

INFORMATION TO USERS

This manuscript has been reproduced from the microfilm master. UMI films the text directly from the original or copy submitted. Thus, some thesis and dissertation copies are in typewriter face, while others may be from any type of computer printer.

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleedthrough, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send UMI a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

Oversize materials (e.g., maps, drawings, charts) are reproduced by sectioning the original, beginning at the upper left-hand corner and continuing from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps.

Photographs included in the original manuscript have been reproduced xerographically in this copy. Higher quality 6" x 9" black and white photographic prints are available for any photographs or illustrations appearing in this copy for an additional charge. Contact UMI directly to order.

Bell & Howell Information and Learning
300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346 USA
800-521-0600

UMI[®]

Courtship in the Personals: How Relationship Goals Affect
Signaling Patterns

Lucia Furtado

A Thesis

in

The Department

of

Sociology and Anthropology

Presented in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
for the Degree of Magisteriate in Arts at
Concordia University
Montreal, Quebec, Canada

September 2000

(c) Lucia Furtado, 2000



National Library
of Canada

Acquisitions and
Bibliographic Services

395 Wellington Street
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

Bibliothèque nationale
du Canada

Acquisitions et
services bibliographiques

395, rue Wellington
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

Your file *Votre référence*

Our file *Notre référence*

The author has granted a non-exclusive licence allowing the National Library of Canada to reproduce, loan, distribute or sell copies of this thesis in microform, paper or electronic formats.

The author retains ownership of the copyright in this thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's permission.

L'auteur a accordé une licence non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque nationale du Canada de reproduire, prêter, distribuer ou vendre des copies de cette thèse sous la forme de microfiche/film, de reproduction sur papier ou sur format électronique.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur qui protège cette thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

0-612-54285-8

Canada

ABSTRACT

Courtship in the Personals: How Relationship Goals Affect Signaling Patterns

Lucia Furtado

The following study utilized a content-analysis of 407 personal advertisements by gay men to distinguish between signals used in search of long term versus purely sexual relationships of gay men in the personals. The data were obtained from four randomly selected issues of the gay magazine *Unzipped*. A comparison was made to a study conducted 20 years ago by Laner and Kamel (1978). The results indicate that in 1998 gay men were more interested in a long term/intimate relationship as opposed to a purely sexual one. Whereas in 1978 the reverse was true, gay men were more interested in sexual relationships. I then examined the contemporary personals in more detail to determine whether relationship goals had an impact on the signaling patterns. In this study signaling patterns are reflected in the descriptive words used by the men placing the ads. Hypotheses one and two predicted that the goal for the relationship would not affect the mention of General Physical Traits and Appearance characteristics. Hypothesis one was not supported while hypothesis two was supported. Hypotheses three, five and six were supported but weakly.

Individuals desiring a Long Term relationship were more likely to cite Nonsexual Interests than those seeking a sexual relationship. Those men who wanted a sexual relationship were more likely to mention Sexual Interests and Sexual Physical Traits than those mentioning a Long Term relationship. Hypothesis four predicted that the relationship goal would be influenced by type of personality mentioned. Although the percentages were in the expected direction, this relationship was not significant. In spite of the fact that the relationships found to be significant were weak, they suggest that in comparison to 1978, contemporary gay men desire a long term versus a purely sexual relationship. In addition, the results of this study suggest to some extent that relationship goal influences signaling patterns.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The following thesis was not done alone. It was a team effort and I would like to thank everyone who has contributed so much. First, Dr. Frances Shaver, my supervisor, for her patience and dedication. Dr. William Reimer and Christine Forsythe, my committee members, for their encouragement and help at the various stages of the thesis writing. Special thanks goes out to Mr. Aureliano DeSoto who helped me with the definition of various terms in the ads that I was unfamiliar with. To my friends, family, and my beloved husband Pietro who supported me through out the whole process and lifted my spirits when times were tough. Lastly, I would like to thank my parents, Rosa and Altino Furtado, who loved, encouraged, and stood by me every step of the way. Without them none of this would be possible and so I dedicate this to them with all my love and appreciation.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES.....	vii
I. INTRODUCTION.....	1
II. THE RESEARCH PROBLEM.....	6
III. LITERATURE REVIEW	
i. The Gender Difference in Courtship Signaling.....	8
ii. Courtship in the Personals.....	22
IV. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK AND RESEARCH PROPOSITION.....	27
V. METHODOLOGY.....	37
VI. FINDINGS AND ANALYSIS.....	51
VII. CONCLUSIONS.....	65
VIII. BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	75
IX. APPENDICES.....	79
APPENDIX ONE: Appearance.....	79
APPENDIX TWO: Relationship Goal.....	81
APPENDIX THREE: Nonsexual Interests.....	90
APPENDIX FOUR: Personality.....	93
APPENDIX FIVE: Sexual Interests.....	96
APPENDIX SIX: Physical Indicators.....	99
APPENDIX SEVEN: Health.....	102
APPENDIX EIGHT: Undefined Terms.....	103

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE A - List Of Categories Utilized By Laner And Kamel (1978) And Lucia Furtado(1998).....	45
TABLE 1 - The Distribution Of Distinct Relationships Sought By Gay Men Who Advertise In The Personals By Year.....	54
TABLE 2 - General Physical Traits And Appearance By The Goal For The Relationship.....	56
TABLE 3 - Sexual Physical Traits By Goal For The Relationship.....	59
TABLE 4 - Personality Traits By The Goal For The Relationship.....	62
TABLE 5 - Nonsexual Interests And Sexual Interests By The Goal For The Relationship.....	64

I. INTRODUCTION

In all cultures, adult humans are constantly forming mateships. Daly and Wilson (1983) note that there is some form of marriage in every known society. Forming partnerships may be a common occurrence in adult human life, but the strategies men and women use to attract a mate are complex and vary by gender, relationship intent, and same-sex and cross-sex relationships.

Desmond Morris (1971) traced a twelve-stage sequence in the pattern of human courtship. According to Morris, in order to form mateships-or "pair-bonds"-each individual must perform certain acts and follow a sequential strategy in order to reach total intimacy with one another. Facial expressions and gestures function as attractants and help individuals determine whether or not they should proceed with formulating a relationship with a particular individual. During courtship, Morris argues, further signs and steps are utilized to establish an intimate relationship between two persons which may in time, evolve into long-lasting bonds including sexual commitments (Morris, 1971:18-22). Morris has outlined the process from initial contact all the way to sexual intimacy. He focuses mostly on the process rather than on the actual tactics used by each gender. In other words, he only discusses the sequence of events that occur in a developing relationship between

two heterosexual individuals in Western society. For example, he centers on how eye contact develops into actual conversation and then develops into touching, such as hand holding. He goes on through a number of stages until total intimacy is reached where the couple finally copulates. He does not discuss in depth the specific acts each person performs or which signals are used by each gender within each stage.

It seems that Morris, in his explanation of "pair-bond" formation, is focusing more on the development of sequences to forming a long-term relationship. According to Morris, the ultimate goal for the stages followed is for a tie to solidify between a man and a woman. This connection is very important because it ensures that the couple stay together even after the sexual drive has passed. In conjunction with this, Morris argues that if the bridge between the man and the woman has not formed with the progression of the stages, then the woman is liable to be abandoned by the man leaving her in a helpless situation alone and with child. Morris states that

each stage will have served to tighten the bond attachment a little more, but, in a biological sense, this final copulatory action is clearly related to a phase where the earlier intimacies will already have done their job of cementing the bond, so that the pair will want to stay together after the sex drive has been reduced by the consummation of orgasm. If this bonding has failed, the female is liable to find herself

pregnant in the absence of a stable family unit (Morris, 1971:22).

Morris is one of the few researchers who has studied human courtship patterns. Although research on human courtship signaling is limited, there is enough evidence to support the notion that humans convey sexual or romantic interest to one another through signs (Moore, 1985; Perper and Weis, 1987; Greer and Buss, 1994; DeWeerth and Kalma, 1995). Some of these signals may invite intimate contact and others may repel it. Furthermore, some may signal with the assumption that a long-term relationship will evolve, while others may come together for only a brief sexual encounter. Clearly, individuals come together for a variety of reasons but one thing is certain, every human body is constantly sending out signals to its social companions.

How do men and women signal sexual or romantic interest to another individual? One way this question has been answered is by observing the gestures or facial expressions used in the presence of the opposite gender (Moore, 1985). Others have tried to answer this question by asking individuals, through questionnaires, how they would act or what tactics they would use to indicate sexual or romantic interest to the other person (Perper and Weis, 1987; Greer and Buss, 1994; DeWeerth and Kalma, 1995). Yet another way to answer this question is by identifying the characteristics or traits individuals say are important to

them in a partner. Several researchers have done this (explore the distinct features individuals consider important) by analyzing personal advertisements and outlining what characteristics or traits are most often sought and offered by the advertisers (Cameron, Oskamp and Sparks, 1977; Laner and Kamel, 1978; Laner, 1978; Deaux and Hanna, 1984).

Most of the studies on courtship signaling focus on heterosexuals and the specific and different tactics they use. The gender difference with the use of these tactics has been a prominent issue in many of the courtship studies (Grammer, 1989; Greer and Buss, 1994; DeWeerth and Kalma, 1995) including those focusing on personal advertisements (Cameron, Oskamp and Sparks, 1977; Deaux and Hanna, 1984). In addition, within the work done on courtship signaling, several focus solely on heterosexual women and their ways of attracting a partner (Perper and Weis, 1987; Moore, 1985). Not nearly enough has been done with men. Likewise, sexual orientation is rarely acknowledged when discussing mate selection and courtship signaling patterns. With the growing recognition that diverse life styles and family types exist, the traditional focus on heterosexual courtship signaling patterns must expand to include more research on individuals of different sexual orientation if we are to

fully understand the complexity of human courtship behaviors.

Another crucial factor that must be considered when examining signaling patterns is the relationship goal. No study, to my knowledge, has explored the association between signaling patterns and relationship goals. Research to determine whether different signaling patterns produce different types of relationships will help us better understand the essence of close human relationships and provide us with an opportunity to assess our own relationship experience with other people around us.

The following thesis is an attempt to distinguish between signals used in search of long term versus purely sexual relationships of gay men in the personal ads. The decision to focus on gay men only was two fold. First, upon viewing the literature it was clear that gay men differ from all other groups when initiating sexual or romantic interests. Second, since I am not familiar with the gay community, the personal advertisements were instrumental because they provided an 'outsider' with the opportunity to study gay relationships. Lastly, studying gay men's personals serves two purposes. It allows for a controlled examination of signals used and relationship goals desired, and it increases the data on non-heterosexuals.

II. THE PROBLEM

One of the limitations of the literature on how gay men signal sexual or romantic interest is that the studies available are primarily based on data collected in the 1960s and 1970s. This body of literature has concentrated almost singularly on gay institutions, such as the gay bars, baths and other gay organizations (Hoffman, 1968; Fisher, 1972; Bell and Weinberg, 1987-89). Amidst the numerous gay institutions, unquestionably the gay bar has received the most attention (Achilles 1967; Hooker, 1967; Hoffman, 1968; Leznoff and Westley 1956; Weinberg 1970).

The problem with research which relies on data obtained from the bar environment or cruising spots is that these institutions tend to be completely focused on sexual activity (Hoffman, 1968). Considering that most of the information available on how gay men signal sexual or romantic interest has been based on these selected gay settings, it is no wonder that

one of the most predominant images of the homosexual man is that he is highly "promiscuous", unable to integrate his emotional and sexual needs, incapable of maintaining a long-standing sexual partnership, and doomed to an eternally hopeless quest for the ideal relationship (Bell and Weinberg, 1987-89:81).

If most of the individuals who go to these places are presumed to do so with the intention of picking up someone for a sexual liaison, clearly then, the tactics gay men

choose will signal to the other individual that he is seeking a sexual liaison and not a long-term relationship.

Studies focusing on gay men in other contexts may provide an opportunity to put some of these stereotypical images to rest. They would contribute not only to our knowledge about homosexuality but also to our general knowledge about close human relationships. Finally, they would allow for new theoretical explanations to be developed and explored in order to try and understand the courtship sequences of gay men.

