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ABSTRACT

The purpose of the present study was to determine if a link could be established between homophobia (negative attitudes toward male homosexuals) in men and intimacy, particularly in same-sex relationships. A further purpose was to determine the role of the male's father in both the intimacy between males and homophobia. Fifty-nine adult heterosexual male volunteers responded to a questionnaire measuring homophobia, intimacy, and retrospective perception of paternal behavior (nurturance, instrumental companionship, sex-role enforcement and affective punishment). Subjects responded to intimacy measures for both their closest same-sex and opposite-sex friend. Correlational analysis showed that, as predicted, homophobia was related to intimacy. Homophobic males saw their male friends as having less special and unique qualities, shared fewer confidences with them, had less empathy with them, and loved their male friends less than non-homophobic males, but homophobia was not related to perceived paternal behaviors. Respondents' perceptions of the father's behavior was related to their current feelings toward their closest male friend. Subjects' intimacy with their female partners was not significantly related to homophobia, although the correlations approached significance. Not surprisingly, negative paternal behaviors (sex-role enforcement and affective punishment) had a negative association with the subjects' ease of communication with his closest female
friend. The findings suggest a link between intimacy and perceived paternal parenting; however, contrary to prediction, homophobia did not mediate the relationship between paternal socialization and male-male intimacy. Results are discussed in the context of the male sex role.
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INTRODUCTION

From a cultural perspective homophobia is defined as any belief system which supports negative myths and stereotypes about homosexual people (Morin & Garfinkle, 1978). Smith (1971) and Weinberg (1973) regard these negative attitudes as arising from "irrational fears of homosexuality in others, the fear of homosexual feelings within oneself, or self-loathing toward one's homosexuality." Lehne (1976) conceptualizes homophobia specifically as "the irrational fear or intolerance of homosexuality," while MacDonald (1976) views homophobia as "an irrational, persistent fear or dread of homosexuals." It must be emphasized, however, that these interpretations of the reasons for negative attitudes toward homosexuals have not yet been empirically validated.

That negative attitudes toward homosexuals do exist is apparent by a national survey by Levitt and Klassen (1973) which reported that 70% of their sample of the general public considered homosexuality wrong, even between individuals who love each other. Almost 50% of the sample agreed with the statement that homosexuality is a social corruption that can cause the downfall of a civilization and 59% supported laws against homosexuality. A large percentage, 86%, believed that only certain occupations were appropriate for homosexuals, with 76% agreeing that homosexuals should not be schoolteachers. Over half of the sample, 56%, believed that homosexuals were afraid of the opposite
sex. A total of 69% thought that homosexuals demonstrated the traits of the opposite sex and 71% believed that homosexuals molested children. The notion that homosexuality is a sickness is still common, and the majority of respondents believed that homosexuals were sexually abnormal, perverted, and/or mentally ill (Weinberg & Williams, 1976).

In a factor-analytic conceptualization of attitudes toward male and female homosexuals, it was found that heterosexuals made greater distinctions and discriminations in conceptualizing homosexuality than had been previously recognized, and males advocated more repression than females against male homosexuals (Millham, San Miguel, & Kellogg, 1976). In a 1977 survey of 28,000 Psychology Today readers, 70% of the heterosexual men believed that homosexual men were not "entirely" masculine and though most of the respondents did not believe masculinity required frequent sexual conquests, they were divided on whether it required heterosexuality.

The behavioral sciences have not neglected homosexuality as an area of study. Weinberg and Bell (1972) found 1,265 references to studies conducted through 1968. Although a large portion of the research literature suffers from unsophisticated and/or nonobjective research designs, the literature does not support the notion that homosexuals are more disturbed than heterosexuals (MacDonald & Games, 1974).

In recent years some shifts in attitudes toward homosexuality have occurred. Kinsey's refusal to equate homosexuality with psychopathology and his insistence that repressive laws concerning homosexual conduct be expunged, has laid the groundwork for America's slow reappraisal of
its attitudes toward and treatment of its homosexual citizens. These cultural and professional attitudes range from a view of homosexuality as sinful, perverted behavior to a view of homosexuality as mental illness, to a more recent professional opinion that it is but one of many alternative lifestyles (Bancroft, 1976; Bullough, 1974), and a normal variant like left-handedness (Barr & Catts, 1974). A study of the relationship between homosexuality and psychopathology in adult males concluded that homosexuality is not a criterion predictor of psychopathology (Clark, 1975). In fact, Freedman (1971) and Weinberg and Williams (1974), reported that the psychological adjustment of homosexuals who have accepted their sexual orientation is, in many cases, superior to most heterosexual males in terms of openness, self-disclosure, self-actualization, and lack of neurotic tendencies. The recent recognition and discussion of homophobia represents a significant shift in the view of homosexuality.

Traditionally, homosexuality has been examined to determine the causes and expression of the abnormality. Ryan (1976) and Williams (1971) refer to this principle as "victim analysis" (i.e. the raped woman is "at fault"). Perhaps the "sickness" of homosexuality has become the illness of the reverse (the heterosexual)---physiologically, psychologically, sociologically. An examination of homophobia implies that fearful attitudes toward homosexuality are the problem, rather than the sexual orientation itself.

In many ways, homophobia is a socially determined prejudice, much like sexism or racism, rather than a medically recognized phobia (Lehne,
1976). Despite persisting notions that homosexuality involves primarily a sexual preoccupation, the data indicate that heterosexuals actually have higher levels of sexual interest (Bell, 1973). Although both men and women can be homophobic, homophobia is generally associated with the fear of male homosexuality (Morin & Garfinkle, 1978). If male homosexuality were no more threatening than being lefthanded, homophobia would not exist. "Are you a lefty?" implies no threat for most men.

The fear of being homosexual or being labeled as homosexual has been described by several writers on men's issues as a powerful and central dynamic in the maintenance of traditional male roles (Lehne, 1976; MacDonald, 1974; Pleck, 1975). Traditionally, only men have been punished for homosexual acts; females are not usually subject to the same sanctions—"in actual practice females are almost never arrested or prosecuted for homosexual activity" (Katchadourian & Lunde, 1975, p. 508).

Not only does homophobia affect prejudice and discrimination of homosexuals, but it also affects the functioning of the homophobic himself. The major research question the present investigation concerns is the relationship between homophobia and lack of intimacy between males.

Smith (1971) drew up the first tentative personality profile of the individual who is particularly negative or fearful regarding homosexuality. His profile included traits such as sexual rigidity, status consciousness and authoritarianism. Smith, though, emphasized caution in drawing conclusions from his limited study. Subsequent research performed over the last 10 years, however, appears to support
and extend Smiths' original conclusions regarding the personality characteristics of the homophobic individual.

Negative attitudes toward homosexuals have been found to correlate with the following: components of the authoritarian personality (Hood, 1973; Larsen, Reed, & Hoffman, 1980; MacDonald & Games, 1973; Smith, 1971), sexual conservatism (Dunbar, Brown, & Ambrose, 1973; MacDonald & Games, 1973; Minnigerode, 1976), greater personal rigidity and personal sex guilt (Smith, 1971), religious conservatism (Alston, 1974; Irwin & Thompson, 1977; Larsen, et al., 1980; Nyberg & Alston, 1976), strong support for a double standard (MacDonald, Huggins, Young, & Swanson, 1972), antifeminism (Minnigerode, 1976), status consciousness (MacDonald & Games, 1974; Smith, 1971), beliefs in traditional family ideology, derogation of women, fear of physical threat (Morin & Garfinkle, 1978), and traditional views of sex roles (Dunbar, et al., 1973; Krulewitz & Nash, 1980; Laner & Laner, 1979, 1980; MacDonald & Games, 1973, 1974; Millham & Weinberger, 1977; Weinberger & Millham, 1979).

Homophobia can be manifested in diverse ways, both subtle (even unconscious) and pronounced. Telling "queer" jokes and belittling homosexuality expresses an element of hostility that is often part of the homophobic attitude. This hostility can be overt. People who are suspected of being homosexual are sometimes subjected to verbal or physical abuse (i.e. some men confirm their "masculinity" through their identification of, and violence toward, the less masculine male). Acceptance of homosexuality has been found to correlate with attitudes related to tolerance for differences such as cognitive flexibility,
non-authoritarianism, and acceptance of ambiguity; there is also less concern with social recognition, obedience, the protestant work ethic, and less traditional definition of sex-roles (MacDonald & Games, 1974). Churchill (1967) has suggested that prejudice against homosexuality in others is a function of one's negative attitude toward one's own sexuality. In this sense, homophobia can restrict the lives of heterosexual people.

As long as homosexual men and women, as well as other groups of people who are simply seen as "different" from the majority of American citizens, continue to be viewed through stereotypical thinking, our society will continue to pay the price inevitably exacted by fear and ignorance. The pernicious effects of these (our) cultural mores are revealed through an analysis of societal factors.

**Socio/Historical Masculinity and Homophobia**

Evidence from anthropological research supports the view that concepts of masculinity and feminity are not absolute values, but rather dictated by the societal framework of the particular culture (Chodorow, 1971; Leavitt, 1971). Morton Hunt, in examining the crisis of American masculinity, stated that social masculinity "does not consist of one unalterable cluster of traits and abilities", and suggested that a realistic study of American history would show that there has been a wide variation of masculine conduct and style within American society.

Whereas masculinity has been a common bond among all men, the unities of age, religion, class, and race have divided men. The very diversity of men's historical experience—the fact that there has been no model American man but a
range of manhoods—forces us to move continually between dominant themes and important variations between the accepted norms and what constituted deviance from it. (Pleck & Pleck, 1980, p. 7)

The religious norms and legal codes of colonial society sanctioned male superiority. The twin cornerstones of colonial social relations were the dominance of husbands over wives and fathers over sons. The ideal of a stable hierarchy ruled by natural male leaders was accepted not only as family practice but as a political doctrine that placed masters over servants, older ahead of younger, and wealthier over poorer. Male superiority was expounded in legal actions; only men could sign contracts and own property. In all the colonies, transmission of property inheritance depended on a man's ability to secure a wife and to father sons. In cases of legal separation men were normally granted custody of children. Sons were critical to continue the family lineage (name), to work the land and attend their fathers in old age. Potency was a prime test of virility; impotence demonstrated insufficient manliness (Pleck & Pleck, 1980). Manliness was implicit in the patriarchal system.

The norms governing relationships between men were also dictated by patriarchy. Definitions for standards of male behavior emerged. Political and social life encouraged male competition. These forms of male aggression and competition in colonial society were highly patterned cultural events. "This separate cultural world of men also encouraged manly intimacy and affection, a love between equals, which was often lacking in sentiments toward the opposite sex...love between men was acceptable as long as it did not extend to sexual contact" (Pleck &
Transgression from these norms demanded punishment; the greatest punishment was reserved for men who had sexual relations with other men. Colonial statutes punished male homosexuality with death, but lesbianism, with few exceptions, was not (even) considered a crime (Pleck & Pleck, 1980).

The Puritan sexual ethic, although uncompromising and severe, was primarily concerned with regulating behaviors that threatened the stability of the family unit. The Puritans were not "antisexual" in principle but rather were opposed to sexual behavior not prescribed by society or the Christian God. Whereas the Puritans were content to restrict sex to marriage, Victorians attempted to restrict sexual behavior within marriage as well. Any acts, therefore, which did not serve procreative purposes, were without any redeeming value whatsoever (Katchadourian & Lunde, 1975). Victorian sexual ideology revolved around the theory that semen was a vital substance and its spillage a grievous and potentially lethal waste. According to McCary (1973), "laws prohibiting...homosexuality and the judgment that such sexual acts were much more reprehensible between men than between women, were based on the need not to waste precious sperm and thereby perhaps impede tribal (social) growth" (McCary, 1973, pp. 9-10). Any "loss" of semen was viewed as mass murder of hundreds of thousands of potential men. "Since there is no loss of sperm in lesbianism, no such rigid prohibitions against it developed" (McCary, 1973, p. 10).

Uncertainty regarding sexuality was widespread as the 17th, 18th, and 19th centuries progressed. Women were seen as a threat, avid for
sex and excessive sex was considered debilitating to manly strength. Full manhood was inextricably linked to fatherhood, which in turn was intertwined with ownership and control. Female partners and children were totally dominated. Manliness was based on freedom of the spirit, and salvation came from hard work rather than faith in God alone. Male children were taught the skills of their fathers and used to acquire possessions, i.e. one measure of manliness. The child himself was a possession. The Christian prohibition of homosexuality was deemphasized and the legal penalties were reduced. Through the late 18th century and early 19th century, attitudes prevailed depicting homosexuality as developing from an unnatural mentality, and was treated as a mental illness (Stearns, 1979).

