COMPARISON OF MALE AND FEMALE HOMOSEXUALS AND HETEROSEXUALS ON THE MASCULINITY/FEMININITY SCALE OF THE MINNESOTA MULTI-PHASIC PERSONALITY INVENTORY

APPROVED

Earl W. Hooker
Major Professor

Jack R. Haynes
Minor Professor

Dean of the School of Education

Robert B. Toulmin
Dean of the Graduate School
COMPARISON OF MALE AND FEMALE HOMOSEXUALS AND HETEROSEXUALS ON THE MASCULINITY / FEMININITY SCALE OF THE MINNESOTA MULTI-PHASIC PERSONALITY INVENTORY

THESIS

Presented to the Graduate Council of the North Texas State University in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements

For the Degree of

MASTER OF SCIENCE

By

Robert E. Pugh
Denton, Texas
January, 1969
# TABLE OF CONTENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chapter</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LIST OF TABLES</td>
<td>iv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.  INTRODUCTION</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Related Literature</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrument</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjects</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statistics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.  THE ANALYSIS OF DATA AND DISCUSSION</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPENDIX</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIBLIOGRAPHY</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## LIST OF TABLES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Means and Standard Deviations on the Masculinity/Femininity Scale for the Various Sub-Groups</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Results of the Analysis of Variance for the Masculinity/Femininity Scores on the Minnesota Multi-Phasic Personality Inventory</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Related Literature

A question which has often been raised by psychologists and laymen alike is concerned with the degree to which feminine traits characterize the male homosexual and masculine traits characterize the female homosexual. A typical definition of homosexuality implies a feminine orientation for male homosexuals and a masculine orientation for the female homosexual. "The homosexual is an individual endowed with sexual desires wholly or in part toward members of the same sex, and possesses characteristics psychic and physical traits of the opposite sex."\(^1\) Greenspoon and Campbell, using male homosexuals as subjects in their studies, have observed similar characteristics and have included them in the definition of homosexuality. "... it has been our experience that the majority of inverts display evidences of physical as well as psychic traits of effeminacy—an effeminate manner, appearance, temperament, and interest.

---

Delicacy of speech and movement, high-pitched voices, aesthetic interest, feminine body-conformation, and 'white-collar' occupations were particularly noticeable. This study would lead one to believe that homosexuality is both organic and psychological in nature.

On the other hand, Wortis conducted several studies, using male homosexuals and male and female heterosexuals as subjects, in an attempt to discover the difference between the male homosexual's body build and that of the male heterosexual and female heterosexual. Subjects for the study were a group of randomly selected male homosexuals above the age of twenty-three, and randomly selected male and female heterosexual subjects chosen from different sections of the United States. The subjects were measured for physical differences. Wortis concluded that some heterosexuals were more masculine in build than were many heterosexual men studied. As an example of the obvious non-descriptive differences in the body build of men, he suggested that one needed only to look around himself and it would be obvious that the differences among men's body build were not that significant. "One has only to look at a random group of adult

---

2H. Greenspoon and J. D. Campbell, "The Homosexual as a Personality Type," American Journal of Psychiatry, CI (March, 1945), 684.
men in the shower room of a bath house to see how very common, for example, the so-called feminine distribution of pubic hair actually is; or one may recollect how many otherwise normal men have high voices.

Magee, the author of One in Twenty, agreed with Wortis when Magee said that "homosexuals are made, not born. Physically they are no different from other people." He continues:

Many people seem to suppose that homosexuals have physical characteristics almost evenly balanced between the two sexes, or that they have a high proportion of the genes or hormones of the opposite sex, or that in some other way there is a strong physical factor involved—that their homosexuality is inborn, built into their physique. It is now agreed by every serious authority that this is not so.

The assumption that most, if not all, male homosexuals were more effeminate than heterosexuals in body build and psychic development is due in part to the male homosexuals themselves. Many of them use the feminine gender when talking to each other.