The literature on personal advertisements has a problem similar to the gay literature cited above: most studies were conducted in the late 1970s and early 1980s. The results and conclusions of these earlier studies may not be relevant for the nineties. Factors such as the HIV/AIDS epidemic may have had an impact on what gay men seek and offer when advertising in the personals. I will be exploring how gay men signal in the late 1990s not only to update the literature, but to discover if AIDS has modified the proposed relationship goal such that gay men may be less inclined to seek purely sexual relationships in the late 1990s than they were in the late 1970s. In addition, I will analyse the extent to which relationship goals influence signaling patterns.

Although the main focus of this study is on gay men and advertisements, it is critical to depict, in advance, how individuals of different sexual orientation and gender signal sexual or romantic interest. It is necessary to do this for the purpose of illustrating the different patterns gay men have in relation to all other groups. Also, citing the tactics used in contexts other than the ads is important in order to determine if signals vary with environment changes.

III. LITERATURE REVIEW

i. THE GENDER DIFFERENCE IN COURTSHIP SIGNALING

As cited in DeWeerth and Kalma (1995), Triver's (1972) theory of Parental Investment suggests that

the sex [sic] that invests the most in reproduction (usually the female) will be more selective in choosing a mate, whereas the sex that invests the least is more likely to desert and to pursue additional mating opportunities. In many species, evolved psychological mechanisms are such that females wanted to be courted, thus requiring time and effort, that is investment from the male. This investment reduces the males' tendency to desert a female for additional mating opportunities (DeWeerth and Kalma, 1995:718).

According to this perspective, a man and woman's choice of tactics would be influenced in terms of differential parental investment. Parental investment is defined by

Campbell (1972) "as any investment by the parent in an individual offspring that increases the offspring's chance of surviving (and hence reproductive success) at the cost of the parent's ability to invest in other offspring" (Campbell, 1972:139). If courtship behavior is grounded in this model, then one would assume that the highly effective acts for heterosexual men to perform are those that indicate their willingness and ability to invest in women. Furthermore, because men want to have children, they should desire in mates those qualities that are linked with fertility, such a physical cues to youth and health. Likewise, they should have an aversion to investing in relationships with women who are sexually promiscuous and a preference for investing only in relationships where women are unlikely to seek out other partners.

Heterosexual women should, according to this perspective, adopt a strategy that imposes maximum choice, holding back until the best male is identified in terms of investment. Effective acts for heterosexual women to perform would be those that emphasize high reproductive value. Female reproductive value is determined frequently by characteristics of youth and health, and these are often well defined by physical appearance and attractiveness (Buss, 1987). Therefore, heterosexual women should be more

likely to enhance their physical appearance than men when trying to attract a member of the opposite sex.

Greer and Buss (1994) tried to verify these assumptions by examining what heterosexual men and women disclosed as the tactics most often used to promote sexual encounters and how efficient these tactics were thought to be. The authors conducted three empirical studies. In the first study Greer and Buss identified 122 acts and sorted them into homogenous clusters. In all, the 122 acts were sorted into 34 clear tactics. Tactics consisted of categories such as the following: Enhance physical attractiveness, Dress seductively, Get target drunk, Go to private or secluded area, Treat to a romantic dinner, or Utilize friendship network. In the second study the authors explored the perceived effectiveness of each tactic when used by a man and when used by a woman. Finally, in the third study, the authors examined the reported frequency with which men and women performed each tactic, as well as being the recipient of each tactic from the other sex (Greer and Buss, 1994:185).

They found that women acknowledge that the most effective acts for men to perform when reinforcing a sexual encounter are those that signal a willingness and an ability to invest time, energy, and material resources in them. For example, tactics most effective for men to use would be to

Imply commitment, Display strength and Give gifts (Greer and Buss, 1994:191). The most effective male acts convey to the woman that sex is not all that he desires from her but that he is willing to invest in her as well. Hence, it seems that women tend to link sexual relationships with the long term even when asked about "sexual only" relationships. Whereas men seemed to answer on a sexual basis only.

Greer and Buss found that men had a different story. According to them, the most effective female act for promoting sexual encounters was to ask a man to have sex with her and to use other acts that signal sexual accessibility. Example of tactics most effective for women to use were: Dress and act seductively, Drop sexual hints in conversation, Directly request sex and Enhance physical attractiveness (Greer and Buss, 1994:191). Therefore, men feel that the best way for a woman to foster a sexual encounter with them is to ask for sex directly. If this is how women should present themselves, that is, show they are sexually accessible, then it is not likely that women will be afforded the opportunity to assess the man's willingness to employ a long-term sexual strategy in which he invests in the relationship. Furthermore, men will be less likely to want to invest because they fear the woman is more likely to seek and copulate with another man.

Greer and Buss's findings seem to contradict what Triver's Parental Investment (1972) has suggested as the best tactics for men and women to value. One explanation for this contradiction may be grounded in the research design. Greer and Buss asked the respondents to rate what they believed to be the most effective tactics for the member of the opposite sex to use when desiring a sexual encounter. It is possible that the men and women in the sample were really reporting what they would like the other person to do if they were seeking a sexual encounter. For example, men really would like it if women would show them they were sexually accessible when they sought a sexual relationship, but this is not the preferred tactic if the woman sought a long term relationship. Therefore, because respondents were asked to indicate which acts would successfully promote a sexual encounter, respondents likely answered with that in mind. They were listing acts that would promote a sexual liaison between two people and not a long-lasting relationship.

Other research has shown that women use more subtle ways of letting a man know she is interested in him without asking for sex directly and showing sexual accessibility. Moore (1985) observed 200 adult white women, ages 18 to 35 in four different social contexts: "a single's bar, a University snack bar, a University library, and a University

Women's Center meetings" (Moore, 1985:243). Using participant observation, behaviors such as "a movement of a body part or parts or whole body" that ended with a man "approaching the subject, talking to her, leaning toward her or moving closer to her, asking the subject to dance, touching her, or kissing her" were coded (Moore, 1985:239). The results show that women seem to attract attention by displaying subtle, nonverbal solicitation such as eye contact, special postures and ways of walking, pouting, eyebrow flashing, primping, smiling, head tossing, neck presentation, nodding, hair flip, gaze fixation, room-encompassing glance, and lip licking.

Likewise, DeWeerth and Kalma (1995) used data gathered from 163 male and female Dutch Caucasian students who were asked to fill in a questionnaire. The subjects were told to imagine they were at a bar and had just noticed a girl or boy with whom they would like to get familiar. The respondents mentioned 84 different ways of letting a person of the other gender know that they were romantically interested in him or her. The results of their findings support the hypothesis that women, more than men, will report using more indirect, nonverbal behaviors such as eye contact together with other facial expressions when intending to initiate romantic contact.

In another study, Perper and Weis (1987) directed our attention to other ways in which women point out their sexual interest in a man. Rather than have their participants respond to a questionnaire, they asked them to write essays explaining how they would provoke a date "to have sex" (p.459) and then coded the themes. They discovered that some of the non-verbal strategies women commonly use are eye contact, touching, kissing or moving physically closer to their date (Perper and Weis, 1987:463). These measures are more direct and straight forward in comparison to the other signals used by women which involve nonverbal signs such as eye contact, hair flip, smiling, and other facial expressions. However, Perper and Weis asked their respondents to report on how they would convince a date "to have sex"; in the other studies respondents were asked to signal "romantic interest". Consequently, this suggests that different strategies were utilized when different relationship goals were wanted.

In sum, the above research findings show that heterosexual women are not passive in initiating a sexual encounter, even though, most of their strategies do involve subtle signals. It may seem that men are the ones constantly initiating an encounter, but if we examine most of women's subtle signals such as eye contact, smiling or hair flipping, these are in reality signs which signal to

the man that he is welcome to approach. Therefore, women do play a big part in initiating encounters since they are the ones who start the process so to speak. Heterosexual men on the other hand, use more direct tactics but in order for their tactics to be successful they must also convey to the women that sex is not all that they desire from her but that they are willing to invest in her as well. This holds true for men desiring a sexual encounter and those interested in a relationship. In Greer and Buss's (1994) study, men wanted women to show they were sexually accessible if they hoped for a sexual encounter. Based on this, I presume that gay men will engage in direct approaches whether they are seeking a sexual encounter or a long term relationship. Furthermore, gay men will not be likely to disclose a willingness to invest because this is what women desire and not men.

The literature available on homosexual courtship patterns has also begun to establish gender differences in the relationship experiences of lesbian women and gay men (Harry, 1983; Pepalau and Gordon, 1982). One example is that gay men meet potential partners in different places in comparison to lesbian women. As cited in Singer and Deschamps (1994:34), of the 1,266 lesbian and gay couples that took part in a 1988 survey by Partners Task Force For Gay And Lesbian Couples, the most frequent way in which

lesbians got acquainted with one another was through friends (28%) and through work (21%). Whereas the most frequent place for men to become acquainted with one another was a bar (22%). Becoming familiar with someone through friends ranked second (19%).

Tanner (1978) studied "self-identified urban lesbians, ranging in age from 20-25, who have lived in a dyadic homosexual household arrangement for a period exceeding six months. The study data were gathered over a three year period from 1972 through 1975 during which the author interviewed in depth both partners in the lesbian relationship" (Tanner, 1968:1). According to Tanner (1978:68), the female homosexual "seems to share the attitude of her unattached female heterosexual counterpart, namely, that the bar scene does not lend itself well to meeting people who are potential mates". In addition, Tanner argues that "single and unattached lesbians have no taste for "one night stands", promiscuity, and sexual behavior that does not work upon fostering a long-term, stable relationship" (Tanner, 1978:68).

Furthermore, the courtship sequence followed by lesbian women seems to differ from that of gay men. Hoffman (1968) interviewed 157 gay men. When conducting his study he spent a great deal of time in places where gay men usually gather, such as in their private homes and gay bars, and spoke

informally with many others. According to Hoffman, lesbian women

rarely pick up partners for one-night stands, but rather, engage in a kind of courtship ritual which is very much like that of heterosexual couples. That is, they typically become socially acquainted with one another first, then go out on dates, and tend to leave the sexual involvement to a later stage in the relationship. This sequence is quite unlike that of the males who usually begin potential sexual relationships with an immediate sexual encounter (Hoffman, 1968:167).

While there are a number of signals gay men use to identify one another and pursue a particular individual, the most common pattern is "cruising". Weinberg and Williams (1974) provide ethnographies of homosexuals' situation in the United States, the Netherlands, and Denmark. The authors constructed an 11-page questionnaire which contained 145 items. Questionnaires were distributed in each country (Weinberg and Williams, 1974:93-95). They define cruising as

the pursuit and solicitation of sexual partners in public places, usually being a patterned activity in those particular places that are known to homosexuals as likely areas to meet other homosexuals (Weinberg and Williams, 1974:30).

When cruising, gay men engage in behavioral gestures which automatically identify themselves to each other.

Hoffman (1968) argues that

a large part of cruising is done with the eyes, by means of searching looks of a prolonged nature and through the surveying of the other man's entire

body. It is also done by lingering in the presence of the other person, and by glancing backward. After a few minutes of cruising, the prospective partner will readily get the message that someone is interested in him (Hoffman, 1968:47-48).

The bar is one place to which gay men go to find a sexual partner. Weinberg and Williams (1974) found that in general, gay men go to bars

for the consumption of alcohol, for meeting new friends and old, for entertaining and being entertained, for sitting, dancing, getting drunk, for something to do, and especially for meeting sexual partners (Weinberg and Williams, 1974:30).

The gay bar is set up quite differently from heterosexual bars. It is organized in such a way that individuals are constantly aware of who flows into the bar. Hoffman (1968) found that it was common in a gay bar for

the patrons who are sitting at the bar itself usually face away from the bar and look toward the other people in the room and toward the door. When a new patron walks in, he receives a good deal of scrutiny, and people engaged in conversation with each other just naturally assume that their interlocutors will turn away from them to watch each new entering patron. There is a great deal of milling about in the bar and individuals tend to engage in short, superficial conversations with each other. They try to make the circuit around the bar to see everyone in it, perhaps stopping to chat with their friends but usually not for very long (Hoffman, 1968:56).

According to Hoffman, all this is part of the pervasive looking and cruising which goes on in the bar. Hoffman has also suggested that the bar scene somehow imitates

homosexual relationships in general. He argues that "in a way, the shortness and superficiality of the conversations in the bar mirror that same brevity and shallowness of interpersonal relations which characterize gay life as a whole" (Hoffman, 1968:56). Moreover, the way the gay bar is set up with gay men sitting to face the door to see who is walking in suggests that they are there in search of "the perfect sexual object or the hero that never arrives" (Hoffman, 1968:56).

