mapping of effective specialized queer IPV services in WEIRD settings, it is crucial to support survivors of diverse genders and sexualities by creating inclusive spaces—through collaboration with local queer communities and networks, both online and in physical settings or events—and by ensuring robust confidentiality protections in non-WEIRD settings. Furthermore, training service providers and raising awareness within local queer communities—both in WEIRD and non-WEIRD contexts—about the multiple forms of violence and the distinct experiences and needs of survivors across gender identities and sexualities can help challenge cis-heteronormative and heterosexist assumptions that undermine survivors' safety and trust.

Building Academic Partnerships Across the Globe on Violence Studies

Given that violence among the queer population is a global public health concern, researchers would benefit from enhanced partnerships and collaborations between universities, which can amplify the global impact of their work and foster greater collaborative efforts in addressing IPV within queer communities. Transnational academic partnerships on queer violence can foster knowledge exchange, support the development of culturally attuned research tools, and create comparative frameworks that capture both universal and context-specific IPV dynamics. Such collaborations must center local researchers and community stakeholders so that solutions are co-produced and rooted in diverse sociocultural realities (Mijić, 2025). For example, strength-based concepts like resilience (Asakura & Craig, 2014) should not be directly translated across contexts or assumed to be something that queer survivors—particularly in non-Western settings—are expected to demonstrate.

Conclusion

Advancing IPV research broadly and the prevention of queer IPV in particular, requires dismantling cis-heteronormative and Western-centric epistemologies and committing to globally situated, intersectional and community-engaged approaches that meaningfully address institutional abandonment across diverse sociocultural contexts.

Funding Open access funding provided by VID Specialized University.

Data availability Not applicable.

Code availability Not applicable.

Declarations

Ethics approval Not applicable.

Consent to participate Not applicable.

Consent for publication Not applicable.

Conflict of interest I have no conflicts of interest that might affect the study.

Open Access This article is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International License, which permits any non-commercial use, sharing, distribution and reproduction in any medium or format, as long as you give appropriate credit to the original author(s) and the source, provide a link to the Creative Commons licence, and indicate if you modified the licensed material. You do not have permission under this licence to share adapted material derived from this article or parts of it. The images or other third party material in this article are included in the article's Creative Commons licence, unless indicated otherwise in a credit line to the material. If material is not included in the article's Creative Commons licence and your intended use is not permitted by statutory regulation or exceeds the permitted use, you will need to obtain permission directly from the copyright holder. To view a copy of this licence, visit <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>.

