

1973

Homosexual Recall of Parent-Child Relationships: A Sampling Problem?

Tim J. Cain

Eastern Illinois University

This research is a product of the graduate program in [Psychology](#) at Eastern Illinois University. [Find out more](#) about the program.

Recommended Citation

Cain, Tim J., "Homosexual Recall of Parent-Child Relationships: A Sampling Problem?" (1973). *Masters Theses*. 3802.
<https://thekeep.eiu.edu/theses/3802>

This is brought to you for free and open access by the Student Theses & Publications at The Keep. It has been accepted for inclusion in Masters Theses by an authorized administrator of The Keep. For more information, please contact tabruns@eiu.edu.

PAPER CERTIFICATE #2

TO: Graduate Degree Candidates who have written formal theses.

SUBJECT: Permission to reproduce theses.

The University Library is receiving a number of requests from other institutions asking permission to reproduce dissertations for inclusion in their library holdings. Although no copyright laws are involved, we feel that professional courtesy demands that permission be obtained from the author before we allow theses to be copied.

Please sign one of the following statements:

Booth Library of Eastern Illinois University has my permission to lend my thesis to a reputable college or university for the purpose of copying it for inclusion in that institution's library or research holdings.

Date

Author

I respectfully request Booth Library of Eastern Illinois University not allow my thesis be reproduced because it is my plan

to have this material published.

August 13, 1973
Date

pdm

HOMOSEXUAL RECALL OF PARENT-CHILD RELATIONSHIPS:

A SAMPLING PROBLEM?

(TITLE)

BY

Tim J. Cain

THESIS

SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR THE DEGREE OF

Master of Arts

IN THE GRADUATE SCHOOL, EASTERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY
CHARLESTON, ILLINOIS

1973

YEAR

I HEREBY RECOMMEND THIS THESIS BE ACCEPTED AS FULFILLING
THIS PART OF THE GRADUATE DEGREE CITED ABOVE

August 13, 1973
DATE

ADVISER

August 13, 1973
DATE

DEPARTMENT HEAD

APPROVED BY THESIS COMMITTEE

Signed _____ Director

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to try to determine whether or not the way that a homosexual recalled his parent child relationships might be a function of the population from which he was drawn.

The primary hypothesis of this paper was that attitudes would not differ significantly between homosexual and heterosexual groups. A secondary hypothesis was that attitudes would not differ significantly between groups in each area covered; therapy, social action, and non-social action.

Sixty male homosexuals and 60 male heterosexuals volunteered to participate in this study.

The 27 item questionnaire adapted by Ray Evans from Irving Bieber's questionnaire was administered to 20 homosexuals in therapy and 20 heterosexuals in therapy; to 20 homosexuals in a social action group and to 20 heterosexuals in a social action group; and to 20 homosexuals and 20 heterosexuals not in social action groups.

The results of this study did not support the major hypothesis in that attitudes did differ significantly between the heterosexuals and the homosexuals. The secondary hypothesis was not supported in that there were significant differences between the two non-social action groups, although there were no significant differences between the social action groups and the therapy groups.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

A very special acknowledgment for assistance in this research is given to Dr. Randall Best, who directed this thesis, and without whose generous help and availability, this thesis would not have been possible. Special thanks are also given to Dr. John Rearden and Dr. Arthur Looby for their invaluable comments and suggestions. I would also like to thank Dr. Ray Evans for the explanations of his research which he provided.

A sincere thanks is extended to the staff of the Eastern Illinois University Counseling Center, for their help in obtaining subjects in therapy.

Acknowledgment is also in order for Miss Julie Bottelson for her help in typing, Mr. Charles Krizic for his help in doing computational work, and to Mrs. Juanita Waggoner, Mr. Larry Glowacki, Mr. Alfred Joseph, Miss Janet Evans, Mrs. Linda Keller, and Mr. and Mrs. John Cain, as well as other friends and relatives whose support and encouragement helped motivate me to continue.

Finally I would like to thank all of the subjects who volunteered to participate in this study, for without their help it would not have been possible.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ABSTRACT.....	iii
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.....	iv
LIST OF TABLES.....	vi
BACKGROUND LITERATURE DEALING WITH THE DEVELOPMENT OF MALE HOMOSEXUAL- ITY.....	1
METHODOLOGY.....	12
A. Subjects.....	12
B. Apparatus.....	12
C. Method.....	15
RESULTS.....	17
DISCUSSION.....	20
REFERENCES.....	26

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE	Page
1 Questionnaire content.....	12
2 Analysis of Variance Table for a Random- ized Two Factor Design.....	18

Background Literature Dealing with the Development of Male Homosexuality

One of the problems in the investigation of sexual deviance is that of definition. Some writers have categorized sexual deviations in the following way: "Normal" sexual deviations are those practices, such as masturbation and premarital sex, which are engaged in so widely that they cannot be considered statistically deviant. Also, social and legal sanctions against such behaviors are usually almost nonexistent. Other practices which fall within this category are extramarital coitus and noncoital genital practices, such as genital petting.

Individual deviance or abnormal sexual deviations include practices which are thought to be harmful by most people, including mental health personnel. Social and legal sanctions may vary from none, as in frigidity, to very high as in the case of pedophilia. Other sexual behavior patterns which are included in this category are exhibitionism (public exposure of one's genitals); voyeurism; fetishism; incest; sadism; and masochism.