There are other places where gay men go to cruise. Weinberg and Williams found that various streets, neighborhoods, parks, public toilets, steam bathers, and transportation centers are other locations where gay men might go to in order to cruise a potential partner (Weinberg and Williams, 1974:29-30). Hoffman (1968) interviewed a prominent attorney who told him how he met the man with whom he has been living for six years. This is an interesting example of how gay men cruise a potential sexual partner out on the streets.

He surveyed all the people walking along the thoroughfare and loitered around some of the store windows, as if he were window-shopping, in order that a possible partner might get the idea that he was interested in making a sexual contact. When he finally attracted the attention of a suitable prospect, the two of them engaged in what one might perhaps regard as a little ceremonial dance, in which they exchanged searching glances and then moved on a little bit to the next store window. Finally, the attorney became somewhat tired of this and walked in the direction of his apartment,

which was nearby. He was not sure whether the other man was going to follow him - but he did. The attorney went into his apartment and the other man followed him inside and proceeded immediately to take off his clothes. A sexual encounter followed. No words were spoken until after the sexual experience was over (Hoffman, 1968:46).

With the establishment of specific locations in which gay men are able to signal to one another, different tactics for promoting sexual or romantic interest will emerge. For example, in restrooms the custom for making contacts is

based on giving signals to the individual in the next booth, usually done by a tapping of the foot or sometimes by passing notes underneath the partition, or by standing at the urinal for rather long periods of time, fondling one's own penis, then looking at and finally touching the penis of the man at the adjacent spot (Hoffman, 1968:47-48).

In a gay neighborhood or well-known cruising spot, "looking back at one another long enough or by glancing at one another's crotch may be all the identification necessary" (Fisher, 1972:46) for a sexual encounter to develop. Fisher (1972) has also suggested that a stare, catching another man's eye for longer than usually anticipated is indication enough to convey special interest. He argues that

because there are many unconscious social rules about how men are supposed to behave toward one another, how long they may look at each other, how close they may stand next to each other, and when it is appropriate for them to touch, any violation of these rules signals a departure from standard procedure and may be used as a cruising technique (Fisher, 1972:46).

The literature clearly supports the notion that there is a gender difference in the signaling patterns of heterosexual men and women. Furthermore, within these few examples mentioned above, we can see that same sex interactions also influence the tactics used when initiating an encounter. Likewise, it is also apparent that the group which follows the most unique sequence for an encounter seems to be gay men. Gay men use both direct and indirect tactics when trying to promote a sexual encounter. Nonetheless, when viewing the literature it is clear that gay men are more sexually explicit than any other group in their signaling patterns and they seem to signal with the understanding or expectation that a sexual encounter will follow almost immediately.

It has become apparent in recent years that part of the courtship and mating selection process now includes personal advertisements, websites, and phone lines. This has brought to light important questions. Do the sexual differences in signaling persist in this new milieu? Have men and women's signaling patterns become more direct when in this more direct context? One of the sites men and women use to find a mate is through local newspapers or specialized magazines. A review of the relevant literature will help determine how, if at all, signaling tactics differ when men and women use personal columns as a venue to seek out a potential mate.

ii. COURTSHIP IN THE PERSONALS

The personal columns provide a means for individuals to declare, in a straight forward manner, what they have to offer and what they desire in a potential mate. Several studies focusing on the print sites suggest that gender and sexual orientation affect what men and women will offer and seek in the personals (Cameron et al., 1977; Laner and Kamel, 1978; Laner, 1978; Deaux and Hanna, 1984).

Cameron et al. (1977) examined how dates and mates were requested by studying one issue of a newspaper for heterosexual singles called the *Singles News Register*. On the basis of exchange theory, the author's hypotheses were upheld. "Exchange Theory's basic assumption is that people try to maximize their profits in social situations" (Cameron et al. 1977:28). Based on this theory, Cameron et al. expected that advertisers would "try to gain an advantage by prescribing the desired relationship, presenting socially valued assets and minimizing negative self traits" (Cameron et al. 1977:28). Also, the authors "anticipated that the characteristics claimed for self and desired in a partner would tend to be ones frequently valued as sex-appropriate in American society, appearance for women and status for men" (Cameron et al., 1977:28-29). The authors findings support their contemplation that advertisers would try to increase their gain by presenting themselves in a remarkable

light and that women would be more likely than men to mention their own physical appearance, while men would be more likely to mention status characteristics.

Laner and Kamel (1978) analyzed 359 advertisements placed in *The Advocate* by gay men. They compared their data with the data of an earlier study by Cameron, Oskamp and Sparks (1977) which focused on newspaper advertisements of heterosexuals only. Laner and Kamel found that gay men, in contrast to heterosexual men, were less likely to offer or seek personality traits and particular physical traits. Homosexual men were also less likely to seek specifics of appearance. Laner and Kamel considered "physical indicators to be such specifics as age, height, weight, hair and eye color, body type, and race" (Laner and Kamel, 1978:150). While "appearance indicators were considered to be those that are evaluative, such as handsome, masculine, or Ivy League type" (Laner and Kamel, 1978:150).

Subsequently, Laner (1978) analyzed ads of lesbians taken from two issues of *The Wishing Well*, a lesbian publication. She compared these results with the findings of earlier studies conducted by Laner and Kamel (1978) and Cameron, Oskamp and Sparks (1977). Laner's findings suggest that lesbian women are more likely to seek personality traits, education and intelligence than are gay men. Likewise, gay men were more likely to seek physical traits,

recreation/interests and appearance qualities more often than lesbian women (Laner, 1978:47). When comparing heterosexual men and heterosexual women to lesbian women, Laner found that both heterosexual men and heterosexual women were more likely to seek personality traits, physical traits and recreation/interests than lesbian women (Laner, 1978:48-49).

Deaux and Hanna (1984) collected 800 personal ads that were assigned to heterosexual women and men, lesbians and gay men. The authors investigated how often advertisers inquired about specific characteristics. An interesting finding was that "offers of physical attractiveness, while generally more typical of women than men, showed a significant interaction of gender and sexual orientation, with female heterosexuals most likely to offer this commodity", since it seems important to men, "and female homosexuals least likely to do so" (Deaux and Hanna, 1984:370).

In comparison to heterosexual men, heterosexual women, and lesbians, gay men seem to care about physical traits more frequently. "They were second only to female heterosexuals in offers of physical attractiveness, and they were the group most likely to offer and to seek information about physical characteristics in general" (Deaux and Hanna, 1984:371).

Deaux and Hanna (1984) found that heterosexual women are noted for "their offers of physical attractiveness, their search for financial security, specific occupational information, and sincerity" (Deaux and Hanna, 1984:374). On the other hand, lesbian women differ from heterosexual women in that homosexual women lay far less stress on physical characteristics and they offer more information about hobbies, interests, and their own security (Deaux and Hanna, 1984:374). With regard to physical characteristics, gay men value physical traits much more than heterosexual men do. Heterosexual men, in contrast, insist on personality traits more often than physical factors when trying to woo a woman. It seems that homosexual men mention with greater regularity traits such as age, race, physical attractiveness and specific physical characteristics (Deaux and Hanna, 1984:374-375). Deaux and Hanna conclude from this that gay men, in comparison to any other group, have "a more superficial basis" (p. 375) when encountering an individual.

It is interesting to note that there is a contradiction in the results of the studies mentioned above. Deaux and Hanna (1984) reported that gay men were most concerned with physical attractiveness, specific physical characteristics and appearance when seeking out a mate in the personals. On the other hand, Laner and Kamel's (1978) study found that although most of the advertisers placed emphasis on physical

characteristics, gay men were less likely than heterosexual men and women to desire specific physical characteristics.

One explanation that comes to mind for this contradiction is that in the 1980s, gay men could have been more preoccupied with physical traits because of the AIDS epidemic. Asking for physical traits and appearance characteristics allowed the advertisers the opportunity to somehow distinguish advertisers who were infected from those who were not. In other words, because the AIDS virus can cause the individual to look ill, looking healthy and physically in shape became a big concern for gay men. Thus, I would expect this emphasis on looking healthy and physically fit to continue. In addition, Deaux and Hanna's (1985) evaluation that gay men are more "shallow" when encountering an individual may have been unfair because their focus on physical traits may be triggered by their concern with health.

The literature on signaling patterns in the personals seems to suggest that gender and sexual orientation are important factors in determining the signaling patterns of men and women. Once again we see that even through this particular venue, gay men have unique preferences and emphasize different traits in comparison to any other group. It is precisely these differences that served as motivation to focus on gay men only for the following research project.

IV. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK AND RESEARCH

PROPOSITION

PROPOSITION

Relationship Goals influence Signaling Patterns.

Cameron et al. (1977) report that heterosexual men and women do not vary when it comes to the kind of relationship they ultimately desire. Regardless of gender, "about one third of the advertisers were marriage-minded, almost one-third specified a meaningful relationship and the remainder were interested in companionship or dating" (Laner and Kamel, 1978:158). On the other hand, according to Laner and Kamel,

gay men who advertise in the personals tend to fall into five distinct categories. Permanent relationships were sought in 8% of the cases and meaningful relationships, such as a companion, pal or friend were sought in 30% of the cases. The largest proportion, 47% of advertisers, sought a sexual relationship and only 6% left the goal for the relationship unspecified. Some form of exchange characterized 9% of the advertisements, such as asking for a ski buddy to go away to Aspen for fun (Laner and Kamel, 1978:158-159).

Clearly then, a greater variety of goals for the relationship is specified by gay men advertising in the personals with the largest proportion seeking a sexual type relationship.

With the few descriptions available in the literature of how gay men express sexual or romantic interest and with

a great magnitude of advertisers seeking a sexual relationship, one is left with the impression that gay men are indeed highly promiscuous and sex is what they are constantly desiring and seeking.

I predict that a possible explanation for gay men's directness regarding sex may be that gay men like to be clear at the start of a relationship about what they want and do sexually, so that they can decide if a particular individual is a suitable partner or not. Lee's (1976) typology study of gay men's advertisements suggested that among gay men "the search for a suitable mate becomes that for a partner with an appropriate love style"(p. 403).

Symons (1979) has suggested that

heterosexual men would be as likely as homosexual men to have sex most often with strangers, to participate in anonymous orgies in public baths, and to stop off in public restrooms for five minutes of fellatio on the way home from work *if women were interested in these activities (my emphasis)*. But women are not interested" (Symons, 1979:300).

This explanation assumes that all men want to behave in this manner and would do so if it were not for women. If heterosexual men do not act this way because of women, then how would one explain gay men who do not enjoy these activities? Symons argues that

even those homosexual men who do not engage in such activities do not necessarily refrain for the same reasons women do. A man may shun impersonal sex and the search for sexual variety for many

reasons other than lack of interest: moral repugnance; fear of disease; fear of public disclosure or legal repercussions; fear of jeopardizing an important relationship; inability to obtain desired partners owing to age or physical unattractiveness; or a preference to channel his time and energy in nonsexual directions (Symons, 1979:300).

Therefore, Symons is suggesting that men abstain from participating in these activities for a variety of reasons, but lack of desire for such behavior is not one of them. Furthermore, a man's reasons for not engaging in these activities differ from a woman's.

Blumstein and Schwartz's (1989) research focused on how intimate relationships shape sexuality. Participants consisted of male homosexual couples, lesbian couples, heterosexual married couples, and heterosexual cohabiting couples. They found that the male homosexual couples had sex more frequently, followed by the heterosexual cohabiting couples and the heterosexual married couples. The lesbian couples were the ones reported to having sex the least often. Blumstein and Schwartz argue that the reason for these differences may be because

men in our culture are allowed and encouraged to desire and demand more sex. They have fewer costs for experiencing or acting on sexual desires (that is, no reduced marketability, no fear of becoming pregnant), and therefore they establish a fairly high sexual frequency in both heterosexual and homosexual relationships (Blumstein and Schwartz, 1989:126).

