To the Graduate Council:

I am submitting herewith a dissertation written by Shelley M. Chavoor entitled "Sexual Identity, Object Choice, and Life Styles Among Women." I recommend that it be accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy, with a major in Psychology.

Charles P. Cohen, Ph.D.
Charles P. Cohen, Ph.D., Chairman

We have read this dissertation
and recommend its acceptance:

Accepted for the Council:

L. Evans Beck
Vice Chancellor
Graduate Studies and Research

SEXUAL IDENTITY, OBJECT CHOICE, AND LIFE STYLES AMONG WOMEN

A Dissertation

Presented for the

Doctor of Philosophy

Degree

The University of Tennessee, Knoxville

Shelley M. Chavoor

June 1981

3051960

Copyright by Shelley M. Chavoor 1981

All Rights Reserved

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I wish to thank the members of my Committee: Charles P. Cohen, Ph.D., William S. Verplanck, Ph.D., Wesley Morgan, Ph.D., and Alice E. Moses, Ph.D. for their guidance and encouragement. They each contributed complementary ideas and expertise.

My parents, Sherman and Joan Chavoor deserve recognition and thanks for providing me with both the financial and emotional support I needed during this project. John K. Hunter and Alma I. Silverthorn contributed much through their thoughtful and constructive comments and encouragement during the writing process. Hazel Tileston was invaluable for her editing and typing of the manuscript.

I would also like to thank contacts in the community who provided me with the names of possible participants.

Finally, I owe a great deal to the women who so generously gave of themselves during the interviews--they made this project possible, and I dedicate this study to them.

ABSTRACT

A sample of 23 lesbian and 23 heterosexual women from the Sacramento and San Francisco Bay areas of California, who were matched on the basis of age, race or ethnic background, socioeconomic status, and educational level, participated in individual, indepth, freely structured interviews regarding topics that they considered important to their life styles. The majority of these women were white, well-educated, and employed at relatively high level occupations.

After all of the interviews were completed, a comprehensive set of categories was generated from the interview transcripts so that aspects of both the process and content of the interviews could be organized and analyzed. The categories were arranged under the following general topic areas:

1. Demographic and Interview Process Categories (including psychological adjustment categories)
2. Work Categories
3. Relationship Categories
4. Children/Motherhood/Parenthood Categories
5. Family of Origin Categories
6. Sex-Role Categories
7. Sexual Object-Choice Categories
8. Miscellaneous Categories (including religion, friends, activities, being alone, and critical lifetime events)

Each transcript was scored on the basis of this category system and the data derived from these transcripts were easily prepared for computer processing and analysis. An independent rater was trained in the category system and subsequently scored three transcripts chosen at random, achieving a high rate of interobserver reliability. Frequency tables were generated and chi square tests were individually computed for all categories.

Few significant differences between lesbian and heterosexual subjects were found in the eight general topic areas except in the area of sexual object choice. This suggests that the major difference in life styles between the heterosexual and lesbian women of this sample is their sexual-object preference. Both lesbian and heterosexual life styles among the women in this study were reflective of the general life style options available for women within the American cultural context. There was also evidence to suggest that many of these women, both heterosexual and lesbian, were feeling the effects of--and adapting to--recent transitions in sex-role behavior in this culture.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER		PAGE
1	INTRODUCTION AND REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	1
2.	METHODOLOGY	21
	Subjects	21
	Interview Technique	30
	Procedures	32
	Data Analysis	33
3.	RESULTS	38
	Section 1	38
	Demographic and Interview Process Categories	38
	Section 2	41
	Work Categories	41
	Section 3	45
	Primary Relationship Categories	45
	Section 4	50
	Children/Motherhood/Parenthood Categories	50
	Section 5	50
	Family of Origin Categories	50
	Section 6	53
	Sex-Role Categories	53
	Section 7	57
	Sexual-Object Choice Categories	57

CHAPTER PAGE

Section 8 62
Miscellaneous Categories 62
Section 9 65
Summary 65
4 DISCUSSION 66
Section 1 67
Demographic Information and Interview Process . . . 67
Section 2 73
Work 73
Section 3 77
Primary Relationships 77
Section 4 80
Children/Motherhood/Parenthood 80
Section 5 82
Family of Origin 82
Section 6 83
Sex Role 83
Section 7 86
Sexual-Object Choice 86
Section 8 88
Miscellaneous Information 88
Section 9 91
Summary and Conclusions 91

CHAPTER PAGE

BIBLIOGRAPHY 92

APPENDICES 101

APPENDIX A. INFORMED CONSENT: LONG FORM 103

INFORMED CONSENT: SHORT FORM 104

INTERVIEW CHECK LIST 105

SUMMARY DATA SHEET AND INTERVIEW CONDITIONS . . 106

POST INTERVIEW QUESTIONS 107

OCCUPATION OF WOMEN INTERVIEWED 108

APPENDIX B. INTERVIEW CATEGORIES 109

APPENDIX C. FREQUENCY COUNTS FOR INTERVIEW CATEGORIES . . . 145

APPENDIX D. INTERVIEW EXCERPTS 182

VITA 305

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE		PAGE
1	Interobserver Reliability	36
2	Demographic Categories Specifically Related to Matching Lesbian and Heterosexual Subjects	39
3	Other Demographic Categories	40
4	Interview Process Categories	42
5	Categories Regarding Subject's Psychological Adjustment	42
6	Categories Regarding Subject's Employment History and Current Status, Work Role, and Nature of Employment	43
7	Categories Regarding Subject's Occupational Choices	46
8	Categories Regarding the Relationship of Work to Other Life Priorities	47
9	Categories Regarding Primary Relationship Status, Patterns, Expectations, and Commitment	48
10	Content Issues Mentioned as Important by Subjects Regarding Primary Relationships	51
11	Children, Motherhood, Parental Responsibility, and Family Stability	52
12	Family of Origin Categories	54
13	Categories Regarding Sex Role, Sex-role Conflict, and Sex-role Transition	55

TABLE PAGE

14 Parental Sex-role Models and Expectations Regarding Subject's Sex-role Options 58

15 Sexual Object Choice Categories 59

16 Friends, Activities, and Being Alone 63

17 Categories Regarding Critical Lifetime Events 64

18 Categories Regarding Religion 64

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION AND REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Theory and research in the area of sexual identity, sex roles, and the encompassing framework of human sexuality are complex, contradictory, and confusing. The area has been (and is) considered and researched from innumerable perspectives and biases, the result of which provides anything but a clear, coherent picture. It seems unreasonable to assume that there would be simple answers to complex issues and questions.

The modern[1] history of the study of issues concerning human sexuality, from Krafft-Ebing and Havelock Ellis, through Freud and Kinsey, to Masters and Johnson, has always been fraught with controversy and dissension. This situation is not difficult to comprehend when one considers the intricacy with which issues regarding sexuality are woven into the fabric of human culture. To stand apart from those things which are integral to a given culture, to examine and question them is no easy task, especially given the propensity of all cultures to imbue their habits, customs, mores, and rules with an aura of truth and rightness. Members of a culture are not often in a position to recognize their own cultural assumptions, let alone question them.

---

[1] Paul Robinson, in "The Modernization of Sex" (1976) considers the years 1890 to 1910 to mark an important watershed in western man's mental history. "Modern" refers to predominantly 20th century developments.

The consideration of human sexuality as a legitimate topic of "scientific" inquiry by the early sex researchers was a monumental transgression of the rules of genteel Victorian society at the turn of the century. The history of the study of human sexuality is a topic in its own right, and it is not within the scope of this paper to discuss it in any more than passing detail. It is sufficient to highlight the fact that the topic is controversial because it is tightly intertwined with so many hidden cultural assumptions about the meaning and nature of the world and the relationship of people to this world and with one another.

In order to construct a framework for the central topic of this study--sexual identity, object choice, and life styles among women--it is appropriate to begin at the beginning with this observation: Human beings, for the most part, can be divided into two sexes on the basis of anatomical configuration, and there are significant variations and differences in the patterns of what these two sexes do and how they behave. Although there is enormous and overlapping variety in what the two sexes do across culture, one can note specific differences in the behavioral patterns between the two sexes within a culture. (Only a small part of these behavioral patterns concern those behaviors having to do with erotic or genital aspects of sexuality directly, although these erotic/genital behaviors are always imbedded within a context of other socio-sexual behaviors.)

Males and females in a given culture tend to do different things--they adopt social roles and engage in patterns of behavior which differ on the basis of gender. If one asks a male and female of a given

culture about these differences, chances are that the differences will be immediately recognized by them and that the major elements of what these individuals report as "what it is to be male or female" will correspond with what other males and females of the same culture will report. From talking with a variety of individuals in a given culture, one could derive some consistent descriptions of differences in behavioral patterns between males and females. When one asks the question, "Why?" the results will be quite different. This kind of question calls for answers requiring a level of reflectivity that differs in nature and scope from the previous question. The easiest answer to this question, and one which makes a good deal of sense, is, of course, "This is what people do." Other alternatives might be: "It is God's will," "It's biology," "People learn to do what they do," etc. In other words, people attempt to justify themselves and their behavior from a variety of viewpoints, be they religious, biological, sociological, psychological, etc. Much theorizing and research about the nature of sexual identity and sex-role differences have been conducted on the basis of these varying points of view.

Leaving the religious aspects of human sexuality to theologians, the following discussion will review briefly the biological, psychological, and sociological points of view. One of the central focuses of controversy in the past has been in regard to the relative impact of biological components of sexual difference and the more sociological or environmental components; in other words, the "nature/nurture" controversy. Currently, the juxtaposition of nature versus nurture is outmoded. According to Money and Ehrhardt (1977):

> Modern genetic theory avoids these antiquated dichotomies, and postulates a genetic norm of reaction which, for its proper expression, requires phyletically prescribed environmental boundaries . . . . The basic proposition should not be a dichotomization of genetics and environment, but their interaction. (p. 1)

From a strictly biological perspective, one would view differences in sex role behavior as expressions of alternatives in the basic biological make-up of the individual, biology thus being viewed as a primary factor in a whole realm of complex socio-cultural behaviors. Biological explanation has been used (or misused) to validate and justify cultural assumptions and values having little to do with biology (except in terms of the "natural endowment" of human beings with the capability of creating cultures and cultural meanings). Indeed, the work of Freud, in regard to sexual differentiation, reflects this tendency to use biological explanations in support of a given cultural system. (In fact, many of the early sexual theories and theorists, while overtly innovative and controversial, provided the culture with just another source of validation; this time, in the guise of "science.")

Biological approaches have yielded data to substantiate some sexual differences in human beings. However, the impact of these biological deviations or sex-role differences is difficult to isolate. To quote a classic paper by Hamburg and Lynde (in Maccoby, 1966):

> From this moment on (the moment of birth) the child's maleness or femaleness is constantly reinforced. It is difficult, then, to determine the extent to which the child's learning of his sex role may be influenced by underlying biological predispositions. (In E. Maccoby "The Development of Sex Differences" p. 15)

Early research by Money (1961) and Hampson and Hampson (1961) suggests that gender role is entirely the result of learning processes

which are independent of chromosomal, gonadal, or hormonal sex. In their research, they looked at individuals whose sex assignment was either incorrect or ambiguous because of their external genitalia. These individuals established an identity or gender role in line with the sex role in which they were reared--not in terms of their actual genetic make-up--that is, their biological sex. In fact, it was found that individuals who underwent a reassignment of sex after early childhood had "poor psychological adjustment." This led them to hypothesize a "critical period" for establishment of gender role, roughly between the ages of 18 months and 3 years. These researchers conclude from their findings that humans are psychosexually neutral at birth (Hampson, 1955; Money, 1961; Money, Hampson, & Hampson, 1957).

Later, this concept of psychosexual neutrality was criticized in a major review by Diamond (1965), who came to the conclusion that prenatal genetic and hormonal influences predispose human beings at birth to a gender orientation, and that

> [Sexual role and gender role] are not neutral and without initial direction at birth. . . . Nevertheless, sexual predisposition is only a potentiality setting limits to a pattern that is greatly modifiable by ontogenic experience. (p. 167)

Given that biology is a relatively permissive limit-setter in terms of the possibility of a seemingly infinite variety of sex-role behaviors within and across cultures, how, then, do those who take a more environmental or social perspective address the question of how people behave the way they do?

Walter Mischel addresses this issue from a social learning perspective in an article titled, "A Social Learning View of Sex

Differences in Behavior" (in Maccoby, 1966). Mischel sees sex-typed behaviors as "Behaviors that typically elicit different rewards for one sex than for the other. In other words, sex-typed behaviors have consequences that vary according to the sex of the performer" (p. 56). He essentially describes the acquisition and performance of sex-typed behaviors or sex roles in terms of the same learning principles as are used to analyze any other aspect of an individual's behavior. According to Mischel, an individual first "learns to discriminate between sex-typed behavior patterns, then to generalize from these specific learning experiences to new situations, and finally to perform sex-typed behavior" (p. 57). The people of every culture essentially teach their offspring their own particular brand of sex-role behavior. The variety and complexity of these behaviors cross-culturally are seemingly infinite. Whereas Mischel does not deny the existence of "mediating cognitive processes" in sex-role acquisition, he views these processes in much the same way as external stimuli whose effects are lawfully determined by his previous learning history" (p. 62).

Kohlberg, in an article in the same book (Maccoby, 1966), looks at development of sex-role behaviors from a different perspective. According to Kohlberg, "Basic sexual attitudes are not patterned directly by either biological instincts or arbitrary cultural norms, but by the child's cognitive organization of his social world along sex-role dimensions" (p. 82). Kohlberg suggests that there are natural components involved in a child's sex-role attitudes because many aspects of these attitudes appear to be universal across culture and family structure. At a certain age, boys and girls label themselves

as male or female, and essentially establish a stable gender identity based on physical attributes of the body. After this point, they acquire those values and behaviors that are in line with their basic self-concept as a male or female. This approach differs significantly from Mischel, who sees the child's behaviors and values as determined, not by gender identity, but by social-learning history. Mischel concurs with Festinger (1957) and Brehm and Cohen (1962) that behavioral performance precedes cognitive and value structuring. In other words, values and cognitions are arranged in such a way as to make them consistent with behavior.

The individual learns a variety of different behaviors, many of which are differentially reinforced on the basis of sex. Moreover, the individual learns to organize these behaviors in elaborate and complex systems and learns to think about and describe these systems in terms of a verbal system of meanings and values which is culturally prescribed and reinforced. Certainly this acquisition of complex behavior is developmentally mediated in terms of the individual's ability and developmental readiness to acquire a complex behavioral repertoire (which includes undisplayed aspects such as thinking). However, what the individual learns is dependent upon what the culture teaches. According to Money and Ehrhardt (1977), establishment of core gender identity is a process of learning in terms of taking place within the context of social interaction. However, they point out that the age of establishment of conceptual language is also the age of establishing a gender differentiated self-concept. They acknowledge the establishment of language as a process of learning, but note that vocal,

syntactical, conceptual speech is possible only in the human species due to a brain which has been "phyletically programed" to be able to acquire speech.

Moving away from phylogeny and returning to "what the culture teaches," one finds very complicated and interwoven systems of behavior and meaning. An individual does not just learn a set of sex-role behaviors; these behaviors are given shape within an elaborate social context. Seemingly disconnected behaviors become related to one another in culturally meaningful ways. Individuals acquire a gender label on the basis of physical attributes, which also include a multitude of socially prescribed sexual roles (behaviors) having to do with such diverse issues as how they physically move and dress, what work they might do to earn a living, how and with whom they might engage in sexual/erotic behavior, what kinds of living arrangements might be made, what kind and level of education they might receive, religious involvement and role, etc. Behavioral differentiation on the basis of sexual identity cuts across many and diverse aspects of a culture. Across cultures, males and females engage in a seemingly infinite variety of behaviors. It is important to note that what is an acceptable sex-role behavior for a given sex in one culture might be totally unacceptable in another; also that some cultures might have similar sex-role expectations in one area, but be different in other areas. What determines a particular culture's sex-role structure is an impossible question to answer, but what is important to understand is that

> The members of any society, as participants in its cultural pattern inevitably perceive some of the dictates of that

> cultural pattern as eternal varieties and perhaps, even as expressions of immutable, natural and moral law. (Money & Ehrhardt, 1977, pp. 125-126)

Certainly this phenomenon makes it difficult to look at one's own culture with any degree of objectivity.

Questions remain unasked because they remain hidden by the observer's own internalization of cultural truths and perspectives. For example, where Freud may have accurately described some aspects of his culture's process for the enculturation of males and females, he remained bound by the culture's perspective of "what is right"--the attitude which holds femaleness to be somehow inferior. To be more specific, there is probably some descriptive truth to the Oedipal situation, given the culture's family structure, attitudes about raising children, and parental participation in that process, etc. However, the language that Freud employed raises his descriptions to the level of biological imperative. His theories embodied the culture's view of the "natural" inferiority of women with such notions as "penis envy" and "weakness of super-ego structure" in females because of the lack of "castration anxiety." Freud remained essentially imbedded in his culture (even though his theories of sexuality initially offended and shocked his culture), and thus did not question his own assumptions about the nature of maleness and femaleness.

As discussed previously, males and females engage in a variety of different behaviors which are organized in a way which becomes meaningful within a cultural context. Certain ways of being are ascribed with "masculinity" or "femininity." These ways of being have to do with what an individual does, how he/she may think or feel, what

decisions might be made--essentially having a very important impact on how an individual lives his/her life. Gagnon and Simon (1973), in their book "Sexual Conduct," describe the acquisition of sexual behaviors and cultural meanings in terms of the learning of complicated scripts. Most researchers tend to look at erotic-sexual behavior in human beings apart from the social context. To quote Gagnon and Simon in reference to Freud and Kinsey, "It is this assembly of the reality of the body and the social and cultural sources of attributed meaning that is missing in the two greatest modern students of sexuality in the West" (p. 5). Whereas focus of the book, "Sexual Conduct" is on those components of sex-role behavior having to do with the erotic, the book is significant in terms of putting those behaviors in their place within the sociocultural context. Instead of viewing the cultural and social matrix as setting limits upon the expression of sexual drive, Gagnon and Simon see the social meanings given to the physical component as releasers of biological events. The social components of sexual behavior do not inhibit the expression of biological events, but

> [They provide] the channels through which biology is expressed. . . . Admitting the existence of a biological substrate for sex in no way allows a greater degree of biological determinism than is true of other areas of corresponding intersection. Indeed, the reverse is more likely to be true: the sexual areas may be precisely that realm wherein the superordinate position of the sociocultural over the biological level is most complete. (p. 15)

These same authors elaborate: "Without the proper elements of a script that defines the situation, names the actors, and plots the behavior, nothing sexual is likely to happen" (p. 19).

The sexual "script" Gagnon and Simon describe is complexly related to social prescriptions of how an individual should live his or her life. Sexuality--or the sexual script--can be seen as an expression of social roles. Delving into the tangled web of traditional western culture, we find that erotic-sexuality has been linked with a social institution called marriage and family. Traditional marriage and family entail an intricate network of roles and relationships which are differentiated by sex, (i.e., wife, mother, housewife, husband, father, provider, son, daughter, sister, brother, etc.).

The family also provides the setting for a person to live his or her life, given that the traditional living situation has been within the domain of the family. Modern marriage and the establishment of family is linked to a heterosexual bonding; that is, two adult individuals of the opposite sex establishing an erotic-sexual relationship, generally viewed as exclusive. What erotic-sexuality has to do with the wide variety of other roles and behaviors entailed in marriage and family can be rather confusing if one attempts to discern a logical reason for such a link. Basically, the link is an arbitrary one; it's just how our particular culture has organized things. Clearly, erotic-sexuality is only a small part of all the behaviors that come to be linked with, and seen as expressions of social roles. If one is willing to seriously look at and question the cultural order of things, it is possible to be overwhelmed by the arbitrariness of this order--overwhelmed particularly in the existential sense that one is confronted with meaninglessness. Cultural verities no longer provide shelter from this dilemma.

In our particular culture, physical gender is linked with a specific set of sex roles and behaviors; these sex-linked roles and behaviors cover a realm of very diverse behaviors, including erotic-sexual behaviors. Somehow these behaviors have come to be seen as mutually dependent upon one another--they are ordered by the culture in such a way that it seems to make a difference if this order is changed--at least members of the culture behave in a manner that would suggest that they are linked. For example, variance from the expected cultural pattern for what is defined as women's work can have an impact on sexual desirability, which, in turn, can have an impact on formation of marriage and familial relationships. It used to be that being a professional woman (as opposed to a homemaker) was synonymous with being "manishly" aggressive, sexually unattractive, and single.

Mirra Komarovsky cites several examples of this kind of linkage through excerpts from autobiographical documents of undergraduate college women in an article entitled "Cultural Contradictions and Sex Roles" (in Bardwick, 1972). Here is one example:

> I also work for a big metropolitan daily as a correspondent . . . I have a lot of acclaim, but also criticism, and I find it confusing and difficult to be praised for being clever and working hard and then, when my efforts promise to be successful, to be condemned and criticized for being unfeminine and ambitious. Here are a few of these reactions: My father: "I don't like this newspaper set-up at all. The people you meet are making you less interested in marriage than ever. You're getting too educated and intellectual to be attractive to men." (p. 60)

The use of a female example is not intended to imply that males are not subjected to this seemingly arbitrary cultural linkage of behaviors. In many respects, men are more narrowly confined in terms

of occupational behavior (as well as a whole range of other behaviors), than women. Currently in our culture there has been a loosening up or changing of sex-role definitions for women, allowing them to engage in a wider variety of behaviors and still be considered feminine (thereby eligible to participate in other sex-linked social behaviors such as marriage and family).

Even with this changing of traditional sexual and sex-role arrangements, the impact of previous cultural tradition is still very much a part of our lives. People are a little less sure of some of the cultural rules regarding how they live their lives.

When an individual transgresses a cultural role expectation ("rule"), there is generally some repercussion in terms of a change in that person's relationship to the cultural matrix. The nature of the repercussion varies with the perceived importance of the transgression. One kind of transgression in the social-sexual matrix has to do with the choice of individuals with whom one engages in erotic-sexual behavior. Given that in our culture many significant social roles, behaviors, ways of organizing life, are attached to the establishment of a heterosexual bond, what happens if an individual chooses to establish an erotic-sexual relationship with a member of the same sex? What happens to all the culturally-prescribed links? How does the individual organize (make sense of) his/her world if he/she varies in this manner from the heterosexual order? How does the "world" (culture) make sense of and handle such transgressions and what impact does that have on the transgressor?

It is very apparent that homosexuality has posed a significant

threat to the heterosocial order of our culture, apparent in terms of the punitiveness of the sanctions against it and the hardship and suffering that individuals labeled homosexual have had to endure. This heterosocial cultural bias is clearly visible in much of the psychological literature pertaining to the subject. Psychological approaches to the understanding of homosexuality have gone along the same routes and been afflicted with the same biases as has the general study of human sexuality and sexual identity. There have been attempts to link homosexuality with biology--to look at it psychoanalytically and consider it from a social learning perspective.

As is true of much of the literature concerning human sexuality and sexual identity, the study of the male has predominated. Female sexuality and sexual identity are often considered secondarily and as variations of the human male.

In "An Annotated Bibliography of Research on Lesbianism and Male Sexuality" (Morin, 1976), covering the years 1967 to 1974, only 22 of the 139 empirical studies listed pertained directly to lesbians. Granted that this, in part, is supposed to be a reflection of the greater accessibility for study of male homosexuals, there is a need for greater study of lesbians. Since 1974 more attention has, in fact, been paid to the study of lesbianism. There has been a trend in psychological research toward conducting more studies about women in general. Women are now being studied independently; issues specifically dealing with women are being examined; and the assumption that research pertaining to men can be arbitrarily applied to women is being re-evaluated. In the area of homosexuality, there is a

recognition that female homosexuality is not a "reversed image of male sexual inversion, and merits an examination of its own" (Mannion, 1976, p. 1).

In light of the preceding, the focus of this study is on women. Consequently the approaches that have been taken and types of research that have been done regarding female homosexuality will be briefly summarized.[2]

In general, much of the research that has been done is rather negatively biased in terms of "pathologizing" homosexuality--pathologizing meaning arbitrarily applying a biological or medical conceptual model to an essentially social phenomenon (e.g., Freud). That which is divergent is seen as "unnatural" or "abnormal" and quite unrelated to "normal" patterns of development and behavior. The emphasis in research has been to find the key to the development of this behavioral deviation. It makes sense that a variation from cultural norms (which have taken on the cloak of truth) would be treated in this manner. Cultural assumptions usually are not examined, but offending deviant behaviors are closely scrutinized for defects and developmental errors. Much energy has been put into examining the etiology of lesbianism. From a Freudian or psychoanalytic perspective, Mannion (1976) states: "Lesbianism is the result of a combination of forces originating in the girl's inability to sublimate her penis envy in an

---

[2]The literature has been reviewed very fully by Kristiann Mannion in "Female Homosexuality: A comprehensive review of theory and research." JSAS Catalog of Selected Documents in Psychology, 1976, 6(2), 44. (Ms. No. 1247)

attachment to her father" (p. 82). The earliest studies of lesbians were clinical accounts, followed by attempts to validate psychoanalytic theory with projective techniques. In most cases, these attempts at theory validation were inconclusive; lesbian protocols could not be readily distinguished from those of heterosexual women and there was little to support the psychoanalytic contention that lesbianism is a regression to an "oral fixation," or a denial of feminine identity.

There were studies utilizing nonprojective techniques, comparing lesbians and heterosexual samples on measures of personal adjustment. In many instances, the lesbian is described as being "better adjusted" than heterosexual controls.

Biographical studies were employed to find a cause for lesbian behavior. According to Mannion (1976), there is evidence to suggest that "parent-child disruptions and an unsettled family life are present in the history of a majority of lesbian women" (p. 83). However, family instability is more frequently correlated with neurosis, and when the variable of psychological adjustment is controlled for, family instability "is most often present in the lesbian who is neurotic, and to a much lesser degree in the well-adjusted lesbian" (p. 83).

Biological studies focusing on hormonal imbalances or genetic variations as an explanation for lesbian behavior have been inconclusive. Much work has been done toward understanding the etiology of lesbianism, and according to Gagnon and Simon (1973), "in the very limited body of research on the lesbian the significance of . . . difference in object choice tends to consume all of the researcher's attention" (p. 176). As with the study of sexuality, in general, the

focus tends to be upon the sexual components of lesbianism outside of a cultural context. Sexuality and sexual object choice are certainly not the sole interest and involvement of the lesbian woman. Like heterosexual women, the lesbian's sexual behavior is imbedded in a social context. Sexual object choice is only a part of a whole network of sociosexual behaviors. How does a lesbian understand, deal with, and organize her life, given her preference of object choice? Does this differ significantly from the heterosexual women?

Jud Marmor (1980) in the book "Homosexual Behavior" addresses this question and suggests that there may be little difference between heterosexual and lesbian women in terms of overt sexual behavior:

> A number of studies in recent years, most notably those of Hedblom (1973), Gagnon and Simon (1967), and Schafer (1977), Bell and Weinberg (1978), and Saghir and Robins (Chapter 15, this volume) all underline the fact that "the patterns of overt sexual behavior on the part of homosexual females tend to resemble closely those of heterosexual females and to differ radically from the sexual activity patterns of both heterosexual and homosexual males" (Gagnon and Simon, 1967, p. 180). (p. 15)

Gagnon and Simon (1973) conducted what they describe as a "tentative, unsystematic, and incomplete investigation" (p. 215) of lesbian women in order to "impose a sense of . . . complexity upon the study of female homosexuality" (p. 215). They point out that too much research has been done which describes the lesbian from the perspective of her "distinguishing characteristic--her sexual conduct" (p. 215). In an attempt to fill in what they consider to be missing in most studies of lesbians, they interviewed an unspecified number of lesbian women regarding "the rest of the activity that fills . . . [their] daily life" (p. 215).

In a more comprehensive and systematic study, Saghir and Robins (1973) interviewed 57 lesbians and 43 heterosexual women using a "semi-structured" interview in order to obtain data

> on early childhood characteristics, adolescent psychological responses, psychopathology, sexual behavior as it evolved from childhood to adulthood, and a variety of other variables and parameters of childhood, adolescence, and adult life. (In Marmor, 1980, p. 281)

More recently, a considerably larger study of homosexuality was conducted by Bell and Weinberg (1978). As in the two previously cited studies (Gagnon & Simon, 1973; and Saghir & Robins, 1973), the research of Bell and Weinberg encompassed a comparable realm of information regarding aspects of behavior not specifically related to the direction of an individual's sexual preference. Although, in that study, twice as many males as females were interviewed, a relatively large sample of females was obtained. In all, 293 lesbians (229 white and 64 black) and 140 heterosexual women (101 white and 39 black) were interviewed, employing a structured interview technique.

Using the studies of Gagnon and Simon (1973), Saghir and Robins (1973), and Bell and Weinberg (1978) as a guide and with the idea of later comparison, this study was designed to look at how women of varying sexual orientations view themselves and organize their lives on a number of different dimensions which include topics such as family life, interpersonal relationships, work, social activities, and sexuality. As will become apparent in the methodology section (Chapter 2), the style of interview used in this study differs significantly from that employed by Saghir and Robins and Bell and Weinberg.

For the purposes of this study, the interviews were intentionally less structured in order to allow the participants maximum freedom in organizing and discussing those topics that they deemed important to their life styles. Structure, in terms of topics and categories for systematic analysis, arose from what the participants said, rather than specific topics and questions of the interviewer. Hopefully, this study will contribute to a more complete understanding of what fills in the rest of the "daily lives" of lesbian women.

In summary, the major portion of studies about female homosexuality have focused on the lesbian's most "distinguishing characteristic" --her sexual-object preference, rather than considering the whole realm of other behaviors that make up her life style. This narrow focus has been further limited by a perspective which assumes from the outset that homosexual behavior is pathological--a result of defective biological make-up or early developmental history. Studies have consequently attempted to validate this perspective--describing clinical cases that illustrate the theorist's point of view, employing psychological techniques to measure personal adjustment, and focusing on early biographical material considered crucial to later deviant adaptation.

A few recent studies have most fortunately attempted to broaden this focus by considering the lesbian woman and her behavior within a social context, allowing life style aspects beyond just those of her sexual behavior to emerge.

This study, which uses a free phenomenalistic interview methodology will provide a broad range of data on the basis of which earlier studies and their inherent assumptions can be critically evaluated.

CHAPTER 2

METHODOLOGY

Subjects

The subjects of this study were a nonclinical (not specifically selected from a psychiatric setting, i.e., hospital or outpatient clinic) sample of 23 lesbian and 23 heterosexual women from the San Francisco Bay area and Sacramento--a city further inland. The Bay area, in particular, is noted for its large homosexual population and a relatively permissive stance on homosexual behavior, as well as other sexual behaviors and life styles. This factor might make the sample somewhat different from a sample obtained in a more conservative section of the country. Subjects were recruited from the following sources: (a) a community recreational center women's exercise class, (b) a gay community center and bar for both sexes, (c) adult continuing education classes at a local junior college, (d) contacts in the lesbian community, (e) through friends and through subjects in the study who knew other women willing to volunteer--essentially an informal "word of mouth" system.

For the most part, these women were interested in and enthusiastic about participating in the study. In cases where contact was made through another person, the contact-person initially asked the prospective subject if she would be willing to talk to the researcher by telephone in order to find out more about the study. After this

telephone conversation, she could decide whether or not to participate. There were only two refusals. One woman said she just didn't like to talk, but that her partner would be glad to participate. The other woman (in the women's exercise class) raised questions of confidentiality and did not want to participate, despite assurances provided by the researcher. (All the other women in the class were willing to participate, although only four from this group were chosen to be interviewed.)

The selection of women on the basis of sexual object preference posed some difficulties in that the emphasis of the study on "life styles" was an attempt to expand the usually limited focus of most researchers on the specific issues of object preference. It is impossible to select a sample on the basis of object preference and not bring the issue into immediate focus. This was handled in the following ways:

The lesbian women, most of whom knew that they were selected on the basis of sexual preference, were told that the study was on "life styles of women" and that it was important to have lesbian women included in the sample; however, the emphasis was not on their sexual preferences, but on their life styles. If lesbianism was important to their life style, then it would probably be important for them to talk about it in the course of the interview, along with other aspects of their lives. In all cases, the topic of sexual object preference was raised during the course of the interview by the lesbian subjects themselves, and in all but one case (lesbian identity really did seem to be the central focus and concern in this subject's life, which

is certainly atypical of the sample) the topic was either included as one of many aspects of their life styles and/or attention was drawn by the subjects to the impact of sexual object preference on other aspects of their life styles.

The heterosexual women did not know that their heterosexuality was, in part, a basis for their selection as subjects. Therefore, the issue of sexual object preference was not as salient. This issue of salience is an important one in terms of the definitions of lesbianism and heterosexuality used for the purposes of this study. In terms of the lesbian sample: A woman was considered a lesbian if she verbally identified (labeled) herself as a lesbian, regardless of her sexual history.[3] If the lesbian subjects had not already been identified as lesbians at the outset of the interview, in all cases they brought up this topic and so labeled themselves at some point during the interview.

The awareness entailed in the labeling process was, in fact, found to be a significant difference between lesbian and heterosexual women. (See Results and Discussion Chapters). A heterosexual object choice is not dealt with by the culture in the same ways that a lesbian object choice is and usually does not become a conscious issue for the heterosexual. That which is culturally "normative" is rarely recognized or labeled except in the face of divergence. In other words, sexual object preference does not have the same conscious importance for heterosexual women as it does for lesbian women. Most

---

[3]A discussion of alternative definitions of lesbianism will be found in Chapter 4.

heterosexual women will not label themselves as heterosexual unless they are specifically asked; they assume it to be understood.

In terms of selection of the heterosexual sample, women were "assumed" to be heterosexual unless they indicated they were not. It was only at the end of the interview that this question was specifically brought up by the interviewer. None of the "assumed heterosexual" women indicated that they were not, in fact, heterosexual. In the course of the interviews, only one heterosexual woman raised the issue of sexual object preference on her own. The issue had apparently been brought to her awareness by her lesbian house mates.

In terms of the issue of "randomness" of sample, it would seem clear from the selection process previously described that the sample was not chosen "randomly" from the population of either heterosexuals or lesbians. With regard to the lesbian sample, according to Bell and Weinberg (1978) in "Homosexualities":

> Nowhere has a random sample of American homosexual men and women ever been obtained; and given the variety of circumstances which discourage homosexuals from participating in research studies, it is unlikely that any investigator will ever be in a position to say that this or that is true of a given percentage of all homosexuals. (p. 22)

Though the sample selection in this study was not done "randomly," lesbian and heterosexual subjects were matched on the basis of age, race, socioeconomic level, and education.

With respect to age, 14 women (7 lesbians and 7 heterosexuals) were in the 20-30 age bracket; 14 (7 lesbians and 7 heterosexuals) were in the 31-40 age bracket; 12 (6 lesbians and 6 heterosexuals) were in the 41-50 age bracket; and 6 (3 lesbians and 3 heterosexuals) were in the over-50 age bracket, the oldest being 63.

In terms of race or ethnic background, all but two of the women were white. These two were Hispanic (1 lesbian and 1 heterosexual). Several of the women knew and reported their cultural background when asked; for example, Irish, Scottish, German, etc., but did not really identify themselves with this background.

The issue of matching the sample on the basis of socioeconomic level posed some significant difficulties. The issues involved in the evaluation of the socioeconomic status of women are worthy of extensive consideration on their own. Consultation with Louise Kantor, Ph.D., a sociologist at California State University, Sacramento; and Barbara Rosenthal, Ph.D., a sociologist at Stanford University, in regard to matching subjects on the basis of socioeconomic status confirmed suspicions of the difficulties involved. They recommended appropriate references.

First, there is no such thing as a single index of socioeconomic status. Reiss (1965) stated: "The stratification structure is complex and multidimensional. Any particular variable of index can at best reflect a selected aspect of the structure that may be strategic from a certain point of view" (p. 139).

One of the more popular indexes used by sociologists for research purposes is the North-Hatt ratings of "Prestige of Occupations" (Cecil C. North and Paul K. Hatt, National Opinion Research Center, Reiss, 1965). This rating essentially describes "prestige strata" rather than just economic level. The advantage of using a rating of prestige strata is that it essentially defines distinctive status groups: "Those people that share a distinctive style of life, accept

each other as equals, and restrict noninstrumental social intercourse to the group" (Blau & Duncan, 1967). This certainly seemed an appropriate kind of scale to use, given that this study considers "life styles" in women. However, the North-Hatt scale, like most--if not all --socioeconomic indexes, does not really include women. Reiss (1965) states:

> We have assembled no evidence on the question of how valid the index of occupational socioeconomic status may be for females. For that matter the whole question of occupational status for females, or those with tenuous family or household attachments is moot. The occupation data do show that in many occupations females earn lower incomes than males. Since the occupational commitments of females, moreover, are less firm on the average than those of males, one can only conclude, as far as occupational status is concerned, that this category is one of some conceptual obscurity. (p. 150)

The preceding quotation illustrates a significant lack of awareness of the issues/biases that conceptually "obscure" the socioeconomic status of women. A translation of the above quotation would be that what women do is not recognized as "work," work being those occupations that men do (although some women do recognized male occupations for less pay); therefore, they have no real occupational status. Ann Oakley (1974) in her book, "The Sociology of Housework," concurs with this perspective. First, she comments that "the social situations of men and women today are structurally and ideologically discrepant, and the dominant value-system of modern industrialized societies assigns greater importance to masculine than to feminine roles" (p. 2). Oakley focuses predominantly on the omission of housework as a topic from the sociology of work. "The invisibility of women in the sociology of work is guaranteed by the choice of

predominantly masculine jobs in research design" (p. 19). This choice is a reflection of the "dominant value-system." Given that housework has not been considered work, women so occupied cannot be rated as to their status on this basis using conventional systems. Sociologists have ordinarily assumed that a valid procedure in the case of an individual with no "unequivocal occupation status of his own is to classify him according to the status of the most pertinent member of his immediate family with whom he lives" (Reiss, 1965, p. 148). Women and children are classified by their husbands'/fathers' occupations. Even those women having occupations that are recognized in the "dominant value-system" are often not considered independently.

Reiss further states that "Although a considerable proportion of these women themselves pursued occupations, the conventional practice would be to classify them according to the occupation of their husbands" (p. 149). The recognition of lack of status of traditional "women's work" was very apparent in some of the interviews in this study. One woman was embarrassed to admit she was a "housewife" and said that at parties, when asked what she did, she always said she was a weaver (she did fiberwork as a hobby) which made her more "intimidating" because people assumed she was an artist. (See Appendix D, Subject #29.)

Two other women indicated that although the volunteer work that they did when they were "housewives" entailed much skill (on the level of a middle management position), they felt themselves to be very inadequate because of the lack of monetary remuneration. They both acquired jobs that were probably less demanding, but described

"feeling better about themselves" because they got paid. Being paid indicated some social recognition of their work.

For purposes of this study, a socioeconomic measure was devised which would provide a rating of women, independent of family or marital status. Socioeconomic status was determined by the following method:

First, two measures of socioeconomic status were used--(a) educational level, and (b) a modified version of the North-Hatt scale. Level of education was relatively easy to determine for all women. Occupational status was more difficult, especially in terms of occupations such as housewife, which are not recognized by the North-Hatt scale. If a woman was "unemployed" or had a job which did not fit into the North-Hatt scale, she was rated on the basis of the highest status of the job she last held, if she had been employed previously. If she had never been employed, educational level was used as a single measure. In the case of a varied job history, the highest status job was chosen as a rating. This was done in at least two cases where subjects had opted out of high-status positions to take lesser status jobs because they wanted more free time or wanted to pursue other personal interests.

Also discovered in the course of this study was the fact that manual labor jobs, which generally have lower status, seem to be "in vogue" among some of the younger women, even though, in all instances, they had Bachelor's degrees or better and had worked at a higher status job. In these instances, the higher status job was chosen as a rating, the reason being that there was a significant

difference between these women and women that had adopted the same occupations from a less advantaged position. At least two of the women were still in school, so they were rated on the basis of intended degree and stated job aspirations. (One woman was working toward an M.S.W.; another, on a B.A. in Philosophy, intending to be a teacher.) In terms of matching, an attempt was made to match on the basis of both education and job status. It was most fortunate that there was little discrepancy between the two measures in terms of levels for the sample subjects, although it was certainly possible for this to occur.

Only one woman considered herself solely a housewife, and she had previously been a secretary. Several of the women indicated they were housewives/mothers/and (occupation). Some of the women in the older age brackets indicated that they had been "traditional housewives" but now had careers outside of the home. One of these women adopted a career because of a divorce; another, because her husband was ill. Both reported that they would never go back to their previous life styles and that the career outside the home was very important to them. The sample is not reflective of the general population of women in terms of employment outside the home, given that all but three were employed.

According to the U.S. Bureau of the Census (1979), 49.3% of American women between the ages of 16 and 65-and-over have jobs outside the home. The sample is also not reflective of the general population in terms of kinds of jobs they hold. Louise Kapp Howe (1978), in the book "Pink Collar Workers: Inside the World of Women's Work" cites the statistic that over one-third of the women in the labor

force are clerical workers; and nearly another third work in non-professional, nondegreed service, or sales jobs (p. 5).

Among the women in this study, only 26% currently work or have worked at jobs which would be classified as "pink collar." In fact, 50% of the sample are employed at jobs which are relatively high level "professional" occupations (33% in traditional feminine professions, i.e., nurse, schoolteacher, social worker; and 17% in less traditional professions, i.e., medical doctor, lawyer, architect, editor). For a list of occupations held by these women, see Appendix A.

In terms of the educational level of the women in the sample, 6 (13%) women were high school graduates only; 4 (9%) had high school plus some college or technical training; 17 (37%) had bachelor's degrees or the equivalent; 12 (26%) had teaching credentials or masters' degrees; and 7 (15%) had more advanced professional degrees (M.D., Ph.D., Law degree, etc.). This group of women is certainly more highly educated than the following national average for women's educational attainment: 35% $\leq$ 3 years high school; 40% = 4 years high school; 13% = 1 to 3 years college; and 12% $\geq$ 4 years college (U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1979).

Interview Technique

Data for the study were collected by interviewing each subject on the general topic of her life style. The style of the interview was informal, conversational, and relatively unstructured. The intent of this style was to allow the subject maximum freedom of choice, order, and amount of discussion of topics. Questions were open-ended

in order to facilitate free flow of conversations and, for the most part, arose during the process of the interview. They were therefore not "standard" except in terms of their open-endedness. This style of interviewing differs significantly from that of Kinsey (1953), Saghir and Robins (1973), and Bell and Weinberg (1978), in terms of the "structured" lack of structure. The Kinsey group had a specific series of questions to which they wanted specific answers. Specific and "accurate" content was of much importance.

Although content areas were of importance to the interview in this study and the interviewer has a list of possible topics for discussion, the "process" of the interview was also an important aspect of the data collected and analyzed. By leaving questions open, the data collected were richer and more reflective of the object of investigation. Probably the best known example of this kind of interview technique is found in the work of Studs Terkel (1967). In the book, "Division Street: America," he is lucid in his description of his technique:

> I realized quite early in this adventure that interviews, conventionally conducted, were meaningless. Conditioned clichés were certain to come. The question-and-answer technique may be of value to determining favored detergents, toothpaste, and deodorants, but not in the discovery of men and women. It was simply a case of making conversation. And listening. Talk of childhood invariably opened the sluice-gates of dammed-up hurts and dreams. From then on, there were occasional questions dependent on the other's flow.
>
> There were of course, key questions, asked idiomatically rather than academically, that would occur and recur. (Prefatory notes)

Procedures

Before data were collected, a small series of preliminary "test" interviews was conducted in order to familiarize the interviewer (in this case, the principal investigator) with the interview techniques. After the interviewer became relatively comfortable with the interview process, the actual data collection began. (All the interviews were conducted by the principal investigator.)

