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ABSTRACT

Sexual Orientation and Capacity for Intimacy

by

Sandra Lee Harshbarger, Master of Science

Utah State University, 1987

Major Professor: William R. Dobson, Ph.D.
Department: Psychology

Capacity for intimacy was examined as a function of sexual orientation. Sixty-six volunteers comprised four groups: heterosexual males, homosexual males, heterosexual females and homosexual females. Subjects' ages ranged from 19 to 61 and education levels ranged from 10 to 21 years of schooling. The four groups were comparable in terms of age, education level and general mental health.

Each volunteer responded to the following instruments: the Orlofsky Intimacy Interview (questionnaire format), the Yufit Intimacy-Isolation Questionnaire, the Rubin Like Scale, the Rubin Love Scale and the Gordon Personal Profile (used to assess general mental health). Responses were compiled and analyzed by either an analysis of variance or a chi-square technique.

The stereotype of the male homosexual as one who is incapable of achieving intimacy was not supported by this study. Likewise, it was found that lesbian women do not
differ significantly from heterosexual women in their capacity for intimacy.
INTRODUCTION

The homosexual experience in the Western world has undergone a dramatic change since the 1960's (Plummer, 1981). Homosexuality is slowly being demedicalized and decriminalized. Bell and Weinberg (1978) credit the origin of this relatively recent attitude to Alfred Kinsey:

Kinsey's refusal to equate homosexuality with psychopathology, and his insistence that repressive laws concerning homosexual conduct be expunged laid the groundwork for America's slow reappraisal of its attitudes toward and treatment of its homosexual citizens (p. 14).

Harry and Devall (1978) trace the history of the psychiatric diagnosis of homosexuality. For the first two-thirds of the twentieth century, psychiatrists labeled, treated and institutionalized homosexuals. Nonpsychiatric evidence accumulated from 1948 to the present which challenged the psychiatric views of homosexuality. Members of the gay liberation movement who felt that psychiatry had imposed a diagnostic injustice upon them demonstrated against and criticized the profession. In 1973, psychiatry removed homosexuality from its diagnostic manual of mental illnesses. In the current Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders (APA, 1980), only homosexuality which is ego-dystonic is classified as a disorder.

Freedman (1971) comments that until recently homosexuality was viewed almost exclusively in terms of
morality. He believes that of the several perspectives through which homosexuality is currently being viewed - genetic, physiological, sociological and psychological, the latter two offer the most in giving us an understanding of the basis of homosexuality and its consequences to the personal adjustment of the individual.

Until recently, very little psychological research existed which did not assume the homosexual orientation is a pathological one. Many research findings suggest, and leaders of the gay movement insist that homosexuality does not preclude positive mental health. Because sexuality necessarily concerns the behavior of one individual in relation to another, it seems fruitful to investigate the homosexual's capacity for intimacy, thereby examining one aspect of the homosexual's mental health.

Shostrom (1963) and Erikson (1963) have both provided definitions of intimacy. Shostrom considered the capacity for intimate contact to be an aspect of positive mental health and defined it as "the ability to develop meaningful relationships with other human beings, unencumbered by exaggerated expectations and obligations" (p. 2). He developed the Personal Orientation Inventory to measure this and other components of self-actualization. Erikson (1963) describes various dilemmas an individual must resolve in order to attain a strong ego identity and a mature personality structure. The young adult who is emerging from the search for identity is ready for intimacy. Erikson's
definition of intimacy is "the capacity to commit to concrete affiliations and partnerships and to develop the ethical strength to abide by such commitments, even though they may call for significant sacrifices and compromises" (Erikson, 1963, p.7). The individual either makes such a commitment or avoids intimacy and experiences isolation. Orlofsky, Marcia and Lesser (1973) have operationalized intimacy into outcomes represented in five relationship styles: intimate, preintimate, stereotyped, pseudointimate and isolate.

Purpose and Objectives

A search of literature revealed only a few studies where homosexuals' capacity for intimacy was directly measured. There is no research to date which is devoted exclusively to the examination and measurement of the capacity for intimacy of homosexuals. It is the intent of this investigation to examine the relationship between sexual orientation and capacity for intimacy in both male and female homosexual and heterosexual subjects.

This study will test the following hypotheses, stated in the null form.

H1) There is no significant difference between lesbian women's and heterosexual women's capacity for intimacy.

H2) There is no significant difference between gay men's and heterosexual men's capacity for intimacy.

H3) There is no significant difference between gay
men's and lesbian women's capacity for intimacy.

H4) There is no significant difference between heterosexual men's and heterosexual women's capacity for intimacy.
REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Many researchers have complained of the paucity of information which exists regarding homosexuality and intimacy. Researchers have slighted topics concerning romantic and emotional aspects of gay relationships. In their 1978 study of lesbian relationships, Peplau, Cochran, Rook and Padesky complained "Virtually no empirical research exists concerning the romantic and sexual relationships of lesbians" (p. 1). Morin (1978) pointed out in his review of the literature that researchers of homosexuality had typically studied gay men and had focused primarily on issues of etiology and personal adjustment. Jones and Bates (1978) likewise complained that little research existed which examined factors such as satisfaction and stability in male homosexual relationships.

Tanner (1978) commented on the dearth of information concerning unmarried couples who are living together in paramarriage situations. Upon surveying the available behavioral science literature on female homosexuality, she found that most of the studies emphasized the exotic or different nature of lesbianism or they examined etiological factors. Neil Tuller (1978) pointed out that research ignored a large segment of the homosexual population: gay couples involved in gay marriage relationships who do not necessarily frequent gay meeting places.
Several researchers have examined the length of homosexual relationships though capacity for intimacy per se has not been measured. Liddicoat (1956) found of those who were involved in an affair, homosexual men were involved an average of four years while homosexual women were involved an average of a little more than six years. The Ladder ("DOB Questionnaire", 1959) reported the average lesbian relationship lasted four to five years. Greenberg (1973) found the majority of male homosexual subjects had not maintained a relationship for as long as one year and no male homosexual subject had been involved in such a relationship more than ten years. Dean (1967) reported homosexual men's "marital" relationships lasted a little less than ten years. Saghir and Robins (1973) found most of the affairs of both their male and female homosexual respondents ended within three years. These researchers found the majority of lesbians and gay men in their sample had experienced several types of relationships: "one night stands" or several contacts with a person for less than four months, liaisons (four months to a year) and at least one longer lasting involvement. Caprio (1956), Allen (1961) and Bieber (1969) have contended that neither male nor female homosexual have been able to establish more than a fleeting alliance with a partner.

Other researchers have focused on the number of sexual partners of homosexual individuals. Bell and Weinberg, in their book **Homosexualities** (1978), describe a stereotype of
the homosexual man which depicts him as one who is incapable of achieving intimacy:

One of the most predominant images of the homosexual man is that he is highly promiscuous, unable to integrate his emotional and sexual needs, incapable of maintaining a long-standing sexual partnership, and doomed to an eternally hopeless quest for the ideal relationship (p. 81).

