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Abstract

With 102 male homosexual and 12 heterosexual Ss, this study explored the possibility that a typology of homosexuality could be developed using an expanded definition of homosexuality. Proposed dimensions were the variables: gender identity, social sex role, sexual orientation, overt sexual behaviors, current psychological status, and parent-child relations. Ss were recruited by a variety of methods and demographic characteristics suggest a fairly heterogeneous sample was obtained. Scores obtained from a battery of six tests were factor analyzed using an oblique (promax) rotation. Eight factors were obtained and factor pattern scores were used in two hierarchical cluster analysis methods (Johnson, 1967; and McQuitty and Koch, 1975). The Johnson method resulted in eight clusters, two of which were single individuals. The McQuitty-Koch method resulted in 11 clusters. Due to the minimal similarity of results from these two methods, further comparative statistical analyses were suggested. Variable patterns for the clusters, n greater than one, from the Johnson method were explored and suggestions regarding behavioral, social and psychological characteristics of the clusters or types were made. Results of this study suggest that (a) the proposed dimensions were theoretically and statistically sound, (b) a typology of homosexuality could be developed using an expanded definition, and (c) that such a typology appears to enhance the discriminations possible within the concept of homosexuality.
Introduction

Homosexuality is a sin. Homosexuality is within the normal limits of human sexual functioning. Homosexuality is a pathological adjustment to inadequate mothering and fathering. The majority of male homosexuals hate and fear women, yet maintain a strong feminine identity. The majority of male homosexuals are neither masculine nor feminine, but are androgynous in their identity. Homosexuals are grandiose, narcissistic, and present a weak and primitive ego structure. Most homosexuals are unable to form close, intimate relationships with others. Over the past century, each of these propositions, as well as numerous others, have been proclaimed as "the" truth by persons studying the nature and etiology of homosexuality. The majority of these hypotheses or "truths" though, represent attempts to explain the totality of one type of human relationship (the homosexual relationship) by primarily utilizing observations which have been filtered through a single set of theoretical eyes. Although such unitary approaches to the understanding of human behavior may allow one to compartmentalize his thoughts or may create the building blocks for future research, it, however, seems only minimally to capture the complexity of the human need to love and to relate sexually. Researchers studying the nature of homosexuality, thus today are confronted with two tremendous tasks. One, they must chart both the manifestations and processes by which two persons of the same biological sex, experience sexual attraction for, and at times, attachment to each other. Two, they need to inquire as to if and how these observed behaviors and hypothesized processes interact within individuals.
Beginning with this broader and more integrative perspective, the present study first sought to define the boundaries of the realm of possible research on homosexuality. Out of this search grew the notion that the universe of behaviors available for study could be said to be man's entire life; for he is born sexual and experiences and develops his sexuality until death. Somewhat more practically though, the range of topics within this universe could encompass both a person's biological nature and his psycho-social self, as well as the interface of these two spheres. Having outlined the major topics of the universe of the concept "homosexuality", the second task was to locate the present study within that universe. To implement this definitional process, an historical review of some of the social and psychological concepts of the nature and etiology of homosexuality is presented. It was believed that such background information would be important, since individual sexual relationships, even though intimate, have never occurred in a vacuum. As noted in this review, homosexuality, as a social phenomenon, has traveled a dialectical wave which has crested in social acceptance and has fallen in deathly social disapproval. With characteristic human responsiveness, the individual homosexual over the ages also has fluctuated by modifying his behaviors and/or feelings in order to survive these social demands. Thus, from an historical perspective, the responses of those participating in this study, as well as the study's own theoretical framework, probably reflect the pressures and social attitudes of contemporary times.

Returning to the task of describing the parameters of this study, one notes that a section on definitions of homosexuality was developed. This section provides not only a grounds for communication, but also serves as an illustration of the varieties of experiences and behaviors which
may be labeled as "homosexual". Once the concept of homosexuality was placed in an historical perspective and was defined, then the particular behaviors and life experiences to be investigated were outlined. These latter sections then review the research status of a number of behaviors and events which are thought to correlate with a homosexual orientation.

The final definitional task for this study was to assimilate the reviewed research findings and definitions into a working theoretical framework and to formulate practical research hypotheses. Although the specific theoretical concepts and hypotheses are elaborated in the summary section, the following conceptualizations provide an overview to the underlying theme of the present study. Often in the past, psychologists have assigned all male homosexuals to a single conceptual group, which they felt was a group distinct from male heterosexuals. This segregation was accomplished by the application of the notion that since the sexual object choice of male homosexuals was another male, not a woman, as seen in male heterosexuals, then all homosexuals were the same—meaning, not like heterosexuals. Stated differently, the norm for appropriate male sexual behavior became the heterosexual orientation. Carrying this line of thought further, the selection of heterosexuality as the standard implied that homosexual behavior then must be "deviant" from the norm. Following this implication, psychological research then focused on the "pathology" of being homosexual. If, however, both heterosexuals and homosexuals were to be seen as points along the continuum of human sexuality, as described by Kinsey (1948) and more recently emphasized in a National Institute of Mental Health task force report (1972), then a homosexual orientation becomes just one possible expression of man's sexual nature. From this more liberal perspective, researchers then could expand their
definition of homosexuality to include the study of not only a person's overt sexual object choice, but also any variety of psycho-social experiences. Implied within the conceptual expansion is the idea that "the" group, male homosexuals, really could include more than one type of individual. The exploratory question then becomes, "What are the psycho-social-behavioral characteristics of various male homosexuals, and how might these characteristics be distributed within a group of persons calling themselves homosexual?"

An Historical Overview of Homosexuality

Early references to homosexuality were made in the laws of Hammurabi in Babylon during the second millennium, in the papyri of Egypt in speaking of the customs of the gods, and in the Old Testament, where homosexuality was described as a "sin" (Socarides, 1978). During the 6th century, B.C., as the monetary and commercial systems of Greece developed, homosexuality was said to have flourished. Lacy (1968) notes that Greek laws made homosexual encounters legal between master and slave, citizen and non-citizen. Yet, erotic physical contact with the same sex was forbidden between two citizens. Throughout the time of Roman rule, many aspects of homosexuality received only minor attention from lawmakers. With the rise of Christianity, however, both secular and ecclesiastical laws severely condemned homosexuality. Havelock Ellis (1936) notes that in the eyes of medieval Christianity, sexual contact between members of the same sex was a form of heresy and could result in being burned at the stake. Movement into the period of Enlightenment brought with it though, a relaxation in the severity of the laws and a separation between the study of behavior and the teachings of morals. Writings of this era took on a utopian slant and human
sexuality then was discussed, intellectually, in terms of human needs. Ellis et al. (1973) identifies the early 19th century as a period of historicocultural essays, where issues such as the social origins of sexuality and the need for sex education received consideration.

In the mid-19th century, Charles Darwin introduced the theory of evolution. His revolutionary thinking marked the beginning of the scientific study of human sexual behaviors. Theories of homosexuality that followed then focused primarily on etiological questions and were based on clinical observations. Ulrich, in 1864, introduced the word uranismus to describe homosexuality. He suggested that homosexuality was a third sex, which arose from different physical and psychological origins than either the sex male or female (Wiedeman, 1962). Havelock Ellis, hoping to apply biological categorizations to psychological phenomena, wrote the seven volume Studies in the Psychology of Sex (1897-1928). Therein, he reviewed materials from published case histories and suggested that there was a "compensatory unlikeness" between men and women. Magnus Hirschfield, in 1899, established the Journal of the Intermediate Sex Stages. Through this medium, Hirschfield became an advocate for homosexuals, calling for a decrease in negative public attitudes and a lessening of legal restrictions. He also began exploring the hypothesis that homosexuality was "inborn" and that it developed from a combination of male and female substances in the brain. He proposed that these inherited substances could be studied through the measurement of physiological differences (Cory, 1973; Rado, in Marmor, 1965). Krafft-Ebing, in Psychopathia Sexualis (1922), stressed a person's biological predisposition to homosexuality. He believed that the brain contained antagonistic male and female centers and that the
relative strength of these centers determined one's sex. Thus, homosexuality was the outcome of a victorious "wrong" center (Rado, in Marmor, 1965). Although the biological theories of the 19th century never emerged as neurological fact, they generated hypotheses which were to mark the course of future research and which provided a scientific basis for future social prejudices. Homosexuality was seen as (a) pathological, (b) an entity separate from heterosexuality, (c) resulting in distinct physical characteristics, and (d) the manifestation of a constitutional bisexuality.

In 1905, in "Three Essays on the Theory of Sexuality," Freud utilized the "borrowed" concept of "constitutional bisexuality" as a cornerstone for a developmental theory of homosexuality. Contrasting with 19th century writers, however, Freud's advocacy of a constitutional component did not mean that homosexuality only originated from biological or neurological deficits. Rather, schooled in Darwinian thought, Freud felt that any constitutional predisposition was both nonspecific in nature and modifiable by life experiences. Thus, an individual, born with a bisexual predisposition, could encounter life experiences which would direct him either toward a heterosexual or homosexual orientation. According to the psychological theory, all humans move through a homoerotic phase of development on their way to heterosexuality (Marmor, 1980). If, during this period, certain conditions occurred, such as an over-attachment to a mother figure, the individual's sexual drive could become inverted (a word coined by Freud in "The Sexual Aberrations" to describe the practice of homosexuality). The inversion then was manifested through deviant (same sex) sexual object choice (Wiedeman, 1962). Freud believed that inverts often sought a sexual
object which represented a compromise between a male and a female; having the mental characteristics of a female and the genitals of a male. Thus, a homosexual's object choice reflected his own "bisexual" nature. For heterosexuals, the vestiges of their earlier "bisexual" nature also remained, but in the form of "latent" homosexual tendencies (Marmor, 1980). Such tendencies could manifest in adulthood via one's sublimated expression of affection toward persons of the same sex or through behavior patterns which presumably were more appropriate for the opposite sex (e.g., a man having artistic interests).

In 1940, Sandor Rado critically reviewed the use of the concept of bisexuality in psychoanalytic theory. Arising from this critique was the suggestion that psychoanalytic theory needed to be much more precise in its transformation of biological concepts into psychological interpretations. Additionally, Rado emphasized Freud's original statement that any constitutional factors that may influence the development of "aberrant" sexual behaviors, act only to prepare the ground for a person's responses to later life experiences.

With the suggestion that life experiences may be highly influential in the development of a homosexual orientation, the study of the nature and etiology of homosexuality moved from a biological perspective to a social one. Building on Freudian dynamic theory, early 20th century researchers began looking for "the" family characteristic which would cause a son to become homosexual. Results of these studies, however, did not reveal any single, causal factor. Rather, a number of family variables were found to be associated with the later appearance of homosexuality. Comparative research, using both homosexuals and heterosexuals, demonstrated though that these family characteristics
were not unique to homosexuals. Similarly, later research comparing homosexuals and heterosexuals on personality variables also found neither group to be exceptionally distinct from the other. Thus, although a number of family and personality variables were believed to be related to the development of a homosexual orientation, none individually identified homosexuality. Working with the above conclusions, researchers in the latter half of this century have investigated the notion that homosexuality is a broad, multivariate concept. It is with this conclusion that the present study begins.

Definitions of Homosexuality

The selection of a meaningful yet practical definition of homosexuality has been a predominant methodological problem in much of the prior research (Gebhard, 1972). Researchers often have failed to ground their definitions of homosexuality within any theoretical or operational framework (Hart, Roback, Tittler, Weitz, Walston and McKee, 1978). Thus, subjects have been selected more on the basis of convenience to the experimenter (usually drawing from captive populations, such as prisoners, Schofield, 1965; hospitalized psychiatric patients, Marsch, Hillard, and Lietcht, 1955; or military personnel, Doidge, et al. 1960), than on the basis of conceptual meaningfulness. Consequently, comparison of results from such studies becomes impossible (Gebhard, 1972).

A definition of homosexuality will vary depending upon the frame of reference used by the researcher. Utilizing a rather global perspective, a definition of homosexuality falls within the concept of human sexuality. According to Freud, Stoller and others (e.g., Hampson and Hampson, 1961), human sexuality is classifiable into three types of sexual characteristics. In his early writings, Freud identified these
sexual characteristics as: (a) one's physical sex, (b) one's mental sexual characteristics, and (c) one's sexual object choice (Wiedeman, 1962). Modifying and elaborating Freud's classifications, Stoller (1965) first chose to use the word "gender" rather than "sexual" to describe the psychological nature of a person's sexuality. Gender is defined as the psychological aspects of those behaviors which depict a person's social concept of masculine and feminine. Second, Stoller, like Freud, began his classifications with a person's physical or biological sex (i.e., male or female genitals, not secondary sexual characteristics). Third, he divided the category of "mental sexual characteristics" into two ideas: (a) core gender identity, and (b) gender role. Core gender identity is said to be established by the age of three years and includes one's body ego concept, one's self-perception as a male or female (Acosta, 1975), and all of one's positive and negative identifications with both biological sexes. Gender role, on the other hand, is an accumulation of experiences through casual learning, explicit instruction and insight, and includes everything a person does to disclose himself or herself as having the status of a man or a woman (Money, 1965). Lastly, Stoller listed a person's sexual orientation (i.e., sexual object choice) or the erotic component of sexuality (Hampson and Hampson, 1961) as another aspect of psychological sex.

In defining homosexuality thus, the category or type of sexual characteristic(s) being evaluated must be stated. The necessity of making such differentiations becomes clear when one notes that each group of sexual characteristics exists fairly independently of the other.
within all humans (Townes, Ferguson, and Gillian, 1976). For many persons, these sexual characteristics are congruent with each other; such as a person who has female genitals, has a female gender identity, behaves according to feminine role expectations, and chooses a male as her object of sexual excitement. Since all characteristics follow a feminine, opposite sex preference pattern, this person is identified as a "female heterosexual". However, there are those individuals who possess a mixture of incongruent sexual characteristics. For example, a person may have male genitals, a female core gender identity, behave in accordance with a feminine role, and choose a male as his object of sexual satisfaction. Would such a person be rightly labeled a homosexual or heterosexual, a male or a female? To answer this question, one needs to understand the degree to which and the manner in which the sexual characteristics group together within one person.

In prior research, the four types of sexual characteristics have been utilized both singularly and in various combinations in order to define homosexuality. From a concrete frame of reference, homosexuality has been defined as the act of having overt sexual relations with a member or members of the same sex (i.e., sexual object choice; Bieber et al., 1962; Freedman, 1971). In 1948, Kinsey quantified this behavioral definition of homosexuality by developing a continuous, seven-point scale along which a person's history of sexual behaviors is located. This scale ranges from exclusively heterosexual (i.e., rating of 0) to exclusively homosexual (i.e., rating of 6). In contrast to Kinsey's objective historical approach, other behavioral definitions of homosexuality have looked at the roles played by partners during
intercourse (i.e., gender role or sex role). Hoffman (1968) identified four "classic" homosexual behavioral patterns: anal insertor (or active and masculine), anal receptor (or passive and masculine), oral insertor (or active and feminine) and oral receptor (or passive and feminine). Criticism of this classification system has been great though, since assignment to one of the above four roles suggests that an individual's sexual behavior is rigidly guided by his or her consciousness of masculinity or femininity. This assumption has not been upheld in research (Hooker, 1965), nor has the recent work of Masters and Johnson (1979) found homosexuals to be so restricted in their sexual behaviors. In fact, Masters and Johnson note that behaviors observed during homosexual intercourse are the same behaviors observed during heterosexual intercourse, differing only in terms of quantity, duration and/or combinations.

In contrast to the unitary definitions of homosexuality, which often look at overt sexual behaviors, some studies have made the definition of homosexuality dependent both upon the observation of certain overt behaviors and the presence of various intrapsychic processes. How and to what degree the sexual behaviors and the intraphysic variables combine to "make" a homosexual seems to depend again upon the researcher. Marmor (1965) states that a homosexual is "one who is motivated, in adult life, by a definite preferential erotic attraction to members of the same sex and who usually (but not necessarily) engages in overt sexual relations with them" (p. 4). Cory (1973), on the other hand, feels that homosexuality means the presence of both the overt behavior and the psychological arousal that motivates a person to desire such an act. For Pasche (1964), a definition of homosexuality must include overt sexual
behaviors with the same sex, as well as the "sum total of behavioral attitudes which express a feminine relationship towards the father" (p. 210). Gershman (1966) describes a "compulsive" homosexual as a person whose persistent emotional and physical attractions to members of the same sex reflect a problem in personality development. Then there are those researchers, such as Bene (1965) and West (1967) who feel that the presence of overt sexual behaviors are peripheral to the definition of homosexuality. Important to them though is the presence of a dominant fantasy or sexual desire for members of the same sex.

Moving from a unitary to a multifaceted definition of homosexuality, Hooker (1965) stated that homosexuality includes "all manifestations, subjective experiences or overt behaviors of sexual attraction between persons of the same gender" (p. 84). Continuing with the notion of a multidimensional definition, Friedman, Green, and Spitzer (1976) organized a number of unitary variables into a system of four parameters, which outlined the use of the term homosexual. Similar to Stoller (1965), they noted that these four parameters could be congruent and incongruent within the make-up of a single individual. The parameters are (a) sense of inner identity (i.e., core gender identity according to Stoller), (b) sexual fantasy life, (c) social role (i.e., gender role according to Stoller), and (d) sexual behavior (e.g., sexual object choice).

Operationally, the most comprehensive definition of homosexuality has been provided by Bell and Weinberg (1978) in their empirical study of sexual behaviors of approximately 1000 persons in the San Francisco area. Utilizing Kinsey's 7-point Heterosexual-Homosexual Continuum
Scale, they first asked individuals to locate both their overt sexual behaviors and their sexual feelings on this continuum. Second, they formed a ratio between these feelings and behaviors, which enabled them to assess the degree of congruence between a person's sexual object choice and his sexual feelings. Through direct questioning, the researchers then evaluated the presence or absence of same and opposite sex fantasies, dreams, and feelings (e.g., Have you ever had heterosexual dreams? Yes or No).

In the present study, male Caucasian subjects identified their sexual orientation (both behaviors and feelings) by use of the Kinsey Heterosexual-Homosexual Continuum Scale and sexual fantasies were assessed through the Derogatis Sexual Functioning Inventory (DSFI: Derogatis and Melisaratos, 1979). Additionally, this study utilized an expanded definition of male homosexuality. This elaborated definition included both the person's gender identity and his social sex-role (both defined above). Practically, a person's gender identity was assessed by the Feminine Gender Identity Scale, Part B (Freund, Nagler, Langevin, Zajac, and Stiner, 1974) and his social sex-role was determined through his responses on the Bem Sex Role Inventory (BSRI; Bem, 1974) and the Gender Role Definition subscale score of the DSFI (Derogatis and Melisaratos, 1979).

Having provided a definition of homosexuality, it now is important to note some conditions that may be confused with homosexuality. Many authorities (Gershman, 1966; Marmor, 1965; and Socarides, 1978, for example) agree that the "true" homosexual must be distinguished from the "situational" (or facultative) homosexual. The "situational" homosexual is a person who has sexual relations with a person of the same sex in a
situation that totally prevents contact with the opposite sex, such as in prisons. Homosexuality also is distinguishable from (a) hermaphroditism (i.e., having both male and female sexual organs), (b) transsexualism (i.e., a condition that exists when a nondelusional person, of one anatomical sex, believes, thinks, and feels, from a very early age, that he/she actually belongs to the opposite sex; Stoller, 1965), and (c) transvestitism (i.e., cross-dressing; Brown, 1973). However, a person presenting any of the above conditions may display, on occasion, homosexually oriented behaviors.

Initially, it was proposed that the use of a more comprehensive definition of homosexuality would allow for greater exploration of the variety of characteristics observed in male homosexuals. For the present study, application of the above idea began with a definitional statement of the characteristics of homosexuality. Following next was the need to review prior psychological literature regarding these definitional components and then to formulate hypotheses as to how these characteristics may appear in the sample studied. Thus, below are overviews of the literature pertaining to the four characteristics of human sexual development (i.e., biological sex, core gender identity, social sex-role, and sexual object choice). Since each characteristic represents not only a category of behaviors, but also describes a phase of development, each in its own right has become the object of research. Therefore, as we look for the connections between these sexual characteristics and prior notions about homosexuality, we may find that these independent characteristics have been evaluated extensively, but rarely have these characteristics been developed into an integrated conception of homosexuality.
Research and Theories Relevant to an Expanded Definition of Homosexuality

Biological sex. The first characteristic, biological sex, may be evaluated from two related perspectives. On the one hand, a person's biological sex can include his genetic or chromosomal structure, which is determined primarily at conception, although possibly alterable by significant environmental or internal factors. On the other hand, biological sex also may be described as that outgrowth of one's genetic coding which manifests in the type of external genitalia a person possesses. Of these two perspectives, only the influence of genetic factors will be elaborated, since by definition, persons presenting atypical external genitalia have been excluded from this study's sample.

Theorists of the late 19th century, as noted previously, believed that homosexuality originated from various brain deficits. Advancing from these early hypotheses, today's researchers are investigating the possibility that the development of a homosexual orientation may be related either to some unknown genetic factor or to an imbalance in fetal brain hormones.

Evaluating the notion that homosexuality may arise from a type of genetic or chromosomal coding, Money (1980) concluded that "the sex chromosomes do not directly determine or program psychosexual status as heterosexual, bisexual, or homosexual" (p.69). It has been suggested, however, that prenatal hormonal influences on the brain are the more likely biological correlates of homosexuality.

Dörner (1975, 1976), following from his work with rats, hypothesized that a deficiency in androgens occurs in the human male fetus between the fourth and seventh month of life which leads to a "neuroendocrine
predisposition for homosexuality". He noted that this predisposition may be present even in adult males who present no abnormal secondary sexual characteristics nor any testosterone production difficulties (Marmor, 1980). Critics of this theory (Tourney, 1980) point out though, that supportive evidence for Dörner's hypothesis relies heavily on the assessment of plasma and urinary levels of testosterone; methods which are extremely sensitive to extraneous variables, such as diet changes, cigarette smoking, and emotional stress. Thus, until more advanced techniques of neuroendocrinological research are utilized in the study of homosexuality, current investigators, such as Money and Tourney, suggest that even if a neurohormonal predisposition to homosexuality occurs, it can be activated only by specific social/environmental factors. The notion of "specific" social and environmental factors may be misleading though. Probably a more accurate conceptualization would be stated as follows: Innate factors act as "potentialities" which interact with the "multiplicity of developmental situations" and lead to the establishment of heterosexuality, homosexuality, or inhibited sexual behaviors in the adult (Wiedeman, 1962, p. 214).

The evaluation of any biological component(s) of homosexuality was beyond the scope of the present study. However, it was felt that mention of the current research status of this sexual characteristic would be valuable since like one's existence within an historical period of time, one's biological nature is an inevitable given of being alive and human.

Core gender identity and gender identity. Through the study of the second human sexual characteristic, the focus of attention moves from man's physiological sexuality to his psychological sexuality. Included within this concept of human sexual development are both
the individual's basic sense of being a male or a female, and the notion that certain psychological processes are necessary for the acquisition of a masculine or a feminine identity. Since we are talking about the internal experiences through which a person comes to understand and label himself, we automatically are speaking more in abstractions than in concrete terms.

Stoller (1964) has emphasized that core gender identity is a permanent, nonvariable aspect of a person's sexual self-concept. Greenson (1964) and Stoller (1964) also have outlined three phases in the development of a core gender identity. First, the infant must become aware of the differences between himself and others. This awareness is considered non-sexual and movement through this phase of basic identity formation determines whether the person will be in contact with reality or will remain in an autistic state. Second, through two types of experiences, the child then gains awareness of the differences between sexes. The first experience is when the child becomes conscious of his own sex by observing and sensing his anatomy. The second experience results from the parent/child interactions and includes all the effects produced by the parent's labeling of the child as either a boy or a girl. Once the child can distinguish between sexes, he then moves toward the third phase of core gender identity development. During this third phase, which is believed to occur around latency, the child attaches impulses and fantasies to his internal gender concept.

Gender identity, in contrast to core gender identity, is thought to be dynamic and modifiable by environmental pressures. As hypothesized by Money (1974), the formation of one's gender identity is monitored by two psychological processes; identification and complementation. Each
process is thought to be independent of the other and is a reflection of the child's interpersonal relationship with his parents. Through the process of identification, the child traditionally forms an attachment to the parent of the same sex and begins to learn how to behave like that parent. Simultaneously, through complementary interactions with the parent of the opposite sex, the child develops a template by which he can understand and respond to persons of the opposite sex. For a congruent sexual development to occur, Money noted that these processes need to develop in a balanced fashion. If, however, parents provide the child with opposite or contrasting teachings, then a disturbance or "transposition" in gender identity may occur.

Initial investigations into the process of identification using homosexual subjects suggested that when a male child failed to identify with the father, as would be expected for the formation of a masculine sexual identity, then he would, out of compromise, identify with the mother (Bene, 1965). However, Paitich and Langevin (1976) also studying the relationship of gender identity and the process of identification, found that a greater degree of a feminine identity was related to a decreased identification with father, but was not necessarily related to an increased identification with mother. Yet, Thompson and others (1973) revealed from their investigations that both male and female homosexuals felt significantly more "alienated" from both parents than did either male or female heterosexuals. Thus, the question of how the identification process was related to the formation of a gender identity remains unsolved. Attempting to shed some light on this controversy, Townes, Ferguson, and Gillam (1976) conducted a comparative study using male heterosexuals, homosexual non-cross dressers, homosexual cross-dressers,
and transsexuals as subjects. They hypothesized the following: If gender identity developed through the process of identification, then one would expect that as the person's gender identity became more similar to the opposite-sex parent, then also one would expect to see a greater degree of disturbance in family relations (implying a break-down in the process of identification had occurred). Additionally, these researchers suggested that the degree of opposite-sex identification (or feminine identification for males) would fall along a continuum, with male transsexuals presenting the most significant feminine identity and the most severe history of family problems and with male heterosexuals having the least feminine identity and the least degree of family disturbance. The results of the study, however, did not obtain the expected patterns. Rather, they found that heterosexuals, as well as homosexuals (both non-cross dressers and cross-dressers) presented primarily a masculine identity, while only the transsexual group displayed the expected feminine identification. Additionally, the hypothesized hierarchy in patterns of family disturbances was not found. The only family characteristic which did differentiate between groups was the degree of father's nurturance, with the heterosexual group reporting significantly more paternal nurturance than did any of the other groups. Thus, returning to Money's proposed processes, Townes' (1976) study suggests that even though a father and a son may experience severe interpersonal problems, which could result in the son feeling alienated, the son still is able to identify with the father's masculinity and thereby develop a masculine gender identity.

In the present study, both a person's gender identity and his identifications with father were assessed. Although one basically could assume that just by the fact that the subjects responded to a call
for "male" subjects, then they have identified their gender identity. However, since prior research (Freund, Nagler, Langevin, Zajac, and Steiner, 1974) has shown that an overlap between male homosexuals and male transsexuals can occur, it was decided to objectively evaluate each male subject's leaning toward transsexualism or his degree of feminine gender identity. The instrument used for this assessment was the Feminine Gender Identity Scale, Part B (Freund et al., 1974). The instrument used to evaluate the subject's parental identification was the Clarke Parent-Child Relations Questionnaire (Paitich and Langevin, 1976). Following the lines of prior research, it was hypothesized that (a) at least two groups of male homosexuals would appear, those having a more feminine gender identity, and those who have a masculine gender identity; and (b) that those males having a high Father Identification score would tend to have a more masculine gender identity, while those having a lower Father Identification score would tend to have a more feminine gender identity.

**Social sex role.** The third sexual characterestic, social sex role, is perhaps the most complicated and the most studied of the four sexual characteristics. Prior to exploring the components of this phase of sexual development, however, commonly used terminologies need to be clarified. Throughout the literature, several terms have been used interchangeably to describe this group of behaviors. Some of the terms used have been gender identity, sex role, gender role, and social sex role. Money and Erhardt (1972) have differentiated two of these commonly used terms by stating that "gender role is
the public expression of gender identity," which suggests that gender identity is an internal or intrapsychic process. Since the other terms, social sex role, sex role, or gender role, all refer to the cultural norms and stereotypes used in depicting a person as masculine or feminine, it is not inappropriate to use them interchangeably. However, to avoid possible confusion, this study used the term social sex role to refer to those behaviors which publically express a person's sense of masculinity or feminity.

In the mid-1970's, Biller (1974) and Constantinople (1973) independently outlined those behaviors which refer to the concept social sex role. From one perspective, social sex role speaks to a person's sex role preference, which includes all activities, interests, or traits in which the person prefers to engage. For example, traditionally, boys "prefer" to play with cars and trucks and girls "prefer" to play with dolls. From a second viewpoint, social sex role also means sex role adoption. Involved here are the actual overt behaviors or traits that a person shows publically. For example, although a boy may prefer to play with a doll, he chooses actually to play with a truck; thus preferring a "feminine" toy, but adopting a "masculine" form of play. Finally, from a third angle, social sex role describes a person's "role orientation" (Biller, 1974) or his "sex role identity" (Constantinople, 1973) both of which represent the evaluative thoughts and affects associated with one's masculinity or feminity.

How a person develops the various aspects of a social sex role has been evaluated from two different theoretical positions. Traditionally, sex-typed behaviors were seen as arising from the process of identification, as described in the review on the development of gender
identity. Recently, though, social learning theorists (Bandura and Walters, 1963) have proposed that children learn sex role behaviors by imitation, observation, and direct reinforcement. From this perspective, parents are "models" and possess characteristics, such as power, status, or nurturance, which "attract" the child to the model. The possibility that the sex role characteristics associated with a homosexual orientation may be learned has been suggested by several authors. From their studies in 1967, both Churchill and West separately concluded that "sex preferences" were indeed learned. This notion later was supported by Green's (1974) longitudinal work with effeminate boys. In his research, Green proposed that some males and females "fail to learn" appropriate sex type preferences and behaviors (i.e., sex-role adoption). Bene (1965) and Evans (1969) also separately have observed that their subjects often tended to have a congruent gender identity, but lacked the "appropriate" gender role.

A review of current psychological literature reveals that investigation into the claims of social learning theorists have taken two different approaches. On the one hand, there have been those who utilize a prospective, longitudinal approach with children; while others have looked retrospectively at the childhoods of adults who hold "atypical" social sex roles.

From the prospective studies, one finds that often effeminate male children both are encouraged by parents to adopt and individually tend to "prefer" the more feminine-like behaviors (Green, 1974, 1975). Specifically, Green noted that the effeminate boy dislikes rough-and-tumble games, tends to play with dolls, often cross-dresses, prefers the companionship of girls in childhood, and typically chooses to role-play
females in fantasy games, such as "house". On psychological tests, Green also observed that the feminine boys' test data look very similar to that of girls the same age. On fantasy tests, the "atypical" boy identifies with a female heroine rather than a male hero, and when asked to do a self-drawing this child most often will draw a female figure. Building on his research, Green (1975) made the following conclusions. He sees the effeminate boy as being "innately" less aggressive, which results in parents establishing a differential relationship with their son. Complaining that "boys play too rough" and preferring the company of girls, these boys tend to become socialized into a female peer group in early childhood. Due to their feminine interests, the son tends to attract mother but alienate father, who eventually may come to see his son as a "mama's boy". When he enters grammar school, the feminine pattern is fairly well established and male peers view this child as "a sissy," which results in his gaining further distance from a traditional male socialization pattern. Projecting ahead, Green offers two hypotheses for why boys reared in the above pattern tend to develop a homosexual object choice in adulthood. One, he notes that throughout childhood the boy has been rejected by males. In adulthood the man is "male affect starved" and thus attempts to compensate by forming a male-to-male relationship. The second hypothesis explains that the effeminate boy becomes so socialized as a female that as an adult his romantic choice becomes a man, which is identical to the choice made by any of the other "girls".

Bates, Skilbeck, Smith, and Bentler (1974) also have conducted longitudinal studies of the developmental patterns of effeminate boys. Using a clinical rating scale, this research team evaluated the boys according to (a) gender appropriate and inappropriate behaviors, (b)
family interactional patterns, (c) demographic information, (d) physical characteristics, (e) history of traumas, and (f) the child's preferences and interpersonal characteristics. Once the ratings were concluded, they then conducted a factor analysis to determine the interrelationships of the characteristics studied. From these analyses, they obtained four factors. Factor I was labeled effeminacy and contained items such as having a feminine voice, gestures, and interests; having many girl playmates; cross-dressing; and having been exposed to a family trauma at an early age (such as a divorce of parents or an adoption). Factor II was called "Family Normalcy". Effeminate boys scores loaded high on the following aspects of this factor: absence of excessive masculinity in either parent, intact family but father worked late, and absence of maternal dominance. The boys under study also presented low loadings on ratings of popularity with peers, as well as a lack of interest in mother's appearance and sewing. Factor III, an overprotectiveness factor, resulted in two types of items. There were those which described the child as "inhibited and fearful," and those which depicted the family atmosphere as "inhibiting and protective". The final factor, Factor IV, was labeled "Social Unresponsiveness," and items loading high on this factor were lack of social skills and lack of social responsiveness, immaturity, and the presence of parental conflict over child rearing practices. From these results, Bates et al. (1974) suggested (a) that the perception of specific effeminate behaviors in early childhood was associated with the later childhood appearance of gender-problems; (b) that persons without gender-problems were likely to come from a relatively "normal" household and to be popular at school, and (c) that boys who showed later gender-
problems probably were "overprotected" in early childhood and had difficulty dealing with the demands of an interpersonal situation.