This attitude spread westward as the American frontier developed. The frontier became a social process as well as a geographic area. Individual initiative, rough manners, and political democracy were encouraged. The urge to expand geographically outlived the American frontier. Sex was no barrier then to participation in all the rigors and hardships of daily life. In fact, the most valued qualities of the frontier woman were strength, toughness, and resourcefulness (manly traits) (Sherman, 1937). Fathers became intensely responsible believing "the right of the (male) parent is to command, the duty of the child to obey" (Stearns, 1979, p. 33). Only with the mechanization of agriculture and the increase in farm prosperity did women's proper place become exclusively the home. Children's moral instruction was relegated to mothers as fathers became deeply preoccupied with business endeavors. The American
Evangelical Protestant ethic expressed concern that too many American boys were being effeminized by overbearing mothers (Dubbert, 1979). As late as 1840, only about eight percent of the people lived in cities or towns with populations of more than 8,000 (World Book Encyclopedia, 1972). The Industrial Revolution which had begun to develop in the eastern cities about that time brought with it the beginning of the factory system (Readers' Digest Almanac & Yearbook, 1968). A flood of 38,000,000 Europeans entered the United States between 1820 and 1920 (Columbia-Viking Desk Encyclopedia, 1953), bringing with them a less restrictive moral code and new manners and customs. One such custom was the change of the male child's garb from feminine apparel to modified adult male attire. Another custom was the Napoleonic Code of 1810 which decreed that consensual sex between consenting adults was appropriate behavior. This code, however, was acceptable only to those foreigners.

This societal concept of manliness was preserved during the late 1800's and early 1900's by a host of youth organizations: Amateur Athletics, 1888, Intercollegiate Sports (Big Ten Conference), 1896, Boy Scouts of America, 1910. Through sports the sense of competition was enhanced, with all its combined forms of aggression, courage and physical prowess. The male image became one of powerful, virile winners (Dubbert, 1979). "Athletic contests were seen as a substitute for warfare, in which the contest was always one of potency" (Dubbert, 1979, p. 202). Manliness was now epitomized by combat. True manhood was claimed by thousands of boys with the advent of the Civil War. Roughness, toughness, even ruthlessness became the accepted masculine image
(Dubbert, 1979) and "a social conscience...was now taken as a genuine sign of effeminacy" (Dubbert, 1979, p. 66). Passiveness was considered unmanly by the American public.

A boy who lacked courage and avoided a fight was considered a sissy—a term commonly used by the end of the 19th century. Fathers feared their sons would be so labeled.

Although the word homosexual was not often used in the public media, frequent references were made to the effeminate or sissy type of male to such an extent that an assumption developed associating him with the homosexual. Such an assumption explains the fears many parents had about sons who they thought were not developing "normally" by participating in "man's activities". (Dubbert, 1979, p. 33)

Common factors in describing a sissy were the dependency upon others and the inability to cope with a given situation. The sissy was just the opposite of what the ideal masculine man should be (Dubbert, 1979).

Arousing a feeling of disgust and indignation for anything unmanly is the responsibility of a good father according to Gullick (as cited in Dubbert, 1979). The father must also set an example of what it is to be a superior man. Articles with titles such as "The Effeminization of Men" appeared in popular magazines as early as 1883. A publication of 1885, Treasure House of Useful Knowledge, admonished its readers that "In this country men do not embrace each other nor do they exchange kisses...men in this country acknowledge an introduction by extending the right hand in greeting...a man should never permit himself to lose his temper in society, nor show that he has taken offense...repel flattery by gravity" (p. 1276).

An article in the Independent, September, 1898, by Maurice Thompson
stated that "the greatest danger that a long period of profound peace offers to a nation is that of [creating] effeminate tendencies in young men" (as cited in Dubbert, 1979, p. 147). Therefore, the First World War was another testing of American's character, perseverance, courage; "guts" had become the new code for manliness (Dubbert, 1979). "The boy scout image was now considered sissified because it implied a moral standard that bordered on being effeminate" (Klapp, 1962, p. 167). Being good implied a feminine influence. Rough talk, strident behavior, and the use of profanity conveyed an attitude that sex was dirty and degrading yet something that red-blooded men enjoyed and through it advertised their masculinity. By 1930, "to become a man" among male peers implied having a sexual experience (Dubbert, 1979). Manliness had become personified by a heterosexual participation. No longer was "manliness" characterized as "the opposite of childishness" (Pleck & Pleck, 1980, p. 23).

David Riesman, in his book, The Lonely Crowd (1950), concluded that "college men these days are much more fearful of possibly being homosexual than they were in earlier generations" and that actually "this fear is pervasive in the middle class generally" (p. 174). Public intolerance for various kinds of deviators had increased (Simmons, 1965). The working class culture had become intolerant of the sissy, the dreamer, and especially the homosexual (Stearns, 1979). When Simmons measured intolerance, lesbians and homosexuals were rated 5.2 and 5.3 respectively, on an intolerance scale of one through seven (seven identifying the type of person toward whom subjects were most intolerant). Simmons did note,
however, that by the time his book was published in 1969, some of the data were likely out of date, and suggested that the homosexual may currently be more readily accepted.

The male mystique has recently been stereotyped as the strong silent type (Bernard, 1972, 1973), and this "model" has had a fairly long history (Fiedler, 1960; Tiger, 1969). It is relevant to note that expression of positive affect, or affection between men in the 1800's was (and still is) seriously inhibited in our culture. Negative affect is acceptable. Men can argue, fight, and injure one another in public view (the "sport" of boxing for instance), but they cannot as easily hold hands, embrace or kiss (Clark, 1972). Without this masculine "model" it is feared that America will become sissified and homosexuality will increase (Dubbert, 1979).

Cultural Changes and Variations in Homophobia

Churchill (1967) noted that cultures differ in their treatment of, and attitudes toward, homosexuality. For instance, ancient Greek culture depicted homosexual love as philosophically, intellectually and spiritually superior to heterosexual love. It was regarded as natural, tender and more exalted. Homosexual love, however, was practiced only by the aristocracy; the citizen class was more concerned with the practical aspects of sexuality, i.e., an ordered household, tax refuge and legitimate progeny. The early Romans, too, embraced this concept of homosexual love, and practiced it widely and openly (Karlen, 1971). Churchill (1967) speaks of homoerotophobia as the extreme fear of homosexuality and behaviors "suggestive" of homosexuality as exhibited by a
culture. In the United States "in fact, the laws defining various common homosexual acts (oral-genital contacts, anal intercourse, mutual masturbation) as crimes do not specify the sexes of the participants. These...are crimes under the laws of most states, whether performed by a man and a woman, two men, or two women" (Katchadourian & Lunde, 1975, p. 507). It is relevant to note that the German Criminal Code, adopted in 1871, made punishable most sexual offenses between men. By 1935, all sexual practices among men were punishable (Suarez & Przyback, 1980).

 Attempts to repress homosexuality are the direct result of socialization practices of "sex negative" cultures according to Churchill (1967). He contended that cultural learning regarding appropriate roles for each sex is a powerful force motivated by fear, dread, and hatred of homosexuals—particularly male homosexuals. Churchill argues that in contemporary American society the attitude toward male homosexuality has reached such phobic proportions that any behavior suggestive of homosexuality is strictly condemned and avoided. Although these observations were made 15 years ago, these attitudes are still prevalent in today's society.

 There is some controversy in the research literature regarding the degree of homophobia in a specific culture. Brown and Amoroso (1975), and Dunbar, Brown and Amoroso (1973), found Brazilians to have the most conservative attitudes toward sex-appropriate behaviors, and of the three cultures studies (Brazilians, Canadians, and West Indians), Brazilians showed the most homophobic attitudes. Whitman, in her 1980 study, suggested that many people assume that Latin American countries
are Catholic and "machistic"; these countries must be more repressive of homosexuality than the Anglo-Saxon countries. In reality, however, attitudes in Latin America are far more permissive and quite different than those in the Anglo-Saxon countries. Most Latin American countries, for example, in following the tradition of the Napoleonic Code, have never criminalized homosexual behavior. Attitudes toward homosexuality tend to be those of toleration and amusement rather than of fear. "In Latin America, homosexuality, like prostitution, is generally regarded as a very ordinary aspect of the social fabric rather than a controversial social or political problem" (Whitman, 1980, p. 90).

It is beyond the scope of this research to judge which point of view is correct; however, the following observation may be relevant. The Napoleonic Code, adopted in France in 1810, contains no criminal laws relating to sex acts between (any) consenting adults (regardless of sex) in private. Italy, Spain, and Portugal adopted similar codes long ago, as did Belgium (1867) and the Netherlands (1886). Denmark legalized consensual adult sex in 1930, Switzerland in 1937, Sweden in 1944, Czechoslovakia and Hungary in 1962, England and Wales in 1967, East Germany in 1968, Canada and West Germany in 1969, Finland in 1970, Austria in 1971, and Norway in 1972. These same sexual acts constitute crimes in Bulgaria, Ireland, Rumania, Scotland, the Soviet Union, and Yugoslavia.

Of all the countries of Europe and North America, the United States has the most severe penalties for proscribed consensual sex acts. Even in the Soviet Union, considered by many to be equally as repressive as the United States in its sex laws, the maximum penalties for consensual sodomy are considerably less (five years versus
ten to twenty years in prison in some states of the United States]. (Barnett, 1973, as cited by Katchadourian & Lunde, 1975, p. 511)

Most criminal laws are directed toward "the preservation of public order". Laws pertaining to sexual behavior, however, embody a particular ethical point of view. Homosexuality, as such, is now legal in all the states; it is only the homosexual acts that are defined as crimes. It should be noted, however, that regardless of law, there will always be strong social forces opposed to homosexual behavior (Katchadourian & Lunde, 1975). Societal reactions to deviance can be measured by the laws pertaining to that deviance. Our laws regarding homosexuality have changed.

Cultural attitudes are more tolerant than actual behaviors exhibited by homophobic individuals. Homophobic males express more stereotyped sex-role attitudes; they also reject other males (not only are attitudes more rejecting, but behaviors are equally rejecting). Tolerance is a general personality characteristic of the non-homophobic, non-sex-role stereotyped male, i.e. males with more moderate or liberal sex-role beliefs (Kruelewitz & Nash, 1980).

Homophobia and the Male Sex Role

Sex stereotypes are the structured sets of inferential relations that link personal attributes to the social categories of female and male (Ashmore & Tumia, 1980). There is no doubt that sex-role stereotyping is pervasive in American society (Broverman, Broverman, Clarkson, Rosenbrantz, & Vogel, 1972; Freeman, 1970; Friedan, 1963; Hacker, 1957; Kenniston & Kenniston, 1964; Komarovsky, 1946; Rossi, 1964; Stacey &
Daniels, 1974). Traditional sex-role standards are still very much in operation and sex-role deviance is met by various negative reactions.

Sex roles are normative prescriptions with negative consequences for those who deviate, rebel, or over-conform. Inasmuch as sex roles prescribe styles of living and adjusting, they set the stage for mal-adaptation. Sex roles cause conflict, particularly for those who try to compromise their sexual identity (Gomberg, 1979).

The masculine sex role—with its emphasis on macho, winning, and achievement—subjects men to serious, even lethal, stresses (i.e. peptic ulcers, essential hypertension, secondary sexual dysfunction, higher suicide rate, and shorter life-span) (David & Brannon, 1976; Farrell, 1974; Pleck & Sawyer, 1974; Quadland, 1980). In extensive interviews with 62 college men it was found that "despite some changes, the traditional ideal of masculinity was still the yardstick against which the seniors measured themselves" (Komarovsky, 1976, p. 22). While some males questioned the machismo elements of masculinity, "the ideal man was still an 'assertive...strong...courageous...aggressive' man" (Komarovsky, 1976, p. 22). Eighty percent of the men interviewed by her experienced mild to severe difficulty in fulfilling masculine-role obligations in one or more of the areas encompassed in the study.

