

THE UNIVERSITY OF MANITOBA
A STUDY OF SELF AND DEVIANCE FROM A SYMBOLIC
INTERACTIONISM PERSPECTIVE:
THE HOMOSEXUAL AND HIS SUBCULTURE

BY

GERALDINE ANNE PERCIVAL

A THESIS
SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES
IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE
OF MASTER OF ARTS

DEPARTMENT OF SOCIOLOGY

WINNIPEG, MANITOBA

OCTOBER, 1973



ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This author would like to express her gratitude and appreciation to all those individuals whose cooperation and effort made this study possible, especially to Greg, Susan, Billy and the many others who helped administer questionnaires and enlarge the sample size.

A special thanks is also extended to Dr. E. Boldt, thesis advisor, and Dr. R. Currie and Dr. J. Schallow for their encouragement and guidance.

ABSTRACT

From the perspective of symbolic interaction, individuals act toward things on the basis of the meanings which these things have for them. Meanings, including meanings about the self, are acquired by the individual through interaction with others. While an individual's self-concept is dependent upon his perception of the evaluations of others toward him, others are of differential importance to the individual in terms of the degree to which they exert an influence over the meanings which he incorporates. A distinction can be made between those others whose evaluations of the individual are accepted by the individual and incorporated into his self-concept, thereby exerting an enduring, generalized influence over the individual (significant or orientational others), and those others whose evaluations of the individual are not incorporated into the individual's self-concept and who, therefore, do not exert an influence on the individual beyond the immediate social influence setting (role-specific others). The way an individual comes to perceive and evaluate himself, therefore, is dependent upon the way he perceives himself as evaluated by a particular "class" of others--those who are orientational to him.

The concept of the "orientational others" has important implications for the study of self-change since it suggests that one way in which enduring changes can occur is through

a displacement of orientational others. That is, when an individual is unable to meet needs for self-validation and acceptance from those who are orientational to him, he may, through interaction with others who accept and support his self-concept, establish new self-defining relationships and thereby incorporate new meanings of self.

A review of the literature on deviance provides some support for this conceptualization of self-change. Some forms of deviance are conducive to deviant group formation, and the interaction of like-deviants is thought to lead to a process of "normalization" whereby the unacceptable behaviour is redefined as "normal" and acceptable. Our formulation of self-change would suggest that the effects of in-group participation on the self-concept of an individual will be positive only to the extent that a displacement of orientational others, from those outside the in-group to those within, occurs.

This study attempts a preliminary test of these propositions within the homosexual context. Since the nature of homosexuality makes this form of deviance conducive to deviant group participation, and since the literature on homosexuality suggests that a homosexual status can only have debilitating consequences for the self-concepts of these individuals, the choice of a homosexual sample would appear to be particularly appropriate for a test of this conceptualization of

self-change. A "snowball" sample of homosexual subjects from the area of Winnipeg will be used in this study. In addition, for the purposes of comparison, a subsample of the homosexual subjects will be matched to a sample of heterosexual subjects. Self-concept will be operationalized using the technique of Semantic Differential. In general, the results support the hypotheses.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER		PAGE
<u>I</u>	THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK I: THE SELF.....	
	Introduction.....	1
	The Perspective.....	1
	Symbols and Meaning.....	2
	The Self as a Meaningful Object.....	4
	Self-Evaluation.....	8
<u>II</u>	THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK II: THE SELF, OTHERS AND SELF-CHANGE.....	
	Others.....	15
	The Self and Others.....	21
	Self-Change.....	22
	The Problem of Motivation.....	25
<u>III</u>	THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK III: THE SELF AND DEVIANCE.....	29
	Deviance as Process.....	30
	Homosexuality as Process.....	33
<u>IV</u>	STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM AND HYPOTHESES..	39
	The Problem.....	44
	Hypotheses.....	45
<u>V</u>	METHODOLOGY.....	48
	Sample.....	48
	Method of Data Collection.....	50
	Semantic Differential Scales.....	52
	Self-Concept.....	54

Table of Contents	- 2 -	PAGE
Perceived Self-Concept.....		54
Participation.....		55
Oriental Others.....		56
CHAPTER		
<u>VI</u>	ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION OF DATA...	58
	Hypothesis I.....	58
	Hypothesis II.....	71
	Hypothesis III.....	74
<u>VII</u>	CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS.....	79
	SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	87
	APPENDIX I.....	95
	APPENDIX II.....	100
	APPENDIX III.....	103
	APPENDIX IV.....	105
	APPENDIX V.....	107
	APPENDIX VI.....	109
	APPENDIX VII.....	111

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE		PAGE
<u>I</u>	Comparable Mean Scores of Male Homosexual and Male Heterosexual Matched Samples on the Self-Concept Variable.....	60
<u>II</u>	Comparable Measures of Central Tendency and Dispersion for Male Homosexual and Male Heterosexual Matched Samples on the Self-Concept Variable.....	61
<u>III</u>	Comparable Mean Scores of Female Homosexual and Female Heterosexual Matched Samples on the Self-Concept Variable.....	63
<u>IV</u>	Comparable Measures of Central Tendency and Dispersion for Female Homosexual and Female Heterosexual Matched Samples on the Self-Concept Variable.....	64
<u>V</u>	Comparable Mean Scores Achieved by the Entire Homosexual and Heterosexual Samples on the Self-Concept Variable.....	66
<u>VI</u>	A Frequency Breakdown by Sex for the Entire Homosexual Sample on the Orientational Other Displacement Variable.....	70
<u>VII</u>	Correlations Between Participation and Orientational Other Displacement.....	73
<u>VIII</u>	Correlations Between Self-Concept and Perceived View of Self Held by Homosexual Orientational Others.....	75

CHAPTER I

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK I: THE SELF

Introduction

Using a symbolic interactionist framework, this study attempts an examination of the process through which meanings, particularly self-definitions, are acquired by the individual. Specifically, it was designed to examine the differential effects which different classes of "others" have on the self-concept of the individual, and hopefully it will contribute to a better understanding of the processes of self-change.

To test the hypotheses which we have drawn from interactionist theory, a sample of homosexual subjects made available to the researcher in the area of Winnipeg was used in this study. In addition, for the purposes of comparison, a sample of heterosexual respondents was matched to a subsample of the homosexual group of subjects. The study was conducted during the spring of 1973.

The Perspective

This study utilizes the perspective of symbolic interactionism, a perspective which derives largely from the social behaviorism of George Herbert Mead and his student and colleague, Herbert Blumer, who has done much to elabor-

ate and refine Mead's original formulations.

In the final analysis, three basic premises encompass the perspective of symbolic interactionism:

1. Human beings act toward things in accordance with the meanings these things have for them;
2. These meanings arise out of social interaction; and,
3. "These meanings are handled in and modified through an interpretive process used by the person in dealings with the things he encounters" (Blumer, 1969:2).

These premises point to the obvious centrality of the concept of "meaning" in symbolic interactionism, and therefore necessitate a closer look at the nature of this concept in relation to the perspective under study.

Symbols and Meaning

Mead's concepts of the "gesture" and the "symbol" are important to an understanding of how meaningful communication arises among individuals. Mead (1934:46) defines the gesture as "that phase of the individual act to which adjustment takes place on the part of other individuals in the social process of behavior", and notes that gestures may or may not be "significant" or meaningful.

In the case of animals other than man, a "conversation

of gestures" may occur; however, such a conversation cannot be considered meaningful. Mead's classic example of a dog-fight illustrates his point. In a dog-fight, the behavior of the dogs represents mechanical or spontaneous responses to immediate external stimuli; the action of one dog being the stimulus for the response of the other.

We have here a conversation of gestures. They are not, however, gestures in the sense that they are significant. We do not assume that the dog says to himself, "if the animal comes from this direction, he is going to spring at my throat and I will turn in such a way." What does take place is an actual change in his own position due to the direction of the approach of the other dog. (Mead, 1934:43).

Mead's example illustrates that for gestures to become significant symbols which provide the participants with meaning, it is necessary that given gestures arouse the same response in others as in the actor (Mead, 1934:47).

As stated by Peter Singelmann (1972:415):

. . . interaction between humans is "symbolic" in that individuals respond to the behavior of others not for some inherent quality in them, but for the significance imputed to them by others.

Mead recognizes language as the mechanism which transforms gestures into significant symbols, and the development of language, in turn, necessitates that the individual be able to "take the role of the other." This latter process will be discussed more fully in relation to the

development of self; here it is sufficient to note that taking the role of the other is necessary for mutually understood meanings to arise. Mead states this point explicitly:

. . . in all conversations of gestures within the social process, whether external (between different individuals) or internal (between a given individual and himself), the individual's consciousness of the content and flow of meaning involved depends on his thus taking the attitude of the other toward his own gestures. In this way every gesture comes within a given social group or community to stand for a particular act or response which it calls forth explicitly in the individual to whom it is addressed, and implicitly in the individual who makes it; and this particular act or response for which it stands is its meaning as a significant symbol. (1934:47).

Meanings shared in this way become the basis for human social organization, as Blumer aptly points out:

Meanings . . . can only be seen as social products, as creations that are formed in and through the defining activities of people as they interact. (1969:5).

The Self as a Meaningful Object

In terms of what things may have meaning for the individual, symbolic interaction takes the position that human beings exist in "worlds" or "environments" composed of "objects" whose existence and meaning arise through the interaction of these beings (Mead, 1934:128-130; Blumer, 1969:10). The nature of these objects is clearly implied

in Mead's discussion of the relationship between the human organism and his environment (Mead, 1934: 128-130), and explicitly stated by Blumer. The latter defines objects as "anything that can be indicated or referred to" (Blumer, 1969:11) and classifies these according to three categories: "physical objects", "social objects" and "abstract objects." As a class, for example, physical objects include such concrete entities as chairs, books or trees; social objects include "others" in their respective role relationships with the actor, such as mother, friend or student; and abstract objects encompass "moral principles, philosophical doctrines or ideas such as justice, exploitation or compassion" (Blumer, 1969:10-11).

The category of social objects is of particular relevance to this study and includes both the "self" and "others." The concept of self, as an object about which a person can acquire meaning, recognizes that an individual "can be an object of his own action . . . can recognize himself . . . acts toward himself and guides himself in his actions toward others on the basis of the kind of object he is to himself" (Blumer, 1969:12). Like other objects, the self-object "emerges from the process of social interaction in which other people are defining a person to himself" (Blumer, 1969:12). Role-taking is seen as a necessary

prerequisite for the development of the self-object.

The introduction of the concept of self into the realm of sociological theory can again be credited largely to Mead. As pointed out earlier, Mead's recognition of a dialectic interdependence between the human organism and its environment is crucial to symbolic interactionism (Singelmann, 1972:415). Mead's approach does not neglect the social context in which biological development occurs, but neither does it, nor can it according to Mead, neglect the contribution of the biological organism to this process (Mead, 1934:1-2).

For Mead, the individual act is part of the social act and, as such, the "inner experiences" of the individual in relation to his environment cannot be ignored. In reference to these "inner experiences" of the individual, Mead states as follows:

This is the beginning of the act; it is a part of the act. The external act which we do observe is a part of the process which has started within; the values which we say the (object) has are values through the relationship of the object to the person that has that sort of attitude. (1934:5).

Mead's emphasis on the "inner experiences" of the individual as well as on the ongoing social process in the emergence of meanings about objects, including the self-object, highlights the importance of self-reflexivity.

It is the characteristic of the self as an object to itself that I want to bring out. This characteristic is represented in the word "self", which is reflexive, and indicates that which can be both subject and object. (Mead, 1934:136-137).

For an individual to be an object to himself, to develop meanings about himself, he must be able to bring himself into the same "experiential field" as those others with whom he is interacting. Mead termed this process as "taking the role of the other."

The individual experiences himself . . . , not directly, but only indirectly, from the particular standpoints of other individual members of the same social group, or from the generalized standpoint of the social group as a whole to which he belongs . . . he becomes an object to himself only by taking the attitudes of other individuals toward himself within a social environment or context of experience in which both he and they are involved. (Mead, 1934:138).

But the process of self-reflexivity has an even more important implication for the understanding of human behavior. Because an individual can be an object to himself, he can interact with himself. Blumer describes the nature of this interaction:

. . . the interaction is social--a form of communication, with the person addressing himself as a person and responding thereto . . . self-interaction exists fundamentally as a process of making indications to oneself. (1969:13).

It is this process of interacting with ourselves, of

making indications to ourselves, which Mead has termed "inner experience" and which gives a distinctive character to human behavior. The individual faces an environment which he must interpret before he can act. As such, "human behavior and action is not a mechanical response to external stimuli but a thing 'constructed' creatively and selectively" (Singelmann, 1972:415).

Self-Evaluation

Charles H. Cooley also made some important contributions toward the development of the concept of self. Cooley's description of the "looking-glass self" clearly illustrates the social nature of the self and particularly the evaluative overtones which the individual's interpretation of indications made to him by others may have. As Cooley notes, the individual's self-feelings may vary considerably depending on how he perceives himself to be as evaluated by others.

As we see our face, figure and dress in the glass, and are interested in them because they are ours, and pleased or otherwise with them according as they do or do not answer to what we should like them to be; so in imagination we perceive in another's mind some thought of our appearance, manners, aims, deeds, character, friends, and so on, and are variously affected by it.

A self-idea of this sort seems to have three principal elements: the imagination of our

appearance to the other person; the imagination of his judgement of that appearance, and some sort of self-feeling, such as pride or mortification. (Cooley, 1902:184).

While Mead acknowledges that an individual's interaction with himself has an evaluative quality which affects his self-feeling (1934:200-209), this is not a point of emphasis in his analysis. Given, however, the premise that people act towards objects differentially in terms of the meanings those objects have for them, the notion of self-evaluation becomes critical to a discussion of self. One's perception of oneself or others as being positively or negatively evaluated in a given social situation should, according to this premise, variously affect the nature of the ongoing interaction.

Cooley's discussion of self-feeling, then, reflects another dimension of the nature of meaning as formulated by Mead. While Mead's foremost concern was with meanings as denotative (i.e., I am a baseball player), Cooley's contribution rests with his recognition that meanings may also be evaluative in nature (i.e., I am a good baseball player).

The Development of Self

To recapitulate, Mead recognizes that the gesture can only become significant or meaningful when it has the same effect on the individual making the gesture as it has on

the individual to whom it is addressed or who explicitly responds to it. Further, it is language which transforms the gesture into a significant symbol and allows the occurrence of mutually understood meaning. The development of language, and hence meanings about objects including the self-object, requires that the individual be able to place himself in the same experiential field as those others with whom he interacts, in order to see himself and other objects from the standpoint or perspective of these others. Mead referred to this process as "taking the role of the other."