Interviews were conducted individually and in private, usually at either the home of the subject or the home of the interviewer. Several interviews were conducted in a private office of a gay recreation center and bar, and one interview was conducted in an empty classroom at a health center. At the beginning of an interview the subject would read the informed consent--long form (Appendix A), and then, if willing to participate, sign the informed consent--short form (Appendix A).

In order to free the interviewer from note-taking and thus facilitate conversation, all the interviews were audio taped.

The interviews usually started with the interviewer repeating statements about the study from the informed consent--long form, emphasizing that the purpose of the interview was to discuss issues considered to be "important to them in living their lives." Often the interviewer would comment that the beginning was the toughest part for most people, but that things would be easier as they continued.

Another technique that was useful at the beginning was to "suggest" topics by making a statement such as: "The women I've interviewed talk about any number of things. Some start with their

work, some talk about their families; one woman talked a lot about the baby she was expecting; another had just retired, so that was on her mind right off."

The interviews really were easier after the initial topic was chosen. The subjects were remarkably able to deal with--and structure--the interview, and quickly became involved in indepth and often very moving conversation.[4] Completion of each interview required from 1 hour to 2 hours. When the interview was finished (conclusion was usually determined by the subject) a series of demographic questions was asked, along with a series of questions regarding the subject's comfort with and opinion of the interview process (Appendix A).

Immediately after the departure of the subject, the interviewer completed an interview topic check list[5] (Appendix A). She also answered questions regarding her reactions to aspects of the interview and the subject (Appendix A).

Data Analysis

After all the interviews were completed, the audio tapes were transcribed and then erased in accordance with the confidentiality agreement. There were over 3,000 pages of typed transcripts, each transcript ranging from 30 to 70 pages. (See Appendix D for excerpts

---

[4]Most of the subjects were middle class, well-educated, and verbally facile. A lower class, less educated and less verbally oriented sample might prove more difficult to interview.

[5]This list was originally designed to be checked during the interview but was found to be distracting. Subjects would assume that there were specific topics about which they were supposed to talk.

from 23 interviews.) A partial sample of these transcripts (15 in all) was carefully reviewed and a comprehensive set of categories (Appendix B) was generated so that aspects of both the process and the content of the interviews could be organized and analyzed. The categories, themselves, are essentially a part of the results of this study because they were derived from the interview data which had been collected. This approach differs from a more typical approach used in other studies wherein categories are pre-generated on the basis of the researcher's expectations about significant topics. The categories of this study were arranged under the following general areas:

1. Demographic and Interview Process Categories
2. Work Categories
3. Relationship Categories
4. Children/Motherhood/Parenthood Categories
5. Family of Origin Categories
6. Sex-role Categories
7. Sexual Object-choice Categories
8. Miscellaneous Categories

In all, 138 categories were generated, each further divided into subcategories ranging from 2 to 18 in number--661 subcategories in total. All 46 interview transcripts were then scored by the principal investigator on the basis of this category system. An independent rater was also trained in this system and subsequently scored three transcripts chosen at random. Interobserver reliability was determined by giving each subcategory a numerical occurrence-nonoccurrence rating (zero for

nonoccurrence, one for occurrence) and then computing percentage agreement, occurrence agreement, and Kappa scores on each of the three transcripts. These scores are presented in Table 1. In addition to the computation of reliability scores on each transcript as a whole, scores were computed for each of the eight general topic areas in order to pinpoint areas of conceptual difficulty. For the most part, the category system worked well and a relatively high rate of interobserver reliability was achieved.[6] The scored data derived from the interview transcripts were easily prepared for computer processing and analyzed using the computer programs of "The Statistical Package for the Social Sciences" (Nie, Hull, Jenkins, Steinbrenner, & Bent, 1975). Frequency tables were generated and chi-square tests were individually computed for all categories. (Data Summary tables are presented in the Results Chapter; Frequency Counts are in Appendix C.)

---

[6]According to Donald P. Hartmann in "Considerations in the Choice of Interobserver Reliability Estimates" Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis, 1977:

> No entirely agreed upon set of rules for deciding on an acceptable value of trial (or session) reliability has yet been formulated. Percentage agreement of 80% for trial reliability seems to have some consensus among applied behavioral researchers. . . . Kappa . . . should exceed .60 (p. 113-114)

Hartmann does not indicate what might be an acceptable level of occurrence agreement.

Table 1

Interobserver Reliability

General Area	Transcript One	Transcript Two	Transcript Three
Demographic and Interview Process Categories:			
Percentage agreement	97%	99%	99%
Occurrence agreement	85%	95%	95%
Kappa	0.91	0.96	0.96
Work Categories:			
Percentage agreement	97%	88%	90%
Occurrence agreement	87%	60%	65%
Kappa	0.92	0.67	0.72
Relationship Categories:			
Percentage agreement	89%	85%	96%
Occurrence agreement	67%	58%	89%
Kappa	0.73	0.64	0.91
Children/Motherhood/ Parenthood Categories:			
Percentage agreement	90%	100%	97%
Occurrence agreement	50%	100%	80%
Kappa	0.62	1.00	0.87
Family of Origin Categories:			
Percentage agreement	94%	90%	97%
Occurrence agreement	67%	54%	82%
Kappa	0.78	0.64	0.88
Sex-Role Categories:			
Percentage agreement	87%	96%	94%
Occurrence agreement	42%	79%	70%
Kappa	0.50*	0.86	0.78

Table 1 (Continued)

General Area	Transcript One	Transcript Two	Transcript Three
Sexual Object Choice Categories:			
Percentage agreement	93%	93%	86%
Occurrence agreement	71%	71%	50%
Kappa	0.79	0.79	0.58*
Miscellaneous Categories:			
Percentage agreement	92%	92%	96%
Occurrence agreement	79%	79%	89%
Kappa	0.82	0.82	0.91
Overall Reliability Scores:			
Percentage agreement	93%	94%	95%
Occurrence agreement	71%	75%	79%
Kappa	0.79	0.82	0.85

*Falls below acceptable Kappa minimum score of 0.60.

CHAPTER 3

RESULTS

Results of Chi Square tests done on each category were compiled and reported in tables organized under section headings referring to the eight general topic areas outlined in the methodology section (Chapter 2). A more complete breakdown of responses in each category, along with frequency counts of the subjects' responses, can be found in Appendix C.

Section 1

Demographic and Interview Process Categories

The results presented in Table 2 demonstrate that subjects in the two groups (lesbians and heterosexual women) defined on the basis of sexual object choice were, indeed, matched--as was intended--in age range, race or ethnic group, educational level, and occupation.[7] There were no significant differences between the two groups on the basis of these categories. Although no attempt was made to match the groups on the basis of any other demographic variables, the results presented in Table 3 indicate no significant differences between groups except in marital status ($p < .01$) and current living

[7]The subjects were first matched using the North-Hatt Scale of Occupational Prestige. The results presented here, however, are based on a less precise job typology (i.e., unskilled labor, skilled labor, white collar, etc.) by which subjects were scored later. It appears, then, that on both measures the subjects were well matched.

Table 2

Demographic Categories Specifically Related to Matching Lesbian and Heterosexual Subjects

Category	X^2	df	p
Sexual object choice	42.086	1	.000**
Age range	0.000	3	1.000
Race/Ethnic group	0.000	1	1.000
Educational level	5.005	5	.415
Type of occupation[a]	5.614	5	.345

[a]Does not refer to the North-Hatt Scale of Occupational Prestige

**$p < .01$

Table 3

Other Demographic Categories

Category	X^2	df	p
Marital status	16.066	4	.002**
Where born	8.190	6	.224
Where raised to adolescence	10.911	7	.142
Where raised from adolescence	10.000	7	.188
Location growing up (i.e., rural, urban, etc.)	4.967	4	.290
Number of siblings in family	5.250	6	.512
Birth order	4.958	4	.291
Current living situation(i.e., house, apartment)	9.684	2	.007**
Household members	12.165	7	.095✓
Location (current)	.638	2	.726
Religion (current)	3.360	7	.849
Religion (raised)	2.709	4	.607

**$p < .01$

✓ Approaching significance at .05 level

situation ($P < .01$), with the category "household members" approaching significance at the .05 level. All of the lesbian women reported their legal marital status to be either single or divorced, whereas 10 heterosexual women indicated that they were currently married. More lesbians than heterosexuals reported living in houses, rather than apartments, and there was some variation in household members between the two groups. (See Appendix C for more detailed frequency counts.)

There appeared to be no significant differences between the two groups in terms of the structuring and sequencing of the interview (Table 4). Both lesbians and heterosexuals tended to talk about current topics in their lives, giving historic referents where appropriate. More lesbians than heterosexuals ended the interview with the topic of their current sexual identity. However, this did not reach statistical significance. No real differences between the two groups were noted in either the interviewer's or subjects' level of comfort during the interview. Interviewer and subjects generally reported themselves to be comfortable.

Categories reflective of psychological adjustment (Table 5) showed no significant differences between the two groups. No subjects were rated as severely disturbed; most women were considered to be "struggling successfully with their conflicts."

Section 2

Work Categories

Among the categories regarding employment history, work status, work role, and nature of employment (Table 6), only two were

Table 4

Interview Process Categories

Category	X^2	df	p
General structure	1.111	4	.892
Sequence (first topic)	6.946	6	.325
Sequence (last topic)	12.828	7	.076✓
Topic area of emphasis	9.423	6	.151
Interviewer's level of comfort	1.616	3	.655
Subject's level of comfort (self report)	3.610	3	.306

✓ Approaching significance at .05 level.

Table 5

Categories Regarding Subject's Psychological Adjustment

Category	X^2	df	p
History of Psychotherapy	4.622	4	.328
Interviewer's subjective impression	4.947	3	.175
Psychodiagnostic impression	1.780	3	.618
Subject's apparent experience of "Locus of control" for her life	4.887	3	.180

Table 6

Categories Regarding Subject's Employment History and Current Status, Work Role, and Nature of Employment

Category	X^2	df	p
Current paid employment status	4.400	5	.493
Volunteer work	10.488	5	.062✓
Work history (refers to paid employment)	10.252	5	.068✓
Current work satisfaction (paid or unpaid)	2.709	3	.438
Nature of current paid employment:			
Stability	12.571	5	.027*
Structure	11.130	4	.025*
Autonomy	7.151	4	.128
Job role (paid or unpaid)	6.284	5	.279

*$p < .05$

✓ Approaching significance at .05 level.

statistically significant at the .05 level. All lesbians were employed at paid jobs, most of which were of medium to high stability by nature of the jobs. A few heterosexual women were unemployed or were employed in lower stability jobs, although the majority of employed heterosexual women worked in medium-to-high-stability jobs. (See Appendix C for detailed frequency counts.)

In terms of job structure, more lesbians reported employment at medium-structure jobs. Heterosexual women were divided nearly equally between high- and medium-structure jobs--or were unemployed.

Differences in work history between the two groups approached significance at the .05 level. Several factors contributed to these differences: Some of the heterosexual women were unemployed; 3 lesbians reported multiple/unstable job histories--not by choice--whereas no heterosexual women reported this; 3 heterosexual women described multiple/unstable job histories--by choice--as compared to 1 lesbian; 5 lesbians reported current instability related to adventurously seeking new direction in employment, in contrast to only 2 heterosexuals; 3 heterosexuals had jobs which were stable occupations (they had worked at them on a long-term basis), but they were actually unstable by nature of the job (e.g., free lance editor); no lesbians reported being in this situation; and 13 lesbians reported being in stable jobs on a long-term basis as compared to 11 heterosexuals in this position.

Differences between groups also approached significance at the .05 level in regard to volunteer work. Lesbian subjects simply did not mention this topic.

There were no significant differences between groups with regard to reasons for working, criterion for job choice, and experience of sexual discrimination on the job (Table 7). Most women reported mixed motives for working, with money and/or benefits and job satisfaction being at the top of the list as reasons for job choice.

Categories considering the relationship of work to other life priorities also produced no significant differences (Table 8). The only category even approaching significance at the .05 level had to do with the "Attitude of spouse, partner, and/or family about subject's employment." Lesbians either did not mention this topic, or if they did, they indicated their partner's/family's support of their work. Heterosexual women brought the topic up more often, indicating that their partners/families were either supportive of work or supportive of either choice--working or not working.

Section 3

Primary Relationship Categories

Categories regarding primary relationship status, patterns of relationship, expectations and commitment (Table 9) yielded only two significant differences (at $< .01$ level) between the two groups. These differences which were found in the categories, "Relationship status of single and divorced subjects" and "Attitude toward traditional heterosexual marriage" essentially reiterate the division of the sample into two groups on the basis of sexual preference.

Single and divorced lesbians reported themselves to be either single (relatively celibate or active with one or more others) or

Table 7

Categories Regarding Subject's Occupational Choices

Category	X^2	df	p
Why work?	2.148	4	.708
Criterion for choosing a job:			
Did not mention	.522	1	.469
Money and/or benefits	0.000	1	1.000
Job satisfaction	0.000	1	1.000
Contributes to society/meaningful	.552	1	.457
Job security	.552	1	.457
Challenge	.095	1	.756
Freedom/independence	0.000	1	1.000
Supportive environment	.673	1	.411
Social activity	.897	1	.343
Other	.522	1	.469
Experience of sexual discrimination in work	5.737	5	.332

Table 8

Categories Regarding the Relationship of Work to Other Life Priorities

Category	X^2	df	p
Current life priorities regarding work/ family and/or primary relationships	2.780	6	.835
Changes in priorities	6.418	6	.378
Reason given for change	4.996	4	.287
External circumstances for change	8.184	6	.224
The nature of work/social life overlap	4.259	4	.372
Attitude of spouse, partner, and/or family about subject's employment	9.856	5	.079✓
Conflicts between work and primary relationship and/or family	.191	1	.661
Conflict resolution regarding work/ family and/or primary relationship	3.433	4	.488

✓ Approaching significance at .05 level.

Table 9

Categories Regarding Primary Relationship Status, Patterns, Expectations, and Commitment

Category	X^2	df	p
Current primary relationship status	4.476	4	.345
Relationship status of single and divorced subjects	29.619	4	.000**
Relationship pattern	8.236	4	.083✓
Relationship expectations	8.000	6	.238
Changes in relationship expectations	7.158	5	.209
Attitude about commitment (current)	6.220	6	.398
Attitude toward traditional hetero-sexual marriage	13.142	3	.004**

**$p < .01$

✓ Approaching significance at .05 level.

living with a partner of the same sex. Heterosexual women indicated they were either single (relatively celibate or active with one or more others), living with a partner of the opposite sex, or did not fall into this category because they were married. Understandably, more lesbian subjects reported their attitude toward heterosexual marriage to be negative, than did heterosexual subjects, the major portion of whom reported themselves to be ambivalent in regard to marriage.

Approaching significance on the .05 level was "Relationship pattern." A major portion of the lesbians reported being involved in serial long-term relationships. Heterosexual subjects were more apt to be involved in one primary long-term relationship. However, most heterosexual and lesbian subjects fell into one of the above two categories, indicating a preference for long-term relationships; and most subjects, regardless of sexual orientation, reported either having been or currently being involved in a long-term monogamous relationship which included sharing living space.

The majority of subjects reported having the expectation that their relationships would be long-term and monogamous. However, they appeared to vary considerably with regard to their level of commitment in these relationships. Both heterosexual and lesbian groups appeared nearly equally divided with regard to permanence of a commitment. (Nineteen subjects reported they were ambivalent about commitment or they felt committed for the present; and 18 subjects wanted commitment, considered themselves to be permanently committed, or took their permanent commitment as a given.)

There were no significant differences between groups on topics they deemed to be important regarding primary relationships (Table 10). Most lesbian and heterosexual women reported communication, friendship, doing things together/sharing interests, and stability and support as being important to them in a primary relationship. A much smaller number of women (from both groups) indicated that sex was an important factor in their primary relationships.

Section 4

Children/Motherhood/Parenthood Categories

Categories relating to children, motherhood, parental responsibility, and family stability did not reveal any significant differences between the two groups (Table 11). For lesbian and heterosexual mothers alike, their children were important to them and they tended to have primary responsibility for their care. The only category approaching significance at the .05 level was that dealing with raising children without a partner. Lesbian mothers reported that they had raised their children at least part of the time, without a partner. This stands to reason, given that all of the lesbian mothers in this sample were divorced and had consequently spent some period of time without a partner.

Section 5

Family of Origin Categories

There were no significant differences between lesbians and heterosexual subjects with regard to categories related to their families of

Table 10

Content Issues Mentioned as Important by Subjects Regarding Primary Relationships

Category	X^2	df	p
Sex	.673	1	.411
Communication	.477	1	.489
Friendship	1.911	1	.166
Do things together/share interests	1.582	1	.208
Stability and support	1.014	1	.313
Not sure	.273	1	.600
Did not mention	0.000	1	1.000
Other	.191	1	.661

Table 11

Children, Motherhood, Parental Responsibility, and Family Stability

Category	X^2	df	p
Does subject have children?	11.226	7	.129
Does subject want children?	5.099	5.	.403
Importance of children to subject's life	10.888	7	.143
Expectations regarding responsibility for children	3.333	4	.503
Actual situation regarding responsibility for children	.476	4	.975
Parents <u>with</u> partners:			
Is partner natural parent?	7.675	4	.104
Has there been a time when subject has raised children without a partner?	5.675	2	.058✓
Parents <u>without</u> partner/marital status	1.560	3	.668
Conflict regarding child custody and/or child support	1.506	4	.825

✓ Approaching significance at .05 level.

origin (Table 12). Most subjects reported that they came from stable/intact families; most subjects were currently maintaining varying (but similar) degrees of contact with their families; and most subjects reported that their feelings about their families as a whole, and about each parent individually, were ambivalent. In terms of family rules, when mentioned, both lesbians and heterosexuals were nearly equally split between having come from families whose rules were strict and overt or having come from families who were permissive, with overt expectations about behavior. The level and general nature of rebellion against family rules or expectations was virtually the same for both lesbian and heterosexual subjects. The only item that approached significance at the .05 level--"Extended family contact (growing up)"--did so on the basis of more lesbian subjects reporting contact with extended family members than did heterosexual subjects.

Section 6

Sex-Role Categories

Among categories dealing with sex role, sex-role conflict, and sex-role transition (Table 13) four categories achieved statistically acceptable levels of significance in regard to differences between the two groups. The only category which reached significance at the < .01 level was essentially a repetition of the category regarding attitude about marriage. Lesbians reported more negative attitudes about marriage than did heterosexuals. Differences at $p < .05$ level were found in the following categories: (a) "Present sex-role division of household labor in current primary relationship"--Lesbians reported a more equalitarian division than did heterosexuals; (b) "Transition in

Table 12

Family of Origin Categories

Category	X^2	df	p
Family stability (growing up)	7.325	5	.197
Extended family contact (growing up)	6.666	3	.083✓
Current contact with family	4.863	5	.432
Attitude regarding family	2.519	4	.641
Change in attitude regarding family	5.176	6	.521
Attitude regarding mother	3.229	3	.357
Attitude regarding father	2.797	4	.592
Subject's experience of family's regard	7.419	5	.191
Family control/Rules (growing up)	2.606	6	.856
Rebellion at some period in life against family	3.606	4	.461

✓ Approaching significance at .05 level.

Table 13

Categories Regarding Sex Role, Sex-role Conflict, and Sex-role Transition

Category	X^2	df	p
Degree to which subject adheres to traditional "feminine" roles (current)	19.730	14	.138
Job/Career choice--Traditional or non-traditional	6.166	3	.103
Present sex-role division of household labor in current primary relationship	13.793	6	.032*
Transition in sex-role division of household labor in current primary relationship	4.030	3	.258
Attitude about traditional feminine roles for self:			
Marriage	18.004	4	.001**
Motherhood	8.761	4	.067✓
Feminine role transition	.952	4	.916
Basic "life style" with regard to sex-role issues	8.949	4	.062✓
Present awareness of sex-role related issues and conflict	1.758	3	.624
Transition in experience of sex-role conflict	8.244	3	.041*
Experience of sexual discrimination	6.285	2	.043*
Feminism	4.642	4	.326

*$p < .05$

**$p < .01$

✓ Approaching significance at .05 level.

experience of sex-role conflict"--Lesbians either mentioned no transition or reported less conflict, usually as a result of having "come-out" as lesbians. Heterosexuals either mentioned no transition or reported experiencing more sex-role conflict for a variety of reasons; (c) "Experience of sexual discrimination"--Lesbians reported experiencing more sexual discrimination (usually because of their lesbianism) than did heterosexuals.

Approaching significance at the .05 level were categories related to motherhood and basic life style. Although a number of lesbians and heterosexual women indicated that they wanted children, more lesbians than heterosexuals either did not mention children or indicated they did not want children. Heterosexuals were more apt to mention children and to be either ambivalent or positive about the possibility of having them.

Most subjects had "mixed" life styles, that is, life styles having elements of both traditional and nontraditional sexual roles. In other words, most of the women in this sample attempted to balance relationships and family with work or a career orientation. However, among those who didn't fall into this "mixed" category, more heterosexual subjects than lesbians had life styles that would be considered either largely traditional or largely nontraditional. Three heterosexual women reported a transition in style toward the nontraditional, and two lesbians reported a transition in the direction of a more traditional style.

There were no significant differences between lesbian and heterosexual subjects with regard to categories concerning parental sex-role

models and expectations regarding subject's sex-role options (Table 14). Most parents were reported to be traditional in their individual roles and in relationship to each other--mothers were housewives and fathers were breadwinners outside the home, and household labor was divided traditionally. Only one parent--a father--actively discouraged his daughter from pursuing a career. Most parents either encouraged their daughters to be successful at what they (the daughters) chose, encouraged a "job to fall back on," or actively encouraged a career.

Section 7

Sexual-Object Choice Categories

All categories related to sexual object choice (Table 15) except one were statistically significant at the level of $p < .01$. It is in this general topic area that lesbian and heterosexual subjects differ most.

In terms of "Awareness of 'decisions' about the gender of sex object choice," lesbians differed significantly because they were aware of this issue; only two heterosexuals mentioned anything about this topic. Lesbian subjects described their "decisions" in the following ways: (a) Four indicated that their object preference was not a decision--they had always felt attracted to women and acted upon this attraction; (b) four said that although they had always felt attracted to women, they consciously decided to act on these feelings; (c) four claimed to have "discovered" their sexual orientation after unsuccessful attempts at heterosexual behavior; (d) seven

Table 14

Parental Sex-role Models and Expectations
Regarding Subject's Sex-role Options

Category	χ^2	df	p
Mother's role model	4.676	6	.586
Mother's expectations regarding sex-role issues and subject's life style	6.263	4	.180
Father's role model	5.611	3	.132
Father's expectations regarding sex-role issues and subject's life style	6.801	5	.235
Differential treatment of siblings on basis of sex, by parents	2.977	4	.560
Parents' role model regarding division of household labor and/or rearing children	7.428	4	.114

Table 15

Sexual Object Choice Categories

Category	χ^2	df	p
Awareness of "decision" in terms of gender of sex object choice	35.981	5	.000**
Impact of sex object choice (in terms of gender) on subject's life style	38.640	2	.000**
Sex role and sex-object choice (by gender)	26.226	3	.000**
Sex role and sex-object choice (not by gender)	12.933	3	.004**
Sex-role type conflict within primary relationship	16.000	4	.003**
Sexuality	3.000	3	.391

**$p < .01$

reported that they felt that the decision to be lesbian was consciously made--for political reasons, life style reasons, sex-role reasons, etc.; and (e) three could not be classified under any of the above categories but mentioned "awareness" of some process by which they became identified as lesbians.

It follows that lesbians, given their awareness of some sort of decision-making process in sexual object choice, would be aware of the possibilities of--or actually experience--some impact of sexual-object preference in their life styles. In fact, all but three of the lesbian subjects reported that sexual-object preference made a difference in their life styles. No heterosexuals mentioned this.

Several lesbian subjects mentioned--either vaguely or specifically --that sex-role and sexual-object choices made on the basis of gender preference were in some way related. The more specific comments either linked sexual-object preference (by gender) to subsequent sex-role behaviors, or sex-role behaviors to subsequent sexual-object preference (by gender). For example, one subject indicated that after she became a lesbian she had to reorder her life because she could no longer expect to be a wife and mother with a husband providing economic support. She essentially related her decision to have a career to the fact that she could not expect to count on economic support from a female partner.

Another subject indicated that her career orientation, her assertiveness, and her desire to have no children, turned her away from the traditional heterosexual marriage relationship. It followed for her that relationships with women would provide more freedom to live

the way she wanted to live. (These two examples are rather extreme examples of the two positions. For most subjects, the issues are less clear.)

The category "Sex role and sex object choice (not by gender)" refers to decisions made regarding the desirability of a partner on the basis of sex-role issues. In this category several heterosexual subjects mentioned issues nonspecifically in regard to sex role and choice of sex object. Lesbians, on the other hand, tended to be more specific, either mentioning a preference for androgynous sex-role behavior or indicating that traditional-sex-role behaviors have an impact on their object choice (whether positive or negative).

In terms of sex-role conflict within a primary relationship, lesbian subjects, for the most part, did not mention any conflict--or mentioned that there was no conflict. Although several heterosexual subjects did not mention conflict, those who did bring up the topic indicated either specifically or nonspecifically that they were experiencing--or had experienced--conflict.

The only category in this area in which there were no significant differences between lesbian and heterosexual subjects was that of bringing up the topic of sexuality (specifically erotic/genital sexuality) during the course of the interview. Neither lesbians nor heterosexuals dwelled on the subject; most mentioned it in passing, with no specific detail and generally within the context of primary relationships.

Section 8

Miscellaneous Categories

In only one category regarding friends, activities, and being alone (Table 16) was there a significant difference ($p < .01$) between lesbian and heterosexual subjects. Lesbians reported a preference for women as friends, whereas heterosexuals did not bring up the topic of sexual preference in friendships. In all other areas subjects reported engaging in a diversity of daily activities including athletics, politics, academics, camping, and hiking--with various participants and, at times, alone.

Table 17 provides a list of categories mentioned by subjects as "critical" life time events. The only significant differences between lesbians and heterosexuals were found in the categories "coming out" ($p < .01$) and "Pregnancy/Motherhood" ($p < .01$). Only lesbians mentioned coming out, in terms of their sexual preference, as an important event. Sexual preference was apparently not a consciously important issue for heterosexual women as compared to lesbians.

Most of the women who mentioned pregnancy or motherhood as a critical event were heterosexuals. No significant differences were found between lesbians and heterosexual subjects in regard to religion (Table 18). Although religion was more important to most subjects while growing up, it appeared to be relatively unimportant to the majority of subjects currently.

Table 16

Friends, Activities, and Being Alone

Category	χ^2	df	p
Subject talks about importance of friends	2.109	2	.348
Subject makes statement "Friends are more important than love relationship."	1.426	1	.232
Friends are mentioned as "extended family."	0.000	1	1.000
Friends/sexual preference	22.000	5	.001**
Degree to which subject participates in activities	2.433	2	.296
Participates with whom?	3.023	2	.220
Specific activities:			
Athletics	0.000	1	1.000
Politics	.112	1	.737
Feminism	0.000	1	1.000
Therapy	.821	1	.364
Reading/academic	1.401	1	.236
Did not mention any activities	0.000	0	1.000
Other activities	1.426	1	.232
Being alone (attitude about)	3.569	3	.312

**$p < .01$

Table 17

Categories Regarding Critical Lifetime Events

Category	X^2	df	p
Did not mention anything as "critical"	.273	1	.600
Marriage/Relationship	.924	1	.336
Divorce/Separation	0.000	1	1.000
Quitting school/job	0.000	1	1.000
"Coming out"	29.052	1	.000**
Pregnancy/Motherhood	7.646	1	.005**
Death in family	.127	1	.720
Other	.088	1	.766

**$p < .01$

Table 18

Categories Regarding Religion

Category	X^2	df	p
Current importance of religion to subject	5.035	6	.539
Importance of religion while growing up	4.672	5	.457
Change in belief	3.028	3	.387

Section 9

Summary

Few significant differences between lesbian and heterosexual women were found in the eight general areas except in the area of sexual object choice, where all categories except one were significant at $p < .01$. The only category in the area of demographic and interview process which was significant at $p < .01$ was "current living situation."

Two "Work Categories" were significant at $p < .05$: (a) structure of paid employment, and (b) stability of paid employment. Categories regarding primary relationships yielded only two significant differences at $p < .01$: (a) relationship status of single and divorced subjects, and (b) attitude toward traditional heterosexual marriage.

There were no significant differences between heterosexual and lesbian subjects regarding children/motherhood/parenthood categories and family of origin categories. Only 4 of 18 categories reached significance at $p < .05$ under the general area of sex roles. Significance occurred in the following categories: (a) present sex-role division of household labor in current primary relationship, (b) attitude about marriage, (c) transition in experience of sex-role conflict, and (d) experience of sexual discrimination.

The general topic area, miscellaneous categories, produced only three categories of significance: (a) friends/sexual preference ($p < .01$), (b) critical lifetime event: coming out ($p < .01$), and (c) critical lifetime event: pregnancy/motherhood ($p < .01$).

CHAPTER 4

DISCUSSION

It is apparent that the most significant difference between the heterosexual and lesbian women in this study is the gender of the people with whom they engage in erotic-sexual behavior (their sexual object choice). Few other aspects of life style differ between the two groups. To quote Liz Diamond from "The Lesbian Primer" (1979): "One (1) thing you can be sure of: Lesbians are women."

The lesbians in this sample were, indeed, women, and remarkably similar in life style patterns to the heterosexual women. This conclusion of similarity is shared in the previously cited studies of Gagnon and Simon (1973), Saghir and Robins (1973), and Bell and Weinberg (1978). The overriding determinants of life styles among women, lesbian and heterosexual alike, have to do with cultural prescriptions of acceptable sex-role behaviors for women. Deviation from "the rules" on the basis of gender of sexual object choice does not significantly alter the lesbians' adherence to other culturally acceptable sociosexual behavioral patterns.

When one moves away from viewing the lesbian exclusively from the perspective of her sexual object preference, one discovers, according to Gagnon and Simon (1973):

> The degree to which the lesbian shares all of the problems of a woman in the society . . . problems of dealing with family and friends, of earning a living, of finding emotional and social support, and--possibly of greatest importance--struggling as all persons do, to create and live with a constantly changing self . . .[regardless of] forms of sexual commitments. (pp. 177-178)

A detailed discussion of the results of this study is divided into the same eight general areas as in the Results chapter (Chapter 3). Comparable data, predominantly from the studies of Gagnon and Simon (1973), Saghir and Robins (1973), and Bell and Weinberg (1978) are discussed, where relevant.

Section 1

Demographic Information and Interview Process

The first topic in this area to consider, particularly in regard to a comparison of this study with the three previously cited studies, is the issue of subject selection on the basis of sexual preference. The definitions of lesbianism and heterosexuality used for this study were based on self-description. If a subject labeled herself as either a lesbian or a heterosexual, regardless of her developmental or sexual history, she was considered as such. This approach to definition differs significantly from that employed by Bell and Weinberg (1978) and Saghir and Robins (1973). Gagnon and Simon (1973) were unclear in their definitions.

The Bell and Weinberg study used a 7-point scale, designed by Kinsey and his associates (Kinsey, Pomeroy, Martin, & Gebhard, 1953), to measure the degree to which respondents were homosexual or heterosexual in their sexual behaviors and feelings (behavior and feelings were rated separately). A score of 0 on the scale would indicate exclusively heterosexual behavior or feelings, and a score of 6 would indicate exclusively homosexual behavior or feelings. Two-thirds of the white lesbians in the Bell and Weinberg study regarded themselves

as exclusively homosexual in terms of current sexual behavior. The next largest number rated themselves 5 on the Kinsey scale (mainly homosexual with a small degree of heterosexuality). Half of the white lesbians rated their feelings as exclusively homosexual and a quarter rated their feelings as "bisexual" (i.e., a score of 4 or less). Most of these lesbians had engaged in heterosexual coitus at least once in their lives, but few had done so in the year previous to the study. The majority of the heterosexual respondents (90%) were rated exclusively heterosexual (0) in both feelings and behavior.

The definition of homosexuality used by Saghir and Robins is as follows (in Marmor, 1980):

> We consider homosexuality to be an early childhood phenomenon characterized by psychologic responses that include emotional attachments and fantasies directed primarily at members of the same sex. These attachments and fantasies develop in childhood and adolescence and persist, more overtly and intensely, into adult life. (p. 281)

The subjects in the Saghir and Robins sample were selected on the basis of their lifelong tendencies to homosexual preferences, rather than the behavior itself" (in Marmor, 1980, p. 294). The majority of these subjects would undoubtedly be rated at 5 or 6 on the Kinsey scale. Saghir and Robins exclude from their sample women who develop homosexual preferences and life styles as adults. They comment that this group of women need to be studied but they are "not truly homosexual" (in Marmor, p. 294). The heterosexual women in the Saghir and Robins sample met similar (but unspecified) criteria to those met by the lesbians.

Although the criteria for classification on the basis of sexual object preference used in this study were less stringent than those of the two studies cited, most of the lesbians in the sample would probably be classified as exclusively homosexual (Kinsey rating 5-6). However, some of the subjects differ from the Saghir and Robins group in that women who chose to become lesbians in adulthood were considered "truly homosexual" and were not excluded from this sample. It is possible that this latter group differs in some respects from lesbians who arrived at their lesbianism by other routes. However, they are living as "lesbians," (i.e., they chose women as sexual partners) and they were recognized as such.

Issues of sample selection and matching in this study were handled in a manner similar to that of Saghir and Robins and Bell and Weinberg. Age, race, and socioeconomic backgrounds were controlled variables; however, Saghir and Robins' study differs from the current research and that of Bell and Weinberg by controlling for marital status. As a consequence, over three-quarters of the heterosexual women in their sample had never been married, and this factor alone would make Saghir and Robins' heterosexual sample quite deviant in terms of the heterosexual population in general. Given the findings of this study that lesbians and heterosexual women do not differ in their actual relationship status as opposed to their legal status, the Saghir and Robins sample of lesbian women probably deviated considerably in life style from the heterosexual women in their sample. The merits of such a matching technique are questionable.

As indicated in the Methodology chapter, the women in this study were selected from the San Francisco Bay area and a city inland from

the Bay area. This area of the country differs from other sections because of its large homosexual population and permissive stance regarding a variety of different life styles. Some aspects of the life styles of the women in this sample are undoubtedly a reflection of Bay area or California culture. As a result, a sample selected from an area outside the San Francisco Bay area and even California may differ in accordance with the culture of the specific area. The sample used in Bell and Weinberg's study was selected from the San Francisco Bay area. The geographic locations of the samples used in the studies of Gagnon and Simon and Saghir and Robins were not reported. In this study, as well as in the three studies cited, both heterosexual and lesbian women tended to have a relatively high socioeconomic status. Comparable data regarding the other demographic information gathered in this study were not found in the other three studies. The only significant difference found between heterosexual and lesbian women in this study, regarding demographic variables other than those used in the initial matching of the sample, was their current living situation. More lesbians lived in houses than did heterosexuals. This fact runs contrary to the notion that women outside the traditional heterosocial relationships of marriage and family might therefore not participate in the middleclass suburban life style often associated with the American family. For many of the lesbians in this sample, middleclass aspirations for a home in the suburbs were realized.

None of the other three studies attempted to deal with analysis of the process of the interview. Their interviews were, for the most

part, highly structured, making such analysis impossible. Although pre-generated categories make some aspects of research easier, and it might be expected that more accurate and detailed information would be obtained by employing a more formally structured interview format, significant amounts of information are actually lost in so doing. It is very significant that the lesbian and heterosexual women in this study talked about their life styles in very similar ways--the topics they chose, and the areas emphasized were virtually indistinguishable except when specifically related to sexual object choice. In many cases, substitution of a masculine pronoun for a feminine one, in reference to a lover, would have made differentiation of a lesbian from a heterosexual woman impossible.

In terms of the issue of detail and accuracy of information, very little was lost by employing a less structured interview technique; much of the content information gathered in this study can reasonably be compared to other more structured studies.

Information regarding psychological adjustment was collected in the course of this study, the results of which were presented under "Demographic and Interview Process Data," and are discussed here. Homosexuality and lesbianism have long been associated with psychopathology. Freud considered it as the result of an arrest in sexual development and built elaborate theories to explain it. More recently, this view of homosexuality has been changing, although Bell and Weinberg (1978) maintain that this stereotype has suffered an extremely slow "death." Recent investigations have failed to show clear or consistent differences between homosexuals and heterosexuals

on measures of psychological adjustment (see Chapter 1, this study). Both Saghir and Robins (1973) and Bell and Weinberg (1978) concur with these general findings; their respective samples of lesbian and heterosexual women were indistinguishable on the basis of psychological adjustment. Saghir and Robins did, however, find a higher incidence of alcoholism among their lesbian subjects. Their ambivalence about their findings regarding lesbian subjects' relatively high level of psychological adjustment is revealed in this statement (in Marmor, 1980): "Although being a homosexual is not necessarily pathologic, manifest homosexuality is a painful and conflict-ridden life style, particularly during the adolescent and early adult years" (p. 293). Is it their contention, perhaps, that "manifest heterosexuality" is not "painful and conflict-ridden" during adolescent and early adult years? If so, it is doubtful that this view would be shared by many developmental theorists and researchers.

On the basis of psychological measures used in this study (subjective impressions of the interviewer, diagnostic category, locus of control), no differences were found between lesbian and heterosexual subjects. Only two lesbians described themselves as alcoholic, and one heterosexual expressed some worry about her excessive drinking habits. This is not to say that there may not be differences in drinking patterns between lesbians and heterosexuals--it is just that both groups were fairly uniform in not talking about this topic.

Both Saghir and Robins (1973) and Bell and Weinberg (1978) describe their lesbian subjects as being more apt to have been in

some kind of psychotherapy than the comparable heterosexual group. Such a finding was not replicated in this study--there was no significant difference between the lesbian and heterosexual groups' participation in psychotherapy. Approximately 60% of all the women in this sample indicated that they had received some kind of psychotherapy.[8]

Section 2

Work

Women's participation in the labor force has fluctuated dramatically over the last century. More recently (in the past 10 years) there has been a large increase in the number of women entering the labor force (U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1979) in the United States. Despite their increasing numbers, the majority of women are still relegated to "pink collar" jobs, and regardless of their position, they earn substantially less than men. Although the stereotype of "a woman's place is in the home" has changed, in the past, a woman's work was often seen as supplementary to that of a husband's or as something to fall back on if she should find herself single, or if she lost her spouse. Full-time career women were considered abnormal and often sexually suspect.

Almost all the women in this sample were employed in paid jobs or careers outside the home. The only exceptions were found among a

---

[8]This figure is comparable to the Bell and Weinberg (1978) totals: 2/3 of the lesbians and over 1/2 of the heterosexuals had received some psychiatric treatment. This high number may be reflective of California life style, where a multitude of therapies are popular. Both this study and that of Bell and Weinberg were conducted in California.

few heterosexual women (one of whom was retired from a full-time career), some of whom expressed discomfort regarding their lack of outside employment (see Appendix D, Interviews #9 and #29). The impression one receives from these heterosexual women is that it is no longer acceptable for a woman to be unemployed; dual career families are becoming normative, requiring a transformation in the organization of traditional family life. Lesbian women, on the other hand, because their sexual preferences have, for the most part, excluded them from traditional heterosocial family organization, have universally had to deal with earning a living.

In regard to the issue of employment, Bell and Weinberg (1978) comment: "To the extent that some people equate homosexuality with emotional instability, they may assume that homosexual men and women are likely to have unstable work records" (p. 141). Gagnon and Simon (1973) suggest that because lesbians are "women alone" and therefore must fend for themselves, they are more likely to be seriously committed to work than most women: "When a woman foregoes the conventional path where a husband would perform this role, labor force participation becomes more important" (pp. 202-203). Reflecting this, the Gagnon and Simon sample of lesbians tended to have relatively stable work histories. Any movement between jobs was associated with job advancement.

The lesbian women in this study showed a similar pattern of stability in employment; they tended to occupy higher stability jobs (by nature of the jobs) than did heterosexual women. In general, more women (both lesbian and heterosexual) in this sample tended to be

employed at higher level professional jobs--fewer pink collar workers (see Chapter 2, Methodology)--than one would expect from the general population, which could be indicative of a higher level of career commitment. Both groups also reported similar motivations for working: Job satisfaction and money and/or benefits.

Among the lesbian subjects of Saghir and Robins (1973), greater job instability was found than for the heterosexual controls. Bell and Weinberg (1978) reported more job changes among their lesbian group than among their heterosexual counterparts, but suggested that the greater number of job changes could reflect more personal ambition and a greater effort to improve their working situation.

Where does work fit in with other traditionally important life priorities for women? Given the current rate at which women are entering the work force, some changes in family structure are inevitably taking place. Women have traditionally been cast in the role of "keeper of the hearth." How, then, do they integrate (or do they integrate) new job roles with this previously held role? If they no longer play this role, who does? Or what happened to it? Recent studies have focused on sex-role conflict among working women. In an article in the Stanford Observer (January 1981) about her current research on young women holding Masters' degrees in Business Administration (MBAs), Loraine T. Zappert, Ph.D. suggests the following: "In attempting to integrate multiple and often conflicting roles, these women are living out the myth of the 'superwoman with a concomitant rise in health symptoms" (pp. 1; 3). Women MBAs, more often than their male counterparts, felt they had the primary responsibility

for household and child-care tasks, as well as feeling they must be the best in what they did at work. In fact, these women did have the responsibility for these tasks--the division of household labor was managed along traditional lines. (The men in Zappert's study, for the most part, had traditional wives who took care of the housework and child care while they functioned as primary breadwinners.)

The topic of sex role and sex-role conflict among the women in this study will be considered in more detail later (Section 6). However, it is appropriate to note here that the majority of subjects in this study, regardless of sexual preference, attempted in some fashion or other to achieve some kind of balance of their work with their primary relationships and/or families. The extent to which they felt they must be "superwomen" is not clear. At least one heterosexual subject reported this pattern in herself--she opted to drop out of career life and be a full-time housewife and mother, although she still struggled with the emotional repercussions of the decision. At least a few heterosexual and lesbian mothers voiced concerns about the adequacy of their child care and the impact of their careers on their children's development.

The division of household labor (see Section 6) was more often reported to be divided on an egalitarian basis by lesbian subjects than by heterosexual subjects. Although both heterosexual and lesbian subjects reported their partners or families to be supportive of their work, lesbians did not report that their partners were supportive of <u>not</u> working. This suggests that for the lesbian, the option of not working and having a partner support her is less salient than

for the heterosexual counterpart. This would also support Gagnon and Simon's (1973) contention that for a lesbian, labor force participation is more important. Although this may have been true in the past, more and more heterosexual women are experiencing pressures to work, as is amply represented by the heterosexual subjects in this study.

