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Social structure and homosexuality: a theoretical appraisal

I

Until very recently sociologists have shown a marked lack of systematic or theoretically oriented interest in patterns of homosexual behaviour. As a form of 'deviant behaviour' homosexuality has attracted attention in the literature on social problems; but in that literature it is singularly lacking in the sort of theoretical attention which has been devoted to, for example, delinquency.¹ A recent, and much quoted, book such as that of Schofield confined its explicitly sociological attention to the value relevant distinction between 'nonconformist' and 'aberrant' in the writings of Merton.² More recently, in a strong plea for the application of sociological concepts in this area, Simon and Gagnon open up fruitful perspectives through the application of role theory; and consideration of how the commitment of the individual to the homosexual role interacts, through each stage of his career, with the complex of his other roles, occupational, familial, religious, etc.³ McCaghy and Skipper commend this approach, and suggest a complementary perspective in which consideration is given to social structural factors which may be conducive towards homosexual behaviour, developing this theme through an examination of the occupational structure of the striptease profession in the eastern U.S.A., and its relationship with lesbianism.⁴

In this paper we are concerned to extend and generalize this insight into the significance of social structural considerations for the understanding of homosexuality: we attempt to isolate and describe some specifically social determinants of the incidence of homosexual behaviour among both men and women. Lest we be misunderstood, however, we

¹ A. E. Ashworth B.Sc.(Econ.) Lecturer in Sociology, University College, Cardiff
² W. M. Walker B.Com. Ph.D. Lecturer in Sociology, University College, Cardiff
³ The authors wish to express their thanks to Professor Paul Halmo of University College, Cardiff, and to Dr Helmut Heisler, of Lancaster Polytechnic, for their assistance on an earlier version of the paper. Thanks are also due to Liuba Natova and Judith Walker for comment and information on various aspects.
must emphasize that it is no part of our endeavour to explain all homosexual behaviour and homosexual predispositions in terms of social factors. In our view a complete theory accounting for this form of behaviour would have to include psychological, probably biological, and possibly other classes of variables in addition to the social. We are concerned here only with differential rates of homosexual behaviour and their relationship with different social settings.

Apart from the limited literature cited above, most theories of homosexual behaviour to date are reducible to two major categories: the biological and the psychological. Biological theories tend to explain homosexuality in terms of either genetic factors or hormone imbalance. However, as Davis has pointed out, it seems unlikely that genetic factors play a significant role since homosexuals would tend to reproduce less than heterosexuals, and if homosexuality were genetically determined, it would constantly be bred against; and empirical studies to establish the significance of both genetic and hormonal factors have produced conflicting and highly indeterminate results. Psychological theories seem more plausible, and are, perhaps, better supported by empirical evidence. Such theories tend to relate homosexuality to particular constellations of family relationships experienced by the child. In no way do we wish to criticize the validity of this perspective; however, it is a basic sociological premise that socialization into new roles is a process that continues throughout the lifespan of the individual, closely related to the structured social situations through which the individual passes. Thus an overconcern with the child-focused psychological perspective may inhibit appreciation of the importance of factors structuring adolescent and adult roles. In the extreme case, we see no reason why some individuals may not become active homosexuals during adulthood without ever having been latent homosexuals in earlier life. More generally, we propose that structured social situations in later life play a significant part in determining patterns of release, or suppression, of tendencies developed in childhood, into actual homosexual, or heterosexual behaviour; that it is necessary to relate some part of the total pattern of homosexuality to sociological factors.

If one examines the assumptions that commentators on homosexuality from a range of scientific and moral viewpoints bring to the analysis of homosexuality one finds something analogous to the economists' model of perfect competition: if, in a given society, there are approximately equal numbers of men and women, then, in numerical terms, all men have equal opportunity to secure a woman; and all women have equal opportunity to secure a man. The implicit assumption is that parity in terms of numbers implies parity in terms of accessibility; and that free competition in the society between men for women and women for men will result, and should result, in the eventual pairing of the sexes. Thus, for example, Andrzejewski, writing about monoga-
amous societies, comments: 'Some additional pleasures may be inaccessible to the poor but no man needs to be deprived of a mate.'