Women, on the other hand, are taught to be less aggressive and less demanding when it comes to sex. Therefore, "it makes sense that in lesbian couples, where both partners have experienced female sexual socialization, there would be a mutual reluctance to take the sexual lead" (Blumstein and Schwartz, 1989:127). If we accept this theory, gay men signal sexual and romantic interest to one another more often because they are signaling to a man who has received the same sexual socialization and thus both parties are willing to take the sexual lead. If both parties are ready to initiate then a rapid disclosure of sexual or romantic interest will follow and in turn this escalates the courtship sequence in which a sexual encounter will take place much sooner. According to Lee (1976) "there is now a positive emphasis on sex (one or several encounters) as a legitimate and desirable part of the process of becoming better acquainted" (p. 413). Therefore, a sexual encounter may take place sooner for gay men - not only because they view this as just another way to become better acquainted - but because this may be a legitimate way to signal to the other individual they are romantically or sexually interested.

As mentioned earlier, the literature has left us with the image that gay men are highly promiscuous and very much oriented towards the sexual when expressing sexual or

romantic interest. In addition, according to Laner and Kamel (1978), the greater bulk of gay men advertising in the personals seem to desire a sexual type relationship. All this information has been supplied without once making reference to how the goal for the relationship (that is what the individual desires or expects to happen with the other person), affects the strategies and tactics adopted to signal sexual or romantic interest. I propose that signaling patterns will be affected by the type of relationship one seeks.

HYPOTHESIS I

Relationship Goals will not affect the mention of General Physical Traits: Gay men who mention long term/intimate type relationships are just as likely to specify general physical traits as gay men who mention short term/sexual type relationships.

HYPOTHESIS II

Relationship Goals will not affect the mention of Appearance: Men who mention long term/intimate type relationships are just as likely to specify appearance characteristics as men who desire short term/sexual type relationships.

The above two hypotheses are based on the assumption that gay men highly value physical appearance. As cited in DeCecco (1988), Hagen and Symons found that gay men are typically concerned with their facial looks and bodily appearance. "Half of the homosexual men surveyed had below average images of their looks and bodies while only one-tenth of the heterosexual subjects held such a perception. The researchers suggested that homosexual men exist in a sub-culture with higher standards for attractiveness and that they assess themselves based on this standard" (DeCecco, 1988:79).

It is interesting to note that in Laner and Kamel's 1978 study, they found that gay men were least likely to seek/offer physical appearance when seeking out a mate in the personal advertisements. On the other hand, one year later, Hagen and Symons (1979) found that gay men were extremely concerned with their looks in comparison to heterosexual individuals. A possible explanation for the different results is grounded in the differing research designs. Laner and Kamel used personal advertisements to analyze what was often sought or offered when searching for a partner, while Hagen and Symons surveyed people asking them how they rated their facial and body images. In other words, I am suggesting that asking individuals directly

about appearance would elicit more of a discontentment with looks than one would find when analyzing ads.

Clark (1977), who interviewed gay men informally, determined that certain gay men have internalized intense competitive mechanisms due to the fact they have been socialized as male. According to Clark, these mechanisms affect partner selection in long term relationships because a gay man is most likely to pursue a male more physically attractive than himself because he was taught to desire such a symbol of attractiveness. In other words, gay men are taught to value physical appearance not only by the general social culture but once again this is reinforced in the homosexual sub-culture. Furthermore, because gay men are taught to desire physical traits such as specific body types, they will try and seek that in a prospective partner. In turn, gay men will find it more difficult to discover a suitable partner for a long term relationship simply because it is impractical to hope for someone who can live up to this high standard of physical attractiveness.

Hypothesis I and II are based on the assumption that most individuals desire and seek a partner to whom they are physically attracted. Furthermore, if we accept Clark's (1977) theory that a gay man is somehow socialized to desire a partner more physically attractive than himself, then he will seek general physical traits and appearance

characteristics regardless of type of relationship sought.

HYPOTHESIS III

Relationship Goals will affect the mention of Sexual Physical Traits: Advertisers who seek short term/sexual type relationships will be more likely to mention sexual physical traits than those who mention long term/intimate type relationships.

It is presumed that those men with the goal of a sexual relationship will be more likely to mention sexual physical traits since they are interested in a purely physical relationship. Hypothesis III is based on the assumption that gay men seeking a sexual type of relationship will ask for specific physical traits focusing directly on the sexual more often because these characteristics are of prime importance when one desires a purely sexual relationship.

HYPOTHESIS IV

Relationship Goals will affect the mention of Personality Traits: Personality traits will be more often mentioned by those men seeking a long term/intimate type relationship than by those seeking a short term/sexual type relationship.

Hypothesis IV is based on the assumption that relationship goals will impact the mention of personality traits. This hypothesis presupposes that if the goal for the relationship is more long-term, then characteristics such as personality become important in prospective mates in order to make them more compatible. In other words, if the relationship goal is more long term it is important to be compatible with one another on other levels. Some individuals may be sexually compatible but their characters may clash. Therefore, if the goal is long term, individuals would try to get along not just sexually but personality wise as well.

HYPOTHESIS V

Relationship Goals will affect the mention of Nonsexual Interests: Men will cite nonsexual interests more often if they are interested in a long term/intimate type relationship than if they are interested in a short term/sexual type relationship.

Similar to hypothesis four, hypothesis V is based on the assumption that those men who mention a more long-term type of relationship will also declare nonsexual interests in order to improve compatibility.

There is evidence to indicate that some gay men want to have a steady love relationship and find this preferable to having only casual liaisons. In Bell and Weinberg's study (1987-89), "potential homosexual respondents were recruited from the following sources: Public advertising, bars, personal contacts, gay baths, organizations, mailing lists and public places" (p.30). A 175 page interview guide containing 528 questions was utilized in face to face interviews. The authors asked gay men how important it was to them to have a permanent living arrangement with a homosexual partner. Seventeen percent of respondents said a relationship was the most important thing in life; 30 percent said it was very important; 20 percent said it was somewhat important; 13 percent said it was nice but not important; and 20 percent said it was not important at all (Bell and Weinberg, 1987-89:322). From this, I would expect that a fairly large percentage of gay men advertising in the personals would be seeking a long term/intimate relationship. I would also expect that if they desire long term/intimate relationships, it is likely that characteristics not focusing on the physical aspects of an individual will be desired and specified more often. In other words, if individuals are oriented towards a more permanent/intimate relationship, it becomes important to be compatible with that person in areas other than the sexual.

HYPOTHESIS VI

Relationship Goals will affect the mention of Sexual Interests: Advertisers will describe sexual interests more often if they are interested in a short term/sexual type relationship versus a long term/intimate type relationship.

Hypothesis VI is based on the assumption that if personality traits and nonsexual interests are important in a potential mate when mentioning more of a long-term relationship, then, the reverse should be true. Gay men who mention a purely sexual type of relationship should be more likely to mention sexual interests in comparison to individuals desiring a more long-term relationship.

V. METHODOLOGY

In order to assess the influence of relationship goals to signaling patterns of gay men, I decided to draw a sample of ads from the gay magazine *Unzipped*, an extension of *The Advocate*. *Trader Dick*, the classified advertisements section of *The Advocate*, used by Laner and Kamel in their study in 1978, is a California publication with National and International circulation. Unfortunately the same newspaper Laner and Kamel used was not available in Canada. An

employee at *L'Androgyne*, a gay and lesbian bookstore in Montreal, explained that *Unzipped* is similar to *The Advocate* in that both *Unzipped* and *The Advocate* focus on gay men only and both have a personal advertisement section.

Furthermore, *Unzipped* has variations in what the advertisers ask for in terms of physical traits. Some gay magazines focus only on chubby men or hairy men, whereas *Unzipped* -like *The Advocate*- represented a wider range of gay men with different interests in terms of physical traits. Therefore, *Unzipped* was an excellent alternative to opt for.

One year's worth of issues was divided up into three-month blocks from which one issue was randomly selected. This was done to ensure that the issues would have been selected from the total issues published in 1998. The issues selected were February 17, 1998; March 31, 1998; July 21, 1998 and September 1, 1998. Within these four issues a total of 611 ads were present. Information type ads, such as those ads advertising mailbox or phone lines were omitted from the sample because interests, traits or relationship goals were not mentioned. This left a total of 527 ads to be utilized for the following thesis.

My first variable, **Relationship Goal** was divided into four categories: *Long Term*, *Intimate*, *Vanilla* and *Variations*. The first category was called *Long Term*. Any

mention of long term/permanent relationships such as long term relationship, life long relationship, life partner, lifemate or life time companion (see appendix two), were placed under the *Long Term* category.

Intimate was the second category. Any reference to terms such as the following: buddy, companion, special/best friend, lover, friendship, soulmate, to share life, good fun or times, love and care for, intimacy, romance, share life or warm loving relationship (see appendix two), were placed under the *Intimate* category.

Vanilla was the third category. This refers to vanilla sex or sex that is common or not out of the ordinary (plain old sex). Examples of terms under this category were the following: jerk off, hot, wild and romantic times, fuck buddies, get busy with, hot sex, hot romance, hot no strings sex, hot oral service, playmate, casual sex, fucking, give/receive head, or mutual masturbation (see appendix two).

It is important to note that certain terms were placed in the category *Vanilla* using the following criteria. Terms such as "help with fantasies", "meet in hotel room", "no attachments", "no long term" or "looking to be naked with other men" are not specific enough or detailed enough to determine whether these advertisers are seeking *Vanilla* sex or *Variations* sex. Therefore, when terms such as these came

up, I placed them in the *Vanilla* category simply because I presume that if the advertiser's intentions were for *Variations sex*, then I am sure he would outline this clearly in the ad. In other words, if someone wants to meet in a hotel room, most everyone would assume some kind of sexual activity is desired, whereas meeting in a hotel room does not point out that one desires more extreme variations such as being tied up or peed on. I believe that if they wanted some more adventurous behaviour they would state it to avoid misunderstandings or even possibly violence.

Variations, category four, refers to sex that is not ordinary. Terms such as explore boots, bondage, shaving, be kinky and dominant, continuous correction, enemas, erotic fun, ff (fist or foot fuck) this pussy hole, fetishes, exchange dirty underwear, fantasy, smell dirty jockies, smelly foot master, toilet training, raunch wet fun, bite, chew and make tit (breast and nipple), hurt or good foot time would fall under the *Variations* category (see appendix two).

The four relationship goals reflect a hierarchy which was applied for cases where advertisers mentioned more than one type of relationship as a goal. For example, an advertiser seeking a long term relationship for nights of hot love making was coded as interested in a *Long Term* relationship only. If an advertiser sought both an *Intimate*

relationship and a *Vanilla* relationship, then I coded this advertiser as seeking an *Intimate* relationship. Basically, whenever an advertiser stated more than one relationship goal, the more "multidimensional" relationship would always take precedence over those less "multidimensional".

A multidimensional relationship may be characterized as a relationship where it is essential for the individual that a variety of relationship types will be present. In other words, an individual seeking this type of relationship wants to connect on many levels. For example, someone wanting a *Long Term* relationship not only desires a partner for long term intimacy and companionship, but a sexual relationship is sought as well. On the other hand, someone seeking an *Intimate* relationship is not necessarily looking for something permanent but may want some of the intimacies and companionships inherent in a multidimensional relationship. Furthermore, an *Intimate* relationship does not always imply that a sexual relationship is desired as well. Some advertisers sought out companionship only, such as a friend to watch movies together. Thus, an *Intimate* relationship has "fewer dimensions" than a *Long Term* relationship.

A single dimensional relationship has more direct or clear cut descriptions of what type of relationship is desired. Since a *Vanilla* and *Variations* relationship are both sexual relationships only, these relationships start

out with fewer dimensions simply because advertisers desire a purely sexual relationship. A *Vanilla* relationship is more dimensional than a *Variations* relationship because someone seeking hot sex leaves the door open to many possibilities. In other words, a variety of sexual activities could constitute hot sex. Since the individual seeking a *Vanilla* relationship does not point out exactly what sexual acts are sought, a somewhat multidimensional relationship is desired. We move towards a unidimensional relationship with *Variations* because the type of relationship being sought is very particular. The sexual activities desired are properly outlined. Hence one can argue that a singular type or a one dimensional relationship is desired.

It is important to assert that in order to determine the definition of many of these terms, numerous months were devoted to speaking with gay men, a professor and students, who were familiar with the terminology used in the personal advertisements. Dr. Frances Shaver, a professor at Concordia University, presented me with a few names of individuals at Concordia who might be able to help me . Also, a great deal of effort was employed in networking with these contacts made at Concordia University in order to finally encounter someone who could shed some light upon those terms unknown to me. Unfortunately, certain terms

were baffling even to the individuals helping me (see appendix eight).