The authors of *Homosexualities* review several studies which contend that homosexual men are likely to have many sexual partners. Braaten and Darling (1965) reported that two-thirds of their male homosexual respondents had engaged in "promiscuous sexual patterns." Schofield (1965) and Saghir and Robins (1973) reported that homosexual men in their investigations had significantly more partners than their heterosexual counterparts. Saghir and Robins (1973) also reported that their lesbian subjects tended to be much less promiscuous than their male homosexual subjects.

Bell and Weinberg (1978) summarize their findings regarding both gay male and lesbian partnerships in their book *Homosexualities*. Most of the lesbian respondents in this study had had less than ten female sexual partners during their adult years. Almost all of these partners were persons they had known beforehand who were intimate in a nonsexual way with them and had had sex more than once with them. Nearly all the respondents were involved in an affair at the time they were interviewed. The relationship tended to involve cohabiting partners who shared similar social positions and who (according to the respondent) were in love. Male homosexual respondents, on the other hand,
reported a large number (hundreds) of sexual partners who were initially strangers but with whom they spent a fair amount of time involving some exchange of personal information. Nearly all respondents had had a "relatively steady relationship" with another man. About a quarter of the male homosexual respondents were in a "couple" situation where they and their partner lived together and had sex with each other.

A few studies have measured homosexual individuals' capacity for intimacy. Freedman (1971) examined the psychological adjustment of lesbian and heterosexual women and used the Personal Orientation Inventory to measure capacity for intimacy of homosexuals. Freedman found that homosexually oriented women were functioning significantly better psychologically in several areas including the capacity for developing meaningful relationships with other people.

Peplau et. al. (1978) examined intimacy and satisfaction in lesbian relationships in an effort to determine if these characteristics correlated with value orientations of dyadic attachment or personal autonomy. Most of the women in this study reported being in a close, loving relationship. Approximately 75% of the respondents indicated that they and their current partner were "in love"; 17% said they were not in love and 8% were undecided. Respondents reported considerable closeness in their relationships (mean 7.7 on a 9-point scale). These data
indicate many lesbians find their relationships highly satisfying. The questionnaires used by these researchers to assess intimacy were Rubin's "love scale" and "liking scale." Scores on these scales were not reported; only the correlations between the scores and value orientations of dyadic attachment and personal autonomy were reported.

Peplau and Cochran (1981) examined value orientations in the intimate relationships of gay men. About half of the gay male subjects were living with a partner. Most men rated their current relationship as extremely satisfying (mean of 7.3 on a 9-point scale). Most men (83%) said they and their current partners were "in love." Rubin's Love Scale scores (a measure of intimacy) were not reported; only the correlations between these scores and value orientations were reported.

Masters and Johnson (1979) explored only sexual intimacy in their book *Homosexuality in Perspective*. Committed homosexual couples generally were more subjectively involved in sexual interaction than married heterosexual couples. An unusually high level of communicative interchange occurred between homosexual partners who openly exchanged information regarding sexual needs during sexual activity.

Two studies have examined satisfaction in gay and heterosexual relationships, though intimacy has not been measured. Freedman (1978) found similar proportions (56%) of heterossexuals and homosexuals to be very or moderately
happy in their love relationships. Cardell, Finn and Marecek (1981) compared ten lesbian couples, five gay male couples and ten heterosexual couples and found comparable levels of satisfaction among the three groups.

One study assessed interest in emotional intimacy. Harry and Lovely (1979) found that gay men committed to the gay world were more likely to be interested in emotionally intimate relationships than gay men who were not committed to the gay community. The five-item scale (labeled "Emotional Intimacy") which the authors used reflected the extent to which the respondent was interested in an emotionally intimate relationship with another man.

In an overview of research on homosexual couples, Peplau (1982) observed that there is a need for a greater range of research techniques, including in-depth interviews. The present study attempts to meet these needs and is the only one to this date devoted exclusively to the examination of the capacity for intimacy of both heterosexual and homosexual individuals. Its purpose is to measure this variable using an in-depth instrument (Orlofsky's Intimacy Interview in questionnaire form) in conjunction with Rubin's Love and Like Scales and Yufit's Intimacy - Isolation Questionnaire.

Very recent research appears to have moved beyond the issue of whether or not gay individuals can have quality relationships to examine what factors contribute to or detract from relationship quality. Blasband and Peplau
(1985) have examined both open and closed gay male partnerships and have found no significant differences in these two types of relationships in terms of love and liking for the partner, satisfaction or commitment. Kurdek and Schmitt (1986) examined gay and heterosexual couples and found that stage of relationship rather than type of couple, is a robust predictor of relationship quality.
METHOD

Subjects

It was proposed that the two general groups of this study - the heterosexuals and the homosexuals - be comparable in terms of age, education level and general mental health. These two general groups were subdivided into four groups which the four research questions of this study examine. These groups are gay males, heterosexual males, gay females, and heterosexual females. The following table presents the number of participants in each of the four categories.

Table 1
Number of Respondents by Sex and Sexual Orientation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gay</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(22.7%)</td>
<td>(25.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heterosexual</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(24.2%)</td>
<td>(27.3%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Age. The subjects' ages ranged from nineteen to sixty-one. The mean ages of the four groups are presented in Table 2. A one-way analysis of variance on the four groups indicates were no significant differences (p=.83) between the four groups on the factor of age: therefore the groups are comparable in terms of age.

Table 2
Mean Ages of Subjects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Gay</th>
<th>Heterosexual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>31.3</td>
<td>36.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>32.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Education. The education levels of the subjects ranged from ten years of schooling to 21 years of schooling. The mean education levels of the subjects of the four groups are presented in Table 3. A one-way analysis of variance of the education levels of four groups indicates there is no significant difference between the four groups on the factor of education level. Therefore, the four groups are comparable in terms of this variable.
### Table 3

**Mean Education Level of Subjects**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Gay</th>
<th>Straight</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>15.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>15.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**General mental health.** The total score of the Gordon Personal Profile, a summation of the Ascendancy, Responsibility, Emotional Stability and Sociability scores, is considered to be a measure of self-esteem. Four one-way analyses of variance compared the Gordon total scores of 1) gay and heterosexual males, 2) gay and heterosexual women, 3) heterosexual men and women, and 4) gay men and gay women.

These analyses indicate the four groups are comparable in terms of their total scores on the Gordon Personal Profile, a test which measures aspects of personality which are "significant in the daily functioning of the normal person" (Gordon, 1978, p.1). There were some differences found between groups on one of the subscales of the Gordon. Heterosexual males scored significantly higher on the Responsibility scale than gay males (p=.053). However, membership in either group accounts for only 11% of the variance in the scores.

The following table presents the mean scores and standard deviations for each of the four groups on the five scales of the Gordon Personal Profile.