Section 3

Primary Relationships

Women's roles in our culture have traditionally been linked to marriage and family. The overriding social imperative for a woman in this culture has been to make and maintain a suitable monogamous marriage relationship. Her genital sexuality could only be expressed within this context. Outside the domain of this marital relationship she has been seen as having little separate identity. Certainly this domestic pattern of relationship has changed enormously within the last century for both women and men. However, the notion of having a loving primary relationship remains the same. The majority of the women in this study considered the development and maintenance of some kind of primary relationship to be as important--if not more so--in their lives as was their work. When actual relationship status was examined, rather than legal status, it was found that almost equal numbers (approximately 75%) of the lesbian and heterosexual subjects were currently involved in long-term primary relationships. In fact, 50% of both lesbian and heterosexual subjects described themselves as currently living with long-term partners in monogamous

relationships. It appears that though lesbians fall outside the traditional heterosocial relationship pattern, they follow conventional feminine patterns of relationship. In the expression of genital sexuality as well, lesbian subjects, like heterosexual subjects, tended to seek sexual gratification within the context of the legitimizing emotional circumstances of a primary relationship. Emotional and friendship aspects of a relationship far outweighed the importance of genital sexuality for these women.

The lesbian subjects in the studies of Gagnon and Simon (1973), Saghir and Robins (1973), and Bell and Weinberg (1978) all followed this feminine pattern of relationship. Simon and Gagnon summarized this point in the following way:

> Almost without exception, the lesbians we interviewed expressed a significant commitment to finding such an enduring love relationship. . . . Their aspirations were fundamentally those embodied in "The American Dream": a comfortable home, an interesting job, access to enjoyable leisure activities, and, above all, a sustaining and loving partner. (p. 209)

Whereas their desires and aspirations are similar to those of heterosexual women, how enduring are their actual relationships? Again, in the literature, the association of homosexuality with emotional instability has produced the notion that homosexual relationships are somehow less substantial and committed than those of heterosexuals. Some researchers suggest that society's antihomosexual attitudes, as well as the lack of legal sanction for relationships (legal marriage) make it more difficult for homosexuals to sustain lasting commitments.

There was some suggestion from the data of this study that perhaps lesbians may have less enduring relationships. More lesbians

than heterosexuals reported relationship patterns of serial long-term commitment; heterosexuals were more apt to report involvement in one primary long-term relationship. However, this is not to imply that lesbian relationships are inferior to those of heterosexuals. Both groups reported their relationships to be personally meaningful and emotionally enhancing for them. There is probably no real difference in quality of relationships between the two groups.

On the basis of their attitudes about commitment, there was no difference between the groups. Perhaps legal sanctions do provide some external support for the maintenance of long-term heterosexual relationships. Increase in the divorce rate over the last century would, however, suggest that this external support is rapidly crumbling. It is significant that both lesbians and heterosexuals were equally divided regarding the issue of permanency of commitment, and that 19 of these women reported ambivalence about commitment or else temporized it as a commitment "for now." The impression one gets from talking with many of these women is that the nature and basis of relationships has changed over the last few decades; old rules no longer apply; and no clear-cut new ones have taken their place. The younger women seemed particularly ambivalent[9] in regard to relationships (see Appendix D, Subject #28, as an example), while some of the older women were able to clearly and articulately describe the changes in cultural relationship assumptions and expectations that have occurred

---

[9]This ambivalence seemed to be a reflection of the current culture rather than an age-related developmental phenomenon.

in their life times (see Appendix D, subjects #26 and #27). Lesbian and heterosexual women alike have been affected by these changes. The nature of their relationships, in general, is more reflective of overall cultural patterning than the nature of their sexual preferences.

Section 4

Children/Motherhood/Parenthood

> Over the past few centuries, women of different ages, classes, and races have moved in and out of the paid labor force. Marriage and fertility rates have fluctuated considerably during this same period. Despite these changes, women have always cared for children, usually as mothers in families. . . . Women's mothering is one of the few universal and enduring elements of the sexual division of labor. . . .
>
> Historically, the actual physical and biological requirements of child bearing and child care have decreased. . . . But . . . women's mothering role has gained psychological and ideological significance. . . .
>
> In spite of the vast growth of the state and wage labor, women continue to perform their mothering activities in the family; the rearing of children remains a major familial responsibility. (Nancy Chodorow "The Reproduction of Mothering" pp. 3, 4, 5)

Seventeen of the women in this study had raised their own children, and an additional three (lesbians) had helped raise a partner's children. In other words, a little less than half of the women (both lesbian and heterosexual) in this sample had participated in childcare or mothering. Almost all of the women who had raised their own children described themselves as having (or having had) primary responsibility for the care of their children, regardless of whether a spouse or partner was present. Women who were mothers, regardless of their sexual preferences, took their mothering roles seriously and considered the rearing of children to be an important aspect of

their lives. Among those women without children, heterosexual women were more apt to bring up the topic of the possibility of having children than lesbian women. These heterosexual women (without children) were slightly less negative about the idea of having children than were lesbians, although both lesbians and heterosexuals expressed varying degrees of ambivalence.

Many of the women who talked about children reported some distress regarding coordination of job roles with maternal responsibility. The distress took the form of guilt about their adequacy as mothers, or apprehensiveness about management of both roles at a future time. Younger women without children particularly voiced their apprehensions--they were concerned about the "intrusion" and interference of children in their careers. This feeling was echoed by the women in Loraine Zappert's study of MBAs (Stanford Observer, 1981) who reportedly felt that their work had a negative impact on decisions about childbearing. (Male MBAs felt that being a parent had a positive effect on work.)

Despite the experience of some sex-role tension, it is apparently more possible today for women to consider the option of remaining childless. Even the fact that this (having children or not) is a question for consideration represents a change in the culture's attitudes about women's roles. As one older heterosexual subject aptly put it:

> I didn't have to think about having children, like women do now. To me, if you got married, you had children. Getting

> married might be a question--but getting married and having children weren't two separate questions.[10]

Lesbian women who were mothers were very much like their heterosexual counterparts. Those who were not mothers differed only slightly in their attitudes about children and motherhood and were similar to heterosexuals in reflecting the culture's changing sex-role options for women.

Section 5

Family of Origin

Much of the literature about homosexuality focuses on early family history, looking at the quality of family life with special emphasis on relationship with and between parents. This preoccupation with early childhood development has its roots in psychoanalytic thinking and is generally an attempt to pin down "causes" of homosexual behavior, postulating that deviant or "pathological" parent-child or parent-parent interactions are significant to later "arrests" in psychosexual development. Certainly family history is an important factor in a whole realm of subsequent human behaviors. However, Gagnon and Simon (1973) point out: "The factors that initiate a homosexual career--indeed, any career--remain only a part of a series of elements in a dynamic and vairable process" (p. 190). Among the lesbian women in their sample, two factors relating to early family history emerged as significant: (a) about half of the women reported

---

[10] From interview of Subject #29, but this quotation is not included in the interview excerpt (Appendix D).

having come from homes that were broken by death, divorce, or separation, (b) there was a tendency for the lesbian to express a strong preference toward one of her parents.

The results of Saghir and Robins' (1973) study were quite similar. They reported that 39% of the lesbian women, but only 5% of the heterosexual controls experienced parental loss by death or divorce prior to the age of 10. Also, among lesbians who were childhood and adolescent tomboys, they found evidence of emotional breakdown in relationship with their mothers.

These findings differ markedly from those of this study: No significant differences were found between lesbian and heterosexual subjects on a variety of familial dimensions. For the most part, these women reported coming from stable/intact families, had predominantly ambivalent feelings about both parents, and maintained varying--but similar--degrees of contact with their families. The nature of family rules and the quality and level of rebellion against these rules also differed little between the two groups.

Section 6

Sex Role

Some of the literature on lesbianism suggests that the development of deviant sex-role patterns among female children may be associated with later adoption of a lesbian life style. Childhood "tomboyism" has been examined as a precursor of lesbian sexual object preference, yielding mixed results and conclusions. It has been noted that masculine behavior in girls is more socially acceptable

than feminine behavior in boys; consequently tomboyism does not receive the same negative sanctions as masculine effeminacy. Women, in general, have been allowed a wider range of deviation from sex-role behaviors than men. In fact, lesbianism is often ignored or treated with much less severity than male homosexuality.

Few differences in sex role behaviors were noted between the lesbian and heterosexual women in this study. Although lesbians, by-and-large, reported negative attitudes about heterosexual marriage, the kinds of intimate primary relationships they developed were very much modeled on the heterosexual ideal. Lesbian subjects did report a more egalitarian division of household labor with their partners than did heterosexual subjects, but beyond this, the kinds of relationships they developed and the issues of intimacy they discussed were more similar to--than different from--heterosexual women.

As discussed previously, the role of mother has long been established as a feminine one by most cultures. The lesbian mothers in this sample adopted similar roles and bore nearly identical responsibilities to the heterosexual mothers. Few of these women limited their activities solely to the tasks of mothering; almost all were employed outside the home and attempted to balance their activities and roles among work, motherhood, and primary relationships. Among the non-mothers, lesbians were less apt to bring up the topic of motherhood and seemed more negative about the prospect of it. These women were not much different in their sex-role behaviors from the heterosexual subjects. As stated in the Results chapter (Chapter 3), most subjects had mixed life styles, including elements of both

traditional and nontraditional sex roles. Although few subjects reported nontraditional styles, heterosexual subjects were more likely to report this than lesbians.

A few members of both groups reported sex-role transition away from the traditional constraints put upon them in childhood. However, most subjects, even though they came from traditional family backgrounds, did not report overt enforcement of sex-role behavior by their parents. Parents, for the most part, were described as being supportive of their daughters' choices regarding either career or traditional marriage roles. However, one subject commented that although she wasn't discouraged by her parents in career aspirations, she wasn't really encouraged--as she imagined a male might be. It is very likely that most of these women experienced covert parental expectations about their sex-role development. Cultural assumptions about behavior tend to remain outside conscious recognition. In this study, only women who had discarded the values of extremely traditional families were really clear about their families' expectations and assumptions.

It is perhaps impossible to live in the United States today and remain unaware of the transition in sex-role behavior curently taking place. Most subjects in this study indicated some awareness of sex-role-related issues and conflicts; more heterosexual women than lesbians described experiencing a transition in sex-role conflict, usually in the direction of greater conflict. Lesbian women who reported a transition in conflict said they experienced less conflict as a result of their adoption of a lesbian life style. Many of these

lesbian subjects reported having to deal with fewer sex-role issues with a female partner than with a male partner. They also reported female partners to be more understanding and sensitive to their needs because they were female--like themselves.

Section 7

Sexual-Object Choice

It is in the area of sexual object choice that lesbians and heterosexuals differ most--not only in regard to the sex of the preferred partner, but in the expression of awareness of a process by which they arrived at their preferences and in the degree to which they consciously recognize or label themselves on the basis of their object preference. In more concrete terms: lesbians prefer women as sexual partners, and heterosexual women prefer men. Most lesbians are aware of--and will talk about--the manner in which they arrived at their sexual object preferences, and most heterosexual women do not express awareness of or talk about their own sexual object preference. Most lesbians will consciously label themselves on the basis of their sexual object preference (e.g., "I am a lesbian") and heterosexual women will generally not do so unless the issue is made conscious to them by a direct question. This is not to say that a lesbian's consciousness did not begin with a series of questions about herself and her relationship to the world around her; it is only that the heterosexual woman has not usually had to deal with questions about her sexual preference--there were no questions so long as she behaved in socially prescribed ways.

Lesbian women recounted a number of different processes through which they "came out" as lesbians. Heterosexual women, on the other hand, were nearly uniform in their apparent lack of awareness of a "coming out" process in the heterosexual world, although it is probable that the actual processes of becoming a heterosexual are not, in fact, at all uniform.

The topic of the interaction of sex-role behavior and sexual object (by gender) preference was considered in Section 6. Lesbian subjects were more likely to bring up this topic with nonspecific comments. However, the relationship of sex-role behavior and sexual object choice (by gender) remains unclear.

Both lesbians and heterosexual women had something to say about sex-role behavior and selection of partner (not by gender)--lesbians reporting a preference for androgynous partners and heterosexuals remaining more nonspecific in their comments.

Many lesbian subjects attested to the superior character of relationships between women as compared to men and women. They reported less sex-role conflict with their female partners and attributed special qualities to women in general (i.e., nurturance, warmth, understanding). Heterosexual subjects were as concerned about similar special qualities in their partners as were lesbians. Both lesbians and heterosexual women delineate identical criteria for partner selection, and both groups give genital sexuality a relatively low priority and only discuss it within the context of a primary relationship.

In this study, the degree to which lesbian life styles actually differ from the life styles of heterosexual women (except by gender of sex-object preference) is relatively small, even though most lesbians portray the impact of object preference on their life styles to be of significance. Apparently, their feelings about the issue of difference are of greater magnitude than actual behavioral differences.

Section 8

Miscellaneous Information

As reported in the Results chapter (Chapter 3) with regard to friendships, activities, and time alone (Table 16), there were no differences noted between lesbian and heterosexual subjects except that lesbians expressed a preference for female friends. This finding that lesbians were more apt to prefer women friends than were heterosexuals was replicated in Bell and Weinberg's (1978) study. Bell and Weinberg also noted that lesbians had more good close friends than their heterosexual counterparts. There was no indication of such a finding in this study.

The issue of friendships between women is significant from a historical perspective and worthy of a brief digression. Several times in the course of this discussion the topic of transition in sex-role behavior and the changing nature of male and female relationships has been emphasized. In the 20th centure there has been a shift away from the polarization of society into male and female spheres--that was characteristic of the 19th century--toward a more fluid and overlapping structure.

In the 19th century rigid role separation of the sexes led to an emotional separation severely limiting the intimacy between men and women. Marital relationships were more functional than intimate and emotional. It has only been in the last 100 years that the nature of the marital relationship has changed, as has the relationship of the family to the greater society. The family of the 20th century is a smaller unit which no longer includes extended family and is much more segregated from society than the family of the 19th century. "The home" is currently viewed as a place to which an individual can withdraw in order to successfully cope with an anonymous "big world" (Berger, 1977).

Intimacy and emotional support between male and female marital partners have become much more important to 20th century couples than they were for their 19th century counterparts. In the 19th century, friendships between women carried an emotional intensity and degree of intimacy that, from a 20th century perspective, would be termed latently homosexual. Their behaviors, which included displays of physical affection and avowals of undying love--often in the form of written correspondence--were casually accepted in American society (Katz and Rapone, 1980). The breakdown of some of the rigid sex-role behaviors of men and women in the 20th century has coincided with an inhibition of close female attachments, and a relative enhancement of intimacy between male-female marital partners.

The preceding historical digression leads to these questions: Where were lesbian relationships in the 19th century? Did they exist as they do today? The following answers are speculative:

The lesbian relationships that exist today cannot be found in the 19th century, just as the heterosexual relationships of the 20th century are rarely found in the 19th century. What we would call lesbian behavior did exist in the 19th century, but most likely in the socially acceptable context of female friendship. It is very unlikely that two women could have been easily able to establish a relationship modeled on the heterosexual marital situation of the 19th century, and it is quite probable that they wouldn't have wanted to establish such a relationship. For most individuals, males and females alike, survival outside the extended family system was problematic. The kind of lesbian relationships possible today have become possible because of the changes in heterosexual marriage and family structure. Modern heterosexual marriage has components (e.g., intimacy) of the female friendships of the 19th century and modern lesbian relationships are strongly reflective of current heterosexual arrangements and relationship expectations.

As reported in the Results chapter (Chapter 3) with regard to critical lifetime events (table 17, p. 64) lesbians and heterosexuals differed little except on the categories "Coming out" and "Pregnancy/Motherhood." This finding further reinforces the idea that the two groups are similar in the way they talk about their lives and in the issues they consider important.

On the topic of Religion, Bell and Weinberg (1978) postulate that lesbians would be less religious than heterosexual women, given the negative attitudes most religions have about homosexuality. Indeed, for their subjects, this was true. In this study, lesbian

and heterosexual women were equally irreligious (Table 18)--perhaps in response to the negative attitudes most religions have about women.

Section 9

Summary and Conclusions

The majority of studies about lesbians in the past have focused almost exclusively on the sexual aspects of their behavior as if this aspect alone constituted their entire being. When one moves away from this very narrow and limiting focus, one discovers a group of complex and quite diverse individuals struggling with the same issues and problems which all human beings face. As has been frequently stated in this discussion, the lesbian subjects differed little from the heterosexual subjects of this study. What is most significant among both groups of women is the degree to which they are dealing with the cultural transitions in sex-role and life style in this century. The study of lesbian life style provides an entryway into the complex realm of cultural structures, and it is in the face of difference that these structures can be seen most clearly.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Abbott, S., & Love, B. Sappho was a right-on woman. New York: Stein and Day, Publishers, 1972.

Adair, N., & Adair, C. Word is out. New York: New Glide Publications|A Delta Special, 1978.

Ariès, P. Centuries of childhood, a social history of family life. New York: Vintage Books, a Division of Random House, 1962.

Bardwick, J. M. (Ed.) Readings on the psychology of women. New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1972.

Becker, E. The denial of death. New York: The Free Press, 1973.

Becker, H. S. Outsiders: Studies in the sociology of deviance. New York: The Free Press, 1963.

Bell, A. P., & Weinberg, M. S. Homosexualities: A study of diversity among men and women. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1978.

Berger, P. Invitation to sociology, a humanistic perspective. New York: Anchor Books, 1963.

Berger, P. Facing up to modernity: Excursions in society, politics, and religion. New York: Basic Books, Inc., Publishers, 1977.

Berger, P. L., & Luckman, T. The social construction of reality. New York: Anchor Books, Doubleday and Company, Inc., 1967.

Berzon, B., & Leighton, R. (Eds.) Positively gay. Millbrae, CA: Celestial Arts, 1979.

Bieber, I. Homosexuality: A psychoanalytic study. New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1962.

Bieber, I. A discussion of "Homosexuality: The Ethical Challenge." Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology. April 1976, 44(2), 163-166.

Blau, P. M., & Duncan, A. D. The American occupational structure. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1967.

Boston Women's Health Collective. Our bodies, our selves. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1976.

Brehm, J. W., & Cohen, A. R. Explorations in cognitive dissonance. New York: John Wiley, 1962.

Burkhard, J. L. Overtness, sexual satisfaction and sexual behavior in a lesbian sample. Unpublished Master's Thesis. Colorado State University, Fort Collins, CO, 1977.

Caprio, F. S. Female homosexuality: A psychodynamic study of lesbianism. London: Peter Owen Limited, 1957.

Caprio, F. S. Variations in sexual behavior. New York: The Citadel Press, 1963.

Chafe, W. H. The American woman, her changing social, economic, and political roles, 1920-1970. London: Oxford University Press, 1972.

Chafetz, J. S., Sampson, P., Beck, P., & West, J. A study of homosexual women. Social Work, 1974, 19(6), 714-723.

Chodorow, N. The reproduction of mothering: Psychoanalysis and the sociology of gender. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1978.

Dank, B. M. Coming out in the gay world. Psychiatry, 1971, 34, 180-197.

Davidson, G. C. Homosexuality: The ethical challenge. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, April 1974, 44(2), 157-162.

de Beauvoir, S. The second sex. New York: Vintage Books, A Division of Random House, 1974.

de Monteflores, C., & Schultz, S. J. Coming out: Similarities and differences for lesbians and gay men. Unpublished manuscript. San Francisco, CA, 1978.

Diamond, L. The lesbian primer. Salem, MA: Women's Educational Media, Inc., 1979.

Diamond, M. A critical evaluation of the ontogeny of human sexual behavior. Quarterly Review of Biology, 1965, 40, 147-175.

Dinnerstein, D. The mermaid and the minotaur: Sexual arrangements and human malaise. New York: Harper Colophon Books, 1977.

Erikson, E. H. Identity, youth, and crisis. New York: W. W. Norton and Co., Inc., 1968.

Ettorre, E. M. Lesbians, women, and society. London: Routledge, Kegan, Paul, 1980.

Everitt, B. S. The analysis of contingency tables. New York: A Halsted Press Book. John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1977.

Female MBA's face tough job pressure. Stanford Observer, January 1981, pp. 1; 3.

Festinger, L. A theory of cognitive dissonance. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1957.

Ford, D. S., & Beach, F. A. Patterns of sexual behavior. New York: Harper Colophon Books, 1951.

Friedan, B. The feminine mystique. New York: Dell Publishing Co., Inc., 1970.

Frieze, I. H., Parsons, J. E., Johnson, P. B., Ruble, N., & Zellman, G. L. Women and sex roles: A social psychological perspective. New York: W. W. Norton and Company, 1978.

Gagnon, J. H. The sexual scene. New York: Transaction Books, 1970.

Gagnon, J. H., & Simon, W. Sexual conduct. Chicago: Aldine Publishing, 1973.

Galana, L., & Covina, G. The new lesbians. Berkeley, CA: Moon Books, 1977.

Galana, L., & Covina, G., (Eds.). The lesbian reader. Oakland, CA: Amazon Press, 1975.

Gardner-Loulan, J. Lesbianism: Historical psychological theories and contemporary feminist research: A comparison of methods and attitudes. Unpublished Master's Thesis, Lone Mountain College, CA, 1977.

Grier, B., & Reid, C. (Eds.). Lesbian lives, biographies of women from the ladder. Oakland, CA: Diana Press, 1976.

Hall, R. The well of loneliness. New York: Pocket Books, 1974.

Halleck, S. L. Another response to "Homosexuality: The Ethical Challenge." Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology. April 1976, 44(2), 167-170.

Hampson, J. G. Hermaphroditic appearance, rearing, and eroticism in hyperadrenocorticism. Bulletin of John Hopkins Hospital, 1955, 96, 265-273.

Hampson, J. L., & Hampson, J. G. The ontogenesis of sexual behavior in man. In W. C. Young (Ed.), Sex and internal secretions (Vol. II). Baltimore: Williams and Wilkins, 1961.

Hartmann, D. P. Considerations in the choice of interobserver reliability estimates. Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis. Spring 1977, 10(1), 103-116.

Hays, W. L. Statistics for the social sciences, (2nd ed.). New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1973.

Hedblom, J. H. Dimensions of lesbian sexual experience. Archives of Sexual Behavior, 1973, 2(4), 329-341.

Hopkins, J. H. The lesbian personality. British Journal of Psychiatry, 1969, 155, 1433-1436.

Howe, L. K. Pink collar workers: Inside the world of women's work. New York: Putnam Books, 1977.

Hutt, C. Males and females. Middlesex. England: Penguin Books, 1972.

Janeway, E. Man's world, woman's place: A study in social mythology. New York: A Delta Book, Dell Publishing Co., Inc. 1971.

Katz, E., & Rapone, A. (Eds.). Women's experience in America: An historical anthology. New Brunswick: Transaction Books, 1980.

Kenyon, F. E. Studies in female homosexuality: Psychological test results. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1968, 32(5), 510-513

Kenyon, F. E. Studies in female homosexuality VI: The exclusively homosexual group. Acta Psychiatrica Scandinavica, 1968, 44(3), 224-237.

Kinsey, A. C., Pomeroy, W. B., Martin, C. E., & Gebhard, P. H. Sexual behavior in the human female. London: W. B. Saunders Company, 1953.

Lasch, C. Haven in a heartless world: The family besieged. New York: Basic Books, Inc., Publishers, 1977.

Kremer, M. W., & Rifkin, A. H. The early development of homosexuality: A study of adolescent lesbians. American Journal of Psychiatry, 1969, 126(1), 91-96.

Levinson, D. J. The seasons of a man's life. New York: Knopf, 1978.

Loney, J. Family dynamics in homosexual women. Archives of Sexual Behavior, 1973, 2(4), 343-350.

Lopata, H. Z. Occupation housewife. London: Oxford University Press, 1971.

Maccoby, E. E. The development of sex differences. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1966.

MacDonald, A. P. The importance of sex-role to gay liberation. Homosexual Counseling Journal, 1974, 1(4), 169-180.

Mannion, K. Female homosexuality: A comprehensive review of theory and research. JSAS Catalog of Selected Documents in Psychology, 1976, 6(2), 44. (Ms. No. 1247)

Marmor, J. (Ed.). Sexual inversion: The multiple roots of homosexuality. New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1965.

Marmor, J. (Ed.). Homosexual behavior: A modern reappraisal. New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1980.

Mead, M. Sex and temperament in three primitive societies. New York: A Laurel Edition, 1969.

Mead, M. Culture and commitment: The new relationship between the generations in the 1970's. New York: Columbia University Press, 1978.

Miller, J. B. Psychoanalysis and women. Middlesex, England: Penguin Books, Ltd., 1973.

Millet, K. Sexual politics. New York: Avon Books, 1969.

Mitchell, J. Psychoanalysis and feminism. New York: Vintage Books, A Division of Random House, 1975.

Money, J. Sex hormones and other variables in human eroticism. In W. C. Young (Ed.), Sex and internal secretions, Vol II. Baltimore: Williams and Wilkins, 1961.

Money, J., & Ehrhardt, A. A. Man and woman/boy and girl. Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 1977 (6th printing).

Money, J., Hampson, J. G., & Hampson, J. L. Imprinting and the establishment of gender role. American Medical Association, Archives of Neurology and Psychiatry, 1957, 77, 333-336.

Morgan, R. (Ed.). Sisterhood is powerful. New York: Vintage Books, 1970.

Morin, S. F. Annotated bibliography of research on lesbianism and male homosexuality (1967-1974). JSAS Catalog of Selected Documents in Psychology, 1976, 6(1), 15. (Ms. No. 1191)

Nie, N. H., Hull, C. H., Jenkins, J. G., Steinbrenner, K. & Bent, D. H. Statistical package for the social sciences (2nd ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill, 1975.

Oakley, A. Sex, gender, and society. New York: Harper Colophon Books, 1972.

Oakley, A. The sociology of housework. New York: Pantheon Books, 1974.

Oberstone, A., & Sukoneck, H. Psychological adjustment and life style of single lesbians and single heterosexual women. Psychology of Women Quarterly, 1976, 2, 172-186.

Oversey, L. Homosexuality and pseudohomosexuality. New York: Science House, 1969.

Poole, K. The etiology of gender identity and the lesbian. The Journal of Social Psychology, 1972, 87, 51-57.

Rapoport, R., & Rapoport, R. Dual career families re-examined: New integrations of work and family. New York: Harper Colophon Books, 1976.

Reiss, A. J., Jr. Occupations and social status. New York: The Free Press, 1965.

Robinson, P. The modernization of sex. New York: Harper Colophon Books, 1976.

Rosaldo, M. Z., & Lamphere, L. (Eds.). Women, culture, and society. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1974.

Rosenfeld, R. A. Women's intergenerational occupational mobility. American Sociological Review. February 1978, 43(1), 36-47.

Rubington, E., & Weinberg, M. Deviance: The interactionist perspective. New York: Macmillan Company, 1973.

Rule, J. Lesbian images. New York: Pocket Books, 1976.

Saghir, M. & Robins, E. Homosexuality I: Sexual behavior of the female homosexual. Archives of General Psychiatry, 1969, 20, 192-201.

Saghir, M. & Robins, E. Male and female homosexuality: Natural history. Comprehensive Psychiatry, 1971, 12(6), 502-510.

Saghir, M. T., & Robins, E. Male and female homosexuality: A comprehensive investigation. Baltimore: Williams and Wilkins, 1973.

Schultz, S. J. Coming out and the growth of gay people and society. Unpublished manuscript, Berkeley: University of California, 1977.

Scott, A. F. Women in American life. New York: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1970,

Seigel, S. Nonparametric statistics for the behavioral sciences. New York: McGraw-Hill Company, Inc., 1956.

Shorter, E. The making of the modern family. New York: Basic Books, Inc., Publishers, 1975.

Siegelman, M. Parental background of homosexual and heterosexual women. British Journal of Psychiatry, 1974, 124, 14-21.

Singer, J. Androgyny; Toward a new theory of sexuality. New York: Anchor Books, 1977.

Socarides, C. W. The overt homosexual. New York: Grune and Stratton, 1968.

Spiro, M. E. Gender and culture: Kibbutz women revisited. New York: Schocken Books, 1979.

Stockard, J., & Johnson, M. M. Sex roles, sex inequality, and sex role development. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1980.

Stoller, R. J. Splitting, a case of female masculinity. New York: Delta Books, 1974.

Stuard, S. M. (Ed.). Women in medieval society. Philadelphia, PA: The University of Pennsylvania Press, Inc., 1976.

Sweetman, R. On our backs: Sexual attitudes in a changing Ireland. London: Pan Books, 1979.

Tanner, D. M. The lesbian couple. Lexington: Lexington Books, D.C. Heath and Company, 1978.

Terkel, S. Division street: America. New York: Discus Books/ published by Avon, 1968.

Terkel, S. Working. New York: Avon Books, 1975.

Thompson, N. L., Schwartz, D. M., McCandless, B. R., & Edwards, D. A. Parent-child relationships and sexual identity in male and female homosexuals and heterosexuals. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1973, 41(1), 120-127.

U.S. Bureau of the Census. Statistical abstract of the United States: 1979 (100th edition). Washington, D.C., author, 1979.

Van den Berg, J. H. The changing nature of man. New York: Delta Books, 1975.

Vida, G. (Ed.). Our right to love: A lesbian resource book. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall, Inc., 1978.

Weibel, K. Mirror, Mirror: Images of women reflected in popular culture. New York: Anchor Books, 1977.

Weinberg, M. S., & Williams, C. J. Male homosexuals, their problems and adaptations. New York: Penguin Books, 1974.

Wheelis, A. The quest for identity. New York: W. W. Norton and Co., Inc., 1958.

Wilson, M. L., & Greene, R. L. Personality characteristics of female homosexuals. Psychological Reports, 1971, 28, 407-412.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

INFORMED CONSENT: LONG FORM

INFORMED CONSENT: SHORT FORM

INTERVIEW CHECK LIST

SUMMARY DATA SHEET AND INTERVIEW CONDITIONS

POST INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

OCCUPATIONS OF WOMEN INTERVIEWED

INFORMED CONSENT: LONG FORM

This is a study of women's lifestyles. For the purposes of this study, I will appreciate your cooperation in an informal conversation regarding issues you consider important to how you live your life. The information you share about yourself will be an important contribution to a better understanding of women and those concerns which are significant in their lives today. There has been much conjecture and theorizing about what appears to be important to women today, but very little research has been done by simply asking women what they think. This study offers women an opportunity to express themselves without interference of someone else's preconceptions about what they are thinking and feeling about their lives.

The interview will take anywhere from 1 to 2 hours, depending upon how much you want to share about yourself and your lifestyle. Some women find the lack of structure, in terms of a specific question/answer format uncomfortable at first, but they generally become more comfortable--and, in fact, enjoy the opportunity to take time out and reflect on the issues important to them in living their lives.

To maintain the free flow of the conversation, the interview will be audio taped so as to avoid the disruption involved in taking notes. If you are at all uncomfortable with the audio taping, you may request that it not be done; or if, during the course of the interview, you wish the recorder to be turned off, you may request that this be done. Your participation is voluntary and you may withdraw your consent and discontinue the conversation at any time you wish.

All information will be kept in strictest of confidence; only the main researcher will know the identity of the participants. No names will be used on any of the information collected, and the audio tapes will be kept in a locked filing cabinet until they are transcribed, after which they will be erased. Portions of the conversation might be used in the text of a paper to be published, but names and significant identifying information will be changed to maintain your anonymity.

You are free to ask the interviewer any questions regarding the study after completion of the conversation. If you would like a summary of the results of the study at a later date, you may request a copy by contacting me at the following mailing address:

Shelley Chavoor
Department of Psychology
Austin Peay Building
University of Tennessee
Knoxville, Tennessee 37916

INFORMED CONSENT: SHORT FORM

I have read about (long form) and understand the purposes of this study. I understand that my participation is voluntary, that the conversation will be audio taped (unless I request that this not be done) and later erased to insure my anonymity; that all I say will be kept in strictest confidence, and that I may end my participation at any time I choose. On this basis I agree to participate in this study.

Date:_____ Signature:_____

Subject No. _____

Date of Interview_____

INTERVIEW CHECKLIST (Check if topic is mentioned or discussed.)

RELATIONSHIPS:

Family: (of origin)

____ Mother

____ Father

____ Siblings

____ Historical material

____ Current relationship

Current Family or Living Situation

____ Partner

____ Children

____ Historical material

____ Current situation

____ General living situation

____ Type of housing

____ Household members

____ Relationship of members

____ Description of general "life style"

Friends:

____ Social life/ activities

____ Dating, sexual relationships

____ Historic

____ Current

WORK:

____ Kind of work

____ Position/Responsibilities

____ Satisfaction

____ Conflicts

____ Relationship of work to rest of life (priorities)

GENERAL STATEMENTS ABOUT LIFE STYLE:

____ Satisfactions

____ Difficulties

____ Hopes and future plans

____ in work

____ in relationships

____ Miscellaneous (list topic briefly)_____

_____

Subject Number _____

Date of Interview _____

Summary Data Sheet

Basic Demographic Information:

Age: _____

Race of ethnic background: _____

Occupation: _____

Religion: (actively involved or not?) _____

Marital status: _____

Where Born: _____

Where raised to adolescence: _____

Where raised from adolescence: _____

History of psychotherapy (if any) _____

_____

Interview Conditions

How contact was made _____

_____

General conditions of the interview:

Place _____

Time _____

Environmental distractions _____

Rapport: How easy was it to talk to this person? _____

What were difficulties. if any? _____

General mood - affective response: _____

_____

Involvement interest with the interview _____

_____

_____

General mental status: (Subjective evaluation of the interviewer about the subject) _____

_____

_____

Subject Number _____

Date of Interview_____

POST INTERVIEW QUESTIONS:

1. How do you feel about this conversation? _____

_____

_____

2. What topics did you find most interesting?_____

_____

Least interesting_____

_____

3. How comfortable did you feel about talking? _____

4. Were there any topics which were particularly difficult to talk about?
_____

_____

5. Were there any topics which you deliberately did not talk about?

_____

6. Do you have any additional comments and general suggestions about the interview?
_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Occupations of Women Interviewed

Stock Helper (Department Store)

Dry Cleaners/Silkpressor

Order Filler (Department Store)

Clerk (State of California)

Nurse

Student - Social Work
(Retired Air Force)

Psychotherapist

Psychiatrist

Health Teacher/Masseuse

Rehabilitation Teacher/
Telephone Installer

Manager/Small Business Owner

Landscaper/Manager (multiple jobs)

Acting Teacher/Director

City Planner/Architect

Secretary (Unemployed)

Engraver/Student getting
B.A. in Philosophy

Artist/Painter

Schoolteacher

Student/Nursery School Teacher/
Mother

Tour Agent/Editorial Assistant

Lawyer

Lawyer/Real Estate Broker

Student/ex-Secretary/Hotline
Volunteer

Ex-Schoolteacher/Salesperson/
Student of Horticulture

Free Lance Editor

Editor/ex-Schoolteacher

Clerk-Typist

Bartender/Dental Assistant

Bookstore Manager/Housewife/Mother

Airline Ticket Agent

Housewife/Weaver

Ex-High School Counselor/
Manager/Bookkeeper

Accountant

Independent Insurance Agent

Schoolteacher

Schoolteacher

Housewife/Former Secretary

Building Mechanic/Housewife/Mother

City Planner (M.A. Degree)

Gerontologist (M.S.W.)

Retired Special Education Teacher/
Now Health Council Volunteer/
Multiple jobs in the past

Business Woman

Singing Teacher

Art Consultant

General Office Worker

Dental Technician/Real Estate/
Airline Stewardess

APPENDIX B

INTERVIEW CATEGORIES

INTERVIEW CATEGORIES

Demographic and Interview Process Categories

_____1. Subject No:

_____2. Age range:

1. 20-30
2. 31-40
3. 41-50
4. 51-

_____3. Ethnic/Racial background:

1. White
2. Black
3. Hispanic
4. Asian
5. Other_____

_____4. Occupation:

1. Unskilled labor
2. Skilled labor
3. Craftsperson
4. White collar
5. Professional
6. Other_____

_____5. Educational level:

1. High school
2. High school plus some college
3. Technical degree

4. College degree
5. Teaching credential/Master's
6. Professional

_____6. Sexual object choice:

1. Heterosexual
2. Lesbian
3. Bisexual

_____7. Marital status:

1. Single
2. Married
3. Separated
4. Divorced
5. Widowed
6. Remarried

_____8. Where born:

1. Northeast
2. Southeast
3. South
4. Southwest
5. Midwest
6. West
7. Outside United States

_____9. Raised to adolescence:

1. Northeast
2. Southeast
3. South
4. Southwest

5. Midwest

6. West

7. Outside United States

8. Other _____

_____10. Raised from adolescence:

1. Northeast

2. Southeast

3. South

4. Southwest

5. Midwest

6. West

7. Outside United States

8. Other_____

_____11. Location growing up: (Predominantly)

1. Rural

2. Suburban

3. Urban

4. Mixed

5. Other _____

_____12. Number of siblings:

1. Only child

2. One

3. Two

4. Three

5. Four

6. Five

7. More than five

_____13. Birth order:

1. Oldest
2. Youngest
3. In between _____
4. Not applicable
5. Unable to determine

_____14. Current living situation:

1. House
2. Apartment
3. Other_____

_____15. Household members:

1. Alone
2. Roommate(s)
3. Spouse/partner
4. Alone with children
5. Spouse/partner with children
6. Family of origin
7. Communal, with spouse/partner
8. Other_____

_____16. Location:

1. Rural
2. Suburban
3. Urban
4. Other_____

_____17. Psychotherapy?

1. None
2. Short-term (less than 6 months) - Terminated

3. Short-term - Currently involved

4. Long-term - Terminated

5. Long-term - Continuing

6. Other_____

_____18. Religion (current):

1. None

2. Protestant

3. Protestant - Fundamentalist

4. Catholic

5. Jewish - Orthodox - Conservative

6. Jewish - Reformed

7. Eastern (Zen, Vedanta)

8. Pagan/Feminist

9. Other_____

_____19. Religion (raised):

1. None

2. Protestant

3. Protestant - Fundamentalist

4. Catholic

5. Jewish - Orthodox - Conservative

6. Jewish - Reformed

7. Eastern (Zen, Vedanta)

8. Pagan/Feminist

9. Other_____

_____20. General Structure:

1. Historic (chronologically)

2. Current topics with historic referents

3. Emphasis on current topics
4. Disorganized approach
5. Other_____

_____21. Sequence (first topic):

1. Work
2. Relationships (primary)
3. Family
4. Sexual identity/Sex role/Feminism
5. Friendships
6. Transition/Change
7. General philosophy - overview
8. Other_____

_____22. Sequence (last topic):

1. Work
2. Relationships (primary)
3. Family
4. Sexual identity/Sex role/Feminism
5. Friendships
6. Transition/Change
7. General philosophy - overview
8. Other_____

_____23. Topic area emphasis:

1. Work
2. Relationships
3. Family
4. Sexual identity/Sex role/Feminism
5. Friendships

6. More than one topic of emphasis/Nothing stands out.
7. Transition/Change
8. Other_____

_____24. Locus of control:

1. Internal
2. Mixed
3. Transition toward more internal
4. External
5. Other_____

_____25. Basic "life style":

1. Traditional
2. Mixed
3. Transition in style toward more nontraditional
4. Transition in style toward more traditional
5. Nontraditional
6. Other_____

_____26. General subjective impressions:

1. "Well-integrated"
2. Struggling successfully with conflicts
3. Mixed
4. Highly conflicted
5. Other_____

_____27. Diagnostic impression:

1. OK
2. Neurotic
3. Personality disorder
4. Borderline

5. Severely disturbed

6. Other_____

_____28. Interviewer level of comfort (Circle Number)

Comfortable 1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5 Uncomfortable

_____29. Subject'slevel of comfort:

1. Comfortable

2. A little uncomfortable

3. Very uncomfortable

4. Uncomfortable at first, then comfortable

5. Other

30. Subject mentions critical lifetime event (Check appropriate items and/or write in additionals)

_____ 1. No mention

_____ 2. Marriage/relationship

_____ 3. Divorce/separation

_____ 4. Quitting school/job

(Value for check = 1; no check = 2)

_____ 5. "Coming out"

_____ 6. Pregnancy/Motherhood

_____ 7. Death in family

_____ 8. Other_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Work Categories

_____31. Current paid employment status:

1. Unemployed (not looking)
2. Unemployed (looking)
3. Part time
4. Full time
5. Retired
6. Other_____

_____32. Volunteer work:

1. No involvement
2. Part-time involvement in past - not currently
3. Extensive involvement in past - not currently
4. Part time involvement currently
5. Extensive involvement currently
6. No mention
7. Other_____

_____33. Job stability (Refers to paid employment):

1. Multiple job history/high instability/not by choice
2. Multiple job history/high instability/by choice
3. Instability related to job transition--new work/new direction
4. Stable occupation/Unstable job
5. Stable job
6. Other_____

_____34. Current work satisfaction (work can be paid or unpaid):

1. Work meets long- and short-term needs
2. Work meets many needs, but exploring alternatives
3. Currently in transition
4. Work meets short-term needs, but not long-term
5. Other_____

_____35. Work/Social life: (work can be paid or unpaid)

1. Work and social life highly overlapping
2. Work and social life partially overlap
3. Work and social life very separate, by nature of job
4. Work and social life very separate by choice
5. Other_____

_____36. Mentions conflict between work orientation and primary relationship/family:

1. Yes
2. No

_____37. Conflict resolution regarding work/family and/or primary relationship:

1. No conflict
2. Unresolved
3. Resolved in favor of work
4. Resolved in favor of family
5. Compromise/balance sought
6. Other_____

_____38. Current life priorities regarding work/family and/or primary relationships:

1. Work central focus
2. Work-oriented but work highly integrated into rest of life
3. Work central focus/family support and stability as a base
4. Work/relationship/family balance
5. Family/Relationship-oriented/work secondary
6. Family/relationship-oriented
7. Other_____

_____39. Sexual discrimination in work:

1. No mention
2. Aware of, but no direct experience with
3. Has experienced
4. Lack of awareness about and/or acceptance of sexual discrimination
5. Sexual discrimination affected job choice
6. Affirmative action made current job possible
7. Other _____

_____40. Change in priorities:

1. No change/work-oriented
2. No change/relationship/family-oriented
3. No change/balanced view
4. Shift from work to greater balance with relationship/family

5. Shift from family to balance with work

6. Shift from work to family

7. Other_____

_____41. Reason given for change:

1. Not applicable

2. External circumstances

3. Attitude/value change

4. Mixed

5. Other_____

_____42. External Circumstances (Item 41-2 & 4)

1. Not applicable

2. Divorce/Separation

3. Illness

4. Didn't get married

5. Got married

6. Sexual orientation

7. Influence of partner's values

8. Other_____

_____43. Nature of current paid employment: Stability

1. High

2. Medium

3. Low

4. Unable to classify

5. Other_____

6. Not applicable

_____44. Nature of current paid employment: Structure

1. High
2. Medium
3. Low
4. Unable to classify
5. Other_____
6. Not applicable

_____45. Nature of current paid employment: Autonomy

1. High
2. Medium
3. Low
4. Unable to classify
5. Other_____
6. Not applicable

_____46. Job role:

1. Self-employed
2. Managerial/Supervisory
3. Middle-level management
4. Staff position
5. Low level position (i.e., factory worker)
6. Other_____

_____47. Why work?

1. Necessity
2. Personal satisfaction/self-enhancement/enjoyment
3. Altruistic - "contribute to society"
4. In case it was necessary (so could support self)

5. Mixed motives

6. No need to work/likes not working

7. Other_____

48. Criterion for choosing a job: (Check appropriate items and/or write in additionals)

_____1. No mention

_____2. Money and/or benefits

_____3. Job satisfaction

_____4. Contributes to society - "meaningful"

_____5. Job security

(Value for check = 1; no check = 2)