Since I was only interested in individuals who state a relationship goal, I excluded the ads where a relationship goal was not presented and coded them as missing. Likewise, ads containing terms that were vague or not specific enough to be placed under any of the four categories (*Long Term, Intimate, Vanilla and Variations*) were omitted from the analysis as well. Ads with these vague terms were placed under the *Other* category. Descriptive terms falling under *Other* included: dad, brother, houseboy, offer benefits, offer salary, mentor, possible help with gym supplements, seeking career in entertainment, share estate, happiness, host, hook up with you, help with chores, cleaning and errands, interpreter for hearing impaired, meet someone or others, or no inmates (see appendix two). In addition, an appendix was created (see appendix eight) in which terms that were undefined are listed and of course these terms were excluded from the analysis also. Overall 120 ads were excluded from the analysis reducing the final sample to 407 ads from the earlier 527.

Laner and Kamel (1978) classified 359 ads in the *Trader Dick* section of *The Advocate* classified magazine. They used the following categories: Personality, Physical Traits, Goal for Relationship, Recreation/Interests, Appearance,

Education, Occupation and Financial Status. While I attempted to replicate Laner and Kamel (1978), some changes in coding were necessary since my focus was on the impact of the relationship goal on items mentioned. Therefore, the present research will use similar categories, with a few additions, to classify the ads in *Unzipped* (refer to page 45).

TABLE A
LIST OF CATEGORIES UTILIZED BY LANER AND KAMEL (1978)
AND LUCIA FURTADO (1998)

LANER AND KAMEL'S CHARACTERISTICS	LUCIA FURTADO'S CHARACTERISTICS
.Personality	.Personality
.Physical Traits	*.Physical Indicators
.Goal For Relationship	.Goal For The Relationship
.Recreation/Interests	**Recreational/Interests
.Appearance	.Appearance
.Education	.Education
.Occupation	.Occupation
.Financial Status	.Financial Status
	.Health Concerns

*Physical Indicators subdivided into two new categories: General Physical Traits and Sexual Physical Traits

**Recreational/Interests subdivided into two new categories: Sexual Interests and Nonsexual Interests

Originally, each of the advertisements was coded based on qualities offered, qualities sought, and both qualities offered and sought. Later on, *the response categories sought, offered, and both were not distinguished as such for the final analysis* because I was only interested in those individuals who mentioned a particular category, such as mentioning a relationship goal versus those who did not mention the goal for the relationship. Thus, an ad in which anyone offered, sought, or both offered and sought a particular category, was coded as having mentioned that category. If a particular category was mentioned, this shows that it is important to that individual. Therefore, there was no need to differentiate between sought or offered since mentioning a particular category shows that it is relevant to the individual and related to his goal. Lastly, the category "not stated" for **Relationship Goal** has been coded as missing because as stated before, I was interested only in those individuals who declared a relationship goal.

Following the pattern of Laner and Kamel (1978), I took **Physical Indicators** to be such specifics as age, height, weight, hair and eye color, body type and race. I considered **Appearance Indicators** to be those that are evaluative, such as handsome, masculine and attractive.

Health Concerns was one variable I modified slightly in comparison to Laner and Kamel. Laner and Kamel placed

health considerations under miscellaneous concerns and an exhaustive list of the descriptions for this category was not clearly outlined. However, we do know that Laner and Kamel included health concerns with the physical characteristics category. I, on the other hand, have placed health concerns as a separate variable since the AIDS epidemic is an important issue especially among gay men. Since it merits further investigation, I decided it would be beneficial to have this information easily accessible and separate from the other variables. A future research goal could be to see how important the issue of AIDS is to gay men advertising in the personals.

If terms such as healthy, clean, unaffected, unused, HIV negative, HIV positive, safe-sex, safe fun, safe, disease free, non-smoker, no drugs, no STD's or non-drinker (see appendix seven) were mentioned, they were classified under the **Health Concerns** variable. As mentioned earlier, the **Health Concerns** variable has been clearly sketched in this manner for future inquiries only, and the thesis will not be centering around the health issue.

In addition, and in contrast to Laner and Kamel, the variable **Recreational/Interests** was divided into two sections creating two new categories due to my focus being on relationship goals and signaling. The first category was referred to as *Sexual Interests*. Terms such as top, bottom,

slave, master, BJs, loves providing oral service, loves getting into feet, boots and sneakers, spitting, watersports, hot, hard sweaty times, butt munch, spankings, 69, seeks someone to FF, loves cock, into chains, or uniforms and chains (see appendix five for extensive list) were classified under the *Sexual Interests* category.

The second category for **Recreational/Interests** was referred to as *Nonsexual Interests*. In this case terms such as hiking, movies, sports fan, have many interests, workouts, antiques, camping, fishing, outdoors, beach, rollercoasters, country, likes beer or cigars, dining out, romantic evenings, walks on the beach, clubs, dancing, quiet evenings at home, moonlit nights, crafts, good food, opera, parks, walks, cooking, gardening, swimming, biking, and sailing (see appendix three) were categorized under *Nonsexual Interests*.

Along with this, it is important to illustrate at this moment how the relationship goals *Vanilla and Variations* were differentiated from the category *Sexual Interests*. If the advertiser used terms such as "looking for/seeks for", "seeks" or "seeks as", this was presumed to be a relationship goal. Whereas, if terms such as "into", "I like" or "likes" were employed, then this was considered to be an interest.

The variable **Physical Indicators** has been divided into two categories as well. The first category constructed was *General Physical Traits* and refers to those characteristics that focus on the general or common physical traits such as eye and hair color, body shape and weight, complexion and if the person is hairy or not (see appendix six). Age and race, both originally categorized under *General Physical Traits*, were excluded here since almost all advertisers mentioned these traits. However, terms such as "dark complexion" or "light skin" were included in this category because skin color does not always refer to race. Likewise, terms such as "young/younger", "old/older" or "middle aged" were left in as well since these terms do not give a clear depiction of how old the person really is. Therefore, I excluded age only when the actual number was presented. For example, if an advertiser mentioned that they were 28 years old, this information was not included in the final analysis.

The second category was *Sexual Physical Traits* and refers to those characteristics that focus mostly on the sexual aspect of the body. For example size and type of penis, if someone is circumcised or not, or how hung they are. Other characteristics referring to size of feet or nice feet were included because this usually is directed at inserting into the person's anus for sexual pleasure and not

just for discovering how the other person looks in terms of foot size (see appendix six).

As mentioned previously, the **Appearance** variable will consist of those terms that are evaluative such as hot, attractive, handsome, hunk, good looking, cute, clean cut or sexy (see appendix one).

The variable **Personality** was coded to include terms such as caring, discreet, down to earth, nice, honest, affectionate, loyal and mature (see appendix four).

Finally, I should mention that although Laner and Kamel have incorporated the variables Education, Occupation and Financial Status in their work, I have chosen to omit these from my final analysis. Since most of the advertisers did not make reference to these categories in the ads, I decided to exclude them from my research. Although not many advertisers made reference to this in Laner and Kamel as well, (8% claimed/desired Education, 17% claimed/desired Occupation and 4% claimed/desired Financial Status) I believe Laner and Kamel decided to keep these categories in their analysis because their focus differed from mine. Their goal was to report the percentage of advertisers mentioning the various types of characteristics regardless of how many mentioned which category.

VI. FINDINGS AND ANALYSIS

As mentioned earlier, Laner and Kamel (1978) state that gay men fall into different categories in terms of the type of relationships they specify. My first task was to compare Laner and Kamel's 1978 breakdown of gay relationship types to my data which were collected 20 years later, in 1998. I felt it was essential, before proceeding further with the analysis, to determine where the differences lay, if any were to be found. I realize that Laner and Kamel categorized their relationship types in a slightly different manner, nonetheless, by combining some of my categories, such as *Vanilla* and *Variations* (both are types of sexual relationships), I was able to compare this to Laner and Kamel's sexual relationship category. Likewise, Laner and Kamel's "unspecified goal" was equated with my "not stated" category.

I predict gay men will desire a long term/intimate relationship more in 1998 because these men are more cautious because of the AIDS epidemic and thus prefer to develop a more stable relationship with an individual before getting together for a sexual encounter.

Davidson (1991) used content analysis to analyse the personals section of *The Village Voice*. He examined "the changes in the language gay men use to refer to their

sexuality between the years 1978, 1982, 1985 and 1988"

(p.125). He found that

the most important change was an increase in health-related language and a relatively new concern among some gay men with sexual exclusivity as a condition for the establishment of a relationship, versus sexual exclusivity being something to be negotiated by couples once a relationship has been formed (Davidson, 1991:135).

Another reason may be that since the public is more accepting of gay relationships, as evidenced by the more openness the public has to discussing gay relationships on television and the freedom gay men have to express their sexual preferences at events such as with the Gay Pride Parade. Gay men may feel more comfortable seeking out and pursuing relationships that do not involve sex only. For example, instead of going to the gay bar (where it is more likely to meet someone only for a one-night stand), gay men may feel free to go out to dinner or a movie first with a potential mate before proceeding to the sexual part of the relationship.

A final possibility could be due to the fact that the majority of advertisers in my sample were older men. In order to determine the mean age of my sample, I read through each ad and noted each time an advertiser offered their age. Most often individuals stated their age straight forwardly. When advertisers stated that they were in their 30s, 40ish or 50+, I coded them as being 35, 45 and 55. Only two

advertisers stated that they were in their 60s and 65+. Therefore, I coded these two individuals as being ages 65.

The average age for respondents in my sample was 38. It is possible gay men of this age become tired of one-night stands and start to feel the need to "settle down". Granted, thirty-eight may not seem old to most of us, but in the gay culture where youth is accentuated (Hoffman, 1968:52), age does carry weight when seeking out a partner for a sexual relationship. Hence, one can also argue that while gay men may still desire a sexual relationship, they will strive for an intimate relationship instead because they believe that this type of relationship is more fulfilling.

Table One, (please refer to page 54), represents the distribution of relationship types sought by gay men who advertise in the personals by year. The percentages indicate that in 1998 gay men's interest in a *Long Term* or *Intimate* relationship has increased and their interest in a sexual relationship has decreased. These results show that relationship goals have changed over the twenty years. Notably, the interest in long term relationships has increased (from 8% to 13.5% ($p < .05$)) as well as the interest in meaningful/intimate relationships (from 30% to 49.9% ($p < .05$)). In addition, there is less interest in sexual

relationships (a drop from 47% to 13.9% ($p < .05$)).

TABLE ONE

**THE DISTRIBUTION OF DISTINCT RELATIONSHIPS SOUGHT BY
GAY MEN WHO ADVERTISE IN THE PERSONALS BY YEAR**

RELATIONSHIP GOAL	PERCENTAGE* 1978 DATA (N=359)	PERCENTAGE 1998 DATA (N=527)	T-TEST % DIFFERENCE
Permanent/ Long Term Relationship	8%	13.5%	P<.05
Meaningful/ Intimate Relationship (companion, pal or friend)	30%	49.9%	P<.05
Sexual** Relationship	47%	13.9%	P<.05
Goal Unspecified/ Form of Exchange/ Not Stated	15%	22.8%	P<.05

* From Laner and Kamel, 1978

** Sexual includes Vanilla (9.3%) and Variations (4.6%)

After examining if sexual relationships are less in demand and intimate relationships more in demand in contemporary personals, I then wanted to determine whether relationship goals had an impact on the characteristics mentioned. For my first and second hypotheses (reflected in Table Two), I predicted that the type of relationship gay men sought would not influence their desire for General Physical Traits and Appearance characteristics.

Table Two represents a test of hypothesis number one, the association between the relationship goal and General Physical Traits (refer to page 56). Gay men who mentioned a *Long Term* relationship were those most likely to also mention General Physical Traits (90.1%). Those who cited an *Intimate* and *Vanilla* type relationship were the next group to ask for General Physical Traits (at 80.2% and 75.5% respectively). Gay men who declared a *Variations* type of relationship were the least likely to mention General Physical Traits (62.5%).