Socially organized sexual deviations include those practices which usually take place within the context of a group structure. These include prostitution, transsexualism, and homosexuality.

Another problem in the investigation of sexual deviance is that of etiology. Genetic causality, innate characteristics, paternal child rearing practices, maternal practices with the child, and general parental practices have been suggested as predisposing an individual to various

sexual behaviors including homosexuality. However, the cause of homosexuality has not yet been determined. It has been suggested by many authorities (McIntosh (1968); Simon and Gaynon (1976)) that there is no single, or specific cause for homosexuality. In investigation the possible significance of parent child relationships in the etiology of male homosexuality, some investigators (Bieber et al. (1962); Chang and Block (1960); Apperson and McAdoo 1968); Fairbairn (1964); West (1959); Wiedeman (1963); Pasche (1963); Whitener and Nikelly (1964); Abe and Moran (1969); Nash and Hayes (1965); Craft (1966); Freud (1910); Gillespie (1963); Socarides (1963); Edwards (1964); Paitich (1965); Bene (1965); Greenstein (1966); Greenblatt (1967); and Rogers (1970)) have found definite etiological factors while others' (Mathes (1967); Murray (1968); and Stoller (1963)) findings have been partially or completely contradictory. Still other investigators (McIntosh (1968); Greenson (1963); Evans (1969); Kendrick and Clarke (1967); Cattell and Morony (1962); and O'Connor (1964)) have ignored any possible significance of parent child relationships and have attributed the development of homosexuality to other factors.

A careful longitudinal study would be required to see what parent child relationships actually were during a child's development, and to determine the adult characteristics of that child. However, this type of study is not feasible at this time.

One of the most influential lines of investigation is related to the psychoanalytic theory. Within this framework, adult sexual practices are thought to relate to conflicts left unresolved from experiences which occurred during childhood, especially during the first five years of life. These experiences involve one, or both of the parents. This model has remained popular for many years, although evidence for it remains weak.

The development of homosexuality in a son has been attributed to both parents by some investigators. Chang and Block (1960), using 20 self-report homosexuals and 20 heterosexuals, hypothesized that the development of homosexuality depended on a strong identification with the mother and a disidentification with the father.

They said that this was the basis for the etiology of homosexuality and their results supported their hypothesis. Apperson and McAdoo (1968) administered the Perception of Parent Behavior Scale to a group of homosexuals and a group of heterosexuals. Both parents of the men in the homosexual group were seen as overly restrictive. West (1959) used the case history files of 50 homosexual patients in Maudsley Hospital, and found a significant difference between the two groups, in that the homosexuals more often had over intense, protective mothers and unsatisfactory father relationships, as well as unsatisfactory relationships between the parents. However, the author did point out that faulty parent child relationships may be due to the child's own peculiarities. He stated that homosexual boys, because of their homosexual characteristics, may be incapable of forming balanced parental relationships.

Pasche (1963) said that the etiology of homosexuality is linked with the mother not acknowledging the authority of the father, whether he is strong or weak, thus becoming the model for identification herself, and she does not view the son as a progressively independent person. Meanwhile, the father has shown his son a very sensualized tenderness during the very early years, and this relationship was suddenly and traumatically terminated.

Whitener and Nikelly (1964) emphasized that the etiology of homosexuality may be seen in the light of isolation from parents in general, with a selective closeness to the mother. Warmth and acceptance is not experienced with the father or father figure. These conclusions were obtained from 39 homosexuals responding to family constellation questions. The authors also stated that if the child lacked normal social outlets during formative years, when they reached puberty they would be emotionally unprepared for a new sexual role and the physiological changes, thus they succumbe to suggestion and continue homoerotic activity

that may lead to a conditioned response.

Abe and Moran (1969) found that while the cause of homosexuality may not be found in a biological factor related to the mother's age, the rearing practices of older parents often follow the attributes given by Bieber (1969) to rearing practices of parents of homosexuals.

Irving Bieber (1962, 1969) conducted a study of attitudes about childhood parental relationships in adult male homosexuals, using an attitude questionnaire. All of the 106 subjects in this study were in psychotherapy, and the questionnaires were completed by the individual patient's therapist. He found that most mothers of the patients were over close and inappropriately intimate with the homosexual son, who was preferred, by the mother, to any of the sisters or brothers, or to the father. The mothers were overcontrolling, overprotective, and infantilizing. The result being that the son became overly dependent and submissive to the mother, and hostile and competitive to his father, felt distant from his father, was isolated from his peers and lacked confidence in his own masculinity. At the same time the fathers were detached, disinterested, competitively hostile, and disparaging toward their son. Typically the father was hated and feared by the son.

Nash and Hayes (1965) stated that homosexuals have a closer relationship with the mother and a poor relationship with the father. They stated that it is the father-mother complex, not a single parent which contributes to homosexuality. Parental absence, either parent, may also be a significant factor. They stated that psychological absence is more important than physical absence.

Stoller (1963) stated that infant parent relationships may have some importance in the etiology of male homosexuality, but the true importance was not known.