Table 4

Group Members Scores On The
Gordon Personal Profile - Means and Standard Deviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Gay Males</th>
<th>Heterosexual Males</th>
<th>Gay Females</th>
<th>Heterosexual Females</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ascendency</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>22.50</td>
<td>21.63</td>
<td>23.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>7.12</td>
<td>5.15</td>
<td>5.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>24.00</td>
<td>26.31</td>
<td>22.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>6.67</td>
<td>5.21</td>
<td>5.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>22.87</td>
<td>24.69</td>
<td>21.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stability</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>4.78</td>
<td>6.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociability</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>19.83</td>
<td>19.10</td>
<td>19.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>7.72</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>6.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self Esteem</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>89.00</td>
<td>91.75</td>
<td>86.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Total Scores)</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>19.05</td>
<td>13.40</td>
<td>16.49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Research questions were not posed to compare the categories of male versus female or gay versus heterosexual because these general categories were broken down into even more definitive categories (gay men, gay women, heterosexual men, heterosexual women). However, data is available for the Gordon Personal Profile which compares these general categories.

A two-way analysis of variance for the Gordon Ascendancy scores indicates there is no significant difference between the way males (both gay and heterosexual
combined) and females (gay and heterosexual combined) responded to this scale \( (p=0.707) \). The same analysis indicates there is no significant difference between the way gays (male and female combined) and heterosexuals (males and female combined) responded to the Gordon Ascendency scale \( (p=0.0695) \). The interaction effect was not statistically significant \( (p=0.734) \).

A two-way analysis of variance of the Gordon Responsibility scores indicates there is no significant difference between the way males (gay and heterosexual combined) and females (gay and heterosexual combined) responded to this scale \( (p=0.484) \). There is a significant difference between the way gays (males and females combined) and heterosexuals (males and females combined) responded to this scale. Heterosexuals responded significantly higher on this scale than gays \( (p=0.033) \). The interaction effect was not statistically significant \( (p=0.726) \).

A two-way analysis of variance of the Gordon Emotional Stability scores indicates there is no statistically significant difference between the way men (gay and heterosexual combined) and women (gay and heterosexual combined) responded to the items of this scale \( (p=0.657) \). There is a statistically significant difference between the way gays (males and females combined) and heterosexuals (male and females combined) responded to the items of this scale. Heterosexuals scored significantly higher than gays
on this scale \( (p=0.039) \). The interaction effect of sex and orientation is not significant on this scale \( (p=0.445) \).

A two-way analysis of variance of the Gordon Sociability scores indicates there is no significant difference between the way men (gay and heterosexual combined) and women (gay and heterosexual combined) responded to the items of this scale \( (p=0.715) \). The same analysis indicates there is no statistically significant difference between the way gays (males and females combined) and heterosexuals (males and females combined) responded to this scale \( (p=0.668) \). The interaction effect is not statistically significant \( (p=0.970) \).

A two-way analysis of variance of the Gordon Self-Esteem scores (the self-esteem score is the total of the four other scores) indicates there is no significant difference between the way men (gay and straight combined) and women (gay and straight combined) responded to the items of this scale \( (p=0.583) \). The same analysis indicates there is no statistically significant difference between the way gays (males and females combined) and heterosexuals (males and females combined) responded to the items of this scale \( (p=0.337) \). The interaction effect of sex and orientation is not significant on this scale \( (p=0.789) \).

The following table summarizes the results of the above mentioned analyses.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Males vs. Females</th>
<th>Gays vs. Heterosexuals</th>
<th>Interaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ascendancy</strong></td>
<td>Not Significant</td>
<td>Not Significant</td>
<td>Not Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(p=0.707)</td>
<td>(p=0.695)</td>
<td>(p=0.734)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Responsibility</strong></td>
<td>Not Significant</td>
<td>Significant</td>
<td>Not</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(p=0.484)</td>
<td>(p=0.033)</td>
<td>(p=0.726)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Emotional Stability</strong></td>
<td>Not Significant</td>
<td>Significant</td>
<td>Not</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(p=0.657)</td>
<td>(p=0.039)</td>
<td>(p=0.445)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sociability</strong></td>
<td>Not Significant</td>
<td>Not Significant</td>
<td>Not</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(p=0.715)</td>
<td>(p=0.668)</td>
<td>(p=0.970)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>Not Significant</td>
<td>Not Significant</td>
<td>Not</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>(Self Esteem)</em></td>
<td>Significant</td>
<td>Significant</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(p=0.583)</td>
<td>(p=0.339)</td>
<td>(p=0.789)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Instruments

This study used Orlofsky's (1976) Intimacy Interview, Yufit's (1956) Intimacy Isolation Questionnaire and Rubin's (1970) Loving and Liking Scales to measure capacity for intimacy of male and female heterosexual and homosexual subjects. In addition the Gordon Personal Profile was used as a measure of general mental health.

Orlofsky's Intimacy Interview is a 20 to 30 minute semistructured interview used to assess intimacy status. This interview was modified so that it could be used for both homosexual and heterosexual subjects to evaluate (1) the presence or absence of close relationships with peers; (2) the presence or absence of commitment to an enduring heterosexual or homosexual love relationship, and (3) depth versus superficiality of relationship. Each subject was be assigned a status of either intimate, preintimate, stereotyped, pseudointimate, or isolate according to the Orlofsky et. al. (1973) rating manual.

According to Orlofsky et. al. (1973), intimate individuals establish and maintain deep and enduring love relationships while preintimates maintain an ambivalent posture about commitment and offer love without obligations and ties. Stereotyped relationships are superficial and predominantly with friends of the same sex. The pseudointimate has entered into a somewhat permanent love relationship, but this relationship lacks closeness and depth. The isolate is withdrawn from social relations,
lacks personal relationships, and only occasionally maintains casual interpersonal contacts. Orlofsky has combined statuses or defined three major statuses: 1) intimacy plus preintimacy, 2) stereotyped relationships plus pseudointimate, and 3) isolate.

Orlofsky et al. (1973) examined the reliability of the intimacy interview. They computed interjudge reliability between two independent raters for 32 randomly selected interviews. For the three major statuses a 94% agreement was obtained. For the five statuses interjudge reliability was 81%. Some construct validity was also established for the intimacy statuses in his study. Intimate plus preintimate subjects scored significantly higher than pseudointimate plus stereotyped relationship subjects (t=2.58, df=44, p.< 01, one tailed) who scored higher than isolate subjects on an abridged version of Yufit's Intimacy-Isolation Scale. Isolate subjects scored lowest on the intimacy subscale and highest on the isolation subscale. In addition, differences among the intimacy statuses were obtained on the Heterosexuality, Autonomy and Affiliation subscales of the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule. Isolates had the lowest heterosexuality scores while pseudointimates and stereotyped relationships had the highest. Intimates plus preintimates were higher than isolates combined with the other statuses on the Autonomy scale.

