A FOCUS ON HOMOSEXUAL COUPLES: AN EXAMINATION OF PERSONALITIES, SEX ROLES, ATTITUDES, AND BEHAVIORS

By

ROBERTO DESDIN

Bachelor of Arts

Drew University

Madison, New Jersey

1974

Submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate College
of the Oklahoma State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the Degree of
MASTER OF SCIENCE
December, 1977

A FOCUS ON HOMOSEXUAL COUPLES: AN EXAMINATION OF PERSONALITIES, SEX ROLES, ATTITUDES, AND BEHAVIORS

Thesis Approved

Vicki Green
Thesis Adviser

Kenneth D. Sandvold

Rex T. Finnegan

Norman N. Durham
Dean of the Graduate College

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I wish to thank Dr. Vicki Green, my major adviser, for her guidance, time, and continued encouragement in this research. Appreciation is also expressed for her confidence in the author and in this work's completion. Gratitude is expressed to Dr. Kenneth Sandvold and Dr. Rex Finnegan for their interest and time in serving on my thesis committee. In addition, I wish to thank my androgynous fingers that had the guts to undertake the typing of this thesis.

I would like to express my deepest appreciation to my parents; my mother, Pilar, and my father, Saturnino, who have spent most of their lives trying to make mine better. This thesis is dedicated to them.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Research accomplished on homosexuality has historically reflected changes in attitudes and social thought. Prior to contemporary times when incidents involving homosexuals (such as the Oscar Wilde case) became public, homosexuality was a topic of interest for medical and psychiatric personnel. Homosexuality was viewed as an oddity, a deviation from the norm that had "medical" or psychiatric implications. This was changed somewhat by the information collected by Kinsey, Pomeroy, and Martin (1948). Their findings that approximately ten percent of the population was homosexually inclined, suggested that homosexuality was more widespread than most people thought. Unfortunately, such statistics did not alter the prevailing view of homosexuals. The medical and psychoanalytic professions still viewed such individuals as ill. In 1969, the National Institute of Mental Health Task Force on Homosexuality was established. The creation of such a body gave tacit approval to the concept of homosexuality as a lifestyle; in addition, scientific studies were both encouraged and funded. One such study is that of Weinberg and Williams (1974) in which problems and adaptations within a homosexual lifestyle were examined. Such studies as Weinberg et al. (1974) are rare; most studies (Bieber, 1962; Socarides, 1972) deal with etiology and treatment. The American Psychiatric Association's declassification of homosexuality as a sexual deviation encouraged physicians and psychiatrists to view homosexuality as an alternative lifestyle, not as an illness, but society is far from accepting this view.

Modern books (Altman, 1973; Weinberg, 1973) deal with homosexuality as a rightful choice and not as a disease stemming from pathological relationships.

Not only has society viewed the homosexual as ill, but it has also had a preconceived notion of the homosexual relationship as one characterized by high promiscuity and little emotional investment. Every kind of relationship exists within homosexuality (Tripp, 1975), from frequent promiscuous contacts to brief encounters to ongoing relationships which closely parallel heterosexual unions. Most people have not been fully aware of this wide range of relationships and have focused on the promiscuous examples (Humphreys, 1970). The more stable forms of relationships have seldom been examined (Oberstone & Sukoneck, 1976) and there is no study which deals exclusively with the comprehensive psychological analysis of a male homosexual couple's relationship. Such a study is important not only because it describes a phenomenon heretofore never described, but also because it provides additional information relative to the relationship of two intimates other than heterosexual couples.

The proposed study will examine a dyadic relationship outside of the traditional societal norms, and as such may provide information regarding future patterns of couple interactions. At a time when traditional sex roles and unions are being questioned, along with the healthiness or pathology of these relationships (Broverman, Broverman, & Clarkson, 1970; Kando, 1972), the homosexual couple provides an in field study from which much valuable information can be gathered (Sweet, 1975). This would be a positive contribution to the homosexual community. This information is essential to the clinician for an understanding of the client, or in this case the couple, requires knowledge of the client's perceptual world. This has often been a complaint of homosexuals who seek counseling or

treatment (Nuehring, Fein, & Tyler, 1974; Sweet, 1975). A better understanding of the homosexual requires that we look at him not only as an individual, but also as part of a system which includes interactions with significant others. Specifically, a comprehensive analysis of gay couples' relationship would provide further information which might be the basis for further positive societal change.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

A review of the literature on homosexuality reveals two major problems with research generated in this area. One of these is the almost exclusive focus upon examining the etiology of homosexuality. Simon and Gagnon (1969) feel this is the most difficult and least rewarding of all approaches. Cooper (1974) calls the etiological literature misguided and irrelevant. Hooker (1969) argues that a psychodynamic interpretation is not sufficient for an understanding of homosexuality and that what is needed is a narrower focus on aspects of homosexuality. The second is that homosexuals have always been viewed as a homogeneous group, and their behavior examined accordingly. This overly simplistic view has resulted in covering up the diversity among homosexuals and concentrating on the sexual aspect of his life (Humphreys, 1970). This concern with one part of a person's life is not something we would allow to happen if the heterosexual were being studied, but the mere presence of "sexual deviation" seems to give the sexual content more significance. Stringer and Grygier (1976) have argued that a highly differentiated multidimensional approach be taken in the study of homosexual personalities.

The present review will not attempt to discuss the etiological literature, or that which considers the homosexual as homogeneous. It will focus on studies examining the adjustment of male homosexuals as it relates to the establishment of an intimate homosexual relationship. Studies on adjustment are relevant to establishing significant interpersonal relationships,

for most of the psychiatric disorders are defined in terms of inappropriate or unsatisfactory interaction styles. If the homosexual is maladjusted, then it is unlikely that his relationships will be satisfactory, or of any significant duration.

One manner in which maladjustment has been evaluated, is on the basis of projective tests results. In a classic study by Hooker (1957), an expert panel was not able to distinguish between a matched group of male homosexuals and heterosexuals on the basis of the Rorschach, Thematic Apperception Test, and Make A Picture Story. This finding has profound impact given the fact that these projective tests have traditionally been used in the identification of homosexuals or latent homosexuals. This finding suggests that homosexuality represents a sex-object preference rather than an aberration of personality, a conclusion substantiated in other studies. Evans (1970), using the Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire, concluded that at most, homosexuals could be considered mildly neurotic and did not necessarily have psychological disturbances. The clearest differences were in terms of sexual orientation. Thompson, McCandless, and Strickland (1971) reported no differences between homosexuals and heterosexuals in defensiveness, personal adjustment, or self-confidence. In 1965, Schofield found a greater commonality between patients being seen for therapy, regardless of whether they were homosexual or heterosexual, than between each clinical group and its respective nonclinical group. The common variable here was patient status, and not sexual orientation. Ohlson (1973), after administering the Jourard and Lasakow Self-Disclosure Questionnaire, found no difference between a homosexual group and a heterosexual group on the ability to disclose, self-concept, and neuroticism. He concluded that male homosexuals have the same ability as heterosexuals to establish bonds of trust, love,

and affection. These studies, contrary to popular belief, indicate that the homosexual cannot be differentiated from the heterosexual on the basis of his adjustment, and that he has the ability to establish an intimate same-sex relationship.

Since homosexuals do not appear to be maladjusted as a group, there is little logic in studying clinic populations of gays and generalizing to all gays. In his review of the literature on adjustment in male homosexuality, Siegelman (1972) criticized both the medical view of homosexuality and the use of clinical patients in studies on homosexuality. In his study of the adjustment level of nonclinical samples of homosexuals and heterosexuals, he found that the homosexuals appeared more well adjusted on some scales, less well adjusted on others, and did not differ from the control group on about half of the scales. Of greater interest was the result of much better adjustment in a select subsample of masculine homosexuals than in a comparable group of masculine heterosexuals. Again, homosexuality per se was not indicative of pathology.

While the homosexual has been greatly studied as an individual in terms of his adjustment in comparison to the heterosexual, his relationships with other homosexuals has been somewhat ignored. No study deals exclusively with the psychological characteristics of a long term homosexual couple relationship. This is in part no doubt due to the popular belief that there are few if any examples of this type of relationship. Kinsey et al. (1948) stated that relationships between two males rarely survived the first disagreements. Studies which have been done on male homosexual relationships have been of an ethnographic nature, with personal observation being the technique employed. The statistical analyses utilized on these studies have been very limited in nature. From a review

of such studies, Hooker (1969), as well as Nuehring et al. (1974) and Altman (1971) state that the homosexual is in search of permanent relationships, but that the gay bar system with its high promiscuity works against it, as does society at large because of the prohibitions involved. Nevertheless, many relationships do survive. Hooker (1969) comments that these marriages involve complex problems of domestic arrangements and role managements, but makes no attempt to describe the variety or complexity of such relationships. Weinberg and Williams (1974) utilizing a questionnaire found that 34% of male homosexuals were limiting their sexual relationships primarily to one person, with 23% reporting having sustained it for more than a year. In addition, 69% reported having an exclusive relationship in the past, with 37% answering that it had lasted more than a year. In an ethnographic study, Warren (1974) describes three models of long term sexual relationships or marriages within the homosexual community. One type is akin to the faithful heterosexual couple, another is similar to the open arrangement type marriage, and the third is known as the three-way arrangement, in which the couple seeks sex with a third person together. The homosexual monogamous marriage is seen as impractical, and at best, a first step toward the other two types of long term relationships. There are differences in how partners for these different types of relationships are chosen; while short term partners are based solely on sexual preference, long term partners are generally chosen on the basis of ethnic, racial, age, and class similarity. In summary, an intimate relationship appears desirable from the homosexual's viewpoint, and may involve different types of both short and long term relationships.

The characteristics of the individuals involved in these relationships have been studied in terms of adjustment. Hammersmith and Weinberg (1973)

found support of significant others positively related to psychological adjustment and homosexual commitment. Weinberg and Williams (1974) found that the homosexual dyad is composed of individuals with greater psychological adjustment. In addition, the homosexual who had more experience with exclusive relationships reported more self-acceptance, a greater stability of self-concept, less depression, less interpersonal awkwardness and less loneliness than did the homosexual with less experience. Dickey (1961) found that homosexually married males felt themselves to be more adequate than unmarried homosexual males. In summary, not only are homosexual individuals as well adjusted as heterosexuals, but they also appear to be better adjusted if they are currently in a lover relationship or have had previous experience with one. This is a finding which is also true of heterosexual couples.

In addition to adjustment, homosexuals have also been studied in their role relations, with psychoanalytic theory providing the explanation of a person with crossed sex identification. Utilizing this framework, Terman and Miles (1936) divided homosexuals into active and passive groups and then administered a masculinity-femininity test. Results were that the femininity scores of the passive homosexuals correlated positively with those of the female heterosexuals. A more contemporary view (Weinberg & Williams, 1974) sees the problems in a homosexual relationship not from role reversal, but from a negative societal view which does not provide rules for successful role interactions. A male homosexual may at first find himself at a loss for guidelines upon interacting with another male; problems may arise such as who should lead while dancing, cruising, engaging in sex, and running a household. The negative attitude of society toward his sexual deviation may have lessened his respect for the social mores,

etc., and some couples may feel free to make up their own rules. However, traditional sex roles may still be employed by other couples in order to facilitate their interactions. More contemporary ethnographic studies shed some light on this area. Hooker (1969) comments that contrary to popular belief, sex roles in homosexual relationships are not dichotomized in a clear cut fashion into masculine and feminine. There are some pairs who follow traditional heterosexual patterns, but these are in the minority. Generally, the variety and form of the sexual acts between partners, and the distribution and character of the tasks performed do not lend themselves to such a differentiation. Sonenschein (1968) states that traditional kinds of gender and role distinctions were typical only of a small minority of homosexual relationships. Altman (1971) comments that sometimes homosexual marriages are close imitations of a traditional marriage in terms of roles, but more likely they exhibit less well defined roles. Nuehring et al. (1974) report that homosexual marriages are close parallels to the patterns of heterosexual couples, but differ in the area of sex roles, where they are less sex-typed. Freedman (1975) also cites more egalitarian sex roles as being characteristic of gay couples. While sex roles may be egalitarian, Dickey (1961) found greater reported adequacy for homosexuals with masculine sex roles than with feminine sex roles. Coupled with the finding of greater feelings of adequacy in couples (Dickey, 1961), one hypothesis might be that both partners are exhibiting masculine sex roles. This is contrary to beliefs as held by the general public. In a recent study, Tavris (1977) found 70% of heterosexual respondents thought homosexual men were not fully masculine. Interestingly, Tavris (1977) also found that homosexual respondents regarded themselves as less masculine than average, and more feminine than average. Ward (1975) found cross

sex typing to be significantly more prevalent among homosexuals (31% for males, 38% for females) than heterosexuals. In referring to the homosexual couple's egalitarian sex roles, Hooker (1969) states that this new approach makes old terms inapplicable, and attributes it to the changing culture of the homosexual world.