Seen in this manner, homosexuality would clearly appear as abnormal, idiosyncratic, and primarily a problem for the psychiatrist. Similarly the early economists viewed monopoly as abnormal and undesirable. However, economic theory progressed to the realization that features of the social structure systematically impede parity of access to the market; imperfect competition is the rule, and is often desirable; perfect competition is the limiting case. In relation to the phenomenon of homosexuality we wish here to question the assumption that parity of numbers implies parity of access. We suggest that the theoretical rationale behind it is weak, and that it is empirically undemonstrated; that it describes not the normal situation present in most societies, but a particular, and perhaps seldom found limiting case: in a similar fashion to what has happened to perfect competition in the economic system, the realization of perfect competition between members of one sex for partners of the opposite sex is systematically impeded by forces which are present in the structure of most societies.

Our major premise relating to homosexuality is as follows, expressed in its most abstract form: if, in any society, or any group within that society the access of members of one sex to members of the opposite sex for erotic, companionship or marriage purposes is persistently obstructed by features of the social structure, then there will be a tendency in the collectivities concerned towards both a relatively high incidence of homosexual behaviour and a relatively tolerant attitude towards such behaviour. In short, institutionalized homosexuality will emerge: a behavioural pattern and a supporting culture, or subculture, will develop and be maintained for at least as long as the obstruction continues. This premise logically implies and summarizes the empirical illustrations which we shall present. It points to an essential similarity between what may appear superficially as disparate instances of homosexual behaviour; and it relates to both male and female homosexuality. A qualification must be entered relating to the nature of the groups, as distinct from whole societies, concerned. These must be such that for the individuals involved they constitute a salient and significant source of their total social experience in terms of time, emotional attachment and self-conception. Such groups must have at least some of the attributes of communities.

II

In this section of the paper we consider some major cultural and structural factors which systematically impede the realization of perfect accessibility between the two sexes. The first factor is the existence of cultural values and norms which function to regulate heterosexual rela-
tions. In all known societies there are rules specifying the conditions, often fairly rigidly circumscribed, under which intercourse may take place between males and females. In some societies such norms have resulted in the institutionalization of single sex communities of various sorts. In such communities the access of one sex to the other is restricted in an obvious and immediately visible way. Much literature has described and documented both the high incidence of homosexual acts in such uni-sex communities as boarding schools, prison and so on, and the existence of fairly strong, though usually informal, normative patterns to sustain and regulate the behaviour.8

The existence of homosexuality in these cases is hardly considered problematical, it being seen as a direct response to a situation where members of the two sexes are physically insulated from each other. This is not to say, of course, that it is not considered morally reprehensible by certain groups and categories of individuals.

In the above cases the relationship between social factors and homosexuality is made highly explicit by the existence of walls, gates, written rules, and so on, but clearly the incidence of homosexual behaviour is not restricted to such communities. We suggest that these physical and formal manifestations of social forces are only one form of socially structured barrier to full heterosexual access; that other rather less obvious but none the less powerful barriers exist. Although there may be others, the major social factor we attempt to relate to homosexuality in this paper is social stratification. We illustrate the proposed relationship at two levels: firstly, with reference to a sub-system within a larger social system; specifically the communities and sub-cultures organized around the theatrical occupations in the United Kingdom and the United States, often referred to as the entertainment world. Secondly, at the level of an inclusive social system our illustration refers to Moslem society. The data used in these illustrations were derived from: (a) a spell of approximately three years participant observation of the theatrical community by one of the authors;9 (b) observation of sectors of Moslem society; and (c) various sources in the literature which are footnoted below.

People who work in the theatrical world form an occupational community. They have a unique set of cognitive, cathectic and evaluative orientations which correspond to the peculiar problems, experiences and needs of their collective existence. A comprehensive description of this sub-culture would be interesting; however, we are here concerned only with the theatrical world's definition of homosexuality. In general a highly tolerant attitude towards most matters sexual is institutionalized. This is extended to sexual behaviours defined by the wider culture as abnormal. Thus no negative sanctions attach to the homosexual. The role is recognized and legitimated by the sub-culture. The homosexual has no need to hide his sexual preferences. The deviant in
the theatre is rather the person who expresses the more usual attitude of intolerance towards homosexuality. The ratio of homosexual males to heterosexual males appears to be higher in this occupation than in any other occupation known to the authors. An interesting fact is that female homosexuals are far less common; the reasons for this will become more clear as we analyse the positions occupied by male and female entertainers within the social stratification system of the U.K.