Orlofsky (1976) examined the relationship of intimacy
status to interpersonal perception to establish predictive validity of the intimacy status constructs. The Partner Perception Questionnaire was administered to subjects of the five intimacy statuses to test the subject's understanding of his partner's self-conception. Each subject was instructed to ask one of the people he was closest with to accompany him to the experiment; this person was the subject's "partner." Intimate plus preintimate subjects scored significantly higher than pseudointimate plus stereotyped subjects who in turn scored higher (not quite significant) than isolate subjects. In the same study interjudge reliability was established. Interviews were conducted and rated by Orlofsky and two assistants. Two interviewers working independently who were blind to the ratings of the assigned partners in the dyads interviewed and rated the subjects of each dyad. All interviews were taped. Interjudge reliability among three judges was computed for 20 randomly selected interviews. The percentage of agreement between two of the three judges was 95% for the overall intimacy status rating; 70% agreement was obtained using unanimous agreement as the criterion.

Concerns expressed by Human Subjects Committee members for the confidentiality of homosexual subjects prompted the author of this study to consider using a written form of Orlofsky's interview. The oral interview is generally tape recorded. After careful consideration, Orlofsky's interview was therefore presented in questionnaire format where
subjects' responses would not have to be tape recorded.

A small pilot study was done to compare ratings of the oral and written interviews of the same individuals. A graduate student in psychology interviewed five volunteers who responded to the Orlofsky Intimacy Interview. The same individuals responded to the questionnaire form of the interview. An undergraduate psychology student who was unaware that the same five individuals responded to both the written and oral interviews, rated the five interview tapes and the five questionnaires. This student assigned the same intimacy statuses to the oral and written interviews in four out of five cases. The decision to proceed with the written interview thus appeared justified.

Rubin's Love and Liking Scales (1970) provided an additional measure of depth in interpersonal relations. Directions for these scales were modified to be applicable to homosexual as well as heterosexual subjects. The 13-item love scale provides a summed measure of three components of love: attachment (a need or desire to be in the other person's presence); caring (a concern for the other's happiness and welfare); and intimacy (self-disclosure) with respect to one's dating partner.

Rubin (1970) assessed construct and discriminant validity of the two measures of love and liking by comparing their empirical links to other variables. Subjects were asked to respond to an item separate from love scale items. The question "Would you say that you and _______ are in
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To establish validity, Gordon performed a study with the development of the profile to examine the relationship between self-report scores and peer perceptions of corresponding characteristics. Product-moment correlations between the peer rating, and scores made on the Long Description traits for a sample of 63 female college dormitory students are .50 for scale A, .57 for scale E, .64 for scale S. Product-moment correlations of 63 females college dormitory students and S are .47, .47, .73 and .61 respectively. Product-moment correlations...
aspects of personality which influence person's daily functioning. Specifically, measures these personality characteristics. Respondents are asked to mark one item in each of four descriptive phrases as being most like one, least like themselves.

Gordom presents reliability data for the manual,  

\[ \text{Gordon Personal Style Inventory Manual} \]

Split-half reliabilities for a sample of student managers were .86, .87, and .82 for scales A, R, E and S respectively. Split-half reliabilities for a sample of college students for scales A, R, E and S were .86, .82 and .87 respectively. Split-half reliabilities for a sample of 218 male managers for scales A, R, E and S were .82, .87, .82 and .85 respectively.

To establish validity, Gordom performed a study using the development of the Profile to examine the relationship between self-report scores and peer perceptions of corresponding characteristics. Product-moment correlations between the peer rating and scores made on the five personality traits for a sample of 55 male college dormitory residents are .50 for scale A, .57 for scale E, .59 for scale S, .44 for scale E, and for scale S. Product-moment correlations of 63 female college dormitory students and S are .47, .47, .73 and .73 respectively.
aspects of personality which are important to the person's daily functioning. Measures: (R), emotional stability (E) and extraversion (L), are among these personality variables. Respondents are asked to rank one item in each of the four descriptive phrases as being most like themselves, one as being least like themselves.

Gordon presents reliability data on the Profile manual, _Gordon Personal Profile: Manual_. Split-half reliabilities for a sample of 53 male and 53 female college students for scales A, R, E and S were .88, .78, .65 and .87, respectively. Split-half reliabilities for a sample of 218 male managers for scales A, R, E and S were .82, .78, .44 and .85, respectively.

To establish validity, Gordon performed a study upon the development of the Profile to examine the relationship between self-report scores and peer perceptions of the corresponding characteristics. Product-moment correlations between the peer rating and scores made on the four major traits for a sample of 55 male college dormitory students are .50 for scale A, .57 for scale B, .50 for scale C, .49 for scale D, .44 for scale S. Product-moment correlations of 63 females college dormitory students and S are .47, .47, .77 and .81 respectively.
aspects of personality which are significant in a normal person's daily functioning: ascendancy (A), responsibility (R), emotional stability (E) and sociability (S). Gordon measures these personality aspects in a test where respondents are asked to mark one item in each tetrad of four descriptive phrases as being most like themselves and one as being least like themselves.

Gordon presents reliability data on the test in his manual, *Gordon Personal Profile Inventory* (1978). Split-half reliabilities for a sample of 92 college students for scales A, R, E and S were .86, .88, .89 and .88 respectively. Split-half reliabilities for a sample of 173 college students for scales A, R, E and S were .86, .87, .87 and .87 respectively. Split-half reliabilities for a sample of 218 male managers for scales A, R, E and S were .82, .84, .82 and .85 respectively.

To establish validity, Gordon performed a study during the development of the Profile to examine the relationships between self-report scores and peer perceptions of the corresponding characteristics. Product-moment correlations between the peer rating, and scores made on the four Profile traits for a sample of 55 male college dormitory students are .50 for scale A, .57 for scale R, .61 for scale E and .44 for scale S. Product-moment correlations for a sample of 63 female college dormitory students for scales A, R, E and S are .47, .47, .73 and .61 respectively.

Product-moment correlations between counselors ratings
and clients' scores in a study by Gawne (Gawne, as cited in Gordon, 1978), on a sample of 27 counseling clients for scales A, R, E and S were .54, .36, .58 and .53 respectively. Product-moment correlations between superiors' ratings and seminarians in a study by Bravo Valdivieso (1970) on a sample of 57 seminarians for scales A, R, E, and S are .48, .58, .21 and .31 respectively. Eysenck and Eysenck (1963) measured correlations between the Gordon Personal Profile and the Eysenck Personality Inventory on a sample of 124 civil service employees. As would be expected, Neuroticism was negatively associated with Emotional Stability (-.53) and Extroversion as positively related to Ascendancy (.58) and Sociability (.57).

Procedure

The researcher originally attempted to gather data in the Utah cities of Logan, Ogden, and Salt Lake City. Only two gay men responded to forty questionnaire packets which were distributed to gay men in these cities through members of the gay community serving as gay contact persons. Response from gay women in these communities was somewhat greater, but still inadequate.