Whitener and Nikelly (1964) stated that sociological and cultural labeling as well as other sociological and cultural factors, not necessarily involving the parents, are

contributive to the etiology of male homosexuality. Once labeled, a self-fulfilling prophecy may occur. McIntosh (1968) stated that the development of homosexuality in an individual is not dependent upon parental relationships, but rather is a social role. She supports this by pointing out that it does not exist in some societies, and is traceable to it's basic origins in others. The basis for the emergence of this role in a society is not explained.

Hereditry, glandular imbalance, and other biological factors have been suggested as predisposing an individual to homosexuality. However, as with most of the theories, there is much open questioning about it. For example, some homosexuals do reveal an imbalance in the ratio of male-female sex hormones, but so do some heterosexuals. Stoller (1963) seems to feel that one of the most significant factors in the etiology of homosexuality is an inherited biological force which gives the fundamental awareness of being male or female. Exactly what this force is, is not known. Greenson (1963) said that parental relationships are not important in the etiology of male homosexuality. Rather it has to do with biological gender identity, and true homosexuality is promoted once the person labels himself or is labeled homosexual. Then, once again, a self-fulfilling prophecy may occur.

Other investigators have neither found a biological nor a parental relationship basis to the development of homosexuality. Evans (1969) conducted a study similar to Bieber's using a questionnaire adapted from Bieber's. The questionnaire was changed only in that he provided multiple choice answers for each of the 27 items. There was a selection of four possible answers for each item. His subjects consisted of 142 heterosexual males and 43 homosexual males. However, none of his subjects were in psychotherapy, although the homosexual subjects were involved in a gay social action group. Although Evans' results were similar to Bieber's the differences between the homosexual group and the heterosexual group were not significant, and neither supported nor refuted Bieber. Although the childhood parental relationships of the homosexual men appear to have been somewhat

less desirable, generally speaking, than those of the heterosexual men, a significant relationship could not be established by the correlation of the two variables, homosexuality and poor parental relationships.

Twenty homosexual, and twenty heterosexual males were given a Semantic Differential Scale by Kendrick and Clarke (1967) proposed to cover family, intimate, valencies, authorities, and values. Slight differences were found between the two groups, but attitudes were not significantly different.

The conclusions of still other investigators have ranged from there being no specific etiology, to homosexuality being a neurotic symptom. For example, Simon and Gaynon (1967) contend that a search for etiology in male homosexuality is useless. One may as well look for the etiology of heterosexuality. Etiology is unimportant according to them. What must be kept in mind they said, is that when the social deviance label is applied, a self-fulfilling prophecy occurs and the individual will experience more severe difficulties and crises. There are as many types of homosexuals as there are of heterosexuals, and if one must look for etiology one must define and trace all of the persons situational factors and his life pattern.

Cattell and Morony (1962) gave the Sixteen Factor Personality Questionnaire to 100 homosexual subjects, as well as normals and general criminals. The results were that homosexuality is a choice of symptom by a primarily neurotic, psychopathic individual, the choice being determined by degree of ego weakness, degree of extraversion, and low degree of super-ego development and radicalism of social outlook. The authors suggested that homosexuals should be treated as psychopaths, not as basically neurotics. P. J. O'Connor (1964), a military psychiatrist, found that homosexuals that came to him for treatment were primarily neurotic with anxiety or depression being the most common

symptom, in both homosexuals and heterosexuals. He feels that homosexuality is an inherited trait which becomes manifest if the boy is predisposed to neurosis.

Primary emphasis for the development of homosexuality in a son has sometimes been placed on the mother as opposed to the father or both parents, and despite other authors contentions that neither parent is involved in the etiology of homosexuality. Other investigators have simply defined the mothers role in the development as being separate from the fathers role. Apperson and McAdoo (1968) stated that mothers of homosexuals showed a lack of concern for others and an overemphasis on sexuality. Fairbairn (1964) stated that the mother of a male homosexual was an overbearing and possessive woman who domineered the whole family. The son becomes overly attached to his mother. Wiedeman (1963) stated that most mothers of homosexuals are overseductive and restrictive of heterosexual strivings. Maternal physical overstimulation may extend into puberty and at the same time the mother may be critical of girls and warn their sons of the dangers of heterosexual involvement. Craft (1966) in a study of 33 homosexual adolescents found that some had hostile mothers and others had repressing or over protective mothers, some of whom were prostitutes.

Freud (1910) stated that overt homosexuals have a strong fixation on the infantile mother in the oral stage. The homosexual makes a narcissistic object choice in order to remain faithful to his mother. The son puts a great deal of emphasis on the male organ and is unable to tolerate its absence in the love object. He also wants to eliminate the breasts in the object. In short, there is a dramatic over identification and attachment with the mother figure rather than the usual identification with the father. Gillespie (1963) stated that the mother child relationship is of vital importance in the etiology of homosexuality. According to Gillespie, homosexuality is a defense against the Oedipus complex and concurrent castration anxiety. This results

from the pre-oedipal mother child relationship.

The importance of the pre-oedipal phase mentioned by Gillespie (1963) was also mentioned by Socarides (1968). He emphasized that the genesis of homosexuality was the result of disturbances which occur earlier than the oedipal phase, that is the undifferentiated or pre-oedipal phase. The will be homosexual retains the primitive state of the original unity with the mother and this becomes highly involved in his ego formation. To the homosexual the mother was, in infancy of the subject, dangerous, frightening, and forcing separation. Later the child feels anxiety over his desire for withdrawal from the mother which eventually causes a rupture in the ego. Still later the homosexual loves his partner as he had actually wished to be loved by the mother. The subject also tries to rid himself of oedipal guilt by demonstrating to his mother that he has no interest in other females. He is also protecting his mother from other men's penises by taking them himself.