The individual, for Mead, is thus conscious before he is self-conscious. The emergence of a self, however, is a process which begins with the individual's very first encounter with others. As language, and hence meanings about objects in the external world develop, meanings simultaneously develop about the self-object. By taking the attitudes of others toward his person, the individual acquires meanings about the self.

Mead stresses two stages in the development of the self: the "play" stage and the "game" stage. The distinction between these two stages rests with the nature of the "others" involved and with the individual's degree of self-development. Mead (1934:151) describes the "play" stage

as "the simplest form of being another to one's self."
It involves a temporal situation in which the child plays at being something or someone. The child assumes the roles of other persons who have somehow entered his life, such as an Indian, a teacher, a parent, and then acts out these roles in relation to himself. For example, to play "Indian" requires "that the child has a certain set of stimuli which call out in itself the responses that they would call out in others, and which answers to an Indian" (Mead, 1934:150). At this stage the child does not possess a fully developed self.

The child responds in a fairly intelligent fashion to the immediate stimuli that come to him, but they are not organized. He does not organize his life as we like to have him do, namely, as a whole. There is just a set of responses of the type of play. The child reacts to a certain stimulus, and the reaction is in himself that is called out in others, but he is not a whole self. (Mead, 1934:152).

The function of the play stage is, thus, to organize the child's responses to the different stimuli which he encounters.

The "game" stage, by contrast, requires that the child be able to assume the attitudes of everyone else involved in the common activity. Mead uses baseball as an example of an organized game. In order to successfully carry out his role as a player, the child must assume the roles of all others involved in the game.

In the game, then, there is a set of responses of such others so organized that the attitude of one calls out the appropriate attitudes of the other. (Mead, 1934:151).

It is the organization of the individual's responses in the game situation which allows the game to continue, for "it is that organization which controls the response of the individual" (Mead, 1934:154).

The emergence of a fully developed self, however, requires that the individual go beyond the game stage. As Mead notes:

. . . in the same way that he takes the attitudes of other individual toward himself and toward one another, he must take their attitudes towards the various phases or aspects of the common social activity or set of social undertakings in which, as members of an organized society or social group, they are all engaged. (1934:155).

The individual must then generalize these attitudes and guide his behavior in social activities accordingly. When an individual can assume the attitudes of the "generalized other", he is said to possess a fully developed self (Mead, 1934:155). The concept of the "generalized other", then, does not refer to specific persons but represents the interests of the group as an organized whole within the perspective of the individual (Kemper, 1966:325).

CHAPTER II
THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK II:
THE SELF, OTHERS AND SELF-CHANGE

It was noted earlier in this paper that Mead showed an apparent "lack of concern" with the process of self-evaluation--a process which appears highly relevant to a discussion of self. The preceding discussion of self-development, in which Mead's references to the role of others in an individual's self-development are vague and obviously incomplete, manifests a further lack of concern since it has long been recognized that others are of differential importance to the individual's self-evaluation.

Part of the problem with Mead's thesis may rest with the well-known fact that what we know of Mead's thoughts comes to us in lectures and notes published by his students. Perhaps the rest of the answer must be sought in terms of why the self was so important to Mead. Mind, Self and Society illustrates that, for Mead, "self" had more "macro" implications than the term has come to suggest. The gaps in Meadian theory lie primarily with the fact that Mead's foremost concern was with individual selves as reflecting a "different aspect or perspective" of the "organized relational pattern" of the human social process (Mead, 1934:154). Only by using the concept of self could

Mead see an explanation for the existence of organized human behavior--for society. His concept of the "generalized other", a term which represents the interests of the group as a whole within the individual, clearly indicates this concern.

Cooley's recognition of the "primary group", then, represents a significant contribution in terms of self-development:

By primary groups I mean those characterized by face-to-face association and co-operation. They are primary in several senses, but chiefly that they are fundamental in forming the social nature and ideals of the individual. The results of intimate association, psychologically, is a certain fusion of individualities in a common whole, so that one's very self, for many purposes at least, is the common life and purpose of the group. Perhaps the simplest way of describing this wholeness is by saying that it is a "we"; it involves the sort of sympathy and mutual identification for which "we" is the natural expression. (Cooley, 1907:23).

However, incomplete and questionable certain aspects of Cooley's formulation appear--especially the significance of the "face-to-face" criterion--there can be no doubt that his ideas represent a step forward from Mead's explanation. Further, Cooley's impact on the development of sociological theory cannot be denied. As Parsons notes:

The connection of the primary group with socialization is patent: the ground work of social personality is in fact laid in intimate relations with a small number of

people; and the special character of mutual interest among primary group members, which Cooley emphasizes so strongly, has been amply proven to be an essential condition of successful internalization, particularly of values and norms. (1968:62-63).

Cooley's contribution to an elaboration of Mead's ideas is hence two-fold: Cooley recognizes that others are of differential importance to the individual in the development of meanings about the self-object, and he stipulates that "identification"¹ is the mechanism by which particular others assume greater importance. Cooley, however, fails to further elaborate his theoretical contributions.

It is not surprising, then, that when one comes to study the development of self in terms of particular others or under particular social conditions, "gaps" appear in the formulations of Mead and Cooley. At this point, it becomes necessary to supplement their approaches with those of more contemporary authors who are concerned with the process of self-development.

Others

While the concept of "other" occupies a central role

1. For a discussion of what motivates an individual to accept the imputations of others, see "The Problem of Motivation", Chapter II.

in the theoretical formulation of Mead, Mead's concern was with the way in which the individual participates in, and is affected by, the society as a whole. The individual's perception of the "generalized other", that is, of the organized attitudes of the group or community to which he belongs, requires that the individual be able to place himself in the same experiential field as those others with whom he interacts, and take the attitudes of these others toward himself and towards the ongoing social activity of which he is a part. The individual's actual membership groups, then, provide the particular standpoint from which the individual comes to experience and evaluate himself and others. Thus, while Mead's discussion of the "generalized other" is vague, he does suggest that particular others (i.e., other members of the groups to which the individual belongs) are significant to the individual in providing him with a perspective of the attitudes of the entire community against which to compare and evaluate himself and others.

Turner elaborates this aspect of Mead's work and notes that "reference group", in the broad sense of that term, and "generalized other" essentially amount to the same thing:

The reference group is a generalized other which is viewed as possessing member roles and attributes independently of the specific individuals who compose it. (1966:158-159).

Turner also recognizes that the generality of the term "reference group" has aroused much controversy among writers, and while he maintains that the different usages for the term are not separate, but merely definitions reflecting differential emphases on the effect and mechanism of the reference group,¹ he suggests that, in actuality, the term encompasses four concepts: identification groups; valuation groups; interaction groups; and, audience groups.

. . . the source of the individual's major perspectives and values might well be named the identification group . . . At the opposite extreme, the individual's behavior is affected by (interaction groups) whose members constitute merely conditions to his actions. The groups are neutrally toned to the actor; he must merely take them into account in order to accomplish his purposes. . . . In between are those (valuation) groups which acquire value to the individual because the standpoint of his identification groups designate them as points of reference . . . we should note a dichotomy cross-cutting the preceding distinctions. . . . These are the (audience) groups by whom the actor sees his role performance observed and evaluated, and he attends to the evaluations and expectations which members of the group hold toward him. (Turner, 1966:158).

In Turner's analysis, a particular constellation of others (i.e., those who comprise the individual's identification groups) provide the individual with his self-definit-

1. Turner cites the different usages for the term "reference group" as, the group against which the individual compares himself in making self-judgments, the group which serves as the source of an individual's values, and the group to which an individual seeks acceptance. (Turner, 1966:157).

ions and a perspective of all others against which he can compare and evaluate himself and others. Kemper makes the same type of distinction, but refers to the members of identification groups as "significant others":

Most individuals . . . are bounded by a relatively small number of others, and of these, even a smaller number are significant to the extent that they contribute in any broad or deep sense to the individual's self-concept . . . by whether of time, social structure or cultural prescription, each person acquires a particular constellation of others whose opinions and behavior are especially important to him and from whom he derives certain central notions about himself. (1966:325-326).

Kemper refers to an individual's configuration of significant others as constituting his "reference set", a term which bears much resemblance to "reference group" and "generalized other":

Reference set . . . is taken to mean the sum total of others, in or out of role sets, present or absent, real or imagined, individual or group normative, comparative or audience, institutionally legitimate or not, who exercise influence over the individual. The reference set constitutes the cast of characters--the significant others--whom the individual takes into account when he acts, or to use Weber's phrase, with respect to whom his "behavior is oriented in its course". (1966:327).

By definition, then, the "reference set" serves as the individual's major source of self-concept; however, Kemper emphasizes that:

. . . not all members of the reference set contribute equally to the individual's self. Some members' interests are specific, others are diffuse and opportunities for interaction with them, except in imagination, may vary considerably. (1966:327).

While Kemper makes a distinction between the degree of importance of significant others, his formulation goes no further. In contrast, Sullivan's formulation of the "significant other" is much more specific. As Denizen notes:

Sullivan coined the term "significant other" to refer to those others whose evaluations of his behavior and attitudes the individual held in high esteem. (1966:298)¹

Sullivan's formulation, however, makes no distinction between those others who are important to the individual only in a role-specific sense and those who are important to the individual in a trans-role, trans-situational sense. Recognizing this, Kuhn's (1964) exploration into the importance of others led him to develop the concept of the "orientational other." While Kuhn's "orientational other" has been operationalized in terms of Sullivan's "significant other" (Denizen, 1966), Kuhn assigns to the "orientational other" four defining attributes which imply that the

1. Denizen points out that there is some question as to whether the term was meant to refer to those individuals responsible for socializing the individual or to all those persons the individual holds in high esteem. Recent usage, however, tends to employ the latter interpretation. (1966:298).

individual tends to have a history of relationships with such others. Moreover, these others are important to the individual regardless of the social role enacted or the social situation in which the actor finds himself. As Kuhn notes:

- 1) the term refers to those others to whom the individual is most fully, broadly and basically committed, emotionally and psychologically;
- 2) it refers to the others who have provided him with his general vocabulary, including his most basic and crucial concepts and categories;
- 3) it refers to the others who have provided and continue to provide him with his categories of self and other and with meaningful roles to which such assignments refer;
- 4) it refers to the others in communication with whom his self-conception is basically sustained and, or changed. (1964:78).

Denizen, following a test of Kuhn's hypotheses, suggests that:

. . . there exist for every individual two classes of significant others: those specific to him when he enacts his many roles and those significant for him in a trans-situational, trans-role sense. We suggest that individuals have longer histories of relationships with orientational others than they do with role-specific others and hence it is to the orientational other that we must turn if we are to learn anything about the more basic, underlying dimensions of an individual's personality. It is these persons who provide the individual with his basic vocabularies and his conception of role and self. (1966:307-308).

The Self and Others

The preceding discussion emphasizes the importance of two "classes" of others to the individual in terms of his self-definitions: those others who are important in a role-specific sense and others who are important in a trans-role, trans-situational sense. This argument suggests that each individual possesses a number of "different" selves given that he enacts a number of different roles with a number of different others. Mead, in a discussion of "multiple selves", also makes this point:

What we have here is a situation in which there can be many selves, and it is dependent upon the set of social reactions that is involved as to which self we are going to be. (1934:143).

At the same time, Kuhn's (1966) formulation suggests that each individual possesses a self somewhat independently of specific role enactments and specific social situations; that is, the individual can perceive and evaluate himself as an actor in the ongoing social process. Mead also makes this point:

There is usually an organization of the whole self with reference to the community to which we belong, and the situation in which we find ourselves. (1934: 142-143).

Erikson (1968:217) refers to what Mead has called the "whole self" as the "composite self" of the individual, and Kuhn suggests that the individual's perception of himself

as an actor in the ongoing social process, independent of specific role enactments and social situations, is provided, sustained and/or changed by his "orientational others." This is the individual's perception of himself which is most important to him, which consists of his evaluation of himself in terms of those concepts which are the most crucial to him, and which is carried into and affects the social interaction in all situations in which the individual becomes involved. For the purposes of this study, "self-concept" refers, then, to the individual's perception of his "whole" or "composite" self.

Self-Change

The concept of the "orientational other" would appear to have important implications for the study of changes in the adult self as well as for the development of self in childhood since it avoids the problems of single model theories of identification.¹ Thus, basic self changes in adulthood may be attributed to changes in one's "orientational others."

While Mead conceptualized the self in terms of process,

1. "Identification", as the motivational factor behind self-acceptance of other's imputations will be discussed in "The Problem of Motivation", Chapter II.

most authors would agree that changes in the self-definitions of an individual are gradual, and closely related to role changes.

Since most people past infancy are playing a great many roles at any given time, and since we seldom change more than one role at a time (or at most a few), it is probable that stability and persistence are lent to personality by the roles that do not change. (Hickman, Kuhn, 1956:38).

Thus the acquisition of new roles implies changing self-definitions on the part of the individual. At the same time, however, just as not all others are of equal significance to the individual, not all roles which he enacts are of equal importance to him. Kuhn suggests that just as the "orientational other" provides the individual with meaningful concepts of self and others, it also provides him with meaningful roles to which these concepts refer (1964:78). Thus, role changes which are perceived as being "major" by the individual would have the most impact upon the individual's self-concept. Schmitt (1966) notes that, in relation to the individual's value system, major role changes may be perceived as being positively or negatively evaluated. From the point of view of symbolic interactionism, it follows that changes in the individual's self-concept would be in the same direction as the major role change, at least initially. Thus, for example, the Catholic girl who positively evaluates the role of nun

presumably undergoes positive changes in her self-concept on becoming a nun. Given that the role of nun is positively evaluated by the individual, her perception of the responses of significant others toward her enactment of the role of nun will either serve to sustain or improve her self-concept (i.e., I am good because I am a nun, or I am a good nun) or downgrade it (i.e., I am a bad nun).

On the other hand, the individual who undergoes a major, negative role change should undergo changes in his self-concept in the same direction. Kuhn's argument suggests that in cases where the negatively evaluated role is not easily abandoned, the individual's perception and evaluation of that role (and hence his perception and evaluation of himself in that role) may change given that he develops new "orientational others" who support his self-concept. Shibutani describes this process:

Although the evidence is far from conclusive, it appears that many transformations of perspective are accompanied by a displacement of significant others There is usually a long period of frustration marked by disturbances in inter-personal relations. . . . Then the "lost soul" is introduced to a new communication channel, often by accident, and becomes aware of another way of looking at life. Experiences are reclassified and the convert forms a new conception of himself. These new meanings are then reinforced by another set of significant others and their sympathetic support is apparently a crucial part of all conversions. (1962:141-142).