The researcher then decided to collect data in her home city, Fort Wayne, Indiana. Data for heterosexual respondents was collected in classrooms at St. Francis College and in Fort Wayne's west central neighborhood where an assistant to the researcher resided. Gay respondents
were solicited through two groups: a group of lesbians who met for dinners, and a gay male support group which addressed gay issues. Other gay respondents were solicited through friends of the researcher who were gay and friends of the researcher's assistant who were gay.

All participants received questionnaire packets containing the following:

1. An introduction section explaining the study.
2. An informed consent form which included the statement that participants may at any time choose to terminate their participation in the study.
3. A questionnaire form of the Orlofsky Intimacy Interview.
4. The Yufit Intimacy Isolation Questionnaire.
5. The Rubin Love and Like Scales
6. The Gordon Personal Profile.

The researcher approached students in psychology classes at St. Francis College, saying that she was interested in learning about the interpersonal relations of heterosexual persons. She distributed questionnaire packets to volunteers and explained that each participant must sign an informed consent form in order to participate in the study. The researcher returned to the classes two to three days later to gather completed questionnaires. Participants' names (signatures) appeared on informed consent forms only, and these forms were immediately separated from the questionnaire data to assure anonymity to
the participants.

The researcher attended a dinner for gay women and collected data there. A good friend of the researcher's introduced her at the conclusion of dinner and the researcher described her study. Again, the study was described as a study of interpersonal relations. Participants responded to the questionnaires that evening. Informed consent forms were separated from the questionnaire data that evening, and participants were assured that these forms would be kept under lock and key.

The researcher was given the name of a gay man who helped to lead a gay male support group by the gay female contact person who introduced her to the lesbian dinner group. The gay male contact person invited the researcher to come to the support group for gay men with the understanding that the group members would be asked if they wanted to participate in the study. Again, the study was introduced as one which would examine interpersonal relations. All members of the group elected to participate in the study, and they decided to complete the questionnaires that evening. Informed consent forms were separated from the questionnaire data that evening, and participants were assured that these forms would be kept under lock and key.

Additional gay participants were solicited individually through contacts of the researchers and the researcher's assistant.
RESULTS

An undergraduate student and the author of this study rated the questionnaire forms of the Orlofsky Intimacy Interview. The raters were blind to the sex and sexual orientations of the respondents. An interrater agreement of 80% was obtained.

Hypothesis 1.

The first hypothesis of this study was that lesbian women would not differ from heterosexual women in their capacity for intimacy. This question was examined in the following way: A chi-square analysis was done on the Orlofsky statuses and one-way analyses of variance were done on the Yufit Intimacy-Isolation scores, the Rubin Like scores and the Rubin Love scores.

As cited in Table 6, a chi-square analysis of the Orlofsky statuses indicates there is no significant difference between the way gay females and heterosexual females responded to the questionnaire form of the Orlofsky Intimacy Interview (chi-square (1)=1.00).

Table 6

Lesbian and Heterosexual Women's Orlofsky Statuses and Chi-Square Significance Levels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Gay Women</th>
<th>Heterosexual Women</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preintimate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Chi-Square (1)=1.000 NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intimate</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7 summarizes the results of the analyses of variance regarding the first question of this study. A one-way analysis of variance of the Yufit Intimacy-Isolation Questionnaire indicates there is no significant difference in the way gay females and heterosexual females responded to this instrument (p=.217). A one-way analysis of variance of the Rubin Like Scale indicates there is no significant difference between the way gay women and heterosexual women responded to this instrument (p=.340). A one-way analysis of variance of the Rubin Love scale indicates there is no significant difference between the way gay women and heterosexual women responded to this instrument (p=.765).

Table 7

Analysis of Variance of Lesbian and Heterosexual Women's Intimacy Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Lesbians</th>
<th>Heterosexual Women</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yufit M</td>
<td>48.65</td>
<td>49.61</td>
<td>p=0.217, NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rubin Like</td>
<td>52.00</td>
<td>57.00</td>
<td>p=0.348, NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rubin Love</td>
<td>49.47</td>
<td>53.28</td>
<td>p=0.765, NS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hypothesis 2.

The second hypothesis of this study was that gay men would not differ from heterosexual men in their
capacity for intimacy. This question was examined in the following way: A chi-square analysis was done on the Orlofsky statuses and one-way analyses of variance were done on the Yufit Intimacy-Isolation scores, the Rubin Like scores and the Rubin Love scores.

As cited in Table 8, a chi-square analysis of the Orlofsky statuses indicates there is no significant difference between the way gay men and heterosexual men responded to this instrument (chi-square (1) = 0.155).

A one-way analysis of variance of Yufit's Intimacy-Isolation Questionnaire indicates there is not a significant difference between the gay men and heterosexual men responded to this instrument (p=.697). A one-way analysis of variance of the Rubin Like scale indicates there is a statistically significant difference between the way gay men and heterosexual men responded to this instrument (p=.035). Gay men responded significantly higher (more intimate) on the Rubin Like scale than heterosexual men. A one-way analysis of variance of the Rubin Love scale indicates there is no significant difference between the way gay males and heterosexual males responded to this instrument (p=.229). Table 9 summarizes the results of the above mentioned analyses of variance.

---

1 One gay male subject's intimacy status was so removed from the distribution that that individual was eliminated from further analysis as recommended by Dr. Adams.
Table 8

Gay and Heterosexual Men's Orlofsky Statuses and Chi-Square Significance Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Gay Men</th>
<th>Heterosexual Men</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preintimate</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>chi-square(1)=0.155, NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intimate</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9

Analysis of Variance of Gay and Heterosexual Men's Intimacy Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Gay Men</th>
<th>Heterosexual Men</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yufit</td>
<td>M 52.67</td>
<td>M 50.44</td>
<td>p=0.697, NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rubin Like</td>
<td>M 56.07</td>
<td>M 53.63</td>
<td>p=0.035 Significant: p&lt;.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rubin Love</td>
<td>M 51.40</td>
<td>M 50.38</td>
<td>p=0.229, NS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hypothesis 3.

The third hypothesis of this study was that gay men would not differ from lesbian women in their capacity for intimacy. This question was examined in the following way. A chi-square analysis was done on the Orlofsky statuses and one-way analysis of variance were done on the Yufit Intimacy-Isolation scores, the Rubin Like scores and the Rubin Love scores.
As stated in Table 10, a chi-square analysis of the Orlofsky Statuses indicates there is a statistically significant difference between the way gay men and gay women responded to the questionnaire form of the Orlofsky Intimacy Interview (chi-square (1)=.017. Gay women responded significantly higher (more intimate responses versus pre-intimate) than gay men.