Gross (1978) suggests that one of the most limiting features of the controlling male sex role is the requirement that men abstain from revealing ignorance or even uncertainty. Bem (1975) holds that the inability of sex-typed men to be nurturant is a major limitation, with important social consequences. According to Parke (1976) the practice
of excluding the father from early interaction with his infant reflects and reinforces a cultural stereotype that such conduct is feminine and therefore unbecoming a male. There is no doubt that society demands stricter adherence by males to the male role than by females to the female role (Del Boca & Ashmore, 1980), although this attitude is an ancient outmoded tradition.

Cost of deviation. Males who deviate into traditionally feminine areas are regarded negatively both for the role deviance per se and because they are engaging in less socially desirable behaviors. Males who venture out of the traditional jobs or home roles are likely to be perceived as "sick" which presumably places them under much greater pressure to conform (MacBrayer, 1960; McKee & Sherriffs, 1959; Polk & Stein, 1972). When a man behaves in a passive manner, his behavior is likely to be considered feminine rather than simply non-assertive (Best, Williams, & Briggs, 1980). MacKinnon (1962) suggested that men repress their feminine elements in order to function successfully in their sex roles. Harford, Willis and Deabler (1967) found a negative relationship between traditional masculinity and "sensitivity" among men.

According to Mussen (1961, 1962) possession of qualities stereotypically associated with the male sex role is more related to adjustment in adolescence than in adulthood. Highly masculine males seem to fare well during adolescence, but suffer an increase in anxiety and neuroticism in adulthood. Mussen (1961, 1962) also found that men who were more masculine in adolescence were rated twenty years later as less "sociable", less "self-assured", and less "self-accepting" than
the men who had been less masculine in adolescence. Pleck (1981), however, has stated that there is some question regarding Mussen's results:

In the 1961 report, Mussen notes a number of serious anomalies in the data but is able to reconcile them. By the 1962 report, however, the anomalies are too far reaching and fundamental to explain away. Actually, Mussen's data show that the most masculine males are poorly adjusted in both adulthood and adolescence. (p. 86)

Males have more difficulty than females in achieving an appropriate sexual identity (Lynn, 1961, 1966). Further, sanctions against sex-inappropriate behavior are greater for males than for females (Bardwick, 1971; Fling & Manosevitz, 1972; Hartley, 1959; Lansky, 1967; Maccoby & Jacklin, 1974). One startling example of these sanctions is the U.C.L.A. Gender Identity Research Treatment Program which tries to help effeminate boys between the ages of four and a half and ten to avoid some of the social pain of their behavior. According to the researchers, "many of the youngsters already walk with a 'mince', and some would prefer to be girls." The researchers also report that "the onset of feminine manners in boys, often a precursor of homosexuality, is usually seen early in childhood", which is just "another sign of constitutional disposition" (M. Gross, 1978, p. 84).

Cost of adherence. Pleck (1975) suggests that adherence to traditional concepts of sex roles limits awareness and self-expression of human beings. There is a growing realization that a high degree of sex typing may not be conducive to psychological adjustment or adaptive behavior. Unclear sex-role expectations are a major source of anxiety. "If severe enough and persistent, such anxiety may lead to serious
emotional difficulty which may cause, or contribute to, behavioral and learning disorders" (Hartley, 1959, as cited by Harrison, 1978, p. 69). The maturation process for boys has become a task. "Rugged independence, even when inappropriate or harmful, has become an integral part of traditional masculinity" (Gross, 1978, p. 97).

Recent years have seen a great increase in the activities of Women's Liberation groups directed at raising public awareness of the deleterious effects of sexism in the community. While these groups have focused largely upon the imbalance in the stereotyped limits imposed upon women in comparison with men, there has been some recognition of the loss suffered by both sexes as a result of role rigidity (Barry, 1980). In a study by Feldman-Rotman and Vallacher (1981), results indicated that "quite simply, cross-sex values may be encouraged for girls, but not for boys" (p. 7). It could be assumed that women have developed more sensitivity to sex-role stereotyping, which creates an awareness of, or response to, current cultural pressures to eliminate sex-role stereotyping. Specifically, to the extent that mothers in the dual-career family value masculine characteristics, they may be tolerant of masculine preferences in their daughters and, at the same time, intolerant of parallel cross-sex identification in their sons. VanGelder and Carmichael (1976), who interviewed feminist mothers, reported that mothers viewed androgynous identification as liberated in their female offspring, but feared that such an orientation in their sons might reflect homosexual tendencies.

Research summarized by Bem (1976) has shown that sex typing in
either a masculine or feminine direction is associated with deficits in cross-sex typed behavior in both males and females. Androgynous individuals show no such deficits, displaying significantly greater situational flexibility in their behavioral choices. It has been argued that culturally imposed sex-role definitions act as a "restricting prison" for human personality and should be abolished; "behavior should have no gender" (Bem, 1976, p. 17). Bem (1976), also implies, however, that even with the dissolution of artificial sex-role distinctions, gender identity as a dichotomous category based on and consonant with bi-anatomical features, must remain as a component of psychological health. Furthermore, she argues that elimination of sex role as a constraint defining behavior by its "appropriateness" for gender should make maleness and femaleness "so self-evident and non-problematic that it rarely even occurs to us to...wish that it were otherwise" (Bem, 1976, p. 17).

The male sex role has fostered inexpressivity—which is not conducive to intimacy, communication, or attachment (Balswick & Peek, 1971). Men are not well-versed in the expression of affection (Bernard, 1972, 1973). It has been pointed out that male sex-role standards have served to inhibit the satisfaction of men's basic personality needs (Fasteau, 1974; Jourard, 1971; Nichols, 1975). It has further been suggested that men must deny their needs for intimacy, support, and emotional expression if they are to view themselves as masculine. The most stereotypic male shows the least amount of intimate relating. This study will attempt to establish a direct relationship between homophobia and male intimacy with other men.
Intimacy and Homophobia

Both friendship and love are encompassed in the term intimacy (Davis, 1973). Davis argues that the greater the intimacy, the greater the potential for both personal attachment and harm. This is evidenced by a nationwide survey conducted by Pleck (1974), which showed that 58% of all males questioned had "not [even] told their best male friend that they [even] liked him" (Lewis, 1978, p. 110).

An intimate friendship permits free expression of emotion, shedding of privacy, absorption of minor conflicts, discussion of personally crucial matters, and opportunities for enriching and enlarging one's self-concept (Douvan & Adelson, 1966). In intimate relationships people feel free to expose more facets of themselves. As a consequence, intimates share profound information about one another's histories, values, strengths and weaknesses, idiosyncrasies, hopes and fears. The more intimate people are, the more information they are willing to reveal and the more they expect their intimates to reveal to them (Altman & Taylor, 1973; Huesmann & Levinger, 1976; Jourard, 1964; Worthy, Gary & Kahn, 1969). It would appear that the term intimacy includes and manifests all the feelings, senses, and emotions one can be aware of and share with another.

Intimacy may be viewed very broadly as sharing a psychological or physical environment (or space) (Patterson, 1976; Skolnick, 1973) with a person to whom one feels especially attached (Davis, 1973), or as a relationship between people whose lives have been deeply entwined (Walster & Walster, 1978). In a more restrictive sense intimacy may
also be perceived as constructive behaviors and feelings (Coutts, 1973). According to this concept intimacy involves mutual sharing of personal concerns and information, accepting and caring for another, using skills for problem solving within the relationship and exchanging assistance, encouragement and constructive criticism.

Orlofsky, Marcia and Lesser (1973) postulate that genuine intimacy generally occurs only after a reasonable sense of identity has been established. Kacerguis and Adams (1980) suggested that identity formation may be a sufficient but not a necessary prerequisite to the development of intimate relationships among adolescents and young adults. (One does not derive one's identity from intimacy, rather intimacy enhances one's identity.) Yufit (1956) found that successful resolution of the "intimacy versus isolation" crisis was most dependent on favorable resolution of three of five psychosocial crises; trust, autonomy, and identity (industry and initiative were not critical). According to the developmental theory proposed by Erikson (1956, 1959, 1963), the achievement of an identity is both the precursor to, and partial prerequisite for, the establishment of an intimate mode of interpersonal relationships. Erikson suggests that forming an identity is a process of the imagination that takes place on all levels of mental functioning as individuals mature. In practice, identity formation takes place as individuals constantly judge themselves in ways and on terms by which others would seem to be judging them.

One of the crucial developmental tasks in adolescence and early adulthood is learning to combine friendship and sex. Early sexual
experimentation is usually carried on outside the context of friendship. Male-female relationships are conducted according to scripts dictated by their same-sex peer group. Part of this group's function is to limit the level of real intimacy that develops in the couple (Finkelhor, 1980). For most adolescent males, intimacy is indistinguishable from sexuality. Sex, rather than being a modality for sharing of feelings, frequently becomes merely another arena for attaining success and achievement.

Kanin (1967) reports that more than 65% of his undergraduate male interviewees indicated that their friends had exerted pressure on each other "to seek premarital sex experience" (p. 497).

The literature on friendships of adolescents and young adults suggest important gender and age related differences. According to Moreland (1980), male-male relationships during adolescence are characterized by competition and an action orientation. In such relationships, males are occasionally aware of the emotional security they are obtaining, but typically this function remains covert. Support and acceptance are indirectly sought and indirectly given, strictly in accordance with the dictums of the male sex-role standards. Status is conferred upon individuals for athletic success and/or physical toughness. "The expression of vulnerability or positive feelings toward other males is particularly taboo" (Moreland, 1980, p. 812). Women's styles, in contrast, suggest earlier competence in intimate relating (Fischer, 1981). Perlman and Goldenberg's (1981) cross-sectional study of students in grade eight, grade eleven, and university level also concluded that girls had more intimate friendships than boys. Viewed as particularly important in
these two studies were the close friendships of college women with those of the same gender, an experience uncharacteristic of adolescent men in high school and college. Compared to women, men showed deficits in many (though not all) aspects of emotional and interpersonal behavior. Men are less emotionally expressive (Allen & Maccoun, 1976; Allen & Hamsher, 1974; Balswick & Avertt, 1977; Bem, Martyna, & Watson, 1976). The evidence is relatively consistent that men have less intimacy than women in same-sex relationships (Booth, 1972; Caldwell & Peplau, 1981). Douvan and Adelson (1968) conclude that while males measure no lower than females in sociability, they do measure lower in intimacy. Men are not necessarily less oriented or responsive to social stimuli (Maccoby & Jacklin, 1974), or less adept at assessing others' emotions or cognitive perspective, but they are less empathic.

There have been inconsistent findings in the relationship between gender and the number of friends. Lowenthal and her associates (1975) found that women reported a greater number of friends, but Booth (1972) found a (nonsignificant) trend for men to have more friends. This paradox may be explained, however, as different meanings are often attributed to the word "friend". This label is likely to be applied to various groups: an overwhelming majority of nonrelatives in a largely unsystematic way, associates lacking other specialized role-relations, people of the same age, people known a long time and people with whom respondents had primarily sociable, rather than intimate or material involvements (C. Fischer, 1981).

Friendships have been analyzed by Rubin (1973) who found that
"women tended to love their same-sex friends more than men did and to also like their opposite sex friend more than men did" (p. 221). Expressing approval, support, and liking suggest feminine behavior to men. As Bem (1974) has suggested, highly sex-typed individuals inhibit behaviors which are stereotypic of the other sex. "Real men" don't talk about or directly express feelings, especially feelings that don't contribute to dominance (Fasteau, 1972). The male role requires men to appear tough, objective, striving, achieving, unsentimental, and emotionally unexpressive. Direct verbal expression of affection or tenderness is displayed only by homosexuals and women (Fasteau, 1972). If a man is tender, if he weeps, if he shows weakness, he will likely be viewed as unmanly by others and he will probably regard himself as inferior to other men (Jourard, 1971).

Pleck (1981) separates the male role into traditional and modern. In the traditional male role, men are generally not expected to be emotionally sensitive to others or emotionally expressive or self-revealing, particularly to feelings of weakness or vulnerability. The traditional male prefers the company of men to the company of women and perceives other men as the primary validators of his masculinity. Though bonds of friendship among traditional men are often strong, they are not emotionally intimate. The modern male, in contrast, prefers the company of women. Women, rather than other men, are viewed as the primary validators of masculinity. Male-male relationships often appear now to derive primarily from workplace contacts and to be expressed primarily through drinking and watching sports on television. The
modern male strongly values the capacity for emotional sensitivity and self-expression in romantic relationships with women. The stereotypic view, however, is "that these emotional behaviors should occur only with women" (Pleck, 1981, p. 141). Maintenance of emotional control is still a crucial role requirement for both the traditional and modern male.