We have seen that effeminate boys often display specific cross-sex behaviors during early childhood. Prior research also has hypothesized that the presence of cross-sex behavior tends to lead to gender-problem behaviors in adolescence and adulthood. Yet, one wonders, how do the results obtained from longitudinal studies of children compare with the data taken from retrospective studies with adults? Bieber et al. (1962), studying a clinical sample of male homosexuals, found that 33% of the male homosexuals, as compared to 10% of the male heterosexuals, played primarily with girls in childhood and that 83% of the homosexual sample, compared to 37% of the heterosexuals, had an aversion to competitive group sports. Both Saghir and Robins (1973) and Stephan (1973) also have observed that in their male homosexual samples there was a significant presence of cross-sex or "girl-like" childhood behaviors. Whitam (1977) noted that the homosexual males in his study, compared to the heterosexuals, reported significantly more of the following childhood experiences: (a) having an interest in dolls, (b) cross-dressing, (c) preferring the company of girls to that of boys, (d) had been regarded as a "sissy" by other boys, and (e) had a sexual interest in other boys rather than girls during childhood play. These adult retrospective findings thus do seem to support Green's hypothesis that the experience and learning of cross-sex behavior in childhood are associated with the later development of an "atypical" social sex role and/or sexual object choice.

In review, the research reported to this point suggests, (a) that the social sex role is learned through the process of socialization and thus reflects the encouragements and inhibitions of the child's early
social groups (e.g., parents and peers), (b) that the child is an active participant in this socialization process, and (c) that the presence of cross-sex socialization experiences during early development often is a good indicator of adolescent and adult gender role problems. Drawing from these conclusions, it was hypothesized that those adult subjects who reported having had a large number of cross-sex play preferences and behaviors during childhood would present a feminine social sex role. Secondly, it was hypothesized that for a number of adult subjects, both homosexual and heterosexual, their childhood socialization experiences primarily were sex appropriate and that such persons would present a masculine social sex role.

In addition to the development of sex role preference through early socialization experiences, the acquisition of a social sex role includes self-identification as masculine or feminine. This self-labeling represents the person's evaluation of the degree of similarity between his perception of his physical, behavioral, and emotional characteristics and his understanding of the stereotypic, cultural sex-role norms. Until recently, assessment of this aspect of social sex role was done by assigning a person to either a masculine or feminine social sex role. However, in the last seven years, major objections to this either/or approach have appeared in the literature. Since the issues underlying these objections are of significance to this study, a brief review of this controversy is given below.

Theoretically, the traditional assignment of a person to either a masculine or a feminine social sex role implied the use of a continuous bipolar scale. On such a scale, if you are assigned to one role, say the feminine, you automatically become less masculine (Shivley and
DeCecco, 1977). Of the tests currently available for measuring masculinity and femininity, the majority have been developed using the bipolar conceptualization of social sex role. In 1973, Constantinople reviewed a number of bipolar masculine-feminine (MF) tests (e.g., the Terman and Miles Attitude-Interest Analysis Test, MF test, 1936; the MF Scale of the Strong-Campbell Vocational Interest Blank; and the MF Scale of the MMPI). In her judgment, all of these tests were found to be "largely inadequate" because (a) they failed to account for the "multidimensionality" of the concepts masculine and feminine, (b) they failed to separately evaluate the possibility that people can be "both" masculine and feminine, rather than "only" masculine or feminine, and (c) they were designed solely on the criterion that their items differentiated samples of males from samples of females.

In 1974, Sandra Bem moved beyond a bipolar conceptualization of social sex role with the introduction of the Bem Sex-Role Inventory (BSRI). This instrument treated masculinity and femininity as two independent dimensions. Thus, people could be described as being "either" more masculine or more feminine, as "both" masculine and feminine, or as "androgynous" (i.e., having equal amounts of masculine and feminine characteristics).

Results of the application of the BSRI reveal some interesting data on androgyny. Bem (1975) found that persons classified as androgynous were more likely than either of the sex-typed persons to show "sex role adaptability across situations". Thus, they more often displayed "masculine" independence when under pressure to conform and "feminine" playfulness when given an opportunity to interact with a small animal. Similarly, Kelly and Worell (1977) found the androgynous individual, as
compared to the sex-typed individual, to be less rigid in his responses on simple tasks. "Androgynous" persons also have been found (a) to have a more diverse set of activities, (b) to have a higher self-esteem than sex-typed persons (Spence, Helmreich, and Stapp, 1974), and (c) to have received greater affection from both parents than more traditionally typed individuals (Kelly and Worell, 1976).

McDonald and Moore (1978), studying a nonclinical sample of 88 male homosexuals, administered a questionnaire which evaluated the men's social sex role, their self-concept, and their attitudes toward women. These researchers found "that homosexual men, like heterosexual men, varied in terms of the extent to which they perceived themselves as possessing various characteristics associated with either sex" (p. 10). For their sample, the majority of homosexual men described themselves as "androgy­nous". In the same vein, Bernard and Epstein (1978), evaluating both heterosexual and homosexual males, observed that their total homosexual sample was androgynous, while none of the heterosexual sample was androgynous. Using matched pairs of homosexuals and heterosexuals, they also found the difference between the two groups to be significant.

Bem's expansion of the concept of social sex role beyond the rigid boundaries of a black or white world of male or female has major impli­cations for the study of homosexuality. Prior to the introduction of the notion that masculinity and femininity may be two independent con­tinua, homosexuals were assessed on bipolar sex role instruments and often were found to be "feminine". Such results then were used as supporting evidence for the hypothesis that homosexuals suffer from an impairment of their masculine self-image (McDonald and Moore, 1978). Additionally, if it could be said that homosexuals "failed" in developing a sense of
masculinity, then that must mean that they were "deviant" or "pathological". If, however, the homosexual was not "feminine" but "androgynous", then possibly their social sex role behaviors represent a sense of greater adaptability rather than a deficiency.

In the present study, the subjects' self-evaluation of their social sex-role was obtained through the use of the BSRI (Bem, 1974). It was hypothesized that subjects would present the following pattern of responses, (a) that those persons having a high score on the Feminine Gender Identity Scale, Part B (meaning they demonstrated a strong desire to be a female), and having a large number of cross-sex socialization experiences in childhood (as measured by the FGI, Part A), would evaluate their adult social sex-role as being feminine, using the BSRI; (b) that there also would be persons who had a low score on the FGI, Part B, thus showing little desire to be a female, who also had few cross-sex socialization experiences in childhood and who would evaluate their adult social sex-role as masculine; (c) that there may be persons who have little desire to be a female and thus had a low FGI, Part B score, who have had a number of cross-sex childhood experiences and who identify their adult social sex-role as androgynous; and (d) that since the three variables - core identity, sex-role preferences, and adult social sex-role - theoretically are independent aspects of a person's sexual identity, these variables could be found in mixtures which are not presently predictable.

**Sexual orientation.** The fourth human sexual characteristic has been identified in the research as sexual orientation. Shively and DeCocco (1977) note that this characteristic includes both the preference for certain physical and affectional activities and the expression of these preferences through various specific
behaviors, fantasies, or dreams. Earlier in the discussion on the Kinsey Heterosexual-Homosexual Continuum Scale it was noted that sexual orientations cover a wide range of behavior. In the discussion below, we look at some of the varieties of sexual behaviors which have been observed previously in homosexual subjects.

In 1948, Kinsey, Pomeroy, and Martin began a massive taxonomic study of human sexual behaviors. Prior to this investigation, only nineteen American studies of any methodological strength had attempted such assessments of human sexual behaviors. Of these nineteen studies, the majority (a) used a mixed or poorly defined sample, (b) administered questionnaires through the mail, (c) were located primarily in New York City, and (d) usually stopped with college-age students. Hoping to obtain a set of more reliable facts about the frequencies and sources of sexual outlets among American males, Kinsey et al. (1948) interviewed approximately 12,000 persons. From these 12,000, he selected those describing themselves as homosexuals and investigated their patterns of sexual behaviors.

Once a sample was obtained, Kinsey next identified the phenomenon to be studied as sexual excitement which resulted in orgasm. He observed that an orgasm could occur under a variety of conditions. These conditions were (a) being alone or with a partner, (b) being within a socially approved or nonapproved situation (e.g., marriage, extramarital affair), and (c) utilizing different kinds of stimulation (e.g., oral or genital contact). Finally, Kinsey compared various combinations of the above sexual behaviors and conditions with twelve demographic variables (e.g., sex, race, religious adherence, and geographic origin).
Comparing his findings with those of earlier studies, Kinsey noted that the incidence of homosexuality reported had ranged from 17% for men over age eighteen (Hamilton, 1929) to 27% for college-age males (Finger, 1947). When homosexual experience was defined as at least one experience of physical contact between two men which resulted in orgasm, Kinsey found that 37% of the total male population fell within this category. Additionally, this percentage rose to 50% when only men who remained unmarried until age 35 were considered. When educational level was included in the data analysis, it was found that 50% of those persons who obtained a grade-school education, 58% of the males who stopped with a high school education, and 47% of the college educated males had at least a single homosexual experience if they remained unmarried until age 35. In contrast, approximately 50% of all males "have neither overt nor psychic" homosexual experiences after adolescence (p. 650).

Although Kinsey et al. (1948) attempted to produce a methodologically sound study, problems did appear. Terman (1948), reviewing Kinsey's publication, pointed out (a) that due to the lack of specificity in describing the total interview situation, further replications would be difficult, (b) that the data on characteristics of subsamples was inadequate, (c) that no definite information regarding the subjects' status as prisoners, mental patients, or underworld persons was given, (d) that no breakdown according to marital status was available on the male sample, (e) that sample size was too small for some subgroups, (f) that no distinction was made between retrospective and current data which leads to a lowered validity, (g) that Kinsey tended to make sweeping generalizations without adequate statistical support, suggesting a large bit of personal bias may have influenced his final conclusions.
In 1979, Gebhard and Johnson published a re-evaluation of Kinsey's data. They note that due to difficulties in data gathering and analysis (such as a fluctuating N and inadequate computer facilities), the original data were felt to be methodologically inaccurate. In this reworking, however, incidence and age-related data for the homosexual sample still were not given because of the complexity of re-analyzing the original data according to background information (e.g., whether they were mental patients, prisoners or college students).

Following Kinsey's style of incidence reporting, a number of other researchers have more recently assessed the sexual behaviors of homosexual subjects. Saghir, Robins, and Walbran (1969) found that in their sample of 89 homosexual men, 86% had homosexual genital contacts before age fifteen, 78% "came out" around the age of eighteen, 50% of the subjects before the age of fifteen had sexual contact with another male about three times per week, 94% of the males sampled had fifteen or more sex partners, and depending on the age period, between 55% and 84% assumed both the "passive" and "active" roles in sexual intercourse. In a similar type study, Loney (1972) learned from 29 male homosexuals that (a) for the majority, their first homosexual experience was with an older male partner and occurred approximately at the age of sixteen. Using a different sample of 31 homosexual males, she also found that of the approximate 194 sex partners, each person had had, only one or two were female. In terms of preferred role during intercourse, 67% of the latter sample preferred a masculine role. After asking Ss in both samples about their desire to change their sexual orientation, approximately 66% stated they preferred to remain themselves.
Most recently, Bell and Weinberg (1978) have completed a seven-year study in the San Francisco area, of approximately 1,000 heterosexual and homosexual, Black and white males and females. Using a 528-item questionnaire, which took from two to five hours to administer in a face-to-face interview, they obtained data about the subjects' social, political, and family histories; prior sexual experiences; and attitudes toward sex and homosexuality. Additionally, the interview included modified items from the MMPI, Rosenberg's (1965) measure of self-esteem, and information about the subjects' psychiatric histories. Analysis of this large body of data revealed five fairly "pure" types of homosexuals. Type I, the "close-couple", was distinguished statistically from the other four types by (a) the fact that the subject was living with a male sex partner, (b) had few sexual problems, and (c) did little cruising. Type II, the "open-couple" subject, was involved in a "marital relation" with a man and also reported having a large number of sexual partners. Additionally, this group depicted themselves as having a large number of sexual problems and as doing a large amount of cruising. Type III, the "functional", was distinguished by being a "single" person who occasionally had affairs; by having a large number of sex partners, a high level of sexual activity, and little regret about being homosexual. The "functionals" also reported few sexual problems. Type IV, the "dysfunctional" was not "coupled", had a large number of sex partners and/or a high level of sexual activity, complained of a large number of sexual problems, and regretted being homosexual. The last group, Type V, the "asexual", was characterized by not being "coupled", having a low level of sexual activity, few sexual partners, and doing little cruising.
Bell and Weinberg (1978) also found that the five types of homosexuality could be separated according to level of psychological adjustment, with Type I, the "close-couple", showing the greatest degree of adjustment and Type V, the "asexual", showing the least. Compared to the other types, the "close-couple" was significantly happier, more exuberant, more self-accepting, and were significantly less lonely, depressed, tense, and paranoid. The responses of each type of homosexual were also compared to those of male heterosexual subjects. Again, the "close-couple" respondent reported more happiness and exuberance than the heterosexual respondent. The only way in which the "close-couple" subjects seemed to show even slight maladjustment was that they reported being significantly more "worried" than the heterosexual subjects. Moving to the "open-couple", there was only one factor on which this group differed significantly from the other groups. Like the "close-couple", this group noted feeling less lonely when compared to other homosexual subjects. However, they saw themselves as being different from the heterosexuals in a number of ways: (a) they had more somatic symptoms, (b) they felt more exuberance but less self-acceptance, and (c) they described themselves as more worried, depressed, and tense. The "functional" group also presented a unique pattern of psychological adjustment factors. In comparison to the other groups of homosexuals, this group tended to depict themselves as having fewer somatic symptoms, feeling happier now than five years ago, feeling exuberant and self-accepting, and as less lonely, worried, depressed, and paranoid. When the "functional" types were evaluated in comparison to the heterosexuals, they were found to describe themselves as more exuberant, lonelier, and more tense. Perusing the data, we can see that although the first three groups report some negative
affect, they all are fairly well "adjusted". The response of the "dysfunctional" group (as the name implies), however, suggests these persons experience more serious psychological concerns. Looking at this group in comparison to the other homosexual groups, we can observe that they (a) felt less happy now and less happy five years ago, (b) were less exuberant and less self-accepting, and (c) were lonelier, more worried, more depressed, more paranoid, and felt more tension. In addition, this was the first group of homosexuals to see their homosexual orientation as being a significant motivating factor for their having had suicidal feelings. Up to this point, none of the other groups had noted having a significant number of suicidal feelings. Similar to their self-evaluation in comparison to other homosexuals, the "dysfunctional" group saw themselves as having more somatic symptoms; being less happy; having less self-acceptance; feeling lonelier, more worried, depressed, tense, and paranoid than the heterosexuals. The data on the last group, the "asexuals", suggests that compared to both other homosexuals and heterosexuals, these persons were having the most difficulty in functioning. They reported having an overall poorer general health than other groups. Additionally, they had more somatic symptoms, less happiness, less self-acceptance, more lonely feelings, and greater worry, depression, tension, and paranoia than heterosexuals. Compared to other homosexuals these persons felt less happy, less exuberant, less self-acceptance, more loneliness, and more depression, tension, and paranoia.

When the two large groups, homosexuals and heterosexuals, were compared, the following results were obtained regarding their psychological adjustment. Although there were some within-group variations, the homosexuals, as a whole, reported having more somatic symptoms than the
heterosexual group. In terms of happiness, both now and five years ago, there was no significant difference between large groups. More specifically though, homosexuals as a whole were found to be more exuberant, less self-accepting, lonelier, and more worried, tense, depressed, and paranoid than heterosexuals taken as a group.

The importance of the Bell and Weinberg (1978) study cannot be overestimated. Until this study, homosexuals were evaluated as one large group and as the results show, this unitary approach gives a biased view of the functioning of most homosexuals. For example, the comparison data between homosexual and heterosexual groups appears to follow much of the past research, with the homosexuals seeming to have more difficulty functioning. However, when the homosexual group is broken down into subgroups, one sees that much of the "poor function" or "lack of adjustment" can be attributed to just two-fifths of the whole group.

It has been hypothesized that homosexuality is not a unitary concept, but rather is multidimensional in nature. As expected, the work of Bell and Weinberg identified overt, sexual behaviors (e.g., frequency of sexual intercourse) as only one of the dimensions of homosexuality. Additionally, this study demonstrated that at least along two dimensions (overt sexual behavior and psychological adjustment), "types" of homosexualities can be determined. These findings suggest that homosexuality is not only multidimensional, but also that the various dimensions may fall into patterns which then depict "types" of homosexualities.

In this study, the sexual histories of all subjects were obtained through the use of the DSFI. This instrument evaluates the person's level of knowledge of sexual facts, amount and kinds of sexual experience, attitudes toward various sexual behaviors, quantity and type of sexual fantasy
life, and degree of satisfaction with his body image and current sexual relationships.

As Bell and Weinberg's study was the first to categorize subjects' sexual histories, little is known about the consistency with which their typology can be applied theoretically to other samples of male homosexuals. Secondly, as their method consisted of a lengthy individualized interview, the question arises as to likelihood that similar sexual history information, gathered by a different method (e.g., self-report inventory), would, after analysis, reveal at least a similar typological structure. Thirdly, the statistical method by which Bell and Weinberg arrived at their typology of homosexuality was a form of hierarchical cluster analysis. This statistical procedure, being fairly new, remains highly variable, depending on the particular method chosen. Thus, the degree of generalizability of Bell and Weinberg's typology comes under question. In the present study, it was hypothesized that if the proposed typology reflects significant characteristics of the nature of male homosexuality, then at least a similar breakdown of sexual, social, and psychological variables would result using a different sample, yet similar variables. Addressing the possibility that Bell and Weinberg's typology may be more a reflection of their statistical methods, the present study (a) used an hierarchical cluster analysis program (Johnson, 1967) which methodologically was highly similar to that used by Bell and Weinberg, and (b) used a second hierarchical cluster analysis method (McQuitty and Koch 1976) which approaches the problem of "similarity" between subjects from a different mathematical model. By applying two substantially different statistical methods to the data, it was believed one could obtain an initial understanding of the degree to which a typology of homosexuality could be method specific.
Correlates of Homosexuality

Psychological correlates. Throughout the previous discussion, it has been emphasized that homosexuality is more than the sex act itself. Following this assumption, homosexuality was defined as a person's inner identity as a male or female, as well as his public social sex role behaviors and his adult self-assignment to a social sex role. Elaborating, we also can say that a man's sexuality, be it partially manifested through heterosexual or homosexual acts, is such a basic component of his existence that it permeates all aspects of his life. Thus, just as being a male heterosexual suggests that a person experiences certain role expectations or certain self-expectations, so does being a male homosexual suggest similar group assignment expectations. Being a member of the group does not necessarily mean, though, that all persons adjust to their group membership in the same manner. For example, it is possible that some male homosexuals do feel totally comfortable with their group assignment and identity and do arrange their lives to reflect such satisfaction. On the other hand, the opposite also is possible. For example, a male homosexual may feel that he does not belong where he is and may act in ways by which he can dis-identify from his current identification group. The above thoughts suggest that the manner in which a person understands and adjusts to the components of his sexuality, thus, is a correlate of his total sexuality.

A review of the literature on homosexuality revealed that two major categories of emotional functioning have been subsumed under the topic, psychological correlates of homosexuality. The more common, and probably
the more controversial grouping of these variables has been a person's "level of emotional adjustment". The second set of emotional or psychological correlates included various dynamic formulations regarding the nature of homosexuality. Below, the reader will find a review of each category.

"Level of emotional adjustment". Historically, the question of "adjustment" in the study of homosexuality has its roots in early psychoanalytic literature. With the introduction of the notion of constitutional bisexuality, Freud also introduced the concept of genital primacy. Specifically, he suggested that all persons pass through a period of bisexuality on their way to maturity and heterosexuality. However, some persons, such as homosexuals, fail to achieve sexual maturity because of early fixations. Thus, by virtue of the assumption that heterosexuality was the proper outcome for all humans, homosexuality was automatically assigned to the "deviant" or "pathological" status.

Research on the "adjustment" levels of homosexuality has been conducted primarily by comparing a sample of homosexuals to a sample of heterosexuals with regard to various personality factors (e.g., paranoia). Not surprisingly, both "marked" differences between groups and "no differences between groups have been reported. On the "poor" adjustment or pro-pathological side are researchers such as Wheeler (1949), who used Rorschach responses as a means of comparing groups. He found that "the" homosexual was paranoid, held derogatory attitudes toward females, had a feminine identification, and was preoccupied with sexual matters. Using protocols for the Thematic Apperception Test, Lindsay (1958) noted that male homosexuals were more likely to display neuroticism, hysteria, mania, depression, autism, and paranoia than male heterosexuals.
In contrast to these early studies, the research of the 1960's and early 1970's, revealed that although personality differences between heterosexuals and homosexuals may appear, these differences may not be as severe as first thought. Saghir, Robins, Walbran, and Gentry (1970), using a structured interview, obtained clinical psychiatric descriptions for 89 male homosexuals and 35 heterosexual "controls". Although there was a slightly greater prevalence of manifest psycho-pathology (e.g., problems with excessive drinking) in the homosexual group, there was an "absence of a striking difference" between groups. Comparing types of homosexuals, Doidge and Holtzman (1960) found that only the "markedly" homosexual group presented a severe or pervasive emotional disorder. The work of these latter researchers, however, has come under criticism for methodological reasons (Freedman, 1971), leaving their conclusions in a questionable position. Yet, the above "pro-pathological" studies suggest that as a group, homosexuals present slightly more "adjustment" problems than heterosexuals, taken as a group.

In 1957, Evelyn Hooker conducted a well designed study which addressed the question of whether the psychological profiles of homosexuals actually were distinguishable from the profiles of heterosexuals. Administering the Thematic Apperception Test, the Rorschach and the Make-A-Picture-Story to 36 pairs (homosexual and heterosexual) of males, matched for age, education, and I.Q., she then asked clinical psychologists to make blind ratings (using a five-point scale) of each person's level of emotional adjustment as assessed by these projective tests. The results indicated that the judges could not distinguish the subjects according to sexual orientation, nor did the judges' ratings of level of emotional adjustment differentiate the groups (heterosexual, homosexual).
From this research, Hooker concluded that (a) psychologically, homosexuality may fall within a normal range of sexual patterns, and (b) that homosexuality may not be a clinical entity as first thought (Freedman, 1971).

Several other studies also have investigated the hypothesis that if homosexuality is related to poorer emotional adjustment, then the psychological profiles of homosexuals should be distinguishable from those of heterosexuals. Using various projective tests as measures of "adjustment", most researchers have been unable to discriminate the homosexual samples from the heterosexual samples (e.g., the Blacky Picture Test, DeLucca, 1966; the Szondi, David, and Rabinowitz, 1952; and the Rorschach and TAT, DeLucca, 1960; and Wayne et al., 1947). When the same overall hypothesis was applied to the psychological profiles obtained on a number of objective personality measures, again the homosexual samples were indistinguishable from the heterosexuals. Using incarcerated and non-incarcerated Australian males, Cattell and Monrony (1962) found no difference in their subjects' (heterosexual and homosexual) levels of anxiety as measured by the 16PF. Revising this study, Evans (1970) tested non-incarcerated, non-patient American males. He also found no differences between groups. Other instruments which also have been unable to differentiate male homosexuals from male heterosexuals are: the MMPI (Dean and Richardson, 1964), the Tennessee Self-Concept Scale (Clark, 1973), the Adjective Check List (Evans, 1971; Thompson, McCandless, and Strickland, 1971), and the Semantic Differential (Thompson, et al., 1971).

Noting the results of both the pro- and con-pathological studies cited above, it can be concluded that differences in the level of emotional adjustment for homosexuals and heterosexuals are minimal. As
stated in a recent review (Hart, Roback, Tittler, Weitz, Walston, and McKee, 1978), "The trend of the research thus far suggests that when differences in adjustment are found, homosexual samples generally prove slightly more deviant than heterosexual samples, but many of the differences are normal-range differences" (p. 605).

In light of these conclusions, it is felt that the labeling of one group as more or less "adjusted" provides little information. Additionally, such large group comparisons (homosexuals versus heterosexuals) assumes that all heterosexuals are psychologically or emotionally identical and that all homosexuals are emotionally similar. Such categorical thinking seems to ignore the years of research into the multiple dimensions of personality. Considering these points, a more profitable line of research may be to look at several psychological factors that contribute to various personality styles and to assess if these factors group together differentially for various types of homosexuals. From this perspective, some homosexuals may be found to possess certain psychological characteristics that are associated with positive adaptive functioning. Other groupings of homosexually oriented persons, however, may be functioning in a non-adaptive manner.

The likelihood of finding a variety of levels of emotional functioning within a single sample of homosexuals is high, as indicated by the work of Bell and Weinberg (1978). If the typologies which they proposed accurately represent a general distribution of psychological variables and the variables assessed are more "traits" than "states", then similar distributions of levels of emotional functioning should be expected using more standard personality measurements.
Dynamic formulations. One of the first dynamic formulations regarding the development of homosexuality was presented by Freud. It was believed that during early childhood the male child became "fixated" or overly attached to his mother. When he arrived at the separation phase of development, he could leave mother only if he identified with her and if he could take himself as a narcissistic sexual object choice. This male, in adulthood, then formed a homosexual and narcissistic relationship with another male, in order to love his partner as mother had loved him (Wiedeman, 1962). Within this formulation, Freud introduced two major psychological variables. The first was the concept of object relations, which was discussed in terms of (a) the child's attachment to and separation from mother, and (b) the child's tendency to relate to future lovers in a narcissistic fashion. The second psychological factor introduced was ego functioning, which was talked about in terms of identification.

For a number of years following the introduction of the above dynamics, little was done to elaborate on the concepts of either "object relations" or "ego functions". Rather, the majority of emphasis was placed on the notions of "fixation" and "drives". From this emphasis arose a number of new "instinctual" formulations which described the psychological correlates of homosexuality in terms of libido. For example, Sadger (in Wiedeman, 1962) proposed that in the mind of a homosexual, the penis was equivalent to mother's breasts. Thus, fellatio was an acting-out of the homosexual's desire to recapture an early (suckling) relationship with mother. With Freud's formal introduction of his structural theory (i.e., introduction of id, ego, and superego) in 1923,
however, a number of psychoanalytic theorists returned to the investigation of the role of "ego" in the development of homosexuality.

Although initially the ego theories were vague and unsystematically presented, some writers, such as Sachs, were able to put forth a dynamic formulation of homosexuality in structural terms. Sachs (1923) suggested that homosexuality arose out of a conflict between a strong instinctual or infantile drive (e.g., the desire to merge or identify with mother) and the ego. The drive, being extremely strong, could not be controlled either by the reality pressures of the ego or by the ego defense of repression. Consequently, a defensive compromise was obtained. Although the majority of the infantile drive was repressed, a part of the drive was sublimated and became ego-syntonic. This unrepressed part of the drive then was expressed through the individual's homosexual activities. For example, if the desire to penetrate or merge with mother went unrepressed, it may have been sublimated through the desire to penetrate a male partner (Socarides, 1978).

In 1938, Freud elaborated on the defensive nature of homosexuality. He emphasized that in homosexuality there is a persistence of primitive ego defenses, such as splitting, introjection, denial, self-blame, and narcissistic withdrawal (Wiedeman, 1962). The presence of a weak or primitive ego structure, combined with narcissistic grandiosity, seemed to result in inadequate impulse control. As a consequence of this impulsivity, the homosexual was believed to be unable to form permanent relationships with others.

In retrospect, current ego psychologists, such as Kernberg (1976), hypothesize that the introduction of the primitive ego defense, splitting, was a major turning point in the development of ego psychology.
As psychoanalytic theory advanced, the intrapsychic process of splitting was tagged as a core process in the development of all object relations. Gradually, through the study of splitting and other such early ego functions, a number of theories describing the stages in the development of object relations appeared. Integrated also into these theories were hypotheses regarding the mechanisms and stages underlying the development of the intrapsychic structures (id, ego, and superego). It is within the object relations, developmental framework, that current dynamic theories of homosexuality fall.

In 1978, Socarides presented a classification system of clinical forms of homosexuality. Of the six classes described (i.e., situational, variational, latent, preoedipal, and oedipal homosexuality, and schizoid homosexuality, only two classes (preoedipal and oedipal) are relevant to this study. Preoedipal homosexuality is characterized by a person who maintains a primary feminine identification with mother, which results in the person feeling a deficient sense of masculinity. Symbolically, this male both wants to fuse with mother and wants to escape from her clutches. Being highly vulnerable to narcissistic injuries, the preoedipal homosexual is highly sensitive to mother's attitudes and behaviors. Due to a deficiency in body-ego boundaries, this male is highly fearful of external bodily injury, which he imagines threatens both himself and his partner. Homosexual acts are intense, and "their effect can be likened to those of the opium alkaloids". Intraphysically, he utilizes primitive defenses, such as splitting, incorporation, and projection; due to the presence of excessive unneutralized aggression, he fails to obtain stable, trustworthy, internal representations of self and others (especially of mother). In terms of his relations with other males, the preoedipal
homosexual often harbors feelings of "chronic distrust, hate, and resentment", while outwardly presenting behaviors indicative of adoration or devotion. As a person, this male feels a deep sense of worthlessness, guilt, and inferiority. Thus, the preoedipal homosexual is believed to suffer from a severe gender disturbance, a low level of ego development, and severely disturbed object relations. Socarides (1978) makes the distinction though that the preoedipal homosexual, as described, has developed sufficient intrapsychic structure to suggest that he has passed through Mahler's (1975) symbiotic, differentiating, and practicing phases of object relations development. However, the preoedipal homosexual is believed to be fixated at the stage of rapprochement. Consequently, the person has not yet achieved object constancy, has a poorly formed psychic structure, and tends to be subject to primitive regressions, when he is caught in the conflict between the desire to merge with mother and the fear of re-engulfment.

Although most of the emphasis in the development of preoedipal homosexuality is placed on the mother/son relationship, the father/son relationship is also significant. During the rapprochement period of separation/individuation, the son "dis-identifies" from mother (Greenson, 1968) and forms an identification with father. However, in the preoedipal homosexual, due to a fixation at this subphase, the son cannot dis-identify, and thus fails to form an adequate identification with father. This failure to identify with the same sex parent then leads to a severe disturbance in the son's core gender identity.

Socarides' (1978) second classification to be reviewed is the oedipal homosexual. In contrast to the preoedipal homosexual, the oedipal homosexual has successfully passed through the subphases of
Mahler's separation-individuation stage of object relations development, and thus has identified with father and has achieved object constancy. However, the oedipal homosexual fails to resolve the oedipus complex (as the name may suggest). Consequently, that male is assumed to adopt the feminine role (social role) in his relationship with father (or with father's representations or his male sex partners). Surrounding the oedipal conflict are anxieties and fears that the father, who represents power, will penetrate the feminine son. Although these anxieties are strong, the oedipal homosexual attempts to master his fears by seducing powerful male figures in homosexual relations; through this seduction, the oedipal homosexual attains the sense of power, security, and dependence which he lacks. In contrast to the obligatory nature of preoedipal homosexuality, oedipal homosexuality is believed to be ego-alien, to be under the control of conscious choice, and to be the source of feelings of guilt and shame.

Throughout his writings, Socarides makes reference to the various levels of object relations noted in different types of homosexuals. A look at his discussion of the nature of these relations reveals that he has directly adopted the stages of object relations for homosexuals, as put forth by Kernberg (1975). Kernberg proposes that homosexuality falls along a continuum. Persons are then differentiated along this continuum according to the degree of severity of pathology observed in their object relations. The most severely disturbed homosexual then is the "grandiose" homosexual and is seen in persons having a narcissistic personality structure. For these males, the sexual partner is "loved" only as an extension of one's own pathological grandiose self. Qualitatively, the investment in others made by the grandiose homosexual is superficial and
transitory in nature. Additionally, due to a lack of integration of both self and object representations, that person lacks empathy and an in-depth understanding of his sexual partner's needs. Moving to a higher level of object relations development, Kernberg next proposed that the narcissistic homosexual could be differentiated from others. The narcissistic homosexual is said to have a conflictual identification with the image of mother and tends to treat his sexual partners as a representation of his own infantile self. Often persons at this level present serious disturbances in object relations which are enacted through various types of neurotic character pathologies. Although these homosexuals do at times demonstrate neurotic-like relationships with their sexual partners, they are able to love others with genuine, deep emotions. Of those types of homosexualities proposed by Kernberg, the best functioning was identified as the "genital or oedipal homosexual". For this person, homosexual relations reflect a defensive submission to the oedipal father. From this perspective, this infantile self relates to a domineering, prohibitive father through homosexual behaviors, as well as neurotic behaviors.