One of the most decisive objective conditions relating to the class situation of the male entertainer, and one of which he is constantly and acutely aware, is the economic insecurity and uncertainty inherent in the occupation. There are two separate dimensions involved. Firstly there is short run insecurity related to the continuous possibility of unemployment. Generally this is in the nature of theatrical productions and is determined largely by the notoriously unpredictable and capricious tastes and demands of audiences. The degree of competition is high and even when employment is found it is often for an uncertain or limited period of time. This is reflected in the British Equity Standard Contract for Chorus Performers, which defines the relationship between employer and entertainer, and which specifies that employment is guaranteed only for 'the run of the show'. Where the show is a 'hit' this may, of course, be for several years; but in many if not most cases the show runs for a lesser duration. The salient fact for the entertainer is that he can be sure of only two weeks' notice of termination of employment. There are seasonal productions such as pantomimes and summer shows in which the entertainer can be reasonably certain of employment for two or three months. However, these cases of relatively certain employment involve at the most six months of the year, and filling in between seasons can be a highly uncertain affair. The second dimension of economic insecurity refers to long run career prospects. Employment opportunities in many branches of the entertainment world tend to favour the young; this is especially true in the dancing, singing and skating spheres. This is a matter of considerable concern to the young entertainer, who realizes that if he has not entered the entertainment elite by or during his fourth decade he may be faced with the prospect of leaving the theatre, learning the skills of a new occupation and adjusting to a new way of life.

If we turn now to a second major dimension of economic class position, namely earnings, we find that, the small minority of the elite apart, these are not high. As the government-sponsored careers pamphlet cited above points out, 'a good proportion of actors and, to an even greater extent actresses, are among the lower paid workers of this country.' The existence of television modifies this position somewhat, as even for the chorus type of entertainer fees for television performances can be quite substantial. However, unless the male entertainer has the good fortune to belong to a group which performs regularly on
television (e.g., ‘The Black and White Minstrel Show’), it is unlikely that such fees will greatly augment his yearly income. In summary, then, a fundamental insecurity in employment chances and rather low average earnings for a substantial number of male entertainers combine to determine a relatively low economic status for the male side of the theatrical occupation as a whole.

In so far as occupational prestige is related to economic class, one would thus expect that the male entertainer would occupy a relatively low position in the status hierarchy. Although ‘actor’, probably because of the difficulties of definition, has not been included in occupational prestige studies, it is our impression that this is the case. People do not typically accord a high or even medium level of prestige to male entertainers, unless they be members of the elite. It may well be that factors other than economic status enter into this determination of low status; for instance, the public image of the entertainer is one in which character traits of unreliability and unpredictability are salient. This image probably has some validity. However, it could plausibly be argued that these traits are at least in part determined by the basic insecurity of the occupation.

Thus far in this discussion of the theatrical profession we have been dealing with the position of the male entertainer in relation to the stratification system of the U.K. The position of the female entertainer appears to be substantially different in this respect. Although insecurity of employment applies equally, and her average earnings are also fairly low, a number of other factors would appear to give her significantly higher social prestige. Significant norms in the society at large define dancing, making-up, acting, etc., as more ‘normal’ for girls than for boys; and temporary jobs, fill-in occupations and so on, are also regarded as more normal in a society in which the concept of a life-long professional career for a woman is not firmly and generally established. A high level of female charm in terms of figure, deportment and so on is a necessary condition of employment for most theatrical jobs; and these are qualities which are favourably evaluated outside the theatre and which can carry over into non-theatrical roles in significant ways: modelling; acting as demonstrators or exhibiting adornments at trade fairs and exhibitions, for instance, are favoured fill-in occupations; and the attractive actress is typically both a sought-after companion for social events and a desirable marriage partner for men of relatively high social standing. Thus, through a variety of avenues, she has access to the higher levels of the stratification system.