One male homosexual wrote in his autobiography:

In me there is a woman and there was a man. The woman was yours and submissive: the man used to

---


5Ibid.
rebel against that submissiveness. Women displeased me but I went after them to give myself a charge and to show myself that I was free. The conceited stupid man in me was the enemy of our love.  

In this passage one male homosexual is lamenting over his lost love, another male homosexual. He clearly expresses his feelings as being womanly.

Barrett used the Terman-Miles Masculine / Feminine scores in studying a male homosexual in New York. It was found that this man scored in the most feminine range of the test. The subject's interest and attitudes were also predominantly feminine in nature. In prisons many male homosexuals are called she men, indicating their feminine orientation.

Dean and Richardson administered the Minnesota Multi-Phasic Personality Inventory to forty college-educated male homosexuals who ranged from twenty to forty-two years of age, and to forty male heterosexuals in graduate school who ranged from twenty-two to

---


7 W. L. Barnette, "Study of an Adult Homosexual and Terman-Miles M/F Scores," American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, XII (June, 1942), 351.

thirty-five years in age. All scales of the Minnesota Multi-Phasic Personality Inventory were used in the study. They found that 'The mean profile of the homosexual group was only slightly higher than that of the comparison group and was still well below a T score of 70, with the exception of the Masculinity/Femininity scale.'

However, Dean and Richardson did not feel that the Masculinity/Femininity scores were valid because of the homosexual's degree of educational achievement. "Since our homosexual group was highly educated, we considered the Masculinity/Femininity difference between the group irrelevant, even though the homosexual group obtained significantly higher mean."  

In a review of Dean and Richardson's study of Zucker and Manosevitz explained that they felt that the differences obtained between the homosexuals and heterosexuals on the Masculinity/Femininity scales were valid to the study. "If anything the C group was more

---


highly educated. If elevated Masculinity/Femininity is entirely a result of educational level the differences between the two groups should have been reversed.\textsuperscript{11}

It seems justifiable to conclude, first, that Dean and Richardson, Zucker and Manosevitz all agree that in Dean and Richardson's original study homosexuals scored significantly higher than heterosexuals on the Masculinity/Femininity scale of the Minnesota Multi-Phasic Personality Inventory. Secondly, the two studies indicate that the Masculinity/Femininity scale can possibly be affected by one's educational achievement but that this scale measures more than Masculinity/Femininity preferences affected by educational achievement.

While there are those who would suggest that all male homosexuals were more effeminate in nature than male heterosexuals, there are others who have said that this was not true. Male homosexuals may be masculine or feminine in regard to their mannerisms and psychological nature. Marnor suggests that there could possibly be a continuum along which the masculine and feminine characteristics may lie. Extreme masculinity and extreme

\textsuperscript{11}Robert A. Zucker and Martin Manosevitz, "MMPI Patterns of Overt Male Homosexuals: Reinterpretation and Comment on Dean and Richardson's Study," \textit{Journal of Consulting Psychology}, XXX (December, 1966), 566.
femininity would be at opposite ends, and there would be many degrees in between the extremes on which one may lie. 12 Whitener, with the use of his questionnaire, found that a great many of the male overt homosexuals among college students were not effeminate. 13 Aaronson and Grumpelt, after giving the Minnesota Multi-Phasic Personality Inventory to a number of homosexuals stated that

The persistent stereotype that homosexuals are in personality more like individuals of the opposite sex seems as a result to require re-evaluation. In addition, the varying proportion of homosexual outlet noted by Kinsey, et al (1948 and 1953), and the delineation by Hathaway (1951) of a number of different kinds of homosexuals, raise further question as to the validity of this concept. If the stereotype is true, then personality measures which differentiate men from women should also differentiate homosexuals from heterosexuals, even though the correlation between these measures is low. 14

They further reported that many of the homosexual men tested scored extremely high on the Masculinity Scale. 15 Bergler also found in his


15 Ibid.
year of clinical practice that there were many male homosexuals

who depicted extremely masculine characteristics in their

behavior.  Female homosexuals, lesbians, have been described as

being more masculine in their mannerisms than the female hetero-

sexual.  This general assumption was disagreed with by Keiser,

Sylvan, and Schaffer.  They seem to feel that there were masculine

and feminine lesbians just as they were masculine and feminine

homosexual men.