Table 10
Gay Men and Gay Women's Orlofsky Statuses and Chi-Square Significance Levels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Gay Men</th>
<th>Gay Women</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preintimate</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Chi-Square(1)=0.017 Significant: p&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intimate</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A one-way analysis of variance of the Yufit Intimacy-Isolation questionnaire indicates there is not a significant difference between the way gay women and gay men responded to this instrument (p=.065). A one-way analysis of variance of the Rubin Like scores indicates there is not a significant difference between the way gay men and gay women responded to this instrument (p=.126). A one-way analysis of variance of the Rubin Love scores indicates there is not a statistically significant difference between the way gay men and gay women responded to this instrument (p=.565). Table 11 summarizes the results of the above mentioned analyses.
Table 11

Analysis of Variance of Gay Men's and Gay Women's Intimacy Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Gay Men</th>
<th>Gay Women</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yufit</td>
<td>M 52.67</td>
<td>M 48.65</td>
<td>p=0.065, NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rubin Like</td>
<td>M 56.07</td>
<td>M 52.00</td>
<td>p=0.126, NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rubin Love</td>
<td>M 51.40</td>
<td>M 49.47</td>
<td>p=0.565, NS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hypothesis 4.

The fourth hypothesis of this study was that heterosexual men would not differ from heterosexual women in their capacity for intimacy. This question was examined in the following way: A chi-square analysis was done on the Orlofsky statuses, and one-way analyses of variance were done on the Yufit Intimacy-Isolation scores, the Rubin Like scores and the Rubin Love scores.

As cited in Table 12, a chi-square analysis of the Orlofsky statuses indicates there is no statistically significant difference between the way heterosexual men and heterosexual women responded to the questionnaire form of the Orlofsky Intimacy Interview (chi-square (1) = .510).

A one-way analysis of variance of the Yufit Intimacy-Isolation Questionnaire indicates there is no statistically significant difference between the way heterosexual men and heterosexual women responded to this instrument (p=.717). A one-way analysis of variance of the Rubin Like scores indicates there is no statistically
significant difference between the way heterosexual men and heterosexual women responded to this instrument (p=.142). A one-way analysis of variance of the Rubin Love scores indicates there is no statistically significant difference between the way heterosexual men and heterosexual women responded to this instrument (p=.370). Table 13 summarizes the results of the above mentioned analyses of variance.

Table 12

Heterosexual Men and Heterosexual Women's Orlofsky Statuses and Chi-Square Significance Levels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Heterosexual Men</th>
<th>Heterosexual Women</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preintimate</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>chi-square=0.510, NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intimate</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 13

Analysis of Variance of Heterosexual Men and Heterosexual Women's Intimacy Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Heterosexual Men</th>
<th>Heterosexual Women</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yufit</td>
<td>M 50.44</td>
<td>M 49.61</td>
<td>p=0.717, NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rubin Like</td>
<td>M 53.63</td>
<td>M 57.00</td>
<td>p=0.142, NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rubin Love</td>
<td>M 50.38</td>
<td>M 53.28</td>
<td>p=0.370, NS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Research questions were not posed to compare the categories of male versus female or gay versus heterosexual because these general categories were broken down into even more definitive categories (gay men, gay women, heterosexual men, heterosexual women). However, data is available on comparisons between general categories, and the following information was obtained.

There is a statistically significant difference between the way males (both gay and heterosexual combined) and females (both gay and heterosexual combined) responded to the questionnaire form of the Orlofsky Intimacy Interview (chi-square (1) = 0.011). Women's attainment of the intimate status (versus preintimate) was significantly greater than men's attainment of the intimate status.

There is no statistically significant difference between the way gays (both male and female) and heterosexuals (both male and female) responded to the questionnaire form of the Orlofsky Intimacy Interview (chi-square (1) = 0.255).

A two-way analysis of variance of the Yufit Intimacy-Isolation scores indicates there is no significant difference between the way men (gay and heterosexual combined) and women (gay and heterosexual combined) responded to this instrument (p=0.130).

There is no significant difference between the way gays (males and females combined) and heterosexuals (males and females combined) responded to the Yufit (p=.730). The
same analysis indicates the interaction effect of sex and orientation was not significant (p=.306).

A two-way analysis of variance of the Rubin Like scores indicates there is no significant difference between the way men and women responded to this instrument (p=0.892). The same analysis indicates there is not a significant difference between the way gays and heterosexuals responded to the Rubin Like scale (p=0.380). However, the interaction effect of sex and orientation is significant (p=0.033).

A two-way analysis of variance of the Rubin Love scores indicates there is no significant difference between the way men and women responded to this instrument (p=.808). The same analysis indicates there is not a significant difference between the way gays and heterosexuals responded to this instrument (p=0.506). The interaction effect of sex and orientation was not significant (p=0.298).

The following table summarizes the results of the above mentioned analyses.
Table 14
Significance Levels of Intimacy Scores
By Sex and Orientation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Males vs. Females</th>
<th>Gays vs. Heterosexuals</th>
<th>Interaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Orlofsky</td>
<td>chi-square(1)= 0.01</td>
<td>chi-square(1)= 0.255, NS</td>
<td>Significant at .01 level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Significant at .01 level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yufit</td>
<td>p=0.130, NS</td>
<td>p=0.730, NS</td>
<td>p=.306, NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rubin Like</td>
<td>p=0.892, NS</td>
<td>p=0.380, NS</td>
<td>Significant at .05 level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rubin Love</td>
<td>p=.808, NS</td>
<td>p=.506, NS</td>
<td>p=.298, NS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DISCUSSION

The findings of this study do not support the contentions of Caprio (1956), Allen (1961) and Bieber (1969), that neither male nor female homosexuals are able to establish more than a fleeting alliance. The hypothesis that there is no significant difference between lesbian women's and heterosexual women's capacity for intimacy was supported in this study. The second hypothesis, that there is no significant difference between gay men's and heterosexual men's capacity for intimacy, was supported by three of the four intimacy measures in this study. Gay men scored significantly higher on one measure of intimacy.

The finding regarding lesbian women is in concordance with Freedman's (1971) finding that the homosexuality of women did not preclude them from forming meaningful relationships. The same finding is congruent with the study of Peplau et al. (1978) where lesbian respondents reported considerable closeness in their relationships. The finding regarding gay men contradicts the stereotype of the male homosexual as one who is incapable of achieving intimacy. The same finding is congruent with Peplau and Cochran's (1981) study where gay men stated their current relationships were "extremely satisfying."

Gay men scored significantly higher on the Rubin Like score than heterosexual men. One might speculate that same-sex intimate relationships would promote a greater degree of
"liking" one's partner. However, if this factor alone explained the significantly higher scores of gay men on this measure, then gay women would have scored significantly higher than heterosexual women on the same scale.

It is interesting that gay men apparently can love as well as heterosexual men and at the same time have a greater capacity for "liking" than their heterosexual counterparts. This finding should stimulate research to further examine the complexity of the relationship capacity of male homosexuals. Rubin's Like Scale seems to measure attraction while the Love Scale measures actual "love" behaviors. Perhaps gay men's greater tendency to experience attraction to other men accounts for their greater frequency of sexual contacts. Further research could explore gay men's perceptions of a partner with whom they would have an affair versus perceptions of a partner with whom they would have a committed relationship. Research which would promote understanding why gay men experience a need for numerous sexual contacts might contribute to the prevention of AIDS, a disease which some experts believe has reached epidemic proportions.