The Problem of Motivation

Before proceeding with our discussion of self-change, the question of what motivates an individual to accept the imputations of others deserves some consideration. Bandura and Walters (1963) note that the role theorists have failed to systematically relate the antecedents of role playing with the nature of the role models involved. Mead's formulation, for example, de-emphasizes the differential importance of others to an individual, and fails to provide an adequate explanation as to what motivates an individual to take the role of the other, to incorporate the perspective of the other and to use this perspective in guiding his own behavior.

Following Cooley's approach, Foote (1951) suggests that a theory of motivation based on the process of identification would adequately explain the differential effects which others have on an individual.¹ Unfortunately, controversy exists over the nature of the antecedent conditions which are thought to facilitate the process of identification. Moreover, while Freud and his followers have probably provided the most detailed and widely accepted explanation of the process of identification, their approaches are limited in that they tend to rely on a single

1. For the purposes of this study, "identification" refers to "the incorporation of the qualities of an external object, usually those of another person, into one's personality" (Hall, 1954:74). This definition is directly credited to Freud.

model explanation of role playing and identification (i.e., parent-child relationships). As such, the significance of other models to the individual's development does not receive due attention. As Bandura and Walters point out:

. . . during their life history children are exposed to a series of models, the relative strength of whose influence depends on their availability, their homogeneity or heterogeneity, their interrelationships, and the extent to which each of them has received rewarding or punishing consequences for his behavior. (1963:92).

Two important dimensions of human interaction which are thought to facilitate the process of identification and, hence, bring about changes in the meanings attributed to the self-object are power and affection. Power refers to the degree to which the socializing agent exerts control, authority or dominance over the individual while affection, or affectivity, refers to the degree to which there are affectionate bonds between parent and child (Brim: 1966).

While most authors, in discussing identification within the context of the family, agree that the aims of socialization are best met by a combination of power and affection in parent-child relationships (Parsons, 1955; Mussen and Distler, 1959; Maccoby, 1959; Brim, 1966; Clausen, 1968), the difficulty with assessing the relative

effects of power and affection within this context are compounded by the fact that parent-child relationships, unlike most other relationships, are usually characterized by high levels of both power and affection. Maccoby (1968) suggests, however, that the degree of power existing in the relationship is less important for change to occur than the emotional context in which power is exercised -- providing that at least some power exists. Power accompanied by hostility or affective-neutrality is most likely to result in public conformity without private acceptance -- a situation which Kelman (1961:62) refers to as "compliance." A similar point is made by Bandura and Walters (1963).

Warmth, on the other hand, tends to promote internalization and is assumed to extend the influence of the socializing agent over a wider range of behavior. Thus Festinger (1953) notes that relationships based on power are likely to result in compliance while relationships based on affection are likely to result in changes in the individual's value system which are less situationally specific. Just as the use of power decreases the attractiveness of the socializing agent and hence decreases his effectiveness in influencing the individual beyond the immediate social influence setting, so the existence of affectionate bonds within a relationship increases the

attractiveness of the socializing agent and motivates the individual to accept the influence of the socializing agent beyond what has been termed compliance. As Kelman notes, the individual is motivated to accept the evaluations of these important others as his own because of his desire to maintain a self-defining relationship:

Accepting influence through identification then, is a way of establishing or maintaining the desired relationship to the other, and the self-definition that is anchored in this relationship. (1961:63).

While the question of what motivates an individual to accept the imputations of others as his own is not directly related to this study, it is important to note that an individual is most likely to accept the evaluations of those primary others with whom he is involved in highly affectionate relationships; in fact, affectionate bonds are seen as a necessary antecedent of identification (Parsons, 1951; Mussen, 1967).

CHAPTER III
THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK III:
THE SELF AND DEVIANCE

A review of the literature suggests that there is a complex relationship between "self" and "others." While others provide the individual with meanings about objects, including the self-object, others are of differential importance to the individual. Only those others who Kuhn has labelled "orientational others" contribute in any meaningful way to the self-concept of the individual. Further, while major role changes presumably bring about changes in the individual's self-evaluation, basic changes in his value system are thought to be related to changes in his "orientational others." This formulation has important implications for the study of individuals who possess deviant self-concepts since it suggests that these individuals need not necessarily possess negative self-concepts as a result of their deviance. While a number of authors have made this observation in relation to certain forms of deviance, such as gang delinquency (Cohen, 1955, 1965; Chapman, 1966; Reiss, 1969; Werthman, 1970), there has been a hesitancy on the part of many authors in applying these same principles to other forms of deviance such as homosexuality. Before discussing the relevant literature on homosexuality, however, it is necessary to discuss

deviance generally from the perspective of symbolic interaction.

Deviance as Process

Symbolic interaction contends that individuals respond to the behavior of others not for some inherent qualities in these behaviors, but "symbolically" on the basis of the meanings these behaviors have for them. Widely shared meanings regarding appropriate and inappropriate behavior in certain situations constitute norms and the violation of norms constitutes deviance. Societal reaction to deviance, in the form of social control mechanisms which range from informal to formal techniques, serve to stigmatize and isolate the deviating individual. The process of stigmatization shifts the focus of deviation from the act itself to the deviating individual (Dinitz, Dynes and Clarke, 1969). Goffman describes this process:

By definition, of course, we believe that a person with a stigma is not quite human. On this assumption we exercise varieties of discrimination, through which we effectively, if often unthinkingly, reduce his life chances. We construct a stigma-theory, an ideology to explain his inferiority and account for the danger he represents, sometimes rationalizing an animosity based on other differences, such as those of social class We tend to impute a wide range of imperfections on the basis of the original one. (1963:5).

Dinitz, Dynes and Clarke note the impact which stigmat-

ization can have on the self-concept of the individual:

As a result of these various reactions both on the interpersonal and institutional level, there is a tendency for deviants to develop negative conceptions of themselves. In a few instances, the deviant may orient himself to a "higher set of values and norms" which provide self-justification. In other words, the deviant may feel that he is right and the world is wrong. This is a possible outcome but it is a difficult one to maintain in the face of greater contradictory evidence. The more usual results of the process are stigmatization and the acceptance of low self-esteem -- the feeling of being "different and bad." (1969:21).

Lemert (1967) coined the term "secondary deviation" to refer to the process whereby deviant acts are symbolically attached to persons thereby increasing the likelihood of subsequent deviation on the part of these persons. Presumably, once an individual is "labelled", he finds it difficult, and often impossible, to alter his conception of himself as unacceptable and others find it difficult to accept those once defined as deviant.

Instead of re-integrating such deviants, which is one intent of social control mechanisms, the stigmatization and subsequent isolation tend to reinforce and confirm deviants as "outsiders." (Dinitz, Dynes and Clarke, 1969:19).

Even the "secret deviant", whose deviance is unknown to the vast majority of others with whom he interacts, suffers the consequences of stigmatization. Once the individual applies the "tainted" label to himself, he is aware of his undesirable differentness and the potential reactions

of others should they find him out (Goffman, 1963).

The process of stigmatization can have the effect of forcing the deviant to seek out social circles which accept, but which also tend to perpetuate, his deviancy (Dinitz, Dynes and Clarke, 1969). In a discussion of delinquency, Chapman states:

If self-acceptance is based upon "other" acceptance of the self and if the legitimate social system produces only negative images of the self, . . . needs for self-validation through love and acceptance will arise in the individual that are not met by the legitimate social system. The delinquent will then reject the legitimate social system for any system that offers an opportunity for fulfillment of his needs. (1966:379).

Lemert notes that the form which deviance takes indicates a good deal about the necessity of deviant group formation and participation:

Groups become instrumentally important in those forms of deviance which require for their systematic or continued activation goods and services provided by others through specially organized relationships. (1967:47).

He further notes the effects which deviant group participation can have on the stigmatized individual:

While transition to such status may be initiated by moral condemnation, social rejections, and penalties, it is completed by charitable justifications, acceptance and provision of the material prerequisites of survival. (1967:49).

Interaction with deviant like-others can lead to what

Lemert (1967:19) refers to as "normalization" -- a mutual re-definition of the unacceptable behavior as "normal" and acceptable. In other words, "normalization" establishes in-group norms which govern the interaction of group members and which define the deviant behavior, and hence the deviating individuals, as "normal" and acceptable.

This formulation suggests that, if other-acceptance of the self is necessary for self-acceptance, then self-acceptance is most likely to be achieved if the deviating individual interacts with like-deviants. Relating this to Kuhn's argument, which suggests that only "orientational others" can significantly affect the self-concept of the individual, we would expect that only those deviant individuals who develop "orientational others" within the deviant group or subculture could accept deviant group norms as their own and develop positive self-concepts despite their deviant status. Without what Shibutani (1962:141-142) refers to as a "displacement of significant others", it is not expected that the individual could come to define his deviant behavior, and hence himself, as "normal" and acceptable.

Homosexuality as Process

The sex of an individual is one of several master status-

determining traits (Hughes, 1945) and, as such, Schur (1965:98) notes that "sex orientation goes to the heart of social and personal identity." This suggests that the concept of sex is highly salient to each individual and that an individual's perception of the way he is evaluated by his significant others in his enactment of his sexual roles should have an important impact on his self-concept. Further, the importance of sexual orientation presupposes that the norms governing sexual behavior, at least in this society, are highly valued and that the violation of sexual norms brings about strong negative sanctions.

A review of the literature dealing with the effects of societal reaction on the self-concepts of homosexuals¹ strongly supports the above generalizations. Numerous authors agree that the individual, upon recognizing himself to be a homosexual, must necessarily develop feelings of inadequacy and low self-esteem (see, for example, Cory, 1960; Schur, 1965; West, 1968). Since there appears to be widespread agreement that a homosexual orientation is not dis-

1. For the purposes of this study, homosexuals are defined in terms of behavior and motivation. As Linder notes, the term homosexual should only be applied to "those individuals who more or less feel an urgent desire toward, and a sexual responsiveness to, members of their own sex, and who seek gratification of this desire predominantly with members of their own sex." (1961:36).

covered until sometime after puberty, or even later in life (Schur, 1965), the development of a negative self-concept seems to be the result of the individual's perception of a major, negative role change.

As Goffman has emphasized, the stigmatized individual shares many of the beliefs and understandings regarding identity that prevail in his society. His general conditioning in the culture alerts him to his own failure to meet the dominant criteria for social approval It must be evident to the confirmed homosexual not only that his sexual inclinations disgust "normals" but also that he is unable -- or, at least, unwilling -- to meet socially prescribed masculine role expectations. (Schur, 1965:98).

Schur refines Goffman's approach, however, by pointing out that the individual's reaction to his realization of himself as a homosexual is critically dependent upon his perception of the reactions of his significant others to homosexuality which, in most cases, reflects the moral condemnation of homosexuality by society.

Social ostracism and the dependency of homosexuals on other homosexuals for sexual gratification are thought to be two factors which result in the formation of a homosexual subculture (Leznoff and Westley, 1969). As Schur (1965:85) notes, the homosexual subculture is not merely a gathering of homosexuals but "a more general culture-within-a-culture, with its distinctive values and norms, modes of speech and dress, as well as its special patterns

of interaction and social differentiation." Hooker (1965) also makes this point and further emphasizes that the most important function of the subculture is to provide the individual with a justification scheme or pattern of beliefs to explain homosexuality.

Thus, the "normalization" of homosexuality within the subculture makes the subculture "the only context in which the homosexual is 'normal'" (Leznoff and Westley, 1969:186), and provides the homosexual with support for his self-concept through other-acceptance of the self. From our earlier discussion on self-other systems, it would appear that some homosexuals, by developing "orientational others" within the subculture who support their self-concepts, could conceivably develop positive self-concepts despite their deviant status; that is, in the words of Dinetz, Dynes and Clarke (1969:21), by orienting themselves to a "higher set of values and norms", they could come to positively evaluate the role of homosexual and hence themselves as homosexuals.

This hypothesis has received almost no support from the literature on homosexuality. While Hooker (1963:174) concludes, following a comparative study of homosexuals and heterosexuals, that "some homosexuals may be very ordinary individuals, indistinguishable, except in sexual

pattern, from ordinary individuals who are heterosexual", the majority of authors contend that a homosexual orientation can only have debilitating consequences for the self-concepts of these individuals.

A person cannot live in an atmosphere of universal rejection, of widespread pretense, of a society that outlaws and banishes his activities and desires, of a social world that jokes and sneers at every turn, without a fundamental influence on his personality. (Cory, 1960:12).

Hoffman describes this "fundamental influence" which societal reaction has on the homosexual:

The homosexual accepts this stigma. He views himself as queer, bad, dirty, something less than human. And he views his partner in the same way. (1972:487).

Presumably, group support within the subculture can only provide the individual with a "sense" of support and acceptance (Leznoff and Westley, 1969:196); it is unable to entirely "neutralize" factors operating to undermine the self-concepts of homosexuals (Schur, 1965:99). Presumably also, it is impossible for the homosexual to alter his basic values which regard heterosexuality as the only legitimate form of sexual behavior between individuals.

It should be mentioned at this point that studies of homosexuals and conclusions about the effects of homosexuality on self-concept probably reflect, at least to some degree, a sampling problem. As West notes:

The belief that the majority of homosexuals are either excessively anxious, conflict-ridden persons, or else primitive impulse types with poorly developed social conscience, probably arises from the concentration of attention upon psychiatric patients and prisoners, two untypical groups who happen to be readily available for examination. (1969:50).

Hoffman (1968) and Schofield (1965) make similar points.

CHAPTER IV

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM AND HYPOTHESES

Before stating the major objectives of this study, the theoretical arguments which have been developed in the preceding chapters will be briefly summarized. The purpose of this approach is to clarify the major concepts used in this study as well as to outline our conceptualization of the processes of behavior to which these concepts refer.

From the perspective of symbolic interaction, individuals exist in "worlds" or "environments" composed of objects, and they act toward these objects on the basis of the meanings which these objects have for them. Meanings about objects, including meanings about the self-object, arise out of the social interaction one has with others.