Upon questioning of 16 heterosexuals and 16 homosexuals, Edwards (1964), found that the mothers of the homosexuals were excessively controlling and neither strongly nurturant nor punitive.

Role learning possibly combined with instrumental or operant conditioning also appears to play a part in the establishing of sex objects. One learns that certain sexual objects are supposed to be sought; hence, they are sought. Strong reinforcements of some nature important to the individual, help maintain his object choice. Mathes (1967) stated that the family role pattern, especially in relation to the mother may prevent the child from developing proper identification with the father. The mother's role was seen as being more instrumental or significant. P. J. O'Connor (1964) said that attachment to the mother may contribute to the etiology of homosexuality if the attachment delays maturation.

The father too has been given all or most of the "blame" for the development of homosexuality. Apperson and McAdoo (1963) said that fathers of homosexuals had not been concerned with their son, or his feelings. That is, they were detached. Fairbairn (1964) said that the main significance of the father is that he allows himself and his son to be dominated by the mother, and thus he does not present an appropriate model. Wiedeman (1963) stated that fathers of homosexuals were detached, rejecting, and hostile, and that he consequently subverts any trace of true male identification and thus consolidates a homosexual trend through adolescence. Craft (1966) in a study of 33 homosexual adolescents found that in the home there was father absence or a hostile father or father figure. Freud (1910) had also stated that there may have been a disturbance in childhood because of the absence, inadequacy, or excessive cruelty of the father. However, he also said that the significance of the mother was much greater.

Paitich (1965) in a study of a group of homosexuals and a group of heterosexuals found that there was no significant differences between their attitudes toward their mothers. However, a significantly greater number of homosexuals had unfavorable attitudes toward the father. Attitudes revealed that identification with the father was affected by his warmth and competency.

Bene (1965) used 83 self-reported homosexuals and 84 heterosexuals, having them complete the Bene-Anthony Family Relations Test. Results were that homosexuals expressed more hostility and less affection going toward and coming from parents. The author viewed the father son relationship as more important in the etiology of homosexuality than the mother son relationship, and it was confirmed that homosexuals more frequently had unsatisfactory relations with their fathers in childhood, had fathers who were weak and ineffectual as parents, and who also were not modeled by their sons.

Greenstein (1966) used the Figure Preference Test on 25 father absent and 50 father present male adolescent delinquents. Fathers of the father present group were rated for degree of dominance and closeness to their sons. The total number of homosexuals in the group was 34. Results indicate no significant difference between the father present and the father absent groups. However, a small but significant correlation was found between the degree of father closeness and frequency of overt homosexuality. That is, the greater the degree of father closeness, the more frequent the occurrence of overt homosexuality.

Greenblatt (1967) used two semantic differentials and found that the father son relationship was more important than the mother son relationship in sexual object choice. Bieber (1962, 1969) had found that fathers of homosexuals were detached, disinterested, competitively hostile, and disparaging. They failed to guard the son from the destructive influences of the mother. He said that the father son relationship was almost as important in the determining of a homosexual outcome as was the mother's seductiveness and overcloseness.

Rogers (1970) stated that the etiology of homosexuality is to be found in blocked personal growth. He said that great feelings of loneliness and of being unloved may lead to homosexuality. In one encounter group he found that feelings of rejection by the father, lead the individual to seek affection and attention from other males, which in turn leads to homosexual activity. Murray (1968) contends that sex-role identity is a function of a learning process. The child learns by modeling and so, consequently, the father must set a good example for the male child, and if he doesn't, the child will become more likely to identify with the mother. P.F. O'Connor (1964) stated that most homosexuals did have a poor relationship with the father.

Moran and Abe (1969) using 291 case records of homosexuals, determined that parental loss in homosexuals is not etiologically important.

The purpose of the current study was to try to determine whether or not the way that a homosexual recalled his parent child relationships might be a function of the population from which he was drawn. For example, Irving Bieber's results might have been a function of the fact that his subjects were drawn from a population who were in psychotherapy.

The primary hypothesis of this paper was that attitudes would not differ significantly between homosexual and heterosexual groups. A secondary hypothesis was that attitudes would not differ significantly between groups in each area covered; therapy, social action, and non-social action.

Methodology

Subjects

One hundred and twenty subjects participated in this study. There were 60 male homosexuals and 60 male heterosexuals, ranging in age from 18 to 26 with a mean age of 20.9. All of the subjects were chosen on a volunteer basis, from the population which they represented in this study.

Apparatus

The 27 item questionnaire, adapted by Ray Evans (1969) from Irving Bieber's questionnaire, was completed by each subject. The questionnaire content appears in Table 1. Included in the questionnaire were the Developmental Six (Items 2-7) and one question dealing with the physical make-up of the subject in childhood (Item 1), which had differentiated the groups in both the Bieber and the Evans studies. Evans provided four possible choices for each item, whereas Bieber used a yes-no dichotomy for all except three items. Questionnaires were used in the final analysis only when all 27 items had been answered, by each individual subject.