The hypothesis that there is no significant difference between gay men's and lesbian women's capacity for intimacy was supported by this study on three out of four measures of intimacy. On the Orlofsky questionnaire, the more in-depth measure of intimacy, the same hypothesis was not supported. Gay women reported a significantly greater capacity for
intimacy than gay men. However, it should be noted that out of five levels of intimacy measured by the Orlofsky-intimate, preintimate, stereotyped, pseudointimate and isolate-all gay respondents reported either preintimate or intimate statuses. Although this study finds gay women to have a significantly greater capacity for intimacy according to the Orlofsky interview, gay males still reported intimate or preintimate statuses.

The hypothesis that there is no significant difference between heterosexual men's and heterosexual women's capacity for intimacy was supported in this study by all four intimacy measures. The author of this study was interested in this particular research question only to the extent that data regarding this question might contribute to the understanding of homosexual intimacy. The review of the literature does not focus on heterosexual intimacy and addresses the topic only as it relates to homosexual intimacy.

In combining the intimacy scores of both gay men and gay women and comparing them to the scores of both male and female heterosexuals, no significant differences were found. The results of this study suggest that homosexuality does not preclude intimacy in gay relationships. This finding regarding homosexual intimacy is significant because an in-depth interview was used in this study, whereas past research has lacked the employment of in-depth intimacy measures (Peplau, 1982).
The finding that homosexuals' have no less a capacity for intimacy than heterosexuals has important implications for psychotherapists and counselors. Despite recent gains in our culture which reflect less prejudice towards gay persons, the stigma of homosexuality still permeates our society. Individuals in the helping profession may take evidence of homosexuals' capacity for intimacy as an invitation to view homosexuals as individuals who have potential for achieving positive mental health while maintaining their sexual orientation. Therapists who have a desire to "fix" the homosexual by changing his or her orientation should examine their own beliefs in light of the findings of this study.

In combining the scores of both gay and heterosexual men and comparing them to the scores of both gay and heterosexual women, a significant difference was found on the Orlofsky measure. Regardless of sexual orientation, women's attainment of the intimate status was significantly greater than men's attainment of the intimate status. This finding also has implications for counselors and psychotherapists. Individuals in the helping professions should be cognizant of gender differences when assessing such factors as pacing the individual in his or her growth towards greater capacity for intimacy.

Methodological Limitations

The sample of this study was a volunteer sample and therefore, not a random sample. However, the four groups
which were examined were comparable in terms of significant
variables - age, education and general mental health. Therefore, any differences in capacity for intimacy can be
expected to be related to sexual orientation or gender (or a
combination) rather than being related to these variables.

Borg (1979) reports that volunteers tend to be better
educated than non-volunteers. The participants of this
sample might be considered a select group because of the
average education levels of the four groups. However,
education level was comparable across the four groups which
were being compared. Further research is needed which would
sample gay subjects with a greater range of educational
experience to determine what effect, if any, this factor has
on gay individuals' capacity for intimacy.

Another limitation of the study is that subjects' sexual orientations were assumed in the gathering of the
heterosexual sample. The researcher felt that asking
subjects, gay or heterosexual to identify their sexual
orientation in the form of responding to a questionnaire
question might have alerted the subjects to the fact that
they were being compared, thereby possibly promoting
competitive responses. When the researcher solicited
volunteers from classrooms, she presented her study as one
concerned with the interpersonal relations of heterosexuals.
The fact that the researcher was interested in studying
interpersonal relations was emphasized. The fact that the
researcher was seeking a heterosexual sample was not
emphasized, though the word "heterosexual" was used. It is possible that a (some) gay individual(s) could have responded to the questionnaires, turning in their completed questionnaire packets along with the heterosexual respondents. The researcher chose to take this risk over the risk of possibly promoting competitive responses by requesting self-identification of sexual orientation. The respondents, gay and heterosexual, were not told they were being compared to other individuals of different sexual orientation and/or different gender.

The sexual orientations of the gay respondents in the sample were also assumed. These participants had identified themselves as being gay through association with a gay male support group or the lesbian dinner group or through interactions (friendships) with the researcher or researcher's assistants.

The fact that most gay respondents were members of either a dinner group, which could be considered to be an informed support group, or an actual support group, could have biased the results. However, if it were true that support groups increased the capacity for intimacy of gay individuals, this finding might only lend support to the notion that gay individuals can have a high capacity for intimacy. Further research is needed to examine the effect of support groups on gay persons' capacity for intimacy.
SUMMARY

The findings of this study supported the following null hypotheses: H1: There is no significant difference between lesbian women's and heterosexual women's capacity for intimacy and, H4: There is no significant difference between heterosexual men's and heterosexual women's capacity for intimacy. Hypothesis two - There is no significant difference between gay men's and heterosexual men's capacity for intimacy - was supported by three of the four intimacy measures. The third hypothesis - There is no significant difference between gay men's and gay women's capacity for intimacy - was not supported by the Orlofsky interview, the main instrument used to measure intimacy. This null hypothesis was supported by the other three instruments measuring intimacy.

Therefore, the stereotype of the male homosexual [referred to by Bell & Weinberg (1978)], as one who is incapable of achieving intimacy is not supported by this sample. Male homosexuals received the intimate and preintimate Orlofsky statuses. According to the Orlofsky intimacy status criteria, these individuals could have participated in a couple relationship but still reported a pseudointimate intimacy status. However, the male homosexuals of this sample reported intimate and preintimate statuses. This finding suggests that male homosexuals have a high capacity for intimacy in spite of the numerous sexual contacts which male homosexuals are reported to have
[Braaten & Darling (1965), Schofield (1965), Saghir & Robins (1973), Bell & Weinberg (1978)].

The findings of this study regarding lesbian women are in concordance with Freedman's finding that the homosexuality of lesbian women did not preclude them from forming meaningful relationships. They are also in concordance with the finding of Peplau et al. (1978) that most lesbian women reported being in close, loving relationships.

Further research is needed to determine what effect, if any, the factor of age has on gay individuals' capacity for intimacy. Further research is also needed to determine the correlation between number of sexual contacts and capacity for intimacy.
REFERENCES


APPENDICES
Appendix A

Intimacy Interview

Is there anybody (guy or girl) who you're pretty close with up here? _______________ (at home?) _______________

Do you see him/her frequently outside of school? __________

How close do you feel with him/her? _______________

What does being close with someone mean to you? _______________

Do you have a lot in common with him/her? ___ What kinds of things _______________

What kinds of things do you talk about with him/her? ________

Do you ever talk about personal matters? ________________

Can you discuss your problems with each other? __________

Why would (do) you discuss your problems with him/her in the first place? ____________________________

Are there any matters that you couldn't or wouldn't share with him/her about yourself? ______________________

Do you find that you go out of your way to help each other out (lending car, money)? ______________________

Do you generally prefer to be with friends or by yourself? ________________________________

The guy-girl that you spend the most time with: What in particular do you like about him/her? __________________________

(dislike about him/her?) ________________________________

What does friendship mean to you? __________________________

Do you date much? _______________
If no-

Have you ever dated (or spent time with a girl/guy)?