In a study of gender differences in self-disclosure (Stokes, Fuehrer & Childs, 1980) in which the homophobic hypothesis was tested, results indicated that antihomosexual scores did correlate negatively with self-disclosure to same-gender intimates and also correlated negatively with self-disclosure to opposite gender intimates. "To support the homophobic hypothesis", the authors concluded, "the antihomosexual score would have to correlate negatively with self-disclosure scores for same-gender targets, but not to opposite gender targets" (p. 196). The literature review has clearly indicated, however, that those holding negative attitudes toward homosexuals also hold the most stereotypical view of the male sex-role. Therefore, men concerned about their masculinity may feel hesitant to relate (self-disclose) to women because women are generally viewed unfavorably (Broverman et al., 1972; McKee & Sherriffs, 1957), and because the association is potentially stigmatizing (Brannon, 1976).

The task of intimacy, according to Fischer and Narus (1981), is to achieve a feeling of closeness to another, a feeling of acceptance toward and by another. Since positive initial evaluations are a first step in the development of potential intimate relationships, those with
a better sense of identity are more likely to develop intimacy with another (Deaux, 1976; Goldman, Rosenzweig, & Lutter, 1979). Identity formation for children and adults is a process of reflection and comparison, as individuals seek to live up to a prescribed model and role; becoming "masculine" involves (in part, at least) a rejection of "femininity" (Chodorow, 1971). The process of identity is away from role assignments though, and away from the predictability of the stereotype. "Peer popularity appears to be related to the possession of stereotypically appropriate sex-related personality characteristics" (Feinberg, Smith, & Schmidt, 1958, as cited by Unger, 1979, p. 199).

A positive relationship exists between popularity and provoked physical aggression in fifth-and-sixth-grade boys. This aggression permeates society. Societies that are the most inhibited in emotional expressiveness are the most capable of acts of war, violence, brutality and cruelty (Prescott, 1975). These societal "values" are identical to those same "values" exhibited by the homophobic individual.

The male sex-role inhibits intimacy among men, and also creates homophobia—therefore, it is expected that homophobic men will have problems with intimacy. This phenomenon may evolve from the initial conditioning of the child by his parents, particularly fathers.

The Paternal Role and Homophobia

Research studies in sex-role development consistently demonstrated that fathers are more concerned than mothers with maintaining stereotypical sex-typed behaviors in their children (Block, 1974), especially in sons (Hetherington & Parke, 1977). Results from studies found that boys,
in comparison to girls, indicated their parents were less affectionate and nurturant and more often punished them or deprived them of privileges (Droppleman & Schaefer, 1976; Hoffman & Saltzstein, 1967, as cited by Spence & Helmreich, 1978; Siegelman, 1967). It also appears that both mothers and fathers emphasize achievement and competition more for sons than for daughters and urge more control of emotional expressions in their sons. Demands for more socially distant behavior are more strict for boys (Unger, 1979).

Josselyn (1956) and Parke (1976) have noted that it is considered inappropriate in our culture for fathers to be nurturant toward their infants. Fathers, having lived in a culture that is terrified of affectionate physical contact between males, do not touch their sons much after infancy (Zilbergeld, 1978). Johnson (1963) found that fathers were more nurturant toward girls and more controlling of boys. "During the first three months of life, but not thereafter, boys are touched, held, rocked, and kissed more than girls" (Lewis, 1972, as cited by Unger, 1979, p. 172; italics added). According to Zilbergeld (1978), "fathers are more uncomfortable holding or cuddling their sons, being more at ease when throwing them around or engaging in mock wrestling or boxing bouts" (p. 134). Gentle cuddling is less frequent with infant sons than with daughters (Biller, 1974; Lamb, 1976, as cited by Lamb, 1981). Since it is the father whom the boy will try to emulate, a very powerful lesson is transmitted by this kind of interaction.

Considerable data have been collected which suggest that sex typing in the male child is related to the model characteristics of father
nurturance and father power consistent with major identification theory models (Bandura, Ross, & Ross, 1963; Mussen, 1961; Mussen & Distler, 1959, 1960; Payne & Mussen, 1956; Sears, 1953). Common to all identification theories are the following assumptions: 1) the male child initially identifies with the mother; 2) through a modeling process certain specified role characteristics of the father (relative power or nurturance) facilitate or inhibit a shift in identification from mother to father; and 3) the resulting father identification promotes appropriate sex typing such as masculine interest, attitudes and heterosexuality. Colley (1959) has gone so far as to suggest that a certain optimum of hostile and rivalrous behavior on the part of the father is important in discouraging the male child's homosexual behavior.

Imagine a father-son interaction where the father is attempting to teach his son to be a real "he-man". The father is harsh, aggressive, and too much of a "tough guy" to allow his son to enter into a close paternal relationship with him. He discourages a relationship rooted in tenderness, acceptance, understanding, and love--necessary prerequisites for a healthy association between father and son. Barry (1970) in research performed over the years, however, has found that the best predictor for success in marriage was if the husband had a close relationship to his father. A nurturant father is important in the development of a heterosexual life style (Townes, Ferguson, & Fillam, 1976). The nurturance of the father affects the ability of the son to be intimate when adult. The father who is sympathetic to the sensitivity of his son's feelings will not impair that son's capacity to form friendships and to love.
Fathers, of course, may and do participate in early child care but in so doing they are assuming the nurturant or maternal role, not what has been traditionally defined as the paternal role (child care is "woman's work", the father provides material support, but rarely takes an active role in the care of the child), and as Baumrind (1975) has noted, the authoritarian mode is more traditional among American families.

Baumrind (1967, 1971) identified and labeled three major patterns of parental behaviors: authoritarian, authoritative, and permissive. In terms of a two-dimensional conceptualization of parental behaviors (restrictive/permissive and accepting/rejecting), the prototypic authoritarian parent is highly restrictive (as opposed to permissive) but relatively low in nurturance and acceptance of the child. The parent imposes demands with little explanation or allowance for the child's needs and opinions and is generally nondemocratic in disciplinary procedures. The parent may or may not be affectionate and emotionally responsive to the child. In contrast, the authoritative parent tends to be high on the restrictiveness dimension but also tends to be accepting. This parent exercises firm control but, at the same time, recognized the child's needs and shares with the child the reasons underlying disciplinary decisions. The parent "values both expressive and instrumental attributes, both autonomous self-will and disciplined conformity" (Baumrind, 1968, p. 261). The permissive parent is high on acceptance of the child but low on restrictiveness. The parent attempts "to behave in a nonpunitive, accepting, and affirmative manner toward the child's impulses, desires and action" but is not "an active agent responsible for shaping or altering
the ongoing or future behavior" (Baumrind, 1968, p. 256). In later studies, Baumrind (1971) found there were many subgroups to the three basic prototypes.

Each style of parenting encourages certain traits in children. Children of authoritarian parents display a high degree of discontent, withdrawal, and distrust (Baumrind, 1971; Baumrind & Black, 1967). The parent attempts to shape, control and evaluate the behavior and attitudes of the child in accordance with a standard of conduct, usually absolute, motivated and formulated by a theological belief. This parent recognizes obedience as a virtue and uses punitive, forceful measures to curb self-will when the child’s actions or beliefs conflict with parental values.

The authoritarian parent believes in inculcating such instrumental values as respect for authority, respect for work, and respect for the preservation of order and traditional structure. This parent does not encourage verbal give and take, believing that the child should accept the parents word about what is right. (Baumrind, 1968, p. 261)

These parents are also "more detached, more controlling, and less warm than other parents" (Baumrind, 1971; Baumrind & Black, 1967). The authoritarian male parent holds the traditional sex-stereotyped sex-role orientation of masculinity. These fathers are most likely to have sons who exhibit the same view (Biller & Barry, 1971).

Subjects with masculine sex-role orientations perceived themselves as more similar to their fathers than did individuals with relatively feminine sex-role orientations. Subjects with masculine orientations and masculine preferences perceived themselves as more similar to their fathers than did the other sex-role pattern groups. (p. 107)

The general effect of specific parenting behaviors either sets up
supportive conditions or nonsupportive atmospheres whereby the child's development is distorted and/or inhibited (Spence & Helmreich, 1978). "Children whose parents are warm, supportive, and respectful of their legitimate needs, for example, may develop the predisposition to treat those with whom they interact in the same way, that is, they acquire expressive characteristics" (Spence & Helmreich, 1978, p. 221).

Children of authoritative parents manifest qualities of self-reliance, self-control, self-assertiveness, contentment and exploration (Baumrind, 1971; Baumrind & Black, 1967). The authoritative parent attempts to direct the child's activities but in a rational issue-oriented manner. This parent encourages self-expression within a framework of responsible behavior. The parent affirms the child's present qualities, but also sets standards. "The authoritative parent uses reason as well as power to achieve these objectives and does not base decisions on group consensus or the individual child's desires...the parent role is not infallible, or divinely inspired" (Baumrind, 1968, p. 261). Spence and Helmreich (1978) have suggested that authoritative parents are androgynous individuals; they are warmer and more accepting of the child than those who are relatively lacking in feminine, expressive attitudes. Spence and Helmreich's (1978) data clearly suggest a strong association between the sons' and the fathers' characteristics, with the mother being secondary. "The androgynous male is competent in both instrumental and expressive domains. He has a broad range of behaviors. He engages in tasks regardless of their stereotypic label" (Unger, 1979, p. 162). Sex stereotyping is less rigid in these children due to parental character-
istics of tolerance, cognitive encouragement and control (Spence & Helmreich, 1978).

The focus of the present study is on the acceptance/rejection dimension of paternal behavior and the stereotypic sex-role assignment attitudes of the non-nurturant traditional father. Men who have had a nurturant and companionable father-son relationship are expected to be tender and physically affectionate (Barry, 1970; Parke, 1976; Townes, Ferguson, & Fillams, 1976). Several studies have reported that the warmth of the father-son relationship is associated with social competence (Cox, 1962; Howells, 1969; Leiderman, 1959; Mussen, Bouterline-Young, Gaddini, & Morante, 1963; Rutherford & Mussen, 1968). Paternal warmth is also associated with self-esteem (Coopersmith, 1967; Medinnus, 1965; Rosenberg, 1965; Sears, 1970) and personality adjustment (Mussen, et al., 1963; Reuter & Biller, 1973; Slater, 1962; Warren, 1957) in boys. Paternal nurturance is also closely associated with intellectual competence of boys (Jordan, Radin, & Epstein, 1975). Non-nurturant and non-companionable fathers who utilize affective punishment techniques and enforce sex-role standards are expected to have sons who demonstrate extreme negative attitudes toward male homosexuals and correspondingly manifest less intimacy in their same-sex and opposite-sex friendships.

Conceptual Overview

Negative attitudes toward homosexuals (Homophobia) have been around for a long time and, as a phenomenon, is as indigenous to American culture as apple pie. The United States is the most homophobic society. Collectively and individually the prejudice against homosexuality is felt in
interpersonal relationships, where the personality characteristics of the homophobic are most devastating. Male-male relationships, beginning with the father-son dichotomy, set the stage for the male child's later intimate relations. The "macho" stereotype, coincidentally most distinguishable in the homophobic, discourages nurturance and encourages inexpressiveness. This combination prevents the forming of deep intimate bonds, not only between men themselves, but with the other half of the population as well.

Statement of the Problem

The reviewed literature lends support to the hypothesis that the male sex-role is correlated with intimacy. The term intimacy appears to have the widest reference for close interpersonal relations as it includes both friendship and love (Davis, 1973). Sex-role stereotyped men in relationships with men are significantly lower in reported intimacy than sex-role stereotyped women in relationships with other women (Fischer, 1981). Douvan and Adelson (1968) conclude that while males measure no lower than females in sociability, they do measure lower in intimacy. Men are also less emotionally expressive (Allen & Haccoun, 1976; Allen & Hamsher, 1974; Balswick & Avertte, 1977; Bem, Martyna, & Watson, 1976). The evidence is relatively consistent that men have less intimacy than women in same-sex relationships (Booth, 1972; Caldwell & Peplau, 1981).