As the homosexual world is changing, there is some evidence that the heterosexual world is at least experiencing some strain. With the advent of the women's movement and increasing concern about womens' place in society, studies have begun to focus more closely on the appropriateness of traditional sex roles and the adjustment of individuals who are clearly sex role stereotyped. Kando (1972) in a study looking at how individuals meet the demands of a self-acknowledged sex role, found that males experience little anxiety in this area, and that females experience much anxiety. Broverman et al. (1972) found that men and women had clearly defined sex role stereotypes. Bem (1975), in reviewing the effects of traditional sex typing, concluded that high femininity in females was consistently correlated with low self-esteem, low self-acceptance, and high anxiety. In males, high masculinity is related to adjustment in adolescence, but in adulthood, it is frequently accompanied by high neuroticism, high anxiety, and low self-acceptance. She adds that greater intellectual development has consistently been associated with cross sex typing. Mednick and Weissman (1975) in reviewing the implications of role change for men, conclude that some research has been done in this area, but little empirical work has appeared. Hochschild (1973) in a similar review, states that little research has been done on the sex roles of men, and even less on men qua men. Tavris (1977) concludes that the concept of masculinity is undergoing some change away from the "macho" image, but it is slow. In summary,

the scientific literature has produced little data on homosexual as well as heterosexual male sex roles.

The reasons for this apparent lack of knowledge concerning male sex roles may not be totally due to ignorance. One reason for this may have been the lack of a theoretical framework in which to understand behaviors which may not be wholly masculine or feminine. Another reason may be the inappropriateness of the scales used. Jenkin and Vroegh (1969) in reviewing concepts of masculinity and femininity suggested new scales be developed in which these two concepts are not mutually exclusive. Constantinople (1973) and Bem (1974) question the validity of masculinity-femininity as a bipolar dimension. In summary, there appears to be a need for a new theoretical framework, as well as new measuring instruments, to further research in this area.

The concept of androgyny, or the combination of both male and female characteristics within a person, may be the new theoretical term which Hooker (1969) seems to be searching for in describing homosexual relationships. Block (1973) in adding to Loevinger's (1966) developmental framework, integrates the concept of sex role identity with the tasks of ego and cognitive development. Block's (1973) approach is nontraditional in that she does not assume that the ultimate development of sex role is either masculinity or femininity. Rather, sexual identity means the development of a sense of self which is secure enough with gender that the individual can and does express human qualities which until now society has labeled as atypical for the individual's gender. Block (1973) believes this integration is essential for development and self-actualization. In reviewing the literature, she feels that women suffer the most from role constraints, although she acknowledges the benefits of androgyny for both

sexes, as do Osofsky and Osofsky (1972). Sandra Bem developed the Bem Sex Role Inventory (BSRI) as a measure of androgyny in which the dimensions of masculinity and femininity are empirically as well as logically independent (Bem, 1974). The assumption underlying the BSRI is that role behavior can not be dichotomized into masculine and feminine. In addition, Bem (1974) assumes that individuals do not exhibit traits across situations, but rather express behaviors that are situation specific. Thus an individual can assume behaviors that society deems masculine or feminine, depending upon the situation. Bem (1975) believes that individuals who can assume behaviors according to the setting and not according to sex role stereotypes are androgynous and are better adjusted than rigidly stereotyped individuals. This would appear to make sense from a psychopathological viewpoint, for rigidity in cognition and behavior is one characteristic of the neuroses.

The BSRI has been used in contemporary research to assess the relationship between sex roles and other behaviors, such as adjustment, attitudes toward feminism, and self-esteem. Deutsch and Gilbert (1976) examined the relationship between BSRI scores and adjustment in college undergraduates. Androgyny was found to be related to adjustment in females, but not for males; for males, masculinity led to better adjustment than androgyny. Zeldow (1976), in the only study found looking at psychological androgyny and attitudes towards feminism, as measured by the Attitudes Towards Women Scale (AWS)(Spence, Helmreich, & Stapp, 1973) found that feminine men had more conservative attitudes than feminine women. Surprisingly, this was his only significant result; neither androgynous and masculine men nor their female counterparts differed significantly in their attitudes. These results are contrary to what is expected and should be

replicated. In addition, he stated that masculinity might be healthy for both sexes, a statement supported by others (Broverman et al. 1970; Tavris, 1977; Dickey, 1961; Block, 1973). Spence et al. (1975) in a somewhat contradictory finding, reported androgyny to be positively correlated with self-esteem. In summary, the concept of androgyny, along with the BSRI for its measurement, appears to be a desirable tool with which to look at the homosexual couple's stated sex role preferences.

The homosexual couple research, until recently, has not only lacked an adequate measuring instrument such as the BSRI, but also has lacked a theoretical framework with which to examine personality characteristics, attitudes, and behaviors from an interpersonal perspective. Much empirical research has been done on heterosexual couples within the theoretical framework of similarity versus complementarity, as related to attraction. The studies done in this area may have some bearing on what the relevant variables are in homosexual dyads. There are two approaches which have been postulated to explain the relationship between personality characteristics and attraction in couples. One is the complementary needs hypothesis (Winch, 1954) which states that attraction will occur between the sexes to the extent that the two people possess dissimilar but interdependent personality characteristics. Another approach is the similarity hypothesis which states that if a male and female possess similar attitudes and needs, they will be attracted to each other. The complementary needs hypothesis is supported in the area of personality coordinates (Ktsanes, 1955; Winch, 1954, 1955; Newcomb, 1956; Levinger, 1970). Additional and more specific support was found in the area of nurturance-succorance, and dominance-submission (Winch, 1963; Rychlak, 1965). In contrast, support for the similarity hypothesis was found in the area of personality coordinates

(Izard, 1960; Singh, 1973; Duck, 1973) and attitudinal coordinates (Byrne, 1961, 1970; Newcomb, 1965; Duck, 1973). Some studies found support for both hypotheses, but on the basis of different bases for examination (Murstein, 1961; Arnold, 1974; Lindner, 1973; Kerckhoff, 1962). The literature contains still other studies (Bowerman, 1956; Mehlman, 1962; Markey, 1973; Curran, 1973), which find no evidence for either the similarity or complementarity hypothesis.

The above approach was utilized in analyzing sex roles and attraction in heterosexual male pairs, female pairs, and male-female couples in a study by Seyfried (1973). He found that males were attracted to other males with sex roles similar to their own, and females were also attracted to other females with sex roles similar to their own. In addition, females were attracted to males with complementary sex roles. Neither the complementary nor the similarity theory was supported by the finding that males rated their attraction to females on the basis of their sex roles. In similar studies, Hogan (1970) and Byrne (1970) found male and female subjects were attracted towards dominant, manly subjects, regardless of whether the relationship was a complementary or similar one. In summary, much empirical work has been done using the similarity-complementarity framework, but no clear cut conclusions can be drawn. Part of the problem may be due to the different populations used, as well as the different aspects of behavior which were measured. Another criticism formerly directed toward the homosexual literature is appropriate here also. To postulate a theory which predicts that all needs in mate selection will be in a uniform direction is overly simplistic and homogeneous in outlook as it relates to the heterosexual couple. Bowerman and Day (1956) suggest that similarity may be operative in some areas, and complementarity in others.

Levinger (1970) acknowledged the importance of the research done within this perspective, but suggested that behaviors also be studied. In conclusion, what is necessary as well as relevant in researching the homosexual couple is a multidimensional approach in which personality, attitudes, and behaviors be measured. The addition of sex roles as another variable would make the research more contemporary in nature.

How this theoretical approach might work in research with homosexual couples is as yet unknown. There is only one source found which addresses this point. In one of the more comprehensive philosophical narratives about the homosexual, Tripp (1975) suggests that in comparison to the heterosexual couple (characterized by a high degree of complementarity), the homosexual couple is characterized by a high degree of similarity. Whether this theoretical framework will be supported or not by empirical data, is not known at the present. Support for use of the similarity-complementarity perspective on the homosexual couple would lend credence to usage of a theoretical framework developed on heterosexuals for homosexuals. If support is not found, then a whole array of questions arise as to whether it is valid to apply a heterosexual perspective on the homosexual couple. Further research in this area would hopefully shed some light on this question, as well as present further accurate information to the public regarding the homosexual couple.

CHAPTER III

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

There have been various criticisms of research and methodology in the study of homosexuality. One is the use of clinical patients as subjects. Weinberg and Williams (1974) state that the medical model of homosexuality has been perpetuated by the use of clinical patients as subjects. They suggest a nonclinical group be studied; this study will do so. A second criticism is that a matched control group has rarely been used in research. In the present study, a heterosexual group will serve as a control. May (1972) reports that research should look at and emphasize the similarities between homosexuals and heterosexuals as a way of decreasing the stigma imposed on the homosexual. Part of this stigma may be due to the general lack of information on the part of the public as regards the less "shocking" aspects of the homosexual's life. This leads to the third criticism, which is looking at homosexuals as a single unidimensional group. Stringer and Grygier (1976) criticize the simplistic homogeneous view of homosexuality, and state that future research should employ a highly differentiated multidimensional approach, a perspective also shared by MacDonald (1974).

Many of the above criticisms can be applied to the study of the homosexual couple as well. In addition, a major criticism of the research on homosexual couples is that the ethnographic observations have not been supplemented with empirical data. More empirical data, as well as the

validation of currently existing information by the use of new instruments, such as the BSRI (Bem, 1974), AWS (Spence et al. 1973), and the Attitude Toward Masculinity Transcendence Scale (ATMTS) (Moreland & Van Tuinen, 1976), would give a more comprehensive picture of the homosexual couple.

The literature on heterosexual couples is of relevance here in indicating the theoretical framework as well as what variables should be studied. This literature has centered on similarity and complementarity as related to attitudes, personalities, and sex roles. Levinger (1970) suggested behaviors should also be studied within this framework. These factors would appear to be of importance in homosexual couples as well.

The present study proposed to investigate variables important to the relationship of nonclinical homosexual couples. Heterosexual couples, and two heterosexual male roommates living together served as controls. The subjects were matched as closely as possible with respect to age. All subjects were under 35 years of age; all pairs had lived together for at least six months. By utilizing the obvious controls, it was possible to ascertain behaviors unique or not unique to homosexual couples. The behaviors studied were as follows: personality traits, sex role identities, attitudes towards women, attitudes towards men, and household behaviors.

The following hypotheses were tested:

1. The homosexual couples will be characterized by personality profiles more similar in nature than those of the control groups, as measured by difference scores on the Taylor-Johnson Temperament Scale (TJTS)(Taylor, 1967; Johnson, 1941).

2. The homosexual and heterosexual couples will be better adjusted than the males control group, as measured by scores on the TJTS.

3. The homosexual couples will be more androgynous than the control groups, as measured by the BSRI.

4. The homosexual couples will exhibit more similar sex role identities than the heterosexual couples, as measured by BSRI scores.

5. The homosexual couples will differ from the control groups on attitudes towards women, as measured by the AWS.

6. The homosexual couples will differ from the control groups on attitudes towards men, as measured by the ATMTS.

7. The homosexual couples will exhibit more similar sex role behaviors than the heterosexual couples, as measured by the Household Behavior Scale (HBS)*.

8. The homosexual couples will be characterized by more androgynous behaviors than the heterosexual couples, as measured by the HBS.

*See Appendix A for material relating to the development of the scale.