TABLE TWO
GENERAL PHYSICAL TRAITS AND APPEARANCE BY THE GOAL FOR
THE RELATIONSHIP

	RELATIONSHIP GOAL			
	LONG TERM	INTIMATE	VANILLA	VARIATIONS
PHYSICAL*				
TRAITS				
MENTIONED	90.1%	80.2%	75.5%	62.5%
APPEARANCE**				
MENTIONED	57.7%	44.1%	53.1%	37.5%
(N=407)	(71)	(263)	(49)	(24)

*Physical: Gamma= -.33
Somers'd= -.12
P=.020

**Appearance: P=.124

In general, the findings of this table failed to support my hypothesis. There is a negative weak association between goal for the relationship and General Physical Traits ($\text{Gamma} = -.33$). Nonetheless, the relationship was significant ($p = .02$). Table Two suggests that the type of relationship mentioned may affect whether or not General Physical Traits will also be identified when seeking a partner.

Table Two also portrays the association between relationship goal and Appearance characteristics, hypothesis number two. While the findings suggest that men desiring *Long Term*, *Intimate* and *Vanilla* relationships are more likely to declare Appearance in comparison to those interested in a *Variations* relationship (57.7%, 44.1%, 53.1% and 37.5% respectively), the relationship is not significant. In other words, relationship goal did not affect the mention of appearance which is what I hypothesized. Thus, my hypothesis has been supported.

In sum, Table Two demonstrates that the more multidimensional the relationship desired is, the more likely General Physical Traits are to be mentioned. The least likely to desire information regarding General Physical Traits and Appearance characteristics (although this was not significant for Appearance characteristics) were those individuals desiring a *Variations* type

relationship. Possibly this is so because those looking for sexual variations feel they must be less choosy seeing that it may be difficult to find someone interested in what they want as sexual variations. Whereas, if the relationship is directed towards a more long term commitment, then gay men become more choosy. As Clark (1977) suggested, they may even wish for someone more attractive than they are.

The test of hypothesis three - relationship goals will influence the mention of Sexual Physical Traits - is in Table Three (refer to page 59). In general, hypothesis three is supported with a positive weak association ($p=.02$). Individuals seeking a sexual encounter were those most likely to mention Sexual Physical Traits.

Men who mentioned a *Long Term* relationship and an *Intimate* relationship were those least likely to specify Sexual Physical Traits (11.3% and 14.8% respectively). Those most likely to mention Sexual Physical Traits were those individuals who desired a *Vanilla* type or a *Variations* type of relationship (30.6% and 25.0% respectively). Gay men who wanted a *Vanilla* type relationship were slightly more likely to mention Sexual Physical Traits than gay men who mentioned a *Variations* type relationship.

TABLE THREE

SEXUAL PHYSICAL TRAITS BY GOAL FOR THE RELATIONSHIP

RELATIONSHIP GOAL

	LONG TERM	INTIMATE	VANILLA	VARIATIONS
SEXUAL TRAITS				
MENTIONED	11.3%	14.8%	30.6%	25.0%
(N=407)	(71)	(263)	(49)	(24)

Gamma= .32
Somers'd= .10
P=.017

These findings were expected because if individuals are wanting only a sexual relationship, sexual traits should be expressed more often if one is to assess the sexual part of the other individual. Once the individual has this information regarding the other individual's sexual traits, then it is possible to determine if those qualities mentioned are what is desired in order to have a sexual liaison or relationship fulfilled.

An unexpected finding was that individuals desiring a *Vanilla* relationship were slightly more likely to be concerned with Sexual Physical Traits than individuals who mentioned a *Variations* type of relationship. It may be that what is desired in *Variations* relationships is for the other individual to be "into" or willing to try some of the suggested adventures and not so much the person's physical traits per se. For example, in a *Vanilla* relationship the sexual relationship is "usual" sex, for example sex commonly had without any objects involved, so the body parts are what are being explored and enjoyed during sex. Whereas in *Variations* the whipping or tying is what is expected and desired so the actual body part may be less important.

Table Four shows the results of hypothesis four: the extent to which the relationship goal influences the reference to Personality traits (see page 61). My

hypothesis has not been supported. Once again, I found a negative weak association and a non-significant relationship. Nonetheless, the percentages are in the expected direction, with those seeking *Long Term* or *Intimate* relationships most likely to mention Personality characteristics (52.1% and 46.8% respectively).

A possible explanation why relationship goal did not influence the mention of Personality traits could be due to the fact that being aware of someone's nonsexual and sexual interests, somehow indicates the type of personality one has. Another explanation for this outcome may be grounded in the coding. There were certain terms categorized under Personality traits, such as discreet, passive or dominant, that may not really describe an individual's personality but rather sketches out a desire for privacy and consideration that some individual's pursuing a sexual or gay relationship may not want others to know about it.

TABLE FOUR

PERSONALITY TRAITS BY THE GOAL FOR THE RELATIONSHIP

RELATIONSHIP GOAL

	LONG TERM	INTIMATE	VANILLA	VARIATIONS
PERSONALITY				
MENTIONED	52.1%	46.8%	34.7%	29.2%
(N=407)	(71)	(263)	(49)	(24)

P=.098

Appearing in Table Five are the relationships between relationship goal and both Nonsexual and Sexual Interests: hypotheses number five and six (refer to page 63). Both hypotheses have been supported. Hypothesis five with a negative weak association and hypothesis six with a positive weak association, and both relationships are significant. Those who specified a *Long Term* relationship were most likely to mention Nonsexual Interests (38%), followed by those who specified an *Intimate* type relationship (23.6%). Next were individuals who mentioned a *Vanilla* type relationship (18.4%) and finally those who desired a

Variations type of relationship were least likely to mention Nonsexual Interests (12.5%).

As expected, those who mentioned either *Long Term*, *Intimate* or *Vanilla* type of relationships were least likely to disclose Sexual Interests (14.1%, 14.8% and 16.3% respectively). Those seeking *Variations* were most likely (at 37.5%) to stress Sexual Interests.

The findings of this table suggest that gay men who mentioned more of a sexual type relationship are the least likely to ask for Nonsexual Interests. Likewise, individuals interested in a long term/intimate relationship are the most likely to cite Nonsexual Interests.

TABLE FIVE
NONSEXUAL INTERESTS AND SEXUAL INTERESTS BY THE GOAL
FOR THE RELATIONSHIP

	RELATIONSHIP GOAL			
	LONG TERM	INTIMATE	VANILLA	VARIATIONS
NONSEXUAL*				
INTERESTS				
MENTIONED	38.0%	23.6%	18.4%	12.5%
SEXUAL**				
INTERESTS				
MENTIONED	14.1%	14.8%	16.3%	37.5%
(N=407)	(71)	(263)	(49)	(24)

*Nonsexual: Gamma= -.31
Somers'd= -.12
P=.019

**Sexual: Gamma= .20
Somers'd= .06
P=.035

Table Five supports the theory that individuals oriented toward a more multidimensional relationship will want to be compatible with the other person in areas other than the sexual. We can see that as the relationship goals mentioned move away from a permanent type of relationship, the less likely Nonsexual Interests will be mentioned. Likewise, this table reveals that men interested in sexual relationships are more likely to inquire about Sexual Interests (23.3%) than men seeking a more long term/intimate relationship (14.7%).

One reason why men mentioning long term/intimate relationships are less likely to mention Sexual Interests may be because they can always disclose their interests later on to their partners, and this can be negotiated between them later on in the relationship as well. For example, if one of the partners would like to try some kinky stuff, both parties can come to some agreement about this later on.

VII. CONCLUSIONS

One of the intentions of this study was to test the accuracy of the stereotypical image of promiscuity our society has about gay men. I have argued that most of the literature available on gay men is based on data gathered in

bars or other locations focusing most often on sexual activities, which may have fostered this belief. This research has shed some light on this topic by demonstrating that a variety of styles and goals exist. The percentages found in Table One support the idea that gay men are not simply promiscuous: 63.4% of those sampled stated a desire for a *Long Term* or *Intimate* relationship, whereas 13.9% desired a sexual relationship. Likewise, gay men who advertised in the personals in 1998 desire *Long Term* or *Intimate* relationships more than sexual relationships. On the other hand, in 1978 the reverse was true: forty-seven percent desired a sexual relationship and only 38% of the advertisers sought a more Permanent/meaningful relationship. These findings suggest that indeed some gay men desire a steady relationship and prefer this to having only a casual liaison.

Hypothesis One which stated that the goal for the relationship will not affect the mention of General Physical Traits was not supported. Instead, the findings in Table Two indicate that men interested in a multidimensional relationship are more likely than men seeking a unidimensional relationship to seek a physically attractive mate. Hypothesis Two stated that relationship goal will not affect the mention of Appearance. Since this relationship was not significant, my hypothesis has been supported.

There is no impact of the relationship goal on the mention of Appearance characteristics. One model for mate selection discussed earlier suggested that men seek physically attractive and youthful mates so they can ensure reproduction is successful. That is, men should seek women that are physically attractive so they can be assured offspring will be produced. Clearly gay men know that having children together is biologically impossible, thus this explanation does not work for men and women in gay relationships.

Clark (1977) suggests that gay men have internalized intense competitive mechanisms due to the fact they have been socialized as male. These mechanisms affect partner selection in long term relationships because a gay man is most likely to desire a partner more physically attractive than himself because they were socialized to desire such a symbol of attractiveness. This could explain why men seeking a partner for a multidimensional relationship will also desire someone physically attractive even though reproduction is not possible. Thus, gay men may want a partner that is physically attractive not for the purpose of reproduction but simply because they have been socialized as male.

Hypotheses three, five and six were supported, but weakly. Men who advertised wanting a permanent relationship

were least likely to also want information on the other person's sexual traits, while those who mention a sexual encounter were definitely interested in the other person's Sexual Physical Traits. I also found that men who desired a purely sexual relationship were less likely to want information regarding the Nonsexual Interests of a potential partner in comparison to men seeking a more permanent relationship. Likewise, men wanting a long term/intimate relationship were more likely to mention Nonsexual Interests and least likely to specify Sexual Interests.

An important result to emerge from this study is that gay men are not all seeking a purely sexual relationship. In fact, gay men specify a greater variety of relationship goals in comparison to heterosexual men and women (Laner and Kamel, 1978:151). Furthermore, the literature available leads one to believe that gay men always use sexually explicit tactics and signal with the expectation that a sexual encounter will occur immediately (see Hoffman, 1968). The results of this study strengthens the idea that depending on the type of relationship one is interested in, different strategies will be utilized.

The findings appearing in Table Five, Goal for the Relationship will influence Sexual and Nonsexual Interests, illustrate that individuals seeking a more multidimensional relationship will signal or advertise interests in order to

attract someone with whom they will be compatible. They select mates based on shared interests and do not focus just on being sexually compatible. These results do not challenge the idea that some gay men seek only sexual relationships and advertise traits and interests with that in mind. Instead, these findings indicate that a variety of relationship types are sought by gay men and with this, suitable tactics will be employed.

In regards to Personality characteristics, hypothesis four, although the percentages were in the expected direction with advertisers mentioning *Long Term* and *Intimate* relationships more likely to specify Personality traits, this relationship was not significant.

We can see that what the individual expects or wants to happen with the other person influences the tactics and strategies used. In the personal ads, these are reflected in the descriptions of what is sought and offered.

Overall, these findings indicate that the goal for the relationship is a variable important to consider when examining human courtship signaling patterns. I have shown that people are motivated by their intentions when selecting a potential partner. As cited in Laner and Kamel (1978), Lee stated that potential mates are selected based on the individuals 'love style'. This seems to suggest that knowing a person's sexual tastes or interests is

incomparable with any other knowledge one can acquire from the individual, such as other traits or characteristics they may have cited. My study, on the other hand, has shown that some men do desire a Long Term or Intimate relationship and information regarding a potential partner's nonsexual interests is often more desirable than knowing about the individual's 'love style'. Individuals seeking a permanent relationship seem to care less about sexual traits than those seeking a sexual relationship (14% versus 29%). Likewise for sexual interests, men interested in sexual relationships were more likely to mention this in comparison to those men interested in a permanent relationship (23.3% versus 14.7%). Whether these findings reflect a behavioral shift or some specific characteristic inherent in advertisers, such as age, remains to be seen. It is possible that focusing on ads allows us to extend our knowledge to men that are older, while in the bars the focus has been on younger individuals. In addition, most of the literature available on gay men and signaling patterns focused on gay bars where sexual explicitness is common and the type of relationships sought are mostly sexual. Focusing on gay men in other contexts allows for a different view of how gay men signal.

Finally, this shift could be a result of the AIDS epidemic as well. This topic certainly merits further

investigation to clarify the picture of gay men in our society.