TABLE 1

Questionnaire Content

Your age _____

Your education _____

Your occupation _____

Father's age _____

TABLE 1-Continued

Father's education _____

Father's occupation _____

Circle the one which answers the question best.

1. How would you characterize your physical make-up as a child?

a. Frail	c. Athletic
b. Clumsy	d. Coordinated
2. During childhood, were you fearful of physical injury?

a. Seldom	c. Often
b. Sometimes	d. Always
3. Did you avoid physical fights?

a. Always	c. Sometimes
b. Often	d. Never
4. Before adolescence, how frequently did you play with girls?

a. Never	c. Often
b. Sometimes	d. Always
5. Were you a "lone wolf" in childhood?

a. Never	c. Often
b. Sometimes	d. Always
6. Did you participate in competitive group games?

a. Never	c. Often
b. Sometimes	d. Very often
7. Did you play baseball?

a. Never	c. Often
b. Sometimes	d. Very often
8. When you were a child, how much time did your mother and father spend with each other?

a. Great deal	c. Little
b. Considerable	d. Very little
9. Did your parents share similar interests?

a. Great many	c. Few
b. Several	d. None
10. When you were young, did your mother insist on being the center of your attention?

a. Never	c. Often
b. Seldom	d. Always

TABLE 1--Continued

11. Do you feel your mother was "seductive" in her activities with you as a child?
 - a. Highly
 - b. Moderately
 - c. Slightly
 - d. No
12. Did your mother discourage masculine attitudes and activities in you as a child?
 - a. Often
 - b. Sometimes
 - c. Seldom
 - d. Never
13. Did your mother encourage feminine attitudes and activities?
 - a. Never
 - b. Seldom
 - c. Sometimes
 - d. Often
14. Did you consider your mother to have been a puritanical person?
 - a. Strongly
 - b. Moderately
 - c. Mildly
 - d. No
15. In her relationships with your father and/or other men, what kind of person do you feel your mother was sexually?
 - a. Frigid
 - b. Cold
 - c. Warm
 - d. Very responsive
16. Did your mother ally herself with you against your father?
 - a. Often
 - b. Sometimes
 - c. Seldom
 - d. Never
17. Did your mother openly prefer you to your father?
 - a. Always
 - b. Often
 - c. Seldom
 - d. Never
18. Do you believe your mother interfered with your heterosexual activities during adolescence and later?
 - a. Often
 - b. Sometimes
 - c. Seldom
 - d. Never
19. Were you your mother's confident?
 - a. Never
 - b. Seldom
 - c. Sometimes
 - d. Often
20. Were you your father's favorite?
 - a. Strongly
 - b. Moderate y
 - c. Mildly
 - d. No

TABLE 1-Continued

21. Did you feel accepted by your father?
 a. Strongly c. Mildly
 b. Moderately d. No
22. How much time did you and your father spend together?
 a. Great deal c. Little
 b. Considerable d. Very little
23. Did your father encourage your masculine attitudes and activities?
 a. Often c. Seldom
 b. Sometimes d. Never
24. As a child, were you aware of hating your father?
 a. Never c. Sometimes
 b. Seldom d. Often
25. Were you afraid he might physically harm or injure you?
 a. Often c. Seldom
 b. Sometimes d. Never
26. Did you accept your father?
 a. Strongly c. Mildly
 b. Moderately d. No
27. Did you respect your father?
 a. Strongly c. Mildly
 b. Moderately d. No

Method

At no time during the study were subjects identified by name or by direct observation. Subjects were obtained from three areas; therapy, social action, and non-social action.

The questionnaire was administered to 20 homosexuals in psychotherapy and 20 heterosexuals in psychotherapy. These subjects were obtained from the Eastern Illinois University Counseling Service. The therapists at the counseling service chose the subjects individually and gave them the questionnaires, and collected them again.

The questionnaire was also administered to 20 homosexuals in a social action group, but not in psychotherapy, and to 20 heterosexuals in a social action group, but not in psychotherapy. The heterosexual subjects were obtained

from social service fraternities on the Eastern Illinois University campus. The homosexual subjects in this group were activists on the Eastern Illinois University campus, associated with the Gay Liberation Front. The heterosexual subjects were obtained by contacting members of the social service fraternities and asking their cooperation in obtaining fellow fraternity members and giving them the questionnaires. The homosexual subjects were obtained by contacting a gay activist on Eastern Illinois University campus, and enlisting his aid in obtaining other gay activist subjects and giving them the questionnaires. These people also collected the questionnaires.

Finally the questionnaire was given to 20 homosexuals not in a social action group, that is, not an organized group, and not in psychotherapy, and to 20 heterosexuals not in a social action group and not in psychotherapy. These subjects also come from Eastern Illinois University campus, and the immediate area surrounding campus. That is, non-students. These subjects were obtained by enlisting the aid of a heterosexual acquaintance to give out and collect questionnaires to other non-social action heterosexuals. The same was done with a non-social action homosexual acquaintance.

Also taken into consideration were the age of the subject, and his socio-economic class, which was determined by his education and occupation. If the subject was a student, his socio-economic class was determined by his father's education and occupation. This information was obtained through the first six initial questions on the questionnaire. Subject's education ranged from 12 years to 17 years, with a mean of 13.9 years. Occupation ranged from professional executive to unskilled laborer. The mean type of occupation was sales, technicians, and small business owners.