CHAPTER IV

METHOD

Subjects

For this study, a tripartite definition of homosexuality was employed. All homosexual subjects had to agree to the following:

1. I am a homosexual.
2. I am committed to this present relationship.
3. I have homosexual sex with my partner.

These statements were appropriately changed for the intimate heterosexual couples. The male roommates had to agree to the statement, "I am a heterosexual".

The subjects consisted of ten homosexual couples recruited through the technique of friendship pyramiding, ten heterosexual couples recruited through psychology classes and friendship pyramiding, and ten male roommates recruited through graduate level and upper division psychology classes. All subjects were under 35 years of age and had lived together off campus for at least six months.

Materials

The three groups were administered the following tests:

1. Bem Sex Role Inventory (Bem, 1974)--a four point likert scale which yields a masculinity score, a femininity score, and an androgyny score.

2. Taylor-Johnson Temperament Scale (Taylor, 1967; Johnson, 1941)--yields a percentile score on nine personality traits.

3. Attitudes Toward Women Scale (Spence et al. 1973)--a four point likert scale; yields a total attitude score.

4. Attitude Toward Masculinity Transcendence Scale (Moreland & Van Tuinen, 1976)--a five point likert scale which yields a total score, as well as scores based on the following four factors: dominance transcendence, homophobia transcendence, nontraditional roles, male-female relationships.

5. Household Behaviors Scale--a five point likert scale; yields a masculine behavior score, a feminine behavior score, and an androgyny score.

Procedure

A sign up sheet was passed around in graduate as well as upper level psychology classes requesting both unmarried heterosexual couples who had been living together for at least six months, and male heterosexual roommates who had been living off campus for at least six months, for a study on interpersonal relationships. The homosexual couples were recruited through the technique of friendship pyramiding; this technique was also employed in obtaining the control groups, so as to assure a large enough sample.

After agreeing to serve as subjects, the couples were contacted by phone, at which time the researcher introduced himself and gave the couple the option of either being tested at school, or in the couple's home. Instructions were given (see Appendix B) and the tests were administered in the following order: TJTS, BSRI, AWS, ATMTS, HBS. Tests were coded by number; subjects were guaranteed anonymity. Subjects were debriefed and informed that if they desired, their results would be interpreted at a later to be arranged date.

CHAPTER V

RESULTS

The three groups studied were as follows: 1) male-male heterosexual roommates (M-M), 2) male-female heterosexual couples (M-F), and 3) male-male homosexual couples (M-M-G). All pairs were under 35 years of age and had lived together for at least six months. Means and standard deviations for all dependent measures for the above three groups are reported in TABLE XIII.

The dependent variables were as follows:

Demographic

1. Age (AGE)
2. Age difference (AGD)
3. Time together (TIM)

Taylor-Johnson Temperament Scale

4. Nervousness (NER)
5. Nervous maladjustment (NEM)
6. Nervous difference scores (PDN)
7. Nervous maladjustment difference scores (NMD)
8. Depression (DEP)
9. Depression maladjustment (DEM)
10. Depression difference scores (PDD)
11. Depression maladjustment difference scores (DMD)
12. Active (ACT)
13. Active maladjustment (ACM)
14. Active difference scores (PDA)
15. Active maladjustment difference scores (DMD)
16. Expressive (EXP)
17. Expressive maladjustment (EXM)
18. Expressive difference scores (PDY)
19. Expressive maladjustment difference scores (EMD)
20. Sympathetic (SYP)
21. Sympathetic maladjustment (SYM)
22. Sympathetic difference scores (PDY)

23. Sympathetic maladjustment difference scores (SMD)
24. Subjective (SUB)
25. Subjective maladjustment (SUM)
26. Subjective difference scores (PDU)
27. Subjective maladjustment difference scores (SMS)
28. Dominance (DOM)
29. Dominance maladjustment (DMN)
30. Dominance differeace scores (PDP)
31. Dominance maladjustment difference scores (DOS)
32. Hostility (HOS)
33. Hostility maladjustment (HOM)
34. Hostility difference scores (PDH)
35. Hostility maladjustment difference scores (HMD)
36. Self-discipline (SDI)
37. Self-discipline maladjustment (SDM)
38. Self-discipline difference scores (PSD)
39. Self-discipline maladjustment difference scores (SDD)
40. Attitude score (ATT)
41. Attitude difference score (ATD)
42. Number of undecideds (MID)
43. Total maladjustment (TMA)
44. Total maladjustment difference scores (TMD)
45. Total personality difference scores (PTO)

Bem Sex Role Inventory

46. BSRI masculine score (BSM)
47. BSRI feminine score (BSF)
48. BSRI androgyny absolute difference score (FMN)
49. BSRI androgyny scores (FMA)

Attitudes Towards Women Scale

50. AWS scores (AWS)
51. AWS difference scores (AWD)

Attitudes Towards Masculine Transcendence Scale

52. ATMTS score (ATM)
53. ATMTS difference scores (ATO)
54. Dominance transcendence score (DTA)
55. Dominance transcendence difference scores (DTB)
56. Homophobia transcendence score (HOT)
57. Homophobia transcendence difference score (HTD)
58. Nontraditional roles score (NTR)
59. Nontraditional roles difference scores (NRD)
60. Male-female roles score (MFR)
61. Male-female roles difference scores (MRD)
62. Masculine liberation trait score (TRA)
63. Trait difference scores (TRD)

Household Behaviors Scale

64. HBS masculine score (HBM)
65. HBS feminine score (HBF)
66. HBS androgyny absolute difference score (FMN)
67. HBS androgyny scores (FMB)

One way ANOVAs were utilized to assess differences among the three groups of subjects. The analyses of variance on the demographic variables resulted in significant differences among the three groups on age and age difference. No significance was reported for time together. (See TABLE I). Tukey's HSD test, a post hoc comparison procedure, was used to determine which means differed significantly. Results showed that Group M-M-G was older than Group M-F as well as Group M-M ($p<.01$). The mean difference between Group M-F and Group M-M was not found to be statistically significant. The homosexual group was older than both the other groups. Tukey's HSD test showed Group M-M-G to have a greater age difference than Group M-M ($p<.05$); Group M-F did not differ significantly from either Group M-M-G or Group M-F. The homosexual group couples had a greater age difference than the male roommates.

Hypothesis 1 and 2 looked at differences in personality profiles and maladjustment, as reflected by scores on the TJTS. The analyses of variance of the TJTS variables resulted in the following variables being significant: DEP, DEM, PDA, and ATT. (See TABLE II). Tukey's HSD test showed that on DEP, as well as on DEM, Group M-F scored significantly lower than Group M-M ($p<.05$); neither group was found to be significantly different from Group M-M-G. The male-female couples were characterized by less depression and less depression maladjustment than the male roommates. Tukey's test on PDA showed that Group M-M-G scored higher ($p=.05$) than Group M-F; neither differed significantly from Group M-M. The homosexual couples had a greater difference on their activity scores than the male-female

couples. Further analysis on the ATT score revealed that Group M-F scored significantly higher ($p<.05$) than Group M-M; neither differed significantly from Group M-M-G. The male-female couples had higher attitude scores, that is, they presented themselves in a more favorable light, than the male roommates. The literature review suggested complementarity in intimate couples on the dominance-submission scale (DOM), but no evidence was found to support this view. The above results do not support hypothesis 1, that more similar personality profiles would be found in gay couples than in either of the control groups. Hypothesis 2, dealing with better adjustment in intimate couples, was partially supported by the DEP and DEM results. The fact that only 4 out of the 45 variables examined were significant creates a problem in interpreting these results, as the significance for these variables may be an artifact of the large number of ANOVAs completed.

Hypotheses 3 and 4 looked at differences in androgyny and sex role identification respectively, as reflected by scores on the BSRI. The analyses of variance on the BSRI variables yielded no significant finding. (See TABLE III). Upon close inspection, it was discovered that the couple mean for Group M-F was not representative of the couples in that group, as the masculinity score of the males and the femininity scores of the females balanced each other. Means and standard deviations were calculated for the males and females separately. (See TABLE IV, V). An analysis of variance was then done on the BSRI variables for males only. (See TABLE VI). The variable BSF was significant. The gay males scored highest on the femininity score, followed by the male roommates and the Group M-F males. Utilizing Scheffe's post hoc procedure for unequal n's, no significance was found for these simple pairwise comparisons. The

hypothesis that gay couples would be significantly more androgynous than the control groups was not supported. The hypothesis that gay couples would be characterized by more similar sex role identities than the control groups was not strongly supported. The Group M-F couples showed a tendency toward having complementary sex role identities.

Hypothesis 5 looked at differences on attitudes towards women, as reflected by scores on the AWS. The analyses of variance on the AWS scores resulted in significance. (See TABLE VII). Utilizing Tukey's test, Group M-M-G was found to score higher than Group M-M ($p<.01$), and Group M-F scored higher than Group M-M ($p<.05$); no significant difference was found between Group M-M-G and Group M-F. Thus, the gay couples are more liberal than the male roommates, but not more liberal than the male-female couples. The hypothesis that the gay couples would express more liberal attitudes than the control groups, was partially supported.

Hypothesis 6 looked at differences in attitudes towards men, as reflected by the ATMTS. The analyses of variance on the ATMTS variables (see TABLE VIII) resulted in a significant difference on the ATM variable. Tukey's test revealed that Group M-F scored significantly higher than Group M-M ($p<.01$); Group M-M-G scored significantly higher than Group M-M ($p<.05$), and no significant differences were found between Group M-F and Group M-M-G. The gay couples as well as the heterosexual couples expressed more liberal attitudes towards men than the male control group. Further ANOVAs done on the ATMTS subscales showed a significant result for homophobia transcendence (HOT), nontraditional roles (NTR), nontraditional roles difference (NRD), and trait (TRA). Tukey's test showed that the homosexual as well as the male-female couples expressed more liberal attitudes towards homophobia transcendence than the male roommates. Tukey's test on NTR also

showed that Group M-F and Group M-M-G scored significantly higher than Group M-M ($p<.01$), but again did not differ from each other. The homosexual as well as the male-female couples expressed more liberal attitudes towards nontraditional roles than the male roommates. Tukey's test on NRD resulted in Group M-M-G scoring significantly higher than Group M-M ($p<.01$) or Group M-F ($p<.05$); Group M-M and Group M-F did not differ significantly from each other. The gay couples had a larger difference in their nontraditional roles scores than either the male-female couples or the male roommates. Tukey's test on TRA showed Group M-M-G scoring significantly higher than Group M-M ($p<.01$) and Group M-F scoring significantly higher than Group M-M ($p<.05$). The gay couples as well as the male-female couples rated themselves as more liberal concerning masculine liberation traits than did the male roommates.

Hypothesis 7 and 8 looked at differences in sex role behavior, as measured by the HBS. The analyses on the HBS scores (see TABLE IX) resulted in the masculine score (HBM) being significant, as well as the androgyny absolute difference score (FMN). Tukey's test on HBM resulted in Group M-M-G scoring significantly higher than Group M-F ($p<.05$) but not differing from Group M-M. The gay couples had a higher masculinity score than the male-female couples, but did not differ from the male roommates. Tukey's test on FMN showed Group M-F scoring significantly higher than either Group M-M ($p<.01$) or Group M-M-G ($p<.01$). The latter two groups did not differ from each other. The male-female couples described a larger difference between their sex role behaviors than either the gay or male roommates. Partial support is thus provided for the hypothesis that the gay couples would have more similar sex role behaviors than the control groups. An analysis looking at only males (as was done

with the BSRI) was performed (see TABLE X, XI). An ANOVA on the HBS variables for males (see TABLE XII) resulted in significance being found for the feminine scale, however, Scheffe's test revealed no significant pairwise comparisons. Group M-M scored the most feminine, followed by Group M-M-G and Group M-F males. Significance was also found for FMB, the androgyny score, (see TABLE XII) with Tukey's test revealing Group M-F males scoring significantly higher than either Group M-M ($p<.01$) or Group M-M-G ($p<.01$); the latter two did not differ from each other. Partial support was thus provided for the hypothesis that gay couples would be more androgynous than the controls. Compared to heterosexual males in a relationship, gay couples are more androgynous in the household behaviors for which they assume responsibility.