In the future, it would be interesting to replicate this study and include heterosexuals and lesbians as well. This would be advantageous because discovering if they use different tactics or approaches based on the goal for the relationship as well would seem to strengthen the hypothesis that relationship intent influences signaling strategies. In addition, if we should discover that other groups do not vary their signaling patterns by intent, this further supports the notion that gay men follow unique sequences. Either way, including individuals of different gender and orientation aids in the interpretation of how intention affects strategies executed.

It would also be beneficial to use a different method for gathering the data such as questionnaires or interviews, to examine if goals for the relationship influence traits desired in a prospective mate. This would be fruitful because it provides the opportunity to discover whether their strategies vary directly with the goal they have in mind. Further, obtaining respondents from other contexts such as the bars or universities would be of value. Then it would be possible to compare goals and tactics as well as ages to see if they differ in any way. They may differ because someone younger may have a better chance of finding

a sexual partner than an older individual. Therefore, it is possible that a younger person has more offers for a sexual relationship and thus may desire a purely sexual relationship more often. In addition, they may be less interested in information regarding the other person's nonsexual interests because they are more interested in a sexual relationship. Moreover, since I am unsure of what percentage of the population actually advertise, it would be useful to generalize results to other populations.

One of the problems with this study is that I do not know how representative this sample of advertisers is of the gay community. However, there are numerous reasons for the decision to limit my study to personal advertisements. First, I was able to use random sampling. I was capable of swaying from the traditional bar focus. In addition, I did accomplish what I set out to achieve. I was able to demonstrate that what gay men described as desired relationships in 1978 has changed in 1998. The percentages indicate that in 1978 gay men were more interested in sexual relationships, whereas in 1998 they seemed to desire more intimate relationships. Furthermore, I was also able to test whether or not desires of certain characteristics or traits would be affected depending on the type of relationship expected or anticipated without worrying whether people have altered their responses.

Finally, some of the hypotheses tested found support for the notion that different relationship goals produce different signaling patterns. In all cases the relationships were weak, nevertheless, some of them were significant. I have shown that the relationship goal does affect signaling patterns. Those individuals seeking a multidimensional relationship were least likely to mention Sexual Physical Traits and Sexual Interests. In addition, individuals seeking a multidimensional relationship were more interested in information regarding the other person's nonsexual interests. This suggests that gay men seeking a multidimensional relationship find it important to be compatible with one another on a level other than the sexual.

In conclusion, this study suggests that there are changes in the types of relationships gay men are seeking over the last twenty years. Also, it seems that gay men choose signaling strategies based on their goal for the relationship. This may explain why some gay men are more sexually explicit and direct. Simply put, they have chosen to execute this strategy because a purely sexual relationship is what they desire. Even though it would be a good idea to replicate this study to increase confidence levels, this study supports the growing body of literature

that addresses the complexity and multidimensionality of gay men's sexual and relational lives.

VIII. BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Achilles, N.(1967). "The Development of the Homosexual Bar as an Institution". In John H. Gagnon and William Simon (Eds.), Sexual Deviance. Harpor and Row, New York, pp. 228-244.
- Bell, A.P. and Weinberg M.S.(1978). Homosexualities: A Study of Diversity Among Men and Women. Simon and Schuster, New York.
- Bell, A.P. and Weinberg, M.S.(1987-89). Homosexualities. Mitchell Bearzley Publishers, London.
- Blumstein, P. and Schwartz, P.(1989). "Intimate Relationships and the Creation of Sexuality". In Risman, Barbara J. and Schwartz Pepper (Eds.), Gender in Intimate Relationships: A Microstructural Approach. California: Wadsworth Publishing Company, pp. 120-129.
- Buss, D. M.(1987). "Sex Differences in Human Mate Selection Criteria: An Evolutionary Perspective". In C. Crawford, M. Smith, and D. Krebs (Eds.), Sociobiology and Psychology: Issues, Goals, and Findings. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum, pp. 120-129.
- Cameron, C., Oskamp, S., and Sparks, M.(1977). "Courtship American Style: Newspaper Ads". Family Coordinator. Vol. 26, pp. 27-30.
- Clark, D.(1977). Loving Someone Gay. Celestial Arts, Milbrae, CA.
- Daly, M. and Wilson, M.(1983). Sex, Evolution, and Behavior. Second Edition. Willard Grant Press, Boston.
- Davidson, A. G.(1991). "Looking for Love in the Age of AIDS: The Language of Gay Personals, 1978-1088". The Journal of Sex Research. Vol. 28, No. 1, pp. 125-137.

- Deaux, K. and Hanna, R. (1984). "Courtship in the Personals Column: The Influence of Gender and Sexual Orientation". Sex Roles. Vol. 11, Nos. 5/6 pp.363-375.
- DeWeerth, C. and Kalma, A. (1995). "Gender Differences in awareness of Courtship Initiation Tactics". Sex Roles. Vol. 32, Nos. 11/12, pp. 717-734.
- Fisher, P. (1972). The Gay Mystique: The Myth and Reality of Male Homosexuality. Stan and Day Publisher, New York.
- Grammer, K. (1989). "Human Courtship Behavior: Biological Basis and Cognitive Processing". In C. Bogel and E. Boland (Eds.), The Sociobiology of Sexual and Reproductive Strategies. Chapman and Hall, London.
- Greer, A. E. and Buss, D. M. (1994). "Tactics for Promoting Sexual Encounters". The Journal of Sex Research. Vol. 31. No. 3, pp. 185-201.
- Harry, J. (1983). "Gay Male and Lesbian Family Relationships". In E. Macklin (Ed.), Contemporary Families and Alternative Lifestyles: Handbook on Research and Theory. Sage, Beverly Hills, CA.
- Hoffman, M. (1968). The Gay World: Male Homosexuality and the Social Creation of Evil. Basic Books, New York, pp. 46-49.
- Hooker, E. (1967). "The Homosexual Community". In John H. Gagnon and William Simon (Eds.), Sexual Deviance. Harper and Row, New York.
- Laner, M. R. and Kamel, G. W. L. (1978). "Media Mating I: Newspaper 'Personal' Ads of Homosexual Men". Journal of Homosexuality. Vol. 3, No. 2, pp. 149-162.

- Laner, M. R. (1978). "Media Mating II: 'Personal' Advertisements of Lesbian Women". Journal of Homosexuality. Vol. 4, No. 1, pp. 41-61.
- Lee, J. A. (1976). "Forbidden Colors of Love: Patterns of Gay Love and Gay Liberation". Journal of Homosexuality. Vol. 1, No. 4, pp. 401-418.
- Leznoff, M. and Westley, A. W. (1956). "The Homosexual Community". Social Problems. Vol. 3, Nos. 4, pp. 257-263.
- Moore, M. M. (1985). "Nonverbal Courtship Patterns in Women: Context and Consequences". Ethology and Sociobiology. Vol. 6, pp. 237-247.
- Morris, D. (1973). "Sexual Intimacy". In E. S. Morrison and V. Borage (Eds.), Human Sexuality: Contemporary Perspectives. National Press Books, Palo Alto, CA. pp. 18-22.
- Pepalau, L. A. and Gordon, S. L. (1982). "The Intimate Relationships of Lesbians and Gay Men". In E. R. Allgeier and N. B. McCormick (Eds.), Gender Roles and Sexual Behavior. Mayfield, Palo Alto, CA..
- Perper, T. and Weis, L. D. (1987). "Proceptive and Rejective Strategies of U.S. and Canadian College Women". The Journal of Sex Research. Vol. 23, No. 4, pp. 455-480.
- Sergios P. and Cody J. (1988). "Importance of Physical Attractiveness and Social Assertiveness Skill in Male Homosexual Dating Behavior and Partner Selection". In John P. DeCecco (Ed.), Gay Relationships. The Haworth Press Inc., New York, NY.
- Singer, B. L. and Deschamps, D. (1994). Gay and Lesbian Stats. The New Press, New York.

- Symons, D. (1979). The Evolution of Human Sexuality. Oxford University Press, New York.
- Tanner, D. M. (1978). The Lesbian Couple. D. C. Health and Company, Lexington, Massachusetts, pp. 66-69.
- Triver, R. L. (1972). "Parental Investment and Sexual Selection". In B. Campbell (Ed.), Sexual Selection and the Descent of Man. Chicago: Aldine, pp. 136-179.
- Weinberg, M. (1970). "The Male Homosexual: Age-Related Variations in Social and Psychological Characteristics". Social Problems. Vol. 17, pp. 527-238.
- Weinberg, M. S. and Williams, C. J. (1974). Male Homosexuals: Their Problems and Adaptations. Oxford University Press, New York, pp. 29-30.

IX. APPENDICES

APPENDIX ONE

APPEARANCE

'colt model'
'cowboy'
'not fem'
good looking/looks good
hot
fit/in shape
masculine
no fats
straight acting/looking
stud/ly
virile
chesty
openly gay
'cool' dude
'fem'
'frat guy'
all American
appearing totally bottom
attractive
average looking
butch
clean cut
cub
cute
exotic
frat jock
freshman type
great looking/great looks
handsome
hot/muscle jocks
stud/hunk
incredible body
jock
leather crotches
macho
muscle man
nerd
good/nice looking
non-visible gay
nordic-type
not good looking
outdoors type
pre-operation transsexual

preppy type
runner
porn model
sexy
smaller
strong
takes care of body
teddy bear
top quality
transvestite
ugly
'cool'
any size
artist type
athlete
black jeans and boots
coach
college jock
cop
decent body
decent looking
farm guys
fireman
heavy
in black socks
in cowboy boots
late youth
leather
marine
no 'queens'
no drag
no tvs (transvestites)
pleasant looking
punk
rock star looks
rugged
soap opera type
solid
southern guy
southern guys in tight wranglers
southern men
stud/no stud
youthful
boyish
late youth

APPENDIX TWO

RELATIONSHIP GOAL

Long Term

seeking long term/permanent relations
for lifetime
life long relationship
life partner
lifemate
lifemate or members
lifemate/partner
lifetime companion
lifetime relationship
lifetime thing

Intimate

buddy
companion
guidance in supportive environment
friend/ship
live-in situation possible
lover
possibly more than friendship
special/best friend
love, home and support
soulmate
to share life
appreciation
be my guy
care and respect
caring
casual recreation
closeted companion
commitment
correspond about common interest
conversation
correspond/meet
dating
dinner
discreet friendship
pen pal
enjoy life
homestead with me
explore world together
for workouts, wrestling, biking
for weekend or lifetime
fun sharing intimacy/showers

fun
get together
good fun
good home
good time/s
interesting companion
intimacy
lasting relationship
let's communicate
let's enjoy being together
masculine friendship
live in
live rent free
live with me
love
love one man with all that he has
love and care for
loving/caring relationship
loyal friendship
make love
roomate
mutual supportive friendship
monogomous relationship
nights of wine dine and fun
pal/good buddy
one on one relationship
quiet laughter
partner
old fashioned relationship
quiet times together
real love
real relationship
regular, reliable fun
relationship
lover
ride off into sunset together
romance
romantic and affectionate times
share life
share life and dreams
share life with
share life's great adventures
someone who seeks family setting
up close/personal
warm cuddles
warm, loving relationship
affection
be like a real couple
close personal relationship
connect
conversation

cuddling
date/dinner
domestic bliss
friend or more
friends +
fun and pleasure
fun times
go to dinner/dining in
have a good time
honest love
kiss, cuddle and teach me new things
lots of love
male bonding
meaningful/serious relationship
monogamous
move in
much to share
mutual intimacy
needed loving/love
no one nighters
not just sex
meet friends
quiet evenings
roomate
sexual experience or relationship
share future
share home
share interests and life/share interests
share movies, dinner, good times
share quality time with
share themselves
share wealth
spend quality time with/intimacy
to be with/spend time
to share comfortable life
to share estate
to wine and dine
walking
helper/partner
looking for a special bud
seeking mr. right/wonderful
to hang out