Modern theorists, such as Dollard, Miller, Mead and Henry

feel that homosexuality was a result of faulty sex typing.  The

child was identified as a boy or girl, and his relationships with

others were defined in terms of sex type.  This typing began with

male and female names, clothes, play patterns, toys, and was con-

tinued throughout life by defining specialized sex roles for men and

women.  As the Oedipus complex arose, the sex roles were further

complicated.  The boy child felt a symbolic sexual love for his


16Edmund Bergler, Homosexuality, Disease or Way of Life

17Keiser, Sylvan, and Schaffer, "Environmental Factors

in Homosexuality in Adolescent Girls," Psychological Review,
XXXVI (February, 1949), 284.

18John Dollard and Neal Miller, Personality and

p. 142.
mother; this put the child in conflict with the father, causing the child to develop castration anxiety. This anxiety repressed, coupled with the failure to sharply define the sex type, possibly caused a perverse sexual adjustment. The child was now confused because his first heterosexual love had been such a failure and his sex roles had not been clearly defined. Heterosexuality has been labeled undesirable now. Therefore, the male child sought to imitate his dominant mother and win the affections of his father; or the child possibly imitated his mother because of an unconscious hate or lack of respect for his submissive father.

Faulty sex typing, coupled with an unnatural solution to the Oedipus complex, resulted in the male homosexual. The female child experienced the same problems, except for the castration anxiety. Instead of the castration anxiety, she had a penis envy when she discovered that her mother was pleased because her father (all men) had a penis and she, as a female, did not. This theory strongly implied that male homosexuals were more effeminate than heterosexual males and that homosexual females were more masculine than heterosexual females.
Hypothesis

Because of the controversies concerning the degrees of effeminacy and masculinity displayed in the male homosexual and the female homosexual, and also because of the lack of research done in this area, a study involving these characteristics is most needed. In the present study it was hypothesized that male homosexuals would score significantly higher on the Masculinity / Femininity scale of the Minnesota Multi-Phasic Personality Inventory than would heterosexual men and that female homosexuals would score significantly higher on the Masculinity / Femininity Scale of the Minnesota Multi-Phasic Personality Inventory than would heterosexual females.

Instrument

The Masculinity / Femininity Scale of the Minnesota Multi-Phasic Personality Inventory was used as the criterion of Masculinity and Femininity in this study because of its basic design for testing the degrees of Masculinity / Femininity tendencies. "The Masculinity / Femininity Scale of the MMPI was designed to measure the tendency of an individual toward masculinity or femininity of
interest pattern. The Minnesota Multi-Phasic Personality Inventory Masculinity / Femininity Scale was also used because of its popularity in related studies involving homosexuality. "High Masculinity / Femininity scores in the investigation were associated with both homosexual problems and emotional instability."^20

Subjects

Subjects for this study were twenty each of male and female homosexuals and twenty each of male and female heterosexuals. Thirty of each were asked to cooperate on the assumption that all who said they would participate would not. If more than twenty of each group did take the Masculinity / Femininity Scale of the Minnesota Multi-Phasic Personality Inventory, twenty scores were chosen at random for this study. All subjects who participated were high school graduates and about 80 per cent had finished or were now in college. Ages of the subjects ranged from nineteen to forty-three years. The mean ages for the different groups were as follows:

(1) heterosexual males -- 22.6 years; (2) homosexual males --

---


^20 Ibid., p. 160.
25.2 years; (3) heterosexual females--25.4 years; and
(4) homosexual females--25.5 years. The homosexuals were
selected from a random sample of homosexual "gay" bars in a large
Southwestern city. One male homosexual and one female homosexual
bar were selected. Male homosexuals and female homosexuals were
visited, respectively, on a Monday and Tuesday night between the
hours of nine p.m. and eleven p.m. or until thirty subjects from
each bar had agreed to take the Masculinity/Femininity Scale of the
Minnesota Multi-Phasic Personality Inventory and had agreed to meet
at a given time for the testing. Both the male and female homosex-
uals did not know the full nature of the study. They were told that a
psychological investigation was being made into some possible differ-
ences between homosexuals and heterosexuals. It was explained that
they were at no time to give their full name to the examiner. Only
first names or nicknames were to be used. Along with the
Minnesota Multi-Phasic Personality Inventory test sheets, the homo-
sexuals were asked to complete a questionnaire concerning their age,
vocational interest, marital status, and their educational level. All
subjects used in the homosexual groups were self-admitted homo-
sexuals.

The heterosexuals were chosen from two bars which were
selected at random from the bars listed in the yellow pages of the
telephone directory. Subjects were approached and asked if they would participate in a short psychological test designed to study some possible differences between people who attend and people who do not attend bars. The assumption was made that the twenty males and females asked to participate were heterosexuals. These bars were also visited on a Monday and Tuesday night between nine and eleven p.m., or until thirty participants were obtained.

When the heterosexual subjects met for testing, they were given a short questionnaire along with the Minnesota Multi-Phasic Personality Inventory. The questions pertained to the general nature of bar-goers, educational level, subject's age, vocation and marital status. There were two additional questions asking if the subject had ever had sexual relations with a member of the (1) opposite sex, and (2) same sex since his eighteenth birthday. No names were used on the test sheets or questionnaires. The need for honesty and truthfulness was stressed. Any subject indicating that he had had sexual relations with a member of the same sex since his eighteenth birthday was not used as a heterosexual subject in this study. His questionnaire and Minnesota Multi-Phasic Personality Inventory were disregarded.
Design and Statistics

A two by two analysis of variance design was employed and the .05 level of significance was the required criterion for rejecting the null hypothesis. The null hypotheses concerning the two main effects and the interaction hypothesis were tested. The main effect comparisons involved the difference between homosexuals and heterosexuals on the Masculinity/Femininity Scale and the differences between the males and females.
CHAPTER II

ANALYSIS OF DATA AND DISCUSSION

It was hypothesized in this study that male homosexuals would score significantly higher on the Masculinity / Femininity Scale of the Minnesota Multi-Phasic Personality Inventory than would heterosexual males and also that female homosexuals would score significantly higher on the Masculinity / Femininity Scale of the Minnesota Multi-Phasic Personality Inventory than would heterosexual females. A two by two analysis of variance design was employed to test the hypothesis.

As shown in Table I, the homosexual males had a mean T score of 80.45; the homosexual females had a mean T score of 58.75; whereas the heterosexual males had a mean T score of 62.70, and the heterosexual females had a mean T score of 45.95. The combined mean for male and female homosexuals was 69.60 and the combined mean for male and female heterosexuals was 54.33.

As shown in Table II, the F for the difference between homosexual and heterosexual groups was 43.58, which was significant at better than the .05 level; therefore the null hypothesis was
rejected, and the research hypothesis was accepted. This result thus supported some of the studies cited in Chapter I which indicated that homosexual males were more effeminate than heterosexual males and that homosexual females were more masculine than heterosexual females.