_____6. Challenge

_____7. Freedom/independence

_____8. Supportive environment

_____9. Social activity

_____10. Other_____

_____49. Attitude of spouse/partner/family about subject's employment:

1. Supportive of work

2. Supportive, but sets limits regarding work time, job nature, etc.

3. Supportive of either choice (work or not)

4. Discouraging of work

5. Accepts work out of necessity

6. No mention

7. Not applicable

8. Other_____

Relationship Categories

_____50. Current primary relationship status: (All items refer to either heterosexual or lesbian relationships)

1. Divorced/separated from long-term-oriented relationship with no current relationships
2. Multiple simultaneous--open (no real primary)
3. One primary--not sharing living space
4. One primary--sharing living space--open
5. One primary--sharing living space--monogamous
6. Other_____

_____51. Relationship pattern:

1. Seeks no primary or sexual/romantic relationship(s)
2. One night stands
3. Multiple--open ("Dating")
4. Serial primary--short-term
5. Serial primary--long-term
6. One primary--long-term
7. Other_____

_____52. Relationship expectations:

1. Does not want "romantic" involvement
2. Wants multiple-open, minimal commitment
3. Wants long-term primary-open commitment
4. Wants long-term primary-monogamous commitment

5. Wants serial long-term

6. Not sure

7. No mention

8. Other_____

_____53. Mentions change in relationship expectations:

1. Open to monogamous

2. Monogamous to open

3. Short-term to long-term

4. Long-term to short-term

5. Change in interpersonal expectations (i.e., "less romantic," "more realistic," "want different things")

6. No mention

7. Other_____

_____54. Commitment (current):

1. No mention

2. Does not want

3. Wants commitment

4. Ambivalent

5. Considers self "committed" for now

6. Considers commitment permanent

7. Commitment is taken as a "given"

8. Other_____

_____55. Relationship status of "single" and "divorced" classification:

1. Single--relatively celibate

2. Single--active with one or more others

3. Living with same sex partner

4. Living with opposite sex partner

5. Other_____

_____56. Attitude toward marriage: (refers to traditional hetero-sexual marriage)

1. No mention

2. Positive

3. Ambivalent

4. Negative

5. Other_____

57. Content issues regarding relationship: What's important (check appropriate items and/or write in additionals)

_____ 1. Sex

_____ 2. Communication

_____ 3. Friendship

(Value for check = 1; no check = 2)

_____ 4. Do things together/Share interests

_____ 5. Stability and support

_____ 6. Not sure

_____ 7. No mention

_____ 8. Other_____

Children/Motherhood/Parenthood

_____58. Children:

1. None
2. Is expecting/with partner
3. Is expecting/without partner
4. Currently has own children/with partner (natural parent or not)
5. Has had own children/raised with partner (children have left home)
6. Has own children/without partner
7. Has had own children/without partner (children have left home)
8. No children of own, but helped or is helping raise partner's children
9. Other_____

_____59. Parents with partners/Is partner natural parent?

1. Not applicable
2. Yes
3. No
4. Combined family
5. Other_____

_____60. Children/no partner/marital status:

1. Not applicable
2. Never married/father has little-to-no contact

3. Never married/father visits
4. Divorced/father has little-to-no contact
5. Divorced/father visits
6. Other_____

_____61. Does subject want children?

1. No, and has none
2. Not decided, has none
3. Yes, and has none
4. Yes, and has children
5. No preference
6. No mention
7. Other_____

_____62. Expectations regarding responsibility for children:

1. Subject feels she should have most of the responsibility for children
2. Subject feels responsibility should be shared with partner and/or natural parent
3. Subject considers shared responsibility as pre-requisite for children
4. Subject feels she should have little responsibility for children
5. No mention
6. Not applicable--doesn't have or want children
7. Other_____

_____63. Actual situation regarding responsibility for children:

1. Subject has had most of the responsibility

2. Responsibility is/was shared
3. Subject has had little responsibility
4. Subject has had less responsibility than she would like
5. Subject has had more responsibility than she would like
6. Not applicable--subject does not have nor want children
7. No mention
8. Other_____

_____64. Conflict regarding child custody and/or child support:

1. Yes
2. No problems
3. No mention
4. Not applicable
5. Other_____

_____65. For parents with current partner, has there been a time when subject has raised children without a partner?

1. Not applicable
2. No mention
3. Yes
4. No

_____66. Importance of children to subject's life:

1. No mention
2. Accepted as part of life
3. Central focus currently
4. Central focus in past, not now.
5. Not important and does not want children

6. Important but not central

7. Wants children in the future

8. Other _____

Family of Origin Categories

_____67. Family stability: (growing up)

1. Intact/Stable
2. Divorced/Remarried/Stable
3. Divorced/Stable
4. Divorced/Unstable
5. Raised by someone other than parents/Stable
6. Raised by someone other than parents/Unstable
7. Other_____

_____68. Extended family: (when growing up)

1. Much extended family contact
2. Some extended family contact
3. Little extended family contact
4. No mention
5. Other_____

_____69. Current contact with family of origin:

1. None
2. Some/avoids contact
3. Some/would like more
4. Medium/adequate amount
5. Much contact/very close
6. Other_____
7. Unclear

_____70. Attutude regarding family:

1. Likes
2. Does not like parents' relationship to each other
3. Ambivalent
4. Conflict with
5. No mention
6. Other_____

_____71. Attitude regarding mother:

1. Positive
2. Negative
3. Ambivalent
4. No mention
5. Other_____

_____72. Attitude regarding father:

1. Positive
2. Negative
3. Ambivalent
4. No mention
5. Other_____

_____73. Control/Rules: (while growing up)

1. Strict/Overt
2. Strict/Ambiguous
3. Permissive/overt "expectations"
4. Permissive/covert "expectations"
5. Chaotic/ambiguous
6. No mention
7. Other_____

_____74. Change in attitude regarding family:

1. No change
2. More positive
3. More negative
4. Shift in level of conflict
5. Has "come to terms" with--or is coming to terms with
6. No mention
7. Other_____

_____75. Rebellion at some period in life against family:

1. No mention
2. None/Cooperative
3. Shift from family values/Not active rebellion
4. Covert rebellion
5. Overt rebellion
6. Other_____

_____76. Subject's experience of family's regard:

1. No mention
2. Doesn't know
3. Negative
4. Positive
5. Change in regard
6. Mixed message
7. Other_____

Sex Role Categories

_____77. Degree to which subject adheres to traditional "feminine" roles (current):

1. Wife and mother, no paid employment
2. Wife, mother, has supplemental job
3. Wife, mother, has career
4. Wife, no paid employment
5. Wife, has job
6. Wife, has career
7. Mother, no paid employment
8. Mother, has job
9. Mother, has career
10. Single, living with partner, no paid employment
11. Single, living with partner, has job.
12. Single, living with partner, has career
13. Single, wants marriage or live-in partner, no paid employment
14. Single, wants marriage or live-in partner, has job
15. Single, wants marriage or live-in partner, has career
16. Single, does not want marriage or partner, has job
17. Single, does not want marriage or partner, has career
18. Other _____

Note: All of the above categories can refer to either heterosexual or lesbian women. If a lesbian woman

considers herself "married" and so states this, then she will be classified as such. Those women considering themselves as "husbands" in a relationship will be put in category 18 "other."

_____78. Feminine role--role transition:

1. No transition
2. Traditional to more nontraditional
3. Nontraditional to more traditional
4. No mention
5. Other_____

_____79. Job/Career choice--Traditional or Nontraditional:

1. Traditional "feminine" job
2. Ambiguous gender job but "acceptable" job
3. Nontraditional "masculine" job
4. Other_____

_____80. Present sex role division of household labor in primary relationship:

1. No mention
2. Traditional
3. Nontraditional/equal and/or role reversal
4. Not applicable traditional dating roles
5. Not applicable nontraditional/equal dating roles
6. Not applicable other_____
7. Other_____

_____81. Transition in sex role division of household labor in current relationship:

1. Traditional to more nontraditional

2. Nontraditional to more traditional

3. No change

4. No mention

5. Other_____

_____82. Present awareness of sex-role related issues and conflict:

1. No mention

2. Implied awareness but no conscious conceptualization

3. Mentions/no conflict

4. Mentions/conflict

5. Other_____

_____83. Transition in experience of sex-role conflict:

1. No mention

2. More conflict

3. Less conflict

4. No change

5. Other_____

_____84. Sexual discrimination:

1. No mention

2. No experience of

3. Has experienced

4. Other_____

_____85. Feminism:

1. No mention

2. Mentions/opposed

3. Mentions/not very important or ambivalent

4. Mentions/pro (not active)

5. Mentions/pro (active)
6. Labels self "feminist"
7. Other_____

_____86. Mother's role model:

1. Traditional
2. Working mother/wife
3. Career mother/wife
4. Job/single or divorced
5. Career/single or divorced
6. No mention
7. Other_____

_____87. Mother's expectations regarding sex-role issues and subject's life style:

1. No mention
2. Does not know
3. Traditional
4. Encouraged "job to fall back on"
5. Encouraged career
6. Actively discouraged career
7. Other_____

_____88. Father's role model:

1. Traditional working role, little active participation in child rearing or housework
2. Nontraditional; participated actively in child rearing, housework, and worked outside the home

3. Nontraditional, participated actively in child rearing, housework, and did not work outside the home
4. No mention
5. Other_____

_____89. Father's expectations regarding sex role issues and subject's life style:

1. No mention
2. Does not know
3. Traditional
4. Encouraged "job to fall back on"
5. Encouraged "career"
6. Actively discouraged career
7. Other_____

_____90. Subject's parents' role model regarding division of household labor and/or child bearing:

1. Traditional
2. Nontraditional
3. Raised by single parent
4. No mention
5. Other_____

_____91. Differential treatment of siblings on basis of sex, by parents:

1. No mention
2. No difference
3. Difference
4. Difference between parents regarding sex roles

5. Other_____

6. Not applicable

_____92. Attitude about traditional feminine roles for self (marriage):

1. Wants marriage

2. Does not want marriage

3. Ambivalent about marriage

4. Other_____

5. No mention

_____93. Attitude about traditional feminine roles: (Motherhood)

1. Wants children

2. Does not want children

3. Ambivalent about children

4. Other_____

5. No mention

Sexual Object Choice Categories

_____94. Awareness of "decision" in terms of gender of sex object choice:

1. No mention
2. Not a decision
3. Was a decision
4. "Discovered" sexual orientation
5. Always felt, or was attracted to, but decided to act on feelings.
6. Other_____

_____95. Impact of sex object choice (in terms of gender) on subject's life style:

1. No mention
2. No difference
3. Makes a difference
4. Other_____

_____96. Sex role and sex object choice (by gender) (Refers to subject's statement about self):

1. Sex object choice has had an impact on sex role behavior
2. Sex role behavior has had an impact on sex object choice
3. Mentions nonspecifically issues in regard to sex object choice and sex role

4. No mention

5. Other_____

_____97. Sex role and sex object choice--not by gender: (Refers to subject's statement about self)

1. Traditional sex role behaviors have impact on object choice.

2. Preference for androgynous sex-role behavior in regard to sex object choice

3. Mentions nonspecifically issues regarding sex role and sex object choice

4. No mention

5. Other_____

_____98. Sex-role type conflict within primary relationship: ("Conflict" does not have to be active.)

1. No mention

2. Mentions no conflict

3. Mentions conflict

4. Mentions nonspecifically

5. Other_____

_____99. Sexuality:

1. Specifically brings up sexual-erotic issues

2. Mentions sexual-erotic issues in passing with no detail

3. No mention

4. Other_____

Miscellaneous Categories

_____100. Relative importance (currently) of religion:

1. No mention
2. Devout
3. Important/Active
4. Somewhat important
5. Nominal affiliation
6. Not important
7. Other_____

_____101. Relative importance (growing up) of religion:

1. No mention
2. Strongly emphasized in family
3. Somewhat important
4. Nominal affiliation
5. Not important
6. Other_____

_____102. Change in belief:

1. No mention
2. Active rebellion against parental religion
3. Changed religion/ No rebellion
4. No change
5. Other_____

_____103. Importance of friends:

1. Talks about importance

2. Mentions friends in passing

3. No mention of topic

4. Friends unimportant

5. Other_____

_____104. Makes statement friends are more important than love relationship:

1. Yes

2. No

_____105. Mentions friends as "extended family":

1. Yes

2. No

_____106. Friends/Sexual preference:

1. No mention

2. Prefers males

3. Prefers females

4. No preference

5. Prefers gays (no preference as to gender)

6. Other_____

_____107. Participates in activities:

1. No mention

2. Not active

3. Somewhat active

4. Very active

5. Other_____

_____108. Participates with?

1. No mention

2. Alone

3. Friends

4. Partner/family

5. Other_____

6. Any combination of 2, 3, and 4

109. Specific activities (check appropriate item(s)):

_____1. Athletics

_____2. Politics

_____3. Feminism

(Check = 1; No check = 2)

_____4. Therapy

_____5. Reading/academic

_____6. No mention

_____7. Other_____

_____

_____

_____

_____110. Being alone:

1. Likes being alone at times

2. Difficulty being alone

3. No mention

4. Other_____

APPENDIX C

FREQUENCY COUNTS FOR INTERVIEW CATEGORIES

FREQUENCY COUNTS FOR INTERVIEW CATEGORIES

Demographic and Interview Process Categories[a]

T	H	L		X^2	df	p
			1. Subject No.:			
T	H	L	2 Age range:	0	3	1.000
14	7	7	1. 20-30			
14	7	7	2. 31-40			
12	6	6	3. 41-50			
6	3	3	4. 51-			
			3. Ethnic/Racial background:	0	1	1.000
44	22	22	1. White			
0	0	0	2. Black			
2	1	1	3. Hispanic			
0	0	0	4. Asian			
0	0	0	5. Other			
			4. Occupation:	5.614	5	.345
2	2	0	1. Unskilled labor			
2	0	2	2. Skilled labor			
3	2	1	3. Craftsperson			
18	8	10	4. White Collar			
17	8	9	5. Professional			
4	3	1	6. Other			
			5. Educational level:	5.005	5	.415
6	3	3	1. High school			
2	2	0	2. High school plus some college			
2	0	2	3. Technical degree			

[a]See legend at end of table

T	H	L		X^2	df	p
17	10	7	4. College degree			
12	5	7	5. Teaching credential/Master's			
7	3	4	6. Professional			
			6. Sexual object choice:	42.086	1	.000**
23	23	0	1. Heterosexual			
23	0	23	2. Lesbian			
0	0	0	3. Bisexual			
			7. Marital status:	16.066	4	.002**
20	5	15	1. Single			
6	6	0	2. Married			
15	7	8	3. Divorced			
0	0	0	4. Widowed			
4	4	0	5. Remarried			
			8. Where born:	8.190	6	.224
9	2	7	1. Northeast			
4	1	3	2. Southeast			
1	0	1	3. South			
2	1	1	4. Southwest			
8	5	3	5. Midwest			
19	13	6	6. West			
3	1	2	7. Outside the United States			
			9. Raised to adolescence:	10.911	7	.142
9	3	6	1. Northeast			
3	0	3	2. Southeast			
1	0	1	3. South			
1	0	1	4. Southwest			

T	H	L		X^2	df	p
9	5	4	5. Midwest			
20	13	7	6. West			
1	0	1	7. Outside United States			
2	2	0	8 Other			
			10. Raised from adolescence:	10.000	7	.188
8	3	5	1. Northeast			
3	0	3	2. Southeast			
1	0	1	3. South			
1	0	1	4. Southwest			
6	3	3	5. Midwest			
24	15	9	6. West			
1	0	1	7. Outside United States			
2	2	0	8. Other			
			11. Location growing up: (Predominantly)	4.967	4	.290
5	2	3	1. Rural			
27	17	10	2. Suburban			
7	2	5	3. Urban			
6	2	4	4. Mixed			
1	0	1	5. Other			
			12. Number of siblings:	5.250	6	.512
6	4	2	1. Only child			
12	5	7	2. One			
16	7	9	3. Two			
6	4	2	4. Three			
2	2	0	5. Four			
1	0	1	6. Five			
3	1	2	7. More than five			

T	H	L		X^2	df	p
			13. Birth order:	4.958	4	.291
16	10	6	1. Oldest			
10	3	7	2. Youngest			
13	5	8	3. In between			
6	4	2	4. Not applicable			
1	1	0	5. Unable to determine			
			14. Current living situation:	9.684	2	.007**
38	15	23	1. House			
6	6	0	2. Apartment			
2	2	0	3. Other			
			15. Household members:	12.165	7	.095✓
7	4	3	1. Alone			
5	1	4	2. Roommate(s)			
18	8	10	3. Spouse/partner			
4	1	3	4. Alone with children			
5	5	0	5. Spouse/partner with children			
2	2	0	6. Family of origin			
4	1	3	7. Communal, with spouse/partner			
1	1	0	8. Other			
			16. Location:	.638	2	.726
5	3	2	1. Rural			
38	18	20	2. Suburban			
3	2	1	3. Urban			
0	0	0	4. Other			
			17. Psychotherapy?	4.622	4	.328
18	10	8	1. None			
10	6	4	2. Short-term (less than 6 months) Terminated			

T	H	L			X^2	df	p
2	1	1		3. Short-term - Currently involved			
12	6	6		4. Long-term - Terminated			
4	0	4		5. Long-term - Continuing			
0	0	0		6. Other			
			18.	Religion (current):	3.360	7	.849
25	11	14		1. None			
6	3	3		2. Protestant			
2	1	1		3. Protestant - Fundamentalist			
6	3	3		4. Catholic			
0	0	0		5. Jewish - Orthodox - Conservative			
1	1	0		6. Jewish - Reformed			
2	1	1		7. Eastern (Zen, Vedanta)			
2	1	1		8. Pagan/Feminist			
2	2	0		9. Other			
			19.	Religion (raised):	2.709	4	.607
7	4	3		1. None			
24	11	13		2. Protestant			
4	1	3		3. Protestant - Fundamentalist			
10	6	4		4. Catholic			
0	0	0		5. Jewish - Orthodox - Conservative			
1	1	0		6. Jewish - Reformed			
0	0	0		7. Eastern (Zen, Vedanta)			
0	0	0		8. Pagan/Feminist			
0	0	0		9. Other			
			20.	General Structure:	1.111	4	.892
9	4	5		1. Historic (chronologically)			
30	15	15		2. Current topics with historic referents			

T	H	L			X^2	df	p
4	2	2		3. Emphasis on current topics			
2	1	1		4. Disorganized approach			
1	1	0		5. Other			
			21.	Sequence (first topic):	6.946	6	.325
17	11	6		1. Work			
7	4	3		2. Relationships (primary)			
9	3	6		3. Family			
3	0	3		4. Sexual identity/Sex role/Feminism			
0	0	0		5. Friendships			
3	2	1		6. Transition/Change			
1	0	1		7. General philosophy - overview			
6	3	3		8. Other			
			22.	Sequence (last topic):	12.828	7	.076 ✓
3	1	2		1. Work			
10	6	4		2. Relationships (primary)			
7	4	3		3. Family			
7	0	7		4. Sexual identity/Sex role/Feminism			
2	1	1		5. Friendships			
6	5	1		6. Transition/Change			
4	1	3		7. General philosophy - overview			
7	5	2		8. Other			
			23.	Topic area emphasis:	9.423	6	.151
1	0	1		1. Work			
2	0	2		2. Relationships			
5	4	1		3. Family			
3	0	3		4. Sexual identity/Sex role/Feminism			
0	0	0		5. Friendships			

T	H	L		x^2	df	p
31	17	14	6. More than one topis of emphasis/ Nothing stands out			
3	2	1	7. Transition/Change			
1	0	1	8. Other			
			24. Locus of control:	4.887	3	.180
7	1	6	1. Internal			
19	12	7	2. Mixed			
10	5	5	3. Transition toward more internal			
10	5	5	4. External			
0	0	0	5. Other			
			25. Basic "life style":	8.949	4	.062 ✓
3	3	0	1. Traditional			
31	13	18	2. Mixed			
3	3	0	3. Transition in style toward more nontraditional			
2	0	2	4. Transition in style toward more traditional			
7	4	3	5. Nontraditional			
0	0	0	6. Other			
			26. General subjective impressions:	4.947	3	.175
4	0	4	1. "Well-integrated"			
22	13	9	2. Struggling successfully with conflicts			
13	7	6	3. Mixed			
7	3	4	4. Highly conflicted			
0	0	0	5. Other			
			27. Diagnostic impression:	1.782	3	.618
6	2	4	1. OK			
26	15	11	2. Neurotic			
8	3	5	3. Personality Disorder			
6	3	3	4. Borderline			

T	H	L			X^2	df	p
0	0	0		5. Severely disturbed			
0	0	0		6. Other			
			28.	Interviewer level of comfort	1.616	3	.655
16	7	9		1. Very comfortable			
24	13	11		2. Comfortable			
5	3	2		3. Mostly comfortable Uncomfortable at times			
1	0	1		4. Uncomfortable			
0	0	0		5. Very uncomfortable			
			29.	Subject's level of comfort:	3.610	3	.306
32	15	17		1. Comfortable			
7	5	2		2. A little uncomfortable			
2	0	2		3. Very uncomfortable			
5	3	2		4. Uncomfortable at first, then comfortable			
0	0	0		5. Other			
			30.	Subject mentions critical lifetime event (Check appropriate items or write in additionals)			
4	3	1		1. No mention	.273	1	.600
32	14	18		2. Marriage/relationship	.924	1	.336
22	11	11		3. Divorce/separation	0	1	1.000
11	5	6		4. Quitting school/job	0	1	1.000
19	0	19		5. "Coming out"	29.052	1	.000**
11	10	1		6. Pregnancy/Motherhood	7.646	1	.005**
10	4	6		7. Death in family	.127	1	.720
20	11	9		8. Other	.088	1	.766

Work Categories

T	H	L		X^2	df	p
			31. Current paid employment status:	4.400	5	.493
1	1	0	1. Unemployed (not looking)			
1	1	0	2. Unemployed (looking)			
15	8	7	3. Part time			
25	10	15	4. Full time			
1	1	0	5. Retired			
3	2	1	6. Other			
			32. Volunteer work:	10.488	5	.062 ✓
4	2	2	1. No involvement			
5	4	1	2. Part-time involvement in past - not currently			
3	1	2	3. Extensive involvement in past - not currently			
8	7	1	4. Part time involvement currently			
3	2	1	5. Extensive involvement currently			
23	7	16	6. No mention			
0	0	0	7. Other			
			33. Job stability (Refers to paid employment:	10.252	5	.068 ✓
3	0	3	1. Multiple job history/high instability/not by choice			
4	3	1	2. Multiple job history/high instability/by choice			
7	2	5	3. Instability related to job transition--new work/new direction			
3	3	0	4. Stable occupation/Unstable job			

T	H	L			X^2	df	p
24	11	13		5. Stable job			
5	4	1		6. Other			
			34.	Current work satisfaction:(work can be paid or unpaid)	2.709	3	.438
16	6	10		1. Work meets long- and short-term needs			
12	7	5		2. Work meets many needs, but exploring alternatives			
7	5	2		3. Currently in transition			
11	5	6		4. Work meets short-term needs, but not long-term			
0	0	0		5. Other			
			35.	Work/Social life: (work can be paid or unpaid)	4.259	4	.372
9	5	4		1. Work and social life highly overlapping			
26	15	11		2. Work and social life partially overlap			
3	1	2		3. Work and social life very separate, by nature of job			
3	0	3		4. Work and social life very separate, by choice			
5	2	3		5. Other			
			36.	Mentions conflict between work orientation and primary relationship/ family:	.191	1	.661
6	2	4		1. Yes			
40	21	19		2. No			
			37.	Conflict resolution regarding work/ family and/or primary relationship	3.433	4	.488
40	21	19		1. No conflict			
1	1	0		2. Unresolved			

T	H	L			X^2	df	p
1	0	1		3. Resolved in favor of work			
0	0	0		4. Resolved in favor of family			
3	1	2		5. Compromise/balance sought			
1	0	1		6. Other			
			38.	Current life priorities regarding work/family and/or primary relationships	2.780	6	.835
4	2	2		1. Work central focus			
4	2	2		2. Work-oriented but work highly integrated into rest of life			
3	2	1		3. Work central focus/family support and stability as a base			
17	6	11		4. Work/relationship/family balance			
7	4	3		5. Family/Relationship-oriented/ work secondary			
3	2	1		6. Family/relationship-oriented			
8	5	3		7. Other			
			39.	Sexual discrimination in work:	5.737	5	.332
27	17	10		1. No mention			
2	1	1		2. Aware of, but no direct experience with			
13	4	9		3. Has experienced			
2	1	1		4. Lack of awareness about and/or acceptance of sexual discrimination			
0	0	0		5. Sexual discrimination affected job choice			
1	0	1		6. Affirmative action made current job possible			
1	0	1		7. Other			
			40.	Change in priorities:	6.418	6	.378
4	2	2		1. No change/work-oriented			

T	H	L		X^2	df	p
4	1	3	2. No change/relationship/ family-oriented			
11	4	7	3. No change/balanced view			
2	0	2	4. Shift from work to greater balance with relationship/family			
9	6	3	5. Shift from family to balance with work			
1	1	0	6. Shift from work to family			
15	9	6	7. Other			
			41. Reason given for change:	4.996	4	.287
20	8	12	1. Not applicable			
2	2	0	2. External circumstances			
6	2	4	3. Attitude/value change			
17	10	7	4. Mixed			
1	1	0	5. Other			
			42. External circumstances (Item 41-2 & 4)	8.184	6	.224
26	10	16	1. Not applicable			
6	3	3	2. Divorce/Separation			
3	3	0	3. Illness			
1	1	0	4. Didn't get married			
0	0	0	5. Got married			
1	0	1	6. Sexual orientation			
4	2	2	7. Influence of partner's values			
5	4	1	8. Other			
			43. Nature of current paid employment: Stability	12.571	5	.027*
14	6	8	1. High			
14	6	8	2. Medium			
8	6	2	3. Low			

T	H	L			X^2	df	p
4	0	4		4. Unable to classify			
1	0	1		5. Other			
5	5	0		6. Not applicable			
			44.	Nature of current paid employment: Structure	11.130	4	.025*
14	7	7		1. High			
23	8	15		2. Medium			
3	3	0		3. Low			
1	0	1		4. Unable to classify			
0	0	0		5. Other			
5	5	0		6. Not applicable			
			45.	Nature of current paid employment: Autonomy	7.151	4	.128
17	9	8		1. High			
13	5	8		2. Medium			
10	4	6		3. Low			
1	0	1		4. Unable to classify			
0	0	0		5. Other			
5	5	0		6. Not applicable			
			46.	Job role:	6.284	5	.279
11	4	7		1. Self-employed			
1	0	1		2. Managerial/Supervisory			
4	2	2		3. Middle-level management			
20	7	13		4. Staff position			
4	2	2		5. Low level position (i.e., factory worker)			
6	5	1		6. Other			

T	H	L			X^2	df	p
			47.	Why work?	2.148	4	.708
9	4	5		1. Necessity			
8	4	4		2. Personal satisfaction/self-enhancement/enjoyment			
0	0	0		3. Altruistic - "contribute to society"			
0	0	0		4. In case it was necessary (so could support self)			
27	14	13		5. Mixed motives			
1	1	0		6. No need to work/likes not working			
1	0	1		7. Other			
			48.	Criterion for choosing a job: (Check appropriate items and/or write in additional)			
2	2	0		1. No mention	.522	1	.469
27	14	13		2. Money and/or benefits	0	1	1.000
33	16	17		3. Job satisfaction	0	1	1.000
9	6	3		4. Contributes to society - "meaningful"	.552	1	.457
9	3	6		5. Job security	.552	1	.457
16	9	7		6. Challenge	.095	1	.756
17	8	9		7. Freedom/independence	0	1	1.000
7	2	5		8. Supportive environment	.673	1	.411
5	4	1		9. Social activity	.897	1	.343
2	2	0		10. Other	.522	1	.469
			49.	Attitude of spouse/partner/family about subject's employment:	9.856	5	.079✓
12	4	8		1. Supportive of work			
1	0	1		2. Supportive, but sets limits regarding work time, job nature, etc.			

T	H	L		x^2	df	p
10	8	2	3. Supportive of either choice (work or not)			
0	0	0	4. Discouraging of work			
0	0	0	5. Accepts work out of necessity			
13	4	9	6. No mention			
9	6	3	7. Not applicable			
1	1	0	8. Other			

Relationship Categories

T	H	L		X^2	df	p
			50. Current primary relationship status: (All items refer to either heterosexual or lesbian relationships.)	4.476	4	.345
8	5	3	1. Divorced/separated from long-term-oriented relationship with no current relationships			
0	0	0	2. Multiple simultaneous --open (no real primary)			
10	3	7	3. One primary--not sharing living space			
2	2	0	4. One primary--sharing living space --open			
23	12	11	5. One primary--sharing living space --monogamous			
3	1	2	6. Other			
			51. Relationship pattern:	8.236	4	.083✓
2	2	0	1. Seeks no primary or sexual/romantic relationship(s)			
0	0	0	2. One night stands			
0	0	0	3. Multiple--open ("Dating")			
4	1	3	4. Serial primary--short-term			
22	8	14	5. Serial primary--long-term			
15	11	4	6. One primary--long-term			
3	1	2	7. Other			
			52. Relationship expectations:	8.000	6	.238
3	1	2	1. Does not want "romantic" involvement			
0	0	0	2. Wants multiple-open minimal commitment			
1	1	0	3. Wants long-term primary-open commitment			

T	H	L			X^2	df	p
30	13	17		4. Wants long-term primary-monogamous commitment			
2	0	2		5. Wants serial long-term			
5	4	1		6. Not sure			
3	2	1		7. No mention			
2	2	0		8. Other			
			53.	Mentions change in relationship expectations:	7.158	5	.209
4	2	2		1. Open to monogamous			
1	0	1		2. Monogamous to open			
2	0	2		3. Short-term to long-term			
0	0	0		4. Long-term to short-term			
13	8	5		5. Change in interpersonal expectations, (i.e., "less romantic," "more realistic," "want different things")			
20	8	12		6. No mention			
6	5	1		7. Other			
			54.	Commitment (current):	6.220	6	.398
8	5	3		1. No mention			
0	0	0		2. Does not want			
6	4	2		3. Wants commitment			
9	5	4		4. Ambivalent			
10	2	8		5. Considers self "committed" for now			
7	4	3		6. Considers commitment permanent			
5	2	3		7. Commitment is taken as a "given"			
1	1	0		8. Other			

T	H	L		X^2	df	p
			55. Relationship status of "single" and "divorced" classification:	29.619	4	.000**
7	5	2	1. Single--relatively celibate			
12	4	8	2. Single--active with one or more others			
13	0	13	3. Living with same sex partner			
4	4	0	4. Living with opposite sex partner			
0	0	0	5. Other			
10	10	0	6. Not applicable			
			56. Attitude toward marriage: (refers to traditional heterosexual marriage)	13.142	3	.0043**
9	3	6	1. No mention			
7	7	0	2. Positive			
14	9	5	3. Ambivalent			
16	4	12	4. Negative			
0	0	0	5. Other			
			57. Content issues regarding relationship: What's important (check appropriate items or write in additionals)			
7	2	5	1. Sex	.673	1	.411
35	19	16	2. Communication	.477	1	.489
35	15	20	3. Friendship	1.911	1	.166
31	13	18	4. Do things together/share interests	1.582	1	.208
34	15	19	5. Stability and support	1.014	1	.313
4	3	1	6. Not sure	.273	1	.600
4	2	2	7. No mention	0	1	1.000
6	2	4	8. Other	.191	1	.661

Children/Motherhood/Parenthood

T	H	L		X^2	df	p
			58. Children:	11.226	7	.129
25	11	14	1. None			
1	1	0	2. Is expecting/ with partner			
0	0	0	3. Is expecting/without partner			
5	5	0	4. Currently has own children/with partner (natural parent or not)			
3	2	1	5. Has had own children/raised with partner (children have left home)			
5	2	3	6. Has own children/ without partner			
3	2	1	7. Has had own children/without partner (children have left home)			
3	0	3	8. No children of own, but helped or is helping raise partner's children			
1	0	1	9. Other			
			59. Parents with partners/Is partner natural parent?	7.675	4	.104
37	16	21	1. Not applicable			
5	5	0	2. Yes			
2	1	1	3. No			
1	1	0	4. Combined family			
1	0	1	5. Other			
			60. Children/no partner/ marital status:	1.560	3	.668
37	19	18	1. Not applicable			
1	1	0	2. Never married/ father has little-to-no contact			

T	H	L			X^2	df	p
0	0	0		3. Never married/father visits			
5	2	3		4. Divorced/father has little-to-no contact			
3	1	2		5. Divorced/father visits			
0	0	0		6. Other			
			61.	Does subject want children?	5.099	5	.403
7	2	5		1. No, and has none			
5	3	2		2. Not decided, has none			
7	4	3		3. Yes, and has none			
17	11	6		4. Yes, and has children			
0	0	0		5. No preference			
8	6	2		6. No mention			
2	1	1		7. Other			
			62.	Expectations regarding responsibility for children:	3.333	4	.503
3	2	1		1. Subject feels she should have most of the responsibility for children.			
2	2	0		2. Subject feels responsibility should be shared with partner and/or natural parent.			
2	1	1		3. Subject considers shared responsibility as prerequisite for children.			
0	0	0		4. Subject feels she should have little responsibility for children.			
30	15	15		5. No mention			
9	3	6		6. Not applicable--doesn't have or want children			
0	0	0		7. Other			

T	H	L			X^2	df	p
			63.	Actual situation regarding responsibility for children:	.476	4	.975
10	5	5		1. Subject has had most of the responsibility.			
6	3	3		2. Responsibility is/was shared.			
0	0	0		3. Subject has had little responsibility.			
0	0	0		4. Subject has had less responsibility than she would like.			
0	0	0		5. Subject has had more responsibility than she would like.			
23	11	12		6. Not applicable--subject does not have nor want children.			
7	4	3		7. No mention			
0	0	0		8. Other			
			64.	Conflict regarding child custody and/or child support:	1.506	4	.825
7	4	3		1. Yes			
1	0	1		2. No problems			
3	1	2		3. No mention			
33	17	16		4. Not applicable			
2	1	1		5. Other			
			65.	For parents with current partner, has there been a time when subject has raised children without a partner?	5.675	2	.058✓
37	16	21		1. Not applicable			
0	0	0		2. No mention			
4	2	2		3. Yes			
5	5	0		4. No			
			66.	Importance of children to subject's life	10.888	7	.143
18	5	13		1. No mention			

T	H	L		χ^2	df	p
6	3	3	2. Accepted as part of life			
6	4	2	3. Central focus currently			
6	5	1	4. Central focus in past, not now			
2	1	1	5. Not important and does not want children			
1	0	1	6. Important but not central			
3	3	0	7. Wants children in the future			
4	2	2	8. Other			

Family of Origin Categories

T	H	L		χ^2	df	p
			67. Family stability: (growing up)	7.325	5	.197
32	17	15	1. Intact/Stable			
1	0	1	2. Divorced/Remarried/Stable			
2	1	1	3. Divorced/Stable			
5	3	2	4. Divorced/Unstable			
2	2	0	5. Raised by someone other than parents/Stable			
0	0	0	6. Raised by someone other than parents/Unstable			
4	0	4	7. Other			
			68. Extended family: (when growing up)	6.666	3	.083✓
3	3	0	1. Much extended family contact			
15	5	10	2. Some extended family contact			
2	2	0	3. Little extended family contact			
26	13	13	4. No mention			
0	0	0	5. Other			
			69. Current contact with family of origin:	4.863	5	.432
0	0	0	1. None			
9	4	5	2. Some/avoids contact			
5	1	4	3. Some/would like more			
14	6	8	4. Medium/adequate amount			
8	6	2	5. Much contact/very close			
6	4	2	6. Other			
4	2	2	7. Unclear			

T	H	L		X^2	df	p
			70. Attitude regarding family:	2.519	4	.641
15	7	8	1. Likes			
1	1	0	2. Does not like parents' relationship to each other			
19	10	9	3. Ambivalent			
10	4	6	4. Conflict with			
0	0	0	5. No mention			
1	1	0	6. Other			
			71. Attitude regarding mother:	3.229	3	.357
14	5	9	1. Positive			
6	2	4	2. Negative			
23	14	9	3. Ambivalent			
3	2	1	4. No mention			
0	0	0	5. Other			
			72. Attitude regarding father:	2.797	4	.592
11	5	6	1. Positive			
6	2	4	2. Negative			
25	13	12	3. Ambivalent			
2	2	0	4. No mention			
2	1	1	5. Other			
			73. Control/Rules: (while growing up)	2.606	6	.856
10	5	5	1. Strict/Overt			
2	1	1	2. Strict/Ambiguous			
13	7	6	3. Permissive/overt "expectations"			
1	1	0	4. Permissive/covert "expectations"			
2	1	1	5. Chaotic/ambiguous			
17	7	10	6. No mention			
1	1	0	7. Other			

T	H	L		X^2	df	p
			74. Change in attitude regarding family:	5.176	6	.521
10	5	5	1. No change			
2	1	1	2. More positive			
1	1	0	3. More negative			
3	2	1	4. Shift in level of conflict			
5	1	4	5. Has "come to terms" with--or is coming to terms with			
23	11	12	6. No mention			
2	2	0	7. Other			
			75. Rebellion at some period in life against family:	3.606	4	.461
17	10	7	1. No mention			
2	0	2	2. None/Cooperative			
4	1	3	3. Shift from family values/ Not active rebellion			
10	5	5	4. Covert rebellion			
13	7	6	5. Overt rebellion			
0	0	0	6. Other			
			76. Subject's experience of family's regard:	7.419	5	.191
30	16	14	1. No mention			
1	1	0	2. Doesn't know			
3	0	3	3. Negative			
7	2	5	4. Positive			
0	0	0	5. Change in regard			
4	3	1	6. Mixed message			
1	1	0	7. Other			

Sex Role Categories

T	H	L		X^2	df	p
			77. Degree to which subject adheres to traditional "feminine" roles (current):	19.730	14	.138
2	2	0	1. Wife and mother, no paid employment			
1	1	0	2. Wife, mother, has supplemental job			
4	4	0	3. Wife, mother, has career			
0	0	0	4. Wife, no paid employment			
1	1	0	5. Wife, has job			
1	1	0	6. Wife, has career			
1	1	0	7. Mother, no paid employment			
2	1	1	8. Mother, has job			
3	0	3	9. Mother, has career			
0	0	0	10. Single, living with partner, no paid employment			
9	2	7	11. Single, living with partner, has job			
7	2	5	12. Single, living with partner, has career			
1	1	0	13. Single, wants marriage or live-in partner, no paid employment			
4	1	3	14. Single, wants marriage or live-in partner, has job			
2	1	1	15. Single, wants marriage or live-in partner, has career			
2	1	1	16. Single, does not want marriage or partner, has job			
0	0	0	17. Single, does not want marriage or partner, has career			

T	H	L			X^2	df	p
6	4	2		18. Other			
				Note: All of the above categories can refer to either heterosexual or lesbian women. If a lesbian woman considers herself "married" and so states this, then she will be classified as such. Those women considering themselves as "husbands" in a relationship will be put in category 18 "other."			
			78.	Feminine role--role transition:	.952	4	.916
3	1	2		1. No transition			
14	8	6		2. Traditional to more nontraditional			
2	1	1		3. Nontraditional to more traditional			
24	12	12		4. No mention			
3	1	2		5. Other			
			79.	Job/Career choice--Traditional or nontraditional:	6.166	3	.103
10	6	4		1. Traditional "feminine" job			
24	13	11		2. Ambiguous gender job but "acceptable" job			
10	2	8		3. Nontraditional "masculine" job			
2	2	0		4. Other			
			80.	Present sex role division of household labor in primary relationship:	13.793	6	.032*
8	3	5		1. No mention			
3	3	0		2. Traditional			
18	8	10		3. Nontraditional/equal and/or role reversal			
1	1	0		4. Not applicable traditional dating roles			
7	1	6		5. Not applicable nontraditional/equal dating roles			

T	H	L			X^2	df	p
8	7	1		6. Not applicable other			
1	0	1		7. Other			
			81.	Transition in sex role division of household labor in current relationship:	4.030	3	.258
3	3	0		1. Traditional to more nontraditional			
0	0	0		2. Nontraditional to more traditional			
6	3	3		3. No change			
33	16	17		4. No mention			
4	1	3		5. Other			
			82.	Present awareness of sex-role related issues and conflict:	1.758	3	.624
4	2	2		1. No mention			
7	3	4		2. Implied awareness but no conscious conceptualization			
9	3	6		3. Mentions/no conflict			
26	15	11		4. Mentions/conflict			
0	0	0		5. Other			
			83.	Transition in experience or sex-role conflict:	8.244	3	.041*
20	8	12		1. No mention			
9	8	1		2. More conflict			
16	6	10		3. Less conflict			
1	1	0		4. No change			
0	0	0		5. Other			
			84.	Sexual discrimination:	6.285	2	.043*
28	18	10		1. No mention			
2	1	1		2. No experience of			
16	4	12		3. Has experienced			

T	H	L			X^2	df	p
0	0	0		4. Other			
			85.	Feminism:	4.642	4	.326
15	9	6		1. No mention			
0	0	0		2. Mentions/opposed			
7	5	2		3. Mentions/not very important or ambivalent			
13	4	9		4. Mentions/pro (not active)			
3	2	1		5. Mentions/pro (active)			
8	3	5		6. Labels self "feminist"			
0	0	0		7. Other			
			86.	Mother's role model:	4.676	6	.586
28	13	15		1. Traditional			
6	3	3		2. Working mother/wife			
1	1	0		3. Career mother/wife			
2	2	0		4. Job/single or divorced			
1	0	1		5. Career/single or divorced			
3	1	2		6. No mention			
5	3	2		7. Other			
			87.	Mother's expectations regarding sex-role issues and subject's life style:	6.263	4	.180
20	9	11		1. No mention			
0	0	0		2. Does not know			
7	2	5		3. Traditional			
4	4	0		4. Encouraged "job to fall back on"			
6	4	2		5. Encouraged career			
0	0	0		6. Actively discouraged career			
9	4	5		7. Other			

T	H	L			X^2	df	p
			88.	Father's role model:	5.611	3	.132
32	14	18		1. Traditional working role, little active participation in child rearing or housework			
3	3	0		2. Nontraditional; participated actively in child rearing, housework, and worked outside the home			
0	0	0		3. Nontraditional, participated actively in child rearing, housework, and did not work outside the home			
2	2	0		4. No mention			
9	4	5		5. Other			
			89.	Father's expectations regarding sex role issues and subject's life style:	6.801	5	.235
23	11	12		1. No mention			
0	0	0		2. Does not know			
2	0	2		3. Traditional			
3	3	0		4. Encouraged "job to fall back on"			
6	4	2		5. Encouraged "career"			
1	0	1		6. Actively discouraged career			
11	5	6		7. Other			
			90.	Subject's parents' role model regarding division of household labor and/or child rearing:	7.428	4	.114
21	12	9		1. Traditional			
1	1	0		2. Nontraditional			
4	3	1		3. Raised by single parent			
16	4	12		4. No mention			
4	3	1		5. Other			
			91.	Differential treatment of siblings on basis of sex, by parents:	2.977	4	.560
24	12	12		1. No mention			

T	H	L			X^2	df	p
5	3	2		2. No difference			
9	4	5		3. Difference			
2	0	2		4. Difference between parents regarding sex roles			
0	0	0		5. Other			
6	4	2		6. Not applicable			
			92.	Attitude about traditional feminine roles for self (marriage):	18.004	4	.001**
11	10	1		1. Wants marriage			
19	4	15		2. Does not want marriage			
11	8	3		3. Ambivalent about marriage			
1	0	1		4. Other			
4	1	3		5. No mention			
			93.	Attitude about traditional feminine roles: (Motherhood)	8.761	4	.067√
21	13	8		1. Wants children			
7	2	5		2. Does not want children			
8	6	2		3. Ambivalent about children			
3	0	3		4. Other			
7	2	5		5. No mention			

Sexual Object Choice Categories

T	H	L		X^2	df	p
			94. Awareness of "decision" in terms of gender of sex object choice:	35.981	5	.000**
22	21	1	1. No mention			
5	1	4	2. Not a decision			
7	0	7	3. Was a decision			
4	0	4	4. "Discovered" sexual orientation			
4	0	4	5. Always felt, or was attracted to, but decided to act on feelings			
4	1	3	6. Other			
			95. Impact of sex object choice (in terms of gender) on subject's life style:	38.640	2	.000**
25	23	2	1. No mention			
1	0	1	2. No difference			
20	0	20	3. Makes a difference			
0	0	0	4. Other			
			96. Sex role and sex object choice (by gender) (Refers to subject's statement about self):	26.226	3	.000**
6	1	5	1. Sex object choice has had an impact on sex role behavior			
11	0	11	2. Sex role behavior has had an impact on sex object choice			
4	1	3	3. Mentions nonspecifically issues in regard to sex object choice and sex role			
25	21	4	4. No mention			
0	0	0	5. Other			

T	H	L			X^2	df	p
			97.	Sex role and sex object choice--not by gender: (Refers to subject's statement about self)	12.933	3	.004**
2	0	2		1. Traditional sex role behaviors have impact on object choice.			
8	0	8		2. Preference for androgynous sex role behavior in regard to sex object choice			
21	14	7		3. Mentions nonspecifically issues regarding sex role and sex object choice			
15	9	6		4. No mention			
0	0	0		5. Other			
			98.	Sex-role type conflict within primary relationship: ("Conflict" does not have to be active)	16.000	4	.003**
32	12	20		1. No mention			
3	0	3		2. Mentions no conflict			
4	4	0		3. Mentions conflict			
5	5	0		4. Mentions nonspecifically			
2	2	0		5. Other			
			99.	Sexuality:	3.000	3	.391
9	3	6		1. Specifically brings up sexual-erotic issues			
20	10	10		2. Mentions sexual-erotic issues in passing with no detail			
16	10	6		3. No mention			
1	0	1		4. Other			

Miscellaneous Categories

T	H	L			X^2	df	p
			100.	Relative importance (currently) of religion:	5.035	6	.539
5	3	2		1. No mention			
2	2	0		2. Devout			
2	1	1		3. Important/Active			
9	5	4		4. Somewhat important			
3	2	1		5. Nominal affiliation			
23	10	13		6. Not important			
2	0	2		7. Other			
			101.	Relative importance (growing up) of religion:	4.672	5	.457
11	4	7		1. No mention			
6	3	3		2. Strongly emphasized in family			
13	6	7		3. Somewhat important			
9	5	4		4. Nominal affiliation			
6	5	1		5. Not important			
1	0	1		6. Other			
			102.	Change in belief:	3.028	3	.387
21	9	12		1. No mention			
1	0	1		2. Active rebellion against parental religion			
14	7	7		3. Changed religion/No rebellion			
10	7	3		4. No change			
0	0	0		5. Other			
			103.	Importance of friends:	2.109	2	.348
31	15	16		1. Talks about importance			

T	H	L			X^2	df	p
13	6	7		2. Mentions friends in passing			
2	2	0		3. No mention of topic			
0	0	0		4. Friends unimportant			
0	0	0		g. Other			
			104.	Makes statement friends are more important than love relationship:	1.426	1	.232
3	0	3		1. Yes			
43	23	20		2. No			
			105.	Mentions friends as "extended family":	0	1	1.000
9	4	5		1. Yes			
37	19	18		2. No			
			106.	Friends/Sexual preference:	22.000	5	.000**
28	21	7		1. No mention			
1	1	0		2. Prefers males			
9	0	9		3. Prefers females			
4	1	3		4. No preference			
3	0	3		5. Prefers gays (no preference as to gender)			
1	0	1		6. Other			
			107.	Participates in activities:	2.433	2	.296
0	0	0		1. No mention			
1	0	1		2. Not active			
31	14	17		3. Somewhat active			
14	9	5		4. Very active			
0	0	0		5. Other			
			108.	Participates with?	3.023	2	.220
1	0	1		1. No mention			
0	0	0		2. Alone			

T	H	L		X^2	df	p
2	2	0	3. Friends			
0	0	0	4. Partner/family			
0	0	0	5. Other			
43	21	22	6. Any combination of 2, 3, and 4			
		109.	Specific activit ies (check appropriate item(s)):			
18	9	9	1. Athletics	0	1	1.000
12	7	5	2. Politics	.112	1	.737
13	7	6	3. Feminism	0	1	1.000
18	7	11	4. Therapy	.821	1	.364
21	13	8	5. Reading/academic	1.401	1	.236
0	0	0	6. No mention	0	0	1.000
43	23	20	7. Other	1.426	1	.232
		110.	Being alone:	3.569	3	.312
24	15	9	1. Likes being alone at times			
7	3	4	2. Difficulty being alone			
13	4	9	3. No mention			
2	1	1	4. Other			

Legend:

T = Total
H = Heterosexual
L = Lesbian

X^2 = Chi Square
df = Degrees of freedom
P = Probability

Significance Key:

* ≤ .05 level
** ≤ .01 level
✓ Approaching significance at the .05 level

APPENDIX D

INTERVIEW EXCERPTS

SUBJECT #1: 35-YEAR-OLD HETEROSEXUAL

I--the first thing that just flashes through my mind is that, if I were to describe myself, presently, I would say--I would describe myself by what I do for a living, because I am very much identified by that. I think of myself as an editor and I think of a real strong connection with books and book publishing. And then I would probably say something, because we're sitting in this house and I'm looking out at my own back yard, I'd probably say that I own a house and I think about that a lot. Umm--that's kind of a new experience for me--being a home owner. I've owned it about a year and a half. So it's still--it's still real present in my consciousness--the difference between being a renter and being an owner, and the kinds of things that occur that might not have occurred before.