Although the current dynamic theories of homosexuality, as presented by Socarides and Kernberg, emphasize the probability of "types" of homosexual, the range of possible or suggested outcomes seems limited by the clinical nature of their formulations. The need for an extension toward the "non-pathological" end of the continuum has been demonstrated through Bell and Weinberg's (1978) empirical findings. Thus, one question becomes, how does one describe the quality and type of object relations, as well as the level of ego development, for the "close-couple" homosexual, for example? Since this person has been shown to maintain a deep,
long-term, intimate relationship with a single partner, does not feel guilty about his homosexuality and tends to maintain a positive self-concept, his characteristics seem to exceed the criteria for the highest level dynamics previously described, the oedipal homosexual. Current dynamic formulations also seem in disagreement with more recent research on social sex role. According to Socarides, the oedipal homosexual most often presents a feminine sex role due to secondary identification with mother. However, sex role research suggests that the majority of non-clinical homosexuals maintain a masculine or androgynous identification. Thus, again a need for an expanded, non-pathological, set of dynamics is underlined.

In evaluating current dynamic proposals of the nature of homosexuality, a second set of possibilities needs to be stated. It is possible that despite the discrepancies in theory outlined above, the explanation of the difference does not lie in an incomplete set of dynamic formulations. Rather, persons who are homosexual and who do not present the object relations and ego deficits described earlier, may reach their decision to become homosexual through a non-dynamic set of events. For example, the symbolic interactionist theorists (e.g., Schwartz and Stryker, 1971) suggest that a homosexual identity is not necessarily formed from problems in early relationships, but could develop from a cognitive, decision making process which is similar to the resolution of cognitive dissonance. Thus, through the balancing of self and others' social evaluations of one's behaviors, a person forms a stable identity as a homosexual.

In addition to the above alternative interpretation, it also should be noted that in the past, dynamic formulations were presented as if these intrapsychic combinations existed only for homosexuals. However, as
Kernberg's review of object relations types indicates, the "grandiose" homosexual, for example, shares its characteristic style of object relations with the "narcissistic" personality type. Thus, it is possible that the psychological variables (i.e., ego development level and nature of object relations) suggested by Socarides and Kernberg, reflect more a personality style than a set of characteristics which distinguishes people according to sexual orientation.

Research along the above lines recently has been conducted by Weis and Dain (1979). Using Loevinger's (1976) measure of ego development, which specifies a series of hierarchical stages for the development of interpersonal relations, impulse control, and conscious preoccupations, these researchers found no significant differences in ego levels between the heterosexual and the homosexual groups. Thus, the ego levels evaluated are common to both sexual orientations, which suggests that "ego level" may be a more universal personality variable than first suspected. Although not tested statistically, differences in levels of ego development, however, were noted within each group (homosexual and heterosexual). The findings of such within-group differences seem to suggest that it may be more profitable to look at the concept of "level of ego development" as one of the dimensions along which subgroups of homosexuals may differ.

Having looked briefly into the internal life of a group of men who share a similar sexual orientation, homosexuality, we again found that as a group these men tend to present poorer emotional adjustment than their counterparts, the heterosexuals. However, the differences between whole groups were slight and recent research suggests (Bell and Weinberg, 1978) that not all homosexuals share a low level of emotional
adjustment. Rather, there appears to be a wide range of levels of functioning within the homosexual group itself. Looking at the intrapsychic dynamics which have been suggested for various homosexuals brings one to the conclusion that the upper portion of a psychic development chart is missing.

In the present study, a number of psychological variables will be assessed through the Affects Balance Scale, and the Brief Symptom Inventory (both sub-scales of the DSFI), and the Washington University Sentence Completion Test for Measuring Ego Development (Loevinger and Wessler, 1978). Some of the variables in these instruments, such as level of anxiety, feelings of guilt, and depression measure how the subjects "are feeling now". Other psychological variables, such as level of ego development or characteristics of interpersonal relations, attempted to evaluate a more stable personality dimension. By identifying these characteristics, it was hoped that insight could be gained into the different manners in which various homosexuals cope with the similar life experience of being "gay".

Social/Environmental Correlates of Homosexuality

To this point, the review of psychological literature on homosexuality has focused on the characteristics of the individual (i.e., his biological make-up, core gender identity, social sex role, overt sexual behavior, psychological adjustment, and personality characteristics). However, as discussed previously, all these characteristics are believed to interact with the person's external environment. Thus, one could say the qualities of the individual homosexual's environment will highlight or de-emphasize various characteristics of his sexuality.
As one primary goal of the present study was to further explore the possibility of a typology of homosexualities, a developmental approach to the selection of research characteristics was utilized. Through this frame of reference, the steps by which a person eventually obtains his adult sexuality were outlined. Implied in a developmental approach is the notion that those characteristics formed early in childhood, are the more basic components of a person's nature and theoretically represent more global concepts. As one moves toward adulthood, though, the qualities or structures of the characteristics become more differentiated, thus allowing for greater variation among individuals. Applying the developmental framework to the possible social/environmental correlates of homosexuality, the home environment stands out as the initial social field to which the individual must adapt in order to grow. In prior research the home environment has been described in terms of parent/child relationships.

**Parent/Child relationships.** In Freud's early writings on homosexuality (1916), he described the homosexual's mother as excessively loving and the father as retiring or absent. Supporting this differentiation, other researchers found the mothers of homosexuals to be strong, dominant (Stekel, 1930), demonstrative, affectionate, and emotional (Terman and Miles, 1936). Fathers, on the other hand, were weak (Stekel, 1930), unsympathetic, autocratic, and frequently absent from home (Terman and Miles, 1936). Integrating the above parental characteristics into a dynamic conception of homosexual development, classic psychoanalysts (Fenichel, 1945; Ferenczi, 1955) proposed that a disturbance in family relationships caused homosexuality. Briefly, the following interactions were proposed by the psychoanalysts. Responding to
mother's dominance and father's weakness, the young male child developed
a very strong fixation on mother. When he arrived at the separation
phase of development, the child, unwilling to give up mother, identified with her. As a result, the male took himself, narcissistically,
as a sexual object. He then searched for male partners whom he could
love as mother had loved him.

In addition to the above dynamics, which cited a disturbed mother-
son relationship as the cause of homosexuality, the early dynamic theorists
also hypothesized that poor father-son relations resulted in homosexuality.
During the phallic phase, the male child was confronted with the oedipal
conflict. "Normally", in this situation, the son experienced disapproval
and anger from father whenever his relationship with mother became too
intimate. Reacting to father's anger, the son develops the fear that
father may physically deprive him of his masculinity, through castration,
for having had sexual desires for mother. To resolve this conflict,
the son identifies with father. By doing so, he avoids father's wrath,
as well as castration, and learns to love mother vicariously through
his observations of father's relationship with her. In adulthood, the
son forms a love relationship with a woman and loves her as he had loved
mother. For the future male homosexual, however, a different resolution
occurred. In this situation, the son is overly attached to mother, which
makes father's disapproval and anger seem even more devastating than
normally. In order to avoid father's anger, the son renounces mother
and then all women as love objects. In adulthood, he turns to males
for intimacy. Implied here is the notion that for the future homosexual
there is a problem in the father-son identification process.
Since the two sets of dynamics described above were believed to occur during different developmental periods, the early psychoanalytic writers suggested that there were two types of homosexuals. One, the preoedipal type, which developed out of mother-son conflicts, and the other, the oedipal type, which developed out of a father-son conflict.

By the late 1950's researchers, however, began to question the psychoanalytic "rules" regarding the development of homosexuality. Looking at prior research, these investigators noted that a number of methodological errors lowered the reliability of analytic data. For example, generalizations about all homosexuals had been made from data originally obtained from a clinical sample of homosexuals, without the benefit of a comparison, non-homosexual group. In response to these methodological criticisms, studies appeared that compared the characteristics of both heterosexuals and homosexuals, for both patients and non-patients. In one such study, West (1959) used both heterosexual and homosexual inpatients as subjects and found the following combinations of parent/child characteristics: Homosexuals had an "overintense" relationship with their mother and an "unsatisfactory" relationship with their father, as compared to heterosexuals. Thus, his data supported the earlier analytic hypothesis of problem relationships with both parents. A second study (Liddicoat, 1957) looked at parent/child relationships for non-patient homosexuals. In this study, it was found that the homosexual's "unsatisfactory" relationship with father was a more significant component in the development of a homosexual orientation, than was his "overattachment" to mother. This finding that the father-son relationship was the primary relationship through which homosexuality developed was supported by the later study of Westwood (1960). In this investigation,
using a non-clinical sample, Westwood observed that although a large number of homosexuals experienced their mothers as "overprotective", the majority described their fathers as "inadequate". Thus again, a problem in the parent/child relationship, particularly with the father, was suggested as the reason why some males were homosexual in adulthood.

Characteristically, the studies of the '50's provided only vague descriptions of the parent/child relationships (e.g., "overintense", "unsatisfactory"). In 1962, however, Bieber, Dain, Dince, Drellich, Grand, Gundlach, Kremer, Rifkin, Wilbur, and Bieber conducted an elaborate and detailed investigation of the homosexual's family relationships. Based on the psychoanalytic notion that homosexuality was a pathological adaptation to an irrational fear of the opposite sex (Bieber et al., 1962), this study had 77 New York City psychoanalysts complete a 450-item questionnaire on 206 (106 homosexuals and 100 heterosexuals) male patients. (Each analyst filled out the questionnaires only for his patients.) Although the results of the Bieber et al. study revealed a number of possible parental conditions that were related to the development of homosexuality, they reported that the "majority" of patients had been reared under the parental situation Bieber called the "triangular system". In this system, the mother of the homosexual was close, binding, intimate (CBI) and controlling with her son and the father was detached, hostile, and rejecting of his son. Often the son of such parents described himself as excessively fearful of physical injury in childhood, tending to avoid physical fights, primarily playing with girls prior to puberty, as the "lone wolf", having little interest in or
participating little in baseball or other competitive sports, as clingy, and as being reluctant to start school as a child.

For Bieber, the data underlined the significance of the parent's role in the child's sexual development. As the result of his parents' personal problems, the son was believed to have developed a terrible fear of the opposite sex, which forced him to seek sexual satisfaction with persons of the same sex. As stated by Bieber,

Among the H-patients (homosexual) who live with a set of natural parents up to adulthood . . . neither parent had a relationship with the H-son one could reasonably construe as 'normal'. The triangular systems were characterized by disturbed and psychopathic interactions; and H-parents apparently had severe emotional problems. . . . When, through unconscious determinants, or by chance, two such individuals marry, they tend to elicit and reinforce in each other those potentials which increase the likelihood that a homosexual son will result from the union. The homosexual son becomes entrapped in the parental conflict in a role determined by the parents' unresolved problems and transferences (p. 310).

Bieber's study evoked a tremendous response in the scientific community; some negative, some positive. Churchill (1967) attacked the study on methodological grounds. He noted that (a) the sample of homosexuals used was not representative of the general population since only the histories of persons in psychoanalytic treatment were evaluated, (b) the data obtained were biased by the personal connections between the psychoanalyst and his patient, and (c) the data represented the therapists' impressions of the patients' own reports of these interactions. Bene (1965), recalling that the data from prior studies on parent/child relationships varied according to the sample's status as patients or non-patients, re-examined Bieber's hypotheses with non-patients. These results provided mixed support for Bieber's claim that disturbances in family relations cause homosexuality. On the affirmative side, Bene found that homosexual males, more frequently than
heterosexual males, had a negative relationship with their fathers. Additionally, fathers of homosexuals were more often perceived as ineffective parents and served less as a role model for their sons than did the fathers of heterosexuals. In contrast to Bieber's work, though, Bene's (1965) research did not confirm the following hypotheses about the mother/child relationship: (a) homosexuals are more strongly attached to mother than heterosexuals, (b) homosexuals are more over-protected and more over-indulged by their mothers than heterosexuals, (c) mothers of homosexuals are more competent and more often taken as a model by their sons than the mothers of heterosexuals. From these data, Bene reasoned that homosexuals attached to their mothers not because of positive attractions, but because of their poor relationships with father. In other words, he suggested that the son would choose a second-best relationship (with mother) rather than go without any relationship. This hunch, however, has recently come under question, and that research will be reviewed later. In Bene's eyes, the son was not the passive victim of his parents' pathologies, as Bieber had suggested, but they were active in the acquisition of their own sexual orientation. As supporting evidence for this hypothesis, Bene observed that with his sample, the homosexual sons expressed more hostility and less affection toward their mothers than did the heterosexual sons. Additionally, the homosexual sons tended to exchange both hostility and lack of affection with their fathers. Thus, the son who becomes a homosexual may behave toward his parents in a way which is different than the behavior of sons who become heterosexual, and this behavior fails to reward the parents, thus stopping the flow of affection between parents and son.
In an effort to more clearly describe those parent characteristics which were said to influence the development of homosexuality, Apperson and McAadoo (1968) conducted a factor analytic study of the item responses of a non-clinical, male, homosexual and heterosexual sample. Descriptions of father were "critical, impatient, cold, and rejecting", and of mother were "overpermissive" and less concerned with teaching basic "respect" for others. Both mothers and fathers of homosexuals scored significantly higher than did the parents of heterosexuals on Factor I: "socialization". This factor contained items which suggested that these parents generally had difficulty relating in interpersonal situations and particularly had trouble teaching their children how to show respect for the rights of others. On a second order factor, "restrictiveness", mothers of heterosexuals scored higher than the mothers of homosexuals, indicating that they tended to discourage high levels of activity in their sons and that they were more insistent on being in a role of authority with their sons. A second order factor for fathers of homosexuals also was found, but was less distinct. Here, items marked illustrated that fathers of homosexuals were concerned with their sons' academic performance, but not particularly with the sons' feelings. Apperson and McAadoo's results add support to Bieber's hypothesis that the parents' personal problems influence the child's later ability to relate sexually to persons of the opposite sex. However, in contrast to Bieber, they seem to be saying that the problem is lack of or poor training in social skills rather than the development of an irrational fear of the opposite sex due to overattachment to mother. In fact, the Apperson and McAadoo data are contrary to Bieber's with regard to attachment to mother, saying that homosexual mothers are less restrictive
than heterosexual mothers. This negative finding regarding mother/son attachment then seems to add support to Bene's data on mothers of homosexuals.

In contrast to all of the above studies which have found some indication that most homosexuals tend to see their parents in a negative light, Greenblatt (1967) has reported that homosexuals tend to have a positive view of their parents. Subjects in a non-clinical homosexual sample described their fathers as "good, generous, pleasant, dominant, and underprotective". Mothers were depicted as "good, generous, and pleasant" and were found to be neither "dominant nor subordinate" nor "over- or under-protective". Similar to Greenblatt, Greenstein (1966) found results which contrasted greatly with prior research. He observed that "the greater the degree of father closeness, the greater the frequency of overt homosexual experiences" (p. 275).

As the returns on parent/child relationship factors came in, researchers noted that there was no "universal" family structure or pattern which always resulted in homosexuality. Some hypothesized that this lack of consistency in the data may be a by-product of the poor methodology used in the earlier studies. Since none of the above studies (e.g., Bene, 1965; Apperson and McAdoo, 1968; or Greenblatt, 1967) had utilized the same or similar instruments, it was felt that little could be said as to which study accurately assessed the homosexual's family relationship patterns. Aware of the need for a more truly comparative study, Evans (1969) modified Bieber's questionnaire (i.e., he chose 27 items and he provided four possible responses, rather than using a forced choice format), and he administered it to a non-clinical sample of homosexual and heterosexual males. Despite these methodological changes, Evans'
results were quite similar to those of Bieber. Homosexual subjects described themselves as "frail, clumsy, fearful of physical injury, less athletic, loners, and seldom playing competitive sports". Mothers of homosexuals were shown to be "puritanical, cold toward men, insistent on being the center of the son's attention, seductive, interfering with the son's heterosexual activities, and discouraging of masculine attitudes". Fathers of homosexuals also were "less likely to encourage male attitudes", spent less time with their sons and were less accepting of their sons. In terms of the sons' behaviors, the homosexual sons were more likely to "hate" their fathers, feel "less respect" for him, and be more frightened of physical harm from father than were heterosexual sons. Unlike Bieber though, Evans did not propose a causal relationship between these findings of poor parent/child relations and homosexuality. Rather, he emphasized that these patterns of rejection, observed in the parents of homosexuals, were also found in a number of parents of heterosexuals. Additionally, he criticized Bieber for over-stating his results, citing that Bieber found a CBI mother in only 28% of his homosexual patient sample and 11% of the control group also displayed the triangular system of parent/child relations, but did not become homosexual. The implication here is that although family patterns may play a role in the development of a homosexual orientation, they are not the singular cause. With this understanding, Evans (1969) suggested that researchers focus more on the son's role in his own psychosexual development.

Even though Evans' study was methodologically sound, and his results consistently followed the results of the majority of the other studies in this area, some persons continued to insist that a disturbed parent/child relationship caused homosexuality. Gundlach (1969), who
was the sixth author in the 1962 Bieber et al. study, was one such re­
sister. He exclaimed that Evans was uninformed and that his arguments
were "not applicable" to a real situation. Looking for evidence to sup­
port his objections, Gundlach turned to Stoller's and Money's works on
transsexuals. Here he noted was proof that parental attitudes and be­
haviors toward children directly affected a child's sexual development.
Although Gundlach accurately reported the findings of the gender identity
research, he failed to distinguish the difference between the development
of gender identity in childhood and the choice of sexual orientation
in adulthood. Thus, he assumed that adults always would be, in a sense,
under the control of their parents; an assumption to which many clinicians
would object. Despite the fact that Gundlach's defense of Bieber's con­
cclusions was weak, his introduction of the work of gender identity would
have large consequences on the future study of homosexual parent/child
relationships.

In 1973, Thompson et al. conducted one of the most methodologic­
ally comprehensive studies on parent/child relationships. Adapting Bieber's
original questionnaire, they administered it to male and female, homo­
sexual and non-homosexuals, patients and non-patients. Results suggest
that for both male and female homosexual subjects, the presence of a
weak and/or hostile father plays a significant role in their later sexual
development. Of the two sexes, the etiology of the male was clearer.
The male homosexual's mother was seductive toward the son, and actively
worked against his maleness. The father, on the other hand, was weak
and/or rejecting and hostile; discouraging of the son's modeling after
the father's behavior; and was consistently undercut by his wife. Al­
though Thompson's data illustrated that a disturbance in parent/child
relationships was present for homosexual subjects, this factor did not significantly and clearly differentiate homosexuals from heterosexuals. However, a new factor, feelings of alienation, was noted to differentiate homosexuals from heterosexuals. It was observed that both male and female homosexuals reported feeling significantly more "alienated" from mother, father, and from people in general, than did the male and female heterosexuals. Indirectly, Thompson's data adds support to Apperson and McAdoo's notion that homosexuals may not have been taught adequate social skills, and thus they tend to have greater problems relating to others and feel alienated. However, social psychologists such as Hooker (1972) would argue that the homosexuals' sense of alienation from family and society represented a consequence of the prejudices arising from the battle of in-group versus out-group. More directly, though, Thompson's data emphasize that the homosexual, male or female, does not maintain a close relationship to mother, as early dynamic theorists had hypothesized.

In review of the literature on parent/child relationships discussed to this point, several patterns appear to be emerging. One, the male child's relationship with his father seems to play a more important role than his relationship with his mother in determining his sexual orientation. Two, parents of homosexuals do present more personal problems, particularly in the area of socialization and interpersonal skills than do the parents of heterosexuals. Three, the son is not the victim of the parents' pathologies, but rather is actively involved in his own growth. Additionally, the relationship with the parents is not one-sided, since the son also contributes a degree of hostility and lack of affection to the relationship. Four, male and female homosexuals
may be distinguished from male and female heterosexuals according to the degree to which they feel alienated from parents and people in general. Although the cause of these feelings of alienation is not clear, the presence of such feelings suggests a higher potential in homosexuals for problems in the area of interpersonal relationships. Five, although many of the above findings have been observed in homosexual males, many of the same findings have been noted in heterosexual males too. Thus, it may be concluded that family disturbances are not "the" cause of homosexuality, but more appropriately, they represent one major problem with which the child must cope while growing up.

In the present study, parent/child relationship factors were evaluated through the use of the Clarke Parent-Child Relations Questionnaire (Paitich and Langevin, 1976). This questionnaire allows past family relationships to be studied along the dimensions of exchange of aggression between parents, and between parents and subjects; provision of affection by parents to the subject; subject's evaluation of the degree to which parents were seen as competent, strict, or overindulgent; and the degree to which the subject identified with both parents.

Following from the review of prior research on parent/child relations, it was evident that any number of combinations of these relationship characteristics could arise from the sample studied. However, since the literature has shown that two primary types of relationships (those which are highly positive and those which are highly negative) have been reported, it was hypothesized that a general dimension containing characteristics of parent/child relations would be found. Patterns of these characteristics, however, would be seen primarily at the individual level, but not necessarily at a sub-group level.
Summary and Hypotheses

It has been suggested that the concept of homosexuality is multi-dimensional and that individual male homosexuals may be assigned to subgroups of homosexuality according to the degree to which they vary on a number of behavioral, social, and psychological dimensions. Theoretically, the above concepts were derived from the assumption that homosexuality is one aspect of human sexuality, and thus encompasses a broader set of experiences than simply one's overt sexual behavior. In order to articulate specific characteristics of these experiences, homosexuality was discussed from a developmental frame of reference. Such a perspective assumes that a person achieves adulthood by moving through various phases of growth, and that occurrences and reactions to these phases eventually integrate to form a unique individual. Retrospectively then, a group of adults, such as male homosexuals, could be divided into subgroups or "types" according to the degree of similarity manifested on the specific achievements of various developmental phases. Thus, the developmental achievements of a gender identity, a social sex-role, and a sexual orientation (i.e., sexual object choice) were hypothesized to be independent "dimensions" along which male homosexuals will fall. People also can be identified by their current behaviors. In this study, the dimensions of current overt sexual behaviors (e.g., fantasies, specific sexual acts) and current psychological status (i.e., general level of emotional adjustment and current level of ego development) also were suggested as dimensions on which subjects would vary. Finally, building on the psychodynamic concept that the quality and nature of our current interpersonal relations are reflections of the characteristics of our early family relationships, the dimension of parent/child relations was suggested.
It should be noted that the above hypothesized relationship between early and current qualities of relations may not hold for persons who have intentionally restructured their style of relating through methods such as psychotherapy.

Reviewed below are some specific hypotheses regarding relationships among dimension variables. Additionally, several exploratory hypotheses are listed.

(a) With regard to the dimension of gender identity, it is suggested that at least two variations among male homosexuals will be found. One, that there will be male homosexuals who have a masculine gender identity. Two, there also would be male homosexuals who have a feminine gender identity.

(b) Also with regard to the dimension of gender identity, it was suggested that persons having a high Father Identification score would tend to have a more masculine gender identity, while those having a lower Father Identification score would tend to have a more feminine gender identity.

(c) With regard to the dimension of social sex-role, the following relationships were proposed. One, it was suggested that persons having a high Part B score on the Feminine Gender Identity Scale (FGI) (a measure of leanings toward transsexualism) and having a large number of cross-sex experiences in childhood would have a feminine social sex role. Two, that persons with a low Part B score, and with a few cross-sex socialization experiences in childhood, would present a masculine social sex-role. Three, that persons having a low Part B score and having a large number of cross-sex experiences, would describe their social sex-role as androgynous.
(d) With regard to the dimensions sexual orientation, current sexual behaviors, and current psychological status, the general hypothesis that male homosexuals would vary along these dimensions was proposed.

(e) With regard to parent/child relations, it was hypothesized that two broad types of relationships would appear (positive - having a large degree of affection being exchanged between parent and subject, and having the subject see his parents as competent; and negative - parents and subject have exchanged a high degree of aggression and parents are seen as strict). If early family interactions do represent a significant social/environmental correlate, then one might expect it to appear as one dimension along which sub-groups would develop.

In addition to the hypotheses given above, this study also explored the possibility that the typological patterns developed in the Bell and Weinberg study represent significant distinguishing characteristics of homosexuality and that a similar group of patterns could appear out of the data of the present study. Due to the fact that the statistical methods for developing an hierarchical typology presently are not necessarily highly consistent in their output, this study also explored the degree of similarity in output between two types of hierarchical cluster analyses.

A final set of exploratory hypotheses dealt with the question of how male homosexuals and male heterosexuals compare. Prior research on a number of behavioral and psychological variables has shown that these two large groups were fairly similar to each other. In this study, a small sample of male heterosexuals was included to see if they would form a separate and distinct sub-group of their own, if they would
distribute fairly evenly across all sub-groups of homosexuals, or if they tended to fall only in one or two specific sub-groups. Thus, the degree of similarity between heterosexual and homosexual subjects was explored.
Method

Subjects

Subjects included 114 adult (seventeen years and older) male, Caucasian, volunteers from three Southern Louisiana cities. Of this total sample, 102 volunteers presented a homosexual orientation (i.e., by both identifying themselves as homosexual and receiving a summary score of four or more on the Kinsey Heterosexual-Homosexual Continuum Scale), and twelve volunteers had a heterosexual orientation (i.e., by both identifying themselves as heterosexual and having a summary score of three or less on the Kinsey Heterosexual-Homosexual Continuum Scale). The heterosexual sample was matched with the homosexual sample using the field research method of "friendship referrals" (i.e., heterosexual subjects were referred to the research project by homosexual friends). This method follows from the social psychology hypothesis that friends tend to be more similar than dissimilar in age, interests, socioeconomic status and educational background.

Since one primary goal of this research was to look at the varieties of homosexualities, multiple recruitment methods were developed in order to tap different sample pools. The first recruitment method was public advertisement. This advertisement included (a) the placement of recruitment cards (see Appendix A) in public places, such as a local grocery bulletin board, and in bars that had been identified as "gay" by the local crisis line, (b) the placement of a written commercial advertisement in a local newspaper, and (c) the discussion of the research project and the need for volunteers with newscasters during radio and television
interviews. A second recruitment method focused on persons who participated in homophile organizations, such as student groups, political action groups, and religious groups. Leaders of such organizations were contacted and arrangements for meeting their members were made, following the guidance of these community leaders. A third recruitment method was personal contacts, both those of the researcher and those of the volunteers. To facilitate this form of recruitment, a number of liaison persons in the homosexual community were contacted and asked to serve as recruitment advisors. Since these persons were highly aware of the individual characteristics of their locale or small group, they thus provided specific guidelines for best reaching the largest variety of persons. In addition, on a smaller scale, each individual volunteer was asked, following the completion of his participation, if he wished to refer a "gay" or "straight" friend to the research project. Regardless of the recruitment method, however, all volunteers were provided with a statement of confidentiality and of their rights as research subjects. (See Appendix B.)

**Instruments**

The following battery of tests was administered to all subjects. It was estimated that between one-and-one-half to two hours would be needed to complete all tests. This estimate proved to be an accurate measure of the actual test-taking time for the majority of subjects.

1. Each subject was asked to complete a Personal Data Sheet (see Appendix C), which was developed specifically for this study as a means of systematically gathering demographic information. Included on this data sheet were several categories of personal information, each of which is discussed below.
To place subjects in an age group, each one provided his specific age on the Personal Data Sheet.

To determine the socioeconomic levels of subjects, the Index of Social Status (McGuire and White, 1955) was utilized. The index score is determined by a three-step procedure. First, subjects provide information regarding their level of education, type of employment, and primary source of income. Second, the personal information is ranked on a seven-point scale (with the highest status categories having the lowest ranking) and then the ranks are multiplied by previously determined weights. Third, the individual weighted scores are summed to form the Index of Social Status. If desired, this index score can be located on a General Conversion Table of Social Indices and the subjects' predicted "social class" can be determined.

Information regarding characteristics of the subjects' current relationships was gathered by the following types of questions. The subjects were asked to report with whom they currently were living (e.g., male lover or wife), as well as identify their marital status (e.g., married, lovers, divorced). Subjects also were asked to report the number of times during the last year they specifically had looked for sexual partners and the estimated number of sexual partners they had over the past year.

The final set of items on the Personal Data Sheet assessed the subjects' mental health histories. Subjects were asked if they ever had received professional counseling, and if so, the age at which they made the initial visit and the length of treatment. Additionally, subjects were asked if the reason for obtaining counseling was related directly to their sexual orientation.
2. The Clarke Parent-Child Relations Questionnaire (PCR, adult form, Paitich and Langevin, 1976) was used to assess the subjects' retrospective reports of aggressiveness, strictness, affection, indulgence, competence, and identification for both mother and father (see Appendix D). This questionnaire contains 116 items, 58 for mother and 58 for father, each of which is placed on one of sixteen scales (e.g., Mother's Aggression to Subject).

The convergent validity for this questionnaire has been assessed by the authors, using an item analysis, a study of the intercorrelations among scales, a principal-components factor analysis, and a test-retest study. Item analysis revealed that all scales, except the mother and father indulgence scales, showed good internal consistency. A study of the intercorrelations of the sixteen scales noted that for either parent, mother or father, the scales were moderately interrelated, but were unrelated to the opposite parent scales. A principal-components factor analysis with eleven iterations revealed that this questionnaire contains two bipolar factors, one factor for mother and one factor for father. The poles for each factor included aggressiveness and strictness at one end and competence, affection, and identification at the other end. The mother factor accounted for 12.32% of the total variance and 22.10% of the common variance. The father factor accounted for 7.12% of the total variance and 12.78% of the common variance. Test-retest reliability coefficients (using a two-week interval) ranged from .64 to .84 for all scales, except (a) the Mother Strictness scale, which presented a .46 reliability coefficient, and (b) the Subject's Aggression Toward Mother scale, which had a reliability of .43.
The PCR also has been evaluated with regard to its ability to discriminate from the variables of age, education, intelligence, and social desirability. Looking at the correlations between age and education and the PCR, coefficients of .01 and .15, respectively, were obtained. Comparing the PCR scale scores to subjects' scores on the Raven Progressive Matrices, no correlation coefficients exceeded .15. Obtaining scores from both the K scale of the MMPI and the Edwards Social Desirability Scale and correlating them with the PCR, only two results were of note. The Mother's Competence scale presented a .27 correlation with social desirability, and a .22 correlation with the K scale of the MMPI.

Comparing the pattern and frequency of item endorsements of females and males, only two items demonstrated any marked variation between groups. The variations were as follows, (a) of 209 males tested, 48% saw themselves as the mother's pet as compared to 27% of the women from a sample of 199 subjects, and (b) with regard to punishment, 46% of the males reported having been "strapped", in childhood, while only 25% of the females reported having been "strapped". Based on these differences in response patterns, and on the fact that the derived centile scales were moderately different according to sex, the writers of the PCR have developed separate norm tables for males and females.

Considering the above information, it can be said that the PCR is applicable to a wide range of ages, educational levels, and levels of intelligence. Additionally, the PCR is relatively free of social desirability and sex bias.

As with most retrospective data, the scale scores of the PCR should not be seen as exact reflections of what actually occurred in childhood (Cox, 1970; Paitich and Langevin, 1976). Rather, the obtained mother
scale scores and the father scale scores should be interpreted as the subjects' current remembrances of their interactions with their parents.

3. The Feminine Gender Identity Scale (Freund, Nagler, Langevin, Zajac, and Steiner, 1974; called the "Background Questionnaire" in this study) was used to measure the degree of adoption of feminine behaviors over different ages and the degree of desire to be the opposite sex (see Appendix E). In contrast to most masculinity-femininity scales that define femininity only in terms of the behaviors of biological females, this scale defines gender identity as the degree to which a male departs "from the usual male pattern toward the pattern typical of transsexual males". The scale consists of two parts. Part A has twelve items and assesses the subject's degree of femininity for three age groups (early childhood, 6-12 years; adolescence, 13-17; and adulthood, 17-present). The following behaviors are evaluated: play preference (e.g., played football or with dolls), identification (e.g., does the person identify with the hero of the story), cross-dressing, desire to be the opposite sex, and body image. Part B is composed of seven items and evaluates the subject's leaning toward transsexuality (e.g., desire to have a sex change, degree one feels he is a woman). On both Parts A and B, items are assigned clinical weights. Scores are obtained by adding the weights together to obtain a Part A score, a Part B score, and a combination score (i.e., Part A + Part B). High scores on Part A are interpreted as indicators of cross-sex childhood socialization experiences, while high scores on Part B are interpreted as indicators of a strong tendency toward transsexualism.

A Vanderbilt item analysis of all items on the Feminine Gender Identity Scale revealed an alpha reliability coefficient of .93. Part-
whole correlations of the items to the full scale, ranged from .29 to .84. A principal-components factor analysis resulted in four factors. Factor 1 included all items of the FGI, with each item having a .30 or greater factor loading. Factor 2 was determined by item number five, which asks the type of role identification used when reading stories during the ages of six to twelve. Factor 3 was the product of item number four of the FGI, which evaluates if subjects often did "female" jobs in the house over the ages of thirteen to fifteen. The fourth factor was determined by item number six, which looks at the subject's wearing of female clothing between the ages of six to twelve.