The Pearson Product-Moment Correlation was utilized to assess the relationship among dependent variables. The results of the correlational analyses are found in TABLE XIV. Of interest is the low positive correlation ($r=.34$, $p=.03$) found between the masculine scales of the BSRI and HBS. A low positive correlation was also found for the feminine scales of the same tests ($r=.27$, $p=.03$). Although the scales are picking up on some common elements, they are in general measuring different entities. Attitudes do not always correlate with behaviors. The BSRI measures how one would behave; the HBS measures how one does behave. The AWS was found to be moderately correlated with the ATMTS ($r=.72$, $p=.0001$) which adds validity to the ATMTS in terms of measuring a liberal orientation.

CHAPTER VI

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

The hypothesis that the gay couples' personality profile difference scores would be divergent from those of the control groups (as measured by the TJTS) was with one exception not supported. Analyses on the subscales of the TJTS resulted in only one significant difference that can be related to the above hypothesis. A test of significance of the pair personality differences on the activity scale revealed that the gay couples had a larger difference than the M-F couples. Thus, the gay couples are characterized by complementarity on activity, while the male-female couples are characterized by similarity.

The activity scale measures a trait described by a continuum from active-social to quiet. It should be noted that while the gay couples appear complementary on this scale, it is not an extreme complementarity. One can speak of one partner tending to be energetic, enthusiastic, and socially involved, while the other partner tends to be socially inactive, lethargic and withdrawn. The point needs to be made that the complementarity is located within the adjusted range and does not indicate maladjustment in either partner. The finding of complementarity runs counter to Tripp's (1975) observations of similarity in gay couples, and should be studied further as this finding may be an isolated result characteristic of this sample. Roswell Johnson (1967) observed that greater marital stability was present in heterosexual couples that scored at approximately

the same activity level. One explanation may be that the gay couples are more tolerant of individual differences and allow for more individuality than heterosexual couples.

The hypothesis that intimate couples (M-F and M-M-G) would be better adjusted than the M-M group, as demonstrated by more of the intimate couples scoring in the acceptable range of the TJTS, was partially supported. Scores for the male roommates were significantly higher than the M-F couples on both the depressive and depressive maladjustment scales. This reflects a tendency for the M-M pairs to be pessimistic, discouraged, and dejected. In addition, the M-F couples scored significantly higher than the heterosexual males control group on the attitude scale, which means that the M-F couples were rating themselves more favorably than the M-M pairs. It is important to note that both scores were within the average range. Results from all three groups fall into the neutral zone of the attitude scale, which means that all subjects answered the questions in a frank, straightforward way.

Looking at the overall results from the TJTS, the remarkable finding is not that gay couples differ from M-F couples in displaying a greater difference of activity levels, but that in general, gay couples do not differ significantly from either control group. Of the 42 measures taken on the TJTS, only four discriminated the groups, and of these four, only one differentiated the gay couples. Importantly, this difference was not on degree of adjustment, but rather on activity levels. This is in basic agreement with past research (Ohlson, 1973; Evans, 1970; Hooker, 1957) which concludes that homosexuality represents a sex-object preference rather than a maladjustment. These past studies have not been able to differentiate between homosexuals and heterosexuals on the basis of

adjustment measures. The present study adds to this line of research by suggesting that homosexual couples cannot be differentiated from the heterosexual couples on the basis of either personality profiles or personality maladjustment. These results are in accord with Tripp's (1975) statement that there are clearly more differences between individuals and individual couples, than between kinds of couples.

The hypothesis that gay couples would be more alike in their sex role identity than the heterosexual couples (as measured by difference scores on the BSRI) was not supported. One possible explanation for why the hypothesis was not supported is that the M-F couples are by nature a nontraditional group due to the fact that they are unmarried and living together. Therefore, one would not expect the greater degree of complementarity (one being more masculine, the other being feminine) one finds in both older and more traditional married couples. Although failing to reach significance by a very small margin, it should be noted that both the M-M-G couples and the M-M couples tended to present more similar sex role identities than the M-F couples. This suggests that these gay couples are not patterning themselves on traditional dichotomous sex roles, but appear to be more akin to male-male roommates. Using the similarity-complementarity framework, the M-M and M-M-G couples tend to be characterized by similarity in sex role identity, while the M-F couples tend to be characterized by complementarity. Additional information below supplements these findings.

The hypothesis that the homosexual couples would be more androgynous than the control groups was not statistically supported. Upon close inspection of the male-female couples' androgyny scores, it was decided that since the males and females in Group M-F were scoring in opposite directions

and thus tended to balance each other, an analysis comparing only the males would be more appropriate. The M-F males were classified as somewhat male sex identified, while both the M-M and M-M-G males were labeled as androgynous. However, these differences were not significant. It is interesting to note that the males did not differ significantly on the masculine scale; this is in opposition to the popular belief that gay males are less masculine than heterosexual males (Tavris, 1977). Supplementing this finding, the feminine scale resulted in overall significance, although no simple pairwise comparison was found to be significant. Thus, it could not be said that gay males were more feminine than heterosexual males.

The hypothesis that the gay couples would differ from the control groups on attitudes towards women as measured by the AWS, was partially supported. The gay couples as well as the M-F couples, expressed more liberal attitudes towards women (were more supportive of nontraditional roles) than the M-M group. The former two groups did not differ significantly from each other. Results were the same when the women were excluded from the analysis, eliminating the possibility that the women were increasing Group M-F's mean. This appears to be an important finding because the gays, even though they are a noncampus group and would not be expected to be as liberal as an on campus group, scored higher than the male roommates. The results indicate that the AWS was able to differentiate the couples with respect to intimacy (M-F and M-M-G vs. M-M), but not sexual orientation. A look at attitudes towards men complements this finding.

The hypothesis that the gay couples would differ from the control groups on attitudes towards men, as measured by the ATMTS, was partially supported. Both the homosexual and male-female couples expressed more

liberal attitudes towards men than the male roommates. However, the intimate couples did not differ significantly from each other. Additional information was obtained from further comparisons performed on the ATMTS subscales. Groups M-F and M-M-G were again found to express more liberal attitudes towards homophobia transcendence and traditional male responsibilities than the male roommates. This result was duplicated on the nontraditional roles variable as well as on the masculine liberation trait. The results of the difference between the couple in their nontraditional roles measure were unique. The gay couples were characterized by a greater difference on their attitudes than either the M-F or M-M pairs. As such, the gay couples appear to be characterized by a greater difference on nontraditional roles, even though they do not differ significantly from the M-F couples on the nontraditional score. An examination of the demographic variables may shed some light on this finding. Results indicate that although the groups were not significantly different on length of relationships, the homosexual group was found to be slightly older (about four years) than the two control groups. This, plus the fact that most of the gay couples were not attending the same university where the other subjects were recruited, would mean that a greater variety of age differences would be expected for these couples. This was statistically confirmed. With the greater age span, it is possible that the older partner of the M-M-G couple is scoring more conservatively than the younger partner. This would explain the greater difference obtained by the gay couples on the nontraditional roles score. This explanation is supported by the negative correlation ($r=-.36$) found between age and scores for the gay men, that is, the older the male the more traditional was his score. The correlations for the control groups were not comparable.

In conclusion, the results from the ATMTS, as well as the AWS, indicate that the intimate couples (M-F and M-M-G) are more supportive of nontraditional roles for men as well as for women than Group M-M. While the intimate couples both express very liberal attitudes, it remains to be confirmed behaviorally. The next hypothesis addresses itself to this issue.

The hypothesis that gay couples would evidence more similar sex role behaviors than the heterosexual couples (as measured by the HBS) was supported. Results indicated that both the M-M and M-M-G groups were characterized by similarity in sex role behaviors (they performed similar behaviors), while the M-F couples were characterized by complementarity, they performed different behaviors. The former two groups were not significantly different from each other. The complementarity in the M-F couples that was suggested in the BSRI is strongly supported in the HBS. This is a very interesting finding, for while the intimate couples have been virtually indistinguishable from each other, and have both been characterized by liberal attitudes towards men and women's roles, only the gay couple (of the intimate couples) actually implements these attitudes in behaviors.

The hypothesis that gay couples would be characterized by more androgynous behaviors than the heterosexual couples (as measured by the HBS) was partially supported by the result that gay males scored significantly more androgynous than the heterosexual males in a relationship. The M-M and M-M-G males did not differ significantly from each other. The femininity scale yielded overall significance for the males, with the M-F males scoring the least feminine; the M-M-G and M-M males scored more feminine and did not differ from each other. These pairwise comparisons were not significant.

These findings confirm observations (Freedman, 1975; Altman, 1971;

Sonenschein, 1968) of a lack of traditional male-female roles in most gay couples. In addition, the HBS makes it very clear that behaviors do not always follow from the attitudes expressed. The lack of androgynous behaviors in the M-F couples may be due to these couples patterning themselves behaviorally on traditional marriage models. While these couples are expressing nontraditional views, the behaviors appear not to have been affected. Societal pressure to conform may be supporting these traditional behaviors. The homosexual is nontraditional to begin with, and if he has acknowledged his homosexuality, has learned to reject traditional ways of doing things, and as such is less susceptible to societal pressure and expectations regarding role behaviors. As such, the gay couple has to reach a solution which is satisfying to the couple, without having any models to follow. The pattern which has emerged in this study is one of similar sex roles and androgynous behaviors. The finding of similar androgynous behaviors in the M-M pairs is probably due to necessity, and an unwillingness for one member to do all the "woman's" work. In this case, society accepts nontraditional roles for men without disapproval. This disapproval would appear to start whenever a relationship is initiated with a woman.

Summarizing the findings, the gay couples studied were indistinguishable from either the heterosexual couples or the male roommates on personality variables, including the maladjustment variables. The exception to this statement are the differences found on the activity scale, as gay couples were found to be complementary. In terms of sex role identification, there was a tendency for the M-F couples to have a different sex role identification, and the M-M and M-M-G males to have a similar sex role identification. These latter two groups of males were found to be

androgynous while the M-F males were somewhat male sex identified. On the attitude scales, the M-M-G and M-F groups did not differ from each other. Both expressed attitudes more liberal than those of the M-M group. The behaviors scale differentiated the M-M-G and M-M group from the M-F group, with the all male groups being similar and the latter group being complementary.

The applicability of the similarity-complementarity framework to homosexual or heterosexual research is questionable. The concept appears to be a convenient heuristic tool, but loses its value when dealing with multifaceted individuals and multidimensional dependent variables. A better approach would be to interpret the result within the framework of that dependent variable and not use a more global approach which may neglect subtle distinctions.

In conclusion, gay couples appear to have elements of both male heterosexual roommates and intimate unmarried heterosexual couples that are stable. The homosexual couples' personality traits were indistinguishable from either. Their sex role identification and behaviors were similar to those of the male roommates, and their attitudes were similar to those of the intimate heterosexual couple.

These conclusions should be seen as tentative for several reasons. First of all, a possible problem with the study is that the sample size utilized was relatively small and limited to a unique geographic location. Thus it would be difficult to generalize these findings to a different section of the country. The author would recommend expanding these findings to other areas of the country and utilizing larger samples to ascertain the validity of such findings. Another problem is that the gay couples were somewhat older than the control groups, creating an age bias for the

group. Inspection of the correlations calculated for the gay males showed a low negative correlation between age and some of the liberal attitude variables. As such, a younger gay couple would probably have been more liberal. Further research looking at younger versus older gay couples would shed some light on this area.

Finally, this study replicates a well known phenomenon that attitudes rarely predict behavior. For this reason, future research should focus upon behaviors. It is also apparent from this study that the attitudes of the public in regard to male homosexuals do not predict or are an accurate representation of homosexual behavior. The author hopes this present study will be instrumental in initiating needed positive social change.

A SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

Altman, D. Homosexual: Oppression and liberation. New York: E. P. Dutton and Company, 1971.

Altman, D. Introduction. In Len Richmond and Gary Noguera (Eds.), The gay liberation book. San Francisco: Tamparts Press, 1973.

Arnold, S. M. Compatability and stability in roommate relationships. Dissertation Abstracts International, 1974, 34, 4012B.

Bem, S. L. The measurement of psychological androgyny. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1974, 42, 155-162.

Bem, S. L. Sex role adaptability: One consequence of psychological androgyny. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1975, 31, 634-643.