What kinds of things? I'm curious.

Well, umm, I have a tenant for one thing, so that makes me a landlady. I have to take care of things for someone else. You know--I had to replace her refrigerator last week. I had to replace a sink or I had to get the work done--to do those things--and, uh, that was real scary to me when I thought about buying a house. I mean because this house was the one I wanted to buy and it just happened to have a little apartment in it and I realized that I was going to have to take care of some things for someone else--that I would be responsible. And uh, I just--

So it's a shift in how you think of yourself?

Yes. Now I realize that I can just sort of take care of them one at a time and it works out OK. But the idea of starting that has--you know--just making that decision was scary to me.

How did you make the decision?

Umm--well--well, I moved into this house with another woman, and we basically persuaded the owner to let us move in as renters by telling him we were thinking of buying. So he gave us an option to buy. Umm--we were desperate! We just wanted a house real badly, and so we did a little song and dance. And then, 8 months later or so, he said he really needed to sell it because he needed the money, and he gave us a very good deal. So we just went ahead and did it. And then I bought her out 6 months later because we ended up being real incompatible financially. And it was a real difficult situation between us. I was more able to buy her out than she was able to buy me out. That's what happened. And,uh, so I've been here by myself for about a year and a half.

You were living alone ?

No, I wasn't alone all the time. She was here for awhile after we quit being co-owners, and then I was actually just by myself for about 8 months, I guess.

How was that?

Well, it was real interesting--umm--a lot of changes took place at once. I also broke up with the man I had been seeing for about 4 years. So, that happened at the same time; so I found myself real alone and feeling real isolated. And--uh--but also, on the other hand, really enjoying it. I left Pat's room completely bare and I used it for an exercise space, and I did some dance work in there and I really benefited from that and sort of appreciated having the time and the space to do that without having anybody else present--ever--unless I invited them in the house. And-uh--but when I wasn't feeling good about being alone, I found I bought a lot of entertainment for myself. I think I spent outrageous amounts of money last spring and fall because I was just trying to entertain myself --trying to put either activity or people into my life elsewhere.

Did it work?

It worked--and it didn't work! Sometimes I felt like I was sort of running in place. And-uh, a lot of times I felt like I was having a real good time. That was the second period of time that I've lived by myself. And sort of the same thing happened both times, because I found that sometimes I really enjoyed it and really liked the privacy; and other times I just felt real isolated--particularly accentuated by the fact that I also work at home, so--

So you don't get out and see people that much?

Unless I really--I have to make contact with people. I have to call up people and make plans with them, rather than just having a regular routine or a job or something that gets me in contact with people. You know, there were times last spring, and where a couple of days would go by, when I wouldn't talk to anybody. And then I would begin to worry about myself turning into a hermit. So I would go through this flurry of activity where I was seeing people--seeing movies or whatever--to keep myself in touch.

I'm wondering what it's like for you?

Umm--well, it's real easy for me to feel--to sort of let my self-esteem go with those periods of time; it's the same trip that I play on myself about work. If I have a period of time that I'm not doing that much work, my self-esteem drops out of the bottom. It's like I feel that if I'm not in contact with people or I don't have work to do or something like that, I must not be worthwhile for some reason or another. And I really can play that trick on myself for a while until I sort of come out on the other side of it, or something comes up, or I get a call, or I get a job, or whatever.

It must be pretty difficult. You seem to have to structure your own life.

Right. I sometimes wonder how would I view myself if I didn't view myself as an editor. I do lay this number on myself about doing productive work. I feel much better when whatever I'm doing is somewhere in the process of producing something. And books are perfect. I mean I have right there--you know--I can say all those books are things that I've done. And-uh when I'm not working or doing something actively, then I feel like I'm sort of not--not contributing anything. And--uh--

When you finish books, do you quickly get into another project, or what?

I usually have some kind of overlap going. It just sort of happens that way--that, you know, jobs come up and the timing is always so crazy that they end up being overlapped, and sometimes I get in a real bind where I'm working on too many things at once because of somebody else's timing. And then other times, I end up without anything to do--because of somebody else's timing. I'm also real subject to the timing of authors and publishers, production houses. I can set up my own personal working schedule, but I have to wait on somebody else.

SUBJECT #03: 63-YEAR-OLD HETEROSEXUAL

Well, my life very much centers around my volunteer work in health, partly because I retired under disability. I was very bitter and angry about retiring because I just reached the point where I thought I was beginning to make enough money so that I felt adequately repaid for all my years and years of education, and it was as though I had just reached the party as the door was closed in my face. I was very angry, and I had a lot of things to get over. I didn't know at the time that I couldn't start working with my health--that it wouldn't become any better until I did something about all this anger and disappointment and resentment and everything. I had no concept of that. I just thought that if I sat around in the sun, I'd get better, because the doctors couldn't do anything for me. They thought that I might have permanent brain damage--might never fully recover my speech.

You had a stroke?

Well, they didn't know I had a stroke. One said that I had viral encephalitis; one said that I had hepatitis; they didn't know what it was. It was just something that cut me down over night--and that was 7 years ago. Anyway, I live alone, and my children are grown and they live in Colorado, and I like living alone. I lived alone for years before I got married and that's my idea of how to live. But it turned out to be very difficult when I was ill. I couldn't cook--and things like that. I lived on cold food for a long time. I got more and more morose and down and defeated. But then when I found new interests in life, I began getting better. I found yoga, for instance. It really intrigued me. I went to yoga classes more and more times, and pretty soon I came every day, because it was as though I couldn't get enough of it. It was like a breath of life to me.

Just the exercise itself, or being with people, or--?

Well, something happens when you do yoga. Yoga isn't just postures. Yoga is a change that happens in the mind when--this is where the mind and body are one. You reach a certain place where your muscles have really let go, and you have really stretched and you've taken in a lot more oxygen, and you begin to see everything differently. . . . I had been on tranquilizers for years, and I had never had anything like this, but I got rid of all that stuff when I got on another thing. I had a friend who was interested in nutrition and got me started on that through letters, and before I knew it, I was going to conferences and doing a whole lot of things about my health. But being here at my volunteer job was the essential thing because there's so much reinforcement, so many people interested in you, so much love, physical touching. You meet people in the hall and they hug you. If you live alone, you don't have that; and you miss it. You don't even know that you miss it. You just know you're kind of cold to the world. So now I'm taking a class in massage, because I feel that that's one way I can get a lot of touching.

Another great thing that happened was that after I'd been here about a year, they had been doing biofeedback with people, when they came in, to give them experience in the relaxation of biofeedback. And they didn't have time to do it and said, "Let's train someone to do it." And I said I'd do it, so I was trained in that, and then for another year or so I worked with everybody who came in on their initial experience and learned a lot about it and became very good at it. And then somebody left who was giving a course in Sunnyvale, and asked if I'd like to take over their course. And, scared to death, I said, "I don't know anything about that, but I'll try." So now I'm giving two courses in relaxation training, and this is what my life is centered around right now -- because these are the things I should have known in my twenties and thirties and forties, so that I wouldn't have gotten where I got in my fifties. And this is how I am rehabilitating myself, through teaching others.

I'm curious where you were in your twenties and thirties that you got to where you were in your fifties. Tell me something about this transformation.

I was very goal-oriented and thought success was the thing to do. I lived in the New York area and commuted, and got a job in the world's largest advertising agency. "Well, we've got to start at the top!" And I went to--I was going to be a copy writer. I started as a secretary, and I went to these beauty schools so I could get rid of my rear end and fix up my face, and get all these wonderful clothes, and all this other stuff. It was all the superficial outward trappings of American success. And it was only after the war--I flew back from overseas--that I realized that I really didn't want that, but I didn't know how else to go. There were no alternatives open that I was aware of, because everybody was doing the same kinds of things: looking for a better job.

So what was open for women--for you--in those days?

Marriage was open, so I got married--which was not a very smart thing for me to do, because I knew absolutely nothing about it. My mother had left my father when I was about 2 years old. I never had a model. I had no idea what men were like at all because I had never had to relate to one except very casually. I certainly knew nothing about children. I had never held a child until I brought my son home from the hospital. It was the last place I should have gone--terrible thing for me to do. But anyway, I stuck that out.

And there was no one around for you to talk to.

No. And I also didn't know about that. I knew about talking to professionals and when we were in Boston, I went to see a psychiatrist. We had very little money because we were living on the GI bill, and I explained that. So he said, "I don't see any reason for you to continue with me because what you need are friends. You just need to have people to confide in, to talk these things over with. You don't need me." And I didn't have any friends that I could talk to about it, because we kept moving, moving, moving. And it seemed that as soon as I made some friends, then we left again. And also I didn't know about openness, and how easy it is to get rid of things that you just talk about. I didn't learn that until I came here--to my volunteer job.

So that's something new with you within the last few years?

You bet it is, because before you were supposed to keep everything to yourself.

You were supposed to be the happy housewife.

Right. And I was happy, happy, happy on the surface. I often say that the happiest years of my life were those miserable 7 years that I was married, because I really--when I look back on it--I blotted out the unpleasantness to such an extent--I managed to suppress it so that it was only when the end came suddenly (clap) like that, that I began to see what was really happening. I was appalled at how I'd been living, but it didn't show me another way. It just showed me that that was a way I didn't want to go. It seems as though I kept finding ways that I didn't want to pursue--things that were wrong for me. And it's only now that I've found something that I want to pursue. Now after I--when I was bringing up my children I worked in things like radio, and television, and advertising; and then I decided that was no good. (Forget it, with kids.) And I became a teacher. I really liked what I was doing with that. But it took so many years to get to the point where I liked it--to feel that I was really accomplishing something. It was just when I got to the point where I felt "This is what I want to do" that BOOM! I got sick.

What kind of a teacher were you?

I was in learning disabilities in the end, because I had learned so much about psychology, through my problems. I had a lot of problems with my children and learned a lot from the psychologist who worked with my children at the guidance center. He was a marvellous man, and his psychiatric social work had gotten us through crisis after crisis, so that I had learned to depend rather heavily on somebody like that. But now I have this feeling--a much better feeling--I go around some days saying, "Thank God that I got out of teaching." And yet, I was enjoying it when I was doing it. Like my marriage, "Thank God that that's over."

And yet I was happy -- simply because you blind yourself. I had blinded myself, and I couldn't see it in another light. So anyway, I like what I'm doing now. In fact, I was thinking this morning when I was coming down here that it's just this week that I'm starting to do two classes--that I'm starting to have enough energy to do it Tuesdays and Thursdays. I've just been doing a Thursday class, because I'm compulsive about preparation and I need a day and a half to get ready for this class, even though I know everything I'm going to say there. I have to go over all my notes and all my papers and everything. And this is something I'd like to be easier about, and I use my relaxation tapes, and I can tell myself that if I don't remember everything there's always another time, and that it wasn't meant to be, and all the other things I learned here.

Does it work?

Yes it does! I used to have so many deadlines and things. So now what I do is set my deadline up a couple days ahead of time, and if I don't meet it, or want to take a nap, or go on a field trip, I do it; and then the deadline is the next day.

SUBJECT #5: 34-YEAR-OLD LESBIAN

Well, I fell into teaching. I guess this does run into history a lot. Uh--when I was growing up, I always felt sensitive and thoughtful, and careful about my life, and thinking a lot about things, but somehow I got all the way to college, and to my junior year--and senior year--without being very serious about my career. And I think it was a lot that I saw then and see now the traditional idea that by 21 or 22, I would be married--you know--that someone would come along on the white horse and take care of me; and therefore I didn't seriously push myself, nor did the rest of society nor my family encourage me to really consider creative alternatives, as a job. I don't think my family really discouraged me, either. They--it was just kind of an absence. My father was a business man, and very successful--very respected. I loved him. I thought it was very impressive. I remember, at times, I said--you know--"I'm going to be in business"; and he would say, well--you know--"It's hard for women in business. They don't really get too far." I was somewhat aware of being a little discouraged, but not seriously discouraged. And anyway, nobody told me I couldn't do anything. They just weren't saying--well--"You could be a doctor, and a lawyer"--

They weren't pushing.

Right, they weren't in any way doing that. So there was some absence --and so I got all the way to my junior year--senior year, actually--junior year--at that point I met--when I went abroad I met a woman who was a teacher and fell in love with her and started the whole lesbian side of my life. At the same time, in a sense, started a career side. I thought, "Oh, OK, I never really wanted to be a teacher, but in the absence of anything else, that sounds great."

She was a teacher at that time; and so I sort of fell into that choice. I did read, at that point, which was brand new and had been put on the book list by mistake--not by mistake--by accident, because the

professor later said he never read it--it was "The Feminine Mystique." And I remember just being startled by chapters where Betty Friedan talked about--you know--women get all the way--40, 50--80!--without ever thinking about themselves seriously. So I thought, "That's really true!"

So I sort of fell into teaching, and for the first 4 or 5 years, I think my conscientiousness sustained me. I worked hard. I prepared hard. I graded papers hard--you know--I just was attempting to be super teacher and thinking next year it will be better. Next year I'll feel more comfortable, or won't consume all of my life--as it does. Uh--and so I got to year 4 or 5 and I began to realize that it's not going to get better. It was--it just changes dimensions. And after I mastered the subject matter that I got onto, which was very big at that time--psychology--and to really working with 150 kids a day, which I can't do, and really being innovative in techniques and really doing this--there was always some new hurdle, and the new hurdle sort of made it a challenge. I had 10 years of challenge, and I had very little of--well--"That's a job well done," or "I do that well." It just seemed like there was always more to do! There were just so many things that, when I walked away each day, I didn't feel good about something--about one kid's remark, or about some small, tiny thing, just gave--and that was a lot of the weight--a lot of the burden of feeling as if I were putting a lot of energy out and not feeling tremendously successful.

And I think in many ways, you know, when I stepped back-- I was very successful. I had lots of kids telling me that. I had people come back after 5 years, or--you know--I felt--I can--with some objectivity--but it's not enough for me to really be nourished by every day. I didn't have that kind of faith . . . I was so terrified with finding a new job. When I left teaching, I thought, "Well, I'll just go to Burger King and be a waitress. I don't care! I just want out!" Anything would have been fine. And a sales job came along, and I went and talked with this woman, and then I thought, "Well, that sounds OK." And she called me back later, and so I slid into $3.00 an hour, and thought, "Fine! This is as good as anything!" And I remember initially feeling really pleased that I did what I did well--I talked to people well. I sold things

perfectly well. I'm not a sales person, but I am honest, and can talk to people and spend time with them and am patient. And then I could close up the cash register at night, lock the door, and walk away. I loved that feeling of feeling competent and successful, and the issue was closed at 5:30. It was done--it wasn't trailing over into my dinner --my evening--my breakfast.

I think the best teachers are the ones who can't disengage. I am rotten at that. I will hang on and with the hanging-on, fight to the point of ridiculousness. That's what I was also aware of in teaching. This needs me to change my personality. I need to be stricter, or I need to be more disengaged, or less involved, and I need to be this-- I need to be that. And after 10 years, I thought, "Fuck it!" I thought, "Either I'm not going to change my personality, or I would have, by this point." So it's a ridiculous hassle. So then the job at the shop ended because she sold the store. I took 6 months off--on unemployment and my savings--and thought I would come up with an ideal job. At the end of 6 months, I DIDN'T!

Were you idle?

I wasn't idle at all. I wish I'd been a lot more idle. I'm pretty comfortable not working, except for the idea that I have to find a job. That was my discomfort.

With the money running out--

Yah. And that was always in the back of my mind. I have to be getting something together. And so I really didn't delve into doing nothing as much as I might have. I did take a semester off when I was teaching; but I had a job at the end of that, that would resume. And I had about 9 months--and, oh, I loved it! I just adored it--I really found that it opened up a place in my life to really explore things that I had not--and I was just tremendously happy with that kind of thing. The last one wasn't like that. I sort of wanted it to be like that, but it wasn't, because I kept thinking, "OK, I've really got to get it together now!" You know, I've gone on unemployment--I've done all these

things. I have to justify this to myself and to someone else, like my mother, or--

So it was an issue of justifying?

Somewhat. Uh--but also my own feeling got--uh--one of the things that I haven't experienced in life--one of the ones, at least, that came up for me was really loving what I do. As a job, I have not experienced that. I taught--and it was fine, but it was awful! And I worked in the shop, and it was perfectly fine. But there was very little element of love there except momentary connections with people. And so, then from my father, especially, I got this feeling (who loved what he did) that it's possible. And I found when I looked at people, especially women--because I tend to look at women as models--people who really turned me on--just as we sit or wander around and talk with people--were people who adored what they did. And I began to have a list of them. There were two potters in Sonoma who loved--I don't think they continued to--but at that point, they loved what they did. And they talked about it with this kind of energy that I really envy. And a dance instructor in Berkeley--and I just began to have this list of people who really loved what they did. And I wanted that--I'm envious of that!

* * * * *

So your relationship is an important part of your life?

Yeah, I think the relationship is a very important part. I also think that I need to think about it, because I get real comfortable about it, and I tend to take our relationship for granted, and I always catch myself up because I know how dangerous that would be.

Let's see! Well, I guess one of my philosophies of life is somewhere--some sort of Calvinistic background which is in my background--Puritan--you know--if you take it for granted, it's going to go away. There's something about deserving in there. You can't get too comfortable or then you don't deserve happiness. There's some other counteracting force. My father was a Calvinist, so I have a strong background

in that.

I'm just trying to get a handle on where I want to start. Well, I think that one of the things that is important to me in life in a relationship in myself, in work, is a sense of contentment that goes into spirituality. There is a real quality ground in to contentment, that when I feel really good and comfortable and content, there is some sort of--like it's a ripple effect--an emanating kind of force I feel, and so I look for it in myself. I get it moment-to-moment--you know--one moment out of 5 million--and I really feel that in my relationship with Karen. Part of that comes from a knowledge of what discontentment is. I was in a relationship previously. We had a fair amount of discontentment, and a lot of it was my own. I was young. When I first began the relationship, I was 19; and so I did a lot of things that I would advise people now not to do.

I really sort of pinned my hopes and my life on someone else and attempted to live through her. All that kind of funny energy that can get going, I see now was happening, and how, surprisingly, I was unhappy, even at very contented times in the relationship--and she was unhappy, and the relationship dissolved after about 8 years, at that point, to my histrionic horror and screaming and yelling, but now I can see that it's no great surprise.

When I met Julia, I was 19 and still in college; and so I went through 4 years of my being on the East coast and she was on the West coast, so we wrote letters all the time. We made phone calls of pining, and all those grave and lovesick things--and meeting for wonderful vacations--and yet, that's really--I don't like living kind of half-hungry and starved. That's a very painful thing. And then we came together and lived--I moved out here to live with her. I was just really aware of that although I loved her tremendously, there were many aspects of her that I could not respect. There were a number of aspects of her that I did not respect. She didn't know herself in a way that was really important to me. And I hoped that through our relationship we could both move to something different, and we didn't.

So there was a hope on your part to change her?

Yes, definitely! Yes--right! She also developed during our relationship of 8 years a very serious drinking problem. Her father had been an alcoholic, and she never had much to drink when we met in Europe. We were with a lot of people who were teachers, and we all started drinking wine; and for a couple of years it was no problem for her--and then it became a very serious problem for many reasons. Alcoholism is very serious for some people. And so that very seriously affected our being together; and yet, I was willing to put up with it--and did--and hoped that she would change. I nagged her and did all the things--the games alcoholics play--their rescuers--and so, although I fought the end of that relationship, I am now very, very pleased that it ended. It took me a couple of years to realize that, though. It was very hard. What was also really important about it was that--you know--life just fits together in these really interesting ways. As we were approaching the point where breakup was going to be pending, we also approached--we met two people who were into psychotherapy. And so that, as I began to feel more and more stress in the relationship and anxiety and crisis, these two (who were also lesbians)--I turned to them for supportive help, and at that point I was not wild about therapy. I thought people could solve their own problems, and you could sit down with loving friends.

* * * * *

I'm curious about your shift from what you described as being traditional--what the transition was like.

Well, it was 17 years ago now. So it was back in the dark ages! When I met Julia and talked with her, I was on this trip to Europe. I was writing a journal at that point, and I remember writing that I had met this person who was just really nice, and I felt a really good rapport with. Then a few days later, there was another entry that I felt more closeness with her than I had felt with many people. And yet, I always had close young women friends--often one or two or three that I felt really good with, and I'm sure it's very natural that everyone feels that. And so when I felt it with her, I thought it was again that

same kind of response, although I had also had the same kinds of traditional--I was going to marry an architect and live in Georgetown, and all these things that are sort of typical role things. I respond really well to closeness and warmth and to woman energy, even though those labels were not in vogue. So when she introduced--at one point she said, "I need to tell you something," and she hemmed and hawed and smoked cigarettes, and back and forth we went through a lot of agony over--she finally told me. I had sort of guessed. There had been a couple of indications. She, at that time, was 27 and I was 19--that had sort of triggered the topic and I hadn't--you know--at some level, I knew that there were such things in the world as lesbians and I thought they were strange and bizarre, and all that. And so when she told me, I was not particularly comfortable. I was quite uncomfortable--you know--feeling chilled in the world and shaking and attempting to respond to her, and saying I really liked her. However, I was not interested in anything like that. And she said, "Well, I just need to tell you that I am a lesbian and I am attracted to you. I wanted you to know that so that you would be aware of what was happening, and should I decide to do anything about that." Well, I was up and out of that room in about 5 minutes--WELL, THAT WAS REALLY NICE! And I tossed and turned all night and the next morning I had to take a test--an entrance test at the Sorbonne. I was not very well and just thought a whole lot, and a lot of what kept coming up was--well--maybe I am some sort of strange person, because I have had these feelings for women all my life, and which I now feel are just really normal feelings that people have. So I thrashed around with the topic a lot and she said, "I'll talk about it with you." And so I went back and I said, "I really want to be friends, you know, and I really want to have this closeness with you, but I don't want anything else--sexual or physical."

Kissing was going to be a big horror, let alone-- So she said, well, she would think about it. So that was OK, and she went through several more days, and then she said, "I think I'm not happy with this, and I don't think I want to see you as much--you know--if you're going to put these restrictions on our friendship. So I said, "OK, that's it." So we sort of played this game back and forth (which I see now as a game).

And then, one day I was out walking around Paris on my own, because I sort of missed her, as we had sort of traveled in this crowd, but--and so we did things together as a crowd, but not just together. I was out walking around to eat something, and somebody walked past me, and one of the things I had noticed about Julia was that she always wore Yardley Lavender--a nice aroma. And this kind of feeling came up for me. I think there is something more for me here. There is an attraction, more than Lavender--an attraction that I have to go back and see what it is about. So I wrote her a note, and we talked. And I can't remember a decision ever being made. I don't think I ever made a decision. I came back thinking, "I want this closeness. I want something here--I don't think I want anything sexual. I don't feel that kind of tie."

But then the closeness kind of developed, and then it seemed like easier steps from there. At one point she reached out to hold my hand and that was a decision which I let go by, and it was nice, and felt good. At that point I had not had any kind of physical closeness with another person. I had been very desirous--at least in my mind--of having it with young men, but I was absolutely turned off by the average high school and college male. And the ones that I was turned on by weren't very interested in me. So I had had some dating experience in combinations of things and just not felt--you know--just felt kind of repulsed by the average young man, at that. And so here was someone who was talking English literature to me. She was an English teacher--you know --like poetry, and all those things that people--women--can love--romantics. And I'm a real romantic.

So I found each step a little bit easier, and I was still wary--I was worried, concerned. I didn't think I was homosexual--I didn't think I was lesbian; and yet, here I was feeling this warmth and attraction for this person--and it was very beautiful! And Julia said, "Oh, this is so romantic! I feel so romantic!" And I thought, "How could we be romantic when we are both women?" At that point, I was very aware of that. That was a very strong connection. Three or four weeks later, I was saying, "Oh, this is so romantic!" Somehow, my traditional views of romance changed from, "You have to be a man and I have to be a woman" to really picking up more of the rapport between us. And how wonderful it was to

have someone who really cared about me--who wanted to know my every idea, who wanted to share things that she had thought about and had considered! And so all of that kind of energy took over, and I was still horrified by the social implications by the mores and all of that, and yet the energy between us became more compelling.

I remember coming back from Europe and thinking my parents would be a lot happier if I was lovers with the garbage man--that they would be delighted--you know--if, in comparison, I said, "Should I sleep with this woman who is an English teacher from California or should I sleep with the garbage man?" They wouldn't have been in favor of sleeping with anyone, but they would say "GARBAGE MAN." A person with whom you have no interest--it sounds wonderful. I'm not making a leading judgment about garbage men, but that was my thought at the time of being 20 that there was absolutely no part of society that I knew about that in any way supported--

In terms of your life, aside from the external--parental--disapproval, and society. I am wondering if it had any other effect on you.

Well, it meant that I became more secretive and more, in a sense, cut off than I already was, feeling alienated--and later I thought--part of what I thought--I think I started out as a kind of a closed, shy person, and so therefore I'm not sure being lesbian forced me into that more, whether I chose to have a sort of nonsocial relationship. Somehow, there was that kind of energy; and so I found that in my last 2 years of college I didn't share things with friends that ordinarily, if I were involved with someone acceptable, I might have--I mean there was such a whole different sort of standards going. In many ways, it was a sort of alienation. In other ways, it was a very kind of beautiful, private, wonderful thing that sustained me. There were nights I would be really down. Julia used to call. She would call--not on the college phones, because there were all sorts of operators and things like that--and she was concerned about that so she would call on a pay phone downstairs; and then it would be midnight in Boston when I was going to college, and it would be only 9:00 out here, so someone would come and get me at midnight and say, "There is a phone call for you downstairs," which was

sort of routine. Except it was never routine that it was a woman. But I would be all excited and go down and have this wonderful call from my lover--which I couldn't share with anyone, although they knew that I was friends with someone I had met in Europe. My friends had heard a lot about her, but not any of the romantic part. So in some ways it was strange; and in some ways it was a very precious, warm, nurturing thing.

I am wondering what kind of effect it had on you in terms of your earlier traditional emotions--you know--get married, and have someone take care of you.

It blew them all to hell!

How was that? After it was blown all to hell?

That wasn't hard. There was a part of me that had prince charming come along and I'd gone and done that, and that would have seemed right when it got blown all to hell. I thought--all right--you know--I--there was no real deep commitment to that anyway. I wanted to have two children and look beautiful, and drive a station wagon . . .

What about children?

I feel very comfortable, not having children. Every now and then I get an attack of baby fever. I don't like to have anything crossed out for me in life.

SUBJECT #9: 44-YEAR-OLD HETEROSEXUAL

Well, I think right now family is of primary importance to me. I think that I have just recently gone through a period of a need for reassurance from myself that I was, in fact, doing what I should do. I worked for a number of years--18 years--when my two older daughters were young and retired and decided to stay home and never had any desire to go back to work--that was 12 years ago. And I guess in the last couple of years, now that my two boys are both in school, I have felt this pressure--not from my family, but outside pressure that you really should be doing something besides being a housewife.

Now I go to company functions and they ask whether you do anything else besides being a housewife and staying at home, and so you start thinking, "Well, maybe I should be doing something," which is why I went back to school last quarter and found out after going to school for 3 months that I was not wasting my life by staying at home being a housewife. And I really was deriving far more fulfillment--or whatever you want to call it--from staying at home than I was from going to school. Rushing off to school every day, although I enjoyed the whole thing, made me feel that it was an interruption in my life.

In how you want to live your life?

Yes, and so I decided that if I do continue into college, I would be taking courses that interest me.

Were you going back for a degree or something?

Initially, I thought I was going to go back for a piece of paper, and this is what I did. I realized at that time that if I go to school, it will be for things that are important to me. I found out myself, anyway, because what other people think isn't that important, although I

naturally want approval from others; but right now I am enjoying being a housewife, and I think with my two boys in school--I'm enjoying my freedom for the first time in 28 years--where I really do have time that I can do what I want to do and if that means cleaning out the garage, I clean out the garage; whereas, at first, I felt that I should be doing something with my time. So when people said, "What do you do?" I could say-- "I do this."

I feel obliged to have something to talk about besides my home and children; and you reach the point where you feel uncomfortable talking about your home and children--and I don't mean whether the floor is yellow, or the wax I use, or anything like that. It's just you think this has to be boring to people because you read so much about the boring wife that has nothing to talk about but--So I did, and I think this is primarily why I made a decision to go back to school. Then at least I had THAT to talk about. Everyone said "What are you taking?" And then you go through this whole--it gets boring, too. If it doesn't get boring to other people, it certainly gets boring to you! One more person says, "What are you taking?" and you go through all of that again. But it was good for me because it did make me start thinking again, and I see that I do read more. I used to read a great deal, and then once I fell into a pattern of taking care of children and trying to take care of a home in my free time, I found that I was sitting in front of the TV.

Will you expand on what your life is like?

Well, primarily, I find it very enjoyable being a housewife. It is something that I didn't want to do, as a child. At 12, I was never going to get married or have children. I was going to be a career woman. I was going to be a secretary. I became a secretary, and I did that for 18 years. And trying to be a secretary, and also being what I thought a mother and wife should be, was extremely difficult; and I found that one day I could not face going back to work again. I really could not face the pressure of doing my job as I felt it should be done at work because my home and my family had to come second--because I was being paid to do my work so the pay made a difference; so if they were paying me to

do a job, if it took 10 hours--it took 10 hours-- and the family had to adjust. So I just couldn't face it one day. I took a leave of absence and after 3 months, I went back and said, "I'm sorry, I just can't do it anymore." I couldn't face the constant struggle.

The struggle centered around--?

I think mostly the pressures of feeling that when I get home, I should prepare a meal, do the washing, the dishes, everything should be done, because I have to keep my home acceptable.

That's an important thing for you?

Well, it's very important to my husband. And I think that--we've been married for 16 years--and I think that somewhere in those 16 years you must do something that was important to the other person; and obviously it's important to you, or you wouldn't continue it for 16 years. I find some things are important to him and some things are not important to me; but unless they are a major job, I will do them anyway because it pleases him. The children are more important to me than my home. I like my home to be clean. I like it to be comfortable. But if my children want to do something that I enjoy with them--or clean house--I'm going to spend the time with the children, because I really enjoy the children. I enjoy seeing them change. And these are all things that I didn't do when the girls were young, because I was working. Because my time with the girls for the most part was to tell them to hurry up and eat, or washing the clothes. In other words, I really didn't feel, in retrospect, particularly as I was going through the period--I really didn't feel like I was a mother. I could have paid someone to do it better than what I was doing. And they may have done it better.

Because you weren't there?

I think because I didn't really share in their growing up, and it--I think--disappoints me; and it disappoints me even more now--the way we fall into a pattern of sending our children to somebody else to take care

of till we can fulfill ourselves. When I find that what I was looking for --for those 18 years--was becoming a success in my "profession," it was right under my nose in my family; and I never derived the fulfillment from working, even though I did a very good job and was very successful in it. And I appreciated the money, and I appreciated the--I had the satisfaction of doing the job well. But as far as the personal relationship--that you can't get from a job, and really, at least in my opinion, that is what success and fulfillment is all about.

I think this disturbs me today because in this area, for instance, I probably--maybe there are five other women in this general area on our block--there is one lady that's retired, and myself, and we are the only ones who are home. So you have the baby, and then get someone to take care of it so you can go do something else. And it disturbs me--not only for the parents, but for the children, because the parents will never know what they missed. I was fortunate in having the opportunity to have more children and stay home with them.

Would you be willing to tell me what that was like for you?

Yes, I quit work 12 years ago. I did not quit to have a child. I quit first, and stayed home and did nothing. And then my husband and I talked about it and decided that we would like to have a child.

How was that 3-6 months for you?

It was--well--actually, I think I was becoming healthy, because the pressure was so great--and mostly the pressure I created myself--was so great that I spent the first 3 months not doing anything. I would feed my daughter and get her off to school and my husband off to work, and then I would lie out in the back yard, or sit in front of the television set. My mind did not work at all. It was just like it was in neutral and after 3 months I started becoming interested in things again. But it was really like I needed some time.

I have always felt very fortunate--because I looked at my husband, and I'd think that the time might come in his life or may have come, where

he would have liked to have done that--or needed to do it. I really looked at it as a personal need. And fortunately, my family accepted it. I think there have probably been times in his life where he may have had that same need, but being a man, and having been raised in the times in which he was raised, where the man is the breadwinner, he has the primary responsibility to support the family. He didn't really have the options. He could not have come to me and said, "I have to take a few months off--would you go out and get a job?" He wouldn't be willing to accept my handling the support because he just would not be able to live with it.

Is that still true today?

I think so. Again, I think, because of our backgrounds in the time that we were growing up. There is something that you cannot accept in your own mind--even if other people are willing to. Even if I said, "Fine, why don't you stay home? I'd like to get out and work anyway for a few months," he just would not be able to face his peers and say, "I'm staying at home. My wife is supporting me."

So the social pressures are pretty strong. How was it for you to work? Was that acceptable?

It was always acceptable. I was working when we met and my husband never put any pressure on me to either quit a job, take a new job, be more successful, or less successful. He did, of course--I don't think he had the same acceptance of my working late or going in on week ends as I have of him doing the same thing. And, again, I understood this because of my upbringing. The wife should come home and prepare the meal.

I think that's still true, but I think they don't want to admit it, primarily because that's not what all the magazines say you're supposed to be doing. It's sad. I would like to see more pressure put on people to live their lives as they need to live them and not have to apologize for what they think is all right. But we do constantly, even in the way we handle ourselves, we are apologizing to the rest of the world for not walking the same path.

You were beginning to tell me a bit about your children and how being at home has been for you--what that life style was like.

Well, it's been far more satisfying than working ever was, and I derive a great deal of satisfaction from my work. I think that I've a very strong need for being accepted--for being loved. And I think that this is one place --in my own home--that I can get it, and that I can accept myself. Whereas, when I was working, I always was trying harder. I was never satisfied. I never felt that I was really doing as good as somebody else. And that, of course, comes from my background because I had very little training. I really learned my job DOING it. So I always felt not quite as capable as those who had a high school education and college. So in retrospect I realize that was stupid.

Now I enjoy sitting--having the opportunity to sit and play with the children. To watch them grow is, at least to me, like no other job. It's a 24-hour-a-day job. And at times, it's very difficult. But its rewards are far more than a pay check because it's a continual reward--just having a child love you--not be afraid of you. Certainly I have the same problems with my children as everyone else, but accepting you as a whole person without any doubts as to your ability is something that is far more--to me anyway--fulfilling. And as I say, fortunately, it only took me 3 months to find out that being mom was a pretty important thing; and that I really wasn't wasting my time when I was playing with the children or helping them build something, or putting something together. My husband has no mechanical abilities at all. I probably never allowed him to even try, because I'd always be willing to do it. I enjoy it. I don't look at it as, "Well I have to do this. I have to put his train set together because you don't know how." I enjoy sitting down with the children, and I was a den mother for my son's cub scout troop. And even my mother, when I told her, said, "Well, I cannot see you as a den mother of anything." Which is true, because everyone has a far different impression of me because they only see me as a professional woman. And my home and family was kind of an afterthought, so it is very difficult to accept--and even for myself, I have to try it before I can believe that I, too, can be a den mother, and it isn't something that's THAT big a deal.

Well, I do know what a big deal it is, and it's a great deal of responsibility. Not only for your own, but 7 or 8 or someone else's. I try to make it enjoyable--make them want to come back.

SUBJECT #10: 36-YEAR-OLD LESBIAN

Well, I--probably the most important thing in my life is my kids and my family and maintaining work in order to--for survival, and to be comfortable in our way of living. I want--the most important I think is to have--to raise my kids with respect and good values and a sense of responsibility. I want them to be well-educated, and--I don't know--the most important thing, actually, I guess, with any mother is her family; and then, of course, my being able to enjoy my work is important to me--my line of work. I think having a lot of friends is important--you know--in a social sense. I like harmony.

And I'm wondering what it's like to live at home with the kids and how things go.

Oh, it's beautiful, I think. You know, my kids have really kept me probably a stable and a responsible person. And if it weren't for them, I probably wouldn't be wanting to have roots so much. I wouldn't want to be--have that freedom--you know--to be able to go; and they also maintain a--or because of them--help me maintain my cool as far as working out with the general public.

How so?

Well, because if it weren't for them, it would be very easy for me, at different times, to say, well--"Stick it!" or--you know-- "Take this job and shove it" type trip, and walk out. But because of the responsibility of having to take care of them, I can't; and so it forces me to keep my cool. Whereas, if you--if you didn't have that responsibility, it would be easier, I believe, to just say, "The heck with everything!" I couldn't have better kids--you know--if I'd ordered them. And we have a good rapport.

And-uh I've been alone with them for 7 years, I guess, now. And I don't find that they've suffered greatly or missed out on anything. Materially, they have probably more than when I was married. They are very active in sports with the Park and Recreation District. They take trips--my older ones have taken trips to --like Idaho, to the church there. And go on camping trips and what-have-you in the church. My son is very much into the church. He was just baptized recently. . . .

I'm not quite sure if I could function well at all without responsibility, really. It seems like the more I have, the better I like it, although it's nerve wracking, at times, I might add.

It becomes a burden at times?

At times. Most of the time, I don't consider it a burden at all. It's like when I was working in construction and what-have-you. My son--I enjoyed having him because he would want to work with me and which gave us a little closer relationship. And my son, I might add, will be 15 and he's still not ashamed--you know--to put his arm around me and kiss me and say, "I love you, Mom," which is to me, in itself, a successful thing these days because you just--I don't see too many children 7 or 8 doing that, let alone a teenager or teenagers. All my children are that way. My little girl's always writing me little love notes, and that type of thing. I have a beautiful family. And, of course, it's like a question that's usually posed to me, "Well, how does being gay affect the children?" and I--I've often wondered--you know--should--will this--you know--affect my kids later on? It isn't something that I rub their noses in at all, but I don't have to rub their noses in it to let them know it's there. So it's something that we don't talk about, and my home is kept clean. I don't--you know--this type of thing isn't brought in and forced upon the kids. My son has his girlfriend and my little girls have their boyfriends, and that's the way I want it.