Comparison of results for groups of male heterosexuals, male homosexuals, and male transsexuals revealed that the FGI discriminates male heterosexuals from male transsexuals with a 100% hit rate. Some overlap between the groups of male heterosexuals and male nontranssexual homosexuals was evident though. Subjects in this overlap group obtained scores of 3 or lower on the FGI, Part A. Those in the homosexual group who presented a score of 15 or higher on Part A of the FGI, also tended to overlap slightly with the transsexual group. Using the Combination score, a slight overlap between the groups of male nontranssexual homosexuals and male transsexuals was found. This overlap group was identified by a Combination score of 24 or higher on the FGI.

Authors of the FGI note that the above results suggest that approximately one-third of the male homosexuals studied showed a high degree of similarity with their heterosexual male controls, and that only a few of the male homosexuals rated high enough to fall into the overlap group with transsexual subjects. They look at these findings as support for the notion that sexual object choice and gender identity are to a
high degree independent of each other. Thus, they see their instrument as being able to identify the degree to which both inversions of sexual object choice and gender disturbance influence a subject's sexual identity.

4. The Bem Sex-Role Inventory (BSRI, Bem, 1974) was used to assess a person's social sex-role (see Appendix F). The BSRI consists of sixty masculine, feminine, and neutral personality characteristics (twenty adjectives to each category). Subjects rate themselves on each characteristic using a seven-point scale, which ranges from one ("never or almost never true") to seven ("always or almost always true"). From these ratings, three scores are obtained: a Masculinity score (M), a Femininity score (F), and a Social Desirability Score (SD). The M and F scores indicate the degree of endorsement (or mean self-rating) of masculine and feminine personality characteristics. Derived from the difference between feminine and masculine endorsements, is a sex-role difference score. This difference, then, is multiplied by a constant, which results in an Androgyny score (A). The A score also can be computed through a computer program which determines the absolute ratio of the F-M difference score. The greater the absolute value of the Androgyny score, the more the subject is either sex-reversed or sex-typed. High positive scores indicate a feminine sex-type and high negative scores indicate a masculine sex-type. The closer the Androgyny score is to zero, the more androgynous is the person. A low SD score indicates a strong tendency to describe oneself in a socially undesirable manner, while a high SD score represents the desire to be seen in a socially desirable manner.
Using two samples of subjects, Bem (1974) reported the internal consistency of the BSRI with an alpha coefficient for each scale (M, F, and SD). Results show a .86 coefficient for both samples on the M scale. Coefficients for the F and SD scales ranged from .82-.80, and .75-.70, respectively. The reliability of the A difference scores range from .86-.85. Theoretically, Bem has claimed that the M and F scores are independent. Testing out this assumption with her two normative samples, she found that the intercorrelations of the M and F scales ranged from .11 to -.02 for male subjects, and from -.07 to -.14 for female subjects. Exploring the possibility that the A scale may actually be tapping a social desirability response set, she obtained the product-moment correlations for the comparisons of the Social Desirability scale with the M, F, and A scales. As expected, M and F scales were correlated with the Social Desirability scale. However, the comparison of the Social Desirability scale with the A scale revealed near-zero correlations. Test-retest reliability of the BSRI, using a four-week interval, resulted in the following product-moment correlations; .90 for the M scale, .90 for the F scale, .93 for the A scale, and .89 for the SD scale. Comparing the BSRI with two other measures of masculinity-femininity, Bem found that the BSRI did not correlate at all with the Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Scale and correlated only moderately with the Masculinity-Femininity Scales of the California Psychological Inventory. Assessing the possibility that scores on the BSRI may represent regional differences between sex-role expectations, Segal and Richman (1978) compared the scores of northern (NYC) and southern (Georgia) samples. Their findings of no significant differences between samples suggest that there is no association between geographic location and sex-role identification. Reflecting on the above set of results, it can be said, (a) that the BSRI taps two empirically
and logically different measures of sex-role, masculinity, and femininity, (b) that the concept of androgyny is a reliable one, (c) that highly sex-typed scores do not reflect a general tendency to respond in a socially desirable manner, and (d) that the scores of the BSRI do not reflect regional differences in sex-role identification.

5. The Washington University Sentence Completion Test for Measuring Ego Development (Form 11-68 for Men, SCT, Loewinger and Wessler, 1978) was used to determine the subjects' levels of ego development (see Appendix G). Loewinger has identified eight sequential stages of ego development (i.e., Impulsive, Self-Protective, Conformist, Conscientious-Conformist, Conscientious, Individualistic, Autonomous, and Integrated). Each stage is described by a specific or characteristic mode of impulse control and character development, of interpersonal relations, and of conscious preoccupations, including one's self-concept. The sentence completion test itself consists of 36 sentence stems. Each stem first is scored according to a level of ego functioning, using a manual of categorized response samples. Second, the cumulative frequency distribution of the subjects' scores then are matched to the "automatic ogive rules", as provided in the manual. These tabled values then provide the subjects' total protocol ratings (TPR) or characteristic levels of ego development.

Research into the reliability and validity of the Washington University Sentence Completion Test has been extensive. Therefore, only a few such studies are reviewed herein and the reader is referred to Hauser's (1978) extensive review for a more detailed discussion. Loewinger and Wessler (1970) determined the interrater reliability of the SCT by comparing those raters who had been trained personally (i.e.,
by the authors) and those who followed the self-training program. For the personally trained raters only, interrater reliability had a median of .86. When raters with different trainings were combined into one group, and pairs of these raters were compared, the interrater reliability ranged from .92-.89. Studying test-retest reliability, Redmore and Waldman (1975) obtained a .79 reliability coefficient using the TPR's of 51 ninth graders, and a .91 reliability coefficient using the same group's item sum scores. In contrast though, when these authors evaluated the test-retest reliability of the SCT using 81 undergraduate psychology students, they found coefficients of .44 for the TRP's and .64 for the item sum scores. To understand these variations in reliability, Redmore and Waldman noted that for the college students the completion of the SCT was a class requirement. Consequently, it is highly possible that the students' motivation to retake a projective test such as the SCT only two weeks after just completing it, may have been fairly low. Thus, in light of the possibility that motivational sets may affect the reliability of the TPR and item sum scores, Redmore and Waldman recommended that adequate time be allowed between administrations of the SCT. Continuing with their study of the SCT, Redmore and Waldman (1975) also found a split-half reliability of .90, when a "no time" interval between parts was allowed, and a .68 split-half reliability when a one-week interval occurred between parts.

Studying the discriminate validity of the SCT, Blasi (1972) found that when the TPR was compared to measures of intelligence, a .46 correlation coefficient resulted for males and a .50 correlation was obtained for females. In contrast, when Hoppe (1972) used the item sum scores
and compared them to measures of intelligence, he obtained a .14 correlation coefficient. As the SCT is a verbal measure, one would expect some correlation between the TPR and verbal fluency. Loewinger (1978), reporting on the correlation between the total number of words used and the TPR, noted that these correlations ranged from .14 to .40 for single females, and from .23 to .51 for the group, married females plus single females. Moving on to the study of the construct validity of the SCT, Hauser reported that this area of research has been limited by methodological problems, particularly with regard to finding adequate behavioral measures of various ego concepts. As a result of these difficulties, the construct validity reports on the SCT have been somewhat inconsistent. However, out of these inconsistent findings, results have arisen which suggest that subjects' age may be an intervening variable. In response to this newer discovery, Hauser has recommended that the construct validity of the SCT be studied within a longitudinal research design.

Studying the effect of social desirability on the SCT, Redmore (1972) concluded that especially for females who try to make a good impression, their item scores usually decrease and most often their TPR reflects a higher "Conformist" or average rating. Additionally, she found that both lack of involvement and lack of cooperation could artificially lower the TPR. In contrast though, increased incentive and even intense study of the ego development concepts usually raises the subjects' TPR only one-half step. Thus, from these findings it can be concluded that social desirability only minimally affects subjects' overall rating of ego development.
In review of the studies evaluating the reliability and validity of the SCT, Hauser concluded that the SCT has been carefully constructed and thus offers a standardized method for assessing ego development. However, due to the complexity of the concepts used in its development and the inherent methodological problems found in the study of such abstract concepts, he noted that more research will be needed, especially research using a longitudinal design, before any unconditional statements regarding the construct validity of the SCT can be made.

6. The Derogatis Sexual Functioning Inventory (DSFI, Derogatis and Melisaratos, 1979, see Appendix H) was used as a multidimensional measure of sexual functioning. This test assesses each person on ten subtests of sexual functioning, each of which is discussed briefly below. The first subtest is Information, which measures the amount of general sexual information subjects possess using 26 true-false statements. The Experience subtest evaluates a person's level of sexual experience through a list of 24 behaviors, which range from basic sexual activity (e.g., kissing) to various forms of intercourse. On the Drive subtest, five behaviors (sexual intercourse, masturbation, kissing and petting, sexual fantasy, and ideal frequency of intercourse) are rated on a nine-point frequency scale. The values then are summed to give a total Drive score. The Sexual Attitudes subtest measures a person on a "liberalism-conservatism" dimension, using a thirty item scale. Symptoms of psychological adjustment or maladjustment are assessed by the Brief Symptom Inventory. This inventory provides both a General Severity Index (GSI) and scores on nine symptom dimensions (e.g., depression, obsessive-
compulsiveness). The balance between a person's positive and negative moods is measured by the Affects Balance Scale; a brief adjective check-list which produces an Affects Balance Index. The Gender Role subtest uses 30 adjectives to measure the relationship between a person's masculine and feminine sex role behaviors. Derogatis (1979) noted that this subtest is similar to the BSRI in its conception, and that the Gender Role Definition score obtained from the scale is highly similar to Bem's Androgyny score. The Sexual Fantasy subtest consists of 20 major sexual themes and results in a total fantasy score. On the Body Image subtest, each subject rates himself on ten general body attributes and five gender-specific attributes, and these ratings are summed to form a Body Image score. The last subtest, Sexual Satisfaction, asks subjects to indicate in which of ten areas in their current sexual relationships (e.g., foreplay, orgasm, frequency of sex), do they feel satisfied and to what degree. As noted above, each subtest yields a subtest score, all of which may be accumulated to form a profile of sexual functioning. Additionally, subjects may put their overall impression of their current level of sexual satisfaction on a scale from one to eight (with eight being "extremely" satisfied). This self-rating results in the Global Sexual Satisfaction Index (GSSI).

As the DSFI is a multidimensional measure of sexual function, study into its reliability and validity has resulted in numerous findings. Consequently, only an overview of the principal findings will be presented, and the reader is referred to the original work (Derogatis and Melisaratos, 1979) for details. The overall internal consistency reliability of the DSFI is very good, with all except three of the subtests
presenting coefficients ranging from .97 (Experience) to .71 (Satisfaction). The three subtests showing slightly lower coefficients were Information (.56), Drive (.60), and Body Image (.58). Derogatis explains that because of the theoretical and actual composition of these subtests, one would not expect to find high degrees of internal consistency. Both the Body Image and the Drive subtests are represented by summary scores of various component concepts. For example, the Body Image score is obtained by summing the subject's report of general satisfaction with his overall physical appearance and his satisfaction with his genital anatomy. According to Derogatis, the combination of these probably distinct concepts could result in a lowering of the summary scores' internal consistency. Only with regard to the Information subtest was it reported that possibly a re-analysis of the items may be required. Turning to test-retest reliability, it has been concluded that the DSFI is a stable measure of sexual functioning. Coefficients of over .90 were found for Experience, Sexual Attitudes, Symptoms, and Fantasy subtests, while Affect and Gender Role were both above .80. The retest coefficient of the Drive subtest was relatively high at .77. The only slightly lower retest coefficient obtained was the .42 coefficient for the Total Negative Affects score. However, since the Affects subtest, as a whole, measures mood which is known to fluctuate over time, one would expect a somewhat lower reliability. The Information subtest, however, again falls somewhat below expectations with a retest coefficient of .61. Looking at the validity of the DSFI, a principal-components factor analysis using a Varimax rotation resulted in seven factors accounting for 52% of the total variance. These factors were labeled Psychological Distress, Body Image, Heterosexual Drive, Autoeroticism,
Gender Role, General Satisfaction, and Sexual Precociousness. Looking at the discriminating capacity of the DSFI, Derogatis reported that a discriminative function analysis resulted in a 77% correct assignment among males (i.e., normal versus problematic sexual functioning), and a 75% correct assignment among females. Examining the coefficients, one notes that the subtest of Information, Symptoms, Affects, and Fantasy showed greatest discriminating power for both sexes, while the Drive scores also were highly discriminating for males. In conclusion, the overall evaluation of the DSFI suggests that it is a multidimensional measure of sexual functioning which demonstrates good reliability, validity, and discriminate powers.

Procedure

All volunteers were presented with a questionnaire packet containing two 9" X 12" clasp folders (one labeled "A" and one labeled "B") in which the questionnaires were arranged. Attached to the top of the packet was an introductory cover letter describing the enclosed materials, the estimated time needed to complete the questionnaires, and information regarding consent, right to privacy, and feedback on final results (see Appendix I). Although the basic information on the cover letter remained the same for all subjects, some variation in manner of presentation occurred depending on the subject's sexual orientation and city of residence. Homosexual subjects residing in the same city as the experimenter (E) received a cover letter (a) that described the study as a study of "gay life styles" and (b) that asked that they return all completed materials
in either one of the original folders or in an enclosed, unmarked third folder, which could be sealed. Homosexual subjects residing outside of E's locale also were told (a) that the study was on "gay life styles" and those who had not made prior arrangements with E for a personal return of materials were asked to return the completed materials by mail using an enclosed, pre-addressed, and pre-stamped third envelope. Heterosexual subjects residing outside E's locale were given packets containing (a) a "gay life styles" cover letter (since these packets were distributed and returned through the assistance of their referring "gay" friend) and (b) containing a third, unmarked, sealable folder. The homosexual volunteers distributing these packets were verbally instructed to remind their heterosexual friend that E was available at all times to meet with them, if they so desired. Heterosexual subjects residing in the same city as E received (a) either the "gay life styles" cover letter or a letter containing similar basic information but describing the study as a study of "human sexuality", and (b) received a third, unmarked, sealable folder in which completed materials could be returned. Homosexual volunteers distributing heterosexual packets in E's city of residence, also were verbally instructed to remind all heterosexual subjects of E's availability for personal contact, if the subject desired.

Within each packet, all questionnaires were presented in a standard order. The two criteria used in selecting the test order were (a) the more projective questionnaires were presented first in order to obtain the most independent responses possible, and (b) the questionnaires containing explicit sexual questions were placed midway through the set of questionnaires in order to provide volunteers with "warm-up" and "closure" time to these potentially sensitive topics. Thus, following
the above criteria, the questionnaires appeared in this order: Packet "A" - Voluntary Consent Form, the Washington University Sentence Completion Test for Males, the BSRI, and the DSFI; Packet "B" - the PCR, the Background Questionnaire Part A, the Background Questionnaire Part B, and the Personal Data Sheet. It should be noted that two separate folders were utilized, rather than a single folder, in order to assist in controlling the subject's desire to look ahead or work out of order.

Guiding the data collection process were three goals; (a) to explore a variety of homosexual life styles by tapping as many resource or sample pools as possible, (b) to follow as closely as possible standard procedures in administration of the questionnaires, and (c) to be sensitively responsive to each volunteer's desire and need for anonymity and privacy. One consequence of the simultaneous application of these three goals was that the researcher had to remain flexible in order to meet each volunteer at his level of trust and social experience. Thus, administration procedures varied slightly depending on the personal limits of the subject or the recommendations of the recruitment advisors. For example, a few volunteers, who wished to remain totally anonymous, asked to use an alias and requested that the questionnaire packet be exchanged only through an uninvolved third party, such as a secretary. In contrast, there were a number of volunteers who requested (individually or through the recruitment advisors) to meet with the researcher (alone or in small groups) in order to be able to present their ideas, feelings, and beliefs about their homosexuality.

Although variations in test administration were present, specific types of variations were recorded during the course of the data collection and were evaluated as independent variables in the data analyses.
As can be seen from Table 1, the first test variable was the presence or absence of E during the actual test-taking time. The second variable, which reflected the presence or absence of others (e.g., friends, lovers) during the testing was tracked for one of three situations, (a) the volunteer was alone during testing, (b) the volunteer was in a small group (two or more persons) during testing, and (c) the presence or absence of others during the testing was unknown to E. The third variable to be considered was the manner in which the volunteer returned the questionnaire. Levels of this variable were (a) returned the questionnaires to a third party, usually another volunteer; (b) returned the questionnaires by mail, and (c) returned the questionnaires personally to E.

Another variable considered was the volunteer's desire or lack of desire for feedback on the final results. Although the subject's desire for or lack of desire for feedback does not represent a specific procedural variation, it does seem to convey information about the subject's degree of openness, as do the variables "presence of E" and "manner of return". Using all Ss as the reference point, it was found that 75 Ss wished to have further contact with E through follow-up feedback, while 39 did not want any continued contact or feedback. Finally, the subject's city of residence was selected as an independent variable, since there were marked variations in the cities' populations, ethnic cultures, and degree of acceptance of gay life styles.

Considering the variety of administration variables, it thus was possible for some volunteers to complete and return the questionnaires while in a small group or individual setting with E present, while others were able to fill out the questionnaires alone in their homes or offices, without E present and return the packets through the mail or a third.
Table 1

Procedural Variations in Testing for Total Sample by City of Residence and Sexual Preference

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Sexual Preference</th>
<th>With E</th>
<th>Without E</th>
<th>Return</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Small</td>
<td>Small</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Indiv. Group</td>
<td>Indiv. Group</td>
<td>Mail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BR</td>
<td>Hom.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Het.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAF</td>
<td>Hom.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Het.</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>Hom.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Het.</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Abbreviations are as follows: BR = Baton Rouge, LAF = Lafayette, NO = New Orleans, Hom = Homosexual, and Het = Heterosexual.
party. It is important to note that E was available to all subjects by phone to answer any questions which may have arisen.

The final procedural variation needing consideration was the fact that the expected number of heterosexual subjects was not obtained. Originally, it was expected that 25 heterosexuals could be contacted through friendship referrals. However, due to a number of personal resistances, such as being a member of a restricted or closed friendship group, or fear of being exposed, the majority of homosexual subjects did not feel comfortable nor capable of referring a heterosexual friend. Therefore, the heterosexual sample was limited to twelve respondents.

**Data Analyses**

Data analyses included a series of steps.

1. Once all tests were returned and scored, the demographic characteristics of the research sample were determined. For both the heterosexual and homosexual subjects, these descriptive statistics (e.g., age, educational level) were compiled according to city of residence. Available for the homosexual subject sample alone was the breakdown of demographic characteristics according to type of recruitment source in each city of residence. Included as demographic characteristics also were the various possible groupings of test administration styles, as well as subjects' reactions to the offer of feedback.

2. Having identified the samples' demographic characteristics, Chi-square analyses were performed on all test score variables against all demographic information. Thus, if it was determined that a demographic characteristic significantly influenced the outcome of any of the test scores, then that demographic variable was included in the factor analysis.
Tables 2 and 3 present the outcomes of the Chi-square analyses. As determined by these statistical procedures, the variables Age, Index of Social Status, Baton Rouge, Professional Counseling, Age of First Counseling, Length of Treatment, Frequency of Looking for Partners, and Age of First Interest in Sexual Activity were retained for placement in the factor analysis variable pool. For a description of the directions of all significant Chi-square interactions, the reader is referred to Appendix J. As a cautionary note, one must consider that with such a large number of Chi-square comparisons, some of the obtained significances could be the result of chance.

3. Data next were sorted into homosexual and heterosexual samples and differences between the two sexual orientation groupings for each test variable were assessed using t-tests and Chi-square analyses as appropriate.

4. In order to summarize the data, which now contained 36 variables, a principal-components analysis (SAS, Barr, Goodnight, Sull, and Hehwig, 1976) was performed. A SCREE test (Catell, 1966) then was applied to the eigenvalues and eight factors were determined. Factor scores (both standardized to z-scores and unstandardized) then were computed for their use in both methods of hierarchical cluster analysis.

5. Two methods of hierarchical cluster analysis were used. One (Johnson, 1967) bases its analysis of clusters on the principle of least distance between pairs of subjects' scores. Separate clusters then are defined according to the maximum distance within each cluster (or the maximum distance between observations). Clusters also are represented on a cluster map. Following an initial computation of clusters by this method, the within-maximum distances for the first fifteen clusters were plotted and eight clusters were retained.
Table 2

Significant Chi-square Comparisons for Demographic Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic Variable</th>
<th>Test Variable</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>d.f.</th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DSFI - Sexual Attitude Subtest</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.504</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PCR - Mother's Aggression to Father Subscale</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9.164</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PCR - Mother Competence Subscale</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.945</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PCR - Father Competence Subscale</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.395</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DSFI - Information Subtest</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.528</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DSFI - Sexual Satisfaction Subtest</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.603</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FGI-A</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.444</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FGI-AB</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.504</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PCR - Mother's Aggression to Subject Subscale</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.224</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PCR - Mother Strict Subscale</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.953</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PCR - Mother's Aggression to Father Subscale</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.718</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PCR - Mother's Aggression to Father Subscale</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.664</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PCR - Mother Competence Subscale</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.380</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PCR - Mother Strict Subscale</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.310</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\)Numbers reflect loss of Ss due to missing values.

\(^b\)BR = Baton Rouge.
Table 3
Significant Chi-square Comparisons for Demographic Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic Variable</th>
<th>Test Variable</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>d.f.</th>
<th>( \chi^2 )</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DSFI - Sexual Attitude Subtest</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.090</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DSFI - Fantasy Subtest</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.937</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FGI-A</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.090</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FGI-AB</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.162</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BSRI-M</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12.156</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BSRI-SD</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9.066</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>DSFI - Sexual Attitude Subtest</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.054</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counseling</td>
<td>DSFI - Fantasy Subtest</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.246</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FGI-A</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.054</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FGI-AB</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.067</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BSRI-M</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10.520</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BSRI-SD</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9.195</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age First</td>
<td>DSFI - Sexual Attitude Subtest</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.038</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obtained</td>
<td>DSFI - Fantasy Subtest</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.038</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counseling</td>
<td>FGI-A</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.356</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FGI-AB</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.205</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BSRI-M</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12.324</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BSRI-SD</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.667</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of Treatment</td>
<td>FGI-AB</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.095</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DSFI - Positive Symptom Distress</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.077</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Index</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PCR - Father's Aggression to Son</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.667</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Subscale</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PCR - Father's Aggression to Mother</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.420</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Subscale</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PCR - Father's Competence Subscale</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.061</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Looked for Partners</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FGI-AB</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.095</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DSFI - Positive Symptom Distress</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.077</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Index</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PCR - Father's Aggression to Son</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.667</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Subscale</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PCR - Father's Aggression to Mother</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.420</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Subscale</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PCR - Father's Competence Subscale</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.061</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age First</td>
<td>DSFI - Sexual Attitude Subtest</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.700</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest in Sexual</td>
<td>DSFI - Fantasy Subtest</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.523</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ABSTNEG - Affects Balance Scale</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.709</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Negative Score</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PCR - Mother's Aggression to Subject</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.005</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Subscale</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PCR - Mother Competence Subscale</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.334</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PCR - Father Affection Subscale</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.415</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The second hierarchical clustering method was the Highest Column Entry Hierarchical method (HCEHC, McQuitty and Koch, 1976). This method first calculated the $r_i$'s for the data and then standardized these coefficients to $z$-scores. Next, the highest entry in each column of a matrix of interassociations between $z$-scores was isolated. Each highest entry is composed of a pair of "most like" scores, and each is considered indicative of a type. Linkages between types were plotted, and this graphic representation was used to determine the number of clusters. Eleven clusters were obtained.

Using matching subject numbers, the degree of initial similarity between outputs of each hierarchical cluster analysis method was assessed. From this comparison, it was determined that further data analyses would be needed, if more information regarding the similarities of outputs was desired. At the time though, such further analyses were not feasible, and these additional statistical analyses were delayed.
Results

Sample Characteristics

Of the 230 persons receiving questionnaire packets, 118 (51%) returned the research materials. Of these 118, 114 persons completed the questionnaires with enough accuracy for their inclusion in the research project. Of the 114 scorable packets, twelve were from heterosexuals and 102 were from homosexuals.

A review of the demographic characteristics of the homosexual (H) sample suggests that this sample was fairly heterogeneous. (See Appendix K for a tabular presentation of all demographic data for both homosexual and heterosexual Ss.) Ages of the H sample ranged from eighteen to fifty years, with the mean age being 31. Looking at the H sample according to agegroup breakdowns, approximately one-fourth of the sample fell into each agegroup (i.e., less than 25 years - 24%; 26-35 years - 24%; 36-45 years - 28%; and 46 years and older - 24%). Distributions according to city of residence indicated that 55% of the sample was from Baton Rouge, while 29% and 17% were from New Orleans and Lafayette, respectively. When method of recruitment was evaluated, it was found that over 1/3 of the Ss were obtained through personal contacts, nineteen were located through contacts in "gay" bars, eighteen were provided by homophile organizations, and seven were obtained through public advertisement.

In terms of current involvement or uninvolvment in a sexual relationship, one-third of the sample identified themselves as being "attached" (i.e., lovers, married, living together, or a combination of having been married
but now in a lover relationship) and two-thirds described themselves as "unattached" (i.e., single, separated, or divorced). It is of interest to note that of the 102 Ss in the H sample, sixteen had had involvement in or were currently involved in a serious heterosexual relationship (i.e., were married, or were separated or divorced). Exploring the current living patterns of the H sample, one finds that 37 Ss resided with a male lover, 31 were living alone, 31 shared a living space with one or more non-sexually involved roommates (either male or female), and fifteen resided with their families (i.e., wife, parents, grandparents, or other relative.)

Moving into the area of the H sample's public life, we note the following distributions in occupational levels: twelve Ss fell into the unskilled or semi-skilled category, 46 held skilled apprentice or skilled master level jobs, 41 were involved in a small business or worked in a semi-professional position, and 15 held a professional position. In terms of levels of education, forty Ss in the H sample had received a high school education or less, 31 had had a maximum of two years of college, 31 had completed four years of college, and twelve had obtained a postgraduate degree. Evaluating the subjects' Indices of Social Status according to placement in a social class, the following distribution was found: four Ss fell into the lower-lower socioeconomic class (SES), 36 were in the upper-lower SES, 31 were placed in the lower-middle SES, 36 were in the upper-middle SES class, and seven were classified in the upper SES class.

The demographic characteristics of the heterosexual (Ht) Ss also appear to be representative of a fairly heterogeneous sample. Ages of the Ss ranged from 21 to 43, with the sample having a mean age of thirty. The four agegroup categories each accounted for 25% of the sample. In
terms of city of residence, one-half of the Ht sample resided in Baton Rouge, while the other half were from the Lafayette area. The New Orleans area, thus, was not represented in the Ht sample. Looking at the category "marital status", one finds that two-thirds of the Ht sample was "attached" and one-third was "unattached". It is of interest to note that these proportions match those obtained in the H sample, but in the reverse direction. Reflecting this variation in marital status, the Ht sample's distribution according to current living arrangements was as follows: one S lived alone, three resided with a non-sexually involved roommate (either male or female), seven lived with their families, and one lived with a female lover.

Although the Ht sample had considerable variation for its size in terms of Ss occupational, educational, and socioeconomic levels, the range of these variations was not as great as that observed in the H sample. This narrower range thus reflects the small Ht sample. Looking at the occupational levels, we find that the Ht sample had no one in the unskilled and semi-skilled category, but did have five of the Ss working at the skilled apprentice to skilled master level, six in small businesses or semi-professional positions, and one working at the professional level. With respect to level of education, five of the Ht sample had a high school education or less, three had completed two years of college, three had received an undergraduate college degree, and one had a post-graduate education. Socioeconomically, the Ht Ss scores on the Index of Social Status placed them in the range from the upper-lower to the upper-middle social class (with three Ss in the upper-lower class, five in the lower-middle class, and four in the upper-middle class).
Procedural Variations for the Heterosexual Sample

One procedural variation which affected only the Ht Ss, dealt with the type of cover sheet and consent form these Ss received (i.e., some received sheets describing the study as a study on "gay life styles", others were told it was a study on "human/male sexuality"). Since it was possible that the style of these forms could affect the type of responses provided by Ss, statistical comparisons of the scores for these two groups of heterosexuals were performed. Computing t-scores for 35 test score variables (i.e., all primary DSFI subtests scores, the secondary scores on the ABS and BSI, both parts of the FGI, and all of the PCR subscale scores), one finds that only one comparison achieved significance, which is almost certainly a chance finding. To investigate the possible effects of the cover letter/consent form differences for non-continuous test scores, five Chi-square comparisons were computed (i.e., for the SCT-TPR, BSRI-M, BSRI-F, BSRI-SD, and the DSFI-GSSI). None of these comparisons reached significance at the .05 level. Evaluating the above results, one could safely say that variations in the cover letters and consent forms received by the Ht sample accounted for only a minute amount of the observed variance found in their test scores.

Heterosexual and Homosexual Group Comparisons

Statistical t-test comparisons between heterosexual and homosexual Ss were performed for 42 continuous test and demographic variables. Included in this set of variables were the Ss ages, four socioeconomic variables, all major DSFI subtest scores, secondary scores from the ABS and BSI, all of the FGI scores, and all of the PCR subtest scores. Of these 42 comparisons, only four reached significance. (See Table 4.)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test Variable</th>
<th>Sexual Preference</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>d.f</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DSFI-EXP</td>
<td>Het.</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>22.83</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5.71</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hom.</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>19.89</td>
<td>101</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSFI-ATT</td>
<td>Het.</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>25.42</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hom.</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>30.63</td>
<td>101</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FGI-AB</td>
<td>Het.</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hom.</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>11.33</td>
<td>101</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCR-Scale 2</td>
<td>Het.</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hom.</td>
<td>101(^a)</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Abbreviations are as follows: DSFI-EXP = Experience Subtest of DSFI, DSFI-ATT = Sexual Attitude Subtest of DSFI, FGI-AB = Combination score of FGI, PCR-Scale 2 = Father's Aggression to Son Subscale of PCR.

\( ^{a}\)Number represents the loss of one S due to missing values.
On the DSFI-Experience subtest, heterosexual Ss had a significantly greater amount of sexual experience than did the homosexual Ss ($p < .01$). Scores on the DSFI - Sexual Attitudes subtest also differed significantly for these two groups, with the homosexual Ss presenting a significantly more liberal set of sexual attitudes ($p < .05$). Comparing heterosexual and homosexual Ss scores on the FGI, one finds that the homosexual Ss Combination (Part A and Part B) scores were significantly larger than those of the heterosexual Ss, suggesting that the homosexual Ss had a stronger tendency toward a feminine gender identity than did the heterosexual Ss ($p < .05$). Finally, these two sexual preference groups also were found to be significantly different from each other on the PCR-Father Aggression to Subject subscale, with the homosexual Ss reporting a greater amount of aggression from father than did the heterosexual Ss ($p < .05$).

The two groups, homosexuals and heterosexuals, also were compared on thirteen non-continuous demographic and test score variables, using Chi-square comparisons. From these statistical comparisons (see Table 5), it was found that the groups differed ($p < .0001$) in terms of marital status (with more homosexuals being "unattached" and more heterosexuals being "attached") and in terms of current living arrangements (with more homosexuals living alone and more heterosexuals living with family members). Additionally, the Chi-square comparisons resulted in the findings (a) that the homosexual Ss had had a significantly ($p < .01$) larger number of different sexual partners during the past year than had the heterosexuals, and (b) that the homosexual group showed significantly ($p < .05$) more variance in terms of the number of times they had specifically looked for a different sexual partner over the past year.
### Table 5

Significant Chi-square Comparisons of Homosexual and Heterosexual Samples on Non-continuous Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Sexual Preference</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>d.f.</th>
<th>$X^2$</th>
<th>f</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NUMBPART</td>
<td>Het.</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>21.62</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hom.</td>
<td>101$^a$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIVEARR</td>
<td>Het.</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>49.59</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hom.</td>
<td>102</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOOKPART</td>
<td>Het.</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9.69</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hom.</td>
<td>101$^a$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARRY</td>
<td>Het.</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>35.23</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hom.</td>
<td>102</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Abbreviations are as follows: NUMBPART = Number of sexual partners in last year, LIVEARR = With whom are you currently living, LOOKPART = Number of times person has looked for sexual partner in last year, and MARRY = Marital status.

$^a$Number represents the loss of one $^5$ due to missing values.
Factor Analysis

An initial principal-components analysis, using 35 variables, produced thirteen factors having eigenvalues above one. Results of a SCREE test using these eigenvalues resulted in eight factors being retained. Table 6 presents the eigenvalues, percent of total variance, and cumulative percent of total variance for the eight factors. A comparison of the results of a principal-components analysis, an orthogonal (varimax) rotation, and an oblique (promax) rotation revealed that the hierarchy of factor loadings for each factor was stable across methods. However, the oblique rotation provided the strongest and most interpretable factor pattern. Accordingly, the factor pattern loadings from the oblique (promax) rotation were chosen as the basis for all further steps in the data analysis.