Bieber, I. A psychoanalytic study of male homosexuality. New York: Basic Books, 1962.

Block, J. H. Conceptions of sex role: Some cross-cultural and longitudinal perspectives. American Psychologist, 1973, 28. 512-526.

Bowerman, C. E. and Day, B. R. A test of the theory of complementary needs as applied to couples during courtship. American Sociological Review, 1956, 21, 602-605.

Broverman, I. K., Broverman, D. M., and Clarkson, F. E. Sex role stereotypes and clinical judgments of mental health. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1970, 34, 1-7.

Broverman, I. K., Vogel, S. R., Broverman, D. M., Clarkson, F. E., and Rosenkrantz, P. S. Sex role stereotypes: A current appraisal. Journal of Social Issues, 1972, 28, 59-78.

Byrne, D. Interpersonal attraction and attitude similarity. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1961, 62, 713-725.

Byrne, D. and Palmer, J. Attraction toward dominant and submissive strangers: Similarity vs. complementarity. Journal of Experimental Research in Personality, 1970, 4, 108-115.

Constantinople, A. Masculinity-femininity: An exception to a famous dictum? Psychological Bulletin, 1973, 80, 389-407.

Cooper, A. J. Aetiology of homosexuality. In J. A. Loraine (Ed.), Homosexuality: Its biological and psychological bases. New York: American Elsevier Publishing Co. Inc., 1974.

Curran, J. P. Examination of various interpersonal attraction principles in the dating dyad. Journal of Experimental Research in Personality, 1973, 6, 347-356.

Deutsch, C. J. and Gilbert, L. A. Sex role stereotypes: Effect on perceptions of self and others and on personal adjustment. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1976, 23, 373-379.

Dickey, B. A. Attitudes toward sex roles and feelings of adequacy in homosexual males. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1961, 25, 116-122.

Duck, S. W. Personality similarity and friendship choice: Similarity of what, when? Journal of Personality, 1973, 41, 543-558.

Evans, R. B. Sixteen personality factor questionnaire scores of homosexual men. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1970, 34, 212-215.

Freedman, M. Homosexuals may be healthier than straights. Psychology Today, March, 1975, 28-32.

Hammersmith, S. K. and Weinberg, M. S. Homosexual identity: Commitment, adjustment, and significant others. Sociometry, 1973, 36, 56-79.

Hochschild, A. R. A review of sex role research. American Journal of Sociology, 1973, 78, 1011-1029.

Hogan, R. and Mankin, D. Determinants of interpersonal attraction: A clarification. Psychological Reports, 1970, 26, 235-238.

Hooker, E. The adjustment of the male overt homosexual. Journal of Projective Techniques, 1957, 21, 18-31.

Hooker, E. The homosexual community. In R. W. Weltge (Ed.), The Same Sex, Philadelphia: Pilgrim Press, 1969.

Humphreys, L. Tearoom trade. Chicago: Aldine Publishing Company, 1970.

Izard, C. E. Personality similarity and friendship. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1960, 61, 47-51.

Jenkin, N. and Vroegh, K. Contemporary concepts of masculinity and femininity. Psychological Reports, 1969, 25, 679-697.

Kando, T. M. Role strain: A comparison of males, females, and transsexuals. Journal of Marriage and the Family, August, 1972, 459-464.

Kerckhoff, A. C. and Davis, K. Value consensus and need complementarity in mate selection. American Sociological Review, 1962, 27, 295-303.

Kinsey, A. C., Pomeroy, W. B., and Martin, C. E. Sexual behavior in the human male. Philadelphia: Saunders Company, 1948.

Ktsanes, T. Mate selection on the basis of personality type: A study utilizing an empirical typology of personality. American Sociological Review, 1955, 20, 547-551.

Levinger, G., Senn, D. J., and Jorgense, B. W. Progress toward permanence in courtship: A test of the Kerckhoff-Davis hypothesis. Sociometry, 1970, 33, 427-443.

Lindner, B. J. Patterning of psychological type, interpersonal understanding, and marital happiness. Dissertation Abstracts International, 1973, 34, 417B.

Loevinger, J. The meaning and measurement of ego development. American Psychologist, 1966, 21, 195-206.

MacDonald, Jr., A. P. Identification and measurement of multidimensional attitudes toward equality between the sexes. Journal of Homosexuality, 1974, 1, 165-182.

Markey, V. K. Psychological need relationships in dyadic attraction and rejection. Psychological Reports, 1973, 32, 111-123.

May, E. P. Perceptions on homosexuals and nonhomosexuals. The Otherwise Monograph Series, National Task Force on Student Personnel Services and Homosexuality, 1972.

Mednick, M. T. The psychology of women: Selected topics. Annual Review of Psychology, 1975, 26, 1-16.

Mehlman, B. Similarity in friendships. Journal of Social Psychology, 1962, 57, 195-202.

Miller, N., Campbell, D. T., Twedt, H., and O'Connell, E. J. Similarity, contrast, and complementarity in friendship choice. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1966, 3, 3-12.

Moreland, J. and Van Tuinen, M. The attitude toward masculinity transcendence scale. Personal communication, March 28, 1977.

Murstein, B. I. The complementary need hypothesis in newlyweds and middle-aged married couples. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1961, 63, 194-197.

Newcomb, T. M. The prediction of interpersonal attraction. American Psychologist, 1956, 11, 575-586.

Nuehring, E. M., Fein, S. B., and Tyler, M. The gay college student: Perspectives for mental health professionals. Counseling Psychologist, 1974, 4, 64-72.

Oberstone, A. K. and Sukoneck, H. Psychological adjustment and lifestyle of single lesbians and single heterosexual women. Psychology of Women Quarterly, 1976, 1, 172-188.

Ohlson, E. L. A preliminary investigation into the self-disclosing ability of male homosexuals. Psychology, 1973, 10, 21-25.

Osofsky, J. D., and Osofsky, J. H. Androgyny as a life style. The Family Coordinator, 1972, 21, 411-418.

Rychlak, J. R. The similarity, compatability, or incompatability of needs in interpersonal selection. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1965, 2, 334-340.

Schofield, M. Sociological aspects of homosexuality. Boston: Little, Brown, and Company, 1965.

Seyfried, B. A., and Hendrick, C. When do opposites attract? When they are opposite in sex and sex role attitudes. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1973, 25, 15-20.

Siegelman, M. Adjustment of male homosexuals and heterosexuals. Archives of Sexual Behavior, 1972, 2, 9-25.

Simon, W. and Gagnon, J. H. Homosexuality: The formulation of a sociological perspective. In R. W. Weltge (Ed.), The same sex. Philadelphia: Pilgrim Press, 1969.

Singh, R. Attraction as a function of similarity in attitudes and personality characteristics. Journal of Social Psychology, 1973, 91, 87-95.

Socarides, C. W. Homosexuality: Basic concepts and psychodynamics. International Journal of Psychiatry, 1972, 10, 118-125.

Sonenschein, D. The ethnography of male homosexual relationships. Journal of Sex Research, 1968, 4, 69-83.

Spence, J. T., Helmreich, R., and Stapp, J. Ratings of self and peers on sex role attributes and their relation to self-esteem and conceptions of masculinity and femininity. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1975, 32, 29-39.

Spence, J. T., Helmreich, R., and Stapp, J. A short version of the attitudes toward women scale (aws). Bulletin of the Psychonomic Society, 1973, 2, 219-220.

Stringer, P. and Grygier, T. Male homosexuality, psychiatric patient status, and psychological masculinity and femininity. Archives of Sexual Behavior, 1976, 5, 15-27.

Sweet, R. T. Political and social action in homophile organizations. New York Times Company: Arno Press, 1975.

Tavris, C. Masculinity. Psychology Today, January 1977, 35-42.

Taylor, R. M. Taylor-Johnson temperament analysis manual. Psychological Publications, Inc., Los Angeles, 1973.

Terman, L. and Miles, C. C. Sex and personality: Studies in masculinity and femininity. New York: Mc Graw-Hill, 1936.

Thompson, Jr., N. L., Mc Candless, B. R., and Strickland, B. R. Personal adjustment of male and female homosexuals and heterosexuals. Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 1971, 78, 237-240.

Tripp, C. A. The homosexual matrix. New York: New American Library, Inc., 1975.

Ward, S. Cited in Spence et al. (1975).

Warren, C. A. B. Identity and community in the gay world. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1974.

Weinberg, G. H. Society and the healthy homosexual. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1973.

Weinberg, M. S. and Williams, C. J. Male homosexuals: Their problems and adaptations. New York: Oxford University Press, 1974.

Winch, R. F. The theory of complementary needs in mate-selections: Final results on the test of the general hypothesis. American Sociological Review, 1955, 20, 552-555.

Winch, R. F., Ktsanes, T., and Ktsanes, V. The theory of complementary needs in mate selection: An analytic and descriptive study. American Sociological Review, 1954, 19, 241-249.

Winch, R. F. The modern family. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1963.

Zeldow, P. B. Psychological androgyny and attitudes towards feminism. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1976, 44, 150.

APPENDIX A

TABLES

TABLE I

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE: DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES

Source	SS	df	MS	F
Age				
Group	210.90	2	105.45	9.31***
Residual	645.50	57	11.32	
Age Difference				
Group	43.33	2	21.67	3.40*
Residual	363.60	57	6.38	
Time Together				
Group	663.33	2	331.67	2.70
Residual	7001.60	57	122.85	

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

TABLE II

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE: TJTS VARIABLES

	Source	SS	df	MS	F
NER					
	Group	1394.53	2	697.27	.90
	Residual	44149.20	57	774.55	
NEM					
	Group	882.23	2	441.12	1.63
	Residual	15411.50	57	270.38	
PDN					
	Group	638.40	2	319.20	.58
	Residual	31408.00	57	551.02	
NMD					
	Group	247.60	2	123.80	.64
	Residual	10987.40	57	192.76	
DEP					
	Group	3544.23	2	1772.12	3.61*
	Residual	27948.75	57	490.33	
DEM					
	Group	1514.10	2	757.05	3.28*
	Residual	13151.55	57	230.73	
PDD					
	Group	145.73	2	72.87	.19
	Residual	22326.00	57	391.68	
DMD					
	Group	281.20	2	140.60	.70
	Residual	11376.20	57	199.58	
ACT					
	Group	1857.10	2	928.55	1.19
	Residual	44338.30	57	777.86	

TABLE II (Continued)

	Source	SS	df	MS	F
ACM					
	Group	61.03	2	30.52	.37
	Residual	4679.15	57	82.09	
PDA					
	Group	2098.53	2	1049.27	3.19*
	Residual	18748.40	57	328.92	
AMD					
	Group	148.93	2	74.47	.90
	Residual	4738.00	57	83.12	
EXP					
	Group	710.63	2	355.32	.59
	Residual	34326.10	57	602.21	
EXM					
	Group	277.03	2	138.52	.83
	Residual	9463.70	57	166.03	
PDE					
	Group	1026.53	2	513.27	1.76
	Residual	16612.20	57	291.44	
PDY					
	Group	137.20	2	68.60	.21
	Residual	18908.20	57	331.72	
SMS					
	Group	584.40	2	292.20	2.58
	Residual	6466.60	57	113.45	
DOM					
	Group	694.80	2	347.40	.57
	Residual	34764.80	57	609.91	

TABLE II (Continued)

	Source	SS	df	MS	F
DMM					
	Group	100.23	2	50.12	1.14
	Residual	2509.50	57	44.03	
PDP					
	Group	1043.20	2	521.60	1.36
	Residual	21932.80	57	384.79	
DOS					
	Group	403.60	2	201.80	2.99
	Residual	3842.00	57	67.40	
HOS					
	Group	3611.20	2	1805.60	2.91
	Residual	35363.65	57	620.41	
HOM					
	Group	756.40	2	378.20	1.60
	Residual	13441.25	57	235.81	
PDH					
	Group	176.53	2	88.27	.25
	Residual	20161.40	57	353.71	
HMD					
	Group	339.73	2	169.87	.85
	Residual	11383.00	57	199.71	
SDI					
	Group	1217.73	2	608.87	1.08
	Residual	32234.20	57	565.51	
SDM					
	Group	257.70	2	128.85	1.26
	Residual	5805.95	57	101.86	