What if one of the kids were gay? How would you deal with that?

This is something that, again, like--it's like a type of employment.

I'm not going to say that I want you to go to college and become a doctor. I would want them all to go to college. But to try to force them into being a doctor when they wanted to drive a dump truck, I would prefer to see them happy driving a dump truck. Same way with whoever they decide to marry, or if they aren't happy with marriage, whatever they decide for their lives, since they have to live it, is what I--I would back them up. It's too easy for people to try to run other people's lives. And I believe, in the long run, we destroy more than we build up by doing so. And--

You seem like a very conscientious mother.

Umm, I don't know. I made my mistakes throughout my life, but one thing I can say--I made them myself! No one else made them for me. And-uh--and I appreciate that fact. You know that, good or bad, they were my decisions. And my father, for instance, was one. I know there've been times that he would just love to take me around the neck and just shake me a little bit and say, "Janet, you know--don't do this" or--you know--whatever. Because this is instinctive--being a parent. But he was cool. He leaned back and bit his tongue and let me go on.

SUBJECT #12: 39-YEAR-OLD LESBIAN

I am a parent--a single parent. I consider myself a professional person by occupation. I am an accountant and have my own office; and I have major accounting contracts. I have one child 10 years old. She attends a private school here. I've been divorced approximately 8 years. Oftentimes after my divorce I thought about perhaps remarrying, but about the time I found somebody that I thought I could care for or live with in any husband-and-wife situation, I think I gave it a little more serious thought and backed down from it, but I think it all relates back to my first marriage. I think I judged too many people in my future by my husband from my past, and that was probably wrong; but now it's 8 years and I keep very busy and active--active with my daughter, active with my friends, and active with people that are very close to me. You don't miss what you haven't had. I didn't have 8 years of married life with my ex-husband so I don't miss married life.

About how long were you married?

About a year and a half. It took about 18 months for our divorce. That was prior--you know--now you have the 6 months thing. Ten years ago it was a different situation. Currently my life is so active, I'm content. I've had a certain amount of enlightenment from within myself. If I want to say that I have a gay life style, in one respect I do, but on the other hand, as far as my home life is concerned and as far as my daughter is concerned, it's 100% straight. People who come to my house know that I have a daughter and they respect that. They don't do anything to upset me or upset her.

I'm confused about the distinction you make between a gay life style and a straight home life. I'm wondering what that means.

Well, in other words, the woman that I'm affiliated with when she's here, it's like two friends being together. We're not emotionally or physically involved in my home where my daughter would witness anything. So therefore, as far as my daughter is concerned, it's a friend of the family who is in our home. This individual is not the only one who has been in my life. There have been a couple of others. Those two individuals are still friends of mine who still come to my home, and so if my daughter thinks anything at all, it's an undiscussed situation. She accepts people. I have a brother who is probably more gay than straight. He came out very late in life--(he's 33 now)--later than most of them come out. He lives normally the same way I do. When his friends come over--he's not one to have someone there every night--but when his friends do come over, again, it's a very "straight" situation.

Some gays are not afraid to show affection or emotion in front of their children. We don't do that. We don't get into talk; we don't get into physical closeness; not any of that in my daughter's presence. I'm not going to say that I wouldn't walk up to somebody and put my arm around her and say something to her. As far as anything more than that--you know--we don't do that. There's nothing obvious about it. If anybody were to come to my house they wouldn't think anything about it. I feel that--you, for instance,--if you were to come to my home, wouldn't know the difference of the supposedly home of a gay person.

* * * * * * *

Did you think that you would end up a single woman and a parent?

Well, actually, I probably never thought that I would be, because I went to school and everything. Again, I was very active, and after I got out when I started working and everything, I was still active and going out a lot. My ideas about getting married were to hop off to the nearest island and honeymoon and travel and carry on. No tie downs, no worries, no problems.

Did you envision working?

Not necessarily. The man I became involved with was a very well-to-do man. My life style per se wasn't going to be like a typical housewife. And maybe that was a little bit intriguing. It started off very well, and after 6 months I found out--this restraint, this tie-down! The 3 years--the 2-1/2 years that I dated him prior to marriage were fun. What happened to the fun? Now all of a sudden, "I'll be home for dinner," or "Meet me at a different club," or this or that. I just decided that that wasn't what I wanted. I wanted my freedom and I wanted back where I was. I grew up in a population of 60,000 and I left that to go to Southern California with a population of probably 500,000. We lived in a beach town (a beach city) and there was a lot to do. I wanted to do it, but he didn't want to do that. He thought that a majority of the time should be spent home in front of the TV. I don't know what it was, exactly, but I wasn't happy after I got married. I don't necessarily think that it was loneliness. I loved the man. I wouldn't have married him if I hadn't. I wouldn't have continued with him for 2-1/2 years prior to marriage if I didn't care about him. I really think that it was just the idea that he wanted to control me, and I didn't get married until late, as far as I was concerned. I was 26 years old and by this time I guess I had pretty much formed my ways and I was old enough to make up my own mind. I traveled during my childhood extensively. My father was an engineer. By the time I was a sophomore in high school, I had my own car. Twenty years ago--in those days it was something!--to be a sophomore in school and have your own car. It was only because my father was gone and I had the family car.

My mother was always just a simple housewife. She never worked. We three children always had a good home and a good education. My older brother has been married and divorced twice. His second wife lives here. She and I are very good friends. I doubt that she knows where my older brother is now.

You don't know where your older brother is?

No, because, frankly, my younger brother and I--not necessarily, because we both have our private sides of our lives--we've always been

closer. When my brother was in Vietnam, I was the one who kept in touch and made certain congressional investigations as to his welfare. We had some communication that he was in a certain situation where he couldn't receive proper medical treatment, and it angered me to think that the army wasn't taking care of him. Like I say, he and I are 5 years apart, and we're pretty tight. As far as my older brother, he's 7 years older than I, and we never really shared any particular closeness. You can say that the two children in the family that bickered--it would have been he and I.

What's your mother like?

She's an average homemaker.

And you're not following in her footsteps?

Not at all. I'm probably more like my father. My younger brother is probably more like my mother.

SUBJECT #14: 47-YEAR-OLD LESBIAN

She doesn't sound like too good a friend.

Yeah. I've been bitter about it for years. Now it's--whatever! I've forgiven, I guess. I've grown up. And this is what she had to do. Nothing's ever been said about it. My mom and dad never said anything more about it. As I say, the last couple of years we've been closer. I really don't care. I'm not close to my brother and his wife. That's not important to me.

How about your parents?

I don't--I don't know, since they've gotten older. My dad is ill. He's dying--emphysema. I feel sad for them. They haven't been happy, as far as I'm concerned, their whole lives. I think they should have divorced years ago, and they stuck together--though I have no idea why--for 50 years of marriage. My mother's very domineering, and my father's just amazing. Mom says it--he does--he jumps. But I've learned to live with that. It's--I'm away from that, and I don't see it. I think if I were around it, it would really bother me. But for some reason I'm not sure I understand that kind of love. But I'm not close to it--'cause I've never been able to confide or tell my feelings to them. . . .

I did things with my father, but he wasn't a warm man. He was a demanding man, but never showed much affection to his kids. And my mother was always a worrier--took care of things and domineered my dad completely --not warm. I'm not sure how I came out to be a warm person.

I love my parents, I guess--whatever you have love for a mom and dad. They brought me into the world. They never understood me; they never took the time to understand me. They didn't have the time. So I don't begrudge them that--they didn't have the time. I was born during the depression, and it was made clear to me that I wasn't planned. It

came as a surprise to them--kind of thing, which I don't think you should tell any child that. It stuck with me. It's fine now, but it hurt. All they'd done was work. Labor. My dad--neither of them are educated. I was determined to get an education, I guess, because I didn't want to go through what they had to go through. And both retired, and Dad finally had a blood disease and had to move to the high altitudes in the Forest Service. And that's where I learned to backpack and all these kinds of things. We went out firefighting with the men, and I always loved it--fishing and backpacking! And then I left home and went to college--anxious to leave home. . . .

I had an apartment in town where I packed down all the money I could --I'd stay out a quarter and then go to school three quarters. So I didn't live at home, but they were very demanding that I come home every other weekend. And I did it. I was involved with this woman in a relationship. It seems like a thousand years ago. I don't even think about it any more. It was a lot of hurt at that time in my life, so I kind of walked out. But the basic question--I love my mother and father. But they've never really gotten to know me and they never will. And that's sad, but that's the way it is. I don't worry about it anymore. I did at one point, but . . .

I went home to visit my family (I go home twice a year). There was one time when my lover of 11 years--the one with the daughter--died of cancer. So I went home and spent some time with my mom and dad. And Mom and I would sit (Dad goes to bed early)--sit in the living room around 9:00 or 10:00 and I would think, "I want to talk to her so bad, 'cause all this stuff is on my mind." And I couldn't even talk to her. One night we were watching some movie that was very sad, and tears were running down my cheeks, and I just really wanted to say, "Hey, Mom, I really need to talk to you. I just need to get this all out." I didn't.

Did they know a friend of yours had died?

Yeah. And they liked her. In fact, they loved her very much--'cause we'd go home and visit my folks, and they accepted her. And from that time on, they quit questioning me. They really liked her and her daughter.

They came down to visit us. We had bought a home together. They kind of accepted the lifestyle, even though they didn't realize I was gay. She was really tremendous!--very warm. She was 10 years older than I. And she liked my mom and dad, and we spent a week in the mountains together and everything was great. I could take her home freely and yet we were still hiding. She liked my dad, and we had a good time. But we were glad to get out of there so we could be alone here--the mountains for a week, and then we vacationed on the way back.

I did a lot of lying to my parents. It's too late now. I should have told them years ago, but I never had the courage.

SUBJECT #15: 23-YEAR-OLD LESBIAN

You grew up in New York and have brothers and sisters?

I have one older brother. He is about 4 years older. Right now he is a--he was one of the last guys drafted and he went into the Merchant Marines, and he is really--he is in the Merchant Marines now, and I haven't seen him in years. We don't get along at all.

What was it like when you were growing up?

Ah, let's see! The first 14 years, all I can remember is I was 14; it is like I was growing up real fast. Before then, I was just--I was fairly independent. I was very off to my own thing. I used to love sports very much. I used to play with little boys who were black--stick ball. I had it down to a fine art. So, it was OK; it was very mellow. For me--I used to fantasize a lot. I used to fantasize about adventures --you know--all that kind of stuff. Everything was fun. And at 14, I started outgrowing the rules of the house; and I started having problems until I left when I was 18.

With your parents?

Uh-huh. I also had problems with my brother who tried to rape me. I was 14, and it was really--it was kind of hard--I wasn't ready. I was still in a dream; I was still playing; I still was not really aware; I hadn't started my period--nothing! I didn't know--so when this happened, it was like he blackmailed me; so he had heard stories about me being with somebody else, and it wasn't true. So he took advantage of my ignorance, and it was very painful. I was traumatized.

Who could I tell? And I had a feeling that my parents knew--like I was in shock, because of my reaction. I couldn't do anything for days.

I used to lock my door at night, and it was crazy; and yet, nobody stepped in. And so I felt isolated--totally! So he left. He left home a couple of years after that. . . . I was just terrified--I wouldn't be alone with him for a minute. It is funny, because he never, ever mentioned anything about it; and later on, when he came back, he was--he was very brotherly. And I was wary. We used to get high together and stuff like that, but there was nothing else. It was like a break. I don't understand him--I don't! He is very--sometimes I used to think he was off--he used to get into a lot of trouble. That is why my parents moved . . . He was into a gangs and drugs and all that kind of stuff. But he was always kind of off. He was too much! He was like Dr. Jeckell and Mr. Hyde. One minute he would be like a sadist, and the next minute he would be so humanistic--Aquarius. So, I don't think I understand him. I never sat down--I did write him a letter--and told him I didn't appreciate it and not to pretend brotherly love, saying "Gee, when are you coming home? You haven't been home for 4 years! You are ignoring the folks!" He is playing up to me, as the good guy, saying he cares for the folks and all that, and--you know--he is totally condescending; and I told him, "Listen, you don't even know me--you know--I am not the little kid that used to run around the house." It felt really good. I don't feel that a woman should hold things--I mean, it is not fair. And as much as incest happens, you don't hear people screaming about "my little girl" when this happened in the family. Whereas, "my little boy"--what was going to happen to his manhood?

Before that time, you were very active and outgoing and athletic?

Oh yeah, very trusting, and I became very bitter, very cynical. It really hit home. You know, it was my brother--my big brother--too.

How did you get along with the gangs in your neighborhood?

I got beat up a lot--so I joined one! You know, I lived between two neighborhoods--two blocks--and it was like--you had to belong to something. You just--people just formed groups. And you had to belong to one or the other. And I wasn't black--and I wasn't white. I was

Puerto Rican, and there wasn't any Puerto Rican gangs, so I finally wound up in the black gang, with women.

So there were women's gangs and men's gangs?

Oh, yeah. I wound up with the women because I could not stand--you know--they protected me in a sense. I didn't want to fight. One of the reasons I didn't want to was because--like--I remember times when I had to, and--you know--I was so violent, and I couldn't handle it. I saw this part of myself, and--oh, I could kill somebody! So I really wanted to stay out. I didn't want to be involved. This one gang took me in--protected me.

How old were you when you were in the gang?

I was--I must have been about 10 years old. They were older than me. I was the youngest one. That is why I say I was kind of protected.

And you were getting beaten up by whom?

People--people wanted my lunch money. I would go to the store to get something, and somebody would say, "Give me the money." I had to break a milk bottle one time. I would stand there and say, "OK." It was the first one, and I just held the bottle and hoped there wouldn't be any blood. But it wasn't hard, because it was the only thing I knew. If I had of been raised somewhere else, I would probably have been scared out of my wits--you know--so, that is the only thing--

SUBJECT #16: 42-YEAR-OLD LESBIAN

What was living alone like for you?

Well, it was really nice--and very important for me. However, I also began my relationships with Nancy at the same time, so it's sort of cheating to say that I lived alone. She was in a little house down in Berkeley, and I was living up here. And we spent a good deal of time together, but it was still very important to me to have my own place and to spend time here alone--just to know that I can do it.

What happened in the previous relationships that I had--I was involved with a woman who was very controlling, and I had a need to blame it all on her. I was also very submissive. So I reached a point where I felt sort of a loss of identity. I'd always been a pretty independent person; and yet, in this strong involvement with someone else, I just totally gave in and really lost my identity and was very uncomfortable--very unhappy. It was fortunate that I got out of it when I did, because it was very important to me to have this place and have it be mine--all the decisions are mine, and so forth. And, at the same time, I was also into therapy--trying to regain myself--and I was also very aware that growing up my family does not share emotions--just a very sort of emotionless family--and I wanted to get something that would help me share my emotions.

It was interesting, 'cause I was a Catholic and very unaware of therapy--very supportive of all that, but had never done any of that myself. I kept thinking when I was in this relationship I wasn't strong enough to get out of--if anything happens, the first thing I'm going to do is get into therapy. And I actually did before the end--I did decide that I wanted to work on some of that. But I didn't know where to go. And I had also, at the time, got caught up on the money thing, so I went to a therapist at Kaiser, (laughs) which didn't cost me at that time, but . . . I think other people had better experiences. He was a very

traditional therapist and not right for me, 'cause I could have outsat him because my resistance was so high. It was ridiculous except that it was the first step, and that was really important. So I went to him for a while and did not really feel anything was being accomplished and cut it off. And then, a few months later, when things got really bad, I thought, "Now I've got to do something," and I still didn't know where to go, so I just went back to talk to him to say that I didn't feel he had the kind of therapy that I needed, but that I needed something. I knew something about gestalt therapy, so I said I needed something like gestalt therapy that's really going to push me a bit; but I don't know who to go to. So he gave me someone's name. And then a friend of mine gave me someone else's name--and that's the person I went to.

This therapist was superb--I mean perfect!--a very small woman--a very good therapist. So I went to her individually for, I think, about 6 months or so, and during that time I went into a group which was just horrendous, and I was not ready for that at all! And I also had been in a gay relationship for 6 years, but the woman I was involved with was very much in the closet; and consequently I followed her mode of behavior but wasn't very comfortable with it. So I was trying to change that. And I was trying to be more open with people and yet really held back, and dealing with all the other things I was trying to deal with, and so it wasn't easy.

So I went into therapy in this group and I felt closed. So I decided this was not for me. I mean, it might be something for me later, but at this point in my life, I wasn't ready. And then the following summer I was in an 8-week group.--and it was also hard, but I was in a better place and I was more willing to--still more reticent, but I could really see the progress--finally being able to deal with the gay issue and being able to talk about it . . . that was a really big breakthrough.

I was wondering what kind of an issue that was for you.

I guess whatever fears we have built in about--well, it's part of not accepting myself and my homosexuality and being able to express that. I take on whatever people think is wrong with it, and therefore it was

difficult . . . At that point I had had no experience talking about being homosexual, except with other homosexuals. And so it was just like this huge barrier to get through--well--except for the therapist--the first time I walked in I talked about it with her. It just is--well--you learn there is something wrong with it early, and then it becomes bigger and bigger and bigger in terms of telling anybody, even though at that time I'm getting more accepting of it myself. The barrier I've created is so great . . . and, of course, I didn't think anybody was going to do anything about it or say anything, and, of course, they didn't--no problems with my telling them, but there was still years of build-up of there being something wrong with being gay.

It's hard to stand alone in the face of other people's judgment. Like I have difficulty about some things about myself that people won't accept, and I feel like my association of something looking bad will come to the forefront. I just remember that being--well, I finally did; I think it was our last meeting or second to last, of it's being so important for me to tell people, and then from there on, it was so much easier. I didn't rush out. I was still very careful about who I told.

The following year, I had a really wonderful year after the breaking up and buying this house. I had put in for a sabbatical for a year's sabbatical. I didn't want to go to school. I had had enough school. But I would do something equivalent. And they allowed me to do that. So I did things like the group in the summer, with a gestalt training group and family therapy. . . . We've had a lot of friends go through est and so we were just going to do it--and so what--might as well! But anyway, it was really nice to do all that stuff. And I also went into a women's group through Esalen in the City and it was just when they were starting kind of a woman's program and--I think Esalen is very male and is still very male. So there were these four women who started some studies, and they had this women's group that I went into; and it was the first time I had been in any kind of a women's group at all--and had always resisted it because, when I was growing up, I had real difficulty with women--and I'll come back to that. So this was the first time I'd ever chosen to get into something like that. And, of course, they were

all heterosexual, and there were about 22 of us, but pretty into-everything and open. I remember I went into that, and it was right after this gestalt group; and it was very important for me. Right off the bat I was going through that gay thing, and of course it was wonderful because they were very accepting and very interested; and this was '73 or '74 when people were being more open about being gay and people were very interested in knowing--very supportive types--so it was a beautiful place, again, to do this.

What I was going to say about women was that when I was growing up, I always felt that I was different in the fact that I always had goals--I always wanted to do well in school; I always wanted to go to college; I always wanted to have a profession; and mixed into that was marriage and having children and all that sort of thing, which I think was more of what was being sold to me. But the strong feelings were to be successful, and so I felt very alone. I felt very alone because no other young women that I knew shared that. But feeling very right about that, and very strong about it, I didn't feel bad about it at all. But I always had to deal with my mother--I read too much; I think school is too important; I study too much; I shouldn't do well in mathematics!

I just wondered how you disappointed your mother.

Everything I did well and wanted to do was wrong. And high schools are really, really hard to deal with. In grammar school you can get along and be a tomboy, but when I entered high school, I knew . . . that I had to be a young lady, and . . . I was just so uncomfortable, and then you're caught betwixt and between because I had male friends; but then I couldn't get very close to them because you don't get close to males. And I didn't have any really close girlfriends 'cause they didn't like to do the things that I liked to do. In my neighborhood were all boys. And the girls wouldn't want to be outside and doing the things I did with them.

Did you have any brothers or sisters?

I had two brothers. I'm in the middle. We're all 5 years apart--there's 5 years in between. So high school--getting into the role thing--it was just horrendous! I hated that. I didn't want to do it; I couldn't do it. I was very resentful; the plans that I had were always secondary to the male. It didn't matter who they were or whatever! If you had any plans in the world--if the boy asked for a date, you were supposed to go. So I became very distrustful of women. I did not like that. As a result I never had any--I couldn't talk to anybody. In fact, I didn't talk to anybody--I could have; I didn't.

I had a lot of friends, but I just felt this superficial quality to them--to everything--and my mother was always saying, "Why can't you be like them?" and I don't want to be! In a way, I want to be like them--again, I want to be popular and have boys running after me and all that stuff, but I don't--I won't be like them. I'm not going to play these games and pretend that these things are important now. It was really a hard time, except that I was successful in school and rewarded that way. I was active in a lot of stuff, and so I was successful that way--but I was also very unhappy in terms of relationships, and not really understanding.

In terms of having close freindships or starting dating, there never was a boy that in high school--I never--I had shut myself in so much and not been able to express emotions that I cut off good relationships, although in college I did develop good relationships with some women friends--that I am still friendly with 20 years later--fortunately. Somehow we got through--I mean they were still--somehow it wasn't so superficial, or something--that I didn't have to--but I still could never share a lot of the stuff that I felt, and I was trying then to pursue the career thing, but also wanting to . . . I wanted to get married--but what else was there--after 21?

Pretty horrifying thought, in those days!

It is incredible the numbers of people that got married at the point of graduation; it was like--if you didn't do it then, it was all over with.

That was a hard struggle. and then the period after I went to Berkeley--that was when I also got into the feelings. . .Here I had done everything I'd wanted, and here I had gotten into Berkeley, so I hadn't stopped at anything I wanted to do; and then when I was graduating, I was really interested in law and I thought about law school a lot for a year; and then I took business law and the professor was just super and everybody was (a course that everybody took) and I did well and talked to him; and he was discouraging me from going into law because "As a woman you will just end up doing research" and . . . Still, that was the way it was and I had majored in economics and so I --he discouraged me, and my parents had put me all the way through Berkeley, and I was just really resistant to ask them to support me for a couple more years . . . I just dropped it and went to work for Trans America in economics; and they told me immediately that this was a man's company, and you don't expect to get anywhere--and I just sort of accepted that. It was happening to my friends, and they just could not get decent jobs, and it seemed more decent than most things; so I worked there for almost 2 years--and I thought I'd go crazy. The only other thing I could think of--all I could do--I had always been sort of interested in teaching and counseling, although my father was in education, so for years had . . . but I thought, "Well, I am interested in this, and it is the only area where I feel I can get equal treatment in terms of jobs, pay, future," etc., so I got my teaching credential.

I wanted to be successful, and a woman isn't supposed to do that sort of thing. My mother wanted me to fit the mold--just worked all your life to get married. And I wasn't doing the right thing--We've talked about it a lot since then, and she still can't accept that that was what she was doing; and I can remember--always remember--that one of my friends who was very popular--we sort of looked alike--and my mother wanted me to be like Kathy. I am not like Kathy--I don't want to be, and my mother just blocked that out, somehow--and even law school. I talked to her about it--"Oh, no, I couldn't have!"--"If you really wanted to go, I would have been in favor of it." My mother has repressed a lot of things--but I also wasn't able to talk about it at that time, and I went through high school as a model child, obeying my parents, and I

didn't get into trouble in any way. I didn't talk back to them. I just always went along with them, behaving as they wanted me to behave.

SUBJECT #18: 36-YEAR-OLD HETEROSEXUAL

I have three kids. They're all teenagers. Well, Joan is going to be a teenager in 8 days. Anyway, she's 12; and then there's a 14-year-old, and a 16-year-old girl. But we've--really, to my point of view--given then a strong sense of family that got passed on. The buck didn't stop with me, you know. I have really woven them into my part of the family, and they probably have got a greater sense of that part of the family than my husband's side, which is strictly WASP. I'm married to the same man that I married when I was 19.

How does one manage that in California?

I don't know how I managed that. I guess I just chose good at the time--or--I don't know! We both communicated really well. We both had lots of other--we both started very early having relationships with the opposite sex. Maybe we'd got a lot of that out of our systems before we met each other. And we had a pretty good idea of what we wanted, even though we were hellishly young. When we met, he was 20.

You know, I look at my kids now, and my oldest daughter's going to be 16 at the end of the summer. When I was 16, I was engaged to be married!--not my present husband, but somebody else. I think, "Oh, my God!" But I was a whole different person than my daughter. I can see how I did that. I was precocious. But then, in Salinas, there was nothing to do except to be precocious socially--real small town. There were the Italians, the Cajuns, lots and lots and lots of Slavonians and Mexicans.

Your family were farmers?

Well, most of them--except my dad and two of his brothers. My dad was a contractor and built houses, and his two brothers were printers.

My dad had a really good business. My brother has my dad's license. You know, you can sign a license over. And so my brother's gotten my dad's contracting license now, and he's building houses--and doing as well as my dad--maybe even better. My brother has a degree in Economics, which theoretically makes you more handy at business. I don't know if it really does.

So that was Salinas and growing up being a teenager in Salinas. I guess what I should mention is, as a kid, I was really sick for 2 years; and that did affect my outlook on life and kind of polarized my thinking; and it did pull everything into focus. I had polio. I was unable to even walk for 10 months. I remember at one point--this muscle pain--and one day I couldn't walk. It turned out everything was fine, but I thought I was going to die. And thinking you're going to die at age 10 makes you look different at stuff after you realize you're not going to die. So, for better or worse, I have had since that time--that, and having been around farm stuff a lot with other relatives--a real sense of how brief it all is. So even as a teenager--teenagers usually think they'll live forever, "I am protected, and it's all going to be all right,"--I was a little more conscious. I did crazy teen-aged things, but I did come to it with a sense of my own mortality, which made me a little different than my peers.

It would come up time and time again. And because of being a small town and a small school--I'll give you an idea--my graduating class as seniors was 63. I mean that is fairly small. Certainly not Nebraska farm town, but it's small for anybody. But I had a hard time finding friends at school. It wasn't so noticeable before I was sick. I was a well-adjusted, cute little kid, with dancing lessons and play acting.

I had a really good time doing theatrical things. And then I was very sick. But I got very active again. I got into horseback riding when I just turned 12--did jumping and things like that, and did the usual--had a good time in junior high. That was nice. I had three cousins that went to my junior highschool. But in highschool I began to really notice, I guess, when I got over the jangling of puberty. That kept me busy for a while. The difference in what I thought was important and what most of the high school kids thought was important really

began to show. And yet, I wasn't really into being a brain. I was considered one of the "smart kids."

I was dating my brother's sixth grade teacher when I was 14, and there wasn't a social difference between us. I mean I was talking about what he was interested in, and he was talking about what I was interested in. He was 23 years old. When I was 15, all my friends were college kids. And it wasn't because of sexual things. It was because they were reading what I was reading and talking about stuff I was talking about. I was painting. I was interested in the whole world at large. I wasn't interested in just who was going to go to the dance. . . . There were Wednesday night dances and moonlight dances down by the creek--nice setting--outdoors--live music in the 50's--everybody roaring up in their cars. It was great! I was--well--you know, Beatnick--a lot of serious black clothes. All the other girls were wearing these crinolines and billowing petticoats. I never did. That's where, visually, I was different. I got a job and made some money and bought Italian boots. Nobody wore boots in those days. Zero! Nobody!--unless you were a cowboy. And then you wore cowboy boots. And so Italian shoes were pretty far-out--a lot of black turtleneck sweaters.

So you were into kind of Beatnick stuff. Were you consciously doing that?

Yeah, yeah. It was pretty conscious. I went with a guy who was a lot older than me. We went--he and I--to a couple of coffee houses and things like that. There were a few of them in Salinas. We went out when I was 14--drinking wine. I even tried a little marijuana at that time. Now, this was back in 1957--talking about art, reading Allen Ginsberg's poems--really far-out, then. I realize that now. NOTHING is far-out any more, but at that time they were far out. And the guitar music and the folk music and the this and the that . . . That is what was happening. After I was more active in high school, as a freshman, until I met this teacher--I was kind of bored doing what high school offered 'cause that's what there was. Then BAM! There was all this other neat stuff, so that's what I did. I got a job working for a newspaper doing the artwork.

So you've been doing artwork for a long time?

Since I was 2. My mom said that--"at age 2." Our house burned down when I was 12, so I don't have any of these drawings any more.

So there I was a teenager in the 50's. No birth control. Lots of dissatisfaction. No place to put your dissatisfaction. Small town --you know--no place for me to fit in highschool--just no place!

There were no other people who were into the same kinds of things?

No. The relationship with the teacher--I mean at 14, how much can you concentrate on anybody? How much have you in common? You're a dingbat at 14! Smart or not, you're a dingbat. And so I had several boyfriends when I was 15--patrolling around, looking for something to happen--waiting to drive. In the fifties you waited to drive. You knew exactly to the half-hour how long it was before you got your license. Of course, I could already drive. I'd been driving since I was 13 or so. I was at that point hardly going to school and was flunking out of high school--just disaster time!

* * * * *

So what has marriage been like?

We had our knock-down drag-outs. It was beforehand--you know--there were immediate clashes. Fortunately, right at the beginning, and this is way back in '63, I said, "I'm not hiring on this ship as a housekeeper." I said, "You gotta remember, I'm an artist!" And, of course, at that time I was 19 and he was 20; we were very young. And he wanted his mother. And he tried to see how much of a mother I might--you know, people do that--"Will she get me up in the morning when I ask her to? I don't like to listen to the alarm clock. Let's see if she'll do it!" And that constituted a few fights. I remember one morning he was getting mad at me because I wouldn't wake him up. By this time I'd become pregnant. And I could have gotten pregnant out of wedlock, but I didn't.

But it wasn't because I was careful--it was just because I was lucky. But I did get pregnant right away.

Did you want to be pregnant right away?

Yeah, I thought it was neat. "Oh, isn't this wonderful! I'm going to have a baby!" God!--you know--I just thought it was the neatest thing --ooooh pregnant! I weighed just 92 pounds--a little wisp of a thing, you know. Anyway--"Oh, I'm going to get fat! That's going to be neat!"

So I was kind of touchy in the morning. I'd been very good. I'd been waking him because our society had set it up for that. I'd been--I'd been very independent until I became a little wifey-thing. "I'll put my pin-curlers in and I'll wake you up in the morning for breakfast." So finally, it got so that he wouldn't wake up; then he'd be late for class--partly because he was working part-time (even though his parents were partly subsidizing us).

So one morning I tried to wake him--I told him several times I was up. I don't remember--I don't think I had morning sickness at that time. Anyway, I told him several times what time it was and that he was going to be late to class. Finally, I had made breakfast. I'd eaten my breakfast. His was cold and dead in the plate. And I said, "Hey, you wanted me to get you up. I told you four times what time it is; you're still in bed, and you'll be late for class." He sat up in bed and he started yelling that it was my fault that he was going to be late for class, and he lay back down again. And I doubled up my fist and I hit him in the face so hard that blood flowed; and when he leaped out of bed, I split! I disappeared 4 or 5 hours and came back later. . . . I went Shoom to the school--to the library. "See you later sweetie!" So we talked about that!

Listen--you know--when you hit somebody who's lying down with their eyes shut, you certainly deserve something. Anyway, that was the sort of thing--there was some conflict while we worked out who was going to be on top of the pecking order. That never has been resolved. At least nobody's on the bottom. And that's nice. you know.

But in between all that, we did really like each other as much as

we loved each other--you know--so that worked out really well--you know. We've had--you know--it was a power play at first. The first year--well, I got very pregnant. There was a house next door that had a loft. And I was using it as a painting studio, but you had to climb up a ladder to get into it; and one day I kind of slipped and hit my stomach. Nothing much happened--it hurt a little bit. And then a week later we were driving along, and somebody ran into the side of our car. And, again, I just got bashed around a little bit. Didn't really get hurt. But a week after that, our first daughter was born--2 months early. For a while we were really worried because she had Hyline Membrane Syndrome (that the Kennedy baby died of). So--we did that. I still went to school. We moved. A couple of moves along the way, we had the second daughter--a year later. I got pregnant again--"Ooooh, I'm going to have a baby again!"

Were you still going to college?

Still going to college. My husband was working half-time and going to school half-time and getting $200 from his parents. So we were living on $400 a month--and had two babies. We thought we were doing just great. We were active with the artist friends, and--you know--doing kind of Sixties things--busy having a good time--working hard--I mean it was hard! Babies are hard. I was going to school.

I wonder what difference that made in your relationship. Did you notice anything?

Well, I was tireder; so I was just shorter. But he understood that I was tired. We both occasionally did some young, really infantile things on each other--you know--like I'd get too short with him and just treat him like a baby. They he'd go off with a bunch of friends for a while--or I'd go off with a bunch of friends for a while. We didn't expect the other person, ever, to be everything for the other person. We didn't expect our marriage to be perfect--or an answer. We didn't cut off our friendship from other people. We didn't put a lot of heavy contingencies on each other's behavior. All we had was the fact that we were both kind

of outspoken, lots of ego-characters. And occasionally we'd slop over onto each other's territory. That's when we'd have fights. "You're taking up over half the living room, and I've obviously got my paintings over here!" "What are you talking about?" -- You know--

So you felt comfortable in letting each other have it.

Oh, yeah. Occasionally we would fight for what we felt our territory was, and sometimes it was manifested in traditional society roles. "Why aren't you taking better care of me?" You know--fill in the blank. Then the other person would feel bristley and fight back. But we were so busy going to school, so busy developing our own talents--you know--developing our own love between each other and having kids--you know--that there wasn't really too much time to do anything else. I started at this point to use some birth control occasionally. I had Catholic gynecologists. I'm not Catholic--I'm not anything. But they weren't really receptive. Of course, this was back then. The pill wasn't really in use when the first two came alone. Diaphragms don't fit me, so I don't use diaphragms. I tried that foam, and I was using that occasionally. Both of us found using a rubber unaesthetic, so we hadn't messed with that. And in spite of occasional use of foam, I got pregnant again for number three daughter. And--"That's all right! Oooooh! Another child! How wonderful!"

* * * * *

Myself as an artist has been first. The strength of the self that my parents gave me as a little tiny kid has been there all along--and has held me in good stead 'cause I couldn't survive otherwise. I know so many people who have talent who have allowed themselves to just be defeated by their own life style. And you have to really keep a sense of self and not be selfish. You're always going to feel that, as a parent, "They take up so much of my time"--blah, blah, blah. And, of course, at some times in their lives it's really true. And you just have to realize that that's part of it. Of course, now, with child care and stuff like that, it's so different now! There wasn't any child care. I made arrangements with friends so that I could get out from my

kids for an afternoon or a weekend, or whatever--to kind of reestablish who I was, so that I wouldn't be just absolutely absorbed by the duties of rearing children. My husband's been busy developing his talents, too; and he's had his ups and downs. I'm sure he's felt overwhelmed at times. But, fortunately, throughout all this--you know--we've been friends for each other. We love to talk to each other, and most of the time we're pretty supportive of each other. And once in a while we snipe at each other. But we're both pretty secure about ourselves. We both have a real sense of ourselves as being fairly large. In fact, a friend said, "God, it's really hard if you two are having an argument and you two aren't speaking to each other or something like that; because of the polarity," she said, "it's almost difficult to be in the same room."

Our relationship is a "given." And it's not like I haven't been tempted to go astray, but I knew that if I had an affair with somebody, as attractive and as much fun as it might have been, that it really would have screwed up communications. And I didn't want to do that. Long-term communication was more important to me than a short-term thrill. Fortunately, my husband and I have a good sexual relationship. We were fairly inexperienced when we got married, but we were enthusiastic. . . . I think the security--the "given," as it were--has given us freedom. It's the foundation for what we can do--cut loose like we did in the sixties and blow our minds. It's funny. A friend of ours from England who also took some acid in the sixties said, "Oh, you all took acid together in the sixties." He said it with an English accent. "That means that you all immediately made love to each other"--á la orgy. And we said, "No, we didn't do that, because we really love each other." Pppssssheeww! Right through his little brain. That was never, ever, what any of us needed to do. So, yeah, the foundation is our relationship.

SUBJECT #24: 49-YEAR-OLD HETEROSEXUAL

I'm an only child, my parents treated me like another adult very young. They respected my opinions. I never grew up that because I was a girl I couldn't do something. When I was 12 years old, my parents moved to a house in Berkeley. It was during the war. My father looked at it Sunday afternoon. He went home, got my mother, and brought her back. That night they made a deposit on it. We moved into it, and all of a sudden, my mother realized that there was no back door--you had to take the garbage through the central hall down and out. And she said it must have been designed by a man; no woman would do that kind of thing.

This has been kind of one of the reasons I thought I might be interested in architecture. I always liked houses--structures.--"Jiminy Crickets! I could do better than that!" Why not? So I never had any feelings to overcome of inadequacy. My parents always supported me in anything I wanted to do--both economically and emotionally.

* * * * *

My family was living in Berkeley when I went to Cal, so I went to school living at home, except for one year I was living in this sorority house; but, basically, I was living at home. And I often thought, as I got older, I should have gone some place like UCLA--or away--to just kind of break that tie a little earlier, because it took me quite a while to really realize I wasn't going to live with my mother and dad the rest of my life; and so I thought that really was a good thought to have my son go away to college. When it got right down to it, it didn't bother me at all when he went away. It bothered my husband, but it never did me. He broke into tears at the airport. And he does every time you put my son on a plane--he just goes all to pieces. And it's really--uh--you know--you always expect the mother to be much more protective of especially her first born.

You mentioned being an only child. I'm wondering what impact, if any, it had on you.

I think I grew up earlier. I had no sibling relationships. That didn't bother me at all. I think being an only child is great. The only reason I had a second one is--suddenly, I got to thinking--when you have all your eggs in one basket, so to speak, what happens if you lose that child? My husband's an only child. I don't think that you can generalize any more by "only children" than about women, or blacks, or any other group. There are some that have certain characteristics because they're only children. . . . You have some pro's and you have some con's. But I had a lot more--obviously a lot more--advantages than if you have to spread economic things over more than one child. My parents were usually traveling a lot, and I got to go along. When I was 16 we went to Mexico City--drove to Mexico City.

Are your parents still alive?

Yes, they've been married 55 years. Mother went back to college when I was a junior in college--at Berkeley. She had quit to put my father through school. And so she'd always kinda felt badly about this--complained a lot. So my dad said, "Why don't you go, too?" So she did. She and I went. Of course, we weren't in the same curriculum. She was in English; but we did have one class together, so we'd meet on campus and talk. My father--he would drive us up to school--you know--pick us up, and make dinner, and do shopping; and he did all kinds of things to help. My mother was--I can remember in the 30's she belonged to the National Women's Party and they were working for the equal rights amendment in that era (which was very unpopular in those days). She wasn't a card carrier or placard person; but she went to the meetings and was very--still is--pro women and women's rights. I had a very understanding father. He went along with that. In fact, I asked about that not too long ago, just because it was kind of curious in my mind that he always went and sort of supported it; and he said, "I feel that there are an awful lot of good brains in this country, and if we'd only use male brains, we're wasting a lot of good resources." That's pretty smart!

So you grew up with parents that were supportive of whatever you wanted to do.

Yes, That is, I think, basically. It's too bad they didn't have other children, because they would have done a good job.

Will you tell me a little bit about your growing up?

My father had a couple of drug stores in Berkeley. We lived in Mt. Clair, which is--do you know where Mt. Clair is? It's out in the hills in the northwest. It's where I started to school, and then when the Second World War came, gasoline became a problem; and it was better to move to Berkeley--to that house with no back door. It was a neighborhood very much like this one--older. I enjoyed it. I went to the public school--Berkeley High. A lot of my friends and neighbors went to Anna Head. It's a private school. I never wanted to go to a private school! I never wanted to go to a private school--didn't want my kids to go to a private school either.

Were you active as a high school student?

I was what you'd call--I was a brain--very much. Which made me a little bit self-conscious, especially with my peer group--especially with the male part of my peer group. I had a very good friend who was Catholic, and I used to go with her to her Catholic youth group and knew kids from other schools. I'd play real dumb. Nobody knew I got straight A's.

Most of the boys that I dated were from another school. We had a marvelous group in junior high. I guess that's really where I got interested in studying. Up until that point, I didn't particularly care one way or the other. In junior high, I met a really neat bunch of kids who were all very studious; and it became kind of a competitive thing. We played together and we'd go on skating parties, and dinner parties, and hikes, and all kinds of activities as a group. There were probably 8 or 9 girls and 8 or 9 boys, and we didn't necessarily go in couples,

but we went as a group. We never paired off with somebody. It was really kind of a nice group--very naive by today's standards, but it was a fun crowd.

The parents were very supportive because we weren't driving in those days. We'd go places and our parents would take us, and we had parties at different friends' houses. And yet, there was this competition--friendly competition--in school, with each class, so that you really wanted to study to keep up with the group; so that's where I started to be interested in studying.

So we moved to Berkeley--I went to Berkeley High. It was a different group. Actually, I guess we moved into Berkeley at the junior high level. I went to grammar school out in the other place. When we moved in, I took the bus on the long commute to finish that year so I could finish the year; and then at the junior high (I got permission to go to one)--to the junior high in Oakland--it was just over the line. That was because all my friends were going to be coming in from the grammar school. But I ended up making a whole different group of friends anyway. But then I went to Berkeley High. All my friends were going to different high schools, so I felt kind of lonesome when I first went to Berkeley High because none of the kids I had gone to grammar school with, or junior high were there. Well, I survived.

College--how did you decide that?

I made the decision that I was going to Berkeley because it was the logical thing to do and had a good school of architecture. I knew at 12 that I wanted to be an architect. I planned my whole program around it. I went up to Berkeley to get the right information, so I took the right courses in high school. I had all of these thoughts that if I didn't make it in architecture, I would go into math, because I was strong in math, calculus, etc.

SUBJECT #26: 46-YEAR-OLD HETEROSEXUAL

It sounds like you went through a hell of a struggle--and have landed on your feet.

When people say it was a struggle--honestly--it did not feel like a struggle. And it was loads of fun. And it was really interesting--and still is interesting. In the past tense, my life seems very exciting. My life is exciting.

You talked about your marriage to George. I'd like to know more about that.

When I say I didn't know him, it's just because while we were married, when I say "perfect marriage" and perfect family" it was that way--because I didn't argue--ever! I don't like arguments, but I will argue now. We had a little house and the children, and I was home all the time--I didn't work. And he worked and came home. We went out together a lot, and coffeed in the morning. And it was all of those things. But it was not real because--well--I really hate to talk about him because he did a really fine thing insomuch as trying to break it off clear. But he was never--he was not ever a good provider. But that is not important, though he thought he was--in that he had dreams, but they didn't materialize. And he talked a lot about what he was going to do and what he wanted to do. . . . And I think the biggest thing is that he could dream about all these things and he had illusions in his mind about how everything was really wonderful, but he never had to really look at it close. So when he married again--and he married a young girl--he would still continue with his dreams, and so forth. She was a real go-getter! And so all the dreams she thought, "Well, we'll do those." And it did him in, because he really wasn't able to do all those things. And then he got a heart attack. So in our marriage, when he wanted the divorce . . .

How did you cope with this "dreamer"?