The reviewed literature also lends support to the hypothesis that those individuals who hold the strongest stereotypes of masculinity and femininity also have the most negative attitudes toward homosexuality. Homophobic individuals are more likely to judge a man as homosexual when
he exhibits "feminine" characteristics (i.e. expressiveness). The most common stereotype of the male homosexual in our society is of an effeminate individual (McIntosh, 1978). Although homophobia is found in both men and women, it appears to be more exaggerated and more powerful in males than in females (Morin & Garfinkle, 1978).

Considerable data have been established that point to a father's relationship to his son as a primary factor in that son's masculinity (Block, 1974; Hetherington & Parke, 1977). Spence and Helmreich's (1978) data clearly suggest a strong association between the sons' and the fathers' characteristics, with the mother being secondary. Block (1974) indicated the critical role of the father in encouraging sex typing and enforcing sex differences; thus, it is expected that some important antecedents of homophobia are to be found in parent-child relationships, specifically the relationship between father and son. Similarly, paternal antecedents are expected to be related to intimacy between men.

The present study has been designed to investigate the correlation between homophobia and intimacy between males:

1. Hypothesis #1: The level of reported intimacy between males will be inversely related to the level of homophobia present in the individual.

2. Hypothesis #2: The level of homophobia present in the male (son) will be directly related to the perceived parenting of the father, such that nurturance and instrumental companionship will be high, and affective punishment and sex-role enforcement will be low when homophobia is low. Conversely, nurturance and instrumental companionship will be
low and affective punishment and sex-role enforcement will be high when homophobia is high.

3. Hypothesis #3: The level of reported intimacy in the son's closest male relationship will be directly related to the perceived parenting of the father, such that nurturance and instrumental companionship will be high and affective punishment and sex-role enforcement will be low when intimacy is high. Conversely, nurturance and instrumental companionship will be low and affective punishment and sex-role enforcement will be high when intimacy is low.
Subjects

Subjects were 59 self-reported heterosexual males from three separate samples. Sample 1 consisted of 21 doctors and interns from the University of Southern California Medical Center. Subjects ranged in age from 26 to 45 years, with a mean age of 29.95 years ($SD = 4.14$). Sample 2 consisted of 23 lawyers, scientists and engineers, employees of the Federal Government, based in San Francisco. Subjects ranged in age from 26 to 52 years, with a mean age of 33.72 years ($SD = 6.15$). Sample 3 consisted of 15 men with diverse employment backgrounds whose spouses and mates were American Airlines employees based in Los Angeles. Subjects ranged in age from 23 to 45 years, with a mean age of 33.46 ($SD = 6.82$). The mean age for the total sample was 32.29 ($SD = 5.88$). Subjects' ethnic backgrounds were 55.2% American/Caucasian, 5.2% Afro-American, 1.7% Mexican-American, 22.4% European, 5.2% Italian-American, and 10.3% Asian-American. Subjects were 39.7% Protestant, 27.6% Catholic, 17.2% Jewish, 3.4% other, and 12.1% reported no religious affiliation. Subjects' educational levels were 60.3% reporting 1 or more years of graduate education, 25.9% college degree, 12.1% with 1 to 3 years college, and 1.7% with high school diploma. Length of subjects' closest female relationship was from 2 months to 23 years with an overall mean of 5.79 ($SD = 5.72$, median was 3.96 years). Differences in ages between the males and their female friends ranged from a minus 6 years (female
to a plus 11 years (male older). Overall mean was 2.20 (SD = 3.48).

Types of relationship were: married, 56.9%; living together, 6.9%; not
living together, 31%; and other, 5.2%. Length of male-male relationship
was from 9 months to 22 years. The overall mean was 12.12 (SD = 8.15,
median was 10.97 years). A total of 27 men reported they had responsi-
bility for younger siblings (46.6%), while 31 men reported no such
responsibility (53.4%).

**Instruments**

1. **Intimacy**
   - (a) A condensed nine item version for Rubin's (1970) Love and Liking Scale was used. Response was rated on a 3-point scale with response options from "disagree completely, not at all true" (1) to "agree completely, definitely true" (3). Ss were instructed to respond first with respect to one's closest opposite-sex friend and then to closest same-sex friend. The primary reason for inclusion of the Rubin's (1970) Loving and Liking Scale was to provide some convergent validity for the Fischer (1981) Intimacy Scale, the principal measure of intimacy. For both the Rubin Loving and Liking Scale, significant associations with Orlofsky's (1976) and Yufit's (1956) intimacy measures have been found (Kacerguis & Adams, 1979).
   - (b) Fischer's (1981) Intimacy Scale. This was a 42 item scale representing a 6-point response format which ranged from (1) indicating "strong disagreement" to (6) indicating "strong agreement". Ss were instructed to respond first to closest opposite-sex friend and then to closest same-sex friend. Items were worded in both a positive and negative direction with reverse scoring employed for the negative items. Six dimensions representing variables
in friendship and intimacy and validated in previous research were included. Internal reliability on these measures were: Ease of Communication, $r = .76$; Confidence Sharing, $r = .84$; Egocentrism, $r = .63$; Empathy, $r = .76$; Voluntary Interdependence, $r = .77$; Person as Unique Other, $r = .66$.

2. Perceived Paternal Antecedents Scale. (a) MacDonald's (1971) adaptation of the Devereux, Bronfenbrenner and Rogers (1969) Cornell Perceived Parenting Questionnaire was used. This instrument was modified further and this study used nine of the 21 items designed to index three of the nine general paternal parenting behaviors. Ss were instructed to select the answer that best described the way in which the "father" (step-father, foster-father, or any other adult male guardian) behaved during the major portion of their childhood. Each item was followed by a set of five response alternatives. The response alternatives for most items were "almost always", "usually", "sometimes", "once in a while", and "never". Where required, an alternative set of responses ranging from "almost every day" through "never" was used with some of the items. The items were not grouped by variables but appeared in random order. As an additional control for response bias, the response alternatives were reversed for half of the items (e.g., "never" through "almost always" in contrast to "almost always" through "never"). The three dimensions selected for the present study were Nurturance, Instrumental Companionship and Affective Punishment. Internal reliability estimates in MacDonald's (1971) study were: nurturance, $r = .81$; instrumental companionship, $r = .71$; affective punishment, $r = .59$. 
(b) A condensed version of the Spence and Helmreich (1978) Parental Attitudes Questionnaire with selected items designed to measure Nurturance and Sex Role Enforcement was used. Items from the MacDonald and Spence and Helmreich scales were combined. Ss were instructed to select the response that best characterized their experience of their father's (or other primary male figure's) attitudes and actions. Response was rated on a 5-point scale with response options from "very characteristic" to "very uncharacteristic". These items were not grouped by variables but appeared in random order. Items were worded in both a positive and negative direction with reverse scoring employed for the negative items.

3. Attitude Toward Male Homosexuality Scale (ATMHS) (MacDonald & Games, 1974). This scale is a modification of the non-sex specific scale introduced by MacDonald et al. (1972). Each of 28 items is responded to on a 9-point scale, ranging from "Strongly Disagree" (1) to "Strongly Agree" (9). Scores can range from 28 to 252, with high scores associated with more negative attitudes toward homosexuality. Items were worded in both a positive and negative direction with reverse scoring employed for the negative items. Internal consistency reliability for the ATMHS has been established at .956.

Procedure

The three sample populations were given the questionnaires and accompanying envelopes. Subjects were asked to indicate the extent to which they agreed or disagreed with each item by placing an appropriate number, or circling the appropriate term, on the individual instruments. The
order of the questionnaires did not vary; in this way the most innocuous scales were presented first and the ones likely to be considered most personal and possibly offensive were presented last. Subjects were asked to identify their category of practiced sexuality and data from the bisexual and homosexual populations were deleted.
RESULTS

Questionnaire return rate was 64 out of 150, or 43%; however, only 59 (39%) of the total sample was from the target heterosexual population. Five subjects were deleted from the sample because they indicated non-heterosexuality. In order to validate the procedure of combining the three groups, a one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was performed on two measures, including the major measure of homophobia (ATMHS). No significant statistical difference among the three samples tested on this measure was found, $F(2,58) = .04$, ns. A one-way analysis of variance was then performed on one of the demographic variables (age). This value of $F$ is also not significant at the .05 level, $F(2,58) = 2.78$. These two ANOVAs thus suggest that all three groups could be combined.

Pearson product-moment correlation coefficients were computed between all the variables in the questionnaire. Table 1 presents the intercorrelations between male-male intimacy measures and homophobia. Partial support was found for hypothesis 1. There was a statistically significant relationship between levels of male friendship and intimacy and the ATMHS (negative attitudes toward male homosexuals) scores. An inverse association of $r = -.26 (p < .04)$ between the ATMHS and the Rubin Love Scale, and a marginal association of $r = -.24 (p < .07)$ between the ATMHS and the Rubin Liking Scale was discovered. The Fischer friendship and intimacy dimensions of Confidence Sharing ($r = -.27, p < .04$), Empathy ($r = -.26, p < .05$), and Person as Unique
TABLE 1

Correlations Between Male-Male Intimacy Measures and Homophobia

(n = 59)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intimacy Measures</th>
<th>Homophobia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RLIM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESCOM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EGOM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMPM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSPM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATMHS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| RLOM   | .35** | .16   | .57*** | -.18   | .48*** | .59*** | .51*** | -.26*  |
| RLIM   | .25*  | -.35**| .38**  | .19    | .23    | -.24   |
| ESCOM  | .29*  | -.25* | .29*   | .14    | .11    | -.16   |
| CSM    | -.04  | .69***| .79*** | .58*** | -.27*  |
| EGOM   | -.15  | -.01  | -.00   | .22    |
| EMPM   | .59***| .49***| -.26*  |
| VIM    | .65***| -.21  |
| PSPM   | -.28* |       |

*p < .05

**p < .01

***p < .001
Other ($r = -.28, p < .04$) also correlated significantly with the ATMHS. The relationships between the ATMHS and the intimacy measures of Ease of Communication, Egocentricism, and Voluntary Interdependence were not significant. In sum, homophobics tend to be lower on a number of scales measuring intimacy between males.

The second hypothesis predicted that homophobia would be related to the perceived parenting of the father, but no support was found for this prediction. Nurturance, Instrumental Companionship, Affective Punishment, and Sex-Role Enforcement were not significantly related to homophobia. Table 2 presents the intercorrelations between the male-male intimacy measures, paternal antecedents, and homophobia.

The third hypothesis predicted that the level of intimacy between males would be directly related to the perceived parenting of the father, such that Nurturance and Instrumental Companionship would be high, and Sex-Role Enforcement and Affective Punishment would be low, when intimacy was high. This hypothesis was partially supported. There was a statistically significant relationship between Nurturance and the Rubin's Love Scale ($r = .36, p < .01$) and between Nurturance and the Fischer dimension of Voluntary Interdependence ($r = .35, p < .01$). A marginally significant association ($r = .24, p < .07$) also occurred between Nurturance and the Fischer dimension of Empathy. Instrumental Companionship was associated with the Rubin's Love Scale ($r = .38, p < .01$) and the Fischer dimension of Voluntary Interdependence ($r = .33, p < .01$). Sex-Role Enforcement was negatively correlated with the Rubin's Love Scale ($r = -.25, p < .06$) and the Rubin's Liking
TABLE 2

Correlations Between Male-Male Intimacy Measures, Paternal Antecedents, and Homophobia

(n = 59)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intimacy Measures</th>
<th>Perceived Paternal Antecedents Measures</th>
<th>Homophobia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NUTU</td>
<td>ICOM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RLOM</td>
<td>.36**</td>
<td>.38**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RLIM</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESCOM</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSM</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EGOM</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>-.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMPM</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIM</td>
<td>.35**</td>
<td>.33**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSPM</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NUTU</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICOM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05

**p < .01

***p < .001
Scale ($r = -0.26, p < 0.05$) and both the Fischer dimensions of Confidence Sharing ($r = -0.25, p < 0.06$) and Empathy ($r = -0.29, p < 0.02$). Egocentrism (a negative intimacy characteristic) was positively correlated with Sex-Role Enforcement ($r = 0.28, p < 0.03$). Affective Punishment had no statistically significant correlation with either the Rubin or Fischer friendship and intimacy measures. In sum, men who perceived their fathers as nurturant and companionable (sharing their time, etc.) were higher on the Rubin's Love and the Fischer Voluntary Interdependence dimension. Men who perceived their fathers as strictly enforcing sex-role standards had lower intimacy scores on the Rubin's Love and Liking Scale, and the Fischer dimensions of Confidence Sharing, and Empathy. Voluntary Interdependence and Person as Unique Other, although statistically non-significant, were also negatively related to Sex-Role Enforcement.