Would you like to date (more)?

Are there any particular reasons why you haven't dated much up to now?

Have you ever dated one girl/guy exclusively?

If no-

How often do you date?

What kinds of things about a girl/guy would prompt you to ask her/him out again?

Do you usually date several persons at the same time?

In the course of your dating, have you ever met a girl/guy with whom you would like to have an enduring relationship? (What happened)?

What do you think has prevented you from doing this up to now?

What in particular do you like or find attractive about her/him?

People sometimes get on each other's nerves in some way or another. Is there anything about him/her that you dislike?

Are you able to discuss it with him/her?

Do you ever fight?

About any particular things, or around any particular themes?

Do you feel you function well as a couple? (like working, playing together?) (any competition between you?)

How about the sexual side of the relationship?

How important a part does sex occupy in the relationship?
Are you in love with him/her?

How about the sexual side of the relationship ... is it good?

Is one of you more in love or more involved in the relationship than the other?

Which of you is more jealous or possessive in general?

Where do you want this relationship to go in the future?

Have you discussed future plans with him/her?

Do you foresee any long-term commitment to each other?

What do you see as the main problem that the two of you have to work out as a couple?

Had you been with any other boys/girls previous to her him?

How does the intensity of feeling in this relationship compare with previous experiences?

Could your relationship be improved in any ways?

What kinds of changes?

Are you happy in the relationship?

How crucial is this relationship to your present and future happiness?

For all Ss

What is a meaningful or good relationship as you see it?

How much of that do you feel you've attained?

What kinds of changes would you like to see in the way you relate with others?
Name ____________ Age ___ Grade ___ Major __________
Name of parents ______________ Home Address ____________
Last grade father completed _______ Last grade mother completed _______
Appendix B

Yufit's Intimacy Isolation Questionnaire

This checklist is part of a program which attempts to find what people enjoy, what things they like to do or have happen to them, and what things they dislike. The following activities have been collected indicate a variety of things which you like and dislike.

DIRECTIONS: Before each statement there are three choices. Circle the one that best describes how you feel about the item.

3 - if the item describes an activity or event which you like or would enjoy
2 - if the item describes an activity or event which you are indifferent to
1 - if the item describes an activity or event which you dislike or would find unpleasant

Please answer all questions.

3 2 1 1. Suffering for a good cause or for someone I love.
3 2 1 2. Talking about how it feels to be in love.
3 2 1 3. Conquering my fears and doubts and attacking a problem head on.
3 2 1 4. Trusting people.
3 2 1 5. Trying to describe my innermost feelings to others.
3 2 1 6. Having someone who is very emotional for a friend.
3 2 1 7. Discussing with younger people what they think or feel about things and what they like to do.
3 2 1 8. Falling madly in love.
3 2 1 9. Being constant in my affections.
3 2 1 10. Enjoying the company of anyone I'm with.
3 2 1 11. Being with people who are always fun-loving, gay, and amusing.
3 2 1 12. Searching with ways of getting along with someone even after it seems he's impossible.
3 2 1 13. Running something very soft against my skin.
3 2 1 14. Feeling intensely about someone or something.
3 2 1 15. Seeking solutions to inner conflicts, moral problems, and spiritual dilemmas.
3 2 1 16. Leading an active life.
3 2 1 17. Comforting someone who is feeling low.
3 2 1 18. Seeking to explain the behavior of people who are emotionally unstable.
3 2 1 19. Lending things I value to a friend.
3 2 1 20. Talking with people about their innermost feelings and difficulties.
Appendix C

Rubin's Liking Scale

DIRECTIONS: Read the following statements, filling in the blanks with a person of the opposite sex in mind. Circle the number which most strongly agrees with how you feel about the statement. Use the following scale:

5 - strongly agree
4 - mildly agree
3 - undecided
2 - mildly disagree
1 - strongly disagree

1. When I am with ________, we are almost always in the same mood. 5 4 3 2 1
2. I think that ________ is usually well-adjusted. 5 4 3 2 1
3. I would highly recommend ________ for a responsible job. 5 4 3 2 1
4. In my opinion, ________ is an exceptionally mature person. 5 4 3 2 1
5. I have great confidence in ________'s good judgement. 5 4 3 2 1
6. Most people would react very favorably to ________ after a brief acquaintance. 5 4 3 2 1
7. I think that ________ and I are quite similar to each other. 5 4 3 2 1
8. I would vote for ________ in a class or group election. 5 4 3 2 1
9. I think that ________ is one of those people who quickly wins respect. 5 4 3 2 1
10. I feel that ________ is an extremely intelligent person. 5 4 3 2 1
11. ________ is one of the most likable people I know. 5 4 3 2 1
12. __________ is the sort of person whom I myself would like to be.  

13. It seems to me that it is very easy for __________ to gain admiration.
Appendix D

Rubin's Loving Scale

DIRECTIONS: Read the following statements, filling in the blanks with a person of the opposite sex in mind. Circle the number which most strongly agrees with how you feel about the statements. Use the following scale:

5 - strongly agree
4 - mildly agree
3 - undecided
2 - mildly disagree
1 - strongly disagree

1. If ________ were feeling badly, my first duty would be to cheer him (her) up.
   SA  MA  U  MD  SD
   5   4   3   2   1

2. I feel that I can confide in ________ about virtually everything.
   SA  MA  U  MD  SD
   5   4   3   2   1

3. I would find it easy to ignore ________'s faults.
   SA  MA  U  MD  SD
   5   4   3   2   1

4. I would do almost anything for ________.
   SA  MA  U  MD  SD
   5   4   3   2   1

5. I feel very possessive toward ________.
   SA  MA  U  MD  SD
   5   4   3   2   1

6. If I could never be with ________, I would feel miserable.
   SA  MA  U  MD  SD
   5   4   3   2   1

7. If I were lonely my first thought would be to seek ________ out.
   SA  MA  U  MD  SD
   5   4   3   2   1

8. One of my primary concerns is ________'s welfare.
   SA  MA  U  MD  SD
   5   4   3   2   1

9. I would forgive ________ for practically anything.
   SA  MA  U  MD  SD
   5   4   3   2   1

10. I feel responsible for ________'s well-being.
    SA  MA  U  MD  SD
    5   4   3   2   1
11. When I am with ________, I spend a great deal of time just looking at him/her.

12. I would greatly enjoy being confided in by _________.

13. It would be hard for me to get along without _________.

SA MA U MD SD

5   4   3   2   1