**TABLE I**

MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS ON THE MASCULINITY/FEMININITY SCALE FOR THE VARIOUS SUB-GROUPS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Homosexuals</th>
<th>Heterosexuals</th>
<th>Homosexuals and Heterosexuals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Males</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>80.45</td>
<td>62.70</td>
<td>M 71.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Females</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>58.75</td>
<td>45.95</td>
<td>M 52.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>11.69</td>
<td>8.95</td>
<td>S.D. 12.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Males and Females</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>69.60</td>
<td>54.32</td>
<td>M 61.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>15.43</td>
<td>12.37</td>
<td>S.D. 15.93</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Mean

2 Standard Deviation

The interaction hypothesis was tested and found to have an $F$ of 1.14, which is not significant at the .05 level. This further substantiated the original hypothesis that the significant difference
existed between homosexuals and heterosexuals, since this result indicated that the differences were consistent across sexes.

TABLE II

RESULTS OF THE ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR THE MASCULINITY /FEMININITY SCORES ON THE MINNESOTA MULTI-PHASIC PERSONALITY INVENTORY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Degrees of Freedom</th>
<th>Variance Estimate</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Homosexual-Heterosexual</td>
<td>7,392.01</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7,392.01</td>
<td>69.03</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male-Female</td>
<td>4,666.51</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4,666.51</td>
<td>43.58</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction</td>
<td>122.52</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>122.52</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>NS1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>8,137.85</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>107.08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>20,318.89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1Not Significant

When the sub-groups were compared, it could be seen that the direction of the differences supported the theoretical orientation from which the hypotheses were derived. However, the male homosexual group scored higher proportionately on the Masculinity/Femininity Scale of the Minnesota Multi-Phasic Personality
Inventory than did the female homosexual group. This would seem to indicate that, in general, homosexual males were proportionately more effeminate than homosexual females were masculine. Also the means for the males for the homosexual and heterosexual groups combined were significantly different from females for both homosexual and heterosexual groups combined. The group of masculine homosexuals and heterosexuals obtained a mean of 71.57, and the group of feminine homosexuals and heterosexuals obtained a mean of 52.35. The F was 69.03, which was also significant at the .05 level. This significance was not expected. The homosexual males scored more than two standard deviations above the national mean for males, as was predicted, and the heterosexual males also scored higher than the national mean for males but within the "normal" range. The homosexual females scored higher than the national mean, as was expected, but not as high proportionately as did the homosexual males, and the heterosexual females scored somewhat lower than the national mean for females. However, both of the female groups scored within the "normal" range. This "normality" of the homosexual females raised some question about the meaning of the data, but the reason for this result was inexplicable. Education and age were both distributed similarly in the
samples, thus eliminating any possible unequal effects that these may have had on the results.

The homosexual subjects were very cooperative and most helpful; however, the heterosexuals seemed to feel somewhat reluctant to cooperate. What effect this may have had on the results is difficult to determine. Though it was not discernible in the homosexual female samples, if this reluctance was present across both female groups, this could have produced a kind of compensatory effort to appear more "normal."
CHAPTER III

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

It was hypothesized in this study that male homosexuals would score significantly higher on the Masculinity / Femininity Scale of the Minnesota Multi-Phasic Personality Inventory than would male heterosexuals and that female homosexuals would score significantly higher on the Masculinity / Femininity Scale of the Minnesota Multi-Phasic Personality Inventory than would female heterosexuals. Some research in the related literature provided some support for the above-stated hypothesis, as did some theoretical positions.

The Masculinity / Femininity Scale of the Minnesota Multi-Phasic Personality Inventory was administered to twenty each of male and female homosexuals and twenty each of male and female heterosexuals. Subjects were chosen at selected bars on Monday and Tuesday nights of consecutive weeks. The homosexuals were told that an investigation was being made into some possible differences between homosexuals and heterosexuals. Additional questionnaires were administered to each group in order to insure that the subjects were approximately equally distributed according to age and education.
The heterosexual subjects were told that a study was being conducted into the possible differences between people who attend and people who do not attend bars. The questionnaire for the heterosexuals differed from that of the homosexuals as follows: (1) it contained questions concerning bar-goers; and (2) it contained an additional two questions, asking if the subject had ever had sexual relations with a member of (a) the opposite sex, or (b) the same sex since his eighteenth birthday. No names were used on the test sheets or questionnaires. Any subject indicating that he had had sexual relations with a member of the same sex since his eighteenth birthday was not used as a heterosexual subject.