Interpretation of factors. Factor #1, accounting for 13.7% of the variance, was labeled "Emotional/Sexual Distress with Feminine Social Sex Role/Gender Identity and Weak Ego vs. Emotional/Sexual Satisfaction with Masculine Social Sex Role and Strong Ego". Table 7 lists the six variables which were scored for this factor, their loadings and descriptions, as well as two unscored but otherwise identifying variables. Looking at the signs of the scoring weights for the variables on Factor #1, we see that it is a bipolar factor. High factor scores indicate high scores on the General Severity Index (or symptom index of the Brief Symptom Inventory contained within the DSFI), high positive (feminine) scores on the Bem Sex-Role Inventory - Androgyny subscale, high positive (feminine scores on the Gender Role Definition subtest of the DSFI, low Total Protocol Ratings
Table 6
Eigenvalues and Variance of Factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Eigenvalue</th>
<th>Percent of Total Variance</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent of Total Variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.947</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>13.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.208</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>22.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.717</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>30.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.474</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>37.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.041</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>42.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.632</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>47.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.440</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>51.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.394</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>55.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 7

**Factor 1: Emotional/Sexual Distress with Feminine Social Sex Role/Gender Identity and Weak Ego vs. Emotional/Sexual Satisfaction with Masculine Social Sex Role and Strong Ego**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scored Variables</th>
<th>Scoring Weights &quot;Loadings&quot;</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DSFI-GSI</td>
<td>.800</td>
<td>Derogatis Sexual Functioning Inventory - General Severity Index Subtest Score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BSRI-A</td>
<td>.708</td>
<td>Bem Sex-Role Inventory - Androgyny Score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSFI-GRD</td>
<td>.474</td>
<td>Derogatis Sexual Functioning Inventory - Gender Role Definition Subtest Score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCT-TPR</td>
<td>-.369</td>
<td>Washington University Sentence Completion Test for Measuring Ego Development - Total Protocol Rating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSFI-ABI</td>
<td>-.780</td>
<td>Derogatis Sexual Functioning Inventory - Affects Balance Index Subtest Score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSFI-SAT</td>
<td>-.783</td>
<td>Derogatis Sexual Functioning Inventory - Sexual Satisfaction Subtest Score</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Other Identifying Variables**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>&quot;Loadings&quot;</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DSFI-FAN</td>
<td>Derogatis Sexual Functioning Inventory - Fantasy Subtest Score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FGI-B</td>
<td>Feminine Gender Identity Scale, Part B</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
on the sentence completion test, low scores (or negative scores) on the Affects Balance Index, and low scores on the Sexual Satisfaction subtest of the DSFI.

Factor #2, accounting for 8.9% of the total variance, was identified as "Pursuit and History of Professional Counseling vs. Absence of History of Professional Counseling". Table 8 provides a list of the three variables which were scored for this factor, as well as their scoring weights and descriptions. High factor scores indicate that $S$s have received counseling, at an older age, and for a longer period of time.

Factor #3, which accounts for 7.5% of the variance, is called "Nonaggressive, Competent, Nonstrict, Affectionate Mother and Restricted Locale vs. Aggressive, Incompetent, Strict, Unaffectionate Mother and an Unrestricted Locale". The factor loadings and descriptions of the five scored variables for this factor, as well as two other identifying, but unscored variables, are presented in Table 9. Noting the variable loadings on Factor #3, we see that this also is a bipolar factor. High factor scores indicate the $S$s have low scores on the Mother Aggressive and Strict subscales of the PCR and high scores on the Mother Competence and Affection subscales of the PCR. Additionally, high factor scores indicate that $S$s were from a restricted locale (i.e., from Baton Rouge).

Factor #4, which accounts for 6.9% of the variance and is labeled "Homosexual Orientation with High Feminine Gender Identity and Restricted Sexual Experience vs. Heterosexual Orientation with Low Feminine Gender Identity and Broader Sexual Experience". Table 10 lists the four scored variables, their factor loadings and descriptions, as well as one identifying, but unscored variable. From Table 10, one sees that high factor
Table 8

Factor 2: Pursuit and History of Professional Counseling vs. Absence of History of Professional Counseling

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scored Variables</th>
<th>Scoring Weights</th>
<th>&quot;Loadings&quot;</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LTTX</td>
<td>.832</td>
<td></td>
<td>Personal Data Sheet - Item 7c - &quot;How long were you seen?&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGEPROF</td>
<td>.807</td>
<td></td>
<td>Personal Data Sheet - Item 7a - &quot;How old were you the first time you sought professional help?&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROFHELP</td>
<td>-.871</td>
<td></td>
<td>Personal Data Sheet - Item 6 - &quot;Have you ever seen a professional, such as a psychiatrist, psychologist, clergyman, or social worker, for a personal or emotional problem (Yes scored 0, No scored 1)?&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 9.

Factor 3: Nonaggressive, Competent, Non-Strict, Affectionate Mother and an Unrestricted Locale vs. Aggressive, Incompetent, Strict, Unaffectionate Mother and a Restricted Locale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scored Variables</th>
<th>Scoring Weights</th>
<th>&quot;Loadings&quot; Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PCR-Scale 1</td>
<td>-.756</td>
<td>Clarke Parent-Child Relations Questionnaire - Mother's Aggression to Subject Subscale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCR-Scale 5</td>
<td>-.623</td>
<td>Clarke Parent-Child Relations Questionnaire - Mother's Aggression to Father Subscale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCR-Scale 11</td>
<td>-.503</td>
<td>Clarke Parent-Child Relations Questionnaire - Mother Strict Subscale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BR</td>
<td>-.482</td>
<td>Restricted Locale of Subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCR-Scale 7</td>
<td>.717</td>
<td>Clarke Parent-Child Relations Questionnaire - Mother's Competence Subscale</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other Identifying Variables</th>
<th>&quot;Loadings&quot;</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PCR-Scale 8</td>
<td>.387</td>
<td>Clarke Parent-Child Relations Questionnaire - Father's Competence Subscale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCR-Scale 9</td>
<td>.380</td>
<td>Clarke Parent-Child Relations Questionnaire - Mother's Affection Subscale</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 10

Factor 4: Homosexual Orientation with High Feminine Gender Identity and Restricted Sexual Experience vs. Heterosexual Orientation with Low Feminine Gender Identity and Broader Sexual Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scored Variables</th>
<th>Scoring Weights</th>
<th>&quot;Loadings&quot; Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FGI-B</td>
<td>.517</td>
<td>Feminine Gender Identity Scale, Part B.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FGI-A</td>
<td>.483</td>
<td>Feminine Gender Identity Scale, Part A.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other Identifying Variables "Loadings" Description

| DSFI-EXP         | -.440          | Derogatis Sexual Functioning Inventory - Experience Subtest Score |
scores are indicative of high Kinsey Feeling and Behavior scores, and high scores on both Parts A and B of the FGI.

Factor #5, which accounts for 5.7% of the total variance, was labeled "Negative Body Image and Emotional/Sexual Inhibition in Youth vs. Positive Body Image and Emotional/Sexual Assertiveness in Maturity". Table 11 displays the four scored variables for this factor, their factor loadings and descriptions. As can be seen, high scores on Factor #5 are indicative of a low score on Body Image satisfaction, a low score on the Subject's Aggression to Father subscale of the PCR, and a low score on the Sexual Drive subscale of the DSFI. Additionally, high factor scores are related to Ss being younger in age.

Factor #6, accounting for 4.5% of the variance, was named "Sexually Experienced, Informed and Precocious vs. Sexually Inexperienced, Uninformed and Delayed". In Table 12, the four variables which are scored on this factor are listed, along with their scoring weights and their descriptions. To obtain a high factor score on Factor #6, Ss would have to have a high score on the Information, Experience, and Sexual Fantasy subtests of the DSFI, as well as having been interested in sexual activity at an early age.

Factor #7, accounting for 4% of the variance, was identified as "Nonaggressive, Competent, Nonstrict, and Affectionate Father with High Social Desirability vs. Aggressive, Incompetent, Strict, and Unaffectionate Father with Low Social Desirability". In Table 13, the six scored variables for this factor are given with their factor loadings and descriptions. High factor scores on this bipolar factor indicate that Ss had low scores on the PCR-Father Aggression subscales and on the Father Strict subscale, and had high scores on the Father Affection and Father Competence
Table 11

Factor 5: Negative Body Image and Emotional/Sexual Inhibition in Youth vs. Positive Body Image and Emotional/Sexual Assertiveness in Maturity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scored Variables</th>
<th>Scoring Weights &quot;Loadings&quot;</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DSFI-BOD</td>
<td>-.762</td>
<td>Derogatis Sexual Functioning Inventory - Body Image Subtest Score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCR-Scale 4</td>
<td>-.720</td>
<td>Clarke Parent-Child Relations Questionnaire - Subject's Aggression to Father Subscale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGE</td>
<td>-.553</td>
<td>Personal Data Sheet - Item 1 - Subject's Age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSFI-DR</td>
<td>-.375</td>
<td>Derogatis Sexual Functioning Inventory - Drive Subtest Score</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 12

Factor 6: Sexually Experienced, Informed, and Precocious vs. Sexually Inexperienced, Uninformed, and Delayed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scored Variables</th>
<th>Scores</th>
<th>&quot;Loadings&quot;</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DSFI-EXP</td>
<td>.724</td>
<td></td>
<td>Derogatis Sexual Functioning Inventory - Experience Subtest Score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSFI-FAN</td>
<td>.554</td>
<td></td>
<td>Derogatis Sexual Functioning Inventory - Fantasy Subtest Score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSFI-INF</td>
<td>.490</td>
<td></td>
<td>Derogatis Sexual Functioning Inventory - Information Subtest Score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSFI-AINT</td>
<td>-.421</td>
<td></td>
<td>Derogatis Sexual Functioning Inventory - Drive Subtest - Item 6 - &quot;At what age did you first become interested in sexual activity?&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Factor 7: Nonaggressive, Competent, Non-Strict, Affectionate Father with High Social Desirability vs. Aggressive, Incompetent, Strict, Unaffectionate Father with Low Social Desirability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scored Variables</th>
<th>Scoring Weights &quot;Loadings&quot;</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PCR-Scale 2</td>
<td>-.749</td>
<td>Clarke Parent-Child Relations Questionnaire - Father's Aggression to Subject Subscale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCR-Scale 6</td>
<td>-.668</td>
<td>Clarke Parent-Child Relations Questionnaire - Father's Aggression to Mother Subscale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCR-Scale 12</td>
<td>-.472</td>
<td>Clarke Parent-Child Relations Questionnaire - Father Strict Subscale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCR-Scale 10</td>
<td>.367</td>
<td>Clarke Parent-Child Relations Questionnaire - Father's Affection Subscale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BSRI-SD</td>
<td>.391</td>
<td>Bem Sex-Role Inventory - Social Desirability Score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCR-Scale 8</td>
<td>.483</td>
<td>Clarke Parent-Child Relations Questionnaire - Father's Competence Subscale</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
subscales of the PCR. Additionally, a high factor score is associated with a high social desirability score, which is interpreted as a strong desire to be seen in a socially desirable manner.

The final factor, Factor #8, accounts for 3.9% of the total variance and has been labeled "Conservative Sexual Attitudes, Low Mother Affection, Low SES and Little Cruising vs. Liberal Sexual Attitudes, High Mother Affection, High SES, and a Large Amount of Cruising". Table 14 describes the four scored variables for this factor, their factor loadings, and their descriptions. High factor scores indicate a person who has conservative sexual attitudes, who presents a picture of mother as unaffectionate, who is in the lower SES, and who infrequently goes searching for sexual partners.

**Cluster Analyses**

An initial hierarchical cluster analysis (Johnson, 1967), using standardized factor scores, provided 1-114 clusters. After an evaluation of a plot of the within-maximum distances for the first fifteen clusters, it was decided that eight clusters should be retained. Of these eight clusters, six had an n greater than one. Clusters V and VIII, however, had only one subject each, and were considered extremes of this sample. Rankings of the standardized factor scores and median standardized factor scores then were obtained for each cluster. From these rankings, the factor composition for each cluster (i.e., the two highest and the two lowest ranked factors) was assessed (see Table 15), and initial descriptive definitions (see Table 16) were developed for all clusters.

Looking at the demographic characteristics of all clusters, one finds that the range of mean ages for the clusters was 19-43 years. Since
Table 14

Factor 8: Conservative Sexual Attitudes, Low Mother Affection, Low SES, and Little Cruising vs. Liberal Sexual Attitudes, High Mother Affection, High SES, and a Large Amount of Cruising

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scored Variables</th>
<th>Scoring Weights &quot;loadings&quot;</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DSFI-ATT</td>
<td>-.675</td>
<td>Derogatis Sexual Functioning Inventory - Attitude Subtest Score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCR-Scale 9</td>
<td>-.629</td>
<td>Clarke Parent-Child Relations Questionnaire - Mother's Affection Subscale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOOKPART</td>
<td>.357</td>
<td>Personal Data Sheet - Item 4 - &quot;How Often during the last year have you specifically gone out to look for a sexual partner?&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SESINDEX</td>
<td>.357</td>
<td>McGuire and White Index of Social Status.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 15

Ranked Median Standardized Factor Scores by Cluster and by Factor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cluster Number</th>
<th>Factor 1&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
<th>Factor 3</th>
<th>Factor 4</th>
<th>Factor 5</th>
<th>Factor 6</th>
<th>Factor 7</th>
<th>Factor 8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>.315(2)</td>
<td>.319(5)</td>
<td>.179(3)</td>
<td>.662(1)</td>
<td>.457(6)</td>
<td>-.219(4)</td>
<td>-.985(8)</td>
<td>-.585(7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(7)</td>
<td>(7)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>.438(3)</td>
<td>.674(2)</td>
<td>-.295(8)</td>
<td>.290(4)</td>
<td>.259(5)</td>
<td>1.034(1)</td>
<td>.049(7)</td>
<td>.056(6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(7)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>-.769(7)</td>
<td>-.977(8)</td>
<td>.655(1)</td>
<td>.139(4)</td>
<td>.279(3)</td>
<td>-.006(5)</td>
<td>.584(2)</td>
<td>-.259(6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(8)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>-.118(5)</td>
<td>-.977(7)</td>
<td>.196(3)</td>
<td>-.2.203(8)</td>
<td>.116(4)</td>
<td>-.157(6)</td>
<td>.584(2)</td>
<td>.739(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(8)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>(7)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>.075(3)</td>
<td>-.977(6)</td>
<td>.164(2)</td>
<td>-.001(4)</td>
<td>.628(1)</td>
<td>-.4.031(8)</td>
<td>-2.055(7)</td>
<td>-.614(5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(7)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(8)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>(8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI</td>
<td>1.749(1)</td>
<td>.937(2)</td>
<td>.655(3)</td>
<td>.566(5)</td>
<td>.373(6)</td>
<td>-.1.095(8)</td>
<td>.584(4)</td>
<td>.095(7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII</td>
<td>-.987(1)</td>
<td>-.977(7)</td>
<td>-.2.243(8)</td>
<td>.490(2)</td>
<td>-.235(6)</td>
<td>.168(4)</td>
<td>-.180(5)</td>
<td>.359(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII</td>
<td>-.522(7)</td>
<td>.430(3)</td>
<td>.565(1)</td>
<td>.392(4)</td>
<td>-.525(8)</td>
<td>-.209(6)</td>
<td>.584(2)</td>
<td>-.147(5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(7)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(8)</td>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup>Each standardized factor score is presented in the following format: Median standard factor score (rank of score for cluster row) / (rank of score by cluster column); and high and low ranks are underlined.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cluster Number</th>
<th>Factor Score Ranks</th>
<th>Description Using Factor Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>High Factor Score on Factor #4</td>
<td>High Factor Score on Factor #1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>High Factor Score on Factor #6</td>
<td>High Factor Score on Factor #2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>High Factor Score on Factor #3</td>
<td>High Factor Score on Factor #7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>High Factor Score on Factor #8</td>
<td>High Factor Score on Factor #8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI</td>
<td>High Factor Score on Factor #1</td>
<td>High Factor Score on Factor #2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII</td>
<td>High Factor Score on Factor #1</td>
<td>High Factor Score on Factor #4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
these age parameters were products of the two outlying clusters however, the range of mean ages for the clusters, \( n \) greater than 1 also was assessed. Results indicate that Cluster VI presented the youngest mean age, at 24 years, and that Cluster I had the oldest mean age, at 31 years. With regard to the Kinsey sexual behavior self-ratings, six of the clusters presented ratings at the homosexual end of the behavioral continuum (i.e., ratings of four to six). Two clusters (Clusters II and IV), however, contained mixed ratings (zero to two and four to six), indicating that both heterosexuals and homosexuals were in these clusters. Reviewing the Kinsey scores for sexual feelings, one finds a slightly greater variation in ratings. Clusters I, II, and IV contained mixed ratings (one to two and four to six), while Clusters III, V, VI, VII, and VIII revealed only homosexual ratings (four to six). Although the above results imply that both Clusters II and IV contained both heterosexual and homosexual subjects, the application of the dual operational definition of heterosexuality resulted in only Cluster IV being identified as a mixed group of both heterosexual and homosexual subjects. Evaluating the types of attachments reported by \( Ss \) in each cluster, one finds that all clusters contained both "attached" and "unattached" persons, with the larger percentage being "unattached". Similarly, the distribution of the characteristic "living arrangements" demonstrated that except for the outlying clusters, this variable did not discriminate between clusters. For the demographic characteristics of occupational level, educational level, and social class, it was found that for all clusters with \( n \) greater than one these variables provided little discriminating information. In contrast, though, the variable "professional counseling" was more revealing. Results indicate that both Clusters II and VI were
heavily weighted with Ss who had a history of counseling, while Clusters III, IV, and VII were weighted with "no professional counseling" Ss. Looking at the clusters according to the variable "length of counseling", one notes that only in Cluster VI did all Ss have a history of counseling; with the majority having had from three months to two years of treatment.

With regard to the sexual partner variables, "frequency of cruising" and "number of sexual partners", some discriminating results were obtained. Clusters I, VI, VII, and the outlying Cluster V, were all weighted toward the more frequent (a few times a month to more than once a week) end of the continuum. Clusters II, III, IV, and outlying Cluster VIII, however, displayed the opposite weighting of less frequency of cruising (once a month to not at all). On the "number of partners" variable, all clusters, except Cluster IV, presented the following pattern; approximately one-half of the Ss had ten or less sexual partners over the past year, and from one to ten of the Ss had had fifty or more sexual partners. For Cluster IV, however, thirteen of the seventeen Ss had had ten or less sexual partners, while none of the Ss had had fifty or more sexual partners.

Compilation of the tentative descriptions of the clusters and the available demographic information led to a slight clarification of the cluster characteristics. However, as these data primarily furnish a definitional framework, one is faced with a need for more specific information regarding the composition of each cluster.

In the following sections, a summary of the results for each cluster is presented in a descriptive manner. The reader is referred to Appendix L for a more detailed review of the data for each cluster. In the Appendix presentation, the individual clusters are discussed
(a) according to their mean scores on the principle factor variables, and (b) in relation to their standing or ranking as compared to all other clusters in the sample. To facilitate these comparisons, each cluster has a set of three variable profiles. The first profile for each cluster summarizes that clusters' mean standardized (z) scores for the Derogatis Sexual Functioning Inventory (DSFI), the Clarke Parent-Child Relations Questionnaire (PCR), the Bem Sex-Role Inventory (BSRI), the Feminine Gender Identity Scale (FGI), and four additional variables, which have been classified as "Other". The second profile for each cluster presents the standardized mean scores for that cluster on the subscales of the Brief Symptom Inventory. The third profile includes the standardized mean cluster scores for the Affects Balance subscales. The mean of zero on each profile represents the standardized (z) mean for the entire sample.

Cluster I

Regarding the composition and comparative rankings of Cluster I to all other clusters in this sample, we can say that Ss in Cluster I (a) were almost exclusively homosexual, (b) presented a more feminine than masculine gender identity, although they could not be called transsexuals, (c) tended to maintain a "near feminine" social sex-role, compared to Bem's normative male sample; however, for the present sample, such a score places them only slightly above the group average, (d) became interested in and involved in sex during adolescence, (e) were slightly below average in terms of general knowledge of sexual information, but were average in terms of sexual experience, (f) ranked highest compared to all other Ss in terms of sexual drive, liberalness of sexual attitudes, and ranked second highest in terms of level of sexual fantasy, (h) were
somewhat above average in terms of overall sexual satisfaction, (i) tended to have highly negative memories of father, but fairly average memories for mother, and (j) psychologically appeared to be average in terms of level of ego development and presented only a slight to moderate degree of emotional distress, which centered around feelings of discomfort in interpersonal relationships.

Cluster II

From the results for Cluster II, we can say that Ss in this cluster (a) are mainly homosexual but do present a small degree of heterosexuality in their sexual feelings and behaviors, (b) had a more feminine than masculine gender identity, but did not have a strong tendency toward transsexualism, (c) presented a "near feminine" social sex-role, which was slightly above average for this sample, (d) were somewhat sexually precocious, and were informed about sexual matters, (e) tended to have a fairly active mental sexual life, but a somewhat less active physical sex life, (f) were somewhat disparaging about their physical appearance in general, and (g) were slightly below average, compared to other Ss, with regard to their level of general sexual satisfaction. In terms of family relations, father was remembered as being basically average, while mother was remembered in a somewhat more negative light. Psychologically, Cluster II falls in the Conscientious level of ego development, and was only slightly above average in terms of emotional distress, with the general level of irritability being the primary contributant to this distress. Additionally, Cluster II was fairly average in terms of the balance of positive and negative affects. Lastly, this is a cluster in which the majority of Ss had sought professional counseling during their late adolescence or early adulthood.
Cluster III

Cluster III consisted of almost exclusively homosexual males, whose core gender identity and social sex-roles were primarily masculine. The men in Cluster III tended to become interested in and to have had their first sexual encounter during early and mid-adolescence. In terms of general information regarding sex, variety of sexual experiences, range of sexual fantasy life and frequency of current sexual involvements, Cluster III falls slightly below the overall sample mean. Additionally, they tend to be somewhat more conservative in their sexual attitudes and tend to be somewhat more critical of their general physical appearance than most other Ss. These Ss, however, do appear to maintain a moderate to good opinion of those physical qualities which are associated with their maleness. On measures of general sexual satisfaction, Cluster III ranked above average. From the patterns of family relations presented, it appears that Cluster III holds rather positive memories for both mother and father. Emotionally, this group, when compared to other clusters (n greater than one), presents the highest level of ego development (being surpassed only by the individual in Cluster VIII), the lowest degree of emotional distress, and the greatest amount of positive affect. As is evident from the above descriptions, Cluster III appears to represent a group of well-functioning, sexually and emotionally satisfied male homosexuals.

Cluster IV

In Cluster IV, one sees a cluster which contains a mixture of both heterosexuals and homosexuals whose gender identity and social sex-role are masculine. Compared to all other Ss, Cluster IV Ss tended to
be slightly older (although still in adolescence) when they had their first sexual experience. Except for a somewhat above average mean sexual experience score, Cluster IV was near the total group mean on the majority of the sexual variables. Likewise, with regard to psychological variables, Cluster IV again was near the sample mean. Additionally, the parent/child relations scales for Cluster IV fell at or slightly below the group mean. Considering all the above information, one then could classify Cluster IV as being representative of the sample mean on most variables.

Cluster V

Cluster V represents an extreme case for this sample. The individual in this cluster (a) was the youngest subject, (b) presented mixed homosexual/heterosexual feelings and behaviors, (c) had a more feminine than masculine gender identity, (d) had an androgynous social sex-role, (e) was sexually precocious, (f) fell far below other Ss in terms of sexual information and sexual experience, (g) was slightly below average in sexual attitudes, range of sexual fantasies, general satisfaction with his physical appearance, and general sexual satisfaction, (h) was exceptionally above average though in terms of his self-ratings of sexual satisfaction, (i) presented a highly negative picture of father and a picture of mother as highly affectionate, but otherwise average, and (j) psychologically was near average in terms of level of ego development, level of general emotional adjustment, and degree of balance between his positive and negative affects.
Cluster VI

Cluster VI was comprised of Ss (a) who were almost exclusively homosexual, (b) who had more feminine than masculine gender identity, and (c) who fell in the highly feminine sex-typed social sex-role. Sexually, Cluster VI (a) was somewhat delayed in terms of age of initial interest in sexual activities, (b) was lower than average on sexual information and experience, primarily due to a lack of contact with females, (c) had a lower than average sexual drive, (d) were near the sample average in terms of sexual attitudes, quantity of sexual fantasy, and satisfaction with one's body image, and (e) were exceptionally lower than average in terms of the general level of sexual satisfaction. Memories of parent/child relations for this cluster were fairly positive for both parents. On the psychological variables, Cluster VI was (a) slightly below average in terms of level of ego development, (b) fell into the upper extremes of symptoms of emotional distress, and (c) were much below the average in terms of presence of positive feelings. Prior demographic descriptions of this cluster also noted that Cluster VI Ss had a history of mental health counseling and were seen for longer periods than were any of the other Ss.

Cluster VII

Cluster VII consisted of almost exclusively homosexual males, who had a feminine gender identity and social sex-role. Sexually, Cluster VII Ss (a) began their sexual interests and activities at an age that was somewhat younger than other Ss, (b) were somewhat below average with regard to knowledge of sexual information, (c) were near the sample mean in terms of sexual experience and sexual drive, (d) were
slightly more liberal in terms of sexual attitudes and had above average fantasy and body image scores (e) had somewhat lower than average levels of sexual satisfaction, (f) had negative memories of father and of mother, (g) were the lowest group in terms of level of ego development, (h) had rather significant signs of emotional distress, and (i) had no history of counseling.

Cluster VIII

Cluster VIII consisted of a single individual who had an exclusively homosexual orientation and a feminine gender identity. In terms of social sex-role, this person gave two different role presentations; on the BSRI, his scores rated him feminine, and on the GRD, his score was in the masculine range. Sexually, this individual (a) was about average in terms of initial sexual involvements, (b) was about average on sexual information, (c) was somewhat below average in terms of experience, (d) was exceptionally above average in drive, liberalness of sexual attitudes, range of fantasy, and body and sexual satisfaction, (e) had exceptionally high scores on the Subject's Aggression to Father subscale, and (f) was exceptionally low in terms of signs of emotional distress.

Comparison of Hierarchical Cluster Analysis Methods

The second hierarchical cluster analysis, the McQuitty and Koch method (1975), resulted in all 114 Ss being placed into one of eleven clusters. Of these eleven clusters, only one cluster was a complete replication of a cluster obtained by the Johnson method. This cluster was Cluster VI by the Johnson method, and Cluster X by the McQuitty-Koch method. Further comparison of the results from these two methods of hierarchical cluster analysis, resulted in Clusters I, II, III, and
IV, from the Johnson method being subdivided among various McQuitty-Koch clusters. For example, Cluster I from the Johnson method contained nineteen Ss; with the McQuitty-Koch method, sixteen of these nineteen Ss were re-grouped to form subunits within the McQuitty-Koch Clusters II, III, IV, and X. If all subunits are compared across both methods, 71 of the 114 Ss could be classified or clustered into various subgroups.

With the information that the McQuitty-Koch and Johnson methods of hierarchical cluster analysis produced somewhat similar, but not identical clustering of Ss, one can figure that the next step in the comparative analysis of these clusterings methods would be to merge those Ss obtained from both and to work toward obtaining a "pure" typology. Such analyses, however, are beyond the scope of this study and have been relegated to the place of "study #2". What can be concluded from the initial comparisons of methods is that (a) the method one uses to determine the "types" of homosexualities can greatly influence the outcome of one's study, (b) that Cluster VI in the present study does appear to represent a unique subgroup for this sample of subjects, and (c) that work toward a "pure" typology may provide a more accurate understanding of the possible interrelations of variables suggested in this study and the subgroups of homosexuals that may arise from these interrelationships.
Discussion

At the outset of this study, it was theorized that homosexuality is multidimensional. From this theoretical assumption, first it was proposed that a conceptual definition of homosexuality would need to highlight those dimensions which are believed to be central to the nature of homosexuality. Second, it was suggested that in a sample of male homosexuals, individuals and/or groups of individuals would be found to vary in the degree to which a proposed dimension applies to them. Third, it was hypothesized that the variation among male homosexuals on the proposed dimensions could be organized into patterns and that these patterns could represent different types of homosexualities.

Dimensions and Factors

The definition of homosexuality proposed in this study includes six dimensions. Three of these dimensions, gender identity, social sex role, and sexual orientation, have been identified previously as characteristics of one's psychological sex (Stoller, 1968). The fourth dimension, overt sexual behaviors, was considered to be primary manifestations of a person's sexuality and thus were thought to be highly correlated with a person's psychological sex. The fifth and sixth dimensions, current psychological status and parent/child relations, were suggested as social/psychological correlates of a person's psychological sex. The entry point into the study of these proposed dimensions was an oblique (promax) factor analysis which produced eight factors. Below, each obtained factor and the interrelations of the factor variables will be discussed in relation to the six proposed definitional dimensions.
Dimension one/dimension three - Factor #4. The first proposed dimension was gender identity. Gender identity has been defined as the knowledge and awareness that one belongs to one sex or another (Stoller, 1968). Theoretically, gender identity (a) is thought to be an independent line of sexual development, and (b) is said to include both the concept of core gender identity (or the basic belief that one is a male or female; Stoller, 1964), and the processes of identification and complementarity by which one acquires the knowledge of his sexual identity (Money, 1974). Prior research on gender identity using homosexual subjects has produced mixed results regarding the distribution of this variable among homosexual males. Townes et al. (1976) found that when heterosexual, homosexual, and transsexual males were compared, only the transsexual male presented a feminine gender identity. Freund et al. (1974), on the other hand, have found that homosexual males can vary along a continuum of gender identity, moving from masculine through masculine/feminine to feminine. According to Freund, the majority of homosexuals in his study fell in the midrange masculine/feminine group. In terms of the processes of identification and complementarity, the literature on homosexuality also has presented mixed results with some theorists suggesting that low father identification is related to high feminine gender identity, while others suggest that there is no relationship between father identification and feminine gender identity.

In the present study, it was hypothesized that both gender identity and sexual orientation would be single dimensions or factors of homosexuality. Additionally, it was suggested that at least two variations along the dimension of gender identity would be found among male homosexual Ss. These expected variations were; (a) that there would
be male homosexuals who had a masculine gender identity, and (b) there would be those who had a feminine gender identity. Thirdly, with regard to the association of the process of identification and gender identity, it was suggested that persons having a high Father Identification score would tend to have a more masculine gender identity, while those having a lower Father Identification score would tend to have a more feminine gender identity.

Results revealed that the measures of gender identity and sexual orientation were not independent as expected, but that these measures were associated with each other and were found on Factor #4. Although the hypothesis of independence was not met for these variables, their interactions, as found on Factor #4, can be understood theoretically. Looking at the factor loadings, one can see that the obtained relationship is as follows: a high degree of homosexuality is directly related to a high degree of feminine gender identity. If we look at this relationship from the idea of degrees of freedom, it could be said that a person's degree of commitment to a particular gender identity limits and focuses his sexual experiences, and that when a sexual object choice is made, the range of possibilities are limited by those earlier choices and experiences. Thus, by having a strong feminine gender identity, a male is somewhat automatically brought into the world of homosexuality, since it is here that he will find social acceptance (Bennett, 1947). From this notion, the association of the variables gender identity and sexual orientation is seen as a consequence of social pressures. Additionally, both longitudinal research on effeminate boys (Stoller, 1964, and Green, 1974), and the retrospective research on adult male homosexuals (Whitam, 1977), have consistently found that the presence of a high degree of
cross-sex preferences in childhood is directly related to the later appearance of gender reversals, particularly in homosexuals. As the instrument in the evaluation of the Ss gender identity did include a section on cross-sex preferences in childhood, it is possible that the association of Factor #4 variables is a further demonstration of the relatedness of childhood preferences and adult sexual orientation. Looking at the obtained relationships of Factor #4 variables, one can see that the above explanation holds for all clusters except Cluster III, which had low scores on the childhood cross-sex preferences, had masculine gender identity, and were exclusively homosexual in orientation. In this instance, then, an understanding of the obtained association between gender identity and sexual orientation may be more representative of the suggested independence of these variables.

In terms of the second hypothesis, which proposed that variation in gender identity would be found within the homosexual group, results comparing Factor #4 across clusters revealed that (a) none of the Ss presented a transsexual gender identity, (b) Ss in Clusters I, II, V, VI, VII, and VIII all had a "more feminine than masculine" gender identity, and (c) Ss in both Clusters III and IV (which included all heterosexual Ss) had a "more masculine than feminine" gender identity. Additionally, within both of the non-transsexual categories there were degrees of variation. For example, Ss in Cluster VII who had a mean Feminine Gender Identity combination score of 15.6 were classified "more feminine", while Ss in Cluster II also were classified as "more feminine" but had a mean combination score of 12.8. From these results, we thus can say that gender identities of male homosexual and heterosexual Ss in this study did display the within-group variations as expected. The arrangement
of these variations were as follows: Male heterosexuals and some-male homosexuals presented masculine gender identities, other male homosexuals had feminine gender identities, which varied categorically from almost masculine to strong feminine.