He worked very hard in his job. He also came home and he'd expect the house to be totally perfect--which it was--and the yard done. He had an illusion that he did the yard, but I did all the yard work. And our yard was very fairy-tale-like. And that's why I currently live in a town house. And nobody could get upset with him or say anything to him because he wouldn't talk to you for 2 weeks. And I really like having everybody talking to me, and talk it all out. But if it's somebody who's not going to talk to me for 2 weeks, I will not do anything to rock the boat. So then it was very easy to have it just the way he wanted it. But when I started reading--when we came here--I got a job. I got a job at a bookstore. It was very hard work -- the noise--and the young people, but the paperbacks were marvelous! But anyway, I started reading political stuff. And George was very "marine corps," short hair and very upset with the kids; and I was reading some of the things that they were reading, and I really loved them. And I was becoming more enthusiastic about the things I was reading and the things I was learning; and there was really no one to talk about them with. Then Vietnam came up. And I was quite vocal about how I felt about Vietnam. And by that time, I think Diane was getting old enough, too, and she became quite vocal about it. And this was a cause of great concern to him because he really thought I was becoming Communist--and liberal--which I suppose I am in some way or another. But it was very frightening to him, to see the changes in the family.

So you and the kids could talk to each other, it sounds like.

The kids and I had a marvelous time. And this is another sad part, because George, although he worked in the city and was gone quite a bit, also liked to be gone so much that he would even stay over night if he had to stay in San Jose. And that's why I say "poor man." He felt so out of it! And yet the children and I didn't talk that much, because I was working--sometimes 6 days a week. And so you're really not talking a lot when you're working. I also didn't have a car all of that time.

Now, these are some of the kinds of things that George would do: When I had a car, he bought a piano instead of getting the brakes fixed on the car. And so I sort of felt like this was telling me something. But I sloughed it off. I was a very rose-colored-glass person. I am not that way anymore. For some reason, I could make excuses for any possible thing that anyone was ever doing. And I would always see that in some way there was a total rationality in their behavior. And I could do that beautifully. It was optimism, but it was something else, too. I felt like it was really just easier. I didn't have to fuss about anything. And one of the things he said when he left me is that this would be bitter medicine for me--that I was too much of an idealist, and I would find out that the world is a very hard place; but I didn't. I found out that it was a very wonderful place, and that you could laugh an awful lot. And I wasn't too concerned, and one of the happiest things about it is that I didn't have to go to movies anymore if I didn't want to. Also, there were a lot of things I had never thought about doing.

What kinds of things?

Well, do you mean the kinds of things I didn't want to do when I was married? That's really about the only thing. And the fact that we could laugh a lot. We did things like take vacations. While I was still married, George had an illusion about liking to camp. So we bought all this camping gear. But we only went once! And then he didn't like it. As soon as the children were old enough and I had a car, we went camping constantly--the kids and I. In fact, we went to the beach so often that--you know--you can only stay in one place 10 days and then you have to move to another place. And George stayed at home, working every day, 24 hours a day, anyway. He didn't care, except when he would call. We went camping. I used to bring a friend for everybody, too. And so he came to pick us up at the beach, which was absolutely wonderful. We'd been down there about 10 days having a wonderful time. But we needed his car to take us all home. And he greeted me, "Gee, you need your hair done." And I thought, "At the beach!" We were miles apart.

There is another very significant thing that happened to me at that time. I had never considered myself lonely or in any way different from any other wife with children and husband working. But one evening after the kids--we had built a campfire and everybody had been singing and enjoying themselves and everybody was asleep, except me. And this young man came by, and he was working on one of the rigs out on the gulf, and he stopped and talked. We just talked about all kinds of things--and then he walked on. And if ever there was a wish in my heart, it was, "Oh, I wish I had somebody to talk to--or this companionship with somebody else." And it was one of those things that you think of and you don't ever think of it again. Somehow, in your life you cannot possibly think of it because of the life you're living. And it was truthfully after--I wasn't married to Dave yet, but we had gone camping one time, a very unlikely person--Dave doesn't look like an outdoorsman at all; and yet, he is the best outdoorsman I've ever met in my life! We were camping and were talking one evening before we went to sleep. And we'd stopped talking, and I was looking at the stars. And I realized that I felt the same way I did so long ago--and "Thanks a lot, God!"

I guess it's easy to get caught up in a lifestyle and not to think about what you're missing.

You just block it. And you don't think about what you're missing because you're too involved in what you're doing and the things you have to do. And so sometimes you have those little things that come up and remind you of something that was totally wonderful or totally sad. It's really incredible because you think, "Oh, yeah, I did have that in mind." And so those are the kinds of things--and so, what else do you want to talk about?

So you and George were, in a lot of ways, not suited for each other in terms of your life style.

Oh, no! And the strange part of it was, though, that when you are working very hard and in America, though it is changing a little bit, at that particular time, I think men worked harder to succeed. And I

think they finally discovered that only one person could be the manager, or one person was going to be president, so there is a more relaxed sort of thing. And men are not just willing to go hither and yon for the company and disrupt family life. But at that particular time, people did, so by the time you entertained and did all of the things that were necessary, you were so exhausted you really didn't have time to do any of those other things. And maybe you didn't even dream about that. I'm sure that, with George, when he did find somebody that he was compatible with, it was such a joy to him that it was worth leaving the family; and since he was supposedly such a family man and all of these other things were so important to him at the time, for him to just be able to say, "You know, I don't want to do this any more," and he had gone to the lawyer and then he had--of all places--taken me to a park and told me he was getting the divorce. This was what was going to happen to me, and I was so docile at the time that I just--and so wiped out--it was such a shock and a surprise, and all of this, that all I could do was go along with it--which was fine, and--

So it was totally unexpected?

Yeah, and you know it is funny. When you--when you say totally unexpected, how can it be totally unexpected? But it was. And even looking back at it, truthfully, I was the most shocked person; and I did tell him he had to tell the children. He wanted me to tell the children, and I said I felt he could tell them. And it was very ironic because it was Fathers' Day. I left for the weekend. I went to the beach--I just had to get away.

SUBJECT #27: 48-YEAR-OLD HETEROSEXUAL

I teach. I've taught 11 years. And I really never planned on teaching! I majored in education at school--my father was far-sighted. He said, "I want you to have something you can fall back on if you need it." And I never--you know--I didn't really plan on teaching. I planned on getting married and having a family. So it was interesting, because about 13 years ago, Conrad had a serious ulcer of the eyeball and one of the fellows that was in our wedding party was an eye doctor--and John said, "I think you're going to have a blind husband. Do you still have your credential valid?" Well, I had let it lapse. So due to John, I--he kind of spurred me on--and everything kind of fell into place and I talked to the Education Department at Hayward. Everything kind of smoothed its way out, and I did go back to school. And I had to change a lot of things. I had an education major in college, and I didn't get a life credential, and--

Did you have to have a specific kind of major?

Well, yeah. Because--like when I was in school, you could be a kindergarten, primary education major and get a credential, and then they changed everything around, and I came under the Ryan Bill, and you had to have an academic major. So that was very interesting -- very interesting to go back to school--because that was the first time--I tell you--that was the first I had ever been on my own doing anything. I went from girl's school, a girl's high school to a Catholic girl's college, and it was different. It was small; and when you were making out next semester's things, you went into the President's office and the Registrar was there and you were there and "Would you like coffee, tea, or coke?" And that's how you made out your schedule. And I went right straight from that to getting married. So I always had somebody taking care of me. And actually, the first time I was ever really on my own, or had to do any thinking for myself, was when I got down to Hayward State.

It was the summer school--I--Well, that would be 13 years ago. And that was really interesting to me because I--talk about somebody who was always sheltered and protected--I used to do dumb things like--you know--if the tire went flat on the car, I would call Conrad at the office and say, "Help! What do I do now? The tire is flat!" The poor man--I can see him--I must have blown his mind. "I locked myself out of the house! What do I do now?" "The dishwasher is overflowing! What do I do now?" And it was really going to--back to school that did me a world of good, because it made me have to do something on my own and it was survival of the fittest! Suddenly, it dawned on me--didn't dawn on me for a while, but pretty quick I got the picture. And--I don't know--I took some classes from demanding people, and I figured out the system; and I thought, "Gee, you have a brain!"--because after (I don't think it happens to people now, but I think that years ago--my generation) you married, you were this quiet little wife, and --you know--the lord and master was your husband who told you, "Put the yellow candles here and put the red candles over there," and you did it with no question. And I think now people are different. And it's more of a two-way relationship. So for me going back to school and finding out I still had a brain--you know--

You'd forgotten?

Oh, yeah, I knew I had a brain before. Sure I did. I knew I was a bright person, but after you pick weeds in the lawn, take care of little children and cook meals for a long time, you forget your brain. So it was really interesting. I really enjoyed going back to school.

What kind of an impact did it have on the family with you going back?

Well, they understood. I don't think it had that much impact on them because I would go off to school while they were in school and my classes were generally 8:00 to 12:00--maybe 1:00--so Conrad would be able to--if I left before the kids--Conrad would see the kids off to school. And I was home before them. They realized I had a lot of studying to do. I had a lot of energy then, too. I was playing golf 3 days a week. I

think it was good--another aspect of it. I had Karen--she was 14 years old--just a freshman in high school. And it dawned on me--it gave me a better understanding of the kinds of competition that they were going to run into. So I think I was a lot more prepared for what high school and college would be like for them--how competitive everything was. It was good--

Any adjustments in the marriage at all during that time?

No, Conrad was really cooperative. The hard time for me would be when I was writing a term paper and what I was doing--I had to take a lot of history classes, and the professor was one of these people--I figured him out right away--he was so demanding--terrifically demanding --and he'd write test questions on the footnotes!--requiring a tremendous amount of reading! And I remember one time he called me and said, "I've looked you up, and I find that you're not getting a Masters' in History." And I said, "No, I'm not." And he said, "Well what are you here for?" And I said, "Well, I'm getting my credential." He said, "Well, who gave you--where did you get all the tests?" And I said, "I don't have your tests." He said, "Well, nobody has ever gotten A's in my class except if they're majoring or getting Masters' in History." I took a lot of classes from him, anyway. Interesting, because much later he called me and said, "I finally found out you had a background in ancient history." and I said, "Uh-huh, sure I have." I figured him out--crummy--testing on the footnotes! It was good. I think that did a lot for me to go back to school. It makes me a lot more confident. I think one thing that's bad--I think that women of my generation--they were under their husbands' thumbs! When you were at home, anything you did--if you played tennis or golf--whatever you did--you still--when you came home--were under this authority.

In what way did that affect your life or your marriage?

Being under his authority?

Yes,

Whatever he says is right. That generation of men almost thought they were gods, and the way their mothers raised them, of course, had its effect. But I think it's good for me to go back to school, and I really do--

But you had a cooperative husband--or it sounds like that.

Yeah, I did. He was very cooperative and I always managed to get my studying in. I did a lot of studying. And also I would study before the kids came home. Actually, where it did have an impact, probably, on my kids was the time that I should have been with the kids in a private school, Catholic schools, parents, a lot of it--the Mothers' Club and all those things that are dependent on the activity of the mother. I really feel I short-changed my children a lot by not--at a time when I should have been going in whole hog--maybe taking on the presidency of the PTA. I didn't have the time. I could not do that. And the same thing with the two younger ones who were in school. So from that standpoint, I wonder if years from now, because I didn't do that, if they won't be of the type that will not do that. I think--you know--kids have parents who were the president of this or the president of that--and if you look at those kids when they grow up, they will be presidents of the Lawyers' Wives Guild, or take on that kind of thing; and I think maybe that's a learned thing.

In terms of your example, they might be self-sufficient doing what they wanted and needed to do. They might not be presidents of the PTA, or whatever, but they might be--

They might be workers. And I can see in my girls now--I really don't think either of those girls will get married. They talk about careers, and I really think that they're maybe--maybe if I had been a more traditional person and not--you know--if I'd played my tennis and played my duplicate bridge and kept at my golf game and these things, and president of this, that, and the other thing, maybe my girls --maybe one of them--would get married, anyway--

Is that something you would like for them?

Yeah.

In terms of grandkids or just in terms of being--

Well, I don't think I'm at the point of being --it would be neat to have grandkids--but I don't think I'm at that point yet. I certainly wouldn't like changing messy diapers of babies again --you know--I've just kind of had it. But, I'd always thought I wanted the girls to get married. But now, looking around--so many of--OK, Karen's been--OK--Karen's been out of school five years in June. She's 26--will be 27 in July, and it's real interesting. When she got out of Berkeley, she must have been in 12 or 13 weddings, and I'll bet--I don't know how many of those kids are still together, but I'll bet there aren't more than three or four of them. Those marriages have all split. And just even breaking up with boy friends--you know--I can see--last summer she broke up with this guy, and she just went through the pits, breaking up with just a fellow she was going out with. And I thought, "Gee, I'm not sure! Maybe they're better off not getting married!"

I'm wondering how it is--you got married and are in a stable relationship--what the difference might be.

Yeah, but you were expected to, then. I came from a very, very traditional life style. I came from an Irish family. My mother was part German and it was just expected. You know--when you got out of high school, you didn't go--I knew where I wanted to go. Well, Stanford, I couldn't get into--I think they were taking just 57 girls. That was right after the war, and they had so many vets coming back. Berkeley--my father just had a fit--"Your cousins went to Berkeley and now look at them, they're teaching!" That wasn't traditional, you know. So I ended up going to a small Catholic school, which was a great school; and I had a very good education there. But you were expected, when you got out of school--everybody I knew--you got married--either that, or you

taught, or you went into the convent. You really didn't have--you know --you had our choices. You didn't do things like go through Europe, and I can remember--I guess I was born maybe 15 years too soon, because one of the things I wanted to do--I wanted to bike through Europe. And then everybody thought, "Oh, my God!" I had all those far-out ideas --I was born 15 years too soon--maybe 20 years too soon, who knows! But you're expected to get married, so--

Was that something you wanted to do, or did you give it a thought at all?

Well, I really think--I think I got married too young. I really do. I got married when I was 21. And I think I got married because I was afraid to go out in the world. And I think also, that because of all these things you're expected to do--I think maybe I was slightly in revolt, too. And the more my parents said, "No, you can't marry him--he's not--your backgrounds are so different!"--I think the more they said that, the more persistent I was. I thought, "I'll show you guys!"

What does being married too young mean?

Too young, for me, was getting out of college and not having a work experience,--because, me--I'd never worked. Well, I didn't know how to write--this is classic--I did not know how to write a check. In other words, you know, your college tuition was paid, and I was given money each week. Here's the money for the week. Well, I was so close to San Francisco that I used to go home most weekends. If not--you know--OK, they'd give me 2 or 3 weeks allowance. But I didn't have a check book. I didn't know how to write out a check. And I was very naive--just a college girl--that's what I was. Just kind of--life was fun--a bowl of cherries--having a good time! But I don't think I was ready to take on responsibilities. I certainly think I was not ready to. I didn't know a thing about taking care of the house. I didn't even make my own bed. At school I found somebody who would--I paid her by the week to make my bed for me. I didn't know how to cook, I didn't know anything!

And I was too young! If I had had time--even a year, or 6 months--and gone out and gotten a job and had some responsibilities for my own money, learned how to write a check, balance a check book, save to buy a car, foot my own bills for a while--I think I would have been a far better person.

Except you know how to do all those things now!

Yeah, I know how to do all those things now, but it took me a long time. After I was married--we were married in November--my parents went to Europe, and I was bored. They were gone 2 or 3 months, and I had a friend who said, "If you're that bored, why don't you get a job?" So I got this job--went down and applied for a job. See, I'd been so gutless, I think maybe I let myself be led into marriage as a way of not having to go out and face the world. Well--and yet, I went down and applied for this job--it was a great job! It was a casualty underwriter for an insurance company. And then I thought, "Gee, there's a great big world out there!" I loved the financial district--just loved it! The company was on Sansome Street, and it was fun going out to lunches, being in a world of adults for the first time that I was in an adult world--you know--on an adult basis. Because up till then, within our large Irish family, there was only my brother and I--but many cousins--and it was a close knit family. You were still a child. Here were the older ones, and you were still a child! So you had this child relationship and it wasn't until I got downtown in that office that I was treated as an adult and dealt with people. And that was a neat experience. But, see, then it was too late, because here I was married. And I thought I could see things here that I liked--I'd like to be a career woman. And I worked--

You didn't see that working could be a part of being married, as well, or--

Yeah, well--I did. I did. There was no question about that. I had a baby--I had my little daughter. I worked up until 2 weeks before I had her. And in those days, women did not go back into a job. And

that was bad. Because what I really wanted to do--and there, again, I buckled under and did what was triditional--you know--what was expected of me. I had pressures--Conrad didn't want me working; my mother and father said, "You got to stay home and take care of this child." I knew nothing about taking care of children. I never even held one before I brought her home. I didn't know what to do with them. But, there again, I buckled under and I really thought that--I think maybe--when you get right down to it, I probably was more a career woman. I probably had a bent toward career, always. And I was born too soon.

In terms of your own daughters being career women, do you see that as excluding marriage?

I wouldn't think so. No, because, listening to them talk, I think if they could--both of them--someone who could--who would be a firm--well, I don't know--I don't mean firm, but who could give a stable home life and would be a person who would feel that--you know--this is for always--I think that both those girls probably would work part time. I know one daughter has talked at various times, and she's said, "Well, I don't know if I want to get married or not, but if I ever do, I'd like to have a home and family." They both would love to have a family and they--particularly this one--have talked about having some kind of a job that would be maybe several days a week or a few hours a day--just so she would have her own life--not to have to depend strictly on her husband. And I think that's bad to have to be dependent on your husband for all inputs.

SUBJECT #28: 25-YEAR-OLD HETEROSEXUAL

Well, to start out, I'm living with a man, for 2 years now. His name is Tom. We've known each other a real long time--someone asked me a week ago where I met him. Thinking back, I've known him for 8 years. We haven't been close all that time. We weren't into a relationship all that time, but it's just amazing to me to see the length of that relationship just because I'm so used to seeing everyone else awash! I've seen a lot of people in and out of relationships, and I certainly never thought of myself as different than that, but apparently that's not true. Umm, let's see! We're pretty committed to each other right now, though. We go in and out of that. We don't really go in and out--it's more like we're committed to being together and living together and sharing and working; and both of us kind of assume that it's going to be some kind of long-term kind of thing. Neither of us are ready to get married, and we're both sort of scared about that.

I think part of it is just the kind of models that are out there in terms of marriage. The ones that were closest to me were my parents and my friends' parents. My parents had a lot of love between them, but the dependency I saw between them didn't seem real healthy. My mother was a housewife, and she spent her whole life taking care of us and my father--doing the housework and cooking, and she never finished college. She had a few jobs that made her feel terrible because they were very menial or low level jobs, and she's very sensitive about that. She feels like she's not very competent; and they had a fairly good relationship in the sense of being caring. And they did things together and that may be one of the reasons it's worked, because my father's willingness to go out and work full time and support a family and go into debt--and my mother spent all her time taking care of us, and I can't foresee that sort of situation and don't know that many other people who are married who, umm--At the rate of divorces--and I don't want to get married and get a divorce. It's scary to feel like one should be married. I'm not sure whether I believe in marriage--whether people could be together their

whole lives. I would like to believe in the romantic side and that things could go well and to live forever happily ever after, or at least work through stuff and really be committed to grow old together and have that companionship in old age, and all that, but as I look around, I don't see too many people who do that, you know. Most people end up breaking up, or staying in a long-term relationship at some huge "sacrifice" of a part of themselves. I am not sure what is more important to me right now. There is a part of me that is very committed to this relationship and loves Tom a lot and wants to be with him; and another part of me says, "What about a relationship with someone I haven't met yet?"

As a matter of fact, I have got a lot of--oh, what is the word for it--it's very hard for me to just accept what I've got. I think maybe there's something better just over the hill, and I keep looking for the ultimate--the perfect thing, and I do that with relationships, too. You know, it's hard for me to accept everything about any one person, thinking that maybe there's someone more perfect out there. I mean, I'm thinking this way constantly, but I think it's a part of what my fear is about--making a long-term commitment is about. If someone else comes along I want to fall in love with and want to be in a relationship with him-- So it's that, and the fear of becoming dependent on someone.

What do you mean by that?

Oh--you know--the way a lot of people become each other's sole support and not doing anything without being a part of a couple--it seems you are no longer you! You're "Joe's wife" or--in other people's eyes, even more than . . . I don't know--I think there's a tendency for people to see you as part of a couple. Even living with Tom--I was amazed at how people--that's not true anymore. When I first moved out here, I think that I have consciously been doing a lot more things on my own. But when I first moved out here I started living with him. I think people reacted very differently than when I was used to being single and living alone. Well, I noticed that single women were less likely to ask me to do things--without feeling that they had to ask him. People would assume I was busy. People would assume that he was my primary commitment.

It seems to me that people felt I was so wrapped up in that relationship that I didn't have time for anything else. It seemed that couples asked us to come over--that was, I guess, the major difference. Also, it was something that I am actually not uncomfortable with, but when men find out I'm living with someone, their attitude is really different! They would not pursue any kind of relationship, except for the unusual kind of man that would want a friendship. It's been so long since I have been living on my own, I can't remember how it is, almost.

It's interesting that this week Tom went on a trip--He's in Chicago, and this is the first week I've been alone in about a year--almost a year --and it's very interesting to see how it feels. I am sort of busy a lot. I think it would be quite different if I were home a lot of the time. But I was really scared when he first left. I was afraid that I would be lonely--and it's almost a nameless kind of fear. I was kind of nervous about being alone. There's this separation stuff, too, and I am worried about what will happen if he gets in a plane crash--all this kind of stuff that I used to do when my parents went away for an evening. I was worried they'd be in a car crash and would never come home, and I'd be alone. And--oh, what else--I was also looking forward to it--seeing what it was like to be on my own rhythm without someone else there; and, in some ways, I really enjoyed it--not having to wait and figure out what we both wanted for dinner and when--like I go to bed when I want to. Just no one else to worry about, and it's sort of nice!

So, you find yourself altering your behavior in your relationship with him?

Oh, yes! Sure I do--yeah, it's only been a few days and I think the main things that are different. . .it's just the practical things--like cooking together. Sometimes I go to bed earlier than I would, because he gets up earlier, and I like going to bed with him. It's really nice to cuddle up together!

The things I miss the most--having someone to share what's happened during the day, the physical affection (I'm amazed at how important that is). The older I get, the more I realize how important it is--the need people have to be held and touched, and things like that, apart from the

sexual needs; and there aren't that many ways to get it in the world other than in a primary relationship. There are people, I guess, who get this from friends, but I don't have so many friends I can cuddle with. I can get hugs, maybe, but I mean really cuddle with them--so that's something that really means a lot.

SUBJECT #29: 42-YEAR-OLD HETEROSEXUAL

As a matter of fact, sometimes I might have a harder time talking like this, but since I've been in California this is an interesting time because I have a lot of free time so that I've been thinking more about certain things that I might otherwise be. And I'm in a very--at a time where I don't know how I feel. I'm ambivalent about a lot of things right now--among other things, I was trying to decide if I want to get a job when we go home. So I have a lot more ambivalence now and I'm a lot more aware than I would usually be.

You're in a transition?

Right! I don't have anything to do. I have time to do this--I don't have my normal--anything. But anything I say today--I might say the opposite thing tomorrow. When I'm home, I say I don't work; but in a sense, I do. I'm a weaver. That's not the right word anymore, but I don't like what is the right word--right now you call it a "fiber artist." What I'm trying to say is that you don't necessarily use a loom anymore if you're involved in the field. But I don't work very hard because I don't have to if I'm working at home. It's real hard working at home. I think most people have that problem--when the phone rings. Then I go up and do something like scrub the kitchen floor, so it's very hard to work hard, working at home. I don't have any deadlines, so I go through spurts of working very hard and getting a lot done and then long times of not doing anything, and I also work one day a week at a yarn store selling yarn. And I teach weaving one or two nights a week. So I do sort of work--like accumulate an income, but I don't really consider it work. But anyway, I'm currently in the position of trying to find out if I should give that up and get a real job.

You don't consider weaving a real job?

Not in my mind--it's not associated with income. I have a hard time associating working and not an income.

Do you sell your work?

I don't very much. You have to be very assertive and very self-confident to sell. There are a number of us in the same condition who are thinking of doing something about it. Like hiring someone else to sell the stuff. Another awkwardness is that I'm an amateur weaver in that I don't have the proper university degree--and that's awkward.

You need a university degree for it?

Well, you should have a Master of Fine Arts to look good. It's not like being a Univeristy Professor who needs a Ph.D. You can do it without an MFA. It's just that it looks better. So I could do that--I could go get my MFA, but there's probably no point in it at this time. I've done all those things that you would do--I mean my experience comes out to about the same thing.

So you have the experience--just no degree.

Right! Well, having a degree puts a lot of rigor into it. I haven't had to be--your attitude is very rigorous when you're going to school, which I never really have at home. And you have to think a lot of things through clearly because you're going to be asked to justify this and that. And when you've done something on your own, you just have to justify it to yourself. It's probably the main value of school that is being called on to justify yourself.

To the external world, as opposed to just yourself?

You can fool yourself about whether you've done what you think you did--I mean you could do all the things you've done, but with no one to say to you, "Explain why" and "Are you sure?" and--

How about your other artist friends?

That works to some degree. We're learning to do that.

I guess I always assumed that weaving or being an artist didn't require a degree.

It didn't, until recently, but it--there were so few people doing it that if you did it you were automatically better than everybody else; but now there are a large number of people doing it, so things start--some people are more ambitious and when they start getting a degree--it wasn't until just recently.

How did you get involved in weaving?

By accident. I just lived somewhere where it was available. And I've never been job-oriented. I'm real apprehensive about going to work, so I never intended to when I was younger; and I don't think that because I was a woman, I didn't have to go to work--but I don't think that I--I mean I would like sort of being a monk, or-- I always liked the idea of being a monk--not a nun--but I've definite reservations about this--a little confusion. As a woman, I didn't have to go to work, so it was convenient--and as a woman, I think there were certain things I never tried to do because it was assumed I would never do them. But I think there are too many people doing too many things. So I have those reservations and the reason I'm thinking of going to work at this point--there are many reasons--but one of the large ones is the system of social pressures to go to work that I'm finding--I'm finding it really hard to stand against them.

What kind of pressure have you experienced?

The pressure is enormous! I'm really amused because when my mother was my age, you had to be very brave to go to work. And I'd be very brave to stay home. The pressure's enormous--you feel very stupid.

Do people just act like you're stupid? Do you really feel stupid?

No, not necessarily, because in my case, I could hang it on the weaving, and that really scares them--because people really mistake that and think that's more creative than whatever they're doing. It's probably incorrect. But that can be used. I frequently go to a party and find some woman trembling in the corner and if you ask her what's the matter, she'll say, "Oh, that woman just asked me what I did, and I said, 'I do nothing.' and she walked away."

A lot of the women I know who went back to work in their late 30's or 40's did it the wrong way. There's got to be another way. A lot of them became--not tough--nervous. And that's bad. But something else--not tough--but--like--almost selfish. There's got to be another way. But I've seen enough women go back to work and just--you know--it's wonderful, wonderful, wonderful that that's what makes me jealous sometimes--some of them just bloom from going back to work. Another thing that scares me a little bit about not working--not necessarily for myself, but in general--is that the weaving class that I teach, if I teach Beginning Weaving, and I'm teaching it to amateurs and I have typically six or seven people in my class--typically two or three will be young working women and two or three will be young students and two or so will be housewives in their 40's more or less. And working women come in and they're a little worried, but they--just anybody--can learn to weave; It's real easy and the way I teach is really easy. The course is only 7 weeks and I think at the end, everybody can do it--for sure--and I tell them that.

So the young working women get to work, and they're worried, but they do it. The students just do it--because they're so used to being in classes they just do it. Older women--almost every time I have one who will walk in the door and say, "I can't do it" the minute she walks in the door, and it's an uphill battle all the way. I just struggle and fight and ease and help and guide and at the end of the sessions, she's doing it; but it's a horrendous battle--and the assumption is that she can't do it. And it's very, very scary. I've had farm women come in who can run a farm, can all her vegetables, kill animals, and run a family,

drive a tractor, and they come in and say they can't do it because they've never had to contend with another person. They feel it's tneir own house and nobody's going to criticize if they make a mistake. Nobody will--I don't know what--something's happening . . . It's real scary. What happens--what hanpens to you? I don't know what happens outside the house, except that they tend to be put down.

Do you experience that?

Yes, but less because I'm really doing things out of the house. Less than--the things I do here, I'm an authority, as when I'm teaching, or with my friends--you know--yes, I'm--I mean I feel I can't do a lot of things. I think about getting a job. I really can't do--I'm not trained. I can't be a dietician--I'm realistic. I don't know how bad it is--I don't know how bad a case of what I am describing I have. I haven't really tested anything--maybe not too bad, because I am doing a lot.

Why are you considering going back to work, then?

Because of the social pressure, feeling silly about not working. Feeling worried about the things--I say this to people and they tend to misunderstand: I would like to feel I could get divorced. Don't misunderstand. I don't want to get divorced! I would like to feel that I don't <u>have</u> to be married--I don't have to be married--I mean I could get divorced. But I would like to feel that it's more--You know what I'm trying to say? I am dependent financially. I would like to feel--I'd have a better commitment if I wasn't dependent financially. If I could feel that I could walk out at any minute. And I can, really. I could if I had to. But I would like to feel independent. Not too much, because my husband doesn't have that hangup about money. You know, I'm very, very lucky. So there's money!

So it's the dependency position that's uncomfortable?

It's a little uncomfortable feeling that you can't take care--well,

I guess it's what goes into that feeling that you can't take care of yourself. Maybe you can--maybe you can't! I don't know.

Not having tried that out on your own?

It's scary!--to think you cant take care of yourself!--I'm so lucky; I'm in such an enviable position that I'm not--well--my husband doesn't really give me--things are just really good. He doesn't care about money; it's not just his and mine. I know other people who--mine and yours--so we don't have any of that.

So he's not the kind of person who would control your behavior?

No. So I have no problems at all; I'm making them all up. They're in the air! I have no real problems.

So you're saying that your commitment would be cleaner, somehow.

It would be nice to feel--I don't know how to say it and not be misunderstood. I guess 'cause I've seen other women who--I guess 'cause I know women who have gotten divorced 'cause they found out they could. Now I don't want to do that. That's why I'm so scared I'll say the wrong thing. I don't want to do that! I just want to feel that I <u>can</u>.

So that you're in a marriage because you want to be--not because you have to?

I <u>am</u> in it because I want to, it so happens; but I also <u>have</u> to, and I would like to take the "have-to" away. It would be nice, though it's not very important. It's not a big issue. And the biggest consideration is that I worry about money. Even though we have plenty, I still worry.

SUBJECT #31: 31-YEAR-OLD LESBIAN

We had been living together for 3 years already, and we'd just planned to keep living together; but neither parents were willing to give us money to leave the country if he were to get drafted. And we figured we needed several thousand dollars to do that, so we decided to get married. And we expected it not to make any changes in our relationship, but it did. People's expectations around us changed; people starting relating to us as a couple--as a MARRIED couple, rather than John and Connie. It just got worse and worse. We should have been really good friends.

Did you leave the country?

No, we didn't. He was 195 the first year of the lottery, and his local board filled their quota at 193-1/2. They didn't count the half--half-way through 193 they filled it. So we didn't have to leave. But we should have been good friends, which is what we are now. Good friends. Living together just didn't work. You know, there are some people you can live with and some people you can't live with. He and I didn't work living together.

Really? In what way?

There was just a lot of hassles. Mine--I had a kind of one-up script. He has more of a one-down kind of script. We'd get hooked all the time. He was very involved in his work and I was more . . . He worked in a laboratory--away. I was more into wanting a relationship where someone would be home a lot with me. The things I like to do are more at home. Being a teacher, I could do all my lessons--all at home rather than working 9:00-3:00, or 8:30-3:30--or something. And our living together didn't quite work. As men go, he's one of those few good men. He's a

really nice guy; he's not heavy into a lot of male scripting and he is not super impressive, he's willing to do his share of the housework and all that kind of stuff, which I think is why I stayed with him as long as I did, We were together for 7 years. He finally left me. I don't know if I would have made the move, because I was really into having a long-term relationship.

What does that mean to you--a long term relationship?

Living with the same person for a long time. The kinds of things that happen when you get to know someone over a period of years. The sense of family that's developed. I don't have a close sense of family with my family, but I knew that that was possible because the rest of my family seemed to have a big extended family.

So that was something you wanted.

Yes, and I think that is something that he and I still share with one another--is the sense of family. You know--we lived together for 7 years. That's longer than we've lived with anyone else except our families.

Included in that were there going to be children?

I really didn't want to have children--although children are important to me. I teach. I don't think I ever want to teach and have children. I think now I'm more open to--at some point, possibly--living with children. I don't want to have children--I hever have wanted to. I like kids.

So, you are now more into wanting to establish a family type of relationship with kids.

Yes, an extended family kind of thing with friends for a while--we're really exploring the possibilities of communal living. You know,

like the communal living days of the sixties--early seventies? We lived with several other people--you know--it wasn't a sexual thing with other people, but we lived in a house with other people and we had lived that way in college, although I had my room in the dormitory, I lived with him and a bunch of other people, and I still live with several other people. I live with three other women, and it will be four women soon. We have a five-bedroom house. I really like that. I don't ever envision wanting to live alone. I am not an "alone" person. I grew up as an only child. I spent plenty of time alone, and I'm not interested in being alone. So, the marriage split up. I got involved in radical psychiatry and started going to women's groups and met a lot of gay women in my groups--started getting in contact with a lesbian subculture in the area. I guess I should backtrack on that. I was extremely heterosexual. I mean I was your model heterosexual. I loved sex with men and that whole trip, and I guess when I was about 19 or 20, I started realizing I sometimes had sexual feelings for women, but I just washed them down. When John and I were in college--when we first got involved with one another--his roommate was gay, and for the 2 years that John and I were together in college, our whole circle of friends was gay. So I was your "faghag" for a couple of years, and our social life was going to parties where we'd be the only straight people. There was a lesbian couple at one party and I was just petrified of them.

I can remember hiding behind males--"Protect me! Protect me! She's staring at me!" And somewhere around then, Gerald, who had been John's gay roommate, told John that he thought I was a dyke, and John told me that; and I thought it was the funniest thing I'd ever heard, and I just laughed and laughed. And after I came out, he was the first person I called. Long distance to Kentucky: "Gerald, guess what, you were right!"

I wonder what that meant and what that coming out meant.

Well, OK. Let me go along with the process. Historical point. During the time that John and I were married, I became more accepting of the fact that I had feelings for women and he was really supportive about

that. He had been involved with Gerald for a while, and he had had gay experiences. He decided he was straight, but it was fine with him if I was turned on to women. And I kept falling in love with my straight women friends. I didn't know any lesbians. And it was just heart-breaking because I would have mad crushes on these women that were friends and spend 3 or 4 months trying to get up the nerve to tell them about it. Finally, I'd tell them; and the response I would get was "That's OK. I still want to be your friend, but I don't feel that way." And it was devastating!

At that time I was really into having an open marriage, but John wasn't. As far as other men were concerned, he was really threatened. He wasn't threatened by my feelings for women.

You felt OK about him having relationships with other people?

I wished he would. He never seemed to want to, but I really wanted him to. So, finally, after he and I split up, this one woman that I just had a crush on for years and had finally given up on (but we were good friends)--she and I went away to Yosemite for a weekend, and she got real drunk and seduced me. And a week later, she went back to men, and has been there ever since. That was really devastating; but around that same time I got friendly with another teacher at the school who, it turned out, was gay. Nobody knew about it, but she told me ; and she and I started being closer friends and started--finally, with someone else--with support, I got up the nerve to try to go to gay people's union at Berkeley again. Years back, I had gone there and it was mostly with gay men that I joined a gay and bi-sexual women's rap group, at one point, and had been involved in that for a while, but never really meeting other lesbians. So Anne and I started going to meetings with other gay women, and a whole new world opened up to me. Along with that, for 3 or 4 years before that, my feminist consciousness had been growing and that was a whole new world. And as time went on, I started identifying myself as a lesbian, rather than a bi-sexual, which I had identified myself as for 7 years before that. I realized that as a feminist and as a lesbian, I wouldn't be going back to men.

In what sense?

It's really hard, I've seen, for any straight feminists I know, to get involved. There's nobody to get involved with. You know--the higher your consciousness gets as a feminist, the less and less acceptable men are to be around. Period! And there are few good men around. I'd been married to one of them, which is why it took me so long to come out at all. But it's really true, whether you're straight or gay, that if you're a feminist, it's hard to find men that we can feel even comfortable TALKING to; so, as time went on, I had fewer and fewer male friends and more and more women friends. All of my life, up until then, my best friends pretty much had been men. Through growing up I had a few girl friends, but more male friends always. I think, in a lot of ways, I was male-identified, as far as being competitive, as being one-up intellectual, all that stuff; I wasn't at all male-identified in my looks, or anything like that. I was never the tomboy. I always wore dresses and acted very feminine, seductive, and all that, but I was definitely out there competing with men in their world and doing it better than they a lot of times. And my closest friends were men. And suddenly, there was this whole new world with women--and lesbians. It was wonderful!

SUBJECT #35: 56-YEAR-OLD LESBIAN

Well, I think I'm a very independent person; and I feel, having grown up in the South, that I've made some real departures from the way I was raised to stay at home, or get married and have a family. And I just moved away gradually from all of those things simply because I found it satisfying to do so. I was interested in a career always but was discouraged somewhat by my parents. They wanted me to go to college to learn how to be a nice wife and a conversationalist and all that kind of thing--but not how to earn a living. In fact, I was never allowed to have a part-time summer job when growing up, because that was not lady-like for women to work. So I grew up, went off to college, never having even washed my own hair or washed out my laundry, or had a job to earn money.

Wealthy family?

No, not wealthy, just middle class--didn't feel poverty. I wanted to study art and finally I was able to finagle them into giving me consent to go to college for a year. Then I could go to art school, so we worked it out fairly well.

Where did you go?

State College for women. And then, of course, the art school I went to was in Nashville. And then I worked for some weekly newspaper. Then I was married and I came out to Oregon--lived out there for about 25 years. I have a daughter who's married now. And eventually that was too confining for me (marriage) so I got out of marriage and eventually worked into this job, which gives me a lot of independence, I feel, as often as I like. I'm an art consultant for a firm that manufactures art materials, and I'm usually a sales representative for promotion of the products by working with teachers--teaching them how to use art materials to good advantage. And I travel all up and down the coast and it's not a regular

job--like--every week I do so and so, or every day I do so and so--it varies. I'm at home this week. I'm preparing materials that I will use in a meeting next week.

I used to teach kids myself before I took this job. So I guess I would describe my life style as very different from the way I was brought up but an awful lot of the values of the work and being responsible for yourself and being loyal to ideals and traditions, so I still also have a lot of that and believe in it. So I'm kinda unconventional and kinda conventional at the same time. I'm a real transitional person.

How's the transition been?

Oh, I would not want to change anything. There are times when I wish certain things had happened to me earlier in my life or I had learned some lessons of life earlier than I did. But there are other times that I'm sometimes glad I didn't, because I believe as you get older, you appreciate an awful lot of things more--things that are good for yourself, rather than important to society or important to your family or something.

Would you care to elaborate about that?

Well, I don't know how to say that exactly, except that I was brought up to be very much concerned about always dressing properly--properly meaning who's ever standard--that could vary--and to be a people-pleaser and not really to be much concerned about my own needs or wants and to really have any role particularly, except as a mediator or a conciliator or want to smile or hold a hand or--that sort of thing. Consequently, when I was 40, and when my daughter and I took this job (which was a real departure for me), I think I began to be more independent on my own and began to understand what I like--not necessarily at someone else's expense. But I have to have what I want, as well as be concerned about other people's needs. And so I think I have appreciated that a great deal, having waited so long to be able to be that way!

So you really felt that you've waited?

Yeah, I have that feeling. I waited 20 years to be me, and I appreciate that. I think my own daughter has not had to wait that long, and I'm very glad that she has matured differently than I.

Was the divorce part of becoming you?

Oh, yes, indeed--positively! I've just felt terribly stifled in a marriage, and I have not yet seen a marriage that I would not be stifled in. You know, couples that I know--my own daughter--I would just feel terribly stifled in any marriage that I've ever yet seen. I'm not saying that they're all that way, but I've never seen one that I, myself, would want.

What is that about?

I don't know, except that whatever therapy I've had--and I've had some--I came to the recognition that in my own growing up, while I got an awful lot of nurturance and closeness from my mother, I saw my daddy as really having what he wanted. The rest of us worked around what he wanted. You know--how much money to have, what kind of food to eat, what friends to have--everything. And I never explored that until I was 35 or 40 years old. But I recognized that I just grew up fearing that the men got what they wanted, and the women took what was left over. And if you were happy with it--well--then you managed; and if you were not happy with it, you were just between the rock and the hard place, and I didn't want to be that way. I think I always felt like there were other things I wanted to do and other places I wanted to go. And I have done that on my own, but in a marriage (and I was married for 12-1/2 years), I certainly couldn't do what I wanted to do when I wanted to do it. It had to be with his consent--you know--literally ask him, "Is it all right with you if I do so and so?" I just got tired of it, so I got out.

I gather that was the way it was when you were growing up--between your parents?

It seemed that way to me. Yeah, it did, definitely! My father, I

think, was a more loving man than my husband was and much more gregarious as a person than my husband was. So perhaps my mother didn't feel the same things I did. But she's alive. They buried my father. He died quite a few years ago. She remarried, and the second husband has since died--just this past year. And I would not be surprised if she married again because she's a personable and attractive woman, and she really likes having a husband to do things for. She really loves it!

So what you saw was a mother that did things for her husband, and her entire life revolved around him.

Well, I think I felt some rivalry between my father and me for my mother's attention, because I knew that I had a lot more of her when he was not around. And when he was there, I didn't count so much--I recognized that. I never felt conscious of hating him--I really don't know. I felt he took her away from me when he came home; and when he was gone, she belonged to me.

Any brothers and sisters?

I have a brother 2 years younger. I also felt he had a lot more privileges than I. Well--he did! He was the boy, and though he was 2 years younger, he could stay out later, and have more freedom for anything. I can remember wanting a bicycle when I was a little girl--and my daddy didn't. That was unlady-like for little girls to ride around on bicycles. So he had bicycles, but I never had one. Of course, see, I'm 56--that was a long time ago and living in the South--I think that makes a difference.

What other kinds of expectations did your father have?

Well, I can remember my daddy saying many times--he never said these things in a harsh manner--I never heard him use swear words; he was a real southern gentleman. I know he behaved differently when women were not around because I overheard him at different times reading the riot

act to the employees there, but I never heard him say so much as "damn" in front of me or in front of my mother. He was that kind of man. And I remember him saying that he thought that all any girl needed to learn was to play the piano and cook well and dance, and then she could have anything she wanted. I didn't want to get what I wanted that way. It just didn't ever satisfy me. I did it--I tried it--I never did like it.

You were aware at that time of not liking it?

I was aware when I was in junior high school I didn't like it.

Were other little girls like that?

I never talked to anybody about that, so I don't really know. I just pretended I felt the same way everybody else did, which was dressing up for dates and hoping to catch this boyfriend and getting asked by that one to go to this dance and all that sort of thing. So I said the same things and did the same things, but inside I never did feel happy with myself. And I always resented the idea that the girl had to wait to be chosen, and the boy could go out and ask whomever he wanted to--if he liked that one, then he could ask her out; but you had to sit there and wait to be asked, and I didn't really like that from then--40 years . . . And also I suppose I was raised a great deal with the idea that <u>that</u> was how you became a real woman or a mature woman--to be chosen by the right "Prince Charming." And if you were not chosen by the "right" one, then what could you do?--Couldn't be a person!--Not a real person! You were left on the vines--a wall flower--all those words. But I'm not the only one that grew up that way.

SUBJECT #36: 41-YEAR-OLD LESBIAN

What's important in my life now--of primary importance to me--is my relationship with Gail and our home life together; and in that sense, I think I am fairly conventional, because my home and my marriage--which this is--are the most important things to me. I have never been career minded. I have never been disciplined or driven towards any direction.