References

- Ahuwalia, D. C., Singh, P., Jami, H., Ummak, E., & Osin, E. (2024). From oppressive to affirmative: Situating the health and well-being of LGBTIQ+ people as impacted by systemic and structural transitions in Russia, Turkey, Pakistan and India. *Journal of Social Issues*, 80(3), 1056–1078. <https://doi.org/10.1111/josi.12644>
- Asakura, K., & Craig, S. L. (2014). *It Gets Better ... but how?* Exploring resilience development in the accounts of LGBTQ adults. *Journal of Human Behavior in the Social Environment*, 24(3), 253–266. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10911359.2013.808971>
- Balsam, K. F., & Szymanski, D. M. (2005). Relationship quality and domestic violence in women's same-sex relationships: The role of minority stress. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 29(3), 258–269. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1471-6402.2005.00220.x>
- Barrett, B. J., & St.Pierre, M. (2013). Intimate partner violence reported by lesbian-, gay-, and bisexual-identified individuals living in Canada: An exploration of within-group variations. *Journal of Gay & Lesbian Social Services*, 25, 1–23. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10538720.2013.751887>
- Clancy, K. B. H., & Davis, J. L. (2019). Soy lent is people and WEIRD is white: Biological anthropology, whiteness, and the limits of WEIRD. *The Journal of Annual Review of Anthropology*, 48(1), 169–186. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-anthro-102218-011133>
- Crisis Center Act (2009). *Act relating to municipal crisis center services* (Lov 2009-06-19-44). Lovdata. <https://lovdata.no/dokumen/t/NL/lov/2009-06-19-44>
- Domestic Abuse Commissioner for England and Wales (2022). *A patchwork of provision: Technical report*. https://domesticabusecommissioner.uk/wp-content/uploads/2022/11/A-Patchwork-of-Provision_Technical-Report_Nov-2022_Final.pdf
- Donovan, C., & Barnes, R. (2020). *Queering narratives of domestic violence and abuse*. Springer International Publishing.
- Donovan, C., & Barnes, R. (2026). Que(e)rying Methodologies for Research on Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Transgender (LGBT+) Domestic Abuse. *Journal of Family Violence*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10896-026-01067-4>
- Donovan, C., & Hester, M. (2008). «Because she was my first girlfriend, I didn't know any different»: Making the case for mainstreaming same-sex sex/relationship education. *The Journal of Sex Education*, 8(3), 277–287. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14681810802218155>
- Donovan, C., & Hester, M. (2014). *Domestic violence and sexuality: What's love got to do with it?* Policy.
- Donovan, C., & Rowlands, J. (2025). *Guidance for researching domestic abuse in lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender + (LGBT+) communities*. Durham University. <https://doi.org/10.15128/r15d86p031q>
- Finneran, C., & Stephenson, R. (2012). Intimate partner violence among men who have sex with men: A systematic review. *Trauma Violence & Abuse*, 14(2), 168–185. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1524838012470034>
- Frankland, A., & Brown, J. (2014). Coercive control in same-sex intimate partner violence. *Journal of Family Violence*, 29(1), 15–22. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10896-013-9558-1>
- Galop (2023). *An isolated place: LGBT+ domestic abuse survivors' access to support*. <https://www.galop.org.uk/resources/an-isolated-place-lgbt-domestic-abuse-survivors-access-to-support>
- Goodmark, L. (2015). Exporting without license: The American attempt to end intimate partner abuse worldwide. In R. Goel, & L. Goodmark (Eds.), *Comparative perspectives on gender violence: Lessons from efforts worldwide*. Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199346578.003.0001>
- Greenwood, G. L., Relf, M. V., Huang, B., Pollack, L. M., Canchola, J. A., & Catania, J. A. (2002). Battering victimization among a probability-based sample of men who have sex with men. *American Journal of Public Health*, 92(12), 1964–1969. <https://doi.org/10.2105/ajph.92.12.1964>
- Hatzenbuehler, M. L., & Link, B. G. (2014). Introduction to special issue on structural stigma and health. *Social Science & Medicine*, 103, 1–6. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2013.12.017>
- Head, S., & Milton, M. (2014). Filling the silence: Exploring the bisexual experience of intimate partner abuse. *Journal of Bisexuality*, 14(2), 277–299. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15299716.2014.903218>
- Henrich, J., Heine, S. J., & Morenzayan, A. (2010b). Beyond WEIRD: towards a broad-based behavioral science. *The Journal of the Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 33(2–3), 111–135. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0140525X10000725>
- Henrich, J., Heine, S. J., & Norenzayan, A. (2010a). Most people are not WEIRD. *The Journal of Nature*, 466(7302), 29–29. <https://doi.org/10.1038/466029a>