Socio-economic class was established using August Hollingshead's (1957) two factor index of social position.

This revealed that of the 120 subjects, 12 were in social class 1; 14 were in social class 2; 25 were in social class 3; 45 were in social class 4; and 24 were in social class 5.

In addition, a total score on the 27 item questionnaire was obtained for each subject by weighting each item from 0 to 3 points, with the higher weighting at the "masculine" end. The weighting was done by using the total number of responses made by heterosexuals to each of the possible responses in Evans' study. That is, for each question, the answer given most often by heterosexuals in Evans' study was weighted 3, and so on.

Results

The results of this study did not support the major hypothesis. Attitudes were significantly different between the heterosexuals and the homosexuals in general. There was also a significant difference between the attitudes of heterosexuals and homosexuals in non-social action groups, but not between heterosexuals and homosexuals in social action groups, or between heterosexuals and homosexuals in therapy. Thus, the secondary hypothesis was not completely supported.

The attitude scores for the three heterosexual groups did not differ significantly. Likewise, there were no significant differences between the mean attitude scores for the three homosexual groups. The mean weighted score for the heterosexual subjects in therapy was 57.4. The mean weighted score for the heterosexual subjects in social action groups was 54.4 and the mean weighted score for non-social action heterosexual subjects was 57.7. The mean weighted score for homosexual subjects in therapy was 50.4, for homosexual subjects in a social action group it was 47.5, and for non-social action homosexual subjects it was 48.5.

The weighted scores of the homosexual subjects ranged from 11 to 68, with a mean of 48.4; those of the heterosexuals ranged from 37 to 71, with a mean of 56.8.

Hartley's test for homogeneity of variance (Myers, 1971, p.99) was used to investigate the homogeneity of variance among the weighted attitude scores. An answer of 3.19 showed that there were no grounds for rejecting homogeneity of variance at the .05 level of significance with 19 degrees of freedom.

An analysis of variance for a randomized two factor design was calculated for the weighted scores obtained from the questionnaires. In the analysis of variance, factor A represented the sexual orientation of the group in question: A_1 representing heterosexuality, and A_2 representing homosexuality. Factor B represented the various areas used in the study; B_1 representing therapy, B_2 representing social action, and B_3 representing non-social action.

The analysis of variance revealed that factor A was significant at the .001 level, that factor B was not significant and that there was no significant interaction between factors A and B. This is represented in Table 2.

TABLE 2

Analysis of Variance Table for a Randomized
Two Factor Design

SV	df	SS	MS	F
Total	119	17,098		
A	1	1,771.4	1,771.4	13.37*
B	2	190.02	95.01	.07
AB	2	34.2	17.1	.012
S/AB	114	15,102	132.47	

* $p < .001$

A Dunn's multiple comparison test was conducted on the means of the two groups of subjects in each of the three areas used in the design. The purpose of conducting this test was to find in which area or areas the significant difference between the homosexuals and the heterosexuals existed.

The results, showed that there was a significant difference between the homosexuals and the heterosexuals in non-social action groups, and not in the therapy or social action groups. With a d of 8.84 required for significance at the .05 level, the d for the non-social action

heterosexuals and homosexuals was 9.2. For the social action heterosexuals and homosexuals it was 6.9, and 7.0 for the homosexuals and heterosexuals in therapy.

A Chi square was calculated on the results of Hollingshead's (1957) two factor index of social position. The Chi square of 3.72 revealed that it was not significant at the .05 level with four degrees of freedom.

Discussion

The purpose of this study was to determine whether or not the way that a homosexual recalled his parent child relationships might be a function of the population from which he was drawn. It was also hypothesized that attitudes would not differ significantly between heterosexual and homosexual groups.

The results of this study could not be explained on the basis of the sample characteristics used, such as socioeconomic class. Sexual orientation was the only variable that differentiated between groups.

The fact that the homosexuals knew that homosexuality was being studied could have had an affect on the results, but if there was any tendency to distort questionnaire responses in the direction of "normal", it was not sufficient to obscure group differences.

The results of the present study were dissimilar from those of Bieber et al. (1962), who found that homosexuals had had a close-binding, intimate mother, and a detached (particularly a hostile-detached) father, whereas heterosexuals had not. The Bieber data were based on psychoanalyst's reconstructions of patient's early parental child relationships, based on impressions received by the psychoanalyst during psychotherapy. In the present study, the data were based on subjects in therapy, as well as subjects in social action groups, and non-social action groups, with all questionnaires completed by the subjects themselves.

The present results were similar to those obtained by Evans (1969), whose results were similar to Bieber's, but

not significantly so, neither supporting nor refuting them. For example, Evans did find that homosexuals had apparently had poor parental relationships, with binding, intimate mothers, and detached fathers. Evans' data were based on retrospective self-reports of how they currently viewed their childhood, by subjects who were in a social action group, and who had never been in psychotherapy.

The patients used in Bieber's study were not aware of the fact that the study was being conducted, and the homosexual subjects in Evans' study and the present study were aware that homosexuality was being studied.

Of the twenty-seven items on the Bieber questionnaire, all but three used a yes-no dichotomy for responses. Evans used the same twenty-seven item questionnaire, but provided a choice of four possible responses for each item, and the present study used the questionnaire as Evans had modified it.