Given that each individual enacts a number of different roles with a number of different others, he may be seen as possessing a multiplicity of selves whose appearance depends upon the social situations in which the individual finds himself. At the same time, however, an individual's perception and evaluation of himself is not entirely situationally dependent; each individual is able to perceive and evaluate himself independently of specific role enactments and specific social situations (i.e., as an actor in the ongoing social process), and this perception

of himself is carried into and affects the interaction in which the individual becomes involved. For the purposes of this study, as was mentioned earlier, self will be conceptualized as the attitudes held by the individual toward himself as an actor in the ongoing social process.

While an individual's self-concept is largely dependent upon his perception of the evaluation of others toward him, others are of differential importance to the individual and, as such do not contribute an equal influence over his self-concept. A distinction can be made between those others whose evaluations of the individual are accepted by the individual and incorporated into his self-concept, thereby exerting an enduring, generalized influence over the individual (primary or "orientational others"), and those others whose evaluations of the individual are not incorporated into the individual's self-concept and who, therefore, do not exert an influence on the individual beyond the immediate social influence setting (secondary or role-specific others). The way an individual comes to perceive and evaluate himself, therefore, is dependent upon the way he perceives himself as evaluated by a particular "class" of others -- those who are orientational to him.

The concept of the "orientational other" has important implications for the study of self-change since it

suggests that one way in which enduring changes can occur is through a displacement of significant or orientational others. More specifically, when an individual is unable to meet needs for self-validation and acceptance from those who are orientational to him, he may, through interaction with others who accept and support his self-concept, establish new self-defining relationships and thereby incorporate new meanings of self. Thus, while the motivational factor behind meaning incorporation has not yet been adequately defined, most authors would agree that affection (i.e., positive affect) is one dimension of human interaction which is essential to this process.

Studies in the area of deviance recognize that societal reaction to deviance, rather than having the desirable effect of re-integrating individuals who violate important norms, serves to isolate and stigmatize the deviant. Stigmatization, which involves the process of applying negative labels to the individual, tends to shift the focus of attention from the deviant act to the deviating individual; the most probable consequence which this process has for the individual is his acceptance of the label and resulting feelings of low self-esteem. Studies into particular forms of deviance, such as gang delinquency, indicate, however, that through a displacement of orientational others, individuals who possess deviant self-concepts need not

necessarily possess negative self-concepts as a result of their deviance. Some forms of deviance are conducive to deviant group participation, and the interaction of like-deviants is thought to lead to a process of "normalization" whereby the unacceptable behavior is re-defined as "normal" and acceptable. Kuhn's formulation suggests that the effects of in-group participation on the self-concept of an individual will be positive only to the extent that a displacement of orientational others, from those outside the in-group to those within, occurs. Since only orientational others are thought to exert a lasting influence over the individual, acceptance of in-group norms, and hence the incorporation of new self-definitions, will occur only when a displacement of orientational others occurs.

Since the nature of homosexuality makes this form of deviance conducive to deviant group participation, we would expect that the same principles which are thought to operate, for example, in the delinquent gang, would operate in the homosexual subculture. In other words, through a displacement of orientational others, some individuals should come to accept homosexuality, and hence themselves, as "normal" and acceptable. Some individuals, through participation in the homosexual subculture, should develop

orientational others within the subculture whose influence over the individual, as reflected in the individual's self-concept, should serve to neutralize the effects of "societal reaction." As such, some individuals are expected to hold positive self-concepts despite their deviant status.

For the purpose of this study, then, self-concept is the major dependent variable and sexual orientation is the major independent variable. Two intervening variables however, have been introduced which are thought to affect the self-concepts of the homosexuals; participation in the homosexual subculture and the development of orientational others.

While this position represents a departure from, if not a contradiction to, the positions of many writers concerned with the effects of a homosexual status on self-concept, there are two considerations which justify further study in this area and which, while not overlooked in the literature, have not received due attention. First, there is evidence to indicate that the process of "normalization" occurs within the homosexual subculture. Hooker (1965), for example, emphasizes that one of the primary functions of the subculture is the provision of a justification scheme or pattern of beliefs to explain homosexuality. A further indication that the process of "normalization"

occurs within the subculture is evidenced by a recent emphasis on "straight" education by active homophile groups (Humphreys, 1972). Secondly, most observations regarding the effects of homosexuality on self-concept are derived from studies of clinical patients or prison inmates -- two highly selective, unrepresentative groups.

The Problem

This study proposes that meanings, including meanings about the self-object, are acquired through interaction with others. Further, while an individual interacts with a multitude of others, only a small number of these are orientational to him and exert an enduring, generalized influence over the meanings which he incorporates. The influence which orientational others have over the individual is reflected in the way an individual comes to perceive and evaluate himself and others. Thus, one way in which enduring changes in self can occur is through a displacement of significant or orientational others.

For the purposes of this study, then, our problem is three-fold: (1) to examine, within a homosexual context, the process through which meanings, particularly those meanings which relate to the self-object, are acquired by the individual; (2) to examine, within a homosexual context,

the process through which changes in meanings attributed to the self-object occur; and, (3) to examine, within a homosexual context, the effects which different classes of "others" have on the individual.

Hypotheses

Hypothesis 1. In general, heterosexuals possess more favorable self-concepts than homosexuals.

The literature on homosexuality which deals with the effects of societal reaction on self-concept suggests that a homosexual status can only have debilitating consequences on the self-concepts of homosexuals. The homosexual, while he receives some support for his self-concept through involvement with other homosexuals, is unable to maintain a favorable self-concept in the face of strong, negative reactions to homosexuality from the larger, dominant society. As such, it is presumed that homosexuals would consistently award themselves lower rankings on a measure of self-concept than would heterosexuals.

We expect, however, that while the mean scores on a measure of self-concept will be lower for homosexuals than heterosexuals, there will be some degree of overlap between homosexuals and heterosexuals on rankings of self-concept since it is conceivable that some homosexuals will develop

orientational others within the subculture who provide them with support for their self-concepts. Thus, it is expected that some homosexuals will hold favorable self-concepts despite their deviant status.¹

Hypotheses II. In general, the greater the individual's participation within the homosexual subculture, the more likely he is to have orientational others who are also homosexual.

Kuhn's discussion of the characteristics of the orientational other suggests that these important others have longer histories of relationships with the individual than do role-specific others and, moreover, that a high degree of positive affect exists in relationships between the individual and his orientational others. As such, we would expect that the greater the individual's participation within the subculture (i.e., the more he interacts with other homosexuals), the more likely it is that some of these individuals will be orientational for him. In other words, the degree of participation within the subculture is thought to reflect the individual's degree of commitment

1. It should also be noted that some overlap on individual scores between homosexual and heterosexual might also be expected to result from the effects of other psychological and sociological factors not controlled for in this study. For example, we have not controlled for all those factors which may have an effect on the self-concepts of heterosexual subjects in our sample.

to the in-group. High participators are expected to have more orientational others who are homosexual than low participators and, as such, influence to accept in-group norms is greater for high participators than for low participators.

Hypothesis III. In general, the more favorably the individual perceives the evaluations of his homosexual orientational others toward him to be, the more favorable his self-concept.

While others are thought to provide the individual with meanings, including meanings about the self-object, others are of differential importance to the individual and, as such, do not exert an equal influence over him. Kühn suggests that only orientational others exert a lasting, generalized influence over the individual. Thus, we would expect that those who see themselves accorded higher rankings by homosexual orientational others should reflect more favorable self-concepts than those who see themselves as less highly regarded by these important others.

CHAPTER IV
METHODOLOGY

Information to test the preceding hypotheses was gathered using a survey research design. The main instrument used in obtaining the data was a form of the Semantic Differential, administered to the subjects in a questionnaire format. A measure of formal participation within the homosexual subculture was obtained using a modified version of Chapin's (1955) "Social Participation Scale." In addition, an index of informal participation was constructed to measure unstructured participation within the homosexual subculture.

Sample

The primary group of subjects used in this study consisted of a "snowball" sample¹ of male and female homosexuals made available to the researcher in the area of Winnipeg. Sixty-eight male homosexuals and twenty-four female homosexuals participated in the study. The male

1. After completing a questionnaire, each respondent was asked to contact other homosexuals he knew for the purpose of enlarging the sample size. Perspective respondents were then contacted by the researcher or one of several assistants and arrangements were made for the completion of a questionnaire.

respondents ranged in age from eighteen to thirty-nine years with a mean age of 24.02 years. The female respondents ranged in age from eighteen years to twenty-nine years with a mean age of 21.86 years. Of the sixty-eight male respondents, thirty were employed full-time in diverse occupations, twenty-five were attending a university full-time and the remainder were either attending a vocational or technical school, seeking employment, or working part-time. Of the twenty-four female respondents, nine were employed full-time in diverse occupations, thirteen were attending a university full-time, one was attending a vocational school, and one was seeking employment.

An effort was also made to obtain a matched sample of male and female heterosexuals. Since the information obtained from these individuals was used for the purposes of comparison with the homosexual data, the method of gathering a sample of heterosexual subjects was determined after information had been gathered from the homosexual subjects. The problems inherent in obtaining a matched heterosexual sample for the entire homosexual group necessitated matching only a subsample of the homosexual respondents -- those attending a university full-time. Thus, heterosexual respondents were solicited from two introductory courses in Sociology at the University of Manitoba. A random sampling of heterosexual university students was

not considered necessary since matching of the two samples was conducted on a one-to-one basis.

A total of forty-one male heterosexuals and forty-two female heterosexuals participated in the study. Of these, twelve heterosexual females were matched with twelve homosexual females. A match could not be found for one homosexual female. Sixteen heterosexual males were matched with sixteen homosexual males. It was not possible to find matches for eight homosexual males because of an unexpected mean age difference between the two groups.

Homosexual and heterosexual subjects were matched on the following variables: age, sex, education, ethnicity and religion.¹ Perfect matches were obtained for the variables sex, education and religion. An attempt was made to match the variables age and ethnicity as closely as possible. Of the eleven cases where a perfect match on the variable age could not be obtained, the mean age difference between respondents was 2.3 years.

Method of Data Collection

The data were collected from the homosexual respondents through the use of self-administered questionnaires. These

1. See Appendix I, items 1-5, for operationalization of these variables. See Appendix II for the characteristics of the homosexual sample on these variables.

questionnaires were distributed to homosexual respondents during the months of February and March, 1973, by the researcher or one of several assistants. The assistants, who were members of Winnipeg's homosexual population, were carefully briefed by the researcher in an attempt to standardize the administration procedure. Respondents had the option of mailing completed questionnaires to the researcher or, immediately following their completion, returning them in sealed, unidentifiable envelopes. The majority of homosexual individuals who were asked to participate in the study were extremely cooperative; only three questionnaires could not be coded. Of those individuals approached by the researcher, only one refused to complete a questionnaire. The assistants reported a similar enthusiasm for the study and, to the researcher's knowledge, were refused cooperation in only a few instances.

Information was collected from the homosexual subjects on the following key variables: (1) self-concept (dependent variable); (2) perceived view of self held by homosexual orientational others; (3) formal participation within the homosexual subculture; (4) informal participation within the homosexual subculture; and, (5) degree of orientational other displacement. Additional information¹

1. The reasons for collecting this information will be discussed in the chapter dealing with analysis and interpretation of data. See Appendix I, items 27, 28.

was gathered which pertained to the individual's history of involvement in highly affective, enduring homosexual relationships and to the period of time which had elapsed since "coming out."¹

Self-administered questionnaires were distributed to heterosexual respondents during the month of March, 1973. These individuals were solicited from two introductory courses in Sociology at the University of Manitoba, and questionnaires were completed and returned during a class period. Information was gathered from the heterosexual subjects on the self-concept variable and on the variables required for sample matching.²

Semantic Differential Scales

The variables "self-concept and "perceived view of self held by homosexual orientational others" were operat-

-
1. According to one author, the phrase "coming out" is used by homosexuals to refer to "one's recognition of oneself as a homosexual or one's entrance into the ongoing stream of homosexual life, specifically into the bar system and privately organized social affairs" (Cavan, 1963:27). The local definition of the term, however, appears to have no either/or qualities; rather, the phrase is used to refer to that time in the individual's life when he recognizes himself to be a homosexual and begins to actively seek out the company of other homosexuals.
 2. See Appendix III for the format of the questionnaire distributed to heterosexual respondents.

ionalized using the technique of Semantic Differential.³ The scales, consisting of bi-polar adjective pairs, were selected to sample three factors: "evaluation" -- eight scales; "potency" -- four scales; and "activity" -- three scales. These scales are as follows: "evaluation", beautiful-ugly, valuable-worthless, successful-unsuccessful, kind-cruel, true-false, wise-foolish, clean-dirty, and good-bad; "potency", hard-soft, strong-weak, sharp-dull and large-small; and, "activity", fast-slow, masculine-feminine, and active-passive. An effort was made to find scales which were highest on the particular factor being measured and low on all other factors (Jenkins, Russell, and Suci, 1958; Osgood and Snider, 1969). A seven point rating scale was used.

The scales, in the form and order in which they were utilized are included in Appendix I. Scales representing the same factor were not allowed to follow one another and the right and left ends of the scales were systematically

3. For a detailed description of this instrument; see, for example, Osgood, 1952; Osgood and Suci, 1955; Osgood, Tannenbaum and Suci, 1957; Osgood and Snider, 1969. The Semantic Differential technique requires subjects to rate the meanings of concepts on seven point, bipolar adjective scales. The instrument assumes that meaning is composed primarily of three factors: evaluation, potency and activity. These factors have been derived empirically rather than theoretically. Scales are selected which have high loadings on one factor but are low on other factors. Each factor is represented at least twice on every Semantic Differential set of scales.

counter-balanced in an attempt to avoid response sets.

Self-Concept

"Self-concept" was operationalized as the sum of the scores obtained on a fifteen scale Semantic Differential, in which subjects rated the concept "me as a person." For purposes of data analysis, the variable "self-concept" was also subdivided into "self-evaluation", the sum of the scores obtained while rating the above concept on the eight "evaluation" scales; "self-potency", the sum of the scores obtained while utilizing the four "potency" scales; and "self-activity", the sum of the scores obtained while utilizing the three "activity" scales. Low scores indicate a negative, unfavorable view of self (or component of self when the three factors listed above are analyzed separately), while high scores indicate a positive, favorable self-concept.

Perceived Self-Concept

"Perceived self-concept" was operationalized as the sum of the scores obtained on the same fifteen scale Semantic Differential while rating the concept "homosexuals whose opinions of me are important to me, think I am." Only individuals who gave information indicating that a

displacement of orientational others had occurred were required to complete this section of the questionnaire. As in the case of the variable "self-concept", "perceived self-concept" was also subdivided into three factors: "perceived self-evaluation"; "perceived self-potency"; and, "perceived self-activity."