- Hester, M., Donovan, C., & Fahmy, E. (2010). Feminist epistemology and the politics of method: Surveying same sex domestic violence. *International Journal of Social Research Methodology*, 13, 251–263. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13645579.2010.482260>
- Hofstede, G. (2011). Dimensionalizing Cultures: The Hofstede Model in Context. *Online Readings in Psychology and Culture*, 2(1). <https://doi.org/10.9707/2307-0919.1014>
- ILGA-Europe (2020). *10th rainbow map*. <https://www.rainbow-europe.org/countryranking>
- ILGA-Europe, & -Europe. (2026). *Annual review of the human rights situation of lesbian, gay, bisexual, trans, and intersex people in Europe*. ILGA. <https://www.ilga-europe.org/report/annual-review-2026/>
- ILGA-Europe. (2019). *Annual review of the human rights situation of lesbian, gay, bisexual, trans, and intersex people in Europe*. ILGA-Europe.
- Isdal, P. (2000). *Meningen med volden* [Meaning of the violence]. Kommuneforlaget.
- Kaos, G. L. (2020). *Homofobik ve transfobik nefret söyleminin internet seyri: Sosyal medya raporu 2020* [Internet trends of homophobic and transphobic hate speech: Social media reports 2020]. <https://kaosgildernegei.org/images/library/2020-sosyalmedya-nefretsoy-lemi-raporu.pdf>
- Krahé, B., & Berger, A. (2013). Men and women as perpetrators and victims of sexual aggression in heterosexual and same-sex encounters: A study of first-year college students in Germany. *Aggressive Behavior*, 39, 391–404. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ab.21482>
- Lin, K., Hu, R., Wang, X., & Xue, J. (2022). Female same-sex bidirectional intimate partner violence in China. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 37(9–10), NP6881–NP6902. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260520959624>
- McCarthy, M., Hester, M., & Donovan, C. (2008). Researching same sex domestic violence: Constructing a survey methodology. *Sociological Research Online*, 13(1), 174–187. <https://doi.org/10.5153/sro.1650>
- Mijić, A. (2025). Navigating the Boundaries of Understanding: Methodological Reflections on Cross-Cultural Challenges in Reconstructive Social Research. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 24. <https://doi.org/10.1177/16094069251337002>
- Øverlien, C. (2020). Young people's experiences of violence and abuse in same-sex relationships: Understandings and challenges. *NJSR – Nordic Journal of Social Research*, 11(1), 109–128. <https://doi.org/10.7577/njsr.3327>
- Regan, K. V., Bartholomew, K., Oram, D., & Landolt, M. A. (2002). Measuring physical violence in male same-sex relationships: an item response theory analysis of the conflict tactics scales. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 17(3), 235–252. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260502017003001>
- Santonniccolo, F., Trombetta, T., & Rollè, L. (2021). The help-seeking process in same-sex intimate partner violence: A systematic review. *Sexuality Research and Social Policy*, 20, 391–411. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13178-021-00629-z>
- Stortinget (2025). *Vedtak i sak 103109: Endringer i krisesenterlova*. <https://www.stortinget.no/no/Saker-og-publikasjoner/Saker/Sak/?p=103109>
- Toplu-Demirtaş, E., Öztemur, G., & Fincham, F. (2020). Perceptions of dating violence: Assessment and antecedents. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 37(1–2). <https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260520914558>
- Ummak, E., Demirtas, E., & Aysegul, A. (2023). Internalized heterosexism and exposed psychological intimate partner violence: Experiences of lesbian and bisexual women in Turkey and Denmark. *Violence and Victims*, 38(2), 213–233. <https://doi.org/10.1891/VV-2021-0128>
- Ummak, E. (2024a). *Silent Suffering: LGBTQ+ Intimate Partner Violence Unveiled*. In M. Burton, V. Bettinson, K. Richardson & A. Speed (Eds.), *Domestic Research Handbook on Domestic Abuse*. Edward Elgar Publishing. 62–76. <https://doi.org/10.4337/9781035300648>
- Ummak, E., Toplu-Demirtas, E., & Jessen, R. (2021). Untangling the Relationship between Internalized Heterosexism and Psychological Intimate Partner Violence Perpetration: A comparative study of Lesbian and Bisexual Women in Turkey and Denmark. *The Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 37(15–16). <https://doi.org/10.1177/08862605211004108>
- Ummak, E., Toplu-Demirtas, E., & Jessen, R. (2024d). When Intimate Partner Violence Victimization and Perpetration Happen in Lesbians, Gays, and Bisexuals: Evidence from Norway. *Journal of Lambda Nordica*, 29(2–3), 67–96. <https://doi.org/10.34041/ln.v29.953>
- Ummak, E., Toplu-Demirtas, E., & Ozkan, H. (2024b). Unheard Voices of LGB People in Türkiye on LGB-specific Intimate Partner Violence Experiences: A Qualitative Analysis. *Journal of Violence Against Women*, 31(8), 1727–1752. <https://doi.org/10.1177/10778012241247195>
- Ummak, E., Turken, S., & Akin, D. (2022). Understanding Intimate Partner Violence Among Ethnic and Sexual Minorities: Lived Experiences of Queer Women in Norway. *Journal of Violence Against Women*, 30(5), 1274–1299. <https://doi.org/10.1177/10778012221147912>
- Ummak, E., Türken, S., Jessen, R., & Toplu-Demirtaş, E. (2024c). “I just thought maybe this is [the] way of doing things”: Exploring lesbian-, gay-, and bisexual-specific intimate partner violence in Norway. *Psychology of Violence*, 14(4), 260–269. <https://doi.org/10.1037/vio0000512>
- Ummak, E., Ucan, B.Y., & Gumus, B. (2025). Barriers to Help-Seeking for Intimate Partner Violence (IPV): Lived Experiences of Queer Individuals in Norway. *Journal of Family Violence*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10896-025-00959-1>
- Yan, F., Tang, S., Goldsamt, L., Wang, H., Chen, J., & Li, X. (2022). Interrelationships between intimate partner violence, coping style, depression, and quality of life among the regular female sexual partners of men who have sex with men. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 37(1–2). <https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260520917519>
- Yu, Y., Xiao, S., & Liu, K. Q. (2013). Dating violence among gay men in China. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 28(12), 2491–2504. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260513479028>

Publisher's Note Springer Nature remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.