The third hypothesis regarding gender identity proposed that persons with a high father identification score would have a masculine gender identity, while those with a low father identification score would have a feminine gender identity. Due to the fact that all Ss, regardless of gender identity or sexual orientation, produced the same high scores on the Father Identification scale of the Parent-Child Relations Questionnaire, no comparisons could be made. One possible understanding of this response pattern is that the test itself is a poor measure of the concept of father-son identification. Paitich and Langevin (1976) have noted that reliability of results for the parent identification scales could be limited by the small number of items on each scale. Additionally, the question of the influence of social desirability should be raised. Following the testing of many Ss, interviews regarding their impression of the tests were conducted. During these interviews, a large number of Ss strongly objected to the Parent-Child Questionnaire. Two primary objections were (a) that the forced choice response format was not representative of their real interactions with their parents, and (b) that the questionnaire felt weighted toward the negative end. Possibly in response to such objections, Ss were more likely to give a positive picture of their relationship with father. Considering these possible response set biases, one should approach the findings regarding parent-child relations with caution.
Dimension two/dimension five - Factor #1. The second proposed dimension was social sex role. Theoretically it has been suggested that the concept of social sex role includes (a) sex role preference, (b) sex role adoption, and (c) sex role identity. Prior research using homosexual Ss indicates that early cross-sex socialization, which is evidenced in cross-sex preferences, is highly related to the later presence (in adulthood) of gender problems. Additionally, past research on sex role identity suggests that male homosexuals may not just be typed as masculine or feminine, but also that many may be androgynous, or balanced, in their sex role identity.

In the present research, it was hypothesized that social sex-role is an independent psychological sex characteristic. Also, the following relationships regarding sex-role preferences, sex-role identity, and gender identity were hypothesized. One, it was suggested that persons having a high Part B score on the Feminine Gender Identity Scale (a measure of leanings toward transsexualism), and having a large number of cross-sex experiences in childhood would have a feminine sex-role identity. Two, that persons with a low Part B score, and with few cross-sex socialization experiences in childhood would present a masculine sex-role identity. Three, that persons having a low Part B score and having a large number of cross-sex experiences, would describe their sex-role identity as androgynous.

With regard to Dimension Five, current psychological status, it was hypothesized that this group of variables also would form a single or independent dimension. Implied in the suggestion that psychological status would be a dimension in the definition of homosexuality, was the expectation that male homosexuals would show variation within their group,
regarding their style of coping (i.e., level of ego development) and their degree of psychological distress or well-being.

The results indicated that neither social sex-role nor current psychological status achieved independence as a separate dimension. These variables however, were found to be related and were both found on Factor #1. An understanding of the presence of this relationship may be obtained through a review of some prior research on social sex-role.

Bem (1974) and others (e.g., Kelly and Worrell, 1976) have suggested that the degree to which a person is sex-typed or not is associated with a person's degree of adaptability. Their thoughts are as follows: If a person's social identity is bound by rigid rules and regulations (such as men do not cry), then when confronted with a situation that demands flexibility or role reversal, that person will run into conflicts and emotional distress. If, on the other hand, a person develops a social identity that contains a variety of flexible sex-role rules and expectations, then when confronted with a demanding situation, he may chose whatever social sex-role that would most appropriately meet the demand of that situation. Following from these formulations, one thus would expect that measures of psychological and sexual adjustment would appear in a factor along with measures of social sex-role.

As noted above, a second set of hypotheses dealt with possible relationships between the variables, gender identity, sex-role preference, and sex-role identity. The first of these relationships proposed a high positive relationship between the three variables. Looking at the obtained relationships of these variables across clusters, one finds that for Clusters I, II, VI, and VII, a high Part B score was associated with a high number of cross-sex experiences in childhood and a high feminine
social sex-role. Thus, for these clusters, the proposed relationship holds true. The second relationship that was proposed stated that low Part B scores would be associated with few cross-sex socialization experiences and with a masculine social sex-role. Such a relationship was found for Clusters III and IV. The third proposed relationship was that a person could have a low Part B score and a high number of cross-sex experiences and would be androgynous. Scanning the clusters, one notes that no such relationship appeared. The only cluster approaching the suggested pattern was the outlying Cluster VIII. This individual did have a low Part B score and a high number of cross-sex socialization experiences, but instead of being androgynous, he was strongly sex-typed as feminine.

From these results, we can conclude for this sample, that for sex-typed individuals (either masculine or feminine), the type of sex-role preferences learned in childhood is related to the degree to which a person makes a commitment to a masculine or feminine gender identity. Looking at these findings, we also could conclude that for sex-typed individuals, there appears to be a continuity in the sex of two of their psychological sex characteristics (e.g., male gender identity is associated with masculine socialization and sex-preferences in childhood, which is associated with a masculine sex-typed social sex-role in adulthood). With regard to those persons presenting an androgynous social sex-role, the results of this study provide little new information, due to the fact that no cluster greater than one achieved an androgynous social sex-role assignment.

Earlier, it was proposed that in a homosexual sample, one would observe variations among individuals and groups of individuals with
regard to their current psychological status. From the results of this study, we can see that such variations were obtained for the persons sampled. The range of obtained variations appear to be broad. Cluster III and IV presented good psychological adjustment, having few signs of emotional distress, having a high weighting toward positive affects, and presenting the higher levels of ego development. Additionally, when sexual satisfaction is considered an indicator of general satisfaction, then these groups also presented a high degree of well-being. In the midrange were Clusters I and II. Here, it was found that these subjects presented adequate psychological adjustment, but were troubled somewhat by problems of irritability and mild discomfort in social situations. Their levels of ego development were at the Conscientious level and represented the midrange of the sample. Additionally these Ss were in the midrange compared to other Ss, with regard to their degree of sexual satisfaction. Finally, Clusters VI and VII represented the lower extreme of adjustment. These Ss presented the worst psychological adjustment, having indications of severe emotional distress, such as deep depression and possible thought disorders. On the SCTTPR test their scores were the lowest overall. In terms of sexual satisfaction, this same pattern of distress was found, in that Ss of these two clusters were quite disappointed with their current sexual relations, as compared to others in the sample. From these results, it can be concluded that unlike some prior research, which has proposed that to be homosexual means one is emotionally disturbed, the the findings herein of variations in Ss degree of emotional and sexual well-being adds support to the similar findings as presented by Bell and Weinberg.
With regard to the interrelationships of the variables social sex role and psychological status, the results suggested that persons with a masculine social sex role (either homosexual or heterosexual) tended to present fewer indications of psychological distress than did the other Ss. Returning to the hierarchy of emotional states presented in the above discussion, it should be noted that Ss in the midrange group presented a lower degree of sex-typeness than did those with more severe emotional problems, although both groups were labeled "feminine" in their social sex role. Thus, again even with a sex-typed group, variations in the degree of emotional adjustment were related to the degree of sex-typeness. Following these ideas further, one might expect that as persons become more masculine in their social sex role, then they too may begin to show more signs of emotional distress. Reviewing these findings, one can see that Bem's idea of the relationship between a high sex-typed sex role and a high degree of emotional distress gains support from this study.

Dimension four - Factors #6 and #5. The fourth proposed dimension was overt sexual behaviors. Following from the works of Kinsey (1948), Master and Johnson (1979), and Bell and Weinberg (1978), it was hypothesized that types of homosexuals could be discriminated from one another, according to the kinds of sexual behaviors they present. Bell and Weinberg have shown that variations in sexual behaviors, such as the frequency in cruising, number of sex partners, and amount of worry about sexual performance, can result in the divisions of homosexuals into subgroups.

For this study, it was hypothesized that an independent dimension, overt sexual behaviors, would appear and that subjects would vary in degrees along this dimension. The results indicated the one factor, Factor #6,
included only sexual behavior variables. Thus, the notion that overt sexual behaviors may be represented by an independent dimension gained support. In addition, it also was found that Factor #5 included two sexual behavior variables, body image and sexual drive. Also, found on Factor #5 were the variables Ss age and Ss Aggression toward Father. One possible understanding of the relationship of these variables is that both body image and sexual drive more directly reflect a person's social involvement with others, than say the sexual behavior of fantasy. If these two variables do represent, in a sense, a person's "front line" sexual behaviors, then the degree to which he feels positively about his sexuality and the degree to which he overtly involves himself in sexual activities may be related to the person's degree of maturity. Following this line of thought, one then would expect that older Ss would present a more positive body image and a greater amount of sexual activity. One possible intervening variable in this relationship may be the degree to which a person is assertive. The variable Subject's Aggression to Father, then could be seen as an indicator of the person's level of assertiveness. Looking at the results, one finds that for Cluster I the maturity-positive body image-high drive relationship is present. However, this relationship is not found for Cluster VII, whose mean age is only one year younger than that of Cluster I. Looking at the possibility that this difference could be a factor of the group's level of assertiveness, we find that both Cluster I and Cluster VII produced the same score on this parent-child variable. In fact all clusters, except Cluster VIII had the same score. Again, we may be faced with the lack of reliability of the Parent-Child Questionnaire. Therefore, all that can be said about the difference between Cluster I and Cluster VII is that these variations may be influenced by variables
not found on this factor. The possibility of this being the case will be discussed below when clusters as a whole will be discussed. Returning to the maturity/immaturity hypothesis, we find that for Clusters III and VI the suggested relationship, immaturity-poor body image-low sex drive, does hold. With regard to those clusters falling in the midrange, we observed that a predictable relationship held; that average age was related to average body image and average sexual drive. Thus, with the exception of Cluster VII, the proposed relationships for the variables on Factor #5 appears to have a fair amount of support.

With regard to Factor #6, which met the expectation that an overt sexual behaviors dimension would appear, we can recall that the relationships between variables was built on the notion of sexual precociousness. Looking at the results for Clusters II and VI, we find that this hypothesized relationship holds true. However, for Clusters IV and VII, one finds that the proposed relationship does not stand strong. Thus, it is possible that other variables, which are unaccounted for, may be influential. For example, Cluster IV, unlike the other clusters has a heterosexual orientation. These Ss also had the oldest mean age for early sexual interest and thus would be expected to have low scores on all other variables. Yet, it was found that for two of the variables (information and experience) these Ss had high scores and that only on the fantasy variable did they have the expected low scores. In part, this divergence from the proposed pattern could be understood by the fact that the first two variables contained much material that was related specifically to heterosexual relationships, thus these Ss would have a greater chance of getting higher scores (due to greater opportunities for exposure). Therefore in this case, a second set of variables could be of some influence.
Dimension six - Factors #3 and #7. The sixth proposed dimension was labeled parent/child relations. It was hypothesized that this dimension would be bipolar, having positive parent/child relations at one end of the pole and negative parent/child relations at the other end. What was found though was that each parent represented a bipolar dimension. Thus, we had positive and negative representations of both mother and father. This finding of two dimensions, one for each parent is not beyond expectations. According to the literature describing children's actual characterizations of parents, a number of researchers have found separate factors for each parent (Schaefer, 1961). Additionally, some work with adult retrospective memories of parents (Goldin, 1969) also has produced two separate categories, one for each parent (Pritt, 1971). Although the presence of two separate dimensions for parents does not meet this study's hypothesis, it does seem to add more meaningful information regarding the Ss relations with their parents.

In terms of variations among Ss on the obtained dimensions, it was found that Cluster III, IV, and VI presented positive representations for both parents, while Cluster VII presented a negative representation for each parent. In contrast to these balanced descriptions of parents, Clusters I and II gave contrasting pictures of each parent. Cluster I remembered father as negative and mother as positive, while the reverse relationships were described by Cluster II.

From these findings we can conclude that on the two dimensions, which represented Ss relationships with parents, the sample of homosexuals in this study tended to give either a balanced or contrasting representation of their parents.
Unexpected findings - Factors #2 and #8. Two factors were obtained that had not been directly proposed as dimensions of homosexuality. The first of these two represents the variables associated with the Ss psychiatric history. The possibility of such a factor has a long history in the literature regarding the psychological adjustment of homosexuals. In that literature it was found that homosexuals' degree of emotional adjustment was directly related to whether they were in the general population or were in the population of psychiatric patients. Additionally, the research surrounding parent/child relations for homosexuals has produced the finding that family characteristics are significantly different for persons having a patient status than for those who are not patients. Thus, the finding of Factor #2 adds weight to the hypothesis that persons who seek counseling or psychiatric treatment are in some way different than those who do not. Also, the presence of Factor #2 could be seen as tentative support for the earlier hypothesis that current psychological status would be a dimension in the definition of homosexuality.

The second unexpected finding was Factor #8. Included here were the variables sexual attitudes, Mother's Affection, frequency of looking for sexual partners and socioeconomic status. Returning to the literature on homosexuality, one can find support for the combination of all variables except Mother Affection. Bell and Weinberg (1978) have reported that in their recent study of homosexual practices, "cruising" for sexual partners was significantly related to the man's age and socioeconomic status. Specifically, they note that (a) young white males cruise more frequently than older white males and (b) Black males having a higher occupational level also tended to cruise more frequently than other Black males. These
results suggest that the relationship of the variables in Factor #8 could be drawn together by the sexual behavior of cruising. The presence of the variable sexual attitude seems appropriate, since one's attitudes often guides one's behaviors. Looking at the results for this study, we note that for clusters having a conservative or slightly liberal set of sexual attitudes, the frequency of looking for sexual partners was low. In contrast, for the clusters having more liberal sexual attitudes, the frequency of looking for sexual partners was high. Cluster VI however, fell in the midrange for sexual attitudes and had a high frequency of looking for partners. Thus, from these findings we can conclude that for subjects having more extreme attitude scores, there does appear to be a relationship between these scores and the frequency with which they look for sexual partners. However, the midranges of these variables have yet to be clearly defined.

In summarizing the findings regarding the proposed dimensions for an expanded definition of homosexuality, one notes that although the hypothesized independence of dimensions or variables was not obtained for most variables, the basic concepts did appear to hold true. Also, as expected, variations among Ss on factors did appear. With these findings we can move to the conclusion that the factors do represent dimensions of homosexuality. For Factors #1, #4, #5, #6, and #8, the factor dimensions appear to be unipolar. For Factors #2, #3, and #7 however, the factor dimensions appear to be bipolar. In reviewing the relationships among variables, some exceptions to the proposed factor dimensions were found. It is possible that these inconsistencies are a by-product of a "semi-pure" typology. In other words, there may be Ss in the current clusterings who either could be better represented in a different cluster or could
be outliers. Thus, it is suggested that when the cluster analysis procedure is carried further, to the point of obtaining a "pure" typology, then the original variable relationships should be re-evaluated.

**Heterosexual - Homosexual Findings**

As an exploratory hypothesis, it was suggested that (a) although differences between homosexual subjects and heterosexual subjects may be found, these would not be numerous, and (b) that it would be of interest to see if the heterosexual subjects distributed within the clusters. Regarding the first hypothesis, results indicated that heterosexual and homosexual subjects did differ with regard to sexual experience, sexual attitudes, gender identity, and Father's Aggression toward Subject. In terms of the finding that heterosexual subjects had more accurate information about sex than did the homosexual subjects, we could reasonably say that this finding may be representative of the subjects' amount of exposure to females; since the majority of homosexual subjects had little contact with women. Secondly, the finding that homosexual subjects had a more feminine gender identity than did the heterosexual subjects seems to follow from the discussion of sex role socialization and preferences, as presented above. It is of interest to note however, that not all homosexual subjects had a feminine gender identity, a fact which on this large group comparison basis, gets somewhat misplaced. Thirdly, the finding that homosexual subjects reported having experienced more aggression from father than did the heterosexual subjects is a direct replication of Paitich and Langevin's (1976) findings. As discussed in the literature review, aggression between father and son has been found to be the most differentiating family characteristic when homosexual and heterosexual subjects are compared. Finally, it was found that homosexual subjects tended to have significantly
more liberal sexual attitudes than did the heterosexual subjects. Such a finding may be understood through the idea of cognitive dissonance. From this theoretical perspective, persons living a life which is frowned upon by the majority of society would come to accept themselves and their "deviant" social behaviors by expanding their cognitive frame of reference, regarding what is "appropriate" and what is "deviant". The proposal of such a theory has been advanced by the symbolic interactionists theorists, who have developed a system of such cognitive readjustment to explain many observed homosexual behaviors.

From Cluster to Typology

It was proposed that the variations in behaviors observed among male homosexuals would fall into meaningful patterns and that these patterns could form a typology of homosexuality. Secondly, it was suggested that some of the basic components of this typology would be similar to some of the findings obtained by Bell and Weinberg (1978). In discussing these exploratory hypotheses, we will be looking directly at the six clusters that had more than one subject. As noted earlier, the second clustering method did derive different clusters, although 71 subjects were matched across methods. From this latter finding, it is suggested that further work be done to refine the present typology.

Cluster I. The Ss in Cluster I represent a group of persons whose development of psychological sex characteristics has followed a continuous more feminine orientation. They had a large number of cross-sex socialization experiences in childhood, developed a more feminine gender identity and as adults present a "near feminine" social sex role. On the surface, they present an average degree of psychological adjustment, with a mild
to moderate degree of emotional distress; maintaining a fairly positive mood, and typically functioning at the Conscientious level of ego development. In terms of early family relations, mother was remembered as being rather average in both her affections and her restrictions. Father, in contrast, was remembered for his aggressions toward his son.

Looking at these subjects' responses on the Brief Symptom Inventory, we can say that the primary emotional conflict involves the issue of dependence-independence. They appear to be in need of support from others, yet simultaneously feel that others cannot be trusted. Thus, when in a relationship they are faced with the dilemma of how to cope with the fear that their needs of dependency and support will not be met. Characteristically, these subjects use avoidance and projection as their primary means of coping with the above dilemma. Therefore, when a problem arises in a relationship they may either leave unexpectedly or pretend that there is no problem, or they may blame their partner for causing the problem. By the latter path of defense, the subjects then are able to say to themselves that nothing is wrong with them and thus avoid feelings of inferiority. However, although this process of projection may provide tension relief, it does tend to alienate others, which may possibly be a source for these persons' complaints that others are unfriendly to them.

It is of interest to hypothesize further that the defense process discussed above was learned through the son's involvements with father. Father being an aggressive man, possibly attacked the son's dependency needs and vulnerabilities. In order to protect himself from the onslaught, the son would withdraw or would say "that's his problem not mine". Possibly, then in adult relationships similar feelings of being attacked (or not being given proper credit) arise and the subjects respond with their old
patterns of behaviors.

Moving to the sphere of sexual outlets, we see from the results that Cluster I subjects have had adequate exposure to sexual information and tend to be active and highly involved with a number of different sexual partners. Their internal fantasy life also appears to be a world designed to heighten images of external stimulation (e.g., using artificial devices for sexual stimulation). The only fantasy which may represent a connection between the psychological dynamics presented above and this cluster's sexual life is the fantasy of being forced to submit to a sexual partner. From this small bit of information we may extrapolate that in some way the submission fantasy is an acting-out of the person's dependency needs. However, more information would be needed before further connections could be drawn.

In terms of the relationship between Cluster I and the typologies found by Bell and Weinberg, Cluster I appears to have a number of characteristics which are similar to the Functional Type. For example, like the Functional group, Cluster I has a high sex drive, appears to be fairly satisfied with his sexual life, and basically presents an adequate psychological adjustment.

Cluster II. Similar to Cluster I, Cluster II subjects have followed a continuous "more feminine than masculine" orientation in the development of their psychological sex characteristics. Unlike Cluster I though, these subjects are not exclusively homosexual, but are "mainly homosexual with a small amount of heterosexuality". Psychologically, these men are rather well adjusted. However, they do present a slight degree of emotional distress, which manifests in feelings of irritability
and a slight difficulty in controlling aggressive impulses.

In the sexual sphere, these men provide an interesting combination of behaviors. On the one hand, the data describes a group of sexually precocious individuals who are well informed and experienced sexually. On the other hand, these subjects also have a level of sexual drive which is average for the whole group, but which is slightly below that expected for persons having such a high mental involvement with sexual matters. Perhaps an understanding of these differences can be obtained through the following ideas. Cluster II subjects tend to be only slightly satisfied with their general appearance and only moderately satisfied with characteristics of their maleness. It is possible that due to these somewhat negative self-images, these subjects are more hesitant to place themselves in situations of sexual vulnerability with any great frequency. This inhibition of sexual activity in persons who have a high interest in sex, however, probably leads to added frustrations, which appear to be released behaviorally in the form of irritability. Additionally, these subjects appear to re-channel their sexual urges and frustrations into a heightened fantasy life where aggressive and promiscuous fantasies are dominant.

When compared to Bell and Weinberg's typology of homosexualities, Cluster II shows minimal similarity to the "Open-Couple" group, in that they both are fairly well adjusted, although the "Open-Couple" subjects are sexually more active than were the subjects of Cluster II.

*Cluster III.* Unlike Clusters I and II, Cluster III Ss had a more masculine orientation throughout the development of their psychological sex characteristics. Similar to Cluster I though, these men are exclusively
homosexual in terms of behaviors and feelings. Psychologically, they are very stable; showing few signs of emotional distress, describing themselves as joyful, content, and vigorous; and feeling highly satisfied with their sexual relationships. In terms of characteristic level of ego development, these men are at a level where independence, autonomy, and self-fulfillment are goals.

In contrast to the above average functioning Cluster III subjects presented in their emotional life, their sexual functioning was slightly below the sample's average. Unlike Cluster II though, their more inhibited sexual style does not appear to be related to a negative self-concept. In attempting to understand this pattern of variables, we must also note that these men were young and showed a fairly high degree of social desirability. This combination of variables suggests that although these men present themselves as independent and autonomous, they also are fairly conscious of being socially appropriate. Thus, it is as if these persons present themselves in a somewhat of a "too positive" light: "I am feeling very well, thank you and I am not abnormal sexually, thank you". Some evidence for this suggestion is found in the fantasies released by these persons. There one sees a number of fantasies related to "breaking the rules"; such as mateswapping and having a forbidden lover.

In terms of sexual satisfaction and psychological adjustment, this group is similar to Bell and Weinberg's "Close-Couple". The majority of Cluster III subjects however, were not "attached" as were those subjects in the "Close-Couple" type.

Cluster IV. Cluster IV Ss, like Cluster III, had a more masculine orientation during their development of psychological sex characteristics.
Unlike any of the other clusters though, this cluster had a "mainly heterosexual orientation with a small degree of homosexuality". It is of interest to note that although Cluster III and IV both had continuous or congruent masculine developments, Cluster IV's social sex role was slightly less sex-typed (or leaning slightly more toward being androgynous) than that of Cluster III.

On the whole, both psychologically and sexually, Cluster IV represents the more conservative aspects of this sample. Emotionally, they are average in adjustment; showing little fluctuation in mood and few signs of emotional distress. Sexually, they are somewhat inhibited, tending to become interested in sex later than most men in the sample, feeling uncomfortable with the exposure of their body, and having a rather limited range of sexual fantasies. In terms of understanding this cluster in more depth, it can only be said that similar to Cluster III, this group had high social desirability scores, which suggests that some of the conservatism observed may have been a product of the desire to present oneself in a socially acceptable manner.

Since this group contained both homosexual and heterosexual subjects no comparison group is available in the Bell and Weinberg typology.

Cluster VI. Cluster VI Ss have followed a feminine orientation throughout the development of their psychological sex characteristics. Unlike Clusters I and II, who followed a similar orientation in development, Cluster VI presents an exceptionally rigid, feminine sex-typed social sex role. Psychologically, this group displays serious emotional problems. They tend to be troubled by somatic problems, as well as high levels of anxiety and strong feelings of depression. Socially, they appear to
be somewhat withdrawn. The degree of emotional distress has reached such a point for this group, that many wonder if "something is wrong with my mind". However, their degree of self-satisfaction suggests that these subjects maintain a sense of body integrity. Thus, it is felt that the fear of loss of control does not necessarily mean that these persons are approaching a psychotic state.

Sexually, Cluster VI subjects are dissatisfied with their current sexual relations and present inhibitions in sexual drive. The low drive score however, is found to be slightly discrepant from the fact that this group tends to cruise frequently. In terms of experience and exposure, to sexual information, Cluster VI appears to have experienced a delayed development.

Considering the young age of Cluster VI subjects and the high degree of anxiety they are experiencing, it is hypothesized that the emotional disturbances appearing in this group, are related to their adjustment to "coming out". Since specific data regarding the age of "coming out" is not available, the following formulations will be made on the basis of available data. If we follow the idea that when an adult first learns a new behavior or for the first time makes a commitment to a set of controversial beliefs, he will tend to overstate the the behaviors or beliefs, then the high sex-type scores for this cluster take on a different light. In adolescents and young adults, such an "overpracticing" is associated with "identity moratorium". For the male homosexual, "coming out" can be a time of extreme stress, during which few support systems are available. Consequently, feelings of anxiety, alienation, and loneliness are heightened. Additionally, during this period of transition, one must re-align many of his basic beliefs and assumptions about himself and others. Such
major cognitive and emotional adjustments, if not dealt with adequately, can result in overwhelming feelings of psychic disorganization. One manner of coping with all this stress and turmoil is to withdraw. A second style of coping may be to peripherally involve oneself in the activities and behaviors of the new "identification" group. Thus, gaining a sense of belongingness without having to fully identify oneself with the full meaning of one's actions.

Applying these formulations to Cluster VI subjects, we may gain an understanding of the problems presented. It is of course necessary to remember that no matter how distressing a life change may be, basically the outcome of the situation depends upon the individual's coping ability. Looking at the data, we find that for Cluster VI the primary coping mechanisms are withdrawal, projection, somatization, and avoidance through cognitive confusion. Although such coping skills would lead one to question if these persons will ever figure out a way to help themselves, the data suggest that a large proportion of these subjects have pursued external assistance (counseling) in learning how to cope. Additionally, the fact that Cluster VI subjects tend to be in counseling longer than other subjects possibly reflects the degree of difficulty subjects have in changing their rather rigid defense system.

Comparing the data for Cluster VI to the typologies of Bell and Weinberg, we see that the "Asexual" type is highly similar in terms of level of emotional adjustment and level of sexual activity.

Cluster VII. In terms of psychological sex characteristics, Cluster VII has followed a more feminine orientation. Compared to the other subjects having a similar line of development, Cluster VII falls about midrange
between androgyny and a strong feminine sex-typed social role.
Psychologically, Cluster VII, like Cluster VI, presents serious emotional difficulties. These subjects report a high degree of somatization, strong feelings of depression, and poor interpersonal relations. Additionally, Cluster VII subjects noted that they had the "slight" belief that "someone had control of their thoughts" and that "something is wrong with my mind".

In the sexual sphere, the data describe a group of men who are well established in their sexual patterns. Having become involved sexually at an early age, Cluster VII subjects report liberal sexual attitudes and a greater than average amount of sexual experience. Currently though, they are only moderately satisfied with their physical appearance, display a low sex drive, tend to look for sex partners fairly frequently, and are unsatisfied with their sexual relationships.

As we attempt to understand the patterns of behaviors presented by Cluster VII, we take note that unlike Cluster VI, these subjects are somewhat older. Also, the types of emotional distresses they describe are notably different. In Cluster VI, subjects were anxious and lonely. Cluster VII subjects, in contrast, appear to be struggling with feelings of hopelessness and worthlessness, as well as what seems to be a rather basic lack of trust and involvement with others. To cope with these emotions, Cluster VII subjects tend (a) to withdraw from others, (b) to turn their tensions inward, which leads to somatic difficulties, and (c) to project their difficulties outward onto others. Unlike Cluster VI also, the men in Cluster VII have not sought professional help.

From the data, it is suggested that Cluster VII represents a group of men who are working their way into a steady pattern of emotional
disturbance and poor interpersonal relationships. Due to these problems long-term sexual relations are probably difficult and sexual encounters thus become the preferred sexual outlet. In addition, due to the subjects' age, lack of involvement in counseling, and fairly well established patterns of difficulties, the prognosis for change in this group is somewhat unfavorable.

In comparison to Bell and Weinberg's typologies, Cluster VII comes nearest the "Asexual" type in terms of level of emotional adjustment and lower level of sexual activity.

In summarizing the above discussions of the obtained clusters, it can be said (a) that for this sample, which primarily had sex-typed social sex roles, there was a notable degree of continuity between psychological sex characteristics, (b) that by expanding the definition of homosexuality to include the concept of coping styles, it appears that even greater differentiations between types can be made, and (c) that there appears to be more interaction between the categories of psychological sex and types of overt sexual behaviors than has been previously proposed in the literature. Additionally, in this review it became obvious that the current rather "all or none" language used in describing the psychological sex characteristics of subjects is very limiting, which suggests more semantic refinement would be helpful.

Summary and Conclusions

With regard to the primary proposals of this study, (a) that male homosexuals express their sexuality through a variety of psycho-social-behavioral characteristics, and (b) among themselves present patterns which reflect types of homosexualities, it may be concluded that for this sample, varieties or types of homosexualities were evident. Of these,
one integrating set of patterns was most outstanding. The relationships among variables were as follows: (a) related to the degree of masculine or feminine continuity in the development of Ss psychological sex characteristics was the degree of the Ss sex-typeness on measures of social sex role, (b) related to the degree of sex-typeness were variables of general psychological adjustment, (c) subdividing the psychological category were the variables age and style of coping (or personality style) and (d) associated with these coping styles were aspects of the subjects' sexual behaviors. The above pattern of interassociations among variables appeared to remain fairly stable across varieties of sexual orientation. With regard to the specific "types" obtained in this study, we must caution that although they are to a large degree moderately similar to aspects of Bell and Weinberg's established types, in terms of psychological variables, there were a number of differences in the patterns of sexual behaviors. Considering the fact that the clusters are in need of statistical refinement, we may find that it is more appropriate to consider the obtained "types" or clusters both as one example of possible patterns in homosexuality and as an intermediate step in the development of a "pure" typology.
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As the present study investigated various behavioral and psychological correlates of homosexuality, not any biological correlates, only a brief review of contemporary biological research was provided. However, readers interested in further information are referred to the following authors: Green, 1974; Livingood, 1972; Karlin, 1971; Marmor, 1980; and Weinberg and Bell, 1972.
VOLUNTEERS NEEDED

Male, caucasian, homosexuals are needed as volunteers for a research project being conducted through the Louisiana State University Department of Psychology. All questionnaires are identified by code numbers and are strictly confidential. If a volunteer wishes, a summary of results will be made available.

Volunteers or persons wanting more information please:

1. Fill out the card below and mail
OR
2. Call (collect) - (504) 344-9721 (M,T,F, & Wknds: 9AM-8PM)

Thank you for your interest.

DETACH CARD HERE AND MAIL:

NAME: (First Only) ______________

PHONE NUMBER: ______________

BEST TIME TO PHONE: ______________

D. Miller, M.A.
P.O. Box 24515
LSU
Baton Rouge, La. 70893
Voluntary Consent

I voluntarily agree to participate in the research project on male homosexuality which is being conducted by a doctoral candidate of the Louisiana State University Department of Psychology.

I understand that all information I provide will be strictly confidential, will be identified by a research number only, and will be used for research purposes only. I am aware that as a participant I have the right to withdraw from this study at any time that I may choose. Additionally, I know that I can request feedback on the results of this project if I so desire.

__________________________________________  ______________________________
Signature                                      Date

__________________________________________
Witness
Voluntary Consent

I voluntarily agree to participate in the research project on human sexuality which is being conducted by a doctoral candidate of the Louisiana State University Department of Psychology.

I understand that all information I provide will be strictly confidential, will be identified by a research number only, and will be used for research purposes only. I am aware that as a participant I have the right to withdraw from this study at any time that I may choose. Additionally, I know that I can request feedback on the results of this project if I so desire.

Signature ___________________________ Date ___________________________

Witness ___________________________
PERSONAL DATA SHEET

Please provide the information requested below, but do NOT include your name on this or any other form in this research packet. Your participation in this research project is sincerely appreciated.

1. Age __________

2. Please look at the following Kinsey Scale. It is known that there are some people who are exclusively homosexual and some who are exclusively heterosexual. Still others fall somewhere in between in terms of their sexual behaviors and feelings. First, please classify yourself on this scale as you see yourself now in terms of your sexual behaviors. Second, classify yourself on this scale with respect to your sexual feelings. (Please circle the number under each heading which best described you.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BEHAVIOR</th>
<th>FEELINGS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exclusively heterosexual</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mainly heterosexual with a small degree of homosexuality</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mainly heterosexual with a substantial degree of homosexuality</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equally heterosexual and homosexual</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mainly homosexual with a substantial degree of heterosexuality</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mainly homosexual with a small degree of heterosexuality</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exclusively homosexual</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Current living arrangements (please check one):

I am currently living alone ______
with a male roommate ______
with a female roommate ______
with a male lover ______
with a female lover ______
with my husband ______
with my wife ______
with my parents ______
other (specify) _____________________________
4. How often during the last year have you specifically gone out to look for a sexual partner? (Check one)

- More than twice a week
- Once or twice a week
- A few times a month
- Once a month or less
- Not at all

5. During the past year, how many different partners have you had sex with? (Check one)

- None
- 1-2
- 3-5
- 6-10
- 11-19
- 20-50
- 51-99
- 100 or more

6. Have you ever seen a professional, such as a psychiatrist, psychologist, Clergyman, or social worker, for a personal or emotional problem?