Intercorrelations between the measures of paternal antecedents showed a positive correlation of $r = 0.30 (p < 0.02)$ between Affective Punishment and Sex-Role Enforcement. On the other hand, Sex-Role Enforcement had a negative correlation with both Nurturance ($r = -0.32, p < 0.01$) and Instrumental Companionship ($r = -0.30, p < 0.02$). This would suggest that some association does exist between the negative characteristics of paternal behavior (Affective Punishment and Sex-Role Enforcement) and the positive qualities of paternal behavior (Nurturance and Instrumental Companionship). A high positive correlation appeared between Instrumental Companionship and Nurturance ($r = 0.72, p < 0.01$) suggesting that these separate dimensions of paternal behavior are actually closely measuring one characteristic.
Supplementary Analyses. Male-Male Relationships

There were no statistically significant relationships between the demographic variables (age, ethnic, religious, and educational backgrounds) and the non-demographic variables (length of male relationship and care of younger siblings) and the measures of homophobia, friendship and intimacy, and paternal antecedents.

The inclusion of the Rubin's Love and Liking Scale was expected to provide validity for the Fischer Scale. According to Fischer (1981), there are two primary factors: one concerned with intimacy (Ease of Communication and Egocentrism) and the other concerned with friendship (Voluntary Interdependence and Person as Unique Other). Confidence Sharing and Empathy had not been found to load heavily on either of the above two dimensions. Thus it was expected that the Rubin Love Scale for Men would correspond to the intimacy variables and the Rubin Liking Scale for Men would correspond to the friendship variables. The highest correlations, however, appeared between the Rubin Love Scale and Confidence Sharing, Empathy, Voluntary Interdependence, and Person as Unique Other, and were not significantly correlated, as expected, with Ease of Communication and Egocentrism (see Table 1). Significantly high correlations also appeared between the Rubin Liking Scale and Egocentrism, as well as Empathy, but not with Voluntary Interdependence and Person as Unique Other.

Confidence Sharing was highly correlated with Empathy, Voluntary Interdependence, and Person as Unique Other, and thus appear to be at least part of a profound male relationship. Empathy also correlated
highly with Voluntary Interdependence as well as Person as Unique Other. In this sample, Confidence Sharing and Empathy were correlated significantly with the measure presumed to tap friendship. It would appear, therefore, that within this sample, clear demarcations between friendship variables and intimacy variables do not exist.

**Male-Female Relationships**

Although no predictions were made for male-female relationships and the measures of homophobia, friendship and intimacy, correlation coefficients were computed between them. Table 3 presents these correlations.

A marginal positive association appeared between Egocentrism toward the female and negative attitudes toward male homosexuals \((r = .23, p < .09)\) suggesting that homophobic men are more egocentric (self-centered and insensitive) toward their female partners. Surprisingly, a marginal positive correlation also appeared between Empathy for the female and the ATHMS \((r = .25, p < .06)\). The Empathy and Ego measures are almost identical, varying only in the positive vs. negative direction of the questions. All the other friendship and intimacy variables, though statistically nonsignificant, showed negative correlations with the ATHMS. Homophobic men tend to be in relationships with women whom they see as both sensitive to them and insensitive to them.

Correlations between male-female intimacy measures, paternal antecedents, and homophobia are presented in Table 4. Although the paternal dimension of Affective Punishment had no significant statistical
### TABLE 3

Correlations Between Male-Female Intimacy Measures and Homophobia

(n = 59)

| Intimacy Measures | Homo-
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>phobia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RLOF</td>
<td>.61***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RLIF</td>
<td>.44***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESCOF</td>
<td>.54***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSF</td>
<td>-.42***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EGOF</td>
<td>-.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMPF</td>
<td>.30*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIF</td>
<td>-.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSPF</td>
<td>-.17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Intimacy Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RLOF</td>
<td>.57***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RLIF</td>
<td>.33**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESCOF</td>
<td>.50***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSF</td>
<td>-.52***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EGOF</td>
<td>-.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMPF</td>
<td>.30*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIF</td>
<td>-.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSPF</td>
<td>-.17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* * * < .05
** * * < .01
*** * * * < .001
TABLE 4

Correlations Between Male-Female Intimacy Measures, Paternal Antecedents, and Homophobia

(n = 59)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intimacy Measures</th>
<th>Perceived Paternal Antecedents Measures</th>
<th>Homophobia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NUTU</td>
<td>ICOM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RLOF</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RLIF</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESCOF</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSF</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EGOF</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>-.27*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMPF</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIF</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>-.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSPF</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05
correlation with male-male relationships, a statistically significant negative association appeared between Affective Punishment and Ease of Communication with the Female ($r = -.25, p < .06$). Ease of Communication with the Female was also negatively correlated with Sex-Role Enforcement ($r = -.29, p < .03$). The positive parenting dimension of Nurturance had no correlations with any of the friendship and intimacy variables. Instrumental Companionship, however, did have a statistically significant negative correlation with Egocentrism toward the Female ($r = -.27, p < .04$). Thus, both positive parenting behaviors and sex-role enforcement appear to have their greater effect on the male-male relationship. It should also be noted that the pattern of significant correlations for male-male relationships is different from those found for male-female relationships.

**Intercorrelations Among Intimacy Measures**

An examination of the intercorrelations between the Rubin and Fischer dimensions for the male-male and the male-female relationships showed, as expected, that loving for the female and liking for the female were more highly correlated with each other ($r = .61, p < .01$) than were loving and liking for the male ($r = .35, p < .01$). The means for Loving the Female were also considerably higher than the means for Loving the Male ($M = 22.54$ and $M = 16.01$ respectively). The means for Liking the Female and Liking the Male ($M = 21.84$ and $M = 21.47$ respectively) were, however, the same.

Although Ease of Communication was not correlated significantly with either of the Rubin's measures in the male-male relationship, Ease
of Communication with the Female did correlate significantly with the Rubin's Liking the Female ($r = .44, p < .01$). The highest correlations with the Rubin's Love Scale for the male-female relationships appeared for Voluntary Interdependence, the Rubin Liking, Person as Unique Other, Confidence Sharing, and Egocentrism, respectively. The highest correlations with the Rubin Liking Scale appeared for Ease of Communication, Voluntary Interdependence, Egocentrism, Empathy, Confidence Sharing, and Person as Unique Other, respectively (see Table 3).

Ease of Communication with the Female had a negative correlation with Egocentricism, and high positive correlations with Confidence Sharing, Empathy, Person as Unique Other, and Voluntary Interdependence, respectively. Interestingly, Confidence Sharing with the Male and Loving the Male, shared exactly the same correlation with each other as did Confidence Sharing with the Female and Loving the Female ($r = .57, p < .01$). It appears that confidence sharing and love are strongly related in a male's relationship, not only in his relationship with his closest male friend, but also with his closest female friend.

Egocentrism, which was statistically significant on only two dimensions of the male-male relationship (the Rubin Liking the Male and Ease of Communication with the Male), was statistically significant (and to a greater degree) with Ease of Communication, Confidence Sharing, the Rubin's Liking, Person as Unique Other, and the Rubin's Loving, respectively. This suggest that Egocentrism has a more negative impact in the male's relationship with the female, than in his relationship with another male.
Relationships Between Cross-Sex Intimacy Measures

Intercorrelations for the corresponding intimacy measures of the male-male and the male-female relationships are presented in Table 5.

There was a distinct lack of significant relationships between the specific intimacy measures of male-male relationships and male-female relationships with one major exception. The Rubin Liking the Male was correlated with a number of male-female intimacy measures. Most notably, Confidence Sharing ($r = .47, p < .01$), Liking the Female ($r = .42, p < .01$), Ease of Communication with the Female ($r = .39, p < .01$), Empathy with the Female ($r = .34, p < .01$), and Loving the Female ($r = .29, p < .02$). It appears that a male's friendship with another male is a positive intimacy characteristic which is not independent of intimacy with his closest female friend.
TABLE 5

Relationships Between Cross-Sex Intimacy Measures

(n = 59)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Male-Male</th>
<th>Male-Female</th>
<th>RLOF</th>
<th>RLIF</th>
<th>ESCOF</th>
<th>CSF</th>
<th>EGOF</th>
<th>EMPF</th>
<th>VIF</th>
<th>PSPF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RLOM</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RLIM</td>
<td>.29*</td>
<td>.42***</td>
<td>.39**</td>
<td>.47***</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>.34**</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESCOM</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSM</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EGOM</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.33**</td>
<td>-.22</td>
<td>-.29*</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMPM</td>
<td>.25*</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIM</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSPM</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05

**p < .01

***p < .001
DISCUSSION

Previous studies have already demonstrated that the male sex-role stereotype is linked to both intimacy and homophobia. Studies have also shown that women have greater "closeness" with one another than men have with each other. Women also manifest less homophobia. The major purpose of this study was to determine if male homophobia (negative attitudes toward male homosexuals) influences and interferes with a "man's" ability to be close to another man. This assumption was supported: homophobic males have less closeness (friendship and intimacy) in their "closest" male relationship than non-homophobic males. Although there were only moderate correlations between the measures designed to elicit "closeness" and homophobia, the pattern was clear. Homophobic males see their male friends as having less special and unique qualities, they share fewer confidences with them, have less empathy with them, and love their male friends less than non-homophobic males.

Homophobia can be perceived as a dislike of feminine behaviors, attitudes, characteristics, and emotions. This dislike may begin within a young male as a slow developmental process; he learns to identify with and accept exclusively male qualities. Awareness of feelings and behaviors suggestive of femininity diffuse within oneself as the developmental process progresses. Femininity becomes alien and unwelcome. If qualities such as closeness, caring, intimate sharing are seen stereo-
typically as feminine, they must be rejected as "ego-alien". In time, feminine attributes in any man (whether oneself or others) are seen as shameful and threatening to one's masculinity; thus, the rejection of these qualities as inappropriate as male behavior. Ultimately then, the homophobic male indiscriminately rejects an entire class of feelings and behaviors construed as feminine.

Not only does homophobia interfere with "closeness" in the homophobic's same-sex relationship, it apparently interferes also in the amount of "closeness" in his opposite-sex relationship. Although this relationship in the data presented in Chapter III was statistically non-significant, there was some indication that the homophobic male tends to have a partner who demonstrates both sensitivity (empathy measure) and insensitivity (ego measure) to his feeling, i.e., "she realizes what I mean even when I have difficulty in saying it", while at the same time suggesting that "she may understand my words but she does not see the way I feel". This discrepancy would not be relevant were it not for the fact that the homophobic's score on all the other intimacy variables are in the negative direction.

The second assumption was that homophobic males would have different perceived paternal parenting than nonhomophobic males: Homophobic males would have fathers who were perceived as enforcing sex-role standards, i.e. "he would disapprove if I cried" and utilizing affective punishment techniques ("he nagged at me"), and would experience less nurturance ("he comforted me and helped me when I had troubles") and less companionship ("he taught me things that I wanted to learn").
assumption was not supported. Although intimacy is related to homophobia it is apparently not mediated by perceived paternal parenting. Perhaps peer pressure during adolescence has a greater influence than perceived paternal behaviors.

The third hypothesis was that men who experience a positive (nurturant and companionable) rather than a negative (sex-role enforcement and affective punishment) association with their father will have a deeper, closer relationship with other men. This assumption was partially supported. Men who shared more emotional closeness via nurturance and instrumental companionship with their fathers love their male friends more and exhibit more voluntary interdependence with them. Men who perceived their fathers as strictly enforcing sex-role standards express more negative egocentricism toward their male friend, have less empathy, less confidence sharing, and both love and like their male friend less. Thus, men perceiving their fathers as nurturant and companionable rather than authoritatively enforcing sex-role standards, had more "closeness" in their same-sex relationships. It is important to note that the male who likes his male friend also has a tendency to share more confidences with his female friend, like her better, have greater communication with her, share more empathy with her, and love her more. Sex-role enforcement also showed a negative association with both companionship and nurturance and not surprisingly, a positive association with affective punishment techniques. Both paternal affective punishment and sex-role enforcement showed a negative association with ease of communication with the female partner, e.g.,
"it's easy to talk with her when I have a problem". It has been assumed that fathers should espouse strict sex-role standards, yet this appears to have a detrimental effect on the son's ability to have an intimate relationship, not only with other males, but also with the female.