Vanilla

jerk off
phone sex
wants to cum
hot, wild and romantic times
to jerk off together
anxious to explore gay sex first time

best bj to completion
demand hot oral attention
discreet encounters
encounters
first timer
fuck buddies
get busy with
good rubdown
guys that want to be served
hot no strings sex
hot oral service
hot rimming sessions
hot romance
hot sex
hot times
hot, wild times
mutual pleasure
mutual rubdowns
oral service
oral sex and mutual masturbation
orally service front and rear
party and play with
phone sex
play mate
pound mouth with cock after jerk off
provide an enjoyable experience
satisfy me
service
service orally
service your pit, balls, cock
sex
sex without limits
sexual fun
use me to satisfy you
use my butt and mouth
being served orally
being undressed
bj/give oral
causal sex
creative tongue/throat massage
deep hole action
for hot times
fuck buddies
fucking
fun in bed
give/recieve head
great sex
hot discreet sex
hot encounters
hot sex
hot time

hot times in the country
mutual masturbation
needs hot sex
oral action
oral expert
oral novice
oral sex
petting
phone sex
ready to serve/serve
satisfy sexually
seeks anal sex
serving at the y, my only pleasure
sucks all
teach joys of being a bottom
to please
trade sucks
wild, hot mutual fantasy fulfillment
wild, no limits, no holes barred time
will please
call, jerk off and listen
clean mouth to suck
discreet fun
entertainment on phone/in person
let's get naked
massage and fun
passion
help with fantasies
man lover
meet in hotel room
no attachments
no long term
looking to be naked with other men
no rough play
not kinky
seek men to please
play toy
no s/m
what ever the imagination allows
first experience
looking for spice
nothing kinky
one nighters
play mate
stop/satisfy desires
to play with
totally satisfy

Variations

explore boots, bondage, shaving
disposed for erotic pleasure
be kinky and dominant
continuous correction
enemas
erotic fun
exchange cock photos
exchange dirty underwear
exotic pleasure
fetishes
ff (fist or foot fuck) this pussy hole
filthy, sadistic master
full oral body worship fantasy
hot sex (hard core)
let's get kinky
shaving
live in for humility training/total control
long hot sessions
paddle my butt
raunch wet fun
shaving buddy
smell dirty jockies
smelly foot master
submissive foot pig
submit to sexually
third partner
three way
toilet training
toy
two on one
watch other guys in public/discreet
watch you doing my lover
who needs discipline
wild times
will train
body worship/worship body
worship smelly feet
bite, chew and make tit hurt
perform medical procedures
bondage
bondage slave
exchange underwear
service for hot feet
gang bangs
good foot time
looking for sm to guide, teach
other couples
service two others
show me my place

smell and kiss socks
good or severe spanking/spanking
three way interaction
willing to train
worship
worship body, tongue shine boots
worshipped
share raunchy times by phone/mail
submission
total ownership
exchange hot stories, pix, undies

Other

dad
houseboy
offer benefits
offer relocation paid
son
husband
possible help with gym supplements
seeks to be admired
adventures
big brother/brother
father figure
get together w/men escorts for fun
happiness
host
interpreter for hearing impaired
looking to meet others
meet
meet others
meet service bb and muscular athlete
no head games
brother
help with body building goals
ltr sponsor
offer private quarters
offer salary
seeking new life
write me
not looking for a free ride
seeking career in entertainment
share estate
apply favorite holds/try to escape
get admired, appreciated more
handle unique fun lifestyle
help with chores, cleaning, errands
home
hook up with me

houseman
light or intensive 'workouts'
making videos
meet another cowboy/horse person
meet influential people
meet someone
mentor
no games
no inmates
no reciprocation
promote and help financially
respect/respected
whose who can appreciate his quality
to smoke with, must inhale
travel
wrestle with
adventure
correspond/meet
enjoy living life to the fullest
filmed
for photo/video exchange
free visits/visits
good living
help get a head
hook up
interesting music
kid brother
leave loveless unhappy relationship
need a real man
no professional hustlers
no sex
no strings
obedient
passionate play
photographed
play/playing house
rebuild my faith in men
room/board
spoil me
sweep me off my feet
treat person nice
offering courses, miracle, science
pleasure
puppy like relationship
role playing
sailing in the Caribbean south pacific
seeks guy photos
spiritual mentor
to show off
trade/exchange photos/videos
dad type

admired
available for lone entertainment
enjoy
for quality future
fulfill needs
great benefit
help perfect my technique
honor
house/yard work
kick back
leather exhibitionist
looking for new future
no affection wanted/reciprocation
no sexual expectations
photos
relax
some contact
support
take me away from here
tutoring
veg. good
wants company
watch videos
weekend mountain get togethers
weekend pleasure
needing relief
big brother or daddy type
straight/married/bi
no married

APPENDIX THREE

NONSEXUAL INTERESTS

enjoy international travel
good company
having fun
have many interests
likes adventure
motorcycle rider
not into bar scene
sports fan
travel
antiques
beach
camping
country
fishing
movies
outdoors
rollercoaster
travel possible
works out/working out
animals
Anne Rice
anti bars, gay settings
bikers
books
California, Arizona winters
cards
ceramics
cigars
classical music
close dancing
clubs
collecting postcards
cooking
country music
crafts
craves deep conversation
dance/dancing
dining out/dinners/eating out
football
gardening
geology
good company, conversation
good cook
good food
guitars
stable lifestyle

see movies
hang out
health and fitness
hiking
horse ranchers
horses
jogger
likes beer
likes cigars
likes food
piercings
loves country
loves family
many interests/fantasies
moon lit nights
mountain, hiking, exploring
mountains
music
natural medicine
nature
no bars
not into bar scene
opera
paranormal events
parks
pets
photography
primitive community life
quiet evenings at home
quiet intimate times/quiet times
racquet ball/tennis
reading
romance
romantic evenings
romantic music
sci-fi
sight seeing
skier
smoking Virginia slims/big cigars
talk
techno music
theater
travel/traveling
travels extensively
treks
upper midwest summers
videos
walks
walks on the beach
watching and making videos
water boating

water skiing
water/snow boarding
weight lifting
whfs radio
writing
art
baseball
biking
books
camping
chat
classical music
cleaning
computers
concerts
cooking
straight lifestyle
cuddles/cuddling
enjoy romance
enjoy sports
fitness
work
gardening
going out
good conversation
hockey
horticulture
interested in the arts
into health and fitness
love to have fun
my dog
not into bar scene
not into clubs
plays
quiet evenings at home
real estate
running
sailing
shopping
spending time with special friends
sunshine
swimming
talks
tennis
wildlife
tattoos
career
massage
people/meeting new people

APPENDIX FOUR

PERSONALITY

caring
discreet
down to earth
driven
focused
great attitude towards life
honest
intelligent
interesting person
sincere
smart
unique
affectionate
fun
generous
live life to the fullest
nice
no hang ups
open minded
active
adventurous/sense of adventure
aggressive
ambitious
curious
comfortable with himself
crazy
distinguished
dominant
easy going
energetic
friendly
fun
funny
generous
gentle
gentleman
genuine
good natured
good personality
humorous
eager
liberal
love to make people laugh
loving/amourous
loyal
mature

entertaining
no control freaks
no ego
non-judgemental
not shy
on time
open to new ideas/try new things
passionate
passive
pleasant
reliable
respects limits
responsible
romantic
sane
self assured
sensitive
sense of humour
sensual
serious
shy
flexible
neat
southern charmer
spiritual
stable
strong
twisted sense of humour
very outgoing
vulnerable
with a mind
with heart
with no attitudes
witty
wonderful
assertive
cocky
common sense
confident attitude
demanding
dependable
emotionally mature
emotionally stable
enthusiastic
fun loving
giving
good
good character
good humor
great attitude
hard working

heart of gold
kind
laid back
no unforgiving attitude
not swishy
patient
quiet
charmer
like to showoff
stable
strict
sweet
tender
true blue
unpretentious
upbeat
warm
well balanced
quick learner
nasty
no vanity
outgoing

APPENDIX FIVE

SEXUAL INTERESTS

bottom
is, gives, or wants oral
top
slave
'69' time/'69'
'doctor'
'patient'
anything from vanilla to very kinky
love raunch videos
bj's
butt munch a+
rimming
cop's uniforms
craves hot and sweaty times
enemas
enjoy's giving bj's
exhibitionist
fantasy
fr/a(giving)
fr/a(no reciprocation)
give hot services
gr/p(recieving)
handballing
hot, hard sweaty times
ropes
into all twisted sex scenes
into being satisfied
into love making
couples/singles/three
into other encounters
into showing off
into steamy times with hot buddies
into toys
j/o sessions
kink
kinky love
kissing
obedient lacky
light bondage
likes sex
long hot sessions
loves being serviced
loves cock
loves feet
loves getting into feet, boots
loves providing oral service

loves sex
man toy/pussy toy
master
muscle toy
muscle worship
mutual j/o
mutual oral
needs more affection
needs oral, anal, rimming service
no anal
nudist
open to your pooh adventure
nylons
oral expert
oral pleasures
oral sex slave
pig
"into" preppy attire
rimming
role playing
scat
seeks someone to ff him
sexy underwear
shaving
slave
sniff dirty underwear
spank me/spankings
spitting
talented tongue
toilet training
tt (tit torture)
uniforms
verbal abuse
toys and ass play
video exchange/videos
voyeur
watersports
worn spots of heels of sock at
'producer'
takes anal
'protégé'
be 'creative'
into bikinis/bikini undies
blind folded
chains/lock and key
cock server
cruising
enjoys nudism
enjoys oral stimulation
enjoys oral action
erotic candle light massage

exchanging underwear
exhibitionist
sucking
foot lover
foot/leather worship
fucking
gives oral
good foot time
insatiable sex drive
into boots
slowly stroked to safe release
into cbt (cock and ball torture)
into ff (fist or foot fucking)
into light b/d
into tights
knows hot to make tit hurt
slave 'toy/crotch'
light b/d, w/s, jockstrap
sexual submissive toy
like to be tied
likes to be orally serviced
loves eating ass
loves socks
make love
making out
masochist
more than one
multiples
mutual '69'
sadist

APPENDIX SIX

PHYSICAL INDICATORS

General Physical Traits

athletic/gym body, pro bb
bald/bald head
eye color
goatee
hair color
height
husky/stocky/hunky
lean/lanky
muscular
smooth/soft body
trim
great/nice smile
hairy
skinny, thin or short, small body
slim or slender body
toned
average or med build or body
bb (body builder)/athletes
beard/bearded
beefy
chubby, fat or heavy body or overweight
clean shaven
crew cut
dark complexion
firm/hard
good/great body
great chest
hairless/not hairy
hairy, hairy(chest), fur all over/furry
husky/musky
light facial hair
little chest hair
mustache
nice build/built
no heavy weights
no overweights/not fat
no tattoos
other measurements (waist, arms, chest)
seeks xl-xxl
shaved head
six pack tummy
solid
tattoo/tattooed
bare body

brush cut
buff
bulky
cesear
chiseled
clean shaven
light skin
long hair
overweight (slightly)
pierced/piercings
stomach ok
tan
wavy hair
weight
bear
swimmer
big
power lifter
smooth chest
senior
young/younger
old/older
tall
tall or short
middle aged
deaf
average height
septuagenarior (man in his seventies)
body builder

Sexual Physical Traits

penis (loose skin)
hung
not circumcised
extremely well hung
big arms/feet
big balls
big cock
big dicked
bubble butt
circumcised
endowed
horse hung
hot ass
hot feet
huge
huge (penis)
hung

round beefy butt
shaved hole
smooth, ticklish stocking feet
thick and big
well hung
white butts
well endowed
foot size
large nipples
nice feet
penis type (small)
penis size
shaved balls
small endowed welcome
small hung
thick
great tongue
hot mouth
tight ass and tongue

APPENDIX SEVEN

HEALTH

clean
healthy
HIV negative
no drugs
non smoker
safe 'fun'
disease free
HIV positive
light drink
no std's
non drinker
safe
safe sex
smoker
social drinker
drinker
drug free
no drunks
smoker

APPENDIX EIGHT

UNDEFINED TERMS

bigger tamer
hand glider
innertubes
chewing gum
long intellectual smoke/cigar
JLC
vb willing slave master
L/D
LA
OC
PS
NFL, NBA, MLB, NHL, PGA
Batman seeks his Robin
Concord/MTZ GR8, tna
shaved/GR with goatee
Nationally recognized PGB
PBL racial male
seeks IL/IN bottom for deep hole action
seeks GM with small meat for hot hook ups
MON CTY HVY
BBM
HWP
H/W prop
LL
bat the ball round with you,
leather sandal worship
seeking higher stats than you
freat, soul, mind, body
tired of sheep
very attractive CD
MD
handballing
WTD
G/A, Fa/P, d/f, G/p
GW
Radical Fairies, Queer Spirit, WICCA,
sex magic