- Yes
- No

7. If you answered "yes" to number 7, please answer the following:
   How old were you the first time you sought professional help? ______
   Did you go for reasons related to your homosexuality? (Check one)
   - Yes
   - No
   How long were you seen? ______________

8. Marital Status: (Check one)

   - Single
   - Married
   - "Living Together"
   - Separated
   - Divorced
   - Widowed

9. Name the highest grade you have completed in school. ______________

10. Please give the exact name of your current occupation (e.g., carpenter, high school teacher, department manager, etc.)

11. Please list the source or sources of your current incomes (e.g., wages, inherited money, commissions, stocks, etc., or any combination of these).
PLEASE NOTE:

Copyrighted materials in this document have not been filmed at the request of the author. They are available for consultation, however, in the author's university library.

These consist of pages:

170 - 197
January 26, 1981

Dear Volunteer:

The questionnaires you are about to fill out are part of a research project on male homosexuality being conducted through the LSU Department of Psychology. One goal of this research is to gather up-to-date information regarding the sexual practices, attitudes, and styles of relating expressed by gay men of a variety of ages and backgrounds. In psychology, as in society at large, little has been done to expose the public to the variety of feelings and issues faced by gays. Due to this lack of information, gays then often have been lumped together under a set of negative, out-of-date stereotypes. This research project thus hopes to begin to fill this information gap by looking at some of the different styles of gay life.

Below are some guidelines for completing the attached questionnaires.

MATERIALS: As you will note, you have been given two envelopes, one labeled "A" and one labeled "B". Please open envelope "A" first, and do not open envelope "B" until you have completed all materials found in envelope "A". Please answer all forms in order given. DO NOT LOOK AHEAD.

CONSENT: Inside envelope "A" you will find a Voluntary Consent Form. Please read the consent form, sign it (first name only, if desired) and date it. I have already signed the witness section. This consent form is to guarantee your legal right to confidentiality.

INSTRUCTIONS: All questionnaires are self-explanatory. Please carefully read all instructions prior to beginning. If at any time you should have any questions, please feel free to call me at 344-9721.

TIME: Completion of questionnaires will take about two hours. Please try to answer all forms on the same day, since moods change on different days.

FEEDBACK: If you wish written feedback of the results of this study, please provide me with an address to which I can send the information. This address may be written on the consent form. I expect the final results to be available by late April or mid-May, 1981.

RETURN OF MATERIALS: Please return all materials in the original envelopes (A & B). Also enclosed in envelope "B" is a third plain envelope in which you may place all answer sheets. This third envelope may be sealed to guarantee total confidentiality.

REFERRALS: If after completing these questionnaires you would like to refer a gay male friend or a straight male friend (who is about your age), please write his name (first) and telephone number on the back of the last page of the Personal Data Sheet or give me a call. Referrals of straight male friends are needed since all answers obtained from gay volunteers will be compared to those obtained from straight volunteers. Please note that although the
above comparisons will be made, the primary focus of this study is on the life styles and feelings of gay men.

YOUR OPINION: If after completing all questionnaires, you would like to write a brief statement regarding your reaction to this research project, PLEASE DO SO!

I greatly appreciate your cooperation and help and am available, by phone, to answer any questions which may arise.

Thanks,

D'Lane Miller

D'Lane Miller
344-9721
January 26, 1981  
(Out-of-Town)

Dear Volunteer:

The questionnaires you are about to fill out are part of a research project on male homosexuality being conducted through the LSU Department of Psychology. One goal of this research is to gather up-to-date information regarding the sexual practices, attitudes, and styles of relating expressed by gay men of a variety of ages and backgrounds. In psychology, as in society at large, little has been done to expose the public to the variety of feelings and issues faced by gays. Due to this lack of information, gays then often have been lumped together under a set of negative, out-of-date stereotypes. This research project thus hopes to begin to fill this information gap by looking at some of the different styles of gay life.

Below are some guidelines for completing the attached questionnaires.

MATERIALS: As you will note, you have been given two envelopes, one labeled "A" and one labeled "B". Please open envelop "A" first, and do not open envelop "B" until you have completed all materials found in envelop "A". Please answer all forms in order given.

DO NOT LOOK AHEAD.

CONSENT: Inside envelop "A" you will find a Voluntary Consent Form. Please read the consent form, sign it (first name only or alias, if desired) and date it. I have already signed the witness section. This consent form is to guarantee your legal right to confidentiality.

INSTRUCTIONS: All questionnaires are self-explanatory. Please carefully read all instructions prior to beginning. If at any time you should have questions, please feel free to call me collect at (504) 344-9721.

TIME: Completion of questionnaires will take about two hours. Please answer all forms on the same day, since moods change on different days.

FEEDBACK: If you wish written feedback of the results of this study, please provide me with an address to which I can send the information. This address may be written on the consent form. I expect the final results to be available by late April or mid-May, 1981.

RETURN OF MATERIALS: Please return all materials, as well as the original envelopes. Enclosed in envelop "B" is a third, pre-addressed and stamped return envelop. Place all completed materials in this third envelop and drop in the mail.

REFERRALS: If after completing these questionnaires you would like to refer a gay male friend or a straight male friend (who is about your age), please write his name/first and telephone number on the back of the last page of the Personal Data Sheet, or give me a call. Referrals of straight male friends are needed since all answers obtained from gay volunteers will be compared to those obtained from straight volunteers. Please note that although the
above comparisons will be made, the primary focus of this study is on the life styles and feelings of gay men.

YOUR OPINION: If after completing all questionnaires, you would like to write a brief statement regarding your reaction to this research project, PLEASE DO SO.

DEADLINE: Please mail all completed materials by February 28, 1981. Or call if you wish for the materials to be picked up personally.

I greatly appreciate your cooperation and help. Please do call (collect) if you have questions.

Thanks,

D'Lane Miller

D'Lane Miller
(504) 344-9721
January 26, 1981

Dear Volunteer:

The questionnaires you are about to fill out are part of a research project on human sexuality being conducted through the LSU Department of Psychology. One goal of this research is to gather up-to-date information regarding the sexual practices, attitudes, and styles of relating expressed by men of a variety of ages and backgrounds. In psychology, as in society at large, information pertaining to the varieties of sexual feelings and issues faced by males remains minimal. Due to this lack of information, some males then have been lumped together under a set of negative, out-of-date stereotypes. This research project thus hopes to begin to fill this information gap by looking at some of the different styles through which men relate sexually.

Below are some guidelines for completing the attached questionnaires.

MATERIALS: As you will note, you have been given two envelopes, one labeled "A" and one labeled "B". Please open envelope "A" first, and do not open envelope "B" until you have completed all materials found in envelope "A". Please answer questionnaires in the order presented. DO NOT LOOK AHEAD.

CONSENT: Inside envelope "A" you will find a Voluntary Consent Form. Please read the consent form, sign if (first name only, if desired) and date it. I have already signed the witness section. This consent form is to guarantee your legal right to confidentiality.

INSTRUCTIONS: All questionnaires are self-explanatory. Please carefully read all instructions prior to beginning. If at any time you should have any questions, please feel free to call (collect) 1-504-344-9721.

TIME: Completion of all questionnaires will take about two hours. Please try to answer all forms on the same day, since moods change on different days.

FEEDBACK: If you wish written feedback of the results of this study, please provide me with an address to which I can send the information. This address may be written on the Consent Form. I expect the final results to be available by late April or mid-May, 1981.

RETURN OF MATERIALS: Please return all materials in the original envelopes (A & B). Also enclosed in envelope "B" is a third plain envelope in which you may place all answer sheets. This third envelop may be sealed and mailed to D'Lane Miller, 711 N. 8th St., Baton Rouge, LA 70802, if you wish.

YOUR OPINION: If after completing all questionnaires, you would like to write a brief statement regarding your reaction to this research project, PLEASE DO SO.

I greatly appreciate your cooperation; please call if you have questions. D'Lane Miller; 1-504-344-9721.
Selection of Variables for Factor Analysis

Two sets of variables were evaluated to determine their appropriateness for inclusion in the factor analysis. Set one included all the original primary test scores; such as those obtained from the DSFI. The criteria for placement in the factor analysis variable pool for set one variables were (a) the scores were to have a variance greater than zero, (b) index scores were to be excluded unless they provided greater conceptual meaningfulness than the individual component scores taken separately, and (c) variables having more than five missing values were to be excluded. Applying the above criteria to the original list of 39 primary test variables, resulted in the exclusion of 11 variables (i.e., BSRI-M, BSRI-F, FGI-AB, PCR-Scales 17 and 18, on the basis of criterion "b"; DSFI-GSSI, using criterion "c"; and PCR-Scales 3, 13, 14, 15, and 16 on the basis of criterion "a"). Set two variables included all 27 demographic and administration variables. Criteria for retention as a factor pool variable were the same three criteria used for set one variables, plus the addition of a fourth requirement; that the variable retained should account for at least a minimum of 8% of the variance observed across the 39 test variables. Stating the fourth criterion in operational terms, a variable was retained if a minimum of three significant ($p < .05$) chi-square comparisons was obtained, when a set two variable was compared to all 39 set one variables. Based on these four criteria, eight of the 27 set two variables were placed in the factor analysis variable pool.

Tables 2 and 3 (see Method, Data Analysis, Number 2, in text) report the significant chi-square comparisons obtained by the eight retained
demographic variables. Looking at the first of these variables separately, one finds that the age of subjects contributed to the variances in subjects' DSFI-Sexual Attitude Subtest scores, PCR-Mother's Aggression to Father Subscale scores, PCR-Mother Competence Subscale scores, and PCR-Father Competence Subscale scores. Specifically, these results revealed that (a) the younger subjects tended to hold more conservative sexual attitudes, while older subjects presented more liberal sexual attitudes; (b) that younger subjects tended to report that mother was not aggressive toward father, while older subjects' scores on this scale were not discriminating; (c) that regardless of age, all subjects tended to describe mother as more competent rather than less competent, and (d) that both older and younger subjects were more likely to describe father as less competent than as more competent. A second demographic variable which was retained for the factor analysis was the Index of Social Status. Comparison of this variable with test variables resulted in six significant chi-squares. On the DSFI-Information subtest, subjects in the higher socioeconomic group had higher scores, thus reflecting more accuracy in the knowledge of sexual facts, while subjects in the lower socioeconomic group had lower scores, thus suggesting that they have less accurate sexual information. A similar pattern of differences between high and low socioeconomic groups also was seen in the DSFI-Sexual Satisfaction subtest scores, with the higher SES group being more satisfied and the lower SES group presenting scores which suggest a lower level of sexual satisfaction. Looking at socioeconomic differences, one finds that a higher level social status was related to lower FGI-A and FGI-AB scores, suggesting these subjects present less of a feminine gender identity. In contrast though, subjects at the lower
SES levels had higher FGI-A and FGI-AB scores, which reflect a greater presentation of a feminine gender identity. On two PCR subscales, Mother's Aggression to Subject and Mother Strictness, all subjects, regardless of SES, had lower scores, thus indicating that mother was seen as low on aggression and low on strictness. The only city of residence reaching the significance levels necessary for retention was Baton Rouge. Reviewing the specific chi-square comparison results, one notes that subjects from Baton Rouge had significantly lower scores on the PCR-Mother's Aggression to Father subscales than subjects from other cities. Additionally, when comparisons were made for Baton Rouge subjects and non-Baton Rouge subjects, both groups obtained significantly low scores on three of the PCR subscales; Mother's Aggression to Subject, Mother Competence, and Mother's Strictness.

Included in the demographic variables that were retained for the factor analysis also were three of the variables associated with subjects history of mental health services. The first of these variables assessed whether subjects had ever sought professional counseling. Results of the chi-square comparisons revealed the following relationships: (a) persons who had professional counseling presented higher scores on the DSFI-Sexual Attitudes subtest, suggesting they held more liberal sexual attitudes, while subjects who had never sought counseling had lower scores and thus, were more conservative in their sexual attitudes; (b) subjects having had counseling had higher scores on the DSFI-Fantasy subtest, while subjects without therapy presented lower fantasy scores; (c) for both the FGI-A and the FGI-AB scores, subjects with a history of counseling had higher scores, while subjects without such a history had lower scores on this
measure of feminine gender identity; (d) subjects having had professional counseling also demonstrated a greater variation in range of mean masculine endorsements on the BSRI-M; and (e) subjects never having had counseling revealed significantly higher scores on the BSRI-SD scale, suggesting that these subjects had a strong tendency to present themselves in a socially desirable manner. The second mental health variable pertained to the age at which subjects first sought counseling. Results of the chi-square comparisons indicated that this variable also accounted for some of the variance found in subjects' scores on the DSFI-Sexual Attitudes subtest, the DSFI-Fantasy subtest, both the FGI-A and the FGI-AB, as well as the BSRI-M and the BSRI-SD. Observed relationships for these variables were, (a) subjects who sought counseling at an early age had more conservative sexual attitudes, (b) subjects who sought counseling at an older age, tended to have a large number of sexual fantasies, (c) for both the FGI-A and the FGI-AB, older subjects had higher scores, suggesting a stronger pull toward a feminine gender identity, (d) persons who sought counseling at an early age obtained a higher mean masculine score on the BSRI and (e) subjects seeking counseling at an older age presented a greater desire to represent themselves in a socially desirable manner. The final mental health related variable was the length of time in counseling. Once again, the same test variables, identified in the above two sets of comparisons, also were found to be significantly related to length of time in treatment. These significant chi-square comparisons were accounted for by the following patterns; (a) shorter time in treatment was related to more conservative sexual attitudes, while longer time in treatment was related to more liberal sexual attitudes; (b) subjects
spending less time in counseling had lower fantasy scores with the reverse also holding true; (c) persons having a longer time in treatment had higher scores on both feminine gender identity measures, while person's having a shorter treatment time had lower scores on the same measures; (d) subjects having had less counseling had a higher mean score on the BSRI-M and; (e) subjects who were in counseling longer had less of a desire to present themselves in a socially desirable manner.

The final set of variables meeting the criteria for inclusion in the factor analysis variable pool dealt with aspects of the subjects' sexual history. The first of these two variables pertained to the frequency with which subjects specifically looked for sexual partners over the past year. For this variable, it was found that those subjects who looked for partners more frequently also had greater variation in their FGI-AB scores, as well as greater variation in their PCR - Father's Aggression to Mother subscale scores. For both those subjects who had looked frequently for partners and those who had looked infrequently or not at all, their scores on the PCR-Father Competence subscale were high, suggesting both groups remember father as competent. The second variable in this group noted the age at which subjects first became interested in sexual activity. Patterns which achieved significance were as follows: (a) subjects having an early interest in sexual activities had higher scores on the DSFI - Sexual Attitudes subtest, indicating a more liberal sexual attitude; (b) earlier interest subjects scored higher on the DSFI - Fantasy subtest; (c) earlier interest subjects also had higher total negative scores on the Affects Balance Scale, suggesting the presence of a more negative mood; and (d) as seen in other variables
under discussion, regardless of age of interest in sexual activities, all subjects had lower scores on the PCR - Mother's Aggression to Subject, higher scores on the PCR - Father Competence subscale and higher scores on the PCR - Father Affection subscale.
Table K-1

Frequency of Age and Marital Characteristics of Homosexual Sample
by City of Residence and Recruitment Source

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City Source</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Marital Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25-35</td>
<td>36-45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>27.48</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bar</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>30.00</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BR</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>21.33</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fly</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>26.25</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Org</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>30.50</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>33.89</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| PC          | 18| 30.83| 2 | 4 | 5 | 7 | 9 | 1 | 3 | - | 2 | - | 2 | 1 |
| Bar         | 0 | -   | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| LAF         | 0 | -   | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Fly         | 0 | -   | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Org         | 0 | -   | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Total       | 18| 30.83| 2 | 4 | 5 | 7 | 9 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 1 |

| PC          | 21| 28.75| 2 | 5 | 10 | 3 | 14 | - | - | 2 | - | 3 | 2 |
| Bar         | 0 | -   | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| NO          | 0 | -   | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Fly         | 0 | -   | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Org         | 10| 29.10| 3 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 4 | 1 | - | - | - | 4 | 1 |
| Total       | 31| 28.90| 5 | 6 | 14 | 5 | 18 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 3 |

**Grand Total** | 109| 31.21| 26| 26| 30| 26| 64| 3| 4| 4| 4| 0| 24| 6 |

*Note:* Abbreviations are as follows: BR = Baton Rouge, LAF = Lafayette, NO = New Orleans, PC = Personal Contact, Ad = Advertisement, Fly = Flyer, Org = Homophile Organization, Sin = Single, MAR = Married, LT = Living
Table 1 (Continued)

Together, Sep = Separated, Div = Divorced, Lov = Lovers, Com = Combination or Ss who were separated or divorced and now are involved in a lover relationship.

\(^a\)Numbers are spuriously high since some Ss were contacted both through a flyer and a bar.

\(^b\)One S (from New Orleans) did not provide his age, thus age group totals reflect one less S.
Table K-2

Frequency of Living Arrangements and Occupation Levels of Homosexual Sample by City of Residence and Recruitment Source

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>( n^a )</th>
<th>Current Living Arrangements</th>
<th>Occupation Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bar</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BR</td>
<td>Ad</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fly</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Org</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PC    | 18     | 3  | 4  | 6  | -- | 12 | 11 | 2  | 1  | 6  | 4  | 2  | 2  | 1  |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
| Bar   | 0      | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
| LAF   | Ad     | 0  | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
| Fly   | 0      | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
| Org   | 0      | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
| Total | 18     | 3  | 4  | 0  | 6  | 0  | 0  | 12 | 1  | 1  | 1  | 6  | 4  | 2  | 1  |    |    |    |    |    |    |

PC    | 21     | 11 | 4  | 5  | -- | 1  | -- | 2  | 3  | 4  | 5  | 5  | 2  |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
| Bar   | 0      | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
| NO    | Ad     | 0  | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
| Fly   | 0      | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
| Org   | 10     | 3  | 1  | 6  | -- | -- | -- | 1  | 2  | 4  | 2  | 1  |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
| Total | 31     | 14 | 5  | 0  | 11 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 1  | 0  | 0  | 3  | 5  | 4  | 9  | 7  | 3  |    |    |    |

GRAND TOTAL | 109 | 30 | 28 | 2 | 35 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 10 | 1 | 1 | 6 | 5 | 30 | 13 | 19 | 20 | 15 |

Note: Abbreviations are as follows: BR = Baton Rouge, LAF = Lafayette, NO = New Orleans, PC = Personal Contact, Ad = Advertisement, Fly = Flyer,
Table 2 (Continued)


aN numbers may be spuriously large since some S were contacted simultaneously through a bar and a flyer.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City Source</th>
<th>n&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Education Level</th>
<th>Social Class</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&gt;8 Yrs</td>
<td>8-12 H.S.</td>
<td>Coll.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bar</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fly</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Org</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City Source</th>
<th>n&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Education Level</th>
<th>Social Class</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&gt;8 Yrs</td>
<td>8-12 H.S.</td>
<td>Coll.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bar</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ad</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fly</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Org</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City Source</th>
<th>n&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Education Level</th>
<th>Social Class</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&gt;8 Yrs</td>
<td>8-12 H.S.</td>
<td>Coll.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bar</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ad</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fly</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Org</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** Abbreviations are as follows: BR = Baton Rouge, LAF = Lafayette, NO = New Orleans, PC = Personal Contact, Ad = Advertisement, Fly = Flyer,
Table 3 (Continued)

Org = Homophile Organization, LL = Lower Lower Socioeconomic Status (SES), UL = Upper Lower SES, LM = Lower Middle SES, UM = Upper Middle SES, and UC = Upper Class

*aNumbers may be spuriously large, since some S were contacted simultaneously through a bar and a flyer.*
Table K-4

Frequency of Demographic Characteristics of Heterosexual Sample by City of Residence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Marital Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&gt;25</td>
<td>26-35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BR</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>29.66</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAF</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>29.33</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>29.99</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Current Living Arrangements</th>
<th>Occupation Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>MR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BR</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAF</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Educational Level</th>
<th>2 Years</th>
<th>Grad. or Prof. Degree</th>
<th>Social Class</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&gt;8</td>
<td>8-12</td>
<td>H.S.</td>
<td>College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BR</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAF</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Abbreviations are as follows: BR = Baton Rouge, LAF = Lafayette, NO = New Orleans, Sin = Single = Mar = Married, LT = Living Together, Sep = Separated, Div = Divorced, Wid = Widowed, Lov = Lovers, A = Alone, MR = Male Roommate, Fr = Female Roommate, ML = Male Lover, FL = Female Lover, H = Husband, W = Wife, P = Parent, GP = Grandparent, O = Other, US = Unskilled, SS = Semi-Skilled, SA = Skilled Apprentice, SM = Skilled
Table 4 (Continued)

master, SB = Small Business, SP = Semi-Professional = P = Professional, LL = Lower Lower Socioeconomic Class (SES), UL = Upper Lower SES, LM = Lower Middle SES, UM = Upper Middle SES, and UC = Upper Class.
Cluster I

Cluster I consisted of a group of males whose sexual feelings and sexual behaviors were almost exclusively homosexual. As a group, their scores on the Feminine Gender Identity Scale ($X_{FGIA} = 9; X_{FGIB} = 5.7; \text{ and } X_{FGIAB} = 14.6$) suggest that their core gender identity is more feminine than masculine. These scores, however, are not indicative of a strong feminine gender identity, or transsexualism. Compared to other clusters, $n$ greater than one, in this sample, Cluster I had scores which were ranked highest on the FGI-A (early cross-sex experiences) and highest on the FGI-Combination scale (leanings toward transsexualism). (See Figure 1, FGI.) With regard to social sex-role, Cluster I presented a mean Androgyny score of .65, which placed them in the "near feminine" group, as compared to the males in Bem's (1974) Stanford normative group. In the present sample though, the BSRI-Androgyny score for Cluster I (see Figure 1, BSRI) is only slightly above the average. Similarly, the Gender Role Definition score on the DSFI (see Figure 1, GRD under DSFI) also was in the average range, as compared to others in this sample.

Looking at the sexual behaviors of Cluster I Ss, we see that their mean age of first interest in sexual activity was twelve years, and their mean age for first sexual intercourse was sixteen years. Comparing Cluster I Ss to other Ss, we find that their general knowledge of sexual information is slightly above average, while their range of sexual experience is average. (See Figure 1, INF and EXP, under DSFI.) In contrast though, Cluster I ranks highest (compared to other clusters, $n$ greater than one on sexual drive, or the frequency with which they engage in various sexual activities. (See Figure 1, DR under DSFI.) Cluster I also ranked highest in terms of the degree to which Ss maintain a liberal sexual attitude.
Looking at Cluster I's position with regard to the expansiveness of Ss sexual fantasy life (see Figure 1, FAN under DSFI), we see that this cluster again ranks high compared to other clusters, n greater than one, being surpassed only by Cluster II. Sexual fantasy items endorsed by more than fifty percent of the Ss in Cluster I were, (a) having more than one sexual partner simultaneously, (b) having intercourse in unusual positions, (c) using artificial devices for sexual stimulation, (d) having homosexual fantasies, (e) having anal intercourse, (f) having oral-genital sex, and (g) being forced to submit to sexual acts. In terms of satisfaction with their general physical appearance, as well as physical qualities of their maleness (e.g., size of penis), Cluster I presented an average level of body satisfaction compared to all other clusters. (See Figure 1, BOD under DSFI.) On the DSFI scales which evaluate both specific satisfaction with aspects of one's current relationships (e.g., usually after sex I feel relaxed and fulfilled, or I worry about my sexual performance) and on the scale which measures the Ss overall impression of their feelings of sexual satisfaction, Cluster I ranked second highest (compared to all clusters n greater than one. (See Figure 1, SAT and GSSI under DSFI.) When the extreme individuals also were included in these comparisons, Cluster I then dropped to third place on these measures of general sexual satisfaction.

The pattern of parent-child relationships presented by Ss in Cluster I (see Figure 1, PCR) suggest that overall, memories of father are rather negative. Compared to the other clusters, n greater than one, Cluster I ranked highest on Father's Aggression to Subject (scale 2), Father's Aggression to Mother (scale 5), second highest on Father's Strictness
(scale 12) and lowest of Father's Competence (scale 8). In contrast, memories of mother suggest that she was affectionate (scale 9). Cluster I ranked second highest overall on Mother Affection. Mother also was seen as average in competence (scale 7), in Strictness (scale 11), and in aggression to father (scale 5), and aggression toward subject (scale 1).

Scales used in the evaluation of Ss emotional status were the sentence completion test, measuring level of ego development (see Figure 1, SCTTTPR) and two scales on the DSFI (see Figure 1, SYM and AFF under DSFI), which measured symptoms of emotional distress and fluctuations in mood. As seen in Figure 1, Cluster I produced an average score on the SCT, with the mean TPR being at the 1-4 level of Conscientious ego development. According to Loevinger (1978), persons at the Conscientious level tend to utilize self-evaluated standards rather than depending on external rules, tend to feel guilt for the consequences of their behaviors, and tend to set life-long goals. Additionally, this level is associated with a concern for communication and mutuality in relationships and with a concern of self-achievement. Cognitively, a Conscientious level person is able to think in terms of complex interrelationships and in terms of patterns of events. On the Brief Symptom Inventory of the DSFI (see Figure 1, SYM under DSFI), the scores of Cluster I Ss were average. Figure 2 presents a profile of the subscale scores of the BSI for Cluster I. As can be seen from this profile, the scores for Cluster I are all near the group mean. Of all the scales, only the phobia (PHOB), the paranoia (PAR), the anxiety (ANX) and the Interpersonal sensitivity (IS) scores were somewhat above the sample mean. If we look directly
at the scores on these subscales, we see that on the Phobia subscale, Ss in Cluster I tended to rate the following items as being slightly true for them; (a) avoids people and activities because of fears, (b) feels uneasy in crowds, and (c) is nervous when alone. On the Paranoia subscale, ratings of slightly to moderately true were given for the following types of items; (a) feelings of being watched, (b) others are to blame for one's own problems, (c) finding it hard to trust others, (d) not getting proper credit from others for your achievements, and (e) feeling that others will take advantage of you if you let them. The third BSI subscale which was of some note was the Interpersonal-Sensitivity subscale. Here Ss in Cluster I reported that the following items were slightly to moderately true; (a) others are often unfriendly to me, (b) feelings of inferiority, (c) feeling self-conscious around others, and (d) my feelings are easily hurt.

With regard to moods, Cluster I had a total score on the Affects Balance Scale (see Figure 1, AFF under DSFI) which placed them only slightly above the mean. From Figure 3, one can see the effect of this nearly average ranking by the relative flatness of the graph. Of the eight emotions evaluated, only anxiety and affection were slightly above average, while contentment was slightly below average.
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Cluster I: Profile of Test Scores Standardized for Louisiana Sample
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Figure 3
Cluster I: Affects Balance Scale Profile
Cluster II

The males in Cluster II described their sexual behaviors and their sexual feelings as "mainly homosexual with a small degree of heterosexuality". The mean age for the cluster was 28. The cluster mean scores of 7.33 on Part A of the Feminine Gender Identity Scale and of 12.9 for the Combination score of this test, suggest that although Ss may be more feminine than masculine in their gender identity, they are far from being transsexual. Compared to all other Ss, the men in Cluster II ranked third in terms of their FGI-Combination score (see Figure 4, FGI), which indicates that their scores were slightly above average. In terms of their social sex-role, Cluster II Ss had a mean of .61 on the BSRI-Androgyny scale, which placed them in the "near feminine" category as compared to Bem's (1974) Stanford normative sample for males. In relation to the current research sample though, such an Androgyny score is considered only slightly above average. (See Figure 4, A under BSRI.) Similarly, Cluster II had a feminine social sex-role score on the Gender Role Definition scale of the DSFI, and was only slightly above the group mean with this score. (See Figure 4, GRD under DSFI.) Of interest also, was the fact that Cluster II produced a mean BSRI-Masculinity score which ranked second to lowest, when compared to all other clusters. (See Figure 4, M under BSFI.) This ranking suggested that Cluster II was rather far below average in terms of their mean number of masculine endorsements on the BSRI.

Compared to all other clusters, Cluster II Ss first became interested in sexual activities (see Figure 4, Age Int. Sex, under Other) at an age somewhat earlier than most Ss ($\bar{x} = 9$ years). However, in the same comparison, Cluster II Ss age at the time of first intercourse
(see Figure 4, Age 1st Sex, under Other) was only slightly younger ($X = 15$ years) than others. Evaluating Cluster II in terms of current sexual behaviors, we see that these $S$s had the highest Information, Experience and Fantasy subtest scores of all $S$s. (See Figure 4, INF, EXP, and FAN under DSFI.) Of these three scores, their quantity of sexual fantasy activity was ranked highest. Sexual fantasy items endorsed by 50% of Cluster II $S$s were (a) having more than one partner simultaneously, (b) having sex in unusual positions, (c) forcing partners to submit, (d) using artificial devices for sexual stimulation, (e) imagining oneself as a prostitute, (f) being bound during sex, (g) having homosexual fantasies, (h) having anal intercourse, (i) having oral-genital sex, and (j) being forced to submit to sex acts. With regard to sexual attitudes (see Figure 4, ATT under DSFI), Cluster II was slightly above average in liberalism of attitudes and ranked third on this scale when compared to all other $S$s. It is important to note that although Cluster II obviously had a great deal of mental sexual activity and past experience with sex, they were at the sample mean in terms of frequency of sexual activities or sexual drive (See Figure 4, DR under DSFI). Additionally, as reviewed in the demographic information, Cluster II was low in terms of frequency of searching for different sexual partners, when compared to all other clusters. Possibly related to the apparent discrepancy between their mental and physical levels of sexual activity is the fact that Cluster II presented a slightly lower than average rating of satisfaction for their physical appearance. Reviewing the particular items which comprise the Body Image subtest of the DSFI, it was found that Cluster II $S$s were "slightly" dissatisfied with their general physical appearance (e.g., feeling that they were less attractive than they would
like to be, disliking parts of their body, and feeling that they were too fat). However, in terms of specific male qualities, Cluster II Ss were only "moderately" satisfied with the size of their penis, the proportions of their body, their attractiveness to the opposite sex, and their physical coordination and athletic abilities. Cluster II Ss also presented a slightly below average score on the Sexual Satisfaction subtest of the DSFI and on the General Sexual Satisfaction Index (a self-rating). (See Figure 4, SAT and GSSI under DSFI.) Although when compared to all other Ss, the GSSI rating for Cluster II was below average, their actual mean rating was "above average". Thus, it was possible for some clusters actually to be feeling fairly good about their sexuality, but when they are compared to others in this sample they were relatively low in either their self-ratings or in their subtest scores themselves.

Assessing the parent-child relations subscale scores for Cluster II, one sees that although there are some fluctuations, these scores are all rather moderate compared to the results of clusters in this sample. In terms of memories of father, Cluster II appears to have seen father as rather average, except for the degree of Father's Aggression toward Mother (see Figure 4, PCF, scale 6), which was slightly above the group mean. On the other hand, mother subscales score for Aggression toward the Subject (scale 1) was slightly above average and ranked second highest overall. The mother scale scores for Affection (scale 9), in contrast, was somewhat below average and was ranked second to last overall.

With regard to level of ego development, Cluster II, like Cluster I, presented an average level ranking of I-4, placing them at the Conscientious level of ego development. Thus, Cluster I and Cluster II were quite similar in terms of patterns of personality characteristics
as described by Loevinger. In terms of level of emotional distress, Cluster II was slightly above the average (see Figure 4, SYM under DSFI) compared to all other clusters. Figure 5 illustrates the mean scores for Cluster II on the subscales of the Brief Symptom Inventory. This profile is extremely flat, suggesting that the majority of subscale scores are near the group mean. The only score from this profile which is of some note was the hostility subscale, which was somewhat above average and which ranked second highest overall. Item endorsement from this subscale reveal that Ss in Cluster II gave a moderately true ranking to item #6, feeling easily annoyed or irritated, and gave a slightly true rating to item #13, temper outbursts that you could not control, #40, having urges to beat, injure or harm someone, #41, having urges to break or smash things, and item #46, getting into frequent arguments.

Moving to measures of Ss fluctuations in positive and negative affects, one can see that the Affects Balance Index (see Figure 4, AFF under DSFI) was only slightly below average for Cluster II. As expected from this near average index score, the breakdown of specific affects measured by the ABS (see Figure 6) resulted in an almost normal profile for Cluster II. Although only slightly above average, the Affection (AFF) subscale was ranked lowest, when all other clusters are considered. The combination of these patterns (i.e., having a near average score and yet also being an extreme score) suggests that across all Ss there was little variance in responses to items on the Affects Balance Scale.