Whereas all of Bieber's subjects were in psychotherapy, Evans' subjects were not in psychotherapy, but were in a social action group. The present study used subjects in therapy, subjects in social action groups, as well as non-social action group subjects.

One possibly important difference between the subjects of the present study, and those of the Bieber and Evans studies involves location. The subjects in the present study were all obtained from the area surrounding a small midwestern town and university, whereas the Bieber and Evans subjects were obtained in large metropolitan areas.

Possible bias on the part of the psychotherapists in the Bieber et al. study, or on the part of the subjects in the Evans study and the present study was not controlled. Also, it is difficult to compare the Bieber and Evans studies since there is an obvious risk involved in generalizing findings from patients in psychotherapy to a non-patient

population, as it is difficult to generalize findings from a non-patient population to a population in psychotherapy.

Bieber attributed the development of homosexuality to the overly intimate, close-binding mother, and the hostile-detached father. Evans felt that the parent child relationships were not significant in the development of homosexuality. Bieber's results supported his theory and while Evans' results were similar to Bieber's, they were not significant, and thus did not support him. However, neither did they refute Bieber's results. The results of the present study did not support Bieber in that a significant difference was shown between the attitudes of heterosexuals and homosexuals in non-social action groups, but not between groups in therapy.

In answering the questionnaire the homosexuals generally, more often described themselves as frail or clumsy as children, and less often as athletic. More of them were fearful of physical injury, avoided physical fights, were loners, and seldom played baseball or other competitive games. They more often considered their mothers to be cold toward men, insisting on being the center of the son's attention, made him her confidant, allied with him against the father, interfered with his heterosexual activities during adolescence, and discouraged masculine attitudes. In retrospect the fathers of the homosexuals were considered as less likely to encourage masculine attitudes and activities, and subjects spent little time with their fathers, were more often aware of hating him, felt less accepted by him, and in turn less frequently accepted or respected the father.

In general, the results of the present study suggest poor parental relationships during childhood for the homosexual subjects, at least as seen in retrospect; however, the etiological significance of this, if any, is not known. Bieber et al. considered the chances high that

a boy exposed to maternal close-binding intimacy and paternal detachment-hostility, would develop severe homosexual problems. However, not all of the homosexual subjects in either the Evans study, or the present study had this type of parental combination in their background. Also, there were heterosexual subjects in both the Evans study and the present study who did have this type of parental combination.

Also, Bieber et al. and Evans under-emphasized one-third of the father, mother, son "triad"; the son himself. It was reported that the parents had a specific type of relationship with the homosexual son which they did not have with other siblings. As to why a particular son would be singled out by the parents, Bieber proposed that that son is unconsciously identified by the mother with her own father or brothers and consequently the son becomes the recipient of sexual feelings which the mother has carried over from her childhood. The father transfers to that son his own unresolved hostility toward his own father or brothers.

Undoubtedly the personalities and behaviors of the parents affect a child's personality, but the possibility must be taken into consideration, that the innate characteristics of the child may at least partially determine the parents reactions toward him. West (1959) pointed out that faulty parent child relationships may be due to the child's own peculiarities. He stated that "homosexual boys, by virtue of their homosexual characteristics, may be incapable of forming balanced parental relationships". The idea that the father of a homosexual son becomes detached and hostile toward his son because he is disappointed or does not understand him is just as reasonable as the idea that the son becomes homosexual because of the father's rejection. Also, the idea that a mother may be more intimate and binding with her homosexual son because of the kind of person he is, is just as reasonable as the idea that the son

becomes homosexual because she is too binding and intimate.

Although the present study found a significant difference between heterosexual's and homosexual's views of their respective childhoods, and although parents of homosexuals may in some way treat their sons in a certain manner different from the parents of heterosexuals, parents are not solely or always contributive to the emergence or development of homosexuality.

Instead, it seems likely that one or both parents may contribute to the homosexuality in a son, through their attitudes and actions toward him, although this may not be the case. For example, Evans (1969) reported that when homosexuality occurs in the absence of a father, it not only detracts from the etiological significance of a poor paternal relationship, but in fact supports the importance of other causal factors. Innate characteristics, a predisposition, or a social introduction into homosexuality among other possible factors, may contribute to the emergence or development of homosexuality. It is also felt that the individual will either accept or reject the homosexual life style after an initial introduction to it, and if he rejects it he will not become homosexual. Mental health problems occur when a person is prevented from accepting homosexual life style by the social restrictions and mores of the society at large, or when he accepts the life style and is made to feel guilty or outcast from society, by those same social restrictions and mores.

Homosexuals may be found in all facets of the social and cultural structure of the present American society. Using Hollingshead's (1958) socio-economic class structure in the present study, it was found that there was no significant difference between the socio-economic classes of the homosexuals and the heterosexuals in this study.

The major difficulty faced in conducting this study was in obtaining the homosexual subjects, especially in the therapy and social action groups. Difficulty was encountered in obtaining homosexual subjects in therapy due to the lack of homosexuals in therapy, in a predominantly rural area. The difficulty was the long periods of time required to obtain twenty subjects.