We suggest that this structured imbalance between the positions of the non-elite male entertainer and the non-elite female entertainer is of fundamental importance in relation to the development of institutionalized homosexuality among males in the theatrical sub-culture. The fact that the male has highly unpredictable and unstable employment
prospects, together with relatively low occupational status, makes him a
less desirable marriage choice for the females within his own occupation
than a man with a higher income, more secure employment, and higher
occupational status. The fact that the female entertainer, having desired
physical qualities, is sought after for erotic purposes, direct and in-
direct, and for companionship and marriage by males outside the
theatre (or elite males within it), means that male entertainers have to
compete on very unequal terms with males of higher socio-economic
status. Such males can afford, for instance, the paraphernalia of court-
ship: the flowers, chocolates, expensive suppers and other costly enter-
tainments.

Given a normally relatively high level of 'occupational endogamy' one might expect this to apply within the theatrical occupation where there are roughly equal numbers of men and women. There are no visible barriers. However, we suggest that we have here a situation of imperfect competition between two categories of males for one category of females. Because of the relatively low socio-economic status of the male entertainer his access to the female entertainer is persistently in-
hibited in a subtle way. Females become, in effect, scarce for the male, because he cannot compete effectively for their favours and time. In this case, as with uni-sex communities, the institutionalization of homo-
sexuality can be seen as a response to a situation where access to mem-
ers of the opposite sex is limited. In the case of the uni-sex community the scarcity derives, slightly indirectly, from the cultural values which regulate heterosexual relations. In the theatrical world it is related to and, at least in part, determined by the values and norms of the system of social stratification.

One might ask why the deprived theatrical male does not turn to
other than theatrical females for gratification of his companionship and
marriage needs. Two factors appear to be of relevance here: firstly his
low socio-economic status makes him a relatively undesirable marriage
partner for most categories of women; and secondly, the geographical
mobility of theatrical performers tends to inhibit the development of
close affectional ties, in many cases a precondition of marriage, with
women external to the profession. 17

Having argued thus far that the socially structured asymmetry of the
positions of male and female entertainers is causally related to the in-
stitutionalization of male homosexuality in the theatrical world we can
now further illustrate our more general point about social barriers to
one-to-one male–female partnerships where there is no numerical
imbalance by consideration of a deviant case. McCaghy and Skipper
have presented evidence on the relatively high rate of homosexual be-
haviour found in one category of female entertainers, namely strippers.
In accounting for this they cite one of the factors we have mentioned,
geographical mobility; but the major reasons they adduce are clearly
related to social stratification, particularly the status dimension. They report that the strippers frequently attempt to conceal their occupational identity in public, 'preferring to call themselves dancers, entertainers, and the like', in order to raise their perceived status; as strippers, they are regarded off-stage by men as easily available 'sex objects'; and in general as 'stupid', 'uneducated', and 'lower-class'. If they form liaisons with 'respectable' or 'nice' men, they quickly find themselves under pressure to give up their occupation; alternatively 'they seem to be involved with more than their fair share of rough, unemployed males who are more than happy to enjoy their paycheck'. Thus here we have a category of 'non-respectable' female entertainers who find that the low status of their occupation (despite comparatively good financial rewards) makes it very difficult for them to strike up lasting relationships with 'nice guys'; and who find it preferable to adopt lesbian behaviour patterns, although many have basically heterosexual preferences, rather than to accept relationships with men on the terms which are available to them. In short, elements of the stratification system operate systematically to impede the stripper's chances of securing a socially acceptable male companion and marriage partner.