TABLE II (Continued)

Source	SS	df	MS	F
PSD				
Group	211.73	2	105.87	.23
Residual	26400.00	57	463.16	
SDD				
Group	547.73	2	273.86	2.43
Residual	6427.20	57	112.76	
ATT				
Group	17.03	2	8.52	4.77**
Residual	101.70	57	1.78	
ATD				
Group	8.13	2	4.07	2.94
Residual	78.80	57	1.38	
MID				
Group	1711.30	2	855.65	1.63
Residual	29918.30	57	524.88	
TMA				
Group	8603.43	2	4301.72	1.43
Residual	171085.55	57	3001.50	
TMD				
Group	8398.53	2	4199.27	2.15
Residual	111471.40	57	1955.64	
PTO				
Group	1963.20	2	981.60	.20
Residual	279551.20	57	4904.41	
EMD				
Group	820.13	2	410.07	2.32
Residual	10090.80	57	177.03	

TABLE II (Continued)

	Source	SS	df	MS	F
SYP					
	Group	1414.63	2	707.32	.97
	Residual	41390.10	57	726.14	
SYM					
	Group	254.80	2	127.40	.66
	Residual	11000.60	57	192.99	
PDY					
	Group	20.93	2	10.47	.03
	Residual	19438.00	57	341.02	
SMD					
	Group	451.90	2	225.95	1.69
	Residual	7629.75	57	133.86	
SUB					
	Group	2532.63	2	1266.32	2.94
	Residual	24573.55	57	431.11	
SUM					
	Group	748.30	2	374.14	3.01
	Residual	7076.55	57	124.15	

*$p < .05$

**$p < .01$

TABLE III

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE: BSRI VARIABLES

	Source	SS	df	MS	F
BSM					
	Group	62.01	2	31.00	.91
	Residual	1940.93	57	34.05	
BSF					
	Group	117.48	2	58.74	2.33
	Residual	1434.34	57	25.16	
FMM					
	Group	.83	2	.42	2.87
	Residual	8.26	57	.14	
FMA					
	Group	1.27	2	.64	1.54
	Residual	23.46	57	.41	

TABLE IV

MEAN SCORES FOR GROUP 2 ON THE BSRI AS A FUNCTION OF SEX

Variable	Male Mean	SD	Female Mean	SD
BSM	5.07	.45	4.60	.49
BSF	4.41	.46	5.07	.53
FMA	-.66	.63	.47	.83

TABLE V

MEAN SCORES FOR MALES ON THE BSRI VARIABLES AS A FUNCTION OF GROUP

Variable	Group 1 (n=20)		Group 2 (n=10)		Group 3 (n=20)	
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD
BSM	4.93	.50	5.07	.45	5.08	.70
BSF	4.56	.49	4.41	.46	4.90	.40
FMA	-.37	.47	-.66	.63	-.18	.57

TABLE VI

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE: BSRI VARIABLES FOR MALES

	Source	SS	df	MS	F
BSM					
	Group	24.52	2	12.26	.36
	Residual	1615.59	47	34.37	
BSF					
	Group	198.58	2	99.29	4.85**
	Residual	962.41	47	20.48	
FMA					
	Group	.50	2	.25	.92
	Residual	13.11	47	.27	

**p=.01

TABLE VII

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE: AWS SCORES

	Source	SS	df	MS	F
AWS					
	Group	1193.20	2	596.60	6.37***
	Residual	5339.20	57	93.67	
AWD					
	Group	270.40	2	135.20	1.99
	Residual	3880.00	57	68.07	

***$p < .001$

TABLE VIII

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE: ATMTS SCORES

	Source	SS	df	MS	F
ATM					
	Group	4066.03	2	2033.02	5.51**
	Residual	21044.15	57	369.20	
ATO					
	Group	48.13	2	24.07	.10
	Residual	14262.60	57	250.22	
DTA					
	Group	230.93	2	115.47	1.96
	Residual	3365.80	57	59.05	
DTB					
	Group	564.93	2	282.47	2.03
	Residual	7925.00	57	139.04	

TABLE VIII (Continued)

	Source	SS	df	MS	F
HOT					
	Group	761.63	2	380.82	10.30***
	Residual	2107.10	57	36.97	
HTD					
	Group	58.80	2	29.40	1.27
	Residual	1318.80	57	23.14	
NTR					
	Group	209.63	2	104.82	4.82*
	Residual	1238.30	57	21.72	
NRD					
	Group	140.93	2	70.47	7.96**
	Residual	504.40	57	8.85	
MFR					
	Group	103.23	2	51.62	1.87
	Residual	1573.75	57	27.61	
MRD					
	Group	13.73	2	6.87	.48
	Residual	813.00	57	14.26	
TRA					
	Group	36.43	2	18.22	6.63**
	Residual	156.50	57	2.75	
TRD					
	Group	12.40	2	6.20	3.02
	Residual	117.20	57	2.06	

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

TABLE IX

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE: HBS SCORES

	Source	SS	df	MS	F
HBM					
	Group	16.97	2	8.49	3.18*
	Residual	151.90	57	2.66	
HBF					
	Group	6.04	2	3.02	.69
	Residual	24.90	57	4.37	
FMN					
	Group	31.95	2	15.98	25.19***
	Residual	36.16	57	.63	
FMB					
	Group	.80	2	.40	.55
	Residual	41.64	57	.73	

*$p < .05$
***$P < .001$

TABLE X

MEAN SCORES FOR GROUP 2 ON THE HBS AS A FUNCTION OF SEX

Variable	Male Mean	SD	Female Mean	SD
HBM	4.00	.38	2.92	.45
HBF	2.98	.51	4.02	.69
FMB	-1.02	.64	1.10	.73

TABLE XI

MEAN SCORES FOR MALES ON THE HBS AS A FUNCTION OF GROUP

Variable	Group 1 (n=20)		Group 2 (n=10)		Group 3 (n=20)	
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD
HBM	3.70	.36	4.00	.38	3.87	.43
HBF	3.73	.60	2.98	.51	3.69	.54
FMB	.03	.56	-1.02	.64	-.18	.47

TABLE XII

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE: HBS VARIABLES FOR MALES

	Source	SS	df	MS	F
HBM					
	Group	6.59	2	3.29	2.06
	Residual	75.02	47	1.60	
HBF					
	Group	42.79	2	21.40	6.64**
	Residual	151.36	47	3.22	
FMB					
	Group	7.35	2	3.67	11.32**
	Residual	15.25	47	.32	

**$p < .01$

TABLE XIII

MEAN SCORES AS A FUNCTION OF GROUP

Variable (N=20 each)	Group 1		Group 2		Group 3	
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD
AGE	23.15	1.66	23.00	2.92	27.05	4.74
AGD	1.70	.92	2.20	1.75	3.70	3.92
TIM	10.70	1.12	18.20	14.96	17.20	12.45
NER	58.20	23.97	51.90	29.10	63.70	30.28
NEM	15.00	15.14	13.15	16.00	22.05	17.89
PDN	28.80	16.59	36.00	26.74	29.40	26.45
NMD	17.00	10.28	13.80	15.54	18.70	15.60
DEP	58.60	24.83	39.95	20.18	51.50	21.37
DEM	17.90	18.79	5.60	11.07	12.05	14.79
PDD	20.10	22.90	23.70	16.17	23.00	20.05
DMD	12.20	13.87	9.40	14.10	14.70	14.76
ACT	47.05	28.65	49.40	25.74	59.85	29.64
ACM	6.35	8.98	3.90	5.88	5.40	11.25
PDA	25.50	15.66	14.20	12.26	27.70	24.46
AMD	5.50	6.52	4.60	5.66	8.30	13.28
EXP	49.70	25.65	57.05	22.31	56.95	25.94
EXM	10.95	14.33	5.70	9.91	8.65	13.76
PDE	31.60	16.67	23.80	17.88	33.30	17.13
EMD	18.50	13.41	9.60	10.36	15.50	15.79
SYP	50.95	27.16	43.05	25.51	54.70	28.24
SYM	11.20	15.07	14.70	13.59	9.80	12.24
PDY	32.70	18.84	31.50	15.48	31.40	20.99
SMD	15.15	14.15	16.00	9.62	9.80	10.65
SUB	62.60	20.56	52.75	17.11	68.50	21.10
SUM	9.60	11.61	5.20	6.10	13.85	12.80
PDU	22.20	19.85	25.90	19.08	24.20	15.99
SMS	9.60	11.37	9.00	10.49	15.90	10.32
DOM	52.50	21.98	60.00	28.96	53.10	22.80
DMM	2.00	5.45	4.55	9.48	1.65	3.60

TABLE XIII (Continued)

Variable (N=20 each)	Group 1 M	Group 1 SD	Group 2 M	Group 2 SD	Group 3 M	Group 3 SD
PDP	22.40	14.51	32.40	24.87	29.20	18.91
DOS	4.00	7.15	8.30	12.10	2.10	3.50
HOS	54.35	22.32	45.15	28.21	64.15	22.56
HOM	11.25	13.51	10.45	14.40	18.35	16.59
PDH	30.10	21.92	27.90	17.64	25.90	16.89
HMD	17.30	12.78	16.50	17.50	21.90	12.06
SDI	40.30	24.38	49.20	22.82	50.40	24.01
SDM	9.65	11.86	4.70	7.72	6.20	10.36
PSD	28.00	20.38	25.80	23.92	30.40	20.77
SDD	14.60	11.58	7.20	8.87	10.80	11.37
ATT	4.05	1.23	5.30	1.47	4.35	1.22
ATD	1.10	1.33	2.00	.94	1.50	1.23
MID	34.90	22.93	23.75	21.36	23.40	24.40
TMA	93.80	56.90	69.10	53.97	95.15	52.95
TMD	40.20	49.93	59.00	46.48	68.70	36.42
PTO	236.40	72.53	241.20	67.87	250.20	71.33
BSM	4.93	.50	4.83	.47	5.08	.70
BSF	4.56	.49	4.74	.50	4.90	.40
FMM	.58	.39	.92	.81	.56	.29
FMA	-.37	.47	-.09	.73	-.18	.57
AWS	51.20	10.68	61.50	9.30	59.50	8.82
AWD	12.20	12.03	9.60	6.04	7.00	4.98
ATM	134.70	18.49	153.45	21.43	150.50	16.77
ATO	19.00	19.13	21.00	14.27	20.60	13.82
DTA	53.90	8.69	58.70	6.93	56.10	6.90
DTB	14.30	18.90	8.00	6.00	7.60	5.07
HOT	25.35	5.45	31.60	6.83	33.75	4.57
HTD	7.10	5.43	5.60	5.31	4.70	3.61
NTR	27.00	4.79	31.15	4.43	30.75	4.54
NRD	3.00	1.77	4.30	3.23	6.70	3.67

TABLE XIII (Continued)

Variable (N=20 each)	Group 1 M	Group 1 SD	Group 2 M	Group 2 SD	Group 3 M	Group 3 SD
MFR	28.30	4.50	31.50	5.94	29.65	5.33
MRD	5.20	4.78	5.00	2.70	6.10	3.59
TRA	4.45	1.53	5.90	2.19	6.25	1.06
TRD	1.70	1.13	2.40	2.17	1.30	.65
HBM	3.70	.36	3.46	.42	3.87	.43
HBF	3.73	.60	3.50	.60	3.69	.54
FMN	.56	.46	2.10	1.28	.60	.45
FMB	.08	.56	.04	.69	-.18	.47

TABLE XIV

CORRELATION MATRIX FOR THE DEPENDENT VARIABLES

	AGE	AGD	TIM	NER	NEM	NMD	DEP	DEM
AGE	1.00	.29*	.46**	.15	.20	.11	-.02	-.02
AGD		1.00	.35**	.02	-.01	.04	-.10	-.14
TIM			1.00	.31*	.26*	-.08	.04	-.02
NER				1.00	.92**	.15	.57**	.55**
NEM					1.00	.17	.58**	.61**
NMD						1.00	-.03	.02
DEP		CODE OF VARIABLES REFER TO PAGE					1.00	.91**