Participation

Two measures relating to participation in the homosexual subculture were obtained. "Formal participation" was operationalized as the sum of the scores obtained on a modified version of Chapin's "Social Participation Scale" (Chapin, 1955; Bonjean, Hill and McLemore, 1967). This scale was originally developed to measure the degree of a person's participation in community groups and organizations and was modified, for the purposes of this study, to measure the degree of a person's participation in the three existing homophile groups or organizations in the city of Winnipeg. Chapin's original scale included a measure of five organizational activities: membership, attendance, contributions, committee memberships and office holdings. Given the nature of the homophile organizations in Winnipeg, the category of "contributions" was omitted entirely and, in the case of one homophile organization, the category of "membership" was given a less rigid interpretation since

no membership dues are collected and no formal membership list exists. As in Chapin's original scale, the four activities used in this scale were assigned arbitrary weights, and the sum of the weighted activities was taken as an index of formal participation.¹

"Informal participation" was operationalized as the sum of the scores obtained on four items relating to unstructured participation within the homosexual subculture. These items were designed to include those aspects of informal participation most often discussed in the literature on homosexuality.² For example, respondents were asked about the amount of leisure time they spent with homosexual friends, the regularity with which they patronized "gay" bars etc., and the frequency with which they engaged in sexual relations with other homosexuals.

For both measures of participation, high scores indicate a greater degree of participation within the homosexual subculture than low scores.

Oriental Others

For the purposes of this study, "orientational others"

1. See Appendix 1, items 9-20. The arbitrary weights assigned these four formal activities are: attendance, never (0), sometimes (1), regularly (2); membership, non-member (0), member (3); committee membership, non-member (0), member (4); office holdings, holds no office (0), holds an office (5).
2. See Appendix I, items 21-24.

was operationalized as "those others whose opinions of the individual matter the most to the individual" (Denzin, 1966). Each subject was required to list five such others, in order of importance, and to indicate the sexual orientation of each person listed.¹

"Orientational other displacement" was operationalized as the total number of orientational others classified by the subject as being homosexual.

1. See Appendix I, item 25.

CHAPTER VI

ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION OF DATA

The primary statistical technique used in the analysis of data was correlation analysis.¹ Tests of significance were performed; however, it must be noted that sample bias, in terms of selection factors, prevents generalization of findings beyond the parameters of this study.

For the purposes of data analysis, both the homosexual and the heterosexual samples were subdivided on the variable sex. Subdivision was considered necessary because there is some evidence in the literature to indicate that modes of adaption to homosexuality differ between males and females. Lesbians, for example, are thought to engage in more enduring and affective relationships than male homosexuals (Schur, 1965). Thus, because of the unknown effects which these differences could have on the variables under study, the data collected from male and female homosexuals were analyzed separately.

Findings

Hypothesis I. In general, heterosexuals possess more

1. See Appendix IV for a discussion of non-parametric correlation analysis.

favorable self-concepts than homosexuals.

Table I illustrates the mean scores of male homosexual and male heterosexual matched respondents on the variable "self-concept" and its component factors, "self-evaluation", "self-potency", and "self-activity." As predicted, male homosexual subjects tended to rank themselves lower on our measure of self-concept than did a comparable sample of male heterosexuals. As indicated by Table I, however, the differences in mean scores achieved by male homosexual and heterosexual matched samples do not show statistical significance at the .05 level when subjected to a one-tailed Sign Test,¹ a non-parametric test of significance; that is, the differences in mean scores are more likely due to chance than to actual differences in the matched samples.

It was also predicted that there would be a high degree of overlap between the individual scores achieved by male homosexual and heterosexual matched subjects. That is, contrary to the expectations of some authors concerned with the effects of a homosexual status on self-concept, the scores achieved by male homosexuals would be relatively, not absolutely, lower than those achieved by a comparable sample of male heterosexual subjects. Measures of central

1. For a discussion of the Sign Test, see, for example, Siegel, 1956.

TABLE I: COMPARABLE MEAN SCORES OF MALE HOMOSEXUAL AND MALE HETEROSEXUAL MATCHED SAMPLES ON THE SELF-CONCEPT VARIABLE (HYPOTHESIS I)¹

	Male Homosexuals	Male Heterosexuals	Sign Test - Probability
Self-Concept ²	69.56	77.44	p=.105
Self-Evaluation	39.50	40.69	p=.151
Self-Potency	16.66	19.63	p=.304
Self-Activity	13.45	16.69	p=.059

1. In all cases, possible scale ranges are as follows:
 Self-concept, 15-105; self-evaluation, 8-56;
 self-potency, 4-28; and, self-activity, 3-21.
2. The variable self-concept is a summary measure composed of the following factors: self-evaluation; self-potency; and, self-activity.

TABLE II: COMPARABLE MEASURES OF CENTRAL TENDENCY AND DISPERSION FOR MALE HOMOSEXUAL AND MALE HETEROSEXUAL MATCHED SAMPLES ON THE SELF-CONCEPT VARIABLE (HYPOTHESIS I)

	Self-Concept		Self-Evaluation		Self-Potency		Self-Activity	
	Homo	Hetero	Homo	Hetero	Homo	Hetero	Homo	Hetero
Maximum	84.0	91.0	52.0	50.0	23.0	24.0	19.0	19.0
Minimum	47.0	64.0	28.0	34.0	9.0	14.0	7.0	13.0
Mode	82.0	70.0 79.0	35.0 40.0 46.0	35.0	16.0 17.0	19.0 22.0	14.0	17.0
Median	70.0	76.5	39.0	40.0	17.0	19.5	14.0	17.0
Range	37.0	27.0	24.0	16.0	14.0	10.0	7.0	6.0

Homosexual N=16
Heterosexual N=16

tendency and dispersion, as illustrated in Table II, support this expectation. The range in scores is greater for male homosexual subjects on the three factors than for the matched sample of heterosexuals; however, an analysis of maximum and minimum scores on factorial components of self-concept indicates that only in the case of the self-potency factor are both the maximum and minimum scores achieved by heterosexual subjects absolutely higher. Further, the percent of overlap in scores shared by the male homosexual and heterosexual matched samples is: self-concept, 62.50%; self-evaluation, 90.63%; self-potency, 87.50%; and self-activity, 84.38%.

Table III illustrates the mean scores of female homosexual and female heterosexual matched respondents on the variable "self-concept" and its component factors "self-evaluation", "self-potency", and "self-activity." Unexpectedly, the mean scores achieved by female homosexual respondents are higher than those achieved by a comparable sample of female heterosexuals except on the self-potency factor. As illustrated by Table III, however, the differences in mean scores are not statistically significant at the .05 level when subjected to the Sign Test, and further interpretation is difficult for two reasons. First, as indicated in Table IV, some inconsistency is present

TABLE III: COMPARABLE MEAN SCORES OF FEMALE HOMOSEXUAL
AND FEMALE HETEROSEXUAL SAMPLES ON THE SELF-
CONCEPT VARIABLE (HYPOTHESIS I)

	Female Homosexuals N=12	Female Heterosexuals N=12	Sign Test Probability
Self-Concept	71.83	69.75	p=.274
Self-Evaluation	42.70	40.75	p=.113
Self-Potency	17.17	16.92	p=.274
Self-Activity	11.92	12.33	p=.500

TABLE IV: COMPARABLE MEASURES OF CENTRAL TENDENCY AND DISPERSION FOR FEMALE HOMOSEXUAL AND FEMALE HETEROSEXUAL MATCHED SAMPLES ON THE SELF-CONCEPT VARIABLE (HYPOTHESIS I)

	Self-Concept		Self-Evaluation		Self-Potency		Self-Activity	
	Homo	Hetero	Homo	Hetero	Homo	Hetero	Homo	Hetero
Maximum	89.0	82.0	52.0	49.0	25.0	20.0	19.0	15.0
Minimum	55.0	58.0	35.0	30.0	11.0	13.0	9.0	8.0
Mode	79.0	73.0	38.0 42.0	43.0	15.0 20.0	16.0	11.0 13.0	11.0 13.0
Median	73.0	71.0	42.0	41.0	17.0	16.5	11.5	12.5
Range	34.0	24.0	17.0	19.0	14.0	7.0	10.0	7.0

Homosexual N=12
Heterosexual N=12

in the female homosexual data. While the mean scores for homosexual females are higher on two factors, with the exception of the self-potency factor, the range in scores is also greater for the homosexual sample on both the self-potency and the self-activity factors. Secondly, the mean is highly subject to changes induced by extreme values especially when the number of cases is very small. Thus, the presence of one female homosexual in the sample with a score of 89.0 on the self-concept measure could account for the slight variation in means noted. The percent of overlap in scores shared by the female homosexual and heterosexual matched samples is: self-concept, 91.66%; self-evaluation, 83.33%; self-potency, 83.33% and self-activity, 91.66%.

Table V reports the comparative mean scores achieved by the entire homosexual and heterosexual samples on the variable self-concept and its component factors. Since these samples are not strictly comparable, one must exercise caution in interpreting the results; however, the findings are sufficiently interesting to warrant noting. Except on the self-activity factor, the mean scores achieved by female homosexuals are higher than those achieved by female heterosexuals. Using a two-tailed difference of means test¹ and 64 degrees of freedom indicates, however,

1. For a discussion of this test of significance, see Blalock, 1960: 170-175).

TABLE V: COMPARABLE MEAN SCORES ACHIEVED BY THE ENTIRE HOMOSEXUAL AND HETEROSEXUAL SAMPLES OF THE SELF-CONCEPT VARIABLE (HYPOTHESIS I)

	Male Homosexuals N=68	Male Heterosexuals N=41	Values of t
Self-Concept	72.68	76.73	t=2.490
Self-Evaluation	40.49	40.95	t=0.540
Self-Potency	17.77	19.02	t=1.860
Self-Activity	14.43	16.56	t=3.438

df=107

	Female Homosexuals N=24	Female Heterosexuals N=42	Values of t
Self-Concept	71.92	69.50	t=1.249
Self-Evaluation	42.04	40.21	t=1.410
Self-Potency	17.63	16.86	t=1.122
Self-Activity	12.25	12.45	t=0.349

df=64

that the differences in mean scores achieved by the entire female homosexual and heterosexual samples do not show statistical significance at the .05 level.

The mean scores achieved by the entire male homosexual sample are lower than the mean scores achieved by the entire male heterosexual sample on the variable self-concept and its component variables, self-evaluation, self-potency and self-activity. Using a one-tailed difference of means test and 107 degrees of freedom indicates that the difference in mean scores on the self-concept variable and the self-potency and self-activity factors do not show statistical significance at the .05 level.

The hypothesis that, in general, heterosexuals possess more favorable self-concepts than homosexuals was supported to the extent that the mean scores achieved by male homosexual subjects were lower than those achieved by comparable male heterosexual subjects. Due to the limitations placed on data analysis when dealing with nonrandom samples, one must be cautious in interpreting the importance of the magnitude of mean differences between the comparable samples; however, tests of significance indicated that the differences in mean scores between the comparable samples (male and female) were not statistically significant at the .05 level. It is apparent from the data, however, that in accordance with the researcher's expectations,

some homosexuals do develop favorable self-concepts despite their deviant status.¹ Earlier, the ability of a homosexual to view himself in a positive manner was theoretically related to his development of orientational others within the homosexual subculture, and the correlations² between self-concept and orientational other displacement (.46 for males and .32 for females) provide positive support for this contention. The probabilities associated with these correlations are .001 and .066 respectively.

Further, it was not expected that individuals who indicated that no displacement had occurred could nevertheless come to accept in-group norms as their own and re-define their behavior, and hence themselves, as "normal" and acceptable. While it would have been interesting to determine the relationship between self-concept and displacement, dichotomizing between individuals with no displacement and those with one or more displacements, this

-
1. The question of experimental bias in a study of this nature is important since it is feasible that the results could reflect the vested interests of respondents. A frequency breakdown of self-concept scores by sex for homosexual respondents is given in Appendix V, and the range and distribution of these scores does not suggest the presence of systematic experimental bias.
 2. The correlations between self-concept and orientational displacement were based on the total homosexual sample of 64 male cases and 24 female cases.
 3. Since we are primarily concerned with the effects of the variables "participation" and "orientational other displacement" on the individual's composite view of self, the summary measure "self-concept" will be used for the remainder of the analysis. Appendix VI presents the correlations between the factorial components of self and "participation" and "orientational other displacement."

type of analysis was not suited to the data since very few individuals in the sample indicated that no displacement had occurred. It should be noted that this finding may be related to the "snowball" nature of the sample; that is, individuals with no displacement would be less likely to have developed friendship bonds with other homosexuals and, thus, less likely to be asked by other homosexuals to participate in the study. Table VI presents the frequency breakdown by sex for the homosexual sample on the displacement variable.

Homosexual respondents were also asked to list their five orientational others in order of importance, indicating the sexual orientations of these others. Where the respondent perceived the sexual orientation of an orientational other to be heterosexual, he was also asked to indicate whether or not this important other was aware of the respondent's homosexual orientation. A relationship was found to exist between self-concept and the sexual orientation of the first important other listed by the individual. That is, the more favorable the self-concept of the respondent, the greater the likelihood that his most important orientational other was also a homosexual. The more unfavorable the self-concept of the individual, the greater the likelihood that his most important orientational other was a heterosexual who was not aware of the

TABLE VI: A FREQUENCY BREAKDOWN BY SEX FOR THE ENTIRE
HOMOSEXUAL SAMPLE ON THE ORIENTATIONAL OTHER
DISPLACEMENT VARIABLE (HYPOTHESIS I)

	Male Homosexuals N=68		Female Homosexuals N=24	
	Absolute Freq.	Relative Freq.	Absolute Freq.	Relative Freq.
No Displacement	9	13.2%	3	12.5%
One Displacement	14	20.6%	9	37.5%
Two Displacements	23	33.8%	5	20.8%
Three Displacements	11	16.2%	3	12.5%
Four Displacements	6	8.8%	3	12.5%
Five Displacements	1	1.5%	1	4.2%
Incomplete Response	4	5.9%	0	0.0%
	<u>68</u>	<u>100.0%</u>	<u>24</u>	<u>100.0%</u>

respondents homosexuality. Using a nonparametric measure, r_s , the correlation between self-concept and the sexual orientation of the first orientational other listed was $-.31$ for males and $-.44$ for females.¹ The probabilities associated with these correlations are $.004$ and $.015$ respectively.