Hitherto we have argued for a connection between homosexuality and social stratification, and illustrated this at the level of a sub-system within a society. We would here like to suggest, and illustrate briefly, that the idea can prove fruitful if applied to the analysis of homosexuality at the level of a whole society. We believe that a clear example of the relationship between homosexuality and stratification at the societal level occurs in Moslem societies. According to Schofield, 'in the Middle East homosexuality is accepted with tolerant jocularity'. This same orientation is much in evidence in that classic of Islamic literature, *The Book of the Thousand Nights and One Night*; it is well documented in the literature; and accords with one of the authors' observations of Islamic society in Aden, where homosexual relationships between males were a standardized mode of behaviour eliciting few or any negative sanctions. These societies are typically highly stratified. In addition, in law, the Muslim is allowed four wives. Bride price is customary. For example, in Aden during the early 1960s, a sum of £100 or more paid to the bride's father was not uncommon. This represented a considerable sum for Arab families from the lower socio-economic strata, where a man's monthly earnings were of the order of £10–£15. Several factors appear to operate in this situation to produce homosexuality. As women are valued objects, men occupying high socio-economic positions tend to realize their economic advantages and acquire the culturally allowed complement of wives. However, the fact that some men can and do obtain four wives means that females are scarce for other men, and these are men in a disadvantaged economic position. These latter can neither afford the bride price for four women, nor support
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them if by some chance they were acquired; and even one wife is expensive. Thus, for those in the lower socio-economic strata the supply of women is limited at the same time as a period of celibacy is undergone while the bride price for one wife is being accumulated. We see this as another instance of a situation in which stratification operates to limit the access of some categories of men to women. Perfect competition is not present; and institutionalized homosexuality emerges as a response. If the above analysis is valid, it describes a situation essentially similar to that found in the theatrical company.

From the perspective of psychological theories which attempt to explain homosexuality in terms of the effects of the child's early environment one would argue that an alternative explanation of homosexuality in the theatrical world could be found by demonstrating that male entertainers tended, in childhood, to over-identify with their mothers, have been preferred sons of mothers, had over-protective mothers and/or absent or inadequate fathers, and so on and that strippers had had difficult relationships with weak fathers, or mothers, fathers who wanted sons, traumatic experience with men, and so on. This may be so, though to the best of our knowledge it has not been effectively demonstrated with the causal connections established; and even if it were demonstrated there would still be difficulties with this type of explanation. Thus one would still have to explain how actual and/or (even more difficult) latent homosexual males, but not females (except for strippers), presumably previously scattered geographically and randomly throughout the population, had come together at some point in time to institute homosexuality in the entertainment world in particular. As far as we can see there is nothing in the occupational skills, activities and techniques of the average male entertainer which is in any way intrinsically related to homosexual behaviour. An explanation which locates the origin of, and the forces which maintain, the institutionalization of homosexuality in demonstrable features of the social structure avoids these difficulties. Of course, once a situation is institutionalized it has some self-maintaining features as well.

III

From an examination of some of the social causes of homosexuality we now move briefly to some of its functions. These are considered at two separate, though related levels: firstly, at the level of psychological functions. Ward and Kassenbaum, in their analysis of homosexuality in a women's prison, show very effectively how homosexual relationships function to ameliorate deprivations experienced by women prisoners: they establish affectional relationships involving love, interpersonal support, security and social status. In this instance, then, institutionalized homosexuality functioned to maintain psychic equili-
brarium. Similarly the deprivations experienced by males where females are scarce include the diminished possibility of enjoying the whole range of satisfactions which derive from playing the heterosexual role. We would argue that in these circumstances the homosexual role, provided that it is protected by benign cultural support, can function as both a sexual and emotional surrogate, and thus help to sustain ego integrity. If it is granted that a fairly high degree of psychic stability is a necessary condition for the sufficient performance of the wide ranges of roles other than the sexual played by the members of any social system then homosexuality, by providing the individual with psychic support not otherwise available, can clearly make a positive contribution towards the stability of that social system.

In some of the illustrations given above homosexuality has particular relevance for the integrative problem and its associated processes which are concerned with maintaining cooperation and solidarity among system members. Any mechanism which contributes towards the achievement of adequate emotional and social relations among those contributing towards the attainment of the goals of a system or sub-system may be considered as at least predominantly functional for that system. Assuming that human beings have a powerful sex-drive or impulse, and that viable social systems must provide adequate institutionalized outlets for its expression, then those social systems in parts of which members of one sex are scarce have particular problems. Member solidarity, and hence system efficiency, would be attenuated if there existed continuous conflict between members of one sex for the few available members of the opposite sex. The emergence of institutionalized homosexuality, or of some functional alternative, avoids the probability of endemic conflict developing in such a situation: those individuals who cannot establish a secure relationship with a member of the opposite sex are offered an alternative sexual and social status; and the group solidarity necessary for system goal attainment can be maintained.