	DEM	DMD	ACT	ACM	AMD	EXP	EXM	EMD
DEM	1.00	.41**	-.12	.26	.07	-.41**	.40**	.43**
DMD		1.00	-.22	.29*	.39**	-.18	.15	.29*
ACT			1.00	-.79**	-.51**	.40**	-.38**	-.31*
ACM				1.00	.52**	-.42**	.44**	.31*
AMD					1.00	-.22	.19	.42**
EXP						1.00	-.86**	-.60**
EXM							1.00	.59**
EMD								1.00

TABLE XIV (Continued)

	EMD	SYP	SYM	SMD	SUB	SUM	SMS	DOM
EMD	1.00	-.03	.03	.20	.17	.10	-.07	-.20
SYP		1.00	-.89**	-.35**	.12	-.03	-.03	-.07
SYM			1.00	.36**	-.04	.07	.09	.07
SMD				1.00	-.02	.12	.28*	.10
SUB					1.00	.86**	.32*	-.03
SUM						1.00	.39**	-.06
SMS							1.00	-.03
DOM								1.00

	DOM	DMM	DOS	HOS	HOM	HMD	SDI	SDM
DOM	1.00	-.66**	-.42**	.37**	.36**	.26*	.00	-.10
DMM		1.00	.66**	-.38**	-.25*	-.20	.05	-.01
DOS			1.00	-.31*	-.16	-.23	-.14	.13
HOS				1.00	.90**	.47**	-.14	.14
HOM					1.00	.46**	-.11	.10
HMD						1.00	.30*	-.10
SDI							1.00	-.81**
SDM								1.00

	SDM	SDD	ATT	ATD	MID	TMA	TMD	BSM
SDM	1.00	.54**	-.28*	-.15	.26*	.28*	-.09	.04
SDD		1.00	-.26*	-.21	.25*	.32*	-.16	.00
ATT			1.00	.25	-.10	-.70**	-.15	.01
ATD				1.00	-.07	-.09	.47**	-.20
MID					1.00	.18	-.08	.12
TMA						1.00	.23	-.13
TMD							1.00	-.08
BSM								1.00

	BSM	BSF	AWS	AWD	ATM	ATO	DTA	DTB
BSM	1.00	.29*	.00	-.02	.12	.10	.10	.00
BSF		1.00	.15	.03	.14	-.05	.12	-.07
AWS			1.00	-.22	.72**	-.10	.56**	-.19
AWD				1.00	-.02	.61**	-.02	.26*
ATM					1.00	.15	.85**	.00
ATO						1.00	.11	.32*
DTA							1.00	-.03
DTB								1.00

TABLE XIV (Continued)

	DTB	HOT	HTD	NTR	NRD	MFR	MRD	TRA
DTB	1.00	-.07	.09	.13	.06	-.06	.13	-.18
HOT		1.00	.11	.62**	.21	.58**	.07	.40**
HTD			1.00	.12	.01	.05	.43**	-.08
NTR				1.00	.09	.41**	.11	.37**
NRD					1.00	.00	.05	.04
MFR						1.00	-.08	.47**
MRD							1.00	-.03
TRA								1.00

	TRA	TRD	HBM	HBF	PDN	PDD	PDA	PDE
TRA	1.00	-.19	-.04	.09	.22	.28	-.02	-.06
TRD		1.00	-.04	.04	-.02	-.11	-.10	.03
HBM			1.00	-.01	.04	-.16	-.05	.06
HBF				1.00	-.02	-.09	-.08	.19
PDN					1.00	.40**	-.15	.08
PDD						1.00	-.07	.09
PDA							1.00	-.03
PDE								1.00

	PDE	PDY	PDU	PDP	PDH	PSD	PTO	SEX
PDE	1.00	.23	-.26*	-.27*	-.13	.07	.20	.15
PDY		1.00	.16	.15	.32*	-.24	.59**	.01
PDU			1.00	.25*	.18	.02	.34**	-.04
PDP				1.00	.02	.07	.33**	-.10
PDH					1.00	.21	.59**	.00
PSD						1.00	.35**	.05
PTO							1.00	.01
SEX								1.00

	DMD	ACT	ACM	AMD	EXP	EXM	EMD	SYP
AGE	.13	-.04	.23	.35**	.04	.00	.09	-.07
AGD	-.15	.01	.05	-.14	.15	-.10	-.19	-.23
TIM	.09	.13	.04	.17	.01	-.06	-.14	-.20
NER	.17	.21	-.06	-.04	-.03	.05	.04	.12
NEM	.24	.14	-.02	.00	-.16	.18	.11	.10
NMD	.24	.17	-.11	.13	.04	.07	.16	-.02
DEP	.31*	-.16	.30*	.13	-.45**	.40**	.44**	.08
DEM	.41**	-.12	.26*	.07	-.41**	.40**	.43**	.11

TABLE XIV (Continued)

	SYM	SMD	SUB	SUM	SMS	DOM	DMM	DOS
AGE	.01	-.08	.01	-.01	.07	.03	-.08	-.17
AGD	.23	.26*	.14	.24*	.21	.00	.05	.10
TIM	.26*	.18	.19	.24	.17	.23	-.03	-.01
NER	-.09	-.10	.66**	.55**	.31*	-.08	.03	.01
NEM	-.07	-.13	.62**	.56**	.24	-.07	.03	-.01
NMD	.03	.02	.15	.06	.41**	.11	-.16	.20
DEP	-.09	-.03	.52**	.50**	.08	-.29*	.09	.10
DEM	-.08	.01	.46**	.49**	.10	-.28	.11	.12
DMD	-.06	.22	.29*	.24	.35**	-.07	.08	.19
ACT	-.09	-.22	.09	.09	.30*	.20	-.15	-.20
ACM	.10	.20	.07	.09	-.06	-.22	.18	.17
AMD	.09	-.02	.05	-.02	-.24	-.10	.01	.05
EXP	-.25*	-.12	-.16	-.17	.06	.28*	-.08	-.06
EXM	.22	.08	.14	.13	-.06	-.20	.07	-.03
EMD	.03	.20	.17	.10	-.07	-.20	.06	.04

	HOS	HOM	HMD	SDI	SDM	SDD	ATT	ATD
AGE	.30*	.15	.34**	.07	-.03	-.09	-.04	-.25*
AGD	.25*	.30*	.35**	.05	.02	-.04	.03	.04
TIM	.24	.22	.34**	.04	-.08	-.10	-.14	-.23
NER	.45**	.38**	.11	-.11	.03	.19	-.73**	-.20
NEM	.42**	.38**	.19	-.08	.05	.18	-.68**	-.06
NMD	.23	.19	.48**	.24	-.12	-.04	-.13	.17
DEP	.28*	.21	.09	-.17	.17	.32*	-.73**	-.23
DEM	.22	.16	.09	-.22	.21	.33**	-.65**	-.09
DMD	.03	.07	.23	.01	-.10	-.20	-.38**	.06
ACT	.18	.14	.01	.00	.02	.27	.05	.00
ACM	-.11	-.10	.02	-.01	.00	-.11	-.12	-.20
AMD	-.06	-.12	.11	.12	-.16	-.34**	-.12	-.10
EXP	.12	.14	-.06	-.12	.03	-.07	.22	-.08
EXM	-.07	-.10	.11	.08	.05	.10	-.21	.11
EMD	.08	.03	.15	.14	-.07	.03	-.27*	.18
SYP	-.16	-.14	-.21	-.05	.09	.11	-.13	-.06
SYM	.09	.06	.21	.06	-.12	-.09	.10	.13
SMD	.07	.21	.33**	.09	-.10	-.23	-.03	.19
SUB	.36**	.36**	.08	-.11	.02	.28*	-.66**	-.21
SUM	.32**	.37**	.12	-.12	.05	.28*	-.58**	-.18
SMS	.18	.21	.26*	.03	-.05	.03	-.23	-.03
DOM	.37**	.36**	.26*	.00	-.10	-.11	.14	-.11

TABLE XIV (Continued)

	MID	TMA	TMD	BSM	BSF	AWS	AWD	ATM
AGE	.00	.09	.14	.07	-.12	.09	-.09	-.02
AGD	.16	.13	.04	.18	.06	.03	-.19	-.02
TIM	.01	.23	.14	.13	-.03	.16	-.03	.24
NER	.07	.60**	.17	.01	.04	-.01	.28	.15
NEM	.02	.69**	.26**	-.02	.08	.04	.29*	.18
NMD	-.11	.08	.21	.12	.07	.01	.10	.17
DEP	.18	.74**	.12	-.20	-.10	-.14	.29*	-.06
DEM	.23	.77**	.20	-.13	-.06	-.12	.28*	-.05
DMD	-.03	.33**	.63	.02	.13	.32	-.11	.17
ACT	-.05	-.19	.12	.25*	.21	-.06	.21	.17
ACM	.03	.36**	-.04	-.23	-.25*	-.04	-.16	-.17
AMD	-.17	.09	.09	-.09	.07	.12	-.13	.07
EXT	-.01	-.49**	-.20	.38	.22	.05	-.28	-.02
EXM	-.05	.53**	.17	-.30	-.19	-.02	.24	.03
EMD	-.22	.35**	.23	-.39**	-.19	-.05	.18	-.05
SYP	-.32*	-.20	-.05	.02	.32	.10	.14	.10
SYM	.30*	.26*	.14	-.04	-.24	-.08	-.09	-.04
SMD	-.10	.18	.19	-.10	-.27*	.13	-.07	.12
SUB	-.04	.62**	.15	-.04	.12	.04	.20	.18
SUM	-.01	.69**	.13	-.04	.05	.02	.07	.10
SMS	-.08	.23	.44**	.10	.00	.11	-.04	.08
DOM	-.03	-.16	-.17	.30*	.00	.00	-.03	.23
DMM	-.18	.13	.19	-.17	.06	.10	.08	-.09
DOS	-.15	.12	.30*	-.10	.18	.06	.14	-.14
HOS	.15	.47**	-.01	.19	-.09	-.03	-.07	.13
HOM	.07	.46**	.03	.15	.05	.00	-.05	.14
HMD	-.02	.29*	.27	.07	-.01	.17	.09	.22
SDI	-.35**	-.24	.08	-.05	.03	.09	-.02	.04
SDM	.26*	.27*	-.09	.04	.01	-.10	.10	-.04

TABLE XIV (Continued)

	ATO	DTA	DTB	HOT	HTD	NTR	NRD	MFR
AGE	.21	-.10	-.04	.17	-.06	-.01	.17	-.12
AGD	.26*	-.05	.05	.04	.04	.04	.29*	-.13
TIM	.22	.23	-.03	.11	-.14	.28*	.27*	.13
NER	.26*	.05	.15	.11	.13	.21	.21	.11
NEM	.28*	.05	.05	.19	.20	.24	.13	.10
NMD	.24	.19	.15	.13	.25	.18	-.17	.04
DEP	.13	-.16	.23	-.06	.11	.14	.03	-.07
DEM	.12	-.13	.21	-.07	.26	.13	-.03	-.01
DMD	-.02	.09	-.07	.11	.18	.21	-.18	.26*
ACT	.21	.24	.17	.06	-.02	.14	.19	.02
ACM	-.08	-.25*	-.06	-.08	.02	-.09	.03	-.09
AMD	-.02	.01	-.12	.13	-.06	.05	-.07	.14
EXP	.12	-.02	-.13	.00	-.03	-.04	.02	-.02
EXM	.10	.05	.06	.00	.11	.03	-.05	.03
EMD	-.04	-.12	.15	.01	.13	.07	-.11	-.07
SYP	-.12	.06	-.06	.07	.07	.16	-.11	.07
SYM	.18	.00	.05	-.10	-.03	-.06	.19	-.02
SMD	.16	.07	.07	.09	.33**	.11	.15	.13
SUB	.21	.11	.00	.09	.21	.31*	.23	.10
SUM	.13	.05	.07	.04	.16	.24*	.33**	.03
SMS	.02	.03	.05	.01	-.10	.11	.31	.05
DOM	.15	.19	-.03	.14	.09	.22	-.05	.17
DMM	-.10	-.10	-.05	-.11	.08	.04	.03	-.11
DOS	-.12	-.20	-.07	-.22	.15	.03	-.01	-.02
HOS	.23	-.01	.21	.19	.04	.24*	.20	.00
HOM	.23	-.02	.21	.20	.16	.30*	.19	-.04
HMD	.34**	.19	.15	.19	.15	.31*	-.12	.00
SDI	-.05	.08	-.19	.08	-.04	.08	-.15	-.08
SDM	.09	.00	.20	-.06	.16	-.16	.11	.06
SDD	.18	.06	.30*	-.10	.16	-.03	.15	-.07
ATT	-.15	.00	-.21	.00	-.18	-.15	-.06	-.10
ATD	.01	.07	-.16	.06	.21	-.01	-.20	.05
MID	.10	-.11	.18	-.18	-.07	-.24	-.02	-.02
TMA	.26*	-.02	.19	.06	.28*	.23	.20	.06
TMD	.23	.07	-.05	.02	.11	.11	.01	.14
BSM	.10	.10	.00	.00	.09	.13	-.10	.13