The difficulty in obtaining homosexual subjects in a social action group, specifically affiliates with The Gay Liberation Front, was due to the increasing militancy of members. The current Gay Liberation Front chapters have become increasingly anti-psychological research, in the area of homosexuality. Consequently, due to limited numbers from whom to obtain subjects, it was difficult obtaining twenty cooperative subjects.

While there is a need for research to be done, in metropolitan as well as rural areas, there would be less difficulty obtaining subjects in a metropolitan environment.

The results of the present study did not support those obtained by Bieber et al. However, the results of the present study are by no means conclusive, and the multi-faceted problem of etiology of homosexuality and of differences between heterosexuals and homosexuals could possibly benefit from further investigations. However, societal norms, expectations and values need to be changed in order to prevent homosexuality from being a "problem".

References

- Abe, K., and P.A.P. Moran. Parental age of homosexuals. British Journal of Psychiatry, 1969, 115, 313-317.
- Apperson, L. and W.G. McAdoo Jr. Parental factors in the childhood of homosexuals. Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 1968, 73, 201-206.
- Bene, E. On the genesis of male homosexuality: An attempt at clarifying the role of the parents. British Journal of Psychiatry, 1965, 111 803-813.
- Bieber, I. Homosexuality. American Journal of Nursing, 1969, 2637-2641.
- Bieber, I., Dain, H.J., Dince, P.R., Drellich, M.G., Grand, J.G., Gundlach, R.H., Dremer, M.W., Rifkin, A.H., Wilbur, C.B., and Hieber, T.B. Homosexuality: A Psychoanalytic Study, 1962. New York: Basic Books.
- Cattell, R. and J. Morony. The use of the 16 PF in distinguishing homosexuals, normals, and general criminals. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1962, 26, 531-540.
- Chang, J., and J. Block. A study of identification in male homosexuals. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1960, 24, 307-310.
- Craft, M. Boy prostitutes and their fate. British Journal of Psychiatry, 1966, 112, 1111-1114.
- Edwards, H. The relationship between reported early life experiences with parents and adult male homosexuality. Dissertation Abstracts, 1964, 24, 4793.
- Evans, R.B. Childhood parental relationships of homosexual men. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1969, 33, 129-135.
- Fairbairn, W.R.D. A note on the origin of male homosexuality. British Journal of Medical Psychology, 1964, 37, 31-32.
- Freud, S. Three Essays on the Theory of Sexuality, 1910. New York: Basic Books.
- Gillespie, W.H. Symposium on homosexuality: Part I. International Journal of Psycho-Analysis, 1963, 203-209.
- Greenblatt, D.R. Semantic differential analysis of the "triangular system" hypothesis in "adjusted" overt male homosexuals. Dissertation Abstracts, 1967, 27, 4123-4125.

References-Continued

- Greenson, R.R. On homosexuality and gender identity. International Journal of Psycho-Analysis, 1963, 213-219.
- Greenstein, J.M. Father characteristics and sex typing. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1966, 3, 271-277.
- Hollingshead, A.B. Two Factor Index of Social Position, 1957. New Haven: August B. Hollingshead.
- Kendrick, D.C., and R.G. Clarke. Attitudinal differences between heterosexually and homosexually oriented males. British Journal of Psychiatry, 1967, 113, 85-99.
- McIntosh, M. The homosexual role. Social Problems, 1968, 16, 182-191.
- Mathes, I.D. Adult male homosexuality and perception of instrumentality, expressiveness, and coalition in parental role structure. Dissertation Abstracts, 1967, 28, 811.
- Moran, P.A.P., and K. Abe. Parental loss in homosexuals. British Journal of Psychiatry, 1969, 115, 319-320.
- Murray, J. Learning in homosexuality. Psychological Reports, 1968, 23, 659-662.
- Myers, J.L. Fundamentals of Experimental Design, 1971. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Nash, J. and F. Hayes. The parental relationships of male homosexuals: Some theoretical issues and a pilot study. Australian Journal of Psychology, 1965, 17, 35-43.
- O'Connor, P.J. Aetiological factors in homosexuality as seen in Royal Air Force psychiatric practice. British Journal of Psychiatry, 1964, 110, 381-391.
- Paitich, D. Attitudes toward parents in male homosexuals and exhibitionists. Dissertation Abstracts, 1965, 25, 4260.
- Pasche, F. Symposium on homosexuality: Part 2. International Journal of Psycho-Analysis, 1963, 210-213.
- Rogers, C. Carl Rogers on Encounter Groups, 1970. Scranton, Pa: Harper and Row.
- Simon, W., and J. Gaynon. Homosexuality: The formulation of a sociological perspective. Journal of Health and Social Behavior, 1967, 8, 177-185.

References-Continued

Socarides, C.W. A provisional theory of etiology in male homosexuality: A case of preoedipal origin. International Journal of Psycho-Analysis, 1968, 49, 27-37.

Stoller, R.J. A contribution to the study of gender identity. International Journal of Psycho-Analysis, 1963, 220-225.

West, D.J. Parental figures in the genesis of male homosexuality. International Journal of Social Psychiatry, 1959, 5, 85-97.

Whitener, M.D., and A. Nikelly. Sexual deviation in college students. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 1964, 34, 486-492.

Wiedeman, G.H. Symposium on homosexuality: Part 3. International Journal of Psycho-Analysis, 1963, 214-216.