Several inferences can be drawn from this finding. The first, obviously, is that the warm, sharing father (nurturant and companionable) provides his son with the ability to participate as an equal in an intimate partnership. Spence and Helmreich (1978) suggested that children whose parents (fathers) are warm and supportive perhaps develop the predisposition to treat others in an equal way. Secondly, if one views the father-son relationship as a tentative and tenuous link forged through positive paternal behavior, then warmth, sensitivity, and compassion are necessary elements of that bonding. What the father gives the son in such a relationship is the capacity to be intimate. Intimacy is based upon the ability to be real. In order to have authenticity in a relationship, it is therefore necessary to give of yourself. The isolation experienced by the son who does not share in this intimate giving creates a lacuna in the boy's identity which can never be filled. His "closeness" with another lacks that first essential ingredient given only through the nurturance and companionship of the father. We have too long ignored the role of the nurturant and companionable (warm) father in the socialization of his sons. For instance, in research cited by Unger (1979), her conclusions were "that parental warmth, which is an important feature of the mother-daughter relationship, is of even greater significance in the father-daughter one" (p. 177). The necessity
for warmth in the father-son relationship is not even mentioned.

An examination of the scales purported to measure the "closeness" in the same-sex relationship and the "closeness" in the opposite-sex relationship show a difference on a number of dimensions. This suggests that the patterning of intimacy variables varies by sex of partner. Certainly egocentrism, which measures the degree to which perceived insensitivity is evidenced, operates differently in the male-male relationship and in a much smaller degree than what is found in the male-female relationship. There were only four questions appearing in the Egocentricism measure: "(she) may understand my words but (she) does not see the way I feel"; "(she) looks at what I do from (her) own point of view"; "sometimes (she) thinks I feel a certain way, because that's the way (she) feels"; and "(her) response to me is usually so fixed and automatic that I don't really get through to (her)". The high correlation on the Ego Scale with other intimacy measures when referred to the female intimate testifies to the hostility felt by the subject for the absolute lack of sensitivity by his female partner, which impacted on a number of other dimensions. For their male friends, this perceived insensitivity does not relate to as many other intimacy variables or as sharply. For female relationships, however, perceived insensitivity is related to the parental antecedent of companionship; i.e., men who see their fathers as not spending much instrumental time with them see their female partners as egocentric. In the male-male relationship, this perceived insensitivity is related to the perception of the father as enforcing rigid sex-role standards. Here, men whose
fathers are seen as highly prescriptive of appropriate sex-roles view
their male friends as egocentric. The intercorrelations between the
identical measures of friendship and intimacy for the male-male vs. the
male-female relationships show that men who perceive their male intimates
as non-empathic also perceive their female intimate in the same direction.
These between-sex intimacy correlations were not significant for any of
the other intimacy measures.

The correlations between Loving and Liking in the male-female
relationships were almost double the correlation found for the same
measure in the male-male relationship. What comprises "closeness", then,
can best be looked at as a reversible shirt—one side exposed in relating
with closest female—the other side worn when relating to closest male.
A male's relationship with his "closest" intimate is different depending
on whether that closest other is male or female. These findings lend
further support to Rubin's (1971, 1973) results. Although Rubin (1971,
1973) found that men tended to love their opposite-sex friend more, but
like them less, no such difference was found in this study in the male's
liking for his female vs. his male friend.

In designing the questionnaire it was necessary to find scales that
had been used to measure closeness in both same-sex relationships and
opposite-sex relationships. There were very low correlations between
the Rubin (1970) and the Fischer (1981) measures and these correlations
did not fit Fischer's dimensional analysis. According to Fischer (1981)
the intimacy factor was ease of communication and egocentricism; the
friendship factor was voluntary interdependence and person as unique
other. The patterning of intercorrelations did not agree with this split. The number of subjects were too small to do a factor analysis to establish what dimensions might account for this patterning. It was expected that the Rubin Love Scale would correspond to the Fischer intimacy variables and the Rubin Liking Scale would correspond to the friendship variables. These high correlations, however, did not appear in either the male-male or the male-female relations. Obviously, more work needs to be done on selection of scales which best measure the empirical dimensions of intimacy. Perhaps the student samples used in the Fischer studies explain the low correlations. The Rubin scales have been widely used in more general populations, and the sample used in this survey, with the exception of the high educational level, fits the parameters of the more general population. Also, the individuals who were willing to respond to the lengthy questionnaire (estimated time fifty minutes) were probably different on a number of variables from those who did not respond. The fact that the questions focused on personal concerns and intimate material was also a self-limiting factor. A total of 57% of the subjects did not mail back completed instruments. Of special interest, however, is the number of subjects, 37 out of 59, who sent in the post card requesting a copy of the results. This regard for further information attests to the interest of those respondents.

The lack of demographic correlations between the measures of homophobia, intimacy (or closeness) and paternal antecedents further suggests the representativeness of the sample tested. Religious
background, ethnic heritage, and age did not appear to be factors which influenced the scores. There is no doubt, however, that sampling bias did occur in this survey and generalizations to the general population are therefore very limited.

The present study has laid additional foundations for understanding the dynamics of Homophobia and its resulting impact on the male. The negative influence of sex-role enforcement also requires further clarification. Although no cause and effect relationship can be supported or inferred, it is obvious that there is a need for future research which will more precisely determine the association. It is important to remember that until the end of the Nineteenth Century, masculinity meant the opposite of childishness. Masculinity today, however, is both a badge and a brand emblazoned on the forehead of the very limited man. Men are not the only victims, though; women also suffer the inevitable and intolerable consequences of these limits.

The stereotype of homosexuality (i.e., the effeminate male) has created a specter that looms darkly on a male's willingness to display his feminine feelings, attitudes, and behavioral characteristics. Deception, though, is a barrier to intimacy. A spurious man cannot be intimate. Perhaps it's time for men to stop pretending to "be men". These pretensions allow only an approximation of the full spectrum of emotions that are within the human range. Men could pretend, instead, to "be like a woman" just to see "how it feels". Certainly anxiety is reduced by the expression of real feelings. Certainly the male sex-role has more than its share of anxiety. Effeminate is not now a neutral or
casual word. It is amusing to consider the possible consequences of its "decriminalization". Of course, this might change the status quo, and would definitely startle, if not downright terrify, "authoritarian establishment".

Unweaving the tangled skein of "tight fisted" emotions is going to require a surrendering to the irony of it all--it would be humorous if it were not so pathetic. But we must change the concept of man in order to balance him. This will take an active role of will, if not of reason. We must teach men to release the emotions which have been frightened inside by the prospect of being "unmanly". Certainly fathers play a significant role in this process. Although the link between fathering and homophobia has not been established, the direct relationship between the quality of fathering and the quality of an adult male's relationships suggests that intergenerational learning between fathers and sons cannot be ignored.

The manifestation of true manliness is the acknowledgment of "man's femininity". A true "Man" is not afraid to display (and reveal) the intimate side of his manly submissiveness to human nature. In order to bring about this change in manliness, though, the prejorative label of effeminancy may have to be disassociated from the male sex-role standard. Perhaps "femininity" is not such a negative charge after all.
APPENDIX

Male Relationship Questionnaire

Instructions

My name is Patty Devlin. I am a graduate student in psychology at California State College, San Bernardino, working under the direction of Dr. Gloria Cowan. As part of my Master's thesis requirements, I am conducting a study designed to investigate male relationships. The questions you will answer span a wide range of thoughts, attitudes, and feelings; therefore, the answers will likely tap strong emotions. There are many myths surrounding a man's relationships and your participation in this study will do much to distinguish between the myths and reality. It is, of course, your option to choose not to participate in this research. All information is, however, totally confidential.

The following pages consist of a questionnaire I would like you to complete. Your questionnaire will be identified by number code only to insure that your answers will remain completely anonymous. Please keep the following points in mind as you complete the questionnaire.

- Please read each item carefully, making certain you understand it before answering.

- Please answer each item honestly. There are no right or wrong answers - only what you think and feel personally. For this research to be an accurate description about male relationships, it is essential that you answer as honestly as you can.

- Please answer each test item even though you find some questions offensive. The importance of this request cannot be over emphasized.

- The questionnaire is divided into five sections, each with its own set of instructions. Please read these instructions carefully before proceeding.

- Do not scan the questionnaire or jump from one section to another. Start with the first section and proceed to the last section in the order that they appear.

- It should take you about fifty minutes to complete the questionnaire. Please plan on filling out the questionnaire during a time of day when you anticipate the fewest interruptions.
If you are interested in the results of this study, send the attached post card. However, evaluation of your individual responses will not be made.

If you do not wish to fill out this questionnaire, please destroy the entire packet.

Section 1

Please write in the appropriate answer or circle the number that best applies to you:

1. Your age:__________

2. Think of the woman you feel closest to at the present time. How long in months/years have the two of you been in a close relationship:

   Months_________  Years_________  Her Age_________

3. What is the nature of your relationship to this woman:
   a. Spouse       c. Not living together
   b. Living together  d. Other (please specify)__________

4. Do you consider this woman as:
   a. Friend       Yes_____  No_____
   b. Lover        Yes_____  No_____  

5. Length of relationship to closest male friend:

   Months_________  Years_________

6. Were you responsible for younger brothers and/or sister while you were growing up:

   Yes_____  No_____  

7. Your Ethnic background__________________________________________

8. Your Religious background_______________________________________

9. Your occupation_______________________________________________

10. Your spouse's occupation_______________________________________
11. Your education:
   a. Less than 12 years
   b. 12 years...H.S. Diploma
   c. 1 - 3 years of College
   d. College Degree
   e. 1 or more years of Graduate education

12. Type of vehicle owned:
   a. Stationwagon
   b. Sports Car
   c. Pickup Truck or Van
   d. Motorcycle
   e. Sedan

13. In which group would you identify yourself, or otherwise categorize yourself:
   a. Heterosexual
   b. Bisexual
   c. Homosexual

Section II

This section is to be completed with respect to the female described in Question2. Please express your feeling about each statement by indicating whether you:

(1) Disagree completely, not at all true.
(2) Agree to some extent, moderately true.
(3) Agree completely, definitely true.

Please put appropriate number in space at the left of each statement. 

____ 1. I feel that I can confide in her about virtually everything.
____ 2. I would do almost anything for her.
____ 3. If I could never be with her I would feel miserable.
____ 4. If I were lonely, my first thought would be to seek her out.
____ 5. One of my primary concerns is her welfare.
____ 6. I would forgive her for practically anything.
____ 7. I feel responsible for her well-being.
8. I would greatly enjoy being confided in by her.
9. It would be hard for me to get along without her.
10. I think that she is unusually well adjusted.
11. I would recommend her for a responsible job.
12. In my opinion she is an exceptionally mature person.
13. I have great confidence in her good judgment.
14. Most people would react favorably to her after a brief acquaintance.
15. I think that she is one of those people who quickly wins respect.
16. She is one of the most likable people I know.
17. She is the sort of person whom I myself would like to be.
18. It seems to me that it is very easy for her to gain admiration.

Complete the following questions in respect to your closest male friend as described in Question 5. Please express your feeling about each statement by indicating whether you:

(1) Disagree completely, not at all true.
(2) Agree to some extent, moderately true.
(3) Agree completely, definitely true.

1. I feel that I can confide in him about virtually everything.
2. I would do almost anything for him.
3. If I could never be with him I would feel miserable.
4. If I were lonely, my first thought would be to seek him out.
5. One of my primary concerns is his welfare.
6. I would forgive him for practically anything.
7. I feel responsible for his well-being.
8. I would greatly enjoy being confided in by him.
9. It would be hard for me to get along without him.
10. I think that he is unusually well adjusted.
11. I would recommend him for a responsible job.
12. In my opinion he is an exceptionally mature person.
13. I have great confidence in his good judgment.
14. Most people would react favorably to him after a brief acquaintance.
15. I think that he is one of those people who quickly wins respect.
16. He is one of the most likable people I know.
17. He is the sort of person whom I myself would like to be.
18. It seems to me that it is very easy for him to gain admiration.