I am very home-oriented, and what centers around my home and my social life with friends, most of which, at this point, I have known for many, many--about 15--years. And that's most important to me. I am getting to the point now where I think that there is another way I would like to make a living, bring in income. I worked for about 16 years. I have been working since I was about 16. I took a break every so often to go to college; but I was never very serious about that, either. And the longest stretch I went to college was a year at a time. Even then, I was working. And with my current job, I worked nights and went to school during the day; and as far as my career and work goes, I have been thinking for a long time for the past 4 or 5 years of what I would like to do--which is new for me--because it has never occurred to me what I would like to do. Anything that brings in an income is fine--I don't care. As long as it's honest, I don't care. And my current job--I kind of went out on my lunch hour from a previous job at the bank and thought--"There's that company--I'll see if they're taking applications," and it must have been right, because within two weeks I got hired. I filled out the application, so I just never really thought about it; I just kind of fell into it. And I've stuck around for 16 years.

I began thinking, "Do I really want to do this for the rest of my life? Is this really what I was cut out to be?" And I thought, "If I change careers, it's got to be something that I can do by myself. I want to do something with my hands. It's got to turn out something I enjoy seeing, whatever that is." I tried woodworking briefly at one point; but the big machines frightened me. I was going to make furniture.

But the big equipment frightened me and I didn't want to work at it. So, anyway, after thinking about it a lot, framing seemed to emerge.

I took a training course in it--in South San Francisco--from a man who has done it for a number of years. He's a master in the sense that he does a lot of restorations. He doesn't work on anything that isn't an original--not interested in a poster--he wouldn't bother with that. But he is a master at what he does, and he will teach me how to gold leaf, how to restore old paper, how to take stains out of old prints, etc.

So you're an apprentice?

I did that for a week and he has a 2-week seminar that I want to go to, and then meanwhile, a friend that I met through the class, who already owns a frame shop--I go over there and work with him in exchange for training. So that's where I'm headed--as far as a career--as far as I know. It's something I can do all by myself--something I can take most anyplace. I don't have to stay in any particular area to do that. I will always have to be in a metropolitan area. But as I say, I think that my home is my primary emphasis.

Would you tell me a little bit about that?

Now, I think I feel really confident of what Gail and I have--what we are both working with, and what we both want--and I have had two previous relationships. The first one was 13 or 14 years ago now, and Lesbianism never shocked me, as such. The woman I was first with told me how she felt about me. I was surprised, at first, and then it seemed natural. Many of my friends have gone through real trials with the initial knowledge, and I didn't have any kind of that experience. We had been together--we worked at the same office together, and that's how we met. And we spent a lot of time together, mostly together over a period of 6 months before it even occurred to me. And it didn't occur to me--she had to tell me how she felt. But even before that time--before she told me how she felt--I had realized that I loved this woman. I had no intentions of expressing it. In fact, I thought she'd be

shocked if I told her--much less having any intentions of expressing it to her physically!

I felt that, emotionally, I was really drawn to her. I realized that as we saw more and more of each other and as our relationship lengthened, I realized that I was putting aside other social life on the eventuality she might call and we could do something together--turning down dates with men. Ending a relationship just before I met her, which I knew I didn't want to get into . . . It was with a man I had been going with for some 6 months, and he had talked about marriage right away. I don't know what I thought at the beginning, except that it never sunk in that he might really mean that. He might really be serious about that situation. And then, when it finally dawned on me that he was serious, I knew that that was not what I wanted. I did not want to play the wife role. I didn't want to do that. And yet I am happy in the home. I am happy with what other people would tend to see as the traditional housewife roles. But I also know in the way it works now--I don't have to come home and cook a meal. It's not up to me to clean the house. I don't do the housewifely things. That is shared equally. And I also know that other things are shared equally, that would traditionally be the man's duties. We both have torn up kitchen floors, we both put down tiles, done painting, and torn appliances apart and tried to fix them. All these things are traditionally men's work--we both do these, as well.

So you're not tied to one role.

No, which is good with me. I like that. Anyway, in the first relationship neither one of us were very aware--in tune with ourselves, and the initial excitement of what I felt--the pleasure I felt--disappeared after about the first 6 months, although at that time, I felt committed. I felt like this is essentially my marriage and it will have to work--you don't just back out because it isn't wonderful.

We lived together. We lived together for 5 years. I met another woman, and it was the first time someone had ever seemed interested in me. And I was overwhelmed with that. It was nice to be told by the person that she loved me. But that didn't hold up after 6 months. That

didn't seem to be the case. There was never much evidence of that. We gave the appropriate gifts at the appropriate times--Christmas and birthdays--and we lived together, and our social life was together, but there was nothing going between us--personal, private, necessary, sustaining--there was no--it was just empty. And it took someone else, tuning in to ME, and really interested in me before I realized that, "That's it! That's what I want!" So the first relationship broke up amazingly quickly. I was 28 when I met Susan, and I was 33 when it broke up. Then I met this other woman, Jenny.

I was so overwhelmed with Jenny's attention and her caring--she is a very warm person. And it was food to the starving, basically, so we made an agreement that I would live with her for 90 days. And at the end of 90 days, we would assess our situation. Jenny had never had a lesbian relationship before, and I wasn't sure at that point that was the direction I wanted to go either, for the rest of my life. I thought, "Ive got to redefine my feelings about other people--men included," and at that time I wasn't really ready to say, "I am a lesbian, through and through, and I will remain such the rest of my life."

What thoughts did you have during that time?

I don't know. At that time I hadn't thought it out carefully. Jenny opened up to me what was possible for me to have. She was not sure that she was ready to commit herself to that kind of relationship, although she had been totally heterosexual before. She had met a close friend of mine at an encounter group. That's how we became friends. So I don't know that I thought it through clearly, except that I didn't have currently what I wanted and Jenny seemed to hold something I did want.

When I left, there didn't seem to be a lot of trauma attached. I know now, in looking back, I wasn't knowledgeable then--I know now--that Susan held it all back. She is that kind of person. She is a very tense, repressed type of individual. And in light of subsequent events, where she has moved out of California and denied her lesbianism, she literally cut off all friends that she had known for many, many years. She refuses to have anything to do with any of us. And seemingly she has made no new contacts. I see now that she wasn't ready. She was isolated, very

isolated!

And I am sorry, because she's--was a lovely woman--she still is, if she ever let it out. So I lived with Jenny, as it turned out, for 5 years. She had a home in Concord and I moved. I tried to change myself totally during that 5 years, and rather than seeking myself and finding out what I was like, and what it was I wanted, and how I wanted to live my life, I turned around and adopted Jenny's style of living--who is on the Bohemian side, given to--I don't say Hippie, because that denotes to me a kind of recklessness, irresponsibility--and she's not that way at all. She quit her job--she was a laboratory assistant--shortly after I moved in and became what was called a bio-energetics therapist. Are you familiar with that?

She went through the training and became a therapist, which gave her a very kind of free style as far as how she worked, and when she didn't work. I went from full time to part time, to accommodate to her hours. I only worked 2-1/2 days a week and we got 4 days off together. And as it turned out, we lived a very kind of exclusive existence--because she worked at home, and I stayed at home, and we made little or no contacts outside. Part of it was because Jenny was not a very social person in some respects--any social contacts at all I had to initiate, and I am not exactly aggressive in that department either. So we kind of isolated ourselves in that little house. Of course, no relationship like that lasts very long. It begins to feed on itself, and no two people can be everything to each other. It very quickly drained us. At least this time, and I think this is a positive--at least this time there was arguing back and forth--something I had never done. We argued back and forth and we fought--not a lot--but enough to make me realize that I had these feelings and they should be expressed. Nobody is going to know what I want unless I tell them. And if I wait so long, until it becomes an angry outburst before they can know what I want, something's got to be done.

As I say, Jenny, I don't think, was ready at that time, to commit herself to a lesbian relationship.

And you said you were not sure either.

I tried it out--I made a lot of talk about getting--trying out the heterosexual life style again.

What was that about?

Perhaps I felt that I had been snowed by the first relationship in the beginning and I never really seriously considered that this is what I feel--this is what I want. I think in some respects, I am a very easy-going person. I kind of flow along very easily with what is happening. I am very susceptible, I think, to suggestions, especially when it comes from people I tend to like or love, and trust their judgment. I never bothered to consider, "That's fine, it works for her, but it may not necessarily work for me." So I kind of adopted Jenny's life style and as I look back now, there was a lot of negative things there. Jenny is a tall woman. She's a big one. This is my theory--it may not be true at all, but this is how I felt. She is a big woman--5 feet 11 inches--and has a stocky build and was never really sure of her own femininity. So when I first met her, I was wearing eyelashes and nail polish, and going to the hairdresser's once a week and doing all the things women are supposed to be doing. And that appalled her. I thought maybe she was right, so I quit all that. And I turned around and started dressing in Levis and sweat shirts. Well, that's not me either. Occasionally that's me, but not all the time. I enjoy makeup; I enjoy nailpolish, and I enjoy high heels occasionally--and dresses. But, anyway, I tried to live like that for 5 years. And, of course, that didn't work out too well either. Neither one of us was willing to commit ourselves specifically to the relationship or to a life style at all. And I don't believe, without some sort of commitment at some point, that anything can work out.

The relationship died. I met Gail through Jenny's cousin. Jenny has a cousin in Nevada and I met Gail one year when Jenny and I had gone up on a vacation. So while we were there, Gail happened by--that was about a year-and-a-half before Jenny and I broke up. And Gail was moving to California, so when she found out we lived in California, she asked if she could see us. We said, "Certainly, if you're ever in the area, give us a call for dinner." And she did on a number of occasions;

and that's how we became acquainted. And there was no immediate attraction the first few times I'd seen her. I had a hard time remembering her name. In fact, the first time I met her, I didn't remember her at all. I just remembered her friend that was with her. I didn't care for her.

SUBJECT #37: 34-YEAR-OLD HETEROSEXUAL

My mom was up here for almost a week, and she was driving me crazy, after a while, because it seems to me like my life style has changed a lot, and it's--my mom seems to me to be really materialistic, which is funny to say because, in a way, I am around more money now than I've ever been in my whole life. But--you know--like every morning, 45 minutes getting makeup on, and she will not leave the house unless everything looks just perfect. Her fussing around with her clothes and other things were just starting to drive me crazy. She started getting on me about--you know--about why don't I --"You look like a kid. Your hair looks like--" uh--you know--everything--etc.--which also bothered me. So, in that way, my life style has really changed. I think probably the thing that's most important to me right now is my relationship with Ken, my husband, and my starting school and looking forward to starting a career, which has been something I haven't had.

What have you been doing?

I started out doing secretarial work for about 5 or 6 years, and I didn't like it, and I just spent another 5 years or so kind of struggling around figuring out what I'm going to do--and being in a lot of therapy for myself, finally realizing that I believed in that, and maybe I'd want to do it. And, working on a hot line for 5 years, too, to get some experience to see if I could really hack it. Then I decided to really do it . . .

With my mom, what I kept wanting to say to her--and never quite could --because I didn't know how to put it in words I felt she could understand --was something like "I hope you can find more direction for your life--some more purpose." It seems like her purpose right now is what kind of car she is going to buy, redecorating her house. My dad is dead. She's a widow.

How long since he died?

A couple of years. I find that, to me, it would be really boring not to have anything to look forward to; and I don't see her doing that, and it bothers me a great deal. But that's herself. She seems to do OK. But I used to be very much like that too, I think. I just changed my ideas about what's important. I used to be very clothes-conscious. As a matter of fact, at one point in my life, I wanted to be a fashion designer and work in a store and stuff, and I just changed.

Could you elaborate a little on how you were then and how you are now?

You mean how did I change? I guess what happened is when I started into my early 20's, I started to realize that a lot of things that I had believed in, I was finding not to be true; for example, the biggest one was that if you just go to school and get a college degree--you know--you don't have to really worry about anything. You know--when you get out of school--you know--because it's been 12 years since I graduated from college, the first time. And, if you get out, it almost doesn't matter, as long as you have your B.A., you're gonna make it. Well, I really found that to be untrue. Then, there were a lot of other things that just seemed like--they were things that my parents always told me --like, if you're always good, you'll get what you want. You know, a lot of stuff just wasn't working out. And I started to change my mind about a lot of things. And then, when I was in college, also, I started becoming a lot more political, and my politics were changing and they were becoming more radical, and when I moved up here, I got involved in women's groups and got involved in stuff that was going on in Berkeley with the Vietnam war. I had a roommate who was really active in that.

I was working at Berkeley at that time, in the Biology Department which turned out to be where I met Ken. And a lot of things just turned around for me. Like the use of makeup, which I used to think was so extremely important, became really phony. Actually, at this point in my life I'm going back to it a little more than I ever used to. Every once in a while, it's like playing "grownup"--to get dressed up and go out to

dinner, but not on an everyday basis, which I used to do. I can't see it. I think it's stupid. I guess it just seems like there were a lot of things I did automatically, because I was raised that way. I was raised really strictly. My parents were very conservative--in their life style and in their politics.

My dad I would consider to be almost a John Bircher. He used to tell me about Communists all the time, which is another thing. I took a philosophy course, and my dad's ideas about Communism weren't necessarily true. Conservative in that I was raised--my parents were real strict when I was raised. It always seemed that I had to be home earlier than anybody else. I had more restrictions than anyone, and that kind of thing when I was raised, which really griped me. My curfews were earlier than anyone else's. I was only allowed to go out one night of the week. I had to choose which night. I wasn't allowed to date until I was a certain age. I wasn't allowed to drive until I was a certain age, which was 2 years beyond legality. I wasn't allowed to drink at home at all. I wasn't allowed to smoke at home at all--just very strict! My boyfriends had to be approved of by both of my parents, and I pretty much went along with all of it, although I didn't like it. I didn't ever really rebel.

Their expectations were for you to go to college, too?

Oh, yes! Very definitely! --to get good grades, stay out of trouble, and stuff like that. But I guess what happened is when I got out on my own, I found out all these virtuous things that I was doing I thought were going to pay off and I started to discover that a lot of people who weren't so virtuous seemed to be having a good time and getting along just as well--probably even better than I was. I was so shy in my teens and 20's. Everybody else seemed to have so much more self-confidence than I did, and--I don't know--I just thought--I started thinking for myself. The thing that bothers me about my mom is I still see her thinking the same way as she did 10 or 20 years ago, because I'm sure I'll think different about things in 10 years than I do now. That just kind of bothers me and makes me sad for her--that she doesn't seem to change very much. You know--she is still very conservative. We went shopping

yesterday, and I wanted to wear my jeans, and she wanted me to get into a dress, and we went through this whole rigamarole, and I finally got into a dress pretty much to please her.

What I find most good about in my life right now is my school, and because it seems like it's been a long struggle from having gone to college, not really knowing what I wanted to do, and then getting out of college and finding I really couldn't get a job--except typing and secretarial, which I had done during the summers in order to make money to go to school.

What did you get a degree in?

I got a degree in Home Economics, and my idea was to be a buyer in a store, and I had two close friends who were in the same position as me, and got into it. They graduated a year before me. They got into it and hated it, and so in my senior year I realized that what I wanted to do just wasn't going to work for me either. When I found out just how long it really takes to get anywhere . . . that is, I was about as unsuited as they come, and there was a need to be cut-throat in order to survive. And, the kind of women that were involved in it--being a little more petty--that was at least the picture I had been given by my friend, and I just thought: "Oh, gosh, I can't do that!" But I wanted to get out of school, by that point, so I just went ahead and graduated.

So you had some aspirations to be in a career, but a feminine career. Was your mom a career woman?

No, although she <u>was</u> in a sense that as soon as we got big enough and old enough, she wanted to get out into the working world. She couldn't stand to be just around the house. But she's never gone into a specific career that she's built throughout her life. She's done a variety of jobs. They've always been kind of unusual. She was a real estate agent for a while. She worked in a newspaper for a while--did some writing for a while, so--you know--just different things; so now she's going through the process--she's tired of real estate (doesn't like it anymore), doesn't want to go back to the newspapers because they don't pay enough

money, and is trying to figure out what to do. She barely graduated from high school. She could tell you some good stuff. Yes, her life has been real interesting. So after I did secretarial work for a while, then I met Ken and we were going to get married.

How old were you?

Twenty-eight, by that time.

Did you have pressure on you to get married earlier, in college?

When I got my B.A. and when I was in my junior and senior years, I was getting really panicked about getting married. Really panicked! I was in a sorority and I wanted so much to be pinned and that whole thing that goes along with that, and have everybody sing and feel real neat and--you know--really have something to look forward to when I got out, because I was already getting disillusioned about my career. At that point of my life, I think if that had happened, I probably would have had children also. At that time of my life, I really wanted to get married and have kids. The hell with working!

I'm wondering what the object of having a B.A. and having a career was.

That was sort of something that you do to fall back on if you want to go to work after you have your kids. It was something that women fall back on. If something happens to your husband, or whatever, you know. Well, anyway, that didn't come to be--that I got married.

Did you date?

Oh, yes. Oh, yes. I got asked a couple of times. It was never someone I wanted to marry. I wasn't desperate enough to marry--or I would have married anybody. But I was sort of hoping that Mr. Wonderful would come along, and he wasn't coming along. Somebody who would take care of me--provide me with lots of money, would be fun, and-- Gosh,

I think that's about as far as I'd go. He had to be handsome; he had to be intelligent, well-educated; he had to be going places in his career; and it seemed that people I would always meet would be combinations of them--had to be a lot of fun. Like, I would meet somebody who was really fun, but he was working in a grocery store as a clerk, or something, and he was out of the running. Or I would meet somebody who was going to be a lawyer, or something, and not be much fun. I remember thinking, if I could take all the guys I know and take little bits and pieces and put them into a puzzle and make them into the kind of person I wanted, then I'd be fine. I was starting to think, "Oh, this just isn't going to work!"

What were you going to be? In relation to this Mr. Wonderful--what was your part?

Wife and mother. Perfect wife and mother--which is all the further my thinking went. It was like at that time in my life my thinking went to: to get through high school with good grades; you go to college and get good grades--which I didn't do--but that's what you're supposed to do. And then you get married. I never thought any further beyond that. I didn't know what happened after that. I really didn't. No, you go to college so you can talk to your intelligent husband, so that if anything happens, you can fall back on it--whatever your career is. And then you get married and have kids, and then I guess that's it. Then your life is over. I never really thought about being beyond 20 or 23 or 24 years of age up until that time, and that's when everything started going weird, you know. That's when everything started kinda falling apart. Well, I didn't get married; I didn't end up with a career that I wanted. When I got out of school and moved up here, I remember in my senior year making out budgets for myself at $1,000 a month, which I felt is what I was going to make. You know, that was in '67. I was going to make a thousand dollars a month and I used to think, "How much am I going to spend for clothes?" and we were going to live in Sausalito and my girl friend and I came traipsing up to Sausalito looking at apartments, which at that time were running at $300 a month, and then we went out to look for jobs. And it just--like I couldn't believe it! I couldn't even make $500! My first job was at $500 a month!

SUBJECT #39: 47-YEAR-OLD LESBIAN

Well, my first engagement was to a guy who was gay, and at that time I just knew what I had learned in text books about homosexuals. He told me he was, but he wanted to get married and wanted to have a home life. He came from a very bad background. His father was an alcoholic, and his mother was a hypochondriac. So he had never had a real home life. That was something he wanted--a home life. And he did achieve that--he did get married to someone and have children. He says he is bisexual, and I know that sexually he IS bisexual, but I think emotionally he is more gay than he is non-gay. And he did really want his family--not only because he wanted to hide, but he wanted the family. But after I got engaged to him, I realized that I really couldn't go that route--that I did not want to get married and have babies.

Sudden realization?

Not a sudden realization, but just an awareness that it took getting engaged and setting the date and getting close to that time--for me to clarify my thinking. As long as it was out there in the future, it was wonderful. It was pretty nice, and I thought yes, that's what I wanted to do. But then we broke up and continued to be friends--but nevertheless we broke up. At any rate, then I got engaged the second time to a man who was much more sophisticated, better educated, older.

Were you still living at home?

No, I had my own apartment, and I was working--on my own. And then I was engaged for the second time. Here, again, I realized that wasn't my thing, so we broke up; and then I discovered to my amazement that one of the reasons I never was in love with a man was because I was a homosexual--that I was a gay lady.

How does one discover that?

It's just something that I haven't heard many people say that they came out in this way--I had two gay boyfriends that I was very, very close to. And I knew all about their life styles and really enjoyed being with them and just learned a lot from them. I'd had crushes on women that I didn't outgrow. You know--it's normal to have when you are very small--I just didn't outgrow those. But somehow I never did anything about them. Until I was 28 years old I never had an affair with a woman. After being friends with these guys, I felt that next time I find a woman that I'm attracted to, I'm going to do more than just sit on my feet, so I did.

How was that--going through that--at that time?

At that time it was not at all traumatic and I think it was really because of those guys. They laughed at me and said that I came out because I wanted to be fashionable like they were. But I often wonder what would happen right now--but at that time had it not been for those two guys, I would not have come out.

It was the best thing that ever happened to me. It was like I imagine it would be for people who don't see well when they get a pair of glasses. Maybe all their life they've never known how little they could see, and then all of a sudden they got the kind of glasses that they could see with. That's exactly the way I felt. When I made up my mind that--you know--I haven't been in love with these guys. I liked them and I knew that there was something missing, but I didn't know what it was. I still felt that some day I would meet THE man that I would feel THAT way about, and would get married.

It was so clear to me. My life made so much sense to me. From that day on, my life fell together. And I knew why I couldn't concentrate on anything. I knew why my humor was so barbed. I really wasn't in tune with myself. And prior to my relationship with these two guys--these gay guys--probably if anyone had told me that I was a lesbian, I would have been insulted. It would have been something ugly, because this was like 1958. This, and coming from the kind of background I came from

in a small town in the South, it would have been nasty.

Unfortunately, I had built a house right next to my sister, because it looked like maybe I wasn't going to get married, and maybe I would end up being an old maid. So I wanted to live near my sister and her husband. And until I came out, it was really nice to have them right next door. Then it was kind of inconvenient, to say the least. My brother-in-law is very "redneck" --you know--"Kill the queer type." He would have made a nice policeman--like Dan White. Even though I knew that I really--what I wanted out of life--or that was who I was, there still was this thought that I might want to get married. I felt no guilt about being gay, but I thought after my relationship with this first woman I liked--2 years . . . and then after that I had several women that I enjoyed, just briefly. It occurred to me that probably I wasn't going to find a woman to live with--that that would be my life style. So maybe I would get engaged to a man and maybe I would get married--to this one particular man I know who was also gay.

Before I became gay, but when I was running around with these two guys, one of them brought over a fellow that I really was terribly attracted to. He wasn't gay at that time--or wasn't doing anything about it. And he was sitting on it too. Because many years later, we are now very good friends, it turned out that he was going through a lot of stuff, and so we got engaged. As a matter of fact, I was very attracted to him, but I didn't think he was interested in me. He was nice to me, but he didn't show any interest otherwise. He moved to San Diego and I was still living in Florida, so I came out to see him. I was on a long extended vacation . . .and so I told him that I was lesbian. Shortly after that, he asked me to marry him, which was very significant. And I learned years later that he went into therapy to see what to do "now that I'm going to get married." Ha, ha! He was scared too!

So at the same time, immediately after I returned from my vacation in San Diego with him, I met the woman I live with now. And she had been married for 10 years and never had a gay experience, but I was terribly attracted to her, and I just came out and said I was gay and was interested in her. So, she really is a remarkable woman. Whatever she wants to do, she does it--she had never been gay before, but she liked me, so why not?

At any rate, I laugh when I say I got engaged to this guy in California when I was married to this woman, because she moved in with me and we set up our relationship. But I still thought--

She was still in her marriage?

No, she was separated--she wasn't divorced. It was all over, but for economic reasons she didn't want to get a divorce.

Did she have any children?

No, she didn't have any children. She had had one miscarriage--it was not one that she wanted. And then she and her husband separated. She decided she wanted to go back to school, so she had come to State University to get her Master's. In her own mind, her marriage was over, but she didn't have the money to pay for the divorce and she thought if he wanted one, he could get it. She was married for several years, and after that, when she got the money, she decided, why not? He is German and moved back to Germany.

But at any rate, I guess, in my own head I thought I wouldn't be able to sustain a relationship with a woman, so I was going to go ahead and get married to Eric. That was my track record. I hadn't been interested in one for a long period of time. I just thought, well, I'm not going to be here, so I might as well--somehow marriage still--by the time I--you know--I liked this Eric so much and I told him I was gay, and he asked me to marry him--that I was going to marry him. At the same time my friend and I were living together. So I got this pretty little watch from Eric and a nice letter. At the same time, Diane and I were living together and she had just come to Florida State. So I don't know what I was thinking about the future. I really wasn't thinking, I guess. I was just enjoying it. And it was very pleasant. I was still working in the bank. Well, I think I had left the bank and I had gone to work for an insurance company. So I was still working in my home town.

Somehow it occurred to me that I really was not going to marry Eric. I was going to live with Diane.

What did she have to say about this whole thing?

Well, this was devastating for her that I would get engaged. She had come out, and she was enjoying it. And she was really catching on to the life style being so much better than she'd ever lived.

What was the life style?

Well, we didn't have a lot of friends, because this was my home town and we had these two fellows, and they knew some other fellows. So it was an uncomfortable thing because I had all these friends I had accumulated over a life time--and all of a sudden, I am not one OF them. And I really didn't want to do all the things I'd been doing. It was very awkward. You don't just drop your friends 'cause you find that out, so--

I'm curious about that--not being one of them, and you didn't want to do the same things--in terms of dating?

Yeah, dating, and I really wanted to be with my gay boyfriends and did things with them, mostly. I liked the freedom. It was like being with someone who understood you--camaraderie--really a mutual interest--not based just on the fact we were all gay. We're still friends to this day, and that's been a long time ago.

SUBJECT #41: 31-YEAR-OLD HETEROSEXUAL

Well, I want to be doing something I'm proud of--something I feel helps people. I am having trouble trying to find the right word to use. But it's--I guess "proud of" is the biggest one. I wouldn't want to do anything that I would be embarrassed about. I mean a person can be embarrassed in a sense that--that I want to be doing something that feels good--the idea of helping people. The idea of little guy against big guy. My work is helping the individual person against the big corporation. In the area of civil rights that means that people who were denied things that they shouldn't have been denied--then get access to. I feel that I've had a part in that. I think it's a little egotistical sometimes. The reason I do is because it really is the David and Goliath idea. Me and my big fight against the insurance companies, me and my big fight against whoever the employer is. You feel like you're taking on . . .

But you fight side by side and it's real important which side you're fighting on--which is--is real different from the way a lot of lawyers feel. And probably most of the lawyers in the office have this sort of idea that it's the hired gun philosophy--you do a good job technically for whoever it is you're representing. I could never do that. I would always have to care about what it is I'm working on, or I just wouldn't be able to do it. I mean,I suppose, technically, I could do the nuts and bolts of what has to be done, but I wouldn't care about it; I wouldn't want to spend all the extra time and effort that I put into my work now.

So work is a pretty central focus.

Oh, yeah.

Has it always been that way? or how'd you get here? I mean when

you were a little kid, were people saying you should be a lawyer? Was that something--?

Well, my parents always pushed education a lot. They always expected that you'd at least go through college--always made us do our studies, homework, and all that. No, I don't think I worked that hard before. I was always very busy, but it wasn't work in a sense that of work--like even during Radcliffe I worked on a lot of activities, and that was very hard. Like I worked on the newspaper until midnight at night and was involved in various political things. But I didn't put that much into course work until I went to Law School. And now it's sort of focused on that, so that now there are very few outside activities that I'm involved in. I'm involved a little bit with State Bar activities, but really no other political activity. I'm not involved in any political clubs or work for any candidates. Not for a long time.

So you were fairly career-oriented from the beginning?

Well, except I didn't know what the career was. I was fairly motivated from the beginning with various things. In other words, I was working. But I really didn't get career--I didn't know I wanted to go to Law School during VISTA. I didn't know that when I left Radcliffe.

And what did you do in VISTA?

Worked on a newspaper -- sort of bringing it all back home philosophy where you talk about what's happening to your neighbors and your landlord and welfare department and all that. And sort of try to help people get ideas of what they can do. . . . Very community-oriented there. The area I was living in was right around the university and that was one of the first times that anyone in the university took responsibility for the community. So that they didn't just put up a fantastic gym that was to be used for students. They put up a fantastic gym, but they made it open to the community. They had training for young kids and swimming and all kinds of stuff. But only under community pressure.

What was growing up like? You mentioned "we." I assume you have a brother or a sister.

Both. An older sister and a younger brother. My older sister is--we were always real competitive. So I would follow her through school. We went to the same schools through high school and all the teachers knew me--so it was like living up to what she was doing. Since then, we've sort of gone in different directions; and we've probably gotten to be better friends. But I don't see her very often now. She's teaching at Barnard now. She followed me--she went to Duke undergraduate and then after I'd been at Radcliffe for two years, she came to Radcliffe as a graduate student. And after I'd been at Barnard for two years, she came to Barnard to teach.

My brother is 6 years younger, and he's--he's had a hard life -- with two older sisters--one of them's a Ph.D., and one of them's a lawyer. He --basically, that was his way of competing was not to compete--was real smart, but he barely finished high school--never went to college. He's --well--he just moved out of home. He'd been living at home until he was 23--a big mistake. He finally moved out and got his own apartment, but he's still working for my father's company. So there's a lot of friction there between him and my parents, because they expected so much more of him.

They expected more of him as a man?

Oh, yeah. And they feel much more let down about him than they would have if either of us--my sister or I--had done what he's done. It's probably fairly standard for that age.

What are your parents like?

Oh, they grew up during the depression. To them, the worst thing is to not have a job. When I quit my job without having another job, they were scared to death that I wouldn't be able to find one. Very security-conscious about not owing money and being able to take care of yourself and not having to depend on anyone. Very traditional in the sense that when my sister and brother-in-law got

married, my sister had a job and my brother-in-law didn't, and they couldn't understnad how they could possibly get married when he couldn't support her--almost to the point of not wanting to come to the wedding. But they finally did come to the wedding. My mother hasn't worked--ever. My father always has. Well, immediately after they got married--it was during the war--so she worked then. But after my father came home from the war she hasn't worked outside the home. Just all volunteer.

So your mother was pretty involved when you were growing up.

Yeah. Much more than my father, because he traveled a lot. Well, my family moved a lot. He's a civil engineer--they build tunnels and subways and stuff like that, so--well--it was mostly always around New York. That was his headquarters. We owned the same house for 25 years but we would move for a couple of years and then move back there. And sometimes he would just go and come back, when it wasn't possible for the family to go. So she was around the most when we were growing up.

I shouldn't give the wrong impression that they were traditional because they always encouraged my sister and me and would do anything they could to help us succeed and financed our education and made sure we were set up all right and all that. But they still think it would be more important for my brother to do that and feel more let down because he didn't . . .I think they're very proud of us. They'd probably like me to be married. They'd probably like my sister to have children. Aside from that--

Where do you stand in regard to that?

Well, I'd probably like that too. But my expectations are getting less and less because I'm 31, and I haven't met anybody yet; and I'm meeting fewer and fewer available men.

So has that been a priority in your life at all, or has your focus been on your work?

It is not a priority in the sense that I would do anything different --but I think I miss it. I don't know what I could change to make it any different--it's sort of like I always thought it would be a part (and I guess maybe at the magic age of 30 you begin to realize that it may not be a part) of your life. So it's --yeah, it's a little depressing at times. But I really don't think I would have done anything different or could have done anything different.

I'm wondering how you imagined it would be?

Oh, just the expectation when you're growing up you always assume that you would be married and have children, and that would be an experience you'd go through. That would be a natural.

Would it fit in with a sort of career-orientation for you?

I don't think I'd give up my career for it. I think that if it were a choice of one or the other, I think I'd try to make it work out so that it didn't have to be an "either/or" choice. My sister seems to have been pretty successful, at that, although I think they're probably not going to have children; but they've certainly managed to both have careers. People do it. More and more people our age--

You end up compromising some.

Maybe you have to for a few years, at least if there are kids and you're really in love, but hopefully, that would be something temporary. I'm 31, and feeling old.

Feeling old?

Feeling like my life is pretty much set--at least as far as the major decisions go. There's really nothing all that major going to happen anymore.

I'm curious what that means.

Well, I think I'm real happy with the type of work I'm doing, so I'm not going to change that. I'm happy with where I'm living, maybe not the particular apartment, but at least in the area of the world. I don't think I am going to get married--or at least I'm not expecting to. I probably hold the romantic idea that it would be real nice if it happened, but I don't think it will.

Do you have any more concrete notions of what being married would be? Or how it would change your life?

I'd probably eat better. I'd--well--I have a sense that life would be easier--I wouldn't always--I have this compulsion to be doing things--like--because I don't want to sit at home. So I try and figure out what I'm going to be doing for tomorrow if it's a holiday, or what I'm going to be doing Saturday night, or like always having to make plans; whereas, I have an idea that if there were someone that I could count on, then you wouldn't have to make plans; there would just be someone to be there and you could do something--or at least have someone there. And it does get lonely if you just sit and don't do anything. And it really makes me depressed, but there are enough people who you can do things with. It just takes the effort to do it.

It's OK as long as you keep busy. You don't let yourself think--I mean, it's not--I don't mean to say that that is depressing, because when I'm busy I'm having a good time with people. Like Donna's coming Friday night, and that's going to be fun--and I'll really enjoy it. But if I were sitting home on Friday night by myself, I'm sure I'd be depressed. So it's my choice to go out with people, and when I'm doing that, it's not like it's a substitute. I don't want to feel like that's my second choice, because I really have a good time when I'm doing it--but I don't really have the option of sitting home like I think I would if there was someone to sit at home with.

I have close friends, but sometimes I feel like I can't put that much--you can't have that much expectation, as you could someone who was

family. That you don't want to burden your friends with things like--that might turn them off; that might be too much of a pressure on them--and I probably do that to the point of ridiculousness. I don't ask for things that you can reasonably ask for--that are really--I hesitate to ask friends for things that I would ask my family for. I do--there's probably five people that I spend ninety percent of my social life with--a fairly limited group of people that--most of whom--I've known for 5 or 6 years--a fairly long period of time. There's some things I just wouldn't ask them for--you can't burden them with . . .

SUBJECT #42: 22-YEAR-OLD HETEROSEXUAL

I am only there because of the money. The money I make is $6.21 an hour. I didn't go to college, so I just went to work because that's as good a paying job as a woman can get. So, I just want to save money, because I don't want to have to work for the rest of my life. It is just too hard! But I used to work in an office, and I just can't sit still. I am too hyper. So what I do now--I work at a warehouse and it is all walking. You fill orders, and so you are constantly moving. I fill catalog orders that go out to different stores throughout the country. I fill the catalog orders and they go to their office--you know --they go by truck. It is a fast 8 hours, so it's not bad, and I like it! I am in charge of the whole floor. There is about 21 people on the floor, so I get a lot of responsibility at times. So it's not bad. However, it is located in a bad district and too many people are ripping off things.

Is that a problem for you getting to work in that district at all?

Well, it is just 5 minutes--near Oakland. Oakland is a bad district. It is just 5 minutes right over the bridge, and I am safe on this side. But--I don't know--it's not bad. But--you know--I don't want to work there the rest of my life; I just don't want to . . . I would like to be married and then start my family before I am 30. Then I don't want to work when I have my kids. I want to be there to enjoy their first steps. I don't want them to be at a baby sitter's. Then they call me and say "Wow! Your kid's walking!"--you know--I don't want that. So I wouldn't mind taking a part-time job, but you know it's hard. I don't want to work on weekends. So you know it would be kind of hard to find a part-time job like that.

You work pretty much for money.

Yeah, like this bedroom set I just bought--I just bought this.

So that's like part of your trousseau for getting married or something?

Well, no. Underneath the bed, I have dishes stored away. I have all my stuff for my kitchen so that when I do move out, all I have to buy is a living room set. That way I won't be in debt--and I don't want to be in debt! So--you know--you need all kinds of stuff, dishes and everything.

Have you ever moved out on your own?

No.

So you have been living at home.

Yeah, and my car will be all paid for. So I will be all set to go in a year. Except I did decide the other night when I was thinking about --well--to just move out and have an apartment, but--I don't know. I keep thinking about traveling, too. So--I don't know--I haven't decided. I'd like to take a cruise, but that costs like--what?--three thousand dollars now--and I don't have that much, so I have to save; and that would take quite a while before I move out. I have about two thousand dollars in the bank--for--you know--in case of emergencies; and then I wouldn't be in the hole. And in order to do that--if I did that--I wouldn't be able to travel! So--I don't know! . . . I would like to--I would'nt mind getting married within a year, but I--

So then you wouldn't move out on your own. You would move out--

Yeah. Well, see, what I do now is on the weekends; and one or two nights a week, I am over at my boyfriend's house if I am not at home. He has his own place. They converted the bottom of the house into an office and he stays there, and he has his own room and uses the stove, like the kitchen--like that. So it is like--his room is really big. It's about as big as this whole apartment, so I can stay over there in his room. It is a home away from home.

How does your mother deal with this?

She, ah, well--you see, Brian is my really serious boy friend. Usually, I never got serious or anything. I just always stayed, and I didn't like to get serious. He is my first one, and this is the first time because I would really like to marry him. So it's not like I am dating. I haven't been dating a whole bunch of guys. I mean my mother really can't say anything--you know. It's my life, you know. She's outruled. I do take things into consideration she says, anyway, but--I don't know. I mean, we're not that close, you know, talking-wise, and so I really don't know exactly what she does feel. We have gotten into quite a few arguments--you know--like . . . she has been married five times, and she just distrusts men.

So when Brian and I broke up--you know--she resented him and she was on my side, which she shouldn't have done because--you know--it is something between us two; and she shouldn't take sides. You know--she would say bad things and it just really blew me out in my mind. I just couldn't believe she would be saying things like that because--you know--I still loved him and she shouldn't say anything bad about it. She is all confused! She is doing it for my own good, because she didn't want me to get hurt again, but you know I am going to get hurt--you know it all the time.

Well, you have to look at it this way, too--you don't know. I think it is best to live with a person first. Because you don't know, and I mean you don't know how their habits are or--you know--if you know, that way if it doesn't work out, you don't go through a divorce. I mean, look at it this way--couples are more into divorce than they are into marriage now days. So, when I make a marriage, I want to make it only one marriage--that's it!--because I have seen her go through so many--I don't want that at all. I want just one marriage, and that's it! I am pretty much old fashioned that way.

SUBJECT #46: 24-YEAR-OLD LESBIAN

Would you tell me a little more about the loss of your mother?

It was pretty painful, although it was something that I expected. I knew it was coming, and I was home when she died. I made it a point to move home. I spent the last year of her life with her and that was really, really, really hard on me because I had to give up a lot to be there. But I felt that she gave up enough of her life for me that it was the least I could do, especially since other members of my family, I thought, weren't giving enough support; so I decided I wanted to be there. It was really hard! I still grieve and I still have a lot of sadness and I still really miss her. And I'm always cursing her for dying too soon, because there are always things--just stupid little things--that I didn't get.

I didn't break down or haven't really fallen to pieces and sometimes I think that I should have, because--I mean I loved my mother more than anyone in the world--and I probably spent more time with her and I know--she loved me the most. You're not supposed to do that, and so I know she really tried to clear some things with me too, and she was really worried about some things but there was so much going on with my brothers and sisters and everyone else--my mother's mother, her sisters--when she died, people were falling apart left and right and I was sort of the middle kid (and most like my mother) that held everything else together so that was my role. So there really wasn't time but then I made time--so I was able to release a lot--I went away--got a lot out of it, but it sure was hard.

It sounds like a very special friendship, as well.

Yeah, yeah, we did a lot together. We were pretty good buddies. We had a lot of fights, too. Sometimes I felt that she wasn't giving me enough space--she wanted me to hang onto her apron strings forever, but I'm really thankful for everything she taught me--the personal values--

just respecting people, being open minded. She was a real worker, and she took a lot of pride in her work. I don't have as much ambition, career-wise, as she did. But when I do a job I really invest myself in it. I've never been fired from a job, and I've always been asked to remain there when I want to quit and do something else. There will often be a raise or an advancement--anything to stay and it's always nice to hear that they like my work--a good thing to have. Her openness and accepting of people were really, really wonderful--because I grew up in such a middle-class neighborhood. School district and state and the whole environment was stifling -- like I never even saw a black person until I was 12, I bet . . . but my mother marched in the sixties in the civil rights marches when she had to go all the way to Boston to find some of the people who would march, because it was so nonexistent where we were, and so I really got a lot from her. Mostly just caring for people and giving people a chance and being optimistic.

You mention friends, and I'm wondering where Sandra fits in, and where a relationship fits in with you and your life.

Well, ideally, I'd like to share my life with--and have--a partner. I've never had a lover as long as Sandra and I have been lovers and it feels really nice to share so much with somebody to really be accepted and loved--and loving and accepting someone. I feel like I know her as well as I've known anyone and it's just more fun to go through life with somebody and always want them there and never be tired of them. There are friends I can always spend an hour with and then that's too much, and I have to get away from them--or a week--or I could see them every day at work, but I would never want them to come home or anything like that. Whereas, I can do just about anything with Sandra and we have enough interests that are different that we are both growing enough on our own so that we're not bored with each other -- growing separately, as well as together, and I guess we've got it made. And she's not allergic to my dog anymore.

That was standing in the way of your relationship?

Oh, definitely! She was having asthma attacks. I visited her on the way out here in November, and I stayed for a month and it was just beginning to get cold and the doors and windows were shut. It was so cold that you put plastic in the inside of your windows. So there was no movement of air--it was dead air, and my dog just made her go crazy. She was so full of antihistamines that her whole body chemistry was really wacked out! She was just a mess--if I had stayed another week, she would have had to have been hospitalized.

It's important to me to maintain this relationship and always work on it, but if it should go sour in any way or if it came to the point where we weren't both growing individually or that the relationship wasn't maintaining or growing, I'm sure we would both want to terminate it and I've really become attached to wanting her in my life, but at the same time I think I would have enough strength to end it and to make it OK on my own. My first commitment is to myself and my happiness. If I can't be happy with me, I can't make anyone else happy, so I have to do my best--and I think Sandra definitely is in my plans for now, and I don't plan forever. So, we'll see what the picture holds when it comes. . . . I think I'm basically a pretty monogamous person--I think that would be an ideal situation to maintain a relationship with one person.

VITA

Shelley M. Chavoor was born in Sacramento, California on October 8, 1950. She attended elementary schools in that city and graduated from Rio Americano High School in February 1968. The following September she entered the University of California at Davis, and in March 1970 transferred to Stanford University where she received a Bachelor of Arts degree in Sociology, awarded in June 1972.

Upon graduation, she joined Volunteers in Asia, a Stanford-based organization, and taught English to Chinese and Russian immigrants in Hong Kong during the summer of 1972. After returning from Asia, she worked for the Stanford Medical Center, Department of Psychiatry, as a research assistant from September 1972 until August 1973.

She entered the Graduate School of the University of Tennessee in September 1973 and received a Ph.D. in Psychology, with a clinical specialty in March 1981. Clinical internship was completed during the years September 1977 to August 1978 at the Veterans Administration Medical Center in Palo Alto, California. While on internship she received specialized training in family therapy. Dr. Chavoor is currently employed at the Palo Alto Veterans Administration Medical Center, Menlo Park Division, as a Research and Program Evaluation Consultant for Psychology Services.

She is married to John K. Hunter, a graduate student in Mathematics at Stanford University, who was originally from Farnham, England.