A two by two analysis of variance design was employed. The homosexual males had a mean T score of 80.45; the homosexual females had a mean T score of 58.75; the heterosexual males had a mean T score of 62.20; and the heterosexual females had a mean T score of 45.95. The combined mean for the homosexuals was 69.60 and the combined mean for the heterosexuals was 54.32. The F for the differences between the homosexual and heterosexual groups was 43.50, which was significant at the .05 level. The interaction was tested and resulted in an F of 1.14, which is not significant at the .05 level. The original hypothesis that male homosexuals were more effeminate than male heterosexuals and that female homosexuals
were more masculine than female heterosexuals was retained, thus substantiating previous studies cited in support of this hypothesis. The null hypothesis was therefore rejected and the research hypothesis accepted.

The males and females differed significantly, with an $F$ of 69.03, which was an unexpected result. The homosexual males scored more than two standard deviations above the national mean for males, as was predicted, and the heterosexual males also scored higher than the national mean for males but within the "normal" range. The homosexual females scored higher than the national mean, as was expected, but not as high proportionately as did the homosexual males, and the heterosexual females scored somewhat lower than the national mean for females.

The homosexual subjects were very cooperative and most helpful; however, the heterosexuals seemed to feel somewhat reluctant to cooperate. What effect this may have had on the results is difficult to determine. Though it was not discernible in the homosexual female sample, if this reluctance was present across both female groups this could have produced a kind of compensatory effort to appear more "normal." It is suggested that in future studies of this type the subjects be given the questionnaires with a self-addressed stamped envelope and asked to mail these to the tester.
This would enable the testee to maintain additional privacy and thus alleviate his feelings that he personally is being investigated.

Studies involving homosexuals would further benefit if subjects could be used that were not in themselves such a particular group as bar-goers. A more general or normal sample of homosexuals would be difficult to find but such a sample would certainly be desirable.
APPENDIX I

QUESTIONNAIRE ADMINISTERED TO HETEROSEXUAL SUBJECTS
ALONG WITH THE MASCULINITY / FEMININITY SCALE OF THE
MINNESOTA MULTI-PHASIC PERSONALITY INVENTORY

Questionnaire

1. Do you like bars? [ ] Yes [ ] No
2. How often do you go to a bar?
   [ ] Weekly
   [ ] Monthly
   [ ] Yearly
3. Do you go alone? [ ] Yes [ ] No
4. Do you prefer to go alone? [ ] Yes [ ] No
5. Do you get intoxicated often?
   [ ] Once a week
   [ ] Once a month
   [ ] Once a year
6. How old are you? _______ Birthday _________________________
7. Sex: [ ] Male [ ] Female
8. [ ] Married [ ] Single [ ] Divorced
9. Last grade formal education? ________________________________
10. Vocation (or intended vocation)? __________________________
11. Have you had sexual relations since your eighteenth birthday with the opposite sex? [ ] Yes [ ] No
12. Have you had sexual relations with a member of the same sex since your eighteenth birthday?[ ] Yes [ ] No
APPENDIX II

QUESTIONNAIRE ADMINISTERED TO HOMOSEXUAL SUBJECTS
ALONG WITH THE MASCULINITY / FEMININITY SCALE OF
THE MINNESOTA MULTI-PHASIC
PERSONALITY INVENTORY

Questionnaire

1. Age ________________
2. Birthday ________________
3. Sex: [ ] Male [ ] Female
4. [ ] Married [ ] Divorced [ ] Single
   [ ] Gay marriage
5. Last grade of formal education completed ________________
6. Vocation (your job or intended job) ________________
BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books


Articles