Hypothesis II. In general, the greater the individual's participation within the homosexual subculture, the more likely he is to have orientational others who are also homosexual.

This hypothesis was based upon participation as a measure of commitment to the in-group.² As such, it was predicted that the greater the individual's commitment, the greater would be the amount of orientational other

-
1. Negative values of r_s are the result of coding procedure where "homosexual other" was assigned the value 1, "heterosexual other--aware" was assigned the value 2, and "heterosexual other--unaware" was assigned the value 3. This correlation is again based on the total homosexual sample of 68 male cases and 24 female cases. For a discussion of Spearman's rank-order correlation, see, for example, Blalock, 1960.
 2. A frequency breakdown of formal and informal participation scores by sex for homosexual respondents is given in Appendix VII.

displacement. As evidenced by Table VII, the value of r_s are in the predicted direction; however, it appears that for both males and females a measure of informal participation is a better indicator of orientational other displacement than is a measure of formal participation. Since informal participation is more dependent upon the existence of affective bonds between participating individuals than is formal participation, this finding was not entirely unexpected.¹

The lower correlation between formal participation and orientational displacement for females may reflect a characteristic difference in behavior between male homosexuals and lesbians. Much less is known about the prevalence of homosexuality among females than among males and this has been attributed to a lower level of visibility for such females (Schur, 1965). It is the opinion of the researcher that formal social clubs do not serve the same functions for female homosexuals as for male homosexuals, and this is reflected in lower attendance and interest by females -- even when in-group commitment is high. While 75.0% of the male sample indicated that it was not presently involved in an enduring, intimate homosexual relation-

1. The reader will recall that Kuhn (Chapter II) saw the existence of affective bonds as an important characteristic of the relationship between an individual and his orientational others.

TABLE VII: CORRELATIONS BETWEEN PARTICIPATION AND
ORIENTATIONAL OTHER DISPLACEMENT (HYPOTHESIS II)¹

	Male Homosexuals N=64	Female Homosexuals N=24
Formal Participation and Orientational Other Displacement	.34 ² (.003)	.20 (.175)
Informal Participation and Orientational Other Displacement	.60 (.001)	.59 (.001)

1. The figures in brackets indicate the probability for each correlation.

2. This correlation is based upon participation in three formal organizations: "Happenings", Club 654, and The Campus Gay Club. The low correlation obtained between participation in The Campus Gay Club and orientational other displacement (-.18) has lowered this value of \bar{r} .

ship, only 7.4% of the male sample indicated that it "seldom" or "almost never" participated in sexual encounters with other males. Thus, the private social club appears to provide the male homosexual with an arena of potential sexual partners for short-term involvements. Local reference to private social clubs as "meat markets" further indicates the importance of the sexual outlet provided by these organizations. Females, on the other hand, are thought to engage in more enduring, affective relationships. Supporting this contention, 41.7% of the female sample indicated a present involvement of this nature. Thus, the demand for new sexual partners is much less evident among females. Moreover, the correlation between sexual encounters and orientational other displacement is higher for females than for males (.42 as compared to .20), suggesting that the sexual function provided by social clubs for males is adequately provided for females through informal participation. The probabilities associated with these correlations are .022 and .057 respectively.

Hypothesis III. In general, the more favorably the individual perceives the evaluations of his homosexual orientational others toward him to be, the more favorable his self-concept.

Table VIII provides the correlations between self-

TABLE VIII: CORRELATIONS BETWEEN SELF-CONCEPT AND PERCEIVED VIEW OF SELF HELD BY HOMOSEXUAL ORIENTATIONAL OTHERS (HYPOTHESIS III)¹

	Male Homosexuals	Female Homosexuals
Self-Concept and Perceived Self-Concept	.79 (.001)	.78 (.001)
Self-Evaluation and Perceived Self-Evaluation	.71 (.001)	.74 (.001)
Self-Potency and Perceived Self-Potency	.81 (.001)	.62 (.001)
Self-Activity and Perceived Self-Activity	.78 (.001)	.73 (.001)

1. Measures of self-concept and factorial components are based upon 68 male cases and 24 female cases; measures of perceived self-concept and factorial components are based upon 56 male cases and 21 female cases. The decrease in the number of cases on the perceived self-concept variable is largely due to the fact that this part of the questionnaire was completed only by those respondents who indicated that some displacement had occurred.

The probability associated with each correlation is given in brackets.

concept and perceived view of self held by homosexual orientational others and, as predicted, the values of r strongly support the hypothesis. Thus, those individuals who see themselves accorded higher rankings by homosexual orientational others hold more favorable self-concepts than those who see themselves as less highly regarded by these important others.

Since this hypothesis is of key importance to our study, the implications of our findings warrant emphasis. The literature on homosexuality suggests that, due to strong, negative sanctions toward homosexuality by the dominant society, a homosexual orientation can only have debilitating consequences for the self-concepts of these individuals. Thus, it would appear that knowledge of an individual's commitment to a "deviant" or a "non-deviant" category of identity could be used as a reliable indicator of affective self-perception. Our findings, however, suggest that the attitudes of the dominant society toward a particular, meaningful role ("deviant" or "non-deviant") less affects the self-concept of an individual than the attitudes of his orientational others toward the role. Thus, identification of the attitudes of orientational others toward a particular, meaningful role should provide a better indicator of affective self-perception.

Certain additional information was generated from the data collected from homosexual respondents which, while not directly related to the hypotheses under study, is nevertheless sufficiently interesting to warrant noting. One might have speculated, for example, that the older homosexual would have greater difficulties accepting his homosexuality (and hence himself) for two reasons: (1) until 1968, homosexual acts were considered a criminal offense in Canada; and, (2) the Gay Liberation Movement, which may be assumed to serve a supportive function is a phenomenon of the late 1960's.¹ While there was a positive correlation between age and length of time since "coming out" (.56 for males and .54 for females)², age did not correlate with any of the other variables used in this study. It is possible that these findings reflect the relatively low mean ages of the homosexual samples;³ however, they do suggest that the older homosexual is as likely as the younger homosexual to hold a favorable view of self.

-
1. For a discussion of the origins and growth of the Gay Liberation Movement, see, for example, Humphreys, 1972; Murphy, 1971.
 2. The probabilities associated with these correlations are .001 and .005 respectively.
 3. Of the entire homosexual sample, only ten males indicated that they were over thirty years of age.

The correlation between length of time since "coming out" and involvement is higher for females than for males. The probabilities associated with these correlations are .067 and .024 respectively; thus, while females were more likely to be presently involved in an enduring, affective relationship or to have had previous such involvements than male homosexuals who had been "out" for a comparable time, it should be noted that the higher correlation for females could have occurred fairly frequently by chance.

CHAPTER VII

CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

Two concepts are of crucial importance to the perspective of symbolic interaction, "self" and "other." The purpose of this study was to examine the relationship between these two concepts in an attempt to clarify the process by which an individual acquires meanings about himself and other objects. Mead recognized that meanings about objects, including the self-object, arise out of the social interaction an individual has with others; by taking the roles of others with whom he interacts, the individual comes to see himself from the perspective or standpoint of these others. Mead's analysis of the self-other relationship is simplistic, however, since it is well documented that others are of differential importance to the individual and, as such, do not exert an equal influence over the meanings he incorporates.

A number of theoretical formulations have been proposed which suggest that at least two general categories of others can be distinguished that exert a differential influence over the self-definitions of the individual, (1) those who are important in a role-specific sense and, (2) those others who are important in a trans-role, trans-situational sense. Since the self is not generally

conceptualized as being entirely situationally dependent, the focus of attention in this study is directed at those others who exert an enduring, generalized influence over the individual. Kuhn refers to this category of others as "orientational others" and argues that the individual's perception of himself as an actor in the ongoing social process, independent of specific role enactments and specific social situations, is provided, sustained and/or changed by his orientational others. Further, while role changes are commonly thought to result in changes in the individual's affective perception of himself, Kuhn's argument suggests that basic, enduring changes in the individual's value system are effected largely through changes in his orientational others.

A review of the literature on deviance provides some support for this conceptualization of self-change. The interaction of like-deviants, for example, is thought to result in a process of "normalization" through which deviant behaviors, and hence deviating individuals, are redefined as "normal" and acceptable (Lemert, 1967). Thus, through a displacement of orientational others, boys who participate in gang delinquency can come to positively evaluate their deviant roles and in the process develop favorable self-concepts despite engaging in behavior which is negatively evaluated by the larger, dominant society.

Kuhn's formulation would suggest that participation in any form of deviance conducive to deviant group formation could result in orientational other displacement and the establishment of new self-defining relationships through which basic value changes could occur. Such changes in an individual's value system in the direction of accepting in-group norms as right and legitimate would, in turn, be reflected in the self-concept of the individual; that is, individuals who have like-deviants as orientational others should hold favorable self-concepts despite possessing a status which is negatively evaluated by the dominant society.

The present study has attempted a preliminary test of these propositions in the homosexual context. Since sexual orientation is considered highly salient to each individual, and to society at large, and since the literature on homosexuality suggests that a homosexual orientation can only have debilitating consequences for the self-concepts of these individuals, the choice of homosexual subjects would appear to be particularly appropriate for a test of Kuhn's formulation.

In general, the data support the hypotheses. There was no substantial difference between the mean scores achieved by matched homosexual and heterosexual university

respondents on our measure of self-concept. While male homosexuals tended to rank themselves lower on this measure than did male heterosexuals, lesbians tended to accord themselves more favorable rankings than did female heterosexuals. The differences in mean scores, however, do not appear to be statistically significant and the data indicated a high degree of overlap on individual scores between homosexual and heterosexual subjects. These findings alone would suggest that the ability of an individual to evaluate himself in a favorable manner is not necessarily dependent upon his commitment to socially recognized, legitimate categories of identity. That is, it does not appear that knowledge of an individual's commitment to a "deviant" or "non-deviant" category of identity can be utilized as a reliable indicator of affective self-perception.

Theoretically, it has been suggested that an individual's affective perception of himself as an actor in the ongoing social process is highly dependent upon his perception of the attitudes of his orientational others toward him. The findings of this study provide positive support for this contention to the extent that a strong, positive relationship was found to exist between the individual's perception of himself and his perception of the way he was viewed by his homosexual orientational others. Moreover,

since an individual's self-concept appears to be lodged in those salient, meaningful roles which he enacts, self-evaluation would appear to be highly dependent upon the individual's perception of the attitudes of his orientational others toward these important roles and toward his enactment of these important roles.

In other words, our findings would suggest that the reaction of the larger society toward an individual vis-a-vis his identification with (and enactment of) a particular, salient role (i.e., homosexual), would appear to influence the self-concept of that individual only indirectly, through its effect on relevant orientational others. This implies, of course, that specification of the attitudes and reactions of orientational others should provide a more reliable indicator of individual affective self-perception than knowledge of global societal reaction.

Since there is evidence to suggest that a process of "normalization" does indeed occur within the homosexual subculture, it was expected that only those individuals who developed homosexual orientational others through participation in the homosexual subculture could come to accept homosexuality, and hence themselves, as "normal" and acceptable. Further, the amount of displacement was expected to be an important factor since the greater the

displacement, the greater the influence exerted on the individual to accept in-group norms as his own.

Since very few individuals in the entire homosexual sample indicated that no orientational other displacement had occurred, a limitation was placed on data analysis. As predicted, however, the amount of displacement was positively related to self-concept; that is, in general, the more homosexual orientational others the individual had, the more favorably he tended to evaluate himself. Moreover, while some differences were noted between male and female homosexuals on this dimension, a positive relationship was found to exist between participation in the homosexual subculture and orientational other displacement. For both males and females, the amount of informal participation within the homosexual subculture proved to be a better indicator of the amount of orientational other displacement than did a measure of participation in formal homophile organizations. This finding can be understood in light of the fact that informal participation, more so than formal participation, requires the existence of affective bonds between participants.

Finally, the findings of this study suggest that modes of adaption to homosexuality, at least in Winnipeg, differ between males and females. Females, for example,

tended to become involved in more homosexual relationships of an affective, enduring type, than did males. This finding could be related to a lower correlation between displacement and participation for females in formal homophile organizations. We have suggested that one of the primary functions provided by the formal homophile organization is, for males, a sexual outlet. The lower visibility of females with high in-group commitment in these organizations, combined with a general tendency for females to involve themselves in more enduring, affective relationships, would suggest that the sexual outlet provided for males in formal participation is, to a considerable degree, provided for females through informal participation.

In conclusion, it would seem important to note some of the limitations placed on this study by the particular research design utilized. The most obvious shortcoming of this study is that, by employing a static research design, it was not possible to actually examine the processes of meaning acquisition and self-change - it was possible only to make inferences about these processes. As a result, some of our findings suggest correlational rather than causal relationships; that is, while self-concept is taken as the dependent variable, different causal relationships

could have produced the correlations found between participation and orientational other displacement. For example, to what degree does each of these latter two variables affect the other? Perhaps a longitudinal case study could be utilized in an attempt to partially overcome this particular limitation.

Further, because it was not possible to actually examine the processes of behavior with which this study was concerned, certain assumptions were accepted about these processes which, while justifiable in terms of the literature, should be kept in mind when evaluating our findings. These assumptions are as follows: (1) that global societal reaction toward homosexuality, and hence toward individuals occupying the role of homosexual, is negative; and, (2) that the individual, upon recognizing himself to be a homosexual, necessarily develops a negative affective perception of himself. Since our findings depend, to some extent, on these assumptions, further research regarding their validity is required.