Section III

Consider the relationship you have with the woman described in Section I, Question 2, and answer the following statements according to how much you agree this is true of your relationship. Use this scale:

(1) Strong disagreement  (4) Slight agreement
(2) Moderate disagreement  (5) Moderate agreement
(3) Slight disagreement  (6) Strong agreement

1. She talks in a way that makes it difficult for me to understand her.
2. When I ask her to do something it is hard to know if she has said she would or would not do it.
3. When she is doing something I don't understand, she can explain about it so that I understand.
4. It's easy to talk to her when I have a problem.
5. I have to say and ask things two or three times before she will answer me.
6. It's easy to let her know about what I like and don't like.
7. I get to explain my side when she and I start to disagree or argue.
8. She and I are always interested in each other's activities and concerns.
9. She and I can nearly always count on each other in times of worry and crisis.
10. She and I tell each other nearly all of our worries and concerns.
11. She and I confide in each other more than we confide in anyone else.
12. She and I tell each other things about ourselves which we are not likely to tell other people.
13. She and I are usually quite accepting of each other's confidences, hurts, pleasures.
14. She may understand my words but she does not see the way I feel.
15. She nearly always knows exactly what I mean.
16. She looks at what I do from her own point of view.
17. Sometimes she thinks I feel a certain way because that's the way she feels.
18. She realizes what I mean even when I have difficulty in saying it.
19. She appreciates exactly how the things I experience feel to me.
20. Her response to me is usually so fixed and automatic that I don't really get through to her.
21. When I am hurt or upset she can recognize my feelings, exactly, without becoming upset herself.
22. If I hadn't heard from her for several days without knowing why, I would make it a point to contact her just for the sake of keeping in touch.
23. She keeps me pretty well informed about her true feelings and attitudes about different things that come up.

24. If I had a choice of two good part-time jobs, I would seriously consider taking the somewhat less attractive job if it meant that she and I could work at the same place.

25. If she were to move away or "disappear" for some reason, I would really miss the special kind of companionship she provided.

26. If she and I could arrange our class or work schedules so we each had a free day, I would try to arrange my schedule so that I had the same free day as she.

27. She thinks and acts in ways that "set her apart" and make her distinct from other people I know.

28. If I had decided to leave town on a certain day for a leisurely trip or vacation and discovered that she was leaving for the same place a day later, I would seriously consider waiting a day in order to travel with her.

29. When I am with her, I get the impression that she is "playing a role" or trying to create a certain kind of "image".

30. When I plan for leisure time activities, I make it a point to get in touch with her to see if we can arrange to do things together.

31. I can count on her to do and say the things that express what she truly feels and believes, even if they are not the things she thinks are expected of her.

32. If I had no particular plans for a free evening and she contacted me suggesting some activity I am not particularly interested in, I would seriously consider doing it with her.

33. Some of the most rewarding ideas, interests and activities I share with her are the kinds of things I find it difficult, if not impossible, to share with any other acquaintances.

34. She is one of the persons I would go out of my way to help if she were in some sort of difficulty.

35. When I am with her, she seems to relax and be herself and not think about the kind of impression she is creating.
36. If I had just gotten off work or out of class and had some free time, I would wait around and leave with her if she were leaving the same place an hour or so later.

37. If I were trying to describe her to someone who didn't know her, it would be easy to fit her into a general class or type of persons.

38. I try to get interested in the activities that she enjoys, even if they do not seem especially appealing to me at first.

39. When she and I get together, I enjoy a special kind of companionship I don't get from any of my other acquaintances.

40. If she and I were planning vacations to the same place and at about the same time and she had to postpone her trip for a month, I would seriously consider postponing my own trip for a month also.

41. She is the kind of person I would miss very much if something happen to interfere with our relationship.

42. I prefer her company to the company of books/TV/music/being alone.

Consider the relationship you have with your closest male friend as described in Section 1, Question 5 and answer the following statements according to how much you agree this is true of your relationship. Use this scale:

(1) Strong disagreement  (4) Slight agreement
(2) Moderate disagreement  (5) Moderate agreement
(3) Slight disagreement  (6) Strong agreement

1. He talks in a way that makes it difficult for me to understand him.

2. When I ask him to do something it is hard to know if he has said he would or would not do it.

3. When he is doing something I don't understand, he can explain about it so that I understand.

4. It's easy to talk to him when I have a problem.

5. I have to say and ask things two or three times before he will answer me.
6. It's easy to let him know about what I like and don't like.

7. I get to explain my side when he and I start to disagree or argue.

8. He and I are always interested in each other's activities and concerns.

9. He and I can nearly always count on each other in times of worry and crisis.

10. He and I tell each other nearly all of our worries and concerns.

11. He and I confide in each other more than we confide in anyone else.

12. He and I tell each other things about ourselves which we are not likely to tell other people.

13. He and I are usually quite accepting of each other's confidences, hurts, pleasures.

14. He may understand my words but he does not see the way I feel.

15. He nearly always knows exactly what I mean.

16. He looks at what I do from his own point of view.

17. Sometimes he thinks I feel a certain way because that's the way he feels.

18. He realizes what I mean even when I have difficulty in saying it.

19. He appreciates exactly how the things I experience feel to me.

20. His response to me is usually so fixed and automatic that I don't really get through to him.

21. When I am hurt or upset he can recognize my feelings, exactly, without becoming upset himself.

22. If I hadn't heard from him for several days without knowing why, I would make it a point to contact him just for the sake of keeping in touch.
23. He keeps me pretty well informed about his true feelings and attitudes about different things that come up.

24. If I had a choice of two good part-time jobs, I would seriously consider taking the somewhat less attractive job if it meant that he and I could work at the same place.

25. If he were to move away or "disappear" for some reason, I would really miss the special kind of companionship he provided.

26. If he and I could arrange our class or work schedules so we each had a free day, I would try to arrange my schedule so that I had the same free day as he.

27. He thinks and acts in ways that "set him apart" and make him distinct from other people I know.

28. If I had decided to leave town on a certain day for a leisurely trip or vacation and discovered that he was leaving for the same place a day later, I would seriously consider waiting a day in order to travel with him.

29. When I am with him, I get the impression that he is "playing a role" or trying to create a certain kind of "image".

30. When I plan for leisure time activities, I make it a point to get in touch with him to see if we can arrange to do things together.

31. I can count on him to do and say the things that express what he truly feels and believes, even if they are not the things he thinks are expected of him.

32. If I had no particular plans for a free evening and he contacted me suggesting some activity I am not particularly interested in, I would seriously consider doing it with him.

33. Some of the most rewarding ideas, interests and activities I share with him are the kinds of things I find it difficult, if not impossible, to share with any other acquaintances.

34. He is one of the persons I would go out of my way to help if he were in some sort of difficulty.

35. When I am with him, he seems to relax and be himself and not think about the kind of impression he is creating.
36. If I had just gotten off work or out of class and had some free time, I would wait around and leave with him if he were leaving the same place an hour or so later.

37. If I were trying to describe him to someone who didn't know him, it would be easy to fit him into a general class or type of persons.

38. I try to get interested in the activities that he enjoys even if they do not seem especially appealing to me at first.

39. When he and I get together, I enjoy a special kind of companionship I don't get from any of my other acquaintances.

40. If he and I were planning vacations to the same place and at about the same time and he had to postpone his trip for a month, I would seriously consider postponing my own trip for a month also.

41. He is the kind of person I would miss very much if something happened to interfere with our relationship.

42. I prefer his company to the company of books/TV/music/being alone.

Section IV

This section contains descriptions of the kinds of things that fathers do. "Father" includes step-father, foster-father or any other adult male guardian who has been responsible for you, and as he acted toward you during the major portion of your childhood.

Read each statement carefully and draw a circle around the category that best fits. Please answer every question.

1. He made me feel that he was there when I needed him.

   ALMOST          USUALLY          SOMETIMES          ONLY ONCE IN
   ALWAYS          NEVER

2. He taught me things that I wanted to learn.

   NEVER          ONCE OR TWICE     ABOUT ONCE       ABOUT ONCE       ALMOST EVERY
   A YEAR         A MONTH          A WEEK          A DAY
3. He nagged at me.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Twice a year</th>
<th>About once a month</th>
<th>About once a week</th>
<th>Almost every day</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. He would disapprove if I cried.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Almost</th>
<th>Always</th>
<th>Usually</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Only once in a while</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. If I did something he didn't like, he would act cold and unfriendly.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Almost</th>
<th>Always</th>
<th>Usually</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Once in a while</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. He scolded and yelled at me.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Twice a year</th>
<th>About once a month</th>
<th>About once a week</th>
<th>Almost every day</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. He helped me with my school work when I didn't understand something.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Twice a year</th>
<th>About once a month</th>
<th>About once a week</th>
<th>Almost every day</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. When I did something he didn't like, he acted hurt and disappointed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Almost</th>
<th>Always</th>
<th>Usually</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Once in a while</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. He punished me by trying to make me feel guilty and ashamed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Once in a while</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Usually</th>
<th>Almost</th>
<th>Always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. He comforted me and helped me when I had troubles.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Almost</th>
<th>Always</th>
<th>Usually</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Only once in a while</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
11. To what age is it acceptable to hug and kiss your son?

These questions also ask for information about your "father's" attitudes and actions. In the space at the left of each statement please put a number from one to five from the scale shown below which best describes how characteristic or uncharacteristic it is as it applied to your experience in your family.

1 2 3 4 5

very characteristic uncharacteristic

____ 1. My father didn't want me to bother him with unimportant little problems.

____ 2. I received a good deal of physical affection from my father.

____ 3. When I look back, I think my father criticized me or punished me a lot more than I deserved.

____ 4. I feel that my father has almost always approved of me and the things I do.

____ 5. My father frequently praised me for doing well.

____ 6. My father always took an interest in my activities.

____ 7. My father frequently criticized what I was doing.

____ 8. My father didn't mind if I played with toys that were supposed to be for the opposite sex.

____ 9. My father was/is very sympathetic to equality of women.

____ 10. My father frequently encouraged me to fight.

____ 11. My father was able to express his emotions to me and could either laugh or cry.

____ 12. My father didn't approve of violence.

____ 13. My father frequently shared his feelings with me.

____ 14. I can remember my father encouraging me to have sex with a girl.
Section V

As part of this survey I am interested in learning about your opinions on homosexuality among males. Please indicate your opinion for each of the statements below. In the space at the left of each statement please put a number from one to nine from the scale shown below which comes closest to representing your opinion. Please answer every question.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Male homosexuals should not be permitted to raise children.
2. Male homosexuals should not be allowed to hold responsible positions.
3. Male homosexual marriage should be legalized.
4. I believe that all male homosexuals should be confined and not released until cured.
5. I would not be too upset if I found that my son were homosexual.
6. Male homosexuality should be a criminal offense.
7. Male homosexuality is a sin.
8. The number of children seduced by male homosexuals is greatly exaggerated.
9. Male homosexuality is unnatural.
10. The thought of male homosexuality is repulsive to me.
11. Male homosexuals are sick.
12. If male homosexuality is allowed to increase it will destroy our society.
13. Apart from their sex lives, there is little difference between male homosexuals and male heterosexuals.
14. Male homosexuality tends to corrupt the entire personality.
15. I find it hard to believe that male homosexuals can really love each other.
16. It would be a mistake to ever have male homosexuals for foremen and leaders over heterosexuals.
17. Homosexual males are generally more feminine than heterosexual males.

18. A male homosexual relationship can be as fulfilling as a heterosexual relationship.

19. Male homosexuals should never be allowed to teach school or supervise children.

20. I can hardly imagine myself having a close friendship with a male homosexual.

21. Because of its perverse nature, sex between male homosexuals can only be animalistic pleasure.

22. I would not wish for male homosexuals to live near me.

23. Male homosexuality is just a different kind of lifestyle and, therefore, should not be condemned.

24. Male homosexuals are very unhappy men who wish they could be heterosexuals.

25. Male homosexuals simply can't be trusted.

26. There may be a few exceptions, but in general male homosexuals are pretty much alike.

27. Male homosexuality is a perversion which should be erased for the good of society.

28. I can't see what male homosexuals are complaining about; if they would just leave heterosexuals alone there wouldn't be any problem.
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