At this juncture it is appropriate to consider briefly why homosexuality rather than some functional alternative tends to emerge in some situations as a response to structured psychic needs. Heterosexual prostitution, auto-eroticism, bestiality and various forms of sexual sublimation are all alternatives which have been known to operate. However, while the first three all allow the direct release of sexual impulse, they do not allow for the expression of emotional needs for companionship, and prolonged, intimate contact with other human beings; and the fourth probably does not provide sufficient release on the first count for the majority of people. Thus homosexuality, particularly where it involves fairly prolonged relationships, which is probably much more common than most research to date has emphasized, may provide, in many situations, a more functional and more appro-
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appropriate response, for both individual and social system needs, than these alternatives; in any case, in urban situations at least, partners of the same sex are much more easily available than suitable animals, and cheaper than prostitutes.

IV

In conclusion, the main elements of our argument are reiterated, and some inferences drawn. Firstly, the assumption that perfect competition between members of each sex for members of the opposite sex is the general rule throughout most societies is questioned. Secondly, it is argued that, assuming that human beings have a powerful sexual impulse, the emergence of institutionalized homosexuality in a situation where members of the opposite sex are scarce is both a plausible and likely behavioural and cultural response. Thirdly, it is hypothesized that social factors may frequently impede perfect accessibility between the sexes. Two social factors are considered in this connection: firstly, cultural factors operating to institute uni-sex communities; and secondly, social stratification, whose workings were illustrated by reference to the theatrical community and Moslem society where women become scarce for men of relatively low socio-economic status, and to the occupation of stripping, where acceptable men are scarce for women in an occupation of low prestige. Thus, it is argued, the social structure generates an impulse towards institutionalized homosexuality.

If the above analysis is valid some more general inferences may be drawn relating to the phenomenon of homosexuality. In the first instance one could argue that, uni-sex communities apart, in so far as stratification is inherent in social systems, and in so far as it obstructs perfect competition between potential marriage partners, there will be a tendency for homosexuality to emerge and become institutionalized. In other words, homosexuality may be statistically normal in any given sample of societies; and it would also be normal in the sense that it is an appropriate and functional response, at both the individual and societal level, to a situation found in many societies. From this it would follow that the sociologist might recommend caution to those social commentators who define homosexuality as a social problem, or as a form of deviant or abnormal behaviour. If they managed to excise homosexuality from a society without possibly far-reaching adjustments to, say, its stratification system, the consequences might be less desirable than the original condition.
Notes


5. In Merton and Nisbet, op. cit., p. 343.
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10. Reliable comparative data on the occupational incidence of homosexuality are not available at present. There are suggestions that painting, hairdressing and interior decorating, for instance, are other occupations of high incidence, but the evidence is virtually non-existent. See, e.g., M. Leznoff and W. A. Westley, ‘The Homosexual Community’, Social Problems, vol. 3 (1956), pp. 257–69.

11. A recent careers advice pamphlet prepared by the Department of Employment and Productivity and the Central Office of Information warns the would-be actor that, although a few weeks of ‘resting’ . . . ‘can be quite pleasant . . . a recent survey showed that almost a third of men and women were unemployed for six months or more in the year . . .’ Choice of Careers No. 98: Dancing and Drama, 2nd ed., London, H.M.S.O., 1969, p. 26.

12. Ibid., p. 12.


14. In 1969 the basic minimum pay for both actors and dancers was £12 a week. This was frequently the rate paid in minor companies, in provincial shows, and for rehearsal time. In the West End the minimum for actors was £18.
per week; and chorus dancers in major London ballet companies received £18–
£23. These rates applied to both men and women.

Film contracts for dancers were usually on a daily basis at £10 per day. T.V.
fees could be, e.g., £30 for a non-
principal, for a 45-minute production
with a week’s rehearsal time.

A survey of earnings conducted for Equity in 1966 showed median earnings
of about £800 a year for men and £450 a year for women, the latter figure re-
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