Finally, while this study has suggested that there may be differences between male homosexuals and lesbians in modes of adaption to homosexuality, the evidence is far from conclusive. Further specification of these differences, their functions and effects is necessary and could contribute greatly to our understanding of homosexuality and its effects on the individual.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

Selected Bibliography

- BANDURA, A., HUSTON, A.C., "Identification as a Process of Incidental Learning", Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 63, 1961, 311-318.
- BANDURA, A., WALTERS, R.H., Social Learning and Personality Development, Holt, Rinehart & Winston, Inc., New York, 1968.
- BECKER, H.S., Outsiders: Studies in the Sociology of Deviance, The Free Press, New York, 1963.
- BERG, C., ALLEN, C., The Problem of Homosexuality, Citadel Press, New York, 1958.
- BIEBER, I., et al, Homosexuality: A Psychoanalytic Study, Basic Books, New York, 1962.
- BLALOCK, H.M., Social Statistics, McGraw-Hill, New York, 1960.
- BLUMER, H., Symbolic Interactionism: Perspective and Method, Prentice-Hall, Inc., Englewood Cliffs, 1969.
- BONJEAN, C.M., HILL, R.J., McLEMORE, S.D., Sociological Measurement: An Inventory of Scales and Indices, Chandler Publishing Co., San Francisco, 1967.
- BRIM, O.G. Jr., "Socialization Through the Life Cycle", Socialization After Childhood, O.G. Brim, S. Wheeler, John Wiley & Sons, Inc., New York, 1966.
- BRONFENBRENNER, U., "Freudian Theories of Identification and their Derivatives", Child Development, 31, 1960, 15-40.
- BURKETT, S.R., "Self-Other Systems and Deviant Career Patterns", Pacific Sociological Review, 15, 1972, 169-183.
- CAVAN, S., "Interaction in Home Territories", Berkeley Journal of Sociology, 8, 1963, 27-31.
- CHAPIN, F.S., Experimental Designs in Sociological Research, Harper & Brothers, New York, 1955.

- CLAUSEN, J.A., "Perspectives on Childhood Socialization", Socialization and Society, Edited by J.A. Clausen, Little, Brown & Co., Boston, 1968.
- COHEN, A.K. Delinquent Boys: The Culture of the Gang, The Free Press, Glencoe, 1955.
- _____, "The Sociology of the Deviant Act", American Sociological Review, 30, 1965, 5-14.
- COOLEY, G.H., Human Nature and the Social Order, Schocken Books, Inc., New York, 1902.
- _____, Social Organization: A Study of the Larger Mind, Charles Scribner's Sons, New York, 1909.
- CORY, D.W. The Homosexual in America: A Subjective Approach, Castle Books, New York, 1960.
- COUCH, C., "Self-Attitude and Degree of Agreement With Immediate Others", American Journal of Sociology, 63, 1958, 491-496.
- COUCH, C., MURRAY, J.S., "Significant Others and Evaluation", Sociometry, 27, 1964, 502-509.
- DENZIN, N., "Significant Others of a College Population", Sociological Quarterly, 7, 1966, 298-310.
- DEUTSCH, M., SOLOMON, L., "Reactions to Evaluations by Others as Influenced by Self-Evaluation" Sociometry, 23, 1959, 93-112.
- DINITZ, S., DYNES, R., CLARKE, A., Deviance: Studies in The Process of Stigmatization and Societal Reaction, Oxford University Press, New York, 1969.
- ERIKSON, E.H., Identity: Youth and Crisis, W.W. Norton & Co., Inc., New York, 1968.
- _____, Identity and the Life Cycle, International Universities Press, Inc., New York, 1969.
- FELDMAN, M.P., MacCULLOCH, M.J., Homosexual Behavior: Therapy and Assessment, Pergamon Press, New York, 1971.

- FESTINGER, L., "An Analysis of Compliant Behavior", Group Relations at the Crossroads, Edited by M. Sherif, M.O. Wilson, Harper & Brothers, New York, 1953.
- FITTS, W.H., HAMMER, W.T., The Self-Concept and Delinquency, Nashville Mental Health Center, Nashville, 1969.
- FOOTE, N.N., "Identification as the Basis for a Theory of Motivation", American Sociological Review, 16, 1951, 14-21.
- GERGEN, K.J., The Concept of Self, Holt, Rinehart & Winston, Inc., New York, 1971.
- GOFFMAN, E., Stigma: Notes on the Management of Spoiled Identity, Prentice-Hall, Inc., Englewood Cliffs, 1963.
- HALL, C.S., A Primer of Freudian Psychology, Mentor Books, Toronto, 1954.
- HAMMERSMITH, S.K., WEINBERG, M.S., "Homosexual Identity: Commitment, Adjustment and Significant Others", Sociometry, 36, 1973, 56-79.
- HARRIS, C.W., Problem of Measuring Change, University of Wisconsin Press, Madison, 1957.
- HARVEY, I., "Homosexuals' Plight", New Statesman, 81, 1971, 489-490.
- HATTERER, L.J., Changing Homosexuality in the Male: Treatment for Men Troubled by Homosexuality, McGraw-Hill, New York, 1970.
- HICKMAN, C.A., KUHN, M.H., Individuals, Groups and Economic Behavior, The Dryden Press, New York, 1956.
- HOFFMAN, M., The Gay World, Basic Books, New York, 1968.
- _____, "Homosexual", Readings in Psychology Today Second Edition, CRM Books, Del Mar, 1972.
- HOOVER, E., "The Adjustment of the Male Overt Homosexual", The Problem of Homosexuality in Modern Society, Edited by H.M. Ruitenbeek, E.P. Dutton & Co., Inc., New York, 1963.

- _____, "Male Homosexuals and their Worlds", Sexual Inversion: The Multiple Roots of Homosexuality, Edited by J. Marmor, Basic Books, New York, 1965.
- HUGHES, E., "Dilemmas and Contradictions of Status", American Journal of Sociology, 50, 1945, 353-359.
- HUMPHREYS, L., Out of the Closets: Sociology of Homosexual Liberation, Prentice-Hall, Inc., Englewood Cliffs, 1972.
- JENKINS, J.J., RUSSELL, W.A., SUCI, G.J., "An Atlas of Semantic Profiles for 360 Words", American Journal of Psychology, 71, 1958, 668-699.
- JOHNSTONE, H.W., Jr., The Problem of Self, Pennsylvania University Press, University Park, 1970.
- KELMAN, H.C., "Processes of Opinion Change", Public Opinion Quarterly, 25, 1961, 57-78.
- KEMPER, T.D., "Self-Conceptions and the Expectations of Significant Others", Sociological Quarterly, 7, 1966, 323-343.
- KUHN, M., "The Reference Group Reconsidered", Sociological Quarterly, 5, 1964, 5-24.
- LAZOWICK, L.M., "On the Nature of Identification", Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 51, 1955, 175-183.
- LEMERT, E.M., Social Pathology, McGraw-Hill, New York, 1951.
- _____, Human Deviance, Social Problems and Social Control, Prentice-Hall, Inc., Englewood Cliffs, 1967.
- LEZNOFF, M., WESTLEY, W.A., "The Homosexual Community", Deviant Behavior and Social Process, Edited by W.A. Rushing, Rand, McNally & Co., Chicago, 1969.
- LINDER, R., "Homosexuality and the Contemporary Scene", Must You Conform? Grove Press, New York, 1961.
- LOFLAND, J., Deviance and Identity, Prentice-Hall, Inc., Englewood Cliffs, 1969.

- MACCOBY, E., "Role-taking in Childhood and its Consequences for Social Learning", Child Development, 30, 1959, 239-252.
- _____, "Moral Values and Behavior in Children", Socialization and Society, Edited by J.A.Clausen, Little, Brown & Co., Boston, 1968.
- MAEHR, M., MENSING, J., NAFZGER, S., "Concepts of Self and the Reactions of Others", Sociometry, 25, 1962, 353-357.
- MANIS, M., "Social Interaction and the Self-Concept", Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 51, 1955, 364-370.
- MANKOFF, M., "Social Reaction and Career Deviance: A Critical Analysis", Sociological Quarterly, 12, 1971, 204-218.
- MANNEHEIM, B.F., "Reference Groups, Membership Groups, and the Self-Image", Sociometry, 29, 1966, 265-279.
- MARMOR, J., Editor, Sexual Inversion: The Multiple Roots of Homosexuality, Basic Books, New York, 1965.
- MEAD, G.H., Mind, Self and Society, Edited by C. Morris, University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1934.
- MIYOMOTO, F., DORNBUSH, S., "A Test of Interaction Hypothesis of Self-Conceptions", American Journal of Sociology, 61, 1956, 399-403.
- MURPHY, J., Homosexual Liberation: A Personal View, Praeger Publishers, New York, 1971.
- MUSSEN, P.H., "Early Socialization: Learning and Identification", New Directions in Psychology III, Edited by T.M. Newcombs, Holt, Rinehart & Winston, Inc., New York, 1967.
- MUSSEN, P.H., DISTLER, L., "Masculinity, Identification, and Father-Son Relationships", Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 59, 1959, 350-356.
- McCAFFREY, J.A., Editor, The Homosexual Dialectic, Prentice-Hall, Inc., Englewood Cliffs, 1972.

- McINTOSH, M., "Homosexual Role", Social Problems, 16, 1968, 182-192.
- OSGOOD, C.E., "The Nature and Measurement of Meaning", Psychological Bulletin, 49, 1952, 197-237.
- OSGOOD, C.E., SNIDER, J.G., Semantic Differential Technique, Adline Publishing Co., Chicago, 1969.
- OSGOOD, C.E., SUCI, G.J., "Factor Analysis of Meaning", Journal of Experimental Psychology, 50, 1955, 325-338.
- OSGOOD, C.E., SUCI, G.J., TANNENBAUM, P., The Measurement of Meaning, University of Illinois Press, Chicago, 1957.
- PARKER, W., Homosexuality: A Selective Bibliography of over 3,000 Items, Scarecrow Press, Metuchen, 1971.
- PARSONS, T., The Social System, The Free Press, New York, 1951.
- _____, "Family Structure and the Socialization of the Child", Family, Socialization and Interaction Process, Edited by T. Parsons and R.F. Bales, The Free Press, New York, 1955.
- _____, "Cooley and the Problem of Internalization", Cooley and Sociological Analysis, Edited by A.J. Reiss, University of Michigan Press, Ann Arbor, 1968.
- QUARANTELLI, E., COOPER, J., "Self-Conceptions and Others: A Further Test of Median Hypotheses", Sociological Quarterly, 7, 1966, 261-297.
- REEDER, L., DONOHUE, G., BIBLARZ, A., "Conceptions of Self and Others", American Journal of Sociology, 66, 1960, 153-159.
- ROSS, H. L., "Modes of Adjustment of Married Homosexuals", Social Problems, 18, 1971, 385-393.
- SAGARIN, E.R., "On Homosexuality", Contemporary Sociology, 2, 1973, 3-13.
- SCHMITT, R.L., "Major Role Changes and Self-Change", Sociological Quarterly, 7, 1966, 311-322.

- SCHOFIELD, M.G., Sociological Aspects of Homosexuality, Longmans, London, 1965.
- SCHUR, E.M. Crimes Without Victims: Deviant Behavior and Public Policy, Prentice-Hall, Inc., Englewood Cliffs, 1965.
- SHARMA, U.D., Homosexuality: A Select Bibliography, Waterloo Lutheran University, Waterloo, 1970.
- SHERIF, M., "Self-Concept", International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences, 14, 1968, 150-159.
- SHERWOOD, J., "Self-Identity and Referent Others", Sociometry, 28, 1965, 66-81.
- SHIBUTANI, T., "Reference Groups and Social Control", Human Behavior and Social Processes, Edited by A. Rose, Houghton Mifflin Co., Boston, 1962.
- SIEGEL, S., Nonparametric Statistics: For the Behavioral Sciences, McGraw-Hill, New York, 1956.
- SINGLEMANN, P., "Exchange as Symbolic Interaction: Convergences Between Two Theoretical Perspectives", American Sociological Review, 37, 1972, 414-424.
- SOCARIDES, C.W., The Overt Homosexual, Grune & Stratton, New York, 1968.
- SULLIVAN, H.S., Conceptions of Modern Psychiatry, W. W. Norton & Co., Inc., New York, 1953.
- TUCKER, C.W., "Some Methodological Problems of Kuhn's Self Theory", Sociological Quarterly, 7, 1966, 345-358.
- TURNER, R., "Role-Taking, Role Standpoint and Reference Group Behavior", Role Theory: Concepts and Research, Edited by B.J. Biddle and E.J. Thomas, John Wiley & Sons, Inc., New York, 1966.
- VIDEBECK, R., "Self-Conception and Reactions of Others", Sociometry, 23, 1960, 351-359.
- WERTHMAN, C., "The Functions of Social Definitions and Self-Definitions in the Development of Delinquent Careers", Crime and Delinquency: A Reader, Edited by C.A. Bersani, The Macmillan Co., London, 1970.

WEST, D. J., Homosexuality, Penguin Books, Harmondsworth,
1968.

WYLIE, R., The Self Concept, University of Nebraska Press,
Lincoln, 1961.

APPENDIX I

FORMAT OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE
DISTRIBUTED TO HOMOSEXUAL RESPONDENTS

Format of the Questionnaire Distributed to Homosexual Respondents:

1. Age: (in years) _____
2. Sex: (Circle one) M F
3. The highest level of education you have attained:
(check one)
 - _____ grade 8 or less
 - _____ some high school
 - _____ graduate of a high school
 - _____ some training at the post high school level
 - _____ graduate of a university
4. Religious Affiliation:
 - _____ Protestant (please specify _____)
 - _____ Roman Catholic
 - _____ Ukranian Catholic
 - _____ Eastern Orthodox
 - _____ Jew
 - _____ Other (please specify _____)
 - _____ None
5. What is your ethnic or racial origin: (eg. British, Polish, Canadian, Indian etc. Please do not list yourself as "Canadian.")