TABLE XIV (Continued)

	MRD	TRA	TRD	HBM	HBF	PDN	PDD	PDA
AGE	.18	.01	-.31*	.13	-.10	-.09	.05	.46**
AGD	-.10	.10	-.10	.10	-.06	.00	-.16	.35**
TIM	.02	.03	-.04	-.06	.02	-.34**	-.02	.28*
NER	.23	.15	-.19	-.07	.14	-.19	.02	.10
NEM	.31*	.14	-.14	-.09	.16	-.07	.09	.06
NMD	.32*	.16	-.23	.09	.03	.61**	.33**	.08
DEP	.09	-.12	-.22	.07	.19	-.24	-.06	.05
DEM	.06	-.13	-.12	.02	.12	-.14	.13	.00
DMD	-.21	.22	-.25	-.08	.03	.22	.80**	.00
ACT	.26*	-.09	.16	.21	.03	-.06	-.12	-.23
ACM	-.15	.01	-.27*	-.13	.04	-.07	.08	.19
AMD	.10	.11	-.24	-.13	.04	.04	.18	.51**
EXP	-.13	-.06	-.01	.19	-.09	.13	.09	-.09
EXM	.17	-.01	.04	-.14	.07	-.02	-.06	.13
EMD	.14	-.10	-.05	-.02	.17	.04	-.06	.18
SYP	.07	.00	.03	.20	.06	-.02	-.02	-.12
SYM	-.04	.02	.00	-.32*	.04	.00	.06	.06
SMD	-.13	.05	.27*	-.21	-.02	-.01	.22	.05
SUB	.08	.17	-.20	-.09	.31*	-.12	.05	.05
SUM	-.03	.11	-.15	-.13	.19	-.24	.06	.06
SMS	-.12	.25	-.32*	.06	.05	.00	.31*	-.21
DOM	.09	.05	.11	-.06	.01	.09	-.02	-.14
DMM	-.06	.00	-.03	.00	.06	.03	.04	-.02
DOS	-.11	.17	-.09	-.14	.02	.09	.11	-.01
HOS	.09	.15	-.29*	.01	.09	-.07	-.03	.07
HOM	.07	.15	-.17	-.12	.17	-.02	.06	.02
HMD	.28*	.20	-.28	.07	.03	.21	.19	.13
SDI	.09	.06	.14	.07	-.03	.21	-.03	-.02
SDM	.06	-.09	-.14	.03	-.07	-.04	-.07	-.03
SDD	.16	-.21	-.19	.07	-.03	-.16	-.21	-.23
ATT	-.08	-.18	.30*	.10	-.22	.12	-.10	-.15
ATD	.13	.20	.27*	-.06	-.04	.44**	.29*	-.12
MID	-.26*	-.20	-.17	.03	-.09	-.11	.12	.11
TMA	.09	.07	-.23	-.19	.17	-.14	.11	.08
TMD	.15	.28*	-.13	-.06	-.02	.21	.56**	.01
BSM	.02	.24	.08	.34**	-.04	.11	.08	.05
BSF	.08	.27*	.08	.00	.27*	.20	.11	-.03
AWS	-.21	.56**	.04	-.15	-.11	.08	.36**	-.09
AWD	.70**	-.11	.22	-.02	.12	-.05	-.21	.04
ATM	.05	.45**	.15	-.15	-.03	.09	.18	-.04
ATO	.65**	-.05	.16	-.09	-.05	.01	-.03	.24
DTA	.05	.26*	.14	-.19	-.16	.12	.15	.00
DTB	.13	-.18	-.08	-.02	-.03	-.16	-.17	.17

TABLE XIV (Continued)

	PDE	PDY	PDU	PDP	PDH	PSD	PTO	SEX
AGE	.09	-.19	-.03	.08	.08	-.01	.09	.24
AGD	-.31*	.05	.22	.41**	.20	.05	.18	.06
TIM	-.11	.03	.15	.19	.22	.11	.13	-.11
NER	.15	.01	.01	.03	.01	.26*	.09	.02
NEM	.19	.02	-.04	.00	.07	.25*	.15	.00
NMD	.29*	.18	.23	-.14	.38**	.41**	.65**	.08
DEP	.26*	-.03	-.27*	.00	.02	.28*	.02	.20
DEM	.28*	.03	-.19	-.02	.07	.30*	.12	.21
DMD	.36**	.53**	.04	.10	.26*	.04	.61**	.09
ACT	-.04	-.08	.21	.09	-.17	.34**	-.02	.01
ACM	.13	.01	-.20	-.04	.12	-.12	.04	.14
AMD	.27*	-.05	-.32*	-.33*	.24	-.12	.13	.08
EXP	-.27*	.00	.25*	.26*	-.07	-.07	.05	-.01
EXM	.30*	-.04	-.25*	-.26*	.09	.11	.01	.07
EMD	.63**	-.05	-.34**	-.38**	.14	.13	.09	.16
SYP	.20	.19	-.19	.04	-.18	.08	.02	.13
SYM	-.20	-.16	.19	-.07	.19	-.06	-.03	-.19
SMD	.02	.46**	.31*	-.02	.44**	-.24	.27*	-.09
SUB	.25*	.13	-.17	.06	.03	.32*	.17	-.07
SUM	.16	.12	.05	.12	.07	.32*	.18	.00
SMS	.17	.34**	.65**	.25*	.12	.29*	.47**	.10
DOM	-.02	.15	-.07	.00	.15	-.12	.02	-.16
DMM	-.04	.04	.07	.26*	-.04	.04	.11	-.02
DOS	-.10	.13	.13	.49**	.03	.04	.27*	-.19
HOS	.03	-.15	.01	.12	.13	.18	.08	.06
HOM	-.01	.06	.10	.17	.24	.13	.20	-.10
HMD	-.13	.13	.24	.13	.80**	.29*	.53**	.06
SDI	.11	.11	.08	-.06	.28*	-.03	.16	.05
SDM	-.13	-.16	-.12	.09	-.07	.27*	-.04	.08
SDD	-.01	-.32*	-.21	.00	-.07	.68**	-.08	.15
ATT	-.22	-.15	.06	-.08	-.10	-.24	-.24	-.07
ATD	-.08	.11	.12	-.19	.36**	.02	.21	-.17
MID	-.36**	-.15	.02	.07	-.04	.04	-.11	.15
TMA	.18	.00	-.07	.05	.20	.30*	.19	.04
TMD	.11	.24	.22	.17	.26*	.14	.47	-.03
BSM	-.05	.24	.04	.19	.08	-.02	.19	.27*
BSF	.01	.25*	-.01	.11	.15	.03	.22	-.30*
AWS	.03	.17	.03	.11	.14	-.04	.22	-.28*
AWD	-.07	.03	-.24	-.10	.18	.19	-.05	.00
ATM	.06	.15	-.08	-.04	.13	.09	.17	-.30*
ATO	-.18	.03	-.19	-.08	.25	.09	.04	-.03
DTA	-.04	.11	-.02	-.07	.14	.23	.19	-.30*
DTB	.00	-.09	.01	-.15	.07	.22	-.03	.07

TABLE XIV (Continued)

	PDE	PDY	PDU	PDP	PDH	PSD	PTO	SEX
HOT	.14	.09	-.17	-.10	.04	-.08	.05	-.16
HTD	.10	.35**	-.25*	-.09	.32*	.00	.31*	.02
NTR	.10	.15	-.11	.11	.17	.16	.21	-.29*
NRD	-.11	-.17	.14	-.04	-.31*	-.01	-.30*	.05
MFR	.02	.21	-.05	-.12	.07	-.09	.11	-.20
MRD	-.02	-.12	-.25*	-.24	.32*	.17	.03	.05
TRA	-.06	.16	.17	.18	.15	-.08	.26	-.17
TRD	.03	.23	-.14	-.32*	-.09	-.34**	-.26*	-.18
HBM	.06	-.03	-.03	.09	-.04	.09	.00	.64**
HBF	.19	.15	-.06	-.06	.06	.01	.05	-.26*
PDN	.08	.25	.01	.06	.27*	.08	.59**	-.09
PDD	.08	.45**	.29*	.03	.27*	-.01	.62**	-.03
PDA	-.03	-.06	-.06	-.16	.12	-.19	.04	.19
PDE	1.00	.23	.16	.15	.33*	-.24	.59**	.01

	TRA	TRD	HBM	HBF	PDN	PDD	PDA
HOT	.40**	.15	-.08	-.06	.05	.15	.02
HTD	-.08	.34**	-.14	-.03	.39	.26	.06
NTR	.37	.03	-.05	.13	.02	.08	-.06
NRD	.04	-.01	-.10	-.08	-.46	-.19	.13
MFR	.47**	.20	-.17	-.07	.12	.29*	-.06
MRD	-.03	.11	.04	.05	.16	-.23	.16
TRA	1.00	-.18	-.04	.08	.22	.28	-.02

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

APPENDIX B

HOUSEHOLD BEHAVIORS SCALE

A series of statements dealing with household functions, such as cleaning, cooking, etc., were administered to 10 homosexual males, 10 heterosexual males, and 10 heterosexual females. Using a five point likert scale (1-masculine, 2-somewhat masculine, 3-androgynous, 4-somewhat feminine, 5-feminine), the subjects were asked to rate these behaviors. Means and standard deviations were computed. A behavior was chosen for the final scale when all three groups agreed to a behavior being masculine, or feminine in orientation. In this manner, the following 10 statements were picked:

1. Taking out the garbage. (masculine)
2. Fixing things around the house. (masculine)
3. Paying the bills. (masculine)
4. Taking care of the car. (masculine)
5. Driving the car. (masculine)
6. Washing the dishes. (feminine)
7. Doing the laundry. (feminine)
8. Cleaning the house. (feminine)
9. Doing the cooking. (feminine)
10. Buying the groceries. (feminine)

APPENDIX C

INSTRUCTIONS

The tests you will be taking will be measuring different aspects of your relationship. Since there are no right or wrong answers, please answer as honestly as you can. It is important that you do not discuss the test material while you are taking it. You may proceed now if there are no questions. Let me know when you are done.

VITA - 2

Roberto Desdin

Candidate for the Degree of

Master of Science

Thesis: A FOCUS ON HOMOSEXUAL COUPLES: AN EXAMINATION OF PERSONALITIES, SEX ROLES, ATTITUDES, AND BEHAVIORS

Major Field: Psychology

Biographical:

Personal Data: Born in Banes, Cuba, November 19, 1952, the son of Saturnino and Pilar Desdin. Fluent in Spanish, French, and English.

Education: Graduated from Memorial High School, West New York, New Jersey, in 1970, with Memorial Scholars Award; received Bachelor of Arts degree, cum laude, with specialized honors in Psychology from Drew University, Madison, New Jersey, in 1974; enrolled in Master's program at Oklahoma State University, 1974-1977; completed requirements for the Degree of Master of Science in December, 1977.

Professional Experience: Teaching Assistant, Department of Psychology, Oklahoma State University, Fall 1974, Spring 1975, Fall 1976, Fall 1977; Research Assistant, Department of Psychology, Oklahoma State University, Spring 1975, Fall 1975; Psychological Associate, Payne County Guidance Center, 1974-1975; Psychological Associate, Bi-State Mental Health Agency, 1975-1976; Psychological Associate, Psychological Services Center, 1976-1978.