Of final interest, was the standing of Cluster II with regard to their history of mental health services. As noted earlier, Cluster II was one of the two clusters in which the majority of Ss had had a history of professional counseling. The "Age Prof." item under the
Other category on Figure 4 points out that compared to other Ss, Cluster II Ss entered counseling at a somewhat later age than most Ss ($\bar{x} = 20$).
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Cluster III

Cluster III consisted of males who described their sexual behaviors and feelings as almost exclusively homosexual. The mean age for this group was 27.51. Scores on the Feminine Gender Identity Scale (see Figure 7, GFI) indicate that Cluster II Ss gender identity is more masculine than feminine, and in fact was quite near the scores that are usually obtained by heterosexual males. Comparing these FGI scores to those of other Ss in this sample, one sees that Cluster II scores fall somewhat below the average. In terms of rankings, the FGI-Combination score for Cluster III is second to lowest, being higher than only the score for Cluster IV. Having a mean BSRI-Androgyny score of a -.85, Cluster II Ss fall into the "near masculine" social sex-role type, as compared to Bem's (1974) Stanford normative sample of males. When all clusters are considered, the mean Androgyny score cited above for Cluster II was the lowest (see Figure 7, A under BSRI). Of note also are the BSRI-masculinity and social desirability scores (see Figure 7, M and SD under BSRI). The obtained mean masculinity score was somewhat above average and was the second highest mean score for all clusters, being surpassed only by Cluster V. The social desirability score for Cluster III also was somewhat above average for the present sample and represented the highest obtained mean score for all Ss. Such a higher score suggests that these Ss had a tendency to present themselves in a socially desirable manner. Supporting the BSRI "near masculine" social sex-role assignment was the somewhat lower than average Gender Role Definition score (see Figure 7, GRD under DSFI) obtained by Cluster III. For the entire sample, Cluster II ranked second to lowest on this measure of social sex-role, being higher than only the individual in Cluster VIII.
Cluster III Ss became interested in sexual activities around the age of eleven, and had their first sexual encounter during adolescence (X = 16 years). Comparing these mean ages to those obtained by other clusters (see Figure 7, under Other), we see that Cluster III represents the approximate sample mean on this item. Evaluating current sexual involvement of Cluster III, one notes that these Ss are slightly below average with regard to general knowledge of sex, range of sexual experience, and sexual drive. (See Figure 7, INF, EXP, and DR under DSFI.) In terms of comparative rankings across clusters, the mean drive score for Cluster III was second to lowest, surpassing only the mean score for Cluster VI. Falling slightly below average also was the mean sexual attitude score for Cluster III (see Figure 7, ATT under DSFI), which suggests that this group is somewhat more conservative. Somewhat lower than average were the sexual fantasy and body image scores for Cluster III. (See Figure 7, FAN and BOD under DSFI.) When only scores from the n greater than one clusters are considered, the scores for Cluster III for sexual fantasy and body image represent the lowest obtained mean scores, which suggests that these Ss had the fewest number or narrowest range of sexual fantasies and that they had the lowest degree of satisfaction with their body image. A review of those sexual fantasy subtest items which were marked by Ss in Cluster III, revealed that in addition to fantasies of various types of intercourse, these Ss also (a) fantasized of having more than one sexual partner, simultaneously, (b) of having a forbidden lover, (c) of mateswapping, (d) of being bound during intercourse, and (e) of being forced to submit to sexual acts. Looking at the body image items marked by Cluster III, one finds that the lower mean score is more related to a moderate to slight dissatisfaction with
their general physical appearance (e.g., feeling that they are less attractive than they would like to be or are slightly too fat or too thin) than it is related to feelings of dissatisfaction with qualities of their maleness. In fact, on those items which were identified as pertaining to a male body image, Cluster III Ss gave all positive endorsements (e.g., feeling extremely satisfied with the size of their penis, feeling moderately satisfied with their physical coordination and athletic abilities, and feeling quite a bit satisfied with their facial features and body proportions). In terms of feelings of sexual satisfaction, Cluster III Ss were slightly above average. In fact, only when \( n \) greater than one clusters are evaluated, Cluster III ranks highest on level of satisfaction with current sexual relations and second highest on overall self-ratings of general sexual satisfaction. Thus, despite the fact that Cluster III Ss level of mental and physical activity were somewhat below that of other Ss in the sample, their overall ratings of sexual satisfaction were above average.

Mean scores for the Parent-Child Relations questionnaire for Cluster III suggest that these Ss maintain positive memories for both mother and father. Looking at the PCR scores in Figure 7, one notes that the scales for Mother and Father Competence (scales 7 and 8, respectively) and the scales for Mother and Father Affection (scales 9 and 10, respectively) are all above the total group average. Additionally, scales pertaining to parent Aggression (scales 1, 2, 4, 5, and 6) and Strictness (scales 11 and 12) are all below the total sample average.

Turning to the psychological variables, Cluster III obtained a mean rating of I-4/I-5 on Loevinger's test for ego development (see Figure 7, SCTTP under Other), which places them in a transitional stage
of development. If only $n$ greater than one clusters are considered, Cluster III ranks highest on this variable. With a Conscientious/Autonomous level of ego development, $S$s in Cluster III typically tend to utilize self-evaluated standards in making judgements and tend to demonstrate a growing ability to tolerate and cope with conflicting inner needs. Interpersonally, $S$s at this level have concerns for maintaining mutuality in relationships and show respect for others' autonomy. Such individuals also typically can see the motives underlying others' behaviors, can understand the demands of social roles, and tend to working toward a sense of self-fulfillment. Cognitively, persons at the Conscientious/Autonomous level of ego development think abstractly, are able to tolerate ambiguity and tend to see events from a broad life-long perspective.

With regard to level of emotional adjustment, Cluster III had a General Severity Index (see Figure 7, SYM under DSFI) which was rather far below that of the group mean. In fact, only the individual in outlying Cluster VIII had a lower symptom score. In Figure 8, the Brief Symptom Inventory subscale profile for Cluster III is presented. It is obvious from this rather flat and below average profile that $S$s in Cluster III presented a rather stable emotional adjustment. Similarly, Cluster III presented an emotionally healthy picture in terms of a balance between positive and negative affects. (See Figure 7, AFF under DSFI.) Compared to all other clusters, Cluster III ranked highest in their level of positive affects and lowest in their level of negative affects. (See Figure 9.)
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Cluster III: Affects Balance Scale Profile
Cluster IV

Cluster IV consisted of those males whose sexual behaviors were described as almost exclusively heterosexual and whose sexual feelings were described as "mainly heterosexual with a small degree of homosexuality". As noted in the section on the demographic characteristics of this cluster, both heterosexual and homosexual Ss were found here. The mean age for Cluster IV was 19.7 years. The Feminine Gender Identity Scale Scores for Cluster IV (see Figure 10, FGI) suggest that these men have a more masculine than feminine core gender identity ($X_{FGIA} = 3.29$ and $X_{FGIAB} = 5.76$). Having a mean BSRI-Androgyny score of $-0.59$, Ss in Cluster IV fall into the "near masculine" sex type social sex-role as compared to the males in Bem's (1974) Stanford normative sample. Compared to other clusters, the BSRI-A score for Cluster IV was somewhat below average and was ranked as the second lowest mean score. (See Figure 10, BSRI.) Additionally, the Gender Role Definition score of the DSFI (see Figure 10, GRD under DSFI) was slightly below average for Cluster IV and was indicative of a masculine social sex-role. With regard to the BSRI-masculinity score for Cluster IV (see Figure 10, BSRI), one can see that it was slightly above average when compared to all other clusters.

Subjects in Cluster IV first became interested in sexual activities around the age of twelve and had their first sexual encounter around age sixteen. When these ages of initial sexual activity are compared to those of Ss in other clusters (see Figure 10 under Other), it was found that Ss in Cluster IV were somewhat older when they first became interested in sex, but were only slightly older than others when they had their first sexual encounter. Exploring the pattern of responses
on the DSFI (see Figure 10) for Cluster IV, one notes that Ss were average in terms of general knowledge of sexual information and in terms of sexual drive. With regard to sexual experience, Cluster IV Ss mean score however, was somewhat above the sample's mean and was ranked second highest overall. Cluster IV Ss also presented the most conservative set of sexual attitudes of all Ss. Falling in the slightly below average range were Cluster IV's mean scores for the range of sexual fantasies and general sexual satisfaction with one's physical appearance. Item endorsements of sexual fantasies resulted in the following: (a) having more than one sexual partner simultaneously, (b) having intercourse in unusual positions, (c) having a forbidden lover, (d) having homosexual fantasies, (e) having fantasies of anal intercourse and (f) having oral-genital sex. Evaluating those items marked by Cluster IV on the Body Image subtest of the DSFI, one finds that these Ss (a) considered themselves only moderately attractive, (b) felt they were slightly too fat, (c) only slightly enjoyed being seen in a bathing suit, (d) were slightly embarrassed to be seen nude by a lover, and (e) considered their facial features, size of penis, body proportions, opposite sex attractiveness, and physical coordination all to be moderately satisfying. Considering the Ss level of general satisfaction with current sexual relationships, Cluster IV fell slightly below average. However, in terms of general self-ratings of sexual satisfaction, Cluster IV was slightly above the mean for all Ss.

Assessing the pattern of family relations for Cluster IV, one notes that on all scales (see Figure 10, PCR), Cluster IV was average or slightly below average. Notably, Cluster IV Ss remembered father as less Aggressive toward Mother (scale 6), less Affectionate (scale 10), and less Strict (scale 12), than did other Ss. Additionally,
Cluster IV Ss presented memories of mother which described her as below the group average in terms of affection.

On the sentence completion test, Cluster IV Ss received a mean rating at the I-4 on Conscientious level of ego development. As with Clusters I and II, who also achieved the Conscientious level of ego development, Cluster IV fell in the average range on this variable, when compared to all other clusters. Similarly, the measures of emotional adjustment (i.e., the BSI, and ABS; see Figure 10, SYM and AFF under DSFI) were in the average range, when Cluster IV was compared to all other clusters. Figure 11, which presents the Brief Symptom Inventory subscales profile for Cluster IV, indicates that this cluster approximates the sample mean on almost all subscales. Additionally, the same baseline-like pattern was found for Cluster IV on the Affects Balance Scale subscales profile (see Figure 12).
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Cluster V

Cluster V was a single individual and was considered an example of one possible group extreme. This individual represented the younger age limits of the sample and fell at a mid-point in terms of sexual orientation (i.e., he described his sexual feelings and sexual behaviors as "mainly homosexual with a substantial degree of heterosexuality"). In Figure 13 (see FGI), we see that this individual is extremely above average and in fact, ranks highest overall, in terms of Feminine Gender Identity scores. These scores, although representative of a more feminine than masculine gender identity, do not, however, allow for placement in the category, transsexual homosexual. On the BSRI (see Figure 13), this individual obtained a zero Androgyny score, which placed him in the "androgynous" category, as compared to Bem's (1974) male normative sample. Compared to Ss in the present study; the zero BSRI-A score also places this individual at the sample mean. Similarly, his Gender Role Definition Score (see Figure 13, GRD under DSFI) was near the group mean and was indicative of a zero difference between masculine and feminine endorsements. His masculinity and femininity self-endorsements on the BSRI were extremely high (rated highest overall).

Looking at the sexual history of the individual in Cluster V, we find that he became interested in sexual activities at the age of eight, which was a great deal younger than most persons in this sample, and he had his first sexual experience at thirteen, which also was somewhat younger than most other Ss. Compared to the total sample, this individual was extremely far below average in terms of general sexual knowledge, and quantity of sexual experience. (See Figure 13.) His drive level, however, was somewhat above the average, falling below only
the individual in Cluster VIII and the Ss in Cluster I. In terms of sexual attitudes, this individual was slightly below the group average, suggesting a more conservative sexual attitudinal system. On the sexual fantasy and body image scales, this individual was below the group mean and in fact, was ranked lowest overall. It is of interest to note that the large discrepancies between the lower than average scores on the measure of satisfaction with one's sexual relationships (see Figure 13, SAT under DSFI) and the subject's extremely higher than average self-rating of his general level of sexual satisfaction (see Figure 13, GSSI under the DSFI).

The pattern of family relations (see Figure 13, PCR) presented by the subject in Cluster V contained extremely higher than average scores for the scale of Father's Aggression toward the Subject (scale 2), Father's Aggression toward Mother (scale 6), Mother's Affection (scale 9), and Father's Strictness (scale 12). In contrast to these extreme ratings, this subject, on the other PCR scales, scored about average.

On the sentence completion test, the individual in Cluster V had a rating of 1-4, which placed him at the Conscientious level of ego development. (See Figure 13, SCTTPR under Other.) Both his General Severity Index score (see Figure 13, SYM under DSFI) and his Affects Balance Index (see Figure 13, AFF under DSFI) fell within the average range when compared to all other Ss. In Figure 14, we see that on the Brief Symptom Inventory, this subject was slightly above average on Interpersonal-Sensitivity (I-S) and Paranoia (PAR). Additionally, he was rather far below the mean on the Depression subscale (DEP). For the I-S subscale, this subject endorsed "moderately" true ratings for item #21, feeling that people dislike you and endorsed "slightly" true ratings for item #20, feelings
are easily hurt; item #22, feeling inferior to others; item #41, feeling self-conscious. Item endorsements for the Paranoia subscale were: (a) a moderately true rating for items #24 and #48, feeling watched by others and others are not giving you proper credit for your achievements, respectively, and (b) a "quite a bit" ratings for items #51, that people will take advantage of you if you let them. On the Depression subscale, this subject gave ratings of "slightly" true to only two items, #13 and #35, feeling lonely and feeling hopeless about the future, respectively. Figure 15 presents the Affects Balance subscale profile for the subject in Cluster V. Overall, his positive affect ratings were slightly above average, with rather higher than average ratings for vigor (VIG) and Affection (AFF). His negative affect ratings placed him in the above average range on the subscales of Anxiety (ANX) and Guilt (GLT).
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Cluster V: Affects Balance Scale Profile
Cluster VI

Cluster VI included males whose sexual feelings and sexual behaviors were almost exclusively homosexual. The mean age for this cluster was 24. The mean cluster scores on the Feminine Gender Identity Scale indicate that these Ss gender identity was more feminine than masculine. These scores, however, were not indicative of a transsexual homosexual. Compared to other Ss in the present sample (see Figure 16, FGI), the mean FGI scores for Cluster VI Ss were somewhat above the average. On the Bem Sex-Role Inventory, the mean androgyny score for Cluster VI was 1.70, which placed them in the "feminine" sex-typed social sex-role category, as compared to Bem's (1974) Stanford normative sample of males. Compared to others in this sample, Cluster VI had a BSRI-A score which was highly above the average. (See Figure 16.) Supporting the notion the Cluster VI Ss held a highly feminine sex-typed social sex-role was the fact that on the Gender Role Definition subtest of the DSFI (see Figure 16, GRD under DSFI), this cluster presented an extremely larger than average positive mean score.

Cluster VI Ss first became interested in sexual activity around the age of twelve and had their first sexual experience at seventeen. These ages, when compared to those of others in the sample (see Figure 16 under Other) are somewhat older than the average. Cluster VI was ranked second to the lowest (being higher only than the individual in Cluster V) on general level of sexual knowledge, as well as variety of sexual experience. (See Figure 16, INF and EXP under DSFI.) More specifically, 50% or more of the Ss in Cluster VI answered the following information questions incorrectly: (a) usually men achieve orgasm more quickly
than women, (b) having intercourse during menstruation is not a healthy practice, (c) the penis must be erect before ejaculation may occur, (d) men reach the peak of their sexual drive in their late teens, while women reach their peak during their 30's, (e) a woman can become pregnant during menstruation, (f) most men and women lose interest in sex after age sixty, (g) menopause in a woman creates a sharp reduction in her sexual desire, and (h) a woman can no longer become pregnant once menopause has begun.

A review of the item responses of Cluster VI Ss on the sexual experience subtest revealed that their much lower than average score, probably was related to the fact that practically none of the Ss in this cluster had had any heterosexual experience. In terms of sexual drive, Cluster VI Ss were greatly below the average, and in fact, ranked lowest overall on this scale. However, Cluster VI did fall near the total sample mean with regard to their sexual attitude score. (See Figure 16, ATT under DSFI.) On the fantasy and body-image subtests of the DSFI, Cluster VI also presented scores which located them near the sample average. Finally, on the two measures of sexual satisfaction, the mean scores for Cluster VI were exceptionally lower than those of any other cluster in the sample. (See Figure 16, SAT and GSSI under DSFI.) Self-ratings of their level of general sexual satisfaction placed this cluster in the "somewhat inadequate" category.

In contrast to the sharp differences from the mean found for Cluster VI on the sexual behavior variables, their pattern of parent-child relations (see Figure 16, PCR) was relatively average and was highly similar to the pattern presented by Ss in Cluster IV. Memories of both parents were fairly positive, with scores for Cluster VI being slightly above
average for the Mother and Father Competence (scales 6 and 7, respectively) and Affection scales (scales 8 and 9, respectively), and somewhat below average for parent to parent aggression scales (scales 5 and 6).

On the psychological variables, Cluster VI differed notably from clusters previously mentioned. The mean rating for Cluster VI on the sentence completion test was at a transitional level (I-3/I-4), which placed them between the Conformist and Conscientious levels of ego development. As observed in Figure 16 (see SCTTPR), this rating located Cluster VI slightly below the group mean on this variable. Persons falling at this transitional level of ego development tend to fluctuate between strict conformity to external rules and the setting of self-determined rules. Interpersonally, they want to feel like they belong and thus will at times, be superficially nice to others. On occasion though, these persons also can feel a sense of mutuality in their relationships. More often, at this level, such persons are conscious of social appearances, and are dimly aware of the motivations behind their own and others behaviors. Cognitively, this group utilizes a mixture of stereotypic thinking and cliches, yet at times are able to see life's challenges from a somewhat more complex frame of reference. From Figure 16 (see SYM under DSFI), one can see that on the General Severity Index of the Brief Symptom Inventory, Cluster VI Ss had scores that were highly above average. Additionally, this cluster also scored far below the average on the Affects Balance Index (Figure 16, AFF under DSFI). Figures 17 and 18 present the BSI and ABS subscale profiles for Cluster VI. Looking at Figure 17 first, one can determine that Cluster VI is exceptionally above average on all subscales, but the Phobia (PHOB) subscale, which was slightly above average.
On the Somatization subscale only two items received fairly severe ratings; item #2, feeling faint or dizzy, had a mean rating of moderately true, while #23, feeling nauseated, had a mean rating of "quite a bit" true. Items on the Obsessive-Compulsive subscale which obtained mean ratings of "moderately" true were, #5, trouble remembering things; #32, your mind going blank; and #36, trouble concentrating. Items on this scale that received a "quite a bit" true rating were, #15, feeling blocked in getting things done; and #27, difficulty in making decisions. Only one item on the Interpersonal Sensitivity subscale was classified as "quite a bit true," and that was #20, feelings are easily hurt. Three of the items on the Depression subscale were of note; #18, feeling no interest in things had a mean cluster rating of "moderately" true, while items #16, feeling lonely, and #17, feeling blue, were rated "quite a bit" true. With regard to the Anxiety subscale of the BSI, a high mean rating of "moderately" true was given to item #1, nervous and shakiness inside, and #19, feeling fearful; and an item rating of "quite a bit" true was given to #38, feeling tense and keyed up. Having a rating of "quite a bit" true, was the item #6, on the Hostility subscale, feeling easily annoyed or irritated. Under the Paranoia subscale, two items, #48 and #51, not being given proper credit for your achievements, and feeling that others will take advantage of you if you let them, respectively, had a mean rating of "moderately" true. Finally, items #44 and #53 of the Psychoticism subscale, never feeling close to another person and the idea that something is wrong with your mind, received a rating of "moderately" true; while item #14, feeling lonely, even when with people, was rated as "quite a bit" true. The profile of Cluster VI for the
Affects Balance subscales (see Figure 18), presents a fairly large discrepancy between positive and negative feelings; with negative affects being greater than average. The only finding which was near the sample mean was the positive feeling of Affection.
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Cluster VI: Profile of Test Scores Standardized for Louisiana Sample
Figure 17

Cluster VI: Brief Symptom Inventory Profile
Figure 18
Cluster VI: Affects Balance Scale Profile
Cluster VII

Comprizing Cluster VII were males whose sexual feelings and behaviors were almost exclusively homosexual. The mean age for the cluster was thirty. On the Feminine Gender Identity Scales, Cluster VII had mean scores which suggested that their gender identity was more feminine than masculine, although these scores were not indicative of a transsexual homosexual. Compared to the scores of other clusters, the FGI scores for Cluster VII (see Figure 19, GRI) were rather above average, with the cluster's FGI-B and FGI-Combination scores ranking second highest for the total sample. On the BSRI, Cluster VII Ss had a mean Androgyny score of 1.04, which placed them in the "near feminine" social sex-role category, as compared to Bem's (1974) Stanford normative sample of males. With respect to all other Ss, the BSRI scores for Cluster VII (see Figure 19) were slightly above average for masculinity and social desirability. Similarly, Cluster VII had a mean score on the Gender Role Definition subtest of the DSFI (see Figure 19, GRD) which was slightly above the sample's mean and which suggested that these persons tended to present a feminine social sex-role.

Cluster VII Ss first became interested in sexual activity around the age of seven and had their first sexual experience at fifteen. These ages for Cluster VII are somewhat younger than those reported by Ss in other clusters (see Figure 19, under Other). In terms of knowledge of sexual facts, Cluster VII Ss were somewhat below the group mean. However, their degree of sexual experience, as well as their current level of sexual drive, both were near the sample mean. From the demographic information we also will remember that this group tended to actively search for sexual
partners on a fairly frequent basis. Additionally, Cluster VII Ss reported a slightly more liberal set of sexual attitudes than did Ss in other clusters. Also falling somewhat above the sample mean were the fantasy and body image mean cluster scores for Cluster VII. Of these two scores, the body image score was ranked second highest, being surpassed only by the individual in Cluster VII. Body image items marked by Cluster VII Ss showed few negative endorsements, with only "slightly" true ratings being given to the items; feeling less attractive than would like to be, feeling too thin, and there are parts of my body I don't like. Otherwise, on the male items, Cluster VI Ss marked all items at the "moderately" true level. For the two measures of sexual satisfaction (see Figure 19, SAT and GSSI, under DSFI), Cluster VII Ss reported ratings that were lower than average. Their mean self-rating of general sexual satisfaction, however, fell into the category "adequate to above average".

From the pattern of family relations presented by Cluster VII (see Figure 19, PCR), it appears that a negative memory of mother was outstanding. Subjects in this cluster ranked highest, as compared to all other Ss, on the scales for Mother's Aggression to Subject (scale 1), Mother's aggression to Father (scale 5), and Mother's Strictness (scale 11). Additionally, Cluster VII Ss were ranked second to lowest, compared across all Ss, on the scale Mother's Competence (scale 7), and Mother's Affection (scale 9). Memories of father also appeared to be somewhat negative, although not as severe as those related to mother. Of the father scales, only scale 6, Father's Aggression to Mother, and scale 10, Father's Affection, came near the sample mean. In contrast, scale 2, Father's Aggression toward Subject, was slightly above the large group mean; scale 8, Father's Competence, was somewhat lower than the
group mean; and scale 12, Father's Strictness, was considerably higher than the sample mean.

Similar to Cluster VI, Cluster VII produced a mean cluster rating at the I-3/I-4 transitional level of ego development. Such a rating placed them between the Conformist and Conscientious level as described by Loevinger. Their specific mean score, however, was less than that of Cluster VI and in fact, Cluster VII ranked lowest overall on this psychological variable. (See Figure 19, SCTTPR under Other.) With regard to Cluster VII's level of emotional adjustment, it was found that their General Severity Index was slightly above the sample mean and was ranked second highest, compared to all other clusters. Likewise, in terms of the balance between positive and negative affects, Cluster VII fell rather far below the group mean on the Affects Balance Index. Additionally, this ABI score was ranked second lowest, compared to all others in this sample, indicating that Cluster VII Ss presented greater negative than positive affects. Figure 20 illustrates the relationships of various personality subscales of the BSI for Cluster VII. As can be noted, all of the scores for Cluster VII on these subscales are above the sample mean. However, most scales are considered only slightly or somewhat above average. Subscales achieving the greatest distance from the mean were Somatization (SOM), Depression (DEP), Phobia (PHOB), Paranoia (PAR), and Psychoticism (PSY). Four of these five scales also were ranked second highest compared to the rest of the sample, with the fifth (Paranoia) being ranked third highest for the total sample. Thus, the only cluster surpassing Cluster VII in high rankings on the BSI subscales was Cluster VI, which produced the top mean scores for eight of the nine subscales. In terms of the specific items marked on the BSI, more than one-half
of the Ss in Cluster VII had slight complaints of chestpains, nausea, hot and cold spells, numbness and feelings of weakness. Additionally, more than one-half of the Ss in Cluster VII felt, to a moderate degree, lonely or blue, or had little interest in things; while "slightly" true ratings were given to items suggesting that these persons had feelings of hopelessness and feelings of worthlessness. On the Phobia subscale, one-half of the Ss marked "slightly" true ratings for the items: Having to avoid things because of fear and feeling uneasy in crowds. For the Paranoia subscale, over one-half of the Cluster VII Ss rated the following items as "slightly" true: Feelings that others are to blame for your own problems, feeling that others cannot be trusted, feelings of being watched, and not getting proper credit from others for your achievements. Receiving a rating of "moderately" true also was the item, feeling that people will take advantage of you if you let them. The Psychoticism scale ratings for this group of Ss were as follows; "slightly" true endorsements were given to the items, someone else is controlling your thoughts; never feeling close to another person; and the idea that something is wrong with your mind. "Moderately" true ratings on this subscale was given to the item feeling lonely even when you are with people. Figure 21 presents the Affects Balance subscale profile for Cluster VII. As seen, Ss in Cluster VII produced more negative than positive affects, which placed them somewhat higher than the average on all four of the negative affect subscales. Of the four positive affect subscales, only the Joy and Affection scales were close to the sample mean. The Contentment and Vigor subscales both fell somewhat below the sample mean. Rankings of the ABS subscale score for Cluster VII indicate that this cluster had the second highest overall scores for feelings of Depression, Guilt,
Hostility and total number of negative affects. This cluster also had
the second lowest overall scores on the subscales of Contentment and
Vigor, as well as the total number of positive affects.

In contrast to the Ss in Cluster VI, who appeared to actively
cope with their feelings of emotional distress by searching for an receiv-
ing some for of counseling, the majority of Ss in Cluster VII had no
history of any mental health treatment.
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Cluster VII: Profile of Test Scores Standardized for Louisiana Sample
Figure 20

Cluster VII: Brief Symptom Inventory Profile
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Figure 21

AFFECTS BALANCE SCALE
Cluster VIII

Cluster VIII was the final cluster resulting for the Johnson (1967) hierarchical cluster analysis method. This cluster contained a single individual who had an exclusively homosexual orientation and who represented the older age group of this sample. On the Feminine Gender Identity Scale (see Figure 22, FGI), this individual had the highest Part A and the lowest Part B score when compared to the total sample. With a score of ten on part A, he approaches the category of "strongly indicative of a feminine gender identity". However, since his FGI-AB score fell below the cutoff of greater than 24, one can only say that the gender identity of this person was more feminine than masculine. With a BSRI-Androgyny score (see Figure 22) of 1.51, this individual was categorized as having a "near feminine" sex-typed social sex-role, compared to Bem's normative sample for males. In relation to other Ss in the present sample, this individual's androgyny score was rather far above the group mean and was ranked second highest overall. His BSRI-masculinity score, on the other hand, was exceptionally far below the mean and, in fact, ranked lowest overall. Juxtaposed to the finding of a feminine social sex-role on the BSRI, was the finding of a high masculine social sex-role on the Gender Role Definition subtest of the DSFI (see Figure 22, GRD under DSFI, and BSRI). Compared to the sample at large, this GRD score was exceptionally far from the mean and was ranked lowest overall.

Looking at the sexual history of this individual, one notes that he first became interested in sexual activities at the age of twelve and had his first sexual experience at the same age. In relation to the other Ss; his age of first sexual interest was somewhat older than average, but his age of first sexual experience was quite a bit younger.
than the average. With regard to current sexual behaviors, the results for this person indicate that his knowledge of sexual information was about average, and that his range of sexual experience was somewhat below average. Of interest, though, were this individual's exceptionally higher than average scores on the drive and attitudes subtest of the DSFI (see Figure 22). Such extreme scores suggest that this is an extremely sexually active male who holds very liberal sexual attitudes. Similarly, his fantasy and body image scores were outstanding. Specific sexual fantasy items marked were (a) having more than one sex partner simultaneously, (b) having intercourse in unusual positions, (c) cross-dressing, (d) using artificial devices for sexual stimulation, (e) being a prostitute, (f) having anal intercourse, (i) dressing in erotic garments, (j) fantasizing that you are the opposite sex, (k) having oral-genital sex and (l) being forced to submit to sexual acts. On the Body Image subtest, this individual gave "extremely" true ratings to the following items: (a) being less attractive than he would like to be, (b) being too thin, (c) being embarrassed to be seen nude by a lover, (d) being satisfied with the size of his penis. Items on the subtest that were marked as "moderately" true were, there are parts of my body I don't like, I am too tall, I have too much body hair, and I am pleased with my physical condition. Again, as on the majority of other sexual subtests, this individual gave exceptionally higher than average scores on the two measures of sexual satisfaction. His self-rating of general sexual satisfaction was "excellent".

The family patterns (see Figure 23, PCR) presented by this S was slightly different than any of the others seen previously. Most outstanding in his profile was an exceptionally high score on scale 4,
Subject's Aggression toward Father. Falling below the group mean were his scores for Mother and Father Aggression toward the Subject (scales 1 and 2), parent to parent aggression (scales 5 and 6), Mother's Affection (scale 9), and Mother and Father Strictness (scales 11 and 12). Falling at the group mean were this subject's scores on mother and father competence (scales 7 and 8).

On the sentence completion, this subject achieved an I-5 or Autonomous level of ego development, placing him at a level which was much higher than that of other Ss. (See Figure 22, SCTTPR.) At the autonomous level of ego development, people are tolerant of inner conflicts, have deep respect for their own and others autonomy, and are able to think in terms of paradoxes. With regard to other psychological variables, this individual ranked lowest on the General Severity Index of the Brief Symptom Inventory (see Figure 11, SYM under DSFI), but was about average in terms of his Affects Balance Index score (see Figure 22, AFF under DSFI). Figure 23 presents the subscales profile of the BSI for this individual. Of note for this profile are the subscales Obsessive-Compulsiveness (OC), Interpersonal-Sensitivity (I-S), Anxiety (ANX), Phobia (PHOB), Paranoia (PAR) and Psychoticism (PSY), all of which were ranked lowest compared to all the scores of all the other subjects. The only items on all the subscales receiving a "moderately" true rating was #38 on the Anxiety subscale; feeling tense of keyed up. Otherwise, "slightly" true ratings were given to only fourteen other items, such as feeling blue and getting into frequent arguments. Figure 24 illustrates the subscale scores for the individual on the Affects Balance Scale, although there are some variations within both the positive and negative affects subscales, the overall balance of these affects was in the average range (see Figure 22, AFF under DSFI).
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Cluster VIII: Brief Symptom Inventory Profile
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AFFECTS BALANCE SCALE
Vita

Born in Lake Charles, Louisiana, in 1949, D'Lane Miller was the youngest of three children, having two older brothers. While attending public schools, she was active in a number of community and student organizations. In 1966, she was elected as a delegate to Pelican Girl's State, and was selected for the Governor's Early Admission to College Program. In 1967, she graduated from Lake Charles High School. As an undergraduate (1967 - 1970), Ms. Miller attended Louisiana State University, where she majored in psychology. She received her B.S. from that institution in May, 1970. From June, 1970 to Sept., 1971, she worked as an Institutional Counselor at Villa Feliciana Geriatric Hospital in Jackson, Louisiana. In Oct., 1971, she began working as an Institutional Counselor at the Baton Rouge Mental Health Center, and in May of 1973, she became the Coordinator of Volunteers Services for both the Baton Rouge Mental Health Center and the Margaret Dumas Mental Health Center. Additionally, during this period of time she was consultant to the Riverside Evaluation Center, which was sponsored by the Dept. of Vocational Rehabilitation, and to two half-way houses, sponsored by the Mental Health Association of Baton Rouge. She also became director of a self-help/socialization group for previous hospitalized patients, which was sponsored by the Mental Health Association of Baton Rouge, in June, 1973. Returning to LSU in Sept., 1974, Ms. Miller began her graduate career in psychology. During this time she was an NIMH fellow, was president of Psi Chi, and was highly active in the Community Psychological Center, through which she became co-facilitator for a number of community training labs. In May, 1978, she married Edward Chandler and also moved to Los Angeles, where she
began her clinical psychology internship at Cedars-Sinai Medical Center, Thalians Community Mental Health Center. At the medical center she received further training in adult, individual and group psychotherapy, in family and child psychotherapy, and became a co-leader in a mixed and later all male gay group. Following the completion of her internship, Ms. Miller became a volunteer worker at Cedars-Sinai and continued working in psychotherapy with a number of clients, including the gay group. In Jan.,1980, she and her husband returned to Baton Rouge, Louisiana, and she began working at The Developmental Psychology Center of LSU and at The Psychology Group (a private group psychology practice). While working at The Psychology Group, Ms. Miller conducted a research project for the Kidney Foundation of Louisiana on patients' attitudes toward treatment. She also was a member of the State Board of Mental Health's Task Force on Epilepsy. Presently employed at The Runnymede Clinic (a private group psychology practice), Ms. Miller is active in psychotherapy with adults and children. Following graduation in May, 1981, she plans to locate a position within a Community Mental Health System or with a Medical Center, to continue her research in the area of homosexuality, and to begin a family.
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