6. Father's occupation: (If deceased give last one held)

7. Are you presently:
 - _____ employed full-time (please specify type of work)
 - _____ attending a university full-time
 - _____ attending a vocational or technical school full-time
 - _____ other (please specify) _____

8. For each pair of words, circle the number that you think best describes you as a person:

- a) ugly . . . 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 . . . beautiful
 b) slow . . . 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 . . . fast
 c) valuable . 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 . . . worthless
 d) feminine . 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 . . . masculine
 e) successful 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 . . . unsuccessful
 f) hard . . . 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 . . . soft
 g) cruel . . . 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 . . . kind
 h) strong . . 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 . . . weak
 i) true . . . 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 . . . false
 j) sharp . . . 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 . . . dull
 k) foolish. . 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 . . . wise
 l) active . . . 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 . . . passive
 m) dirty. . . 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 . . . clean
 n) small. . . 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 . . . large
 o) good . . . 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 . . . bad

9. Do you attend "Happenings"? (check one)

_____ never
 _____ sometimes
 _____ regularly

10. Are you a member of "Happenings"? (check one)

_____ yes
 _____ no

11. Are you a member of any "Happenings" committees?
 (check one)

_____ yes
 _____ no

12. Do you hold a specific office in "Happenings"? (eg.
 president, etc.) (check one)

_____ yes
 _____ no

13. Do you attend "654"? (check one)

_____ never
 _____ sometimes
 _____ regularly

14. Are you a member of "654"? (check one)

_____ yes
 _____ no

15. Are you a member of any "654" committees? (check one)

_____yes
 _____no

16. Do you hold a specific office in "654"? (check one)

_____yes
 _____no

17. Do you attend meetings of the Campus Gay Club?
 (check one)

_____yes
 _____no

18. Do you consider yourself a member of the Campus Gay Club? (check one)

_____yes
 _____no

19. When Campus Gay Club members decide to participate in particular activities, do you volunteer your time and energy to achieve club aims? (check one)

_____yes
 _____no

20. Do you hold a specific office in the Campus Gay Club?
 (check one)

_____yes
 _____no

21. When I relax, I spend my time with gay friends: (check the answer which best describes you)

_____very often
 _____quite often
 _____sometimes
 _____seldom
 _____almost never

22. I go to pubs, bars, cocktail lounges, restaurants, etc., which I know are popular with gay people: (check one)

_____very often
 _____quite often
 _____sometimes
 _____seldom
 _____almost never

23. I become sexually involved with a member of the same sex: (check one)

_____ very often
 _____ quite often
 _____ sometimes
 _____ seldom
 _____ almost never

24. I accept invitations to parties where I know that most or all of the people attending are gay: (check one)

_____ very often
 _____ quite often
 _____ sometimes
 _____ seldom
 _____ almost never

25. List five people, in order of importance, whose opinions of you as a person matter the most to you. In each case, specify the person's relationship to you (eg. friend, brother, etc.) and indicate whether the person is "gay" or "straight." Do not use names, and please do not use the terms "wife" or "husband" unless legally applicable.

	Person's Relationship to you	"Gay" or "straight"	Is this person aware that you are "gay"?
1.			
2.			
3.			
4.			
5.			

26. Did you list any persons who are "gay" in the previous question (#25 above)? If yes, indicate how you think these gay person(s) regard you as a person? (Please circle the appropriate number for each pair of words).

a) ugly . . . 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 . . . beautiful
 b) slow . . . 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 . . . fast
 c) valuable . 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 . . . worthless

26. cont'd

- d) feminine. . . 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 . . . masculine
 e) successful. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 . . . unsuccessful
 f) hard . . . 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 . . . soft
 g) cruel. . . 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 . . . kind
 h) strong . . 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 . . . weak
 i) true . . . 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 . . . false
 j) foolish. . 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 . . . wise
 k) active . . 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 . . . passive
 l) sharp. . . 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 . . . dull
 m) dirty. . . 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 . . . clean
 n) small. . . 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 . . . large
 o) good . . . 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 . . . bad

27. How long ago (in years and months) did you "come out"?

28. Have you ever been involved in a relatively enduring (eg. 6 months or more) intimate relationship with one other gay person?

_____yes
 _____no

Are you presently involved in such a relationship?

_____yes (for how long? _____)
 _____no

29. To what degree would you say religion now has an influence on your life? (check one)

_____very strong
 _____quite strong
 _____some
 _____slight
 _____none

APPENDIX II

FREQUENCY BREAKDOWN OF HOMOSEXUAL SAMPLE
BY SEX ON VARIABLES AGE, EDUCATION, ETHNICITY, AND RELIGION

Frequency Breakdown of Homosample by Sex on Variables Age, Education, Ethnicity, and Religion:

AGE

Age	Male Homosexuals		Female Homosexuals	
	Absolute Freq.	Relative Freq.	Absolute Freq.	Relative Freq.
18	3	4.4%	3	12.5%
19	6	8.8%	3	12.5%
20	8	11.8%	2	8.3%
21	8	11.8%	3	12.5%
22	8	11.8%	3	12.5%
23	3	4.4%	4	16.7%
24	8	11.8%	1	4.2%
25	5	7.4%	4	16.7%
27	6	8.8%		
29	3	4.4%	1	4.2%
30	1	1.5%		
31	2	2.9%		
32	2	2.9%		
34	1	1.5%		
35	1	1.5%		
38	1	1.5%		
39	1	1.5%		
No Response	1	1.5%		
	<u>68</u>	<u>100.0%</u>	<u>24</u>	<u>100.0%</u>

Education

	Male Homosexuals		Female Homosexuals	
	Absolute Freq.	Relative Freq.	Absolute Freq.	Relative Freq.
Grade 8 or less			1	4.2%
Some high school	6	8.8%	5	20.8%
Grad. high school	10	14.7%	4	16.7%
Some post high school	37	54.4%	12	50.0%
Grad. university	15	22.1%	2	8.3%
	<u>88</u>	<u>100.0%</u>	<u>24</u>	<u>100.0%</u>

Ethnicity

	Male Homosexuals		Female Homosexuals	
	Absolute Freq.	Relative Freq.	Absolute Freq.	Relative Freq.
Minority Group	3	4.4%	2	8.3%
Cont. Europe	26	38.2%	11	45.9%
Scandinavian	6	8.8%	2	8.3%
Anglo	32	47.1%	7	29.2%
Insuff. Info.	1	1.5%	1	4.2%
No Response	1		1	4.2%
	<u>68</u>	<u>100.0%</u>	<u>24</u>	<u>100.0%</u>

Religion

	Male Homosexuals		Female Homosexuals	
	Absolute Freq.	Relative Freq.	Absolute Freq.	Relative Freq.
Protestant	25	36.7%	11	45.9%
Roman Catholic	17	25.0%	6	25.0%
Ukranian Catholic	2	2.9%	2	8.3%
Jew	5	7.4%	2	8.3%
None	<u>18</u>	<u>26.5%</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>12.5%</u>
	68	100.0%	24	100.0%

APPENDIX III

FORMAT OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE
DISTRIBUTED TO HETEROSEXUAL RESPONDENTS

Format of the Questionnaire Distributed to Heterosexual Respondents:

1. Age: (in years) _____
2. Sex: (circle one) M F
3. Religious Affiliation: (check one)
 - _____ Protestant (please specify) _____
 - _____ Roman Catholic
 - _____ Ukrainian Catholic
 - _____ Eastern Orthodox
 - _____ Jew
 - _____ Other (please specify) _____
 - _____ None
4. To what degree would you say religion now has an influence on your life?
 - _____ very strong
 - _____ quite strong
 - _____ some
 - _____ slight
 - _____ none
5. What is your ethnic or racial origin? (eg. British, Polish, Canadian Indian, etc. Please do not list yourself as "Canadian").

6. Father's occupation: (If deceased give last one held)

7. Are you presently: (check one)
 - _____ attending a university full-time (indicate year of course) _____
 - _____ attending university part-time (indicate year of course) _____
8. For each pair of words, circle the number that you think best describes you as a person:
 - a) ugly . . . 1 2 3 4 5 6 6 . . . beautiful
 - b) slow . . . 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 . . . fast
 - c) valuable . 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 . . . worthless
 - d) feminine . 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 . . . masculine

APPENDIX IV
SUPPLEMENTARY DATA ANALYSIS

Supplementary Data Analysis

In addition to the analysis presented in Chapter V, the data for Hypothesis II and Hypothesis III were also analyzed using the Spearman rank-order correlation coefficient, r_s . This procedure was felt to be of value as a check on the primary analysis, since the product moment correlation coefficient is highly subject to changes induced by extreme cases, particularly when the number of cases is small. Despite this limitation however, parametric techniques, wherever possible, are to be preferred over nonparametric measures and, thus, \underline{r} was used in the primary analysis.

Table I and II present comparable values of r_s for values of \underline{r} given in Tables VII and VIII, Chapter V. The reader will note that the results obtained using nonparametric analysis are in general agreement with those obtained using parametric techniques.

TABLE I: CORRELATIONS BETWEEN PARTICIPATION AND ORIENTATIONAL OTHER DISPLACEMENT (HYPOTHESIS II)

	Male Homosexuals N=64	Female Homosexuals N=24
Formal participation and Orientational Other Displacement	.35 (.002)	.20 (.175)
Informal Participation and Orientational Other Displacement	.57 (.001)	.55 (.003)

Figures in brackets indicate the probability associated with each correlation.

TABLE II: CORRELATIONS BETWEEN SELF-CONCEPT AND PERCEIVED VIEW OF SELF HELD BY HOMOSEXUAL ORIENTATIONAL OTHERS (HYPOTHESIS III)¹

	Male Homosexuals	Female Homosexuals
Self-Concept and Perceived Self-Concept	.74 (.001)	.83 (.001)
Self-Evaluation and Perceived Self-Evaluation	.67 (.001)	.73 (.001)
Self-Potency and Perceived Self-Potency	.76 (.001)	.66 (.001)
Self-Activity and Perceived Self-Activity	.77 (.001)	.75 (.001)

1. Measures of self-concept and factorial components are based upon 68 male cases and 24 female cases; measures of perceived view of self and factorial components are based upon 56 male cases and 21 female cases. Figures in brackets indicate the probability associated with each correlation.

APPENDIX V

FREQUENCY BREAKDOWN OF SELF-CONCEPT SCORES
BY SEX FOR HOMOSEXUAL RESPONDENTS

Frequency Breakdown of Self-Concept Scores by Sex for
Homosexual Respondents:

	Male Homosexuals		Female Homosexuals	
	Absolute Freq.	Relative Freq.	Absolute Freq.	Relative Freq.
47.0	1	1.5%		
51.0	1	1.5%		
52.0	1	1.5%		
53.0	1	1.5%		
55.0	1	1.5%	1	4.2%
56.0	1	1.5%		
59.0	1	1.5%		
61.0			1	4.2%
62.0	1	1.5%		
63.0	5	7.4%	3	12.5%
64.0	3	4.4%		
65.0	1	1.5%	1	4.2%
66.0	3	4.4%	1	4.2%
67.0	1	1.5%		
68.0	2	2.9%	1	4.2%
70.0	1	1.5%	1	4.2%
71.0	2	2.9%		
72.0	3	4.4%	2	8.3%
73.0	2	2.9%	3	12.5%
74.0	1	1.5%	1	4.2%
75.0	2	2.9%		
76.0	5	7.4%	1	4.2%

	Male Homosexuals		Female Homosexuals	
77.0	6	8.8%	2	8.3%
78.0	3	4.4%	1	4.2%
79.0			2	8.3%
80.0	5	7.4%	2	8.3%
81.0	1	1.5%		
82.0	4	5.9%		
83.0	1	1.5%		
84.0	3	4.4%		
86.0	1	1.5%		
87.0	1	1.5%		
89.0			1	4.2%
90.0	1	1.5%		
93.0	<u>1</u>	<u>1.5%</u>	<u>24</u>	<u>100.0%</u>
	68	100.0%		

Possible Scale Range =15.0-105.0

APPENDIX VI

CORRELATIONS BETWEEN FACTORIAL
COMPONENTS OF SELF-CONCEPT AND
PARTICIPATION AND ORIENTATIONAL
OTHER DISPLACEMENT

1. CORRELATIONS BETWEEN FACTORIAL COMPONENTS OF SELF-
CONCEPT AND ORIENTATIONAL OTHER DISPLACEMENT

	Male Homosexuals N=64	Female Homosexuals N=24
Self-Evaluation and Orientational Other Displacement	.40 (.001)	.19 (.187)
Self-Potency and Orientational Other Displacement	.41 (.001)	.26 (.110)
Self-Activity and Orientational Other Displacement	.28 (.013)	.30 (.080)

2. CORRELATIONS BETWEEN FACTORIAL COMPONENTS OF SELF-
CONCEPT AND FORMAL PARTICIPATION

	Male Homosexuals N=68	Female Homosexuals N=24
Self-Evaluation and Formal Participation	.43 (.001)	.02 (.458)
Self-Potency and Formal Participation	.33 (.003)	.32 (.061)
Self-Activity and Formal Participation	-.02 (.450)	.28 (.094)

3. CORRELATIONS BETWEEN FACTORIAL COMPONENTS OF SELF-
CONCEPT AND INFORMAL PARTICIPATION

	Male Homosexuals N=68	Female Homosexuals N=24
Self-Evaluation and Informal Participation	.50 (.001)	.26 (.113)
Self-Potency and Informal Participation	.44 (.001)	.46 (.011)
Self-Activity and Informal Participation	.25 (.020)	.22 (.150)

APPENDIX VII

FREQUENCY BREAKDOWN OF PARTICIPATION SCORES
BY SEX FOR HOMOSEXUAL RESPONDENTS

FREQUENCY BREAKDOWN OF INFORMAL PARTICIPATION SCORES BY SEX
FOR HOMOSEXUAL RESPONDENTS:

	Male Homosexuals		Female Homosexuals	
	Absolute Freq.	Relative Freq.	Absolute Freq.	Relative Freq.
6.0	1	1.5%		
7.0	3	4.4%		
8.0	3	4.4%	2	8.3%
9.0	4	5.9%	1	4.2%
10.0	3	4.4%	3	12.5%
11.0	6	8.8%	1	4.2%
12.0	6	8.8%	1	4.2%
13.0	5	7.4%	3	12.5%
14.0	13	19.1%	1	4.2%
15.0	8	11.8%	2	8.3%
16.0	7	10.3%	5	20.8%
17.0	6	8.8%	3	12.5%
18.0	1	1.5%		
19.0	2	2.9%		
20.0				
	<u>68</u>	<u>100.0%</u>	<u>2</u> <u>24</u>	<u>8.3%</u> <u>100.0%</u>

Possible Scale Range = 0.0-20.0

FREQUENCY BREAKDOWN OF FORMAL PARTICIPATION SCORES BY
SEX FOR HOMOSEXUAL RESPONDENTS:

	Male Homosexuals		Female Homosexuals	
	Absolute Freq.	Relative Freq.	Absolute Freq.	Relative Freq.
0.0	1	1.5%	1	4.2%
1.0	11	16.2%	4	16.7%
2.0	10	14.7%	2	8.3%
3.0	9	13.2%	5	20.8%
4.0	2	2.9%	1	4.2%
5.0	6	8.8%		
6.0	6	8.8%	4	16.7%
7.0	5	7.4%		
8.0	3	4.4%		
9.0			1	4.2%
10.0	4	5.9%	1	4.2%
11.0	1	1.5%	1	4.2%
13.0	1	1.5%	1	4.2%
14.0	2	2.9%	1	4.2%
17.0	2	2.9%		
18.0	1	1.5%	1	4.2%
19.0	3	4.4%	1	4.2%
20.0	<u>1</u>	<u>1.5%</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>4.2%</u>
	68	100.0%	24	100.0%

Possible Scale Range